

From Easy to Hard: The MIR Benchmark for Progressive Interleaved Multi-Image Reasoning

Hang Du^{1*}, Jiayang Zhang^{1*}, Guoshun Nan^{1,†}, Wendi Deng¹, Zhenyan Chen¹,
Chenyang Zhang¹, Wang Xiao¹, Shan Huang¹, Yuqi Pan¹, Tao Qi¹, Sicong Leng²

¹Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications ²Nanyang Technological University

{7597892, zzzjy, nanguo2021, dengwendi02, zhenyanchen}@bupt.edu.cn,

{2650465680, xiaowangsama, huangshan2022, panyuqi2022,}@bupt.edu.cn,

{taoqi.qt, Lengsicong}@gmail.com

Abstract

*Multi-image Interleaved Reasoning aims to improve Multi-modal Large Language Models' (MLLMs) ability to jointly comprehend and reason across multiple images and their associated textual contexts, introducing unique challenges beyond single-image or non-interleaved multi-image tasks. While current multi-image benchmarks overlook interleaved textual contexts and neglect distinct relationships between individual images and their associated texts, enabling models to reason over multi-image interleaved data may significantly enhance their comprehension of complex scenes and better capture cross-modal correlations. To bridge this gap, we introduce a novel benchmark **MIR**, requiring joint reasoning over multiple images accompanied by interleaved textual contexts to accurately associate image regions with corresponding texts and logically connect information across images. To enhance MLLMs' ability to comprehend multi-image interleaved data, we introduce reasoning steps for each instance within the benchmark and propose a stage-wise curriculum learning strategy. This strategy follows an "easy to hard" approach, progressively guiding models from simple to complex scenarios, thereby enhancing their ability to handle challenging tasks. Extensive experiments benchmarking multiple MLLMs demonstrate that our method significantly enhances models' reasoning performance on MIR and other established benchmarks. We believe that MIR will encourage further research into multi-image interleaved reasoning, facilitating advancements in MLLMs' capability to handle complex inter-modal tasks. Our code and dataset are available at <https://github.com/Shelly-coder239/MIRBench>.*

*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding Author

1. Introduction




Figure 1. **An example from MIR.** This question aims to compare the sizes of the “truck” and “palm”. Dashed box content is inferred by the model from context. *Text2Region* connects explicit textual elements (“truck” and “cola”) and implicit objects (“human palm in image3”, “truck in image1”) to image regions. *Region2Region* establishes relationships between these regions, such as the cola and truck in image2, the palm and cola in image3. By reasoning over the relationship between “palm” “Coca-Cola”, and “truck”, the correct size relationship is derived.

Interleaved image-text data refers to a sequence in which multiple images and text segments are dynamically interleaved, creating a cohesive flow that integrates both visual and textual information [10, 11, 49]. Textual content alone often struggles to fully convey complex or nuanced messages [19, 21, 27, 28, 64]. By interleaving multiple images with text, the integration of visual elements significantly enriches information delivery [16, 38, 40, 61].

Multi-image interleaved data, widely prevalent across social media platforms, news outlets, and digital publications [1, 2, 41, 42], plays a crucial role in a wide range of applications within journalism and related




Figure 2. **Overview of our proposed MIR Benchmark.** It comprises 22,257 questions derived from 138,277 images, organized into three distinct categories—sequential (5,455), spatial (9,350), and analytical (7,821)—which are further divided into 12 fine-grained tasks to rigorously evaluate multi-image interleaved reasoning.

fields.[8, 15, 22, 37, 39, 43].

Recent advancements in multimodal large language models (MLLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across diverse multimodal contexts[7]. However, previous work primarily focused on pushing the performance limits of single-image or multi-image tasks[18, 36, 50, 56], with limited exploration of multi-image interleaved scenarios. Multi-image interleaving tasks require MLLMs to exhibit precise image comprehension, accurately align images with corresponding texts, and establish correct associations between them. Figure 1 illustrates a multi-image interleaved Q&A example. Accurately answering the question about the size ratio between the truck in *image1* and the palm in *image3* involves two key challenges: *Text2Region* and *Region2Region*. First, *Text2Region* requires matching explicit textual elements like “truck” and “cola” to their corresponding images (*image1*, *image2* and *image3*). It also needs to implicitly link contextually inferred objects, such as “truck” and “palm” to their respective images (*image1* and *image3*). Next, *Region2Region* involves establishing the relationships between these regions, such as comparing the “truck” and the “cola” in *image2*, the “cola” and the

“palm” in *image3*. By establishing the logical chain connecting “palm”, “Coca-Cola”, and “truck”, the correct conclusion can be derived. These challenges necessitate the development of MLLMs that explicitly account for the unique characteristics of interleaved multi-image data.

Previous studies have highlighted the critical role of large, high-quality, and challenging benchmarks in developing and evaluating MLLMs for multi-image reasoning tasks. Building on this foundation, existing benchmarks have demonstrated their potential [17, 33, 50]. However, they still exhibit limitations in addressing more practical real-world scenarios: 1) *Limited evaluation of multi-image reasoning.* Current multi-image benchmarks primarily focus on basic multi-image question-answering, often requiring only the extraction of textual information from images and relying on LLMs for text-based reasoning. Consequently, they fail to incorporate interleaved textual information and overlook more complex reasoning paradigms, such as text-to-region and region-to-region inference, which are essential for capturing the deeper interplay between visual and textual content.[26, 29, 36, 45, 53]. 2) *Lack of step-by-step reasoning.* Existing multi-image benchmarks focus

primarily on end-task accuracy, neglecting the intermediate reasoning steps. 3) *Data leakage*. Since most of the existing datasets are derived from other widely used public datasets, which have already been pre-trained by MLLMs, this could potentially result in data leakage issues[23, 33].

These limitations highlight the need for a benchmark that not only integrates interleaved multi-image data but also supports advanced reasoning capabilities. To this end, we introduce MIR, a comprehensive benchmark consisting of 22,257 challenging image-text interleaved QA pairs across 12 diverse scenarios. Our dataset includes 138,277 images, averaging six images per instance, as illustrated in Figure 2. We equip each instance with 5 systematic and structured reasoning steps: *Summary*, *Caption*, *Text to region reference*, *Region to Region relationship*, *Conclusion*. Based on reasoning steps, we propose a stage-wise curriculum learning approach, which prioritizes training on simple samples and gradually introduces harder ones. When training on harder samples, we leverage reasoning steps to continuously guide the MLLMs in mastering the reasoning process. Through step-wise training schema, our method guides the MLLMs to progressively master complex tasks from “easy” to “hard”, thereby enhancing the model’s reasoning capabilities.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We curate MIR, a novel benchmark focused on interleaved multi-image reasoning and featuring a structured five-stage reasoning process to enhance models’ ability to reason across multiple images and textual contexts
- We propose a stage-wise curriculum learning method to improve MLLMs reasoning capabilities and generalization performance. This method helps the model progressively grasp complex reasoning processes by advancing from simple to difficult tasks.
- We conduct extensive experiments on MIR. Results show that the MIR enables us to push the boundaries of current MLLMs’ reasoning capabilities.

2. Related Work

2.1. Interleaved Multi-image Benchmarks

Recent advancements in MLLMs lead to the development of numerous image benchmarks, which are crucial for evaluating multimodal large language models (MLLMs). Existing benchmarks for MLLMs primarily fall into two categories: multi-image benchmarks [23, 29, 34, 36] and interleaved benchmarks [18, 25, 34, 46]. The multi-image benchmarks comprehensively evaluate the performance of MLLMs across multiple dimensions of multi-image tasks. NaturalBench [29] incorporates a comprehensive set of adversarial samples to produce “blind” responses that fail to properly utilize visual information. Img-Diff[26] is designed to enhance fine-grained image recog-

ognition of MLLMs. Mantis-Eval [23] and MMIU [36] challenge MLLMs with more comprehensive multi-image data. Nevertheless, multi-image benchmarks’ lack of interleaved textual data limits their capacity to capture vision-language connections and comprehend multimodal contextual information. The interleaved benchmarks primarily concentrate on image-text interleaved data. BLINK [18] focuses on core visual perception abilities with visual prompting. The ICL benchmarks [25, 44] provide a thorough assessment of their interleaved capabilities across few-shot to many-shot settings. LLaVa-Next-Interleave [31, 32] adopts the interleaved multi-image data format to strengthen the cross-modal capability in LMMs. However, they still face challenges in step-by-step reasoning and potential data leakage. More detailed comparisons are available in Table 1.

2.2. Multi-modal Large Language Models

The development of reasoning capabilities in Large Language Models (LLMs) has been a focal point of research[52, 58]. Early studies often relied on neural-symbolic methods, employing formal languages rather than natural language to explicitly model the reasoning process[3, 4, 13, 14]. However, with the emergence of powerful LLMs, new approaches have been proposed by leveraging their inherent reasoning abilities[47, 55]. Techniques such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, which decompose complex problems into intermediate reasoning steps, have demonstrated potential in guiding LLMs to generate structured solutions[6, 57]. These methods have been further extended to MLLMs[24, 63]. Visual programming [20] provides a modular neuro-symbolic system that utilizes computer vision models as functions and integrates CoT techniques with GPT-3 LLM for compositional visual reasoning. However, CoT-guided multi-step reasoning still struggles with consistency, often leading to errors and hallucinations[48]. Some methods [12, 62] leverage GPT-4 to generate reasoning process and incorporate both correct and incorrect reasoning chains during training, enhancing the model’s reasoning capabilities through reinforcement learning (RL). Nevertheless, RL-based reasoning is slow and resource-intensive[9]. In contrast, our approach employs a stage-wise reasoning strategy, guiding the model from “easy” to “hard” tasks, which proves to be a more efficient approach for improving reasoning capabilities.

3. Dataset

In this section, we first give a brief overview of MIR in Section 3.1. Then we describe each task in detail, providing an in-depth explanation of the data curation process in Section 3.2. The quantitative analysis of the MIR is illustrated in Section 3.3. More details can be found in Appendix A 1.1.

Dataset	Samples	Images	Interleave	Multi-image	Rationale	Steps	Answer-type	Annotator
MVbench[35]	4,000	4,000	✓	✗	✗	✗	MCQ	Auto
MMIU [36]	11,600	77,000	✗	✓	✓	✗	MCQ	Auto
MIRBENCH [56]	925	3,496	✗	✓	✗	✗	MCQ & Free-form	Auto
BLINK [18]	3,807	7,300	✗	✓	✓	✗	MCQ	Semi-Manual
MUIRBench [50]	2,600	11,264	✓	✓	✓	✗	MCQ	Semi-Manual
LLAVA-INTERLEAVE [32]	17,000	-	✓	✓	✗	✗	MCQ & Free-form	Auto
MMRA [53]	1,024	3,403	✗	✓	✗	✗	MCQ	Semi-Manual
MILEBench [45]	6,440	97,855	✗	✓	✗	✗	MCQ & Free-form	Auto
MMMU [60]	11,500	12,507	✓	✓	✓	✗	MCQ & Free-form	Semi-Manual
MMIE[54]	20,103	26,535	✓	✓	✓	✗	MCQ & Free-form	Semi-Manual
MIR(Ours)	22,257	138,277	✓	✓	✓	✓	MCQ	Semi-Manual

Table 1. **Comparison of Multi-image benchmarks.** Compared to the existing benchmarks, MIR possesses the largest number of data samples and the highest number of images. Each sample in MIR is accompanied by five reasoning steps. Additionally, MIR employs a multiple-choice question (MCQ) format to ensure standardized and consistent evaluation.

3.1. Dataset Overview

Focusing on interleaved multi-image reasoning, our MIR consists of 138,277 images and 22,257 multiple-choice questions. MIR enhances MLLMs’ comprehension and performance in complex multimodal scenarios by analyzing intricate image-text relationships. Existing multi-image benchmarks always focus on simple relationships between images (e.g., similarity, spatial location, or long-context reasoning). However, real-world reasoning tasks are far more complex, requiring models to recognize spatial relationships across multiple views or objects, infer sequential dependencies in dynamic temporal sequences or state changes, and perform logical reasoning based on counterintuitive or abstract concepts. Thus we adopt *Spatial*, *Sequential*, and *Analytical* classification framework as the foundation for data collection, and further refine it into 12 specific subcategories according to the types of the collected data.

3.2. Dataset Construction

Data Collection: To mitigate risks of data leakage and ensure compliance, MIR adopts a multi-faceted data collection strategy. Specifically, the MIR comprises three primary sources: (1) Original recordings captured by our research team in controlled environments. (2) Publicly accessible content curated from short-video platforms. (3) Educational resources harvested from open-access learning platforms. All collected data undergoes a rigorous multi-stage review process, where sensitive materials including political content and explicit imagery are systematically filtered out. Furthermore, proper authorization and usage rights have been secured through official channels from both platform providers and content creators, ensuring full legal compliance and ethical data-handling practices. More details of the collection process are available in the Appendix.

Data Processing: As shown in Figure 3, we adopt a semi-automatic approach to generate Q&A pairs within our benchmark. Towards different task types, we employ dis-




Figure 3. **Illustration of data construction.** We collect and filter data from multiple sources to obtain raw images or text. For spatial tasks, we generate/synthesize images by our platform; for sequential tasks, we extract frames/calculate offsets from videos; for analytical tasks, we leverage web scraping/model editing to process images. The final dataset is created by annotating images and text through multiple rounds using LLMs and human effort.

tinct image acquisition and preprocessing strategies. For Spatial tasks, we develop a three-dimensional geometric platform system. This platform is able to generate various geometric shapes (including cubes, cylinders, and cones) at any coordinate point in 3D space and automatically pro-

duce multi-view projections of these shapes, such as front, side, and top views. For Sequential tasks, we mainly rely on video frame extraction and calculating the positional changes of objects across different images to generate data samples. For Analytical tasks, we implement a dual-channel image acquisition strategy: (1) targeted web scraping from domain-specific sources to collect relevant real-world images, and (2) synthetic image generation using state-of-the-art text-to-image models [5] to create tailored scene representations.

Q&A Generation Our approach primarily leverages LLMs for the automatic generation of question-answer pairs and reasoning steps. During the process of Q&A Generation, we adopt different generation strategies tailored to the characteristics of various tasks: For tasks with a high degree of structure, we utilize predefined question templates, where specific entities or image region information could be directly embedded into the templates. For other tasks, we construct questions based on multimodal information sources, including image captions, prompts used for image generation, and contextual information related to the images. Throughout the question generation process, we place particular emphasis on ensuring logical consistency and multi-image coverage, guaranteeing that the generated questions thoroughly assess the model’s ability to understand and reason across multiple images. For structured questions, answers are derived through manual techniques, including coordinate calculations and logical reasoning. For unstructured questions, images are first converted into corresponding textual descriptions, which are then concatenated with the questions, and answers are generated using LLMs. Furthermore, to construct Multi-Choice Questions, we employ the LLM to generate three plausible yet incorrect answer options for each question, ensuring a comprehensive and challenging evaluation framework.

Reasoning Step Generation We primarily generate reasoning steps by combining human expertise with LLMs. Specifically, we first annotate critical steps according to the task difficulty, such as captioning or text-to-image generation, and then use LLMs to assist in annotating the remaining steps. Finally, we manually inspect error-prone tasks (e.g. Forced Perspective, ScaleBlur). This process is repeated multiple times to attain the final reasoning steps. The requirements for each reasoning step are as follows: *Summary*: MIR provides a high-level summary interpretation of the question, outlining the primary aspects of the problem it intends to address. *Caption*: MIR delivers a brief and comprehensive summary of the images contained in each piece of data. *Text to region*: MIR provides an in-depth examination of the methods for precisely aligning specific image regions with their associated textual descriptions. *Region to text*: MIR further illustrates the logical relationships between various image regions. *Conclusion*: MIR synthesizes

an answer based on the preceding reasoning. Through this approach, we ultimately obtain MIR of high quality.

3.3. Dataset Analysis

Our MIR is organized into three primary categories, each of which is further divided into four subcategories. The dataset consists of 138,377 images and 22,257 annotations, with each annotation averaging approximately 3,970 characters. The distribution of annotation categories in the dataset is shown in Figure 4a, while the distribution of the number of images is presented in Figure 4b. Additionally, the average character count per annotation for each category is depicted in Figure 4c. More details can be found in the Appendix.




Figure 4. **Statistics of our MIR dataset.** Figure (a) shows the categories of MIR along with their respective proportions. Figure (b) illustrates the total number of images as well as the number of images per group for each task type. The average character count per annotation for each category is depicted in Figure (c)




Figure 5. **Architecture of the proposed method.** We use an expert model to split the dataset into easy and difficult samples. After fine-tuning on easy samples, we sample 40% of difficult ones for multi-stage curriculum learning. First, we combine the question with summary, caption, text2region, and region2region as input to generate the conclusion. Next, we move region2region to the target output, then add text-to-region from the question, followed by the caption, and finally the summary. The goal is for the model to autonomously generate a full reasoning process from the original question and arrive at the correct answer.

4. Methodology

In this section, we propose a novel method to fine-tune MLLMs based on curriculum learning, seamlessly integrating the reasoning steps of our MIR. As shown in Figure 5, our method first employs a screening mechanism to classify all samples based on their difficulty. Then, we fine-tune the MLLMs with simple samples to establish a solid foundational understanding. Subsequently, more complex samples are employed to further refine the MLLMs, enhancing its capability to grasp deeper knowledge and solve intricate problems. Unlike traditional fine-tuning methods that directly focus on question-answer pairs, our method aims to guide the model not only in providing correct answers but also in grasping the underlying thought process and problem-solving methodology. This approach enhances the MLLM’s adaptability to tasks of varying complexities while simultaneously improving its generalization ability.

4.1. Adaptive Difficulty Filter

The adaptive difficulty filter aims to effectively distinguish between challenging and simple samples within MIR. Specifically, we input each question into the Qwen-VL2.5[?] model for inference and repeat this process 10 times to obtain stable evaluation results. Based on the model’s performance, we establish a clear classification criterion: if the correct response rate for a given question exceeds 70%, it is categorized as simple data; conversely, if the correct rate falls below 70%, it is classified as challenging data. This probability-based classification method ensures the objectivity and reliability of data categorization. Here Q denotes a question within MIR, $n = 10$ is the number of tests for each question, $c(Q)$ is the number of correct responses for question Q out of n trials, and $p(Q) = \frac{c(Q)}{n}$ is the correct

response rate for question Q . The adaptive difficulty filter classifies Q as simple or challenging based on the following rule:

$$\text{Classification}(Q) = \begin{cases} \text{Simple}, & \text{if } p(Q) \geq 0.7 \\ \text{Challenging}, & \text{if } p(Q) < 0.7 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

4.2. Training Strategy

Our training strategy is designed to progressively guide the model in mastering the ability to solve complex problems. To achieve this goal, we propose a progressive “easy-to-hard” training framework. Specifically, our framework consists of two parts: first, we fine-tune the model using simple samples to help it develop a foundational problem-solving capability. Then, we adopt a stage-wise approach to gradually enhance the model’s reasoning ability. At each training stage, we sample 40% of the data from the pool of challenging examples and structurally refine them to align with the current training objectives. In the first stage, the input question Q is augmented by concatenating it with all reasoning steps $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$, where n is the total number of steps. The answer A remains unchanged. The new input Q_{new} and output A_{new} are defined as:

$$Q_{\text{new}} = Q \oplus s_1 \oplus s_2 \oplus \dots \oplus s_n \quad A_{\text{new}} = A \quad (2)$$

Here, \oplus denotes the concatenation operation. In the second stage, the input question Q is combined with all reasoning steps except the final step s_n . The answer A aligns with the final reasoning step s_n . The new question Q_{new} and the answer A_{new} are defined as:

$$Q_{\text{new}} = Q \oplus s_1 \oplus s_2 \oplus \dots \oplus s_{n-1} \quad A_{\text{new}} = A \oplus s_n \quad (3)$$

Method	In-domain				Out-of-domain		
	Spatial	Sequential	Analytical	Average	MIRBENCH	BLINK	MUIRBench
Mantis	29.30%	28.57%	33.12%	30.46%	42.83%	47.21%	37.53%
Mantis(Tuning)	33.21%	30.11%	36.78%	33.71%	43.10%	48.03%	38.58%
Mantis(Ours)	35.25%	31.04%	40.26%	35.99%	40.82%	49.17%	39.01%
LLava-Next-Interleave	31.23%	22.74%	30.09%	28.79%	40.30%	48.87%	38.57%
LLava-Next-Interleave(Tuning)	39.07%	25.01%	35.44%	34.42%	41.21%	49.31%	41.32%
LLava-Next-Interleave(Ours)	42.25%	25.04%	37.85%	36.58%	43.19%	52.27%	40.25%
LLava-OneVision	42.31%	36.53%	38.12%	39.31%	45.91%	49.00%	40.61%
LLava-OneVision(Tuning)	45.17%	39.29%	41.20%	42.36%	47.04%	50.34%	42.22%
LLava-OneVision(Ours)	50.34%	41.27%	45.99%	47.60%	49.23%	52.93%	45.34%
Qwen2-VL	29.00%	56.60%	45.96%	40.44%	50.04%	50.34%	45.67%
Qwen2-VL(Tuning)	37.31%	58.33%	49.59%	45.15%	53.45%	52.19%	45.51%
Qwen2-VL(Ours)	40.42%	59.65%	52.93%	51.76%	54.47%	56.61%	46.67%
Mplug-Owl3	37.83%	28.65%	30.71%	33.13%	44.43%	49.90%	37.50%
Mplug-Owl3(Tuning)	40.34%	31.21%	35.66%	36.51%	46.09%	52.04%	37.93%
Mplug-Owl3(Ours)	44.17%	34.90%	39.64%	40.36%	49.31%	55.57%	39.25%

Table 2. **Main results of our method.** We evaluate the performance of the base MLLMs, fine-tuned MLLMs, and MLLMs enhanced with our method across multiple benchmarks. The results show that nearly all MLLMs improved after fine-tuning with MIR, with our method delivering the most significant performance gains.

In the later stages, we progressively reduce the guidance on reasoning steps. The final objective is for the model to autonomously generate a complete reasoning process based solely on the original question and reach the correct answer. This design enables the model to transition from relying on external guidance to independently solving complex problems, achieving a fundamental shift from “learning to reason” to “reasoning autonomously”.

5. Experiments

5.1. Implementation Details

In the experimental setup section, we select current state-of-the-art open-source MLLMs for systematic evaluation. All of these models possess functionality for multi-image interleaved comprehension. Specifically, we choose five representative models for comparative experiments: Mantis[23], mPLUG-Owl3[59], LLaVA-NeXT-Interleave[33], Qwen2-VL[51] and LLaVA-OneVision[31]. For each model, we implement three training strategies: (1) Zero-shot evaluation using the original pre-trained model, (2) Full Fine-tuning, (3) Fine-tuning by our proposed method. To ensure the generalizability of our method, the evaluation covers both in-domain and out-of-domain perspectives. For in-domain evaluation, we assess model performance on our custom dataset in three dimensions: sequence analysis, spatial relations, and analytical inference. For out-domain evaluation, we employ three cross-domain benchmarks, including MIRB, BLINK, and MUIR. During the evaluation phase, since lmms-eval[30] relies on rule-based

answer matching, long outputs often struggle to align with the correct answers. Therefore, we uniformly employ GPT to match model outputs with the ground truth. This evaluation scheme ensures the reliability and comprehensiveness of the experimental results.

5.2. Results of Our Method

The experiment results are illustrated in Table 2. We conduct comprehensive evaluations of the original MLLMs, the fine-tuned MLLMs, and the MLLMs enhanced with our proposed method across multiple benchmarks. During the tests of in-domain, the models demonstrate a notable improvement after finetuning in in-domain testing, with an increase of approximately 3% to 5%. By employing our method, the model’s performance was further enhanced, achieving a rise of 7%. During the tests of out-of-domain, by adopting our proposed method, most models achieve a performance improvement of 1% to 5% over the baseline. In contrast, traditional fine-tuning methods yields a maximum gain of only 2%. The experimental results demonstrate that MLLMs fine-tuned with our method achieve significant performance improvements across all benchmarks, fully validating the effectiveness of MIR. Notably, compared to using MIR alone, our approach lead to even more substantial performance gains. This outcome strongly confirms that our designed “easy-to-hard” learning strategy effectively guides the model to progressively master complex features, thereby achieving better generalization capabilities.

Through experiments, we have discovered some interesting phenomena: (1) The ability to follow instructions is crit-




Figure 6. **Case Study of our method.** The model follows a structured reasoning process: it clarifies the question intent (summary), analyzes the image (caption), localizes the target region (text2region), establishes relationships between regions (region2region), and derives the correct answer (conclusion). These results demonstrate that the MLLM trained with our method is able to maintain a structured reasoning pipeline, enabling it to produce more accurate and logically consistent answers.

ical for step-wise curriculum learning, as stronger instruction adherence enhances the effectiveness of the learning process. (2) The model shows the least improvement in performance on sequence tasks after fine-tuning, which may be attributed to the fact that the images in sequential tasks are extracted from videos. These extracted images often fail to accurately represent the entire video, leading to the model’s suboptimal performance in sequential tasks.

Qwen2-VL	stage1	stage2	stage3	stage4	stage5
spatial	35.19%	34.60%	40.57%	46.29%	50.96%
Sequential	32.22%	35.55%	33.05%	34.44%	36.66%
Analytical	44.85%	38.97%	43.52%	48.52%	58.82%
Average	38.01%	36.73%	41.03%	45.97%	51.76%

Table 3. **Ablation study.** This table presents the Qwen2-VL’s performance on MIR after completing training at each stage.

5.3. Ablation Study

As illustrated in the Table 3. The decline in Stage 2 stems from higher task complexity, requiring more training data or finer adjustments to adapt to the logically intensive structure. In contrast, Stage 3 and Stage 4 tasks align better with the model’s reasoning capabilities, leading to performance recovery. Stage 4, in particular, closely aligns with the model’s core strengths, driving significant improvement.

5.4. Case Study

The first case is the output of mPLUG-Owl3 on the sight-seeing task in MIRB[50] after tuning with our method. As

shown in Figure 6, mPLUG-Owl3 demonstrates a complete reasoning process: it first clarifies the intent of the question (summary), then conducts a detailed analysis of the image content (caption), effectively establishes relationships between images (region2region), and ultimately derives the correct answer (conclusion). Since this data is not strictly interleaved, the text-to-region process is absent. The second case aims to compare the sizes of a tower and a car. The model first formulates its reasoning process (summary). It then thoroughly analyzes each image (caption), identifies and localizes the objects to be compared (text2region), and establishes their relationships (region2region). Finally, leveraging these relationships, the model derives the correct answer (conclusion). These cases illustrate that the MLLM trained with our method is able to follow a structured reasoning process and ultimately arrive at the correct answer.

6. Conclusion

This paper introduces MIR, a novel benchmark for multi-image interleaved reasoning. Each data instance includes a detailed reasoning step, designed to guide models in understanding the intricate relationships between multiple images and interleaved texts. Building on these reasoning steps, we propose a stage-wise curriculum learning approach to enhance models’ reasoning and generalization abilities through progressive learning. We believe MIR will inspire further exploration and development in various downstream tasks, such as cross-modal reasoning, scene understanding, and complex visual-textual analysis.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant 2022YFB2902200. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62471064.

References

- [1] Moses Alabi. Visual learning: The power of visual aids and multimedia. 2024. 1
- [2] Kholoud Alwashmi, Georg Meyer, Fiona Rowe, and Ryan Ward. Enhancing learning outcomes through multisensory integration: A fmri study of audio-visual training in virtual reality. *NeuroImage*, 285:120483, 2024. 1
- [3] Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. MathQA: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2357–2367, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [4] Saeed Amizadeh, Hamid Palangi, Alex Polozov, Yichen Huang, and Kazuhito Koishida. Neuro-symbolic visual reasoning: Disentangling “Visual” from “Reasoning”. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 279–290. PMLR, 2020. 3
- [5] Jinze Bai and Shuai Bai et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023. 5
- [6] Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michał Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, and Torsten Hoefler. Graph of thoughts: solving elaborate problems with large language models. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*. AAAI Press, 2024. 3
- [7] Nitzan Bitton-Guetta, Yonatan Bitton, Jack Hessel, Ludwig Schmidt, Yuval Elovici, Gabriel Stanovsky, and Roy Schwartz. Breaking common sense: Whoops! a vision-and-language benchmark of synthetic and compositional images. In *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2616–2627, 2023. 2
- [8] Xinye Cao, Guoshun Nan, Hongcan Guo, Hanqing Mu, Long Wang, Yihan Lin, Qinchuan Zhou, Jiayi Li, Baohua Qin, Qimei Cui, Xiaofeng Tao, He Fang, Haitao Du, and Tony Q. S. Quek. Exploring llm-based multi-agent situation awareness for zero-trust space-air-ground integrated network. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 43(6):2230–2247, 2025. 2
- [9] Yuji Cao, Huan Zhao, Yuheng Cheng, Ting Shu, Yue Chen, Guolong Liu, Gaoqi Liang, Junhua Zhao, Jinyue Yan, and Yun Li. Survey on Large Language Model-Enhanced Reinforcement Learning: Concept, Taxonomy, and Methods. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2404.00282, 2024. 3
- [10] Dongping Chen, Ruoxi Chen, Shu Pu, Zhaoyi Liu, Yanru Wu, Caixi Chen, Benlin Liu, Yue Huang, Yao Wan, Pan Zhou, and Ranjay Krishna. Interleaved scene graph for interleaved text-and-image generation assessment. *CoRR*, abs/2411.17188, 2024. 1
- [11] Wei Chen, Lin Li, Yongqi Yang, Bin Wen, Fan Yang, Tingting Gao, Yu Wu, and Long Chen. Comm: A coherent interleaved image-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. *CoRR*, abs/2406.10462, 2024. 1
- [12] Yangyi Chen, Karan Sikka, Michael Cogswell, Heng Ji, and Ajay Divakaran. Measuring and improving chain-of-thought reasoning in vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 192–210, Mexico City, Mexico, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [13] Ting-Rui Chiang and Yun-Nung Chen. Semantically-aligned equation generation for solving and reasoning math word problems. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2656–2668, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [14] Minkyu Choi, Harsh Goel, Mohammad Omama, Yunhao Yang, Sahil Shah, and Sandeep Chinchali. Towards neuro-symbolic video understanding. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024*, pages 220–236, Cham, 2025. Springer Nature Switzerland. 3
- [15] Hang Du, Guoshun Nan, Sicheng Zhang, Binzhu Xie, Junrui Xu, Hehe Fan, Qimei Cui, Xiaofeng Tao, and Xudong Jiang. Docmsu: A comprehensive benchmark for document-level multimodal sarcasm understanding. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(16):17933–17941, 2024. 2
- [16] Hang Du, Sicheng Zhang, Binzhu Xie, Guoshun Nan, Jiayang Zhang, Junrui Xu, Hangyu Liu, Sicong Leng, Jiangming Liu, Hehe Fan, Dajiu Huang, Jing Feng, Linli Chen, Can Zhang, Xuhuan Li, Hao Zhang, Jianhang Chen, Qimei Cui, and Xiaofeng Tao. Uncovering what, why and how: A comprehensive benchmark for causation understanding of video anomaly. In *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 18793–18803, 2024. 1
- [17] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A. Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. BLINK: Multimodal Large Language Models Can See but Not Perceive. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2404.12390, 2024. 2
- [18] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A. Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024*, pages 148–166, Cham, 2025. Springer Nature Switzerland. 2, 3, 4

- [19] Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Gabriel Ilharco, Alex Fang, Jonathan Hayase, Georgios Smyrnis, Thao Nguyen, Ryan Marten, Mitchell Wortsman, Dhruva Ghosh, Jieyu Zhang, Eyal Or-gad, Rahim Entezari, Giannis Daras, Sarah Pratt, Vivek Ramanujan, Yonatan Bitton, Kalyani Marathe, Stephen Mussmann, Richard Vencu, Mehdi Cherti, Ranjay Krishna, Pang-Wei Koh, Olga Saukh, Alexander Ratner, Shuran Song, Han-naneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, Romain Beaumont, Sewoong Oh, Alex Dimakis, Jenia Jitsev, Yair Carmon, Vaishaal Shankar, and Ludwig Schmidt. Datacomp: In search of the next generation of multimodal datasets. 2023. 1
- [20] Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual program-ming: Compositional visual reasoning without training. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pat-tern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 14953–14962, 2023. 3
- [21] Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Wenhui Wang, Yaru Hao, Saksham Singhal, Shuming Ma, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Owais Khan Mohammed, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Zewen Chi, Johan Bjorck, Vishrav Chaudhary, Subhojit Som, Xia Song, and Furu Wei. Language is not all you need: Aligning perception with language models. 2023. 1
- [22] Md. Farhan Ishmam, Md. Sakib Hossain Shovon, M.F. Mridha, and Nilanjan Dey. From image to language: A crit-ical analysis of visual question answering (vqa) approaches, challenges, and opportunities. *Information Fusion*, 106: 102270, 2024. 2
- [23] Dongfu Jiang, Xuan He, Huaye Zeng, Cong Wei, Max Ku, Qian Liu, and Wenhui Chen. Mantis: Interleaved multi-image instruction tuning, 2024. 3, 7
- [24] Dongzhi Jiang, Renrui Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Yanwei Li, Yu Qi, Xinyan Chen, Liuhui Wang, Jianhan Jin, Claire Guo, Shen Yan, et al. Mme-cot: Benchmarking chain-of-thought in large multimodal models for reasoning quality, robustness, and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09621*, 2025. 3
- [25] Yixing Jiang, Jeremy Irvin, Ji Hun Wang, Muham-mad Ahmed Chaudhry, Jonathan H. Chen, and Andrew Y. Ng. Many-shot in-context learning in multimodal founda-tion models, 2024. 3
- [26] Qirui Jiao, Daoyuan Chen, Yilun Huang, Bolin Ding, Yaliang Li, and Ying Shen. Img-Diff: Contrastive Data Synthesis for Multimodal Large Language Models. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2408.04594, 2024. 2, 3
- [27] Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Leo Tronchon, Stas Bek-man, Amanpreet Singh, Anton Lozhkov, Thomas Wang, Siddharth Karamcheti, Alexander M. Rush, Douwe Kiela, Matthieu Cord, and Victor Sanh. Obelisc: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents. 2023. 1
- [28] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Fanyi Pu, Jingkang Yang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Mimic-it: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning. 2023. 1
- [29] Baiqi Li, Zhiqiu Lin, Wenxuan Peng, Jean de Dieu Nyandwi, Daniel Jiang, Zixian Ma, Simran Khanuja, Ranjay Krishna, Graham Neubig, and Deva Ramanan. Naturalbench: Evaluating vision-language models on natural adversarial samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14669*, 2024. 2, 3
- [30] Bo Li, Peiyuan Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Fanyi Pu, Xinrun Du, Haotian Liu, Yuhao Dong, Yuanhan Zhang, Ge Zhang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Lmms-eval: Accelerating the development of large multimodal models, 2024. 7
- [31] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Peiyuan Zhang, Yanwei Li, Zi-wei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. LLaVA-OneVision: Easy Visual Task Transfer. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2408.03326, 2024. 3, 7
- [32] Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07895*, 2024. 3, 4
- [33] Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. LLaVA-NeXT-Interleave: Tackling Multi-image, Video, and 3D in Large Multimodal Models. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2407.07895, 2024. 2, 3, 7
- [34] Juncheng Li, Kaihang Pan, Zhiqi Ge, Minghe Gao, Wei Ji, Wenqiao Zhang, Tat-Seng Chua, Siliang Tang, Han-wang Zhang, and Yueting Zhuang. Fine-tuning multimodal LLMs to follow zero-shot demonstrative instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3
- [35] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understand-ing benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22195–22206, 2024. 4
- [36] Fanqing Meng, Jin Wang, Chuanhao Li, Quanfeng Lu, Hao Tian, Jiaqi Liao, Xizhou Zhu, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, Ping Luo, Kaipeng Zhang, and Wenqi Shao. Mmiu: Multimodal multi-image understanding for evaluating large vision-language models, 2024. 2, 3, 4
- [37] Guoshun Nan, Zhijiang Guo, Ivan Sekulic, and Wei Lu. Reasoning with latent structure refinement for document-level relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meet-ing of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1546–1557, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [38] Guoshun Nan, Rui Qiao, Yao Xiao, Jun Liu, Sicong Leng, Hao Zhang, and Wei Lu. Interventional video grounding with dual contrastive learning. In *2021 IEEE/CVF Confer-ence on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2764–2774, 2021. 1
- [39] Abhilash Nandy, Yash Agarwal, Ashish Patwa, Millon Mad-hur Das, Aman Bansal, Ankit Raj, Pawan Goyal, and Niloy Ganguly. ***YesBut***: A high-quality annotated multi-modal dataset for evaluating satire comprehension capability of vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Con-ference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Process-ing*, pages 16878–16895, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Asso-ciation for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [40] Matthew Peterson. The integration of text and image in me-dia and its impact on reader interest. *Visible Language*, 48: 22–39, 2014. 1
- [41] Lhoussine Qasserras. The role of visual learning aids across diverse learning styles in high school education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 7:68, 2024. 1

- [42] Junqiang Ren and Jiajin Xu. Ideational interplay of textual and visual elements in graphical abstracts of biology research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 78:156–179, 2025. 1
- [43] Himanshu Sharma and Anand Singh Jalal. A framework for visual question answering with the integration of scene-text using phocs and fisher vectors. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 190:116159, 2022. 2
- [44] Mustafa Shukor, Alexandre Rame, Corentin Dancette, and Matthieu Cord. Beyond task performance: Evaluating and reducing the flaws of large multimodal models with in-context learning, 2024. 3
- [45] Dingjie Song, Shunian Chen, Guiming Hardy Chen, Fei Yu, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang. Milebench: Benchmarking mllms in long context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18532*, 2024. 2, 4
- [46] Alane Suhr, Stephanie Zhou, Ally Zhang, Iris Zhang, Huajun Bai, and Yoav Artzi. A corpus for reasoning about natural language grounded in photographs, 2019. 3
- [47] Ron Sun. Robust reasoning: integrating rule-based and similarity-based reasoning. *Artif. Intell.*, 75(2):241–295, 1995. 3
- [48] Omkar Thawakar, Dinura Dissanayake, Ketan More, Ritesh Thawkar, Ahmed Heakl, Noor Ahsan, Yuhao Li, Mohammed Zumri, Jean Lahoud, Rao Muhammad Anwer, Hisham Cholakkal, Ivan Laptev, Mubarak Shah, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Salman Khan. Llamav-o1: Rethinking step-by-step visual reasoning in llms, 2025. 3
- [49] Changyao Tian, Xizhou Zhu, Yuwen Xiong, Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, Wenhai Wang, Yuntao Chen, Lewei Lu, Tong Lu, Jie Zhou, et al. Mm-interleaved: Interleaved image-text generative modeling via multi-modal feature synchronizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10208*, 2024. 1
- [50] Fei Wang, Xingyu Fu, James Y Huang, Zekun Li, Qin Liu, Xiaogeng Liu, Mingyu Derek Ma, Nan Xu, Wenxuan Zhou, Kai Zhang, et al. Muirbench: A comprehensive benchmark for robust multi-image understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09411*, 2024. 2, 4, 8
- [51] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 7
- [52] 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 *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2022. Curran Associates Inc. 3
- [53] Siwei Wu, Kang Zhu, Yu Bai, Yiming Liang, Yizhi Li, Haoning Wu, JH Liu, RuiBo Liu, Xingwei Qu, Xuxin Cheng, et al. Mmra: A benchmark for evaluating multi-granularity and multi-image relational association capabilities in large visual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.17379*, 2024. 2, 4
- [54] Peng Xia, Siwei Han, Shi Qiu, Yiyang Zhou, Zhaoyang Wang, Wenhao Zheng, Zhaorun Chen, Chenhang Cui, Mingyu Ding, Linjie Li, Lijuan Wang, and Huaxiu Yao. MMIE: Massive Multimodal Interleaved Comprehension Benchmark for Large Vision-Language Models. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2410.10139, 2024. 4
- [55] Ronald R. Yager. Approximate reasoning as a basis for rule-based expert systems. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, SMC-14(4):636–643, 1984. 3
- [56] Kai Yan, Zhan Ling, Kang Liu, Yifan Yang, Ting-Han Fan, Lingfeng Shen, Zhengyin Du, and Jiecao Chen. Mir-bench: Benchmarking llm’s long-context intelligence via many-shot in-context inductive reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09933*, 2025. 2, 4
- [57] Ling Yang, Zhaochen Yu, Tianjun Zhang, Shiyi Cao, Minkai Xu, Wentao Zhang, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Bin Cui. Buffer of thoughts: Thought-augmented reasoning with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. 3
- [58] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2023. Curran Associates Inc. 3
- [59] Jiabo Ye, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Anwen Hu, Ming Yan, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mplug-owl3: Towards long image-sequence understanding in multimodal large language models, 2024. 7
- [60] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9556–9567, 2024. 4
- [61] Yen Na Yum, Neil Cohn, and Way Kwok-Wai Lau. Effects of picture-word integration on reading visual narratives in 11 and 12. *Learning and Instruction*, 71:101397, 2021. 1
- [62] Ruohong Zhang, Bowen Zhang, Yanghao Li, Haotian Zhang, Zhiqing Sun, Zhe Gan, Yinfei Yang, Ruoming Pang, and Yiming Yang. Improve Vision Language Model Chain-of-thought Reasoning. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2410.16198, 2024. 3
- [63] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, Hai Zhao, George Karypis, and Alex Smola. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00923*, 2023. 3
- [64] Wanrong Zhu, Jack Hessel, Anas Awadalla, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Jesse Dodge, Alex Fang, Youngjae Yu, Ludwig Schmidt, William Yang Wang, and Yejin Choi. Multimodal c4: An open, billion-scale corpus of images interleaved with text. 2023. 1