
OMNIDPO: A Preference Optimization Framework to Address Omni-Modal Hallucination

Junzhe Chen^{1,2*}Tianshu Zhang^{1*}Shiyu Huang³Yuwei Niu⁴Chao Sun¹Rongzhou Zhang¹Guanyu Zhou²Lijie Wen^{1†}Xuming Hu^{2†}¹Tsinghua University, ²The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou),³OpenRL, ⁴Chongqing University,

chenjz24@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

wenlj@tsinghua.edu.cn, xuminghu97@gmail.com

Abstract

Recently, Omni-modal large language models (OLLMs) have sparked a new wave of research, achieving impressive results in tasks such as audio-video understanding and real-time environment perception. However, hallucination issues still persist. Similar to the bimodal setting, the priors from the text modality tend to dominate, leading OLLMs to rely more heavily on textual cues while neglecting visual and audio information. In addition, fully multimodal scenarios introduce new challenges. Most existing models align visual or auditory modalities with text independently during training, while ignoring the intrinsic correlations between video and its corresponding audio. This oversight results in hallucinations when reasoning requires interpreting hidden audio cues embedded in video content. To address these challenges, we propose OMNIDPO, a preference-alignment framework designed to mitigate hallucinations in OLLMs. Specifically, OMNIDPO incorporates two strategies: (1) constructing text-preference sample pairs to enhance the model’s understanding of audio-video interactions; and (2) constructing multimodal-preference sample pairs to strengthen the model’s attention to visual and auditory information. By tackling both challenges, OMNIDPO effectively improves multimodal grounding and reduces hallucination. Experiments conducted on two OLLMs demonstrate that OmniDPO not only effectively mitigates multimodal hallucinations but also significantly enhances the models’ reasoning capabilities across modalities. All code and datasets will be released upon paper acceptance.

1 Introduction

Omni-modal large language models (OLLMs) have rapidly advanced in their ability to understand and generate content from combined inputs such as images, audio, and text. By leveraging information from multiple modalities, these models can perform complex tasks ranging from video question answering to audio-visual scene description. However, despite these advancements, hallucination remains a critical issue: models often produce outputs that do not accurately reflect the given visual or auditory input [51, 60]. This phenomenon of generating inconsistent or fabricated omni-modal content is broadly referred to as omni-modal hallucination. It poses serious risks in high-stakes applications (e.g., medical video analysis or autonomous driving), where factual precision is paramount.

Previous studies in the bimodal (text-image) setting have shown that the significantly stronger capability of text encoders compared to visual encoders results in dominant textual priors [4, 27]. Consequently, models tend to rely heavily on input text while overlooking visual information—a primary cause of multimodal hallucinations [18]. Similarly, OLLMs exhibit comparable issues: they are inclined to depend on textual inputs while neglecting other modalities [20]. Furthermore, omni-modal scenarios introduce new challenges. Existing OLLMs typically align vision or audio with text separately during training, while failing to account for the intrinsic interactions between video and its associated audio [24]. This limitation leads to hallucinations, especially in tasks that require reasoning based on subtle audio cues embedded within video content.

Research on mitigating multimodal hallucinations generally falls into two categories. 1) Training-free methods, which do not modify the model’s parameters. Representative examples include contrastive decoding (e.g., VCD [36]), which mitigates hallucinations by introducing blurred or ambiguous images during decoding to expose and counteract biased language priors; and inference-time intervention (e.g., ICT [8]), which enhances model reliability by injecting intervention vectors into activation layers during the forward pass. However, these methods may inadvertently eliminate all language priors, including those beneficial for reasoning, which can negatively affect performance on reasoning-intensive tasks. Moreover, decoding-based approaches typically require multiple passes during inference, often resulting in significantly increased latency. 2) Training Approaches, which fine-tune models using either synthetic or manually annotated high-quality data to guide the model toward paying more attention to visual information and thus reducing hallucinations. However, manually annotating such data is often prohibitively expensive, while existing synthetic datasets either focus solely on the text modality or fail to capture the intricate relationships between video and its associated audio in omnimodal scenarios.

To address the challenges of overly dominant textual priors and insufficient alignment between audio and visual modalities in omni-modal scenarios, we propose OMNIDPO, a novel preference-based alignment framework that extends DPO [57] to omni-modal scenarios to effectively mitigate hallucinations across video, audio, and text modalities. We begin by constructing a new omni-modal preference-alignment dataset, OMNIDPO-10k, to train our model. Each sample in the dataset consists of a question along with paired textual preferences and audio/video modality preferences, as illustrated in Figure 1. Based on the MSRVT dataset [84], we select video samples that contain audio. For generating positive textual preference samples, we first feed the audio into Qwen2-Audio [15] to extract a description of its content. This audio-derived text is then combined with the video and passed to Qwen2.5-VL [3] to generate an answer that reflects understanding of the video’s audio. For the negative samples, we input the same video without its audio into Qwen2.5-VL, producing an answer that lacks comprehension of the audio cues. These textual preference pairs specifically target the issue of misalignment between audio and visual modalities. Additionally, to address the problem of overly dominant textual priors, we introduce noisy variants of video and audio inputs to create modality preference pairs. These are used to encourage the model to attend more carefully to visual and auditory signals rather than relying solely on textual inputs. Based on this OMNIDPO-10k, OMNIDPO extends the Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) paradigm to multi-modal settings by introducing conditional preference learning for each modality. In addition to the standard DPO objective, OMNIDPO incorporates modality-aware losses that explicitly encourage the model to attend to visual and auditory evidence.

Our experimental results demonstrate that applying OMNIDPO to both Qwen2.5-Omni [83] and MiniCPM-o-2.6 [89] leads to an average performance improvement of 3.48% on the CMM benchmark [34] and 4.23% on AVHBench [66]. Notably, beyond effectively reducing omni-modal hallucinations, OMNIDPO also enhances the model’s reasoning and question-answering capabilities in single-modality scenarios. Our contributions can be summarized as:

- We propose OMNIDPO, a direct preference optimization framework tailored for video-audio-text alignment, which addresses the challenge of hallucinations in omni-modal settings by introducing modality-specific conditional preference learning.
- We construct a 10k-sample omni-modal preference dataset OMNIDPO-10k covering diverse real-world scenarios, designed to expose and counteract modality-specific and cross-modal hallucinations. To our best knowledge, OMNIDPO and OMNIDPO-10k are the first hallucination mitigation method and corresponding preference optimization dataset specifically designed for omni-modal scenarios.

- Extensive experiments on Qwen2.5-Omni and MiniCPM-o-2.6 demonstrate that OMNIDPO significantly mitigates hallucinations in omni-modal settings while also enhancing the models’ unimodal reasoning capabilities.




Figure 1: Overview of OMNIDPO.

2 Related Work

2.1 Omni-Modal Large Language Models

Building on the success of large language models (LLMs) [5, 68, 52, 67, 14], research in the multimodal domain has gained significant momentum. Omni-Modal Large Language Models utilize LLMs as their core language models, enhancing them with modality-specific tokenizers and encoders to map multimodal inputs into a shared representation space. The powerful language backbones then process these representations to generate outputs based on multimodal inputs and textual instructions [90]. Several studies [3, 45, 86, 46, 71, 42] focus on enabling LLMs to handle image inputs, while others [12, 97, 19, 94, 10] aim to provide more comprehensive sensory capabilities to LLMs. These models are designed to process a variety of inputs, including but not limited to text, images, videos, and audio, while producing outputs in text or possibly audio formats as well [89, 38, 83, 102, 9, 64]. Some models even generate images and videos [78, 32, 96] by incorporating modality-specific detokenizers or diffusion blocks. A significant challenge in this area is aligning the embeddings from different modalities into a unified representation space. While many works utilize a text-based or text-image joint space for this purpose, others experiment with anchoring the embeddings in the image space [21] or adopting an egalitarian approach to treat all modalities equally [74]. Some studies have also proposed progressive alignment strategies [25, 49] to prevent forgetting and to better handle the interaction between modalities [99, 73, 74].

2.2 Hallucination in Omni-Modal Large Language Models

While hallucinations in vision-language models have been extensively studied, relatively little research has focused on hallucinations in omni-modal models. Existing works on hallucinations in vision-language models point to several causes, such as modality gaps [40, 44], language priors [26], and statistical biases [1]. Mitigation efforts typically fall into two categories. The first approach focuses on additional training, including the creation of new datasets [43, 22, 7, 23, 65] or improving data cleaning techniques [92, 58, 63], as well as the introduction of new training objectives [62, 6, 103, 101], most of which are addressing the issues of modal-inequality [70, 82, 81, 77, 80] or

even small modifications to the model structure [88, 41] or pipeline [79]. The second approach targets the inference phase, using methods such as contrast decoding, based on novel decoding strategies. The contrast term can be the logits resulting from distorted inputs [11, 35], self-generated middle-term [16, 75, 29, 37], among others [69, 59, 31, 55, 87]. Another technique involves detecting and correcting hallucinations during generation [33, 17, 50], while some approaches manipulate the attention weights assigned to image inputs [104, 98, 28, 2, 48]. Prompt-based strategies [56, 76, 85, 95, 72] and external tools [13, 91, 100] are also used to enhance the credibility of the model, along with inference time steering [8, 47, 30, 39] and other strategies [105, 54, 53]. However, hallucinations in omni-modal LLMs remain an underexplored area, with a few notable exceptions. Research by [34] and [66] has identified modality imbalance as a contributing factor to hallucinations in OLLMs. Both works developed benchmarks to address this issue, but have not yet provided mitigation strategies.

3 Dataset Construction

Multimodal hallucinations often arise because text priors dominate other modalities: even when a model receives visual and auditory inputs, it may ignore those signals in favor of familiar textual patterns. Moreover, existing omni-modal training aligns each modality with text independently, overlooking the critical interaction between video and its native audio track. As a result, when understanding hinges on subtle sound cues embedded in the footage, the model can confidently produce incorrect “hallucinated” answers.

To address these issues, we construct two types of preference pairs that explicitly reward genuine audio–visual reasoning:

Audio–video alignment preferences To ensure our model truly leverages both audio and video, we first filter out any clip without an audio track, retaining only $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{(V_i, A_i) \mid A_i \neq \emptyset\}$ from MSRVT. Each remaining sample is represented as $X = \{V, A, T\}$, where V is the video frames, A the raw audio waveform, and T any accompanying text prompt or question. We then call Qwen2-Audio, denoted $t_a = \mathcal{F}_{\text{audio}}(A)$, which produces a concise textual summary of speech, sound effects, or background music. Feeding $\{V, t_a\}$ into Qwen2.5-VL (denoted \mathcal{F}_{VL}) yields a multimodal answer $Y^+ = \mathcal{F}_{\text{VL}}(V, t_a)$, whereas masking out the audio text gives $Y^- = \mathcal{F}_{\text{VL}}(V, \emptyset)$. The resulting pair $\{(X, Y^+), (X, Y^-)\}$ teaches the model that genuine audio cues in X should be preferred over video-only reasoning.

Modality-robustness preferences Even with aligned audio–video pairs, large models tend to fall back on strong text priors. To counteract this, we create two degraded versions of X :

$$X_{V^-} = \{V^-, A, T\}, \quad X_{A^-} = \{V, A^-, T\},$$

where

$$V^- = V + \varepsilon_v, \quad \varepsilon_v \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_v^2 I), \tag{1}$$

$$A^- = A + \varepsilon_a, \quad \varepsilon_a \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_a^2 I). \tag{2}$$

Combined dataset Putting both strategies together, our final dataset is

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(X, Y^+), (X, Y^-)\} \cup \{(X, Y^+), (X_{V^-}, Y^+)\} \cup \{(X, Y^+), (X_{A^-}, Y^+)\},$$

providing both audio–video alignment pairs and modality-robustness pairs to drive downstream preference optimization.

In total, we collected 9141 pairs of samples on 1076 distinct videos. More elaborate information on durations of videos and audios and the length of the captions can be found in Figure 2.

4 Method

In this section, we detail the OMNIDPO framework for omni-modal hallucination mitigation. We first formalize the problem and recap the standard DPO objective. We then introduce our conditional multi-modal preference optimization approach, describing how we generate modality-conditioned preference pairs and incorporate them into the training loss.




Figure 2: Key statistical information of our dataset.

4.1 Task Formulation

We consider a general omni-modal input $X = \{V, A, T\}$, where V is visual input (a sequence of video frames, which can degenerate to a single image), A is auditory input (e.g. an audio track or spoken question), and T is textual input (such as a text prompt or question). The OLLM is tasked with generating a textual output Y (an answer or description). Hallucination occurs when Y contains information not supported by V or A . We assume access to a dataset of preference comparisons $\{(X, Y^+, Y^-)\}$, where for each input X two candidate outputs are given: Y^+ (the preferred/correct output) and Y^- (the less preferred, possibly hallucinated output). These could be obtained via human annotation or automated generation, plus human verification.

DPO provides a way to train the model $P_\theta(Y|X)$ to align with preferences without explicit reinforcement learning. Given a preference tuple (X, Y^+, Y^-) , the standard DPO objective encourages the model to increase the probability of Y^+ and decrease that of Y^- . The DPO loss is:

$$L_{\text{DPO}}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y^+, Y^-)} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \left(\frac{\log P_\theta(Y^+|X)}{\log P_{\text{ref}}(Y^+|X)} - \frac{\log P_\theta(Y^-|X)}{\log P_{\text{ref}}(Y^-|X)} \right) \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

where σ is the sigmoid function and β is temperature for the preference difference.

4.2 OMNIDPO

As described in Section 3, in addition to the original human preference comparisons between output pairs (Y^+, Y^-) given the full input X , we introduce new comparisons using modified inputs X_{V^-} and X_{A^-} , which are constructed by masking visual or audio modalities, respectively. We denote the model’s output probabilities as $P_\theta(Y|X)$ when full input is given, and $P_\theta(Y|X_{V^-})$, $P_\theta(Y|X_{A^-})$ for the degraded cases.

Visual Preference Objective: We create a comparison between the same output under full vs. degraded visual input. Ideally, the model should assign a higher likelihood to the correct output Y^+ when it has the full video V than when it only has V^- . To enforce this, we treat (X, Y^+) as the preferred scenario and (X_{V^-}, Y^+) as the dispreferred scenario. We do not alter the output in this pair — only the input differs. The visual preference loss L_{vis} can be written as:

$$L_{\text{vis}}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(X, X_{V^-}, Y^+)} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \left[\log \frac{P_\theta(Y^+ | V, A, T)}{P_{\text{ref}}(Y^+ | V, A, T)} - \log \frac{P_\theta(Y^+ | V^-, A, T)}{P_{\text{ref}}(Y^+ | V^-, A, T)} \right] \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

This term pushes the model to increase $P_\theta(Y^+|V, A, T)$ relative to $P_\theta(Y^+|V^-, A, T)$. Intuitively, the model is penalized if it would be just as confident in Y^+ even with a missing/blurred video. The only way for the model to satisfy this objective is to genuinely utilize the visual input V when available (since with V it should produce higher confidence in the correct answer). Notably, we do not include Y^- in this comparison; we are not directly contrasting Y^+ vs Y^- here, but rather Y^+ with vs. without vision.

Auditory Preference Objective: Analogously, we define an audio preference loss L_{aud} . We compare the model’s confidence in Y^+ with full input vs. with muted audio. The audio preference loss is:

$$L_{\text{aud}}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(X, X_{A^-}, Y^+)} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \left[\log \frac{P_\theta(Y^+ | V, A, T)}{P_{\text{ref}}(Y^+ | V, A, T)} - \log \frac{P_\theta(Y^+ | V, A^-, T)}{P_{\text{ref}}(Y^+ | V, A^-, T)} \right] \right) \right] \quad (5)$$

This term teaches the model to rely on auditory information A when it is present. For example, if the question T asks “Is the person in the video speaking?” and the correct answer Y^+ is “Yes, you can hear them speak”, then with A silenced the model should be much less certain, and L_{aud} will enforce that difference in probability. Without such training, a model might answer “Yes” purely from prior knowledge that people in videos often speak, which would be a hallucination if the audio is silent; OMNIDPO prevents this by explicitly penalizing confidence when the evidence (audio) is absent. It’s important to note that the degraded-input comparisons always involve the preferred output Y^+ . We assume Y^+ is the ground-truth or a human-verified correct answer that is consistent with the full input. By training the model on (X_{V^-}, Y^+) and (X_{A^-}, Y^+) , we are not asserting that Y^+ is wrong for the degraded input—rather, we are asserting that with less information, the model should be less sure. In practice, if Y^+ truly depends on the missing information, Y^+ might no longer even be a correct answer when the modality is removed (e.g., if the video is removed, the question might be unanswerable). The model doesn’t explicitly know this, but the optimization will implicitly encourage the model to assign lower probability in those cases, which aligns with the idea that it shouldn’t output Y^+ confidently if it can’t see/hear the necessary cues.

Combining Objectives: The full OMNIDPO loss combines the standard preference loss with the new modality-specific terms, where λ_V and λ_A are hyperparameters:

$$L_{\text{OMNI}}(\theta) = L_{\text{DPO}}(\theta) + \lambda_V L_{\text{vis}}(\theta) + \lambda_A L_{\text{aud}}(\theta). \quad (6)$$

5 Experiments

5.1 Experiments Setup

Datasets and Metrics. **AVHBench** [66] is specifically designed to assess the perception, reasoning, and hallucination robustness of OLLMs. It comprises four evaluation subsets: Audio-Visual Matching, Audio-Visual Captioning, Audio-Driven Video Hallucination, and Video-Driven Audio Hallucination. In our evaluation, we focus on the two hallucination-focused subsets, which specifically measure a model’s tendency to hallucinate visual content based solely on audio priors, or vice versa. To quantify performance in hallucination mitigation, the benchmark employs standard classification metrics: Accuracy, Precision, Recall, and F1 Score.

CMM (Curse of Multi-Modalities) [34] is a benchmark specifically designed to evaluate hallucination behavior in OLLMs across text, vision, and audio modalities. It focuses on measuring a model’s tendency to generate modality-inconsistent outputs by presenting it with inputs where one or more modalities contradict the others. Each sample is paired with two probing questions—one targeting an existing object or event (ground-truth answer “yes”) and one targeting a non-existent one (ground-truth “no”)—covering both visual and auditory modalities. CMM uses two core metrics: Perception Accuracy (PA) and Hallucination Resistance (HR), defined as follows:

$$\text{PA} = \frac{\# \text{ correctly predicted "yes"}}{\# \text{ ground-truth "yes"}}, \quad \text{HR} = \frac{\# \text{ correctly predicted "no"}}{\# \text{ ground-truth "no"}}, \quad (7)$$

where PA measures the model’s ability to correctly detect real elements, while HR quantifies its robustness in rejecting non-existent ones.

Baselines and Models. We conduct experiments using two recently released and widely adopted OLLMs: Qwen2.5-Omni and MiniCPM-o-2.6. As baselines, we include both training free methods such as VCD and ICT, as well as a training based method, DPO (text only), which performs preference optimization solely on textual responses.

Implementation Details. For both models, we adopt full-parameter fine-tuning using fp16 precision. The learning rate scheduler is set to cosine, with a warmup ratio of 0.1. The DPO loss coefficient (β) is fixed at 0.1 throughout all training runs. For Qwen2.5-Omni, we use a learning rate of 1e-6, while for MiniCPM-o-2.6, the learning rate is set to 1e-5. We set $\lambda_V = \lambda_A = 1$. All experiments were conducted on a system equipped with $8 \times \text{H100 GPUs}$

5.2 Main Results

AVHBench Table 1 presents the results of Qwen2.5-Omni and MiniCPM-o-2.6 on the two domains of AVHBench: Audio-Driven Video Hallucination and Video-Driven Audio Hallucination. From the results, we draw the following conclusions: **1)** Applying OMNIDPO leads to significant improvements in F1-score, with average gains of 5.82% for Qwen2.5-Omni and 2.64% for MiniCPM-o-2.6. This demonstrates that OMNIDPO, by leveraging both textual preference optimization and omni-modal preference alignment, effectively mitigates hallucination in multimodal settings. **2)** Existing methods such as VCD and ICT, which were originally proposed for vision-language hallucination mitigation, provide only marginal improvements—and in some cases even degrade performance. While these methods reduce the influence of biased language priors and encourage visual grounding, they fail to model the subtle interactions between audio and visual modalities. Moreover, intervention-based approaches like ICT rely on activation shifts observed in visual tasks, which do not generalize well to omnimodal contexts. **3)** For Qwen2.5-Omni, the base model exhibits a strong bias toward answering "yes," often relying on a single modality without properly integrating cross-modal information. This results in hallucinations when critical multimodal cues are absent. OMNIDPO addresses this by constructing multimodal preference pairs that teach the model to be cautious in its affirmations. As a result, the "yes" response rate drops by 16.96%, indicating improved resistance to hallucination in omni-modal scenarios. **4)** While text-only DPO helps the model better understand fine-grained audio-video relationships, it fails to sufficiently shift the model’s attention toward non-textual modalities. The dominance of the language modality remains unbalanced, limiting its effectiveness and resulting in no significant performance gains.

CMM Table 2 presents the performance of Qwen2.5-Omni and MiniCPM-o-2.6 on the CMM benchmark, which evaluates hallucination robustness under two major domains: Spurious Inter-modality Correlation and Uni-modality Overreliance. Based on the results, we draw the following conclusions: **1)** Applying OMNIDPO consistently improves both PA and HR across all sub-domains. For Qwen2.5-Omni, OMNIDPO achieves an average improvement of +1.6% (pa) and +4.5% (hr). Similarly, MiniCPM-o-2.6 sees gains of +1.9% (pa) and +4.9% (hr). Notably, the larger improvement in hr suggests that OMNIDPO is particularly effective at reducing false affirmations of non-existent multimodal information, which aligns with its design: by training on modality-aware preference pairs, the model learns to suppress overconfident hallucinations when visual or auditory evidence is insufficient. **2)** Methods like VCD and ICT, which focus on vision-language grounding, improve performance in the VL domain, but this comes at the cost of decreased performance in other areas. Specifically, these methods often degrade performance in the Visual Dominance domain, suggesting an over-correction toward visual features that suppresses necessary cross-modal balance. Moreover, since neither VCD nor ICT explicitly models audio-visual interactions, they fail to improve the VAL (video-audio-language) sub-domain. This highlights the limitation of vision-centric interventions when applied to omni-modal contexts. **3)** While standard DPO slightly improves VAL by learning

Table 1: AVHBench results for Qwen2.5-Omni and MiniCPM-o-2.6 on the two subsets—Audio-driven Video Hallucination and Video-driven Audio Hallucination. Metrics include Accuracy (Acc.), Precision (Prec.), Recall (Rec.), F1-score, and the proportion of “Yes” responses (Yes %)

Model	Audio-driven Video Hallucination					Video-driven Audio Hallucination				
	Acc. (↑)	Prec. (↑)	Rec. (↑)	F1 (↑)	Yes (%)	Acc. (↑)	Prec. (↑)	Rec. (↑)	F1 (↑)	Yes (%)
Qwen2.5-Omni										
Qwen2.5-Omni	74.12	68.72	88.56	77.38	64.44	67.60	60.84	98.78	75.30	81.18
+ VCD	77.40	75.94	80.20	77.52	60.02	68.11	61.40	97.52	77.38	79.90
+ ICT	76.70	73.12	84.45	78.58	61.28	68.80	62.10	96.50	77.80	78.95
+ DPO	71.74	67.73	83.04	74.61	58.19	68.70	62.41	94.04	75.03	71.72
+ OMNIDPO	84.42	88.87	78.70	83.47	44.28	77.51	70.40	94.93	80.85	67.42
MiniCPM-o-2.6										
MiniCPM-o-2.6	74.65	72.78	78.75	75.71	53.79	72.80	70.42	78.63	74.41	55.55
+ VCD	73.97	72.94	76.20	74.55	53.21	73.96	72.15	78.05	75.04	55.05
+ ICT	75.92	74.83	78.12	76.46	53.32	72.25	69.88	78.20	73.92	55.18
+ DPO	76.07	74.66	78.92	76.76	52.55	74.73	72.81	78.93	75.81	54.54
+OMNIDPO	76.85	74.72	81.16	77.81	54.31	76.68	74.70	80.70	77.58	54.02

Table 2: Performance of Qwen2.5-Omni and MiniCPM-o-2.6 on the CMM benchmark after applying different hallucination-mitigation strategies. The benchmark examines two broad error sources—Spurious Inter-modality Correlations and Over-reliance on Unimodal Priors—broken down into six sub-domains: VL (Visual–Language), AL (Audio–Language), VAL (Visual–Audio–Language), Visual Dom (Visual-dominance), Audio Dom (Audio-dominance), and Lang Dom (Language-dominance).

Model	Spurious Inter-modality Correlation						Uni-modality Overreliance						Overall	
	VL		AL		VAL		Visual Dom		Audio Dom		Lang Dom		pa ↑	hr ↑
	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑		
Qwen2.5-Omni														
Qwen2.5-Omni	92.0	86.5	92.0	78.0	93.0	90.5	95.0	56.5	92.5	39.5	85.5	74.0	91.7	70.2
+VCD	93.5	89.0	90.0	77.5	93.5	90.0	94.5	56.5	93.0	40.0	87.5	75.0	92.0	71.3
+ICT	94.5	90.0	89.0	78.0	94.0	91.5	93.5	57.0	93.5	39.5	88.0	75.0	92.1	71.8
+DPO	92.5	87.0	92.0	79.5	95.0	93.5	95.5	66.0	94.5	37.5	87.0	76.0	92.8	73.3
+OMNIDPO	94.0	89.5	91.5	83.5	95.5	94.5	95.5	63.5	95.0	41.5	88.0	75.5	93.3	74.7
MiniCPM-o-2.6														
MiniCPM-o-2.6	85.0	91.0	95.0	53.0	92.0	76.5	91.0	56.5	89.0	34.5	76.5	72.0	88.1	63.9
+VCD	88.0	91.5	95.0	52.0	91.0	76.5	89.5	55.0	89.0	33.0	78.5	74.5	88.5	63.8
+ICT	89.0	93.5	94.5	54.5	93.0	76.5	88.5	56.0	90.5	35.0	78.0	75.5	88.9	65.1
+DPO	87.0	93.0	95.5	57.5	94.5	78.5	90.5	58.5	91.5	32.5	81.5	77.0	90.1	66.2
+OMNIDPO	90.0	94.0	96.5	59.5	93.0	81.5	94.0	63.5	91.5	32.5	81.0	82.0	91.0	68.8

from textual preference pairs, it brings minimal improvements—or even regressions—on other domains. For example, DPO underperforms in Audio Dominance and Visual Dominance, indicating that without modality-specific conditioning, models still over-rely on dominant priors or shortcuts. In contrast, OMNIDPO improves all sub-domains by explicitly encouraging the model to distinguish between complete and degraded modality inputs.

6 Analysis

6.1 Ablation Study

To investigate how preference optimization for different modalities affects a model’s resistance to hallucination, we conduct an ablation study on Qwen2.5-Omni. The results are presented in Table 3. From the table, we observe that applying either video-only or audio-only preference optimization individually yields positive effects on the model’s performance. When both modalities are optimized simultaneously, the model’s robustness against hallucination is further enhanced. Interestingly, on the CMM benchmark, we notice a modality interference effect: optimizing preferences for only one modality can negatively impact the performance related to the other modality. In contrast, jointly optimizing both audio and video preferences leads to consistent and overall improvements across modalities.

Table 3: Ablation Study. “+ Audio” denotes applying only the audio loss L_{aud} , while “+ Video” uses only the visual loss L_{vis} . For the CMM dataset, results are reported on the Spurious Inter-modality Correlation subsets: VL, AL, and VAL. For AVHBench, “A-V Hal.” refers to the Audio-driven Video Hallucination setting, and “V-A Hal.” to the Video-driven Audio Hallucination setting.

Model	CMM						AVHBench			
	VL		AL		VAL		A-V Hal.		V-A Hal.	
	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑	pa ↑	hr ↑	Acc. ↑	F1 ↑	Acc. ↑	F1 ↑
Qwen2.5-Omni	92.0	86.5	92.0	78.0	93.0	90.5	74.1	77.4	67.6	75.3
+ Audio	93.5	82.5	93.0	82.5	92.5	93.5	80.9	81.1	76.7	80.4
+ Video	95.5	88.5	90.5	63.0	94.0	66.0	82.4	81.4	66.3	74.6
+ OMNIDPO	94.0	89.5	91.5	83.5	95.5	94.5	84.4	83.5	77.5	80.9




Figure 3: Performance comparison on reasoning benchmarks (MMAU [61] and MMMU [93]) after applying different alignment methods. All evaluations are performed in a zero-shot setting. OMNIDPO leads to consistent improvements across both benchmarks, indicating enhanced multimodal reasoning, while VCD and ICT show limited or modality-specific gains.

6.2 Experiments on Non-hallucination Benchmarks

To investigate whether applying OMNIDPO affects a model’s general reasoning capabilities, we evaluate performance on two widely used benchmarks: MMAU (Massive Multi-Task Audio Understanding) [61] and MMMU (Massive Multi-discipline Multimodal Understanding) [93]. We also compare results with VCD and ICT. The outcomes are shown in Figure 3. Experimental results show that after applying OMNIDPO, Qwen2.5-Omni achieves an average performance gain of 2.4%, while MiniCPM-o-2.6 improves by 3.6%. This indicates that OMNIDPO not only mitigates hallucinations but also enhances the model’s reasoning and understanding capabilities by encouraging better attention to audio and visual inputs through multimodal preference optimization. In contrast, VCD reduces performance on reasoning tasks, likely because it removes language priors, including those beneficial for reasoning. ICT, while improving performance on MMMU by reinforcing visual grounding, does not account for audio modality and thus fails to improve the model’s understanding of auditory information.

6.3 Case Study and Error Analysis



Figure 4: Case Study and Error Analysis of OMNIDPO.

In Figure 4, we present a case study from the CMM benchmark to evaluate the performance of our model, OMNIDPO. As illustrated on the left side of the figure, while the base model, Qwen2.5-Omni, failed to distinguish between maps with trees, our OMNIDPO completed the task. In this instance, OMNIDPO overcame the tendency to answer "Yes" due to language priors and instead derived the correct response from the visual information.

On the right side of the figure, however, both the base model and OMNIDPO produced incorrect answers. We hypothesize that this is due to limitations in the base model’s visual understanding. Although OMNIDPO mitigates the issue of over-reliance on textual modality, it does not fundamentally enhance the visual capabilities inherited from the base model. Consequently, when faced with ambiguous visual content, such as in the right part of Figure 4, where roads closely resemble rivers, the model still struggles to provide an accurate response.

7 Conclusion and Limitations

We presented OMNIDPO, the first dedicated framework for mitigating omni-modal hallucinations in OLLMs. By extending DPO with modality-specific objectives, OMNIDPO effectively compels models to ground their outputs in both visual and auditory inputs, rather than over-relying on textual priors or spurious correlations. To support training, we constructed OmniDPO-10k, the first preference-alignment dataset specifically designed to expose and counteract hallucinations arising

from misaligned or over-relied modalities (text, video, audio). Each sample includes paired modality-based preferences, enabling fine-grained supervision over model behavior. Through experiments on cutting-edge benchmarks (CMM and AVHBench) and models of different scales, we demonstrated that OMNIDPO substantially reduces hallucinations across video, audio, and text scenarios, outperforming existing alignment methods.

Limitations Due to limitations in the base models, our work currently supports only textual, visual, and audio modalities. Future research may explore the incorporation of more diverse input forms. Although our methods involve training, the computational cost is moderate rather than prohibitive; nonetheless, the development of training-free approaches could offer valuable alternatives.

References

- [1] Vedika Agarwal, Rakshith Shetty, and Mario Fritz. Towards Causal VQA: Revealing and Reducing Spurious Correlations by Invariant and Covariant Semantic Editing, May 2020.
- [2] Wenbin An, Feng Tian, Sicong Leng, Jiahao Nie, Haonan Lin, QianYing Wang, Guang Dai, Ping Chen, and Shijian Lu. Agla: Mitigating object hallucinations in large vision-language models with assembly of global and local attention. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [3] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report, 2025.
- [4] Zechen Bai, Pichao Wang, Tianjun Xiao, Tong He, Zongbo Han, Zheng Zhang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Hallucination of multimodal large language models: A survey, 2025.
- [5] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D. Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901, 2020.
- [6] Beitao Chen, Xinyu Lyu, Lianli Gao, Jingkuan Song, and Heng Tao Shen. Alleviating hallucinations in large vision-language models through hallucination-induced optimization, 2024.
- [7] Cong Chen, Mingyu Liu, Chenchen Jing, Yizhou Zhou, Fengyun Rao, Hao Chen, Bo Zhang, and Chunhua Shen. PerturboLLaVA: Reducing Multimodal Hallucinations with Perturbative Visual Training, March 2025.
- [8] Junzhe Chen, Tianshu Zhang, Shiyu Huang, Yuwei Niu, Linfeng Zhang, Lijie Wen, and Xuming Hu. Ict: Image-object cross-level trusted intervention for mitigating object hallucination in large vision-language models, 2024.
- [9] Kai Chen, Yunhao Gou, Runhui Huang, Zhili Liu, Daxin Tan, Jing Xu, Chunwei Wang, Yi Zhu, Yihan Zeng, Kuo Yang, Dingdong Wang, Kun Xiang, Haoyuan Li, Haoli Bai, Jianhua Han, Xiaohui Li, Weike Jin, Nian Xie, Yu Zhang, James T. Kwok, Hengshuang Zhao, Xiaodan Liang, Dit-Yan Yeung, Xiao Chen, Zhenguo Li, Wei Zhang, Qun Liu, Jun Yao, Lanqing Hong, Lu Hou, and Hang Xu. Emova: Empowering language models to see, hear and speak with vivid emotions, 2025.
- [10] Sihan Chen, Handong Li, Qunbo Wang, Zijia Zhao, Mingzhen Sun, Xinxin Zhu, and Jing Liu. VAST: A Vision-Audio-Subtitle-Text Omni-Modality Foundation Model and Dataset, October 2023.
- [11] Zhaorun Chen, Zhuokai Zhao, Hongyin Luo, Huaxiu Yao, Bo Li, and Jiawei Zhou. Halc: Object hallucination reduction via adaptive focal-contrast decoding, June 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.00425>.

- [12] Zesen Cheng, Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Yifei Xin, Xin Li, Guanzheng Chen, Yongxin Zhu, Wenqi Zhang, Ziyang Luo, Deli Zhao, and Lidong Bing. Videollama 2: Advancing spatial-temporal modeling and audio understanding in video-llms, 2024.
- [13] I-Chun Chern, Steffi Chern, Shiqi Chen, Weizhe Yuan, Kehua Feng, Chunting Zhou, Junxian He, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. Factool: Factuality detection in generative ai – a tool augmented framework for multi-task and multi-domain scenarios, July 2023. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13528>.
- [14] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2(3):6, 2023.
- [15] Yunfei Chu, Jin Xu, Qian Yang, Haojie Wei, Xipin Wei, Zhifang Guo, Yichong Leng, Yuanjun Lv, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen2-audio technical report, 2024.
- [16] Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James Glass, and Pengcheng He. Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models, March 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.03883>.
- [17] Sebastian Farquhar, Jannik Kossen, Lorenz Kuhn, and Yarin Gal. Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. *Nature*, 630(8017):625–630, Jun 2024.
- [18] Alessandro Favero, Luca Zancato, Matthew Trager, Siddharth Choudhary, Pramuditha Perera, Alessandro Achille, Ashwin Swaminathan, and Stefano Soatto. Multi-modal hallucination control by visual information grounding, 2024.
- [19] Chaoyou Fu, Haojia Lin, Zuwei Long, Yunhang Shen, Meng Zhao, Yifan Zhang, Shaoqi Dong, Xiong Wang, Di Yin, Long Ma, Xiawu Zheng, Ran He, Rongrong Ji, Yunsheng Wu, Caifeng Shan, and Xing Sun. Vita: Towards open-source interactive omni multimodal llm, 2024.
- [20] Hongcheng Gao, Jiashu Qu, Jingyi Tang, Baolong Bi, Yue Liu, Hongyu Chen, Li Liang, Li Su, and Qingming Huang. Exploring hallucination of large multimodal models in video understanding: Benchmark, analysis and mitigation, 2025.
- [21] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all, 2023.
- [22] Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Harkirat Singh Behl, Xin Wang, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Yin Tat Lee, and Yuanzhi Li. Textbooks are all you need, 2023.
- [23] Anisha Gunjal, Jihan Yin, and Erhan Bas. Detecting and preventing hallucinations in large vision language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18135–18143, 2024.
- [24] Yuxin Guo, Shuailei Ma, Shijie Ma, Xiaoyi Bao, Chen-Wei Xie, Kecheng Zheng, Tingyu Weng, Siyang Sun, Yun Zheng, and Wei Zou. Aligned better, listen better for audio-visual large language models, 2025.
- [25] Jiaming Han, Kaixiong Gong, Yiyuan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, Kaipeng Zhang, Dahua Lin, Yu Qiao, Peng Gao, and Xiangyu Yue. Onellm: One framework to align all modalities with language, 2025.
- [26] Qidong Huang, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Bin Wang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Dahua Lin, Weiming Zhang, and Nenghai Yu. Opera: Alleviating hallucination in multi-modal large language models via over-trust penalty and retrospection-allocation. *arXiv preprint*, March 2024.
- [27] Wen Huang, Hongbin Liu, Minxin Guo, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Visual hallucinations of multi-modal large language models, 2024.

- [28] Fushuo Huo, Wenchao Xu, Zhong Zhang, Haozhao Wang, Zhicheng Chen, and Peilin Zhao. Self-introspective decoding: Alleviating hallucinations for large vision-language models, 2024.
- [29] Fushuo Huo, Wenchao Xu, Zhong Zhang, Haozhao Wang, Zhicheng Chen, and Peilin Zhao. Self-Introspective Decoding: Alleviating Hallucinations for Large Vision-Language Models, March 2025.
- [30] Nick Jiang, Anish Kachinthaya, Suzie Petryk, and Yossi Gandelsman. Interpreting and editing vision-language representations to mitigate hallucinations, 2025.
- [31] Junho Kim, Hyunjun Kim, Yeonju Kim, and Yong Man Ro. Code: Contrasting self-generated description to combat hallucination in large multi-modal models, 2024.
- [32] Dan Kondratyuk, Lijun Yu, Xiuye Gu, José Lezama, Jonathan Huang, Grant Schindler, Rachel Hornung, Vighnesh Birodkar, Jimmy Yan, Ming-Chang Chiu, Krishna Somandepalli, Hassan Akbari, Yair Alon, Yong Cheng, Josh Dillon, Agrim Gupta, Meera Hahn, Anja Hauth, David Hendon, Alonso Martinez, David Minnen, Mikhail Sirotenko, Kihyuk Sohn, Xuan Yang, Hartwig Adam, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Irfan Essa, Huisheng Wang, David A. Ross, Bryan Seybold, and Lu Jiang. Videopoet: A large language model for zero-shot video generation, 2024.
- [33] Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. *arXiv*, Apr 2023.
- [34] Sicong Leng, Yun Xing, Zesen Cheng, Yang Zhou, Hang Zhang, Xin Li, Deli Zhao, Shijian Lu, Chunyan Miao, and Lidong Bing. The curse of multi-modalities: Evaluating hallucinations of large multimodal models across language, visual, and audio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12787*, 2024.
- [35] Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Guanzheng Chen, Xin Li, Shijian Lu, Chunyan Miao, and Lidong Bing. Mitigating Object Hallucinations in Large Vision-Language Models through Visual Contrastive Decoding, November 2023.
- [36] Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Guanzheng Chen, Xin Li, Shijian Lu, Chunyan Miao, and Lidong Bing. Mitigating object hallucinations in large vision-language models through visual contrastive decoding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13872–13882, 2024.
- [37] Jiaming Li, Jiacheng Zhang, Zequn Jie, Lin Ma, and Guanbin Li. Mitigating Hallucination for Large Vision Language Model by Inter-Modality Correlation Calibration Decoding, March 2025.
- [38] Yadong Li, Jun Liu, Tao Zhang, Tao Zhang, Song Chen, Tianpeng Li, Zehuan Li, Lijun Liu, Lingfeng Ming, Guosheng Dong, Da Pan, Chong Li, Yuanbo Fang, Dongdong Kuang, Mingrui Wang, Chenglin Zhu, Youwei Zhang, Hongyu Guo, Fengyu Zhang, Yuran Wang, Bowen Ding, Wei Song, Xu Li, Yuqi Huo, Zheng Liang, Shusen Zhang, Xin Wu, Shuai Zhao, Linchu Xiong, Yozhen Wu, Jiahui Ye, Wenhao Lu, Bowen Li, Yan Zhang, Yaqi Zhou, Xin Chen, Lei Su, Hongda Zhang, Fuzhong Chen, Xuezhen Dong, Na Nie, Zhiying Wu, Bin Xiao, Ting Li, Shunya Dang, Ping Zhang, Yijia Sun, Jincheng Wu, Jinjie Yang, Xionghai Lin, Zhi Ma, Kegeng Wu, Jia li, Aiyuan Yang, Hui Liu, Jianqiang Zhang, Xiaoxi Chen, Guangwei Ai, Wentao Zhang, Yicong Chen, Xiaoqin Huang, Kun Li, Wenjing Luo, Yifei Duan, Lingling Zhu, Ran Xiao, Zhe Su, Jiani Pu, Dian Wang, Xu Jia, Tianyu Zhang, Mengyu Ai, Mang Wang, Yujing Qiao, Lei Zhang, Yanjun Shen, Fan Yang, Miao Zhen, Yijie Zhou, Mingyang Chen, Fei Li, Chenzheng Zhu, Keer Lu, Yaqi Zhao, Hao Liang, Youquan Li, Yanzhao Qin, Linzhuang Sun, Jianhua Xu, Haoze Sun, Mingan Lin, Zenan Zhou, and Weipeng Chen. Baichuan-omni-1.5 technical report, 2025.
- [39] Zhuowei Li, Haizhou Shi, Yunhe Gao, Di Liu, Zhenting Wang, Yuxiao Chen, Ting Liu, Long Zhao, Hao Wang, and Dimitris N. Metaxas. The Hidden Life of Tokens: Reducing Hallucination of Large Vision-Language Models via Visual Information Steering, February 2025.

- [40] Weixin Liang, Yuhui Zhang, Yongchan Kwon, Serena Yeung, and James Zou. Mind the gap: Understanding the modality gap in multi-modal contrastive representation learning, 2022.
- [41] Jiaqi Liao, Yuwei Niu, Fanqing Meng, Hao Li, Changyao Tian, Yinuo Du, Yuwen Xiong, Dianqi Li, Xizhou Zhu, Li Yuan, et al. Langbridge: Interpreting image as a combination of language embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19404*, 2025.
- [42] Bin Lin, Zongjian Li, Xinhua Cheng, Yuwei Niu, Yang Ye, Xianyi He, Shenghai Yuan, Wangbo Yu, Shaodong Wang, Yunyang Ge, et al. Uniworld: High-resolution semantic encoders for unified visual understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03147*, 2025.
- [43] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Mitigating hallucination in large multi-modal models via robust instruction tuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [44] Hanchao Liu, Wenyan Xue, Yifei Chen, Dapeng Chen, Xiutian Zhao, Ke Wang, Liping Hou, Rongjun Li, and Wei Peng. A Survey on Hallucination in Large Vision-Language Models, May 2024.
- [45] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [46] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [47] Sheng Liu, Haotian Ye, Lei Xing, and James Zou. Reducing hallucinations in vision-language models via latent space steering, 2024.
- [48] Shi Liu, Kecheng Zheng, and Wei Chen. Paying more attention to image: A training-free method for alleviating hallucination in vlms, 2024.
- [49] Zuyan Liu, Yuhao Dong, Jiahui Wang, Ziwei Liu, Winston Hu, Jiwen Lu, and Yongming Rao. Ola: Pushing the Frontiers of Omni-Modal Language Model with Progressive Modality Alignment, February 2025.
- [50] Alexander Nikitin, Jannik Kossen, Yarin Gal, and Pekka Marttinen. Kernel language entropy: Fine-grained uncertainty quantification for llms from semantic similarities. *arXiv*, May 2024.
- [51] Taichi Nishimura, Shota Nakada, and Masayoshi Kondo. On the audio hallucinations in large audio-video language models, 2024.
- [52] OpenAI. GPT-4. <https://openai.com/gpt-4>, 2023.
- [53] Leyi Pan, Aiwei Liu, Shiyu Huang, Yijian Lu, Xuming Hu, Lijie Wen, Irwin King, and Philip S. Yu. Can LLM watermarks robustly prevent unauthorized knowledge distillation? *CoRR*, abs/2502.11598, 2025.
- [54] Leyi Pan, Aiwei Liu, Yijian Lu, Zitian Gao, Yichen Di, Lijie Wen, Irwin King, and Philip S. Yu. Waterseeker: Pioneering efficient detection of watermarked segments in large documents. In Luis Chiruzzo, Alan Ritter, and Lu Wang, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, April 29 - May 4, 2025*, pages 2866–2882. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025.
- [55] Phuc Phan, Hieu Tran, and Long Phan. Distillation contrastive decoding: Improving llms reasoning with contrastive decoding and distillation, 2024.
- [56] Xiaoye Qu, Jiashuo Sun, Wei Wei, and Yu Cheng. Look, compare, decide: Alleviating hallucination in large vision-language models via multi-view multi-path reasoning, August 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.17150>.
- [57] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct Preference Optimization: Your Language Model is Secretly a Reward Model, July 2024.

- [58] Vikas Raunak, Arul Menezes, and Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt. The curious case of hallucinations in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1172–1183, 6 2021.
- [59] Kim S., Cho B., Bae S., Ahn S., and Yun S.Y. Vacode: Visual augmented contrastive decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05337*, July 2024.
- [60] Pranab Sahoo, Prabhash Meharia, Akash Ghosh, Sriparna Saha, Vinija Jain, and Aman Chadha. A comprehensive survey of hallucination in large language, image, video and audio foundation models, 2024.
- [61] S Sakshi, Utkarsh Tyagi, Sonal Kumar, Ashish Seth, Ramaneswaran Selvakumar, Oriol Nieto, Ramani Duraiswami, Sreyan Ghosh, and Dinesh Manocha. Mmau: A massive multi-task audio understanding and reasoning benchmark, 2024.
- [62] Pritam Sarkar, Sayna Ebrahimi, Ali Etemad, Ahmad Beirami, Sercan Ö. Arık, and Tomas Pfister. Mitigating object hallucination in mllms via data-augmented phrase-level alignment, 2025.
- [63] Lei Shen, Haolan Zhan, Xin Shen, Hongshen Chen, Xiaofang Zhao, and Xiaodan Zhu. Identifying untrustworthy samples: Data filtering for open-domain dialogues with bayesian optimization. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 1598–1608, 2021.
- [64] Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Huayang Li, Jialu Xu, Yan Wang, and Deng Cai. Pandagpt: One model to instruction-follow them all, 2023.
- [65] Zhiqing Sun, Sheng Shen, Shengcao Cao, Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yikang Shen, Chuang Gan, Liang-Yan Gui, Yu-Xiong Wang, Yiming Yang, Kurt Keutzer, and Trevor Darrell. Aligning large multimodal models with factually augmented rlhf, 2023.
- [66] Kim Sung-Bin, Oh Hyun-Bin, JungMok Lee, Arda Senocak, Joon Son Chung, and Tae-Hyun Oh. Avhbench: A cross-modal hallucination benchmark for audio-visual large language models, 2025.
- [67] GLM T., Zeng A., Xu B., Wang B., Zhang C., Yin D., Rojas D., Feng G., Zhao H., Lai H., and Yu H. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*, June 2024.
- [68] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [69] Zhong W., Feng X., Zhao L., Li Q., Huang L., Gu Y., Ma W., Xu Y., and Qin B. Investigating and mitigating the multimodal hallucination snowballing in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00569*, August 2024.
- [70] Fei Wang, Wenxuan Zhou, James Y. Huang, Nan Xu, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Muhao Chen. mDPO: Conditional Preference Optimization for Multimodal Large Language Models, June 2024.
- [71] P Wang, S Bai, S Tan, S Wang, Z Fan, J Bai, K Chen, X Liu, J Wang, W Ge, and Y Fan. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, Sep 2024.
- [72] Xintong Wang, Jingheng Pan, Liang Ding, and Chris Biemann. Mitigating hallucinations in large vision-language models with instruction contrastive decoding, 2024.
- [73] Zehan Wang, Ziang Zhang, Xize Cheng, Rongjie Huang, Luping Liu, Zhenhui Ye, Haifeng Huang, Yang Zhao, Tao Jin, Peng Gao, and Zhou Zhao. Freebind: Free lunch in unified multimodal space via knowledge fusion, 2024.

- [74] Zehan Wang, Ziang Zhang, Hang Zhang, Luping Liu, Rongjie Huang, Xize Cheng, Hengshuang Zhao, and Zhou Zhao. OmniBind: Large-scale Omni Multimodal Representation via Binding Spaces, July 2024.
- [75] Sangmin Woo, Donguk Kim, Jaehyuk Jang, Yubin Choi, and Changick Kim. Don't miss the forest for the trees: Attentional vision calibration for large vision language models, 2024.
- [76] Junfei Wu, Qiang Liu, Ding Wang, Jinghao Zhang, Shu Wu, Liang Wang, and Tieniu Tan. Logical closed loop: Uncovering object hallucinations in large vision-language models, June 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.11622>.
- [77] Kai Wu, Boyuan Jiang, Zhengkai Jiang, Qingdong He, Donghao Luo, Shengzhi Wang, Qingwen Liu, and Chengjie Wang. Noiseboost: Alleviating hallucination with noise perturbation for multimodal large language models, May 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.20081>.
- [78] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-gpt: Any-to-any multimodal llm, 2024.
- [79] Tsung-Han Wu, Heekyung Lee, Jiabin Ge, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Trevor Darrell, and David M. Chan. Generate, but Verify: Reducing Hallucination in Vision-Language Models with Retrospective Resampling, April 2025.
- [80] Zongyu Wu, Yuwei Niu, Hongcheng Gao, Minhua Lin, Zhiwei Zhang, Zhifang Zhang, Qi Shi, Yilong Wang, Sike Fu, Junjie Xu, et al. Lanp: Rethinking the impact of language priors in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12359*, 2025.
- [81] Xin Xiao, Bohong Wu, Jiacong Wang, Chunyuan Li, Xun Zhou, and Haoyuan Guo. Seeing the image: Prioritizing visual correlation by contrastive alignment, 2024.
- [82] Yuxi Xie, Guanzhen Li, Xiao Xu, and Min-Yen Kan. V-DPO: Mitigating Hallucination in Large Vision Language Models via Vision-Guided Direct Preference Optimization, November 2024.
- [83] Jin Xu, Zhifang Guo, Jinzheng He, Hangrui Hu, Ting He, Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Jialin Wang, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Bin Zhang, Xiong Wang, Yunfei Chu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-omni technical report, 2025.
- [84] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. MSR-VTT: A Large Video Description Dataset for Bridging Video and Language. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5288–5296, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 2016. IEEE.
- [85] Xiaohan Xu, Chongyang Tao, Tao Shen, Can Xu, Hongbo Xu, Guodong Long, and Jianguang Lou. Re-reading improves reasoning in large language models, February 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06275>.
- [86] L Xue, M Shu, A Awadalla, J Wang, A Yan, S Purushwalkam, H Zhou, V Prabhu, Y Dai, M S Ryoo, and S Kendre. xgen-mm (blip-3): A family of open large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08872*, Aug 2024.
- [87] Park Y., Lee D., Choe J., and Chang B. Convis: Contrastive decoding with hallucination visualization for mitigating hallucinations in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13906*, August 2024.
- [88] Ziang Yan, Zhilin Li, Yinan He, Chenting Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Xiangyu Zeng, Zilei Wang, Yali Wang, Yu Qiao, Limin Wang, and Yi Wang. Task Preference Optimization: Improving Multimodal Large Language Models with Vision Task Alignment, December 2024.
- [89] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, et al. MiniCPM-o 2.6: A gpt-4o level mllm for vision, speech and multimodal live streaming on your phone. <https://github.com/OpenBMB/MiniCPM-o>, 2024.
- [90] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models. *National Science Review*, 11(12), November 2024.

- [91] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Tong Xu, Hao Wang, Dianbo Sui, Yunhang Shen, Ke Li, Xing Sun, and Enhong Chen. Woodpecker: Hallucination correction for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [92] Qifan Yu, Juncheng Li, Longhui Wei, Liang Pang, Wentao Ye, Bosheng Qin, Siliang Tang, Qi Tian, and Yueting Zhuang. Hallucidoctor: Mitigating hallucinatory toxicity in visual instruction data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12944–12953, 2024.
- [93] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of CVPR*, 2024.
- [94] Xianghu Yue, Xiaohai Tian, Lu Lu, Malu Zhang, Zhizheng Wu, and Haizhou Li. Coavt: A cognition-inspired unified audio-visual-text pre-training model for multimodal processing, 2024.
- [95] Han Z., Bai Z., Mei H., Xu Q., Zhang C., and Shou M.Z. Skip: A simple method to reduce hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01345*, 2024.
- [96] Jun Zhan, Junqi Dai, Jiasheng Ye, Yunhua Zhou, Dong Zhang, Zhigeng Liu, Xin Zhang, Ruibin Yuan, Ge Zhang, Linyang Li, Hang Yan, Jie Fu, Tao Gui, Tianxiang Sun, Yugang Jiang, and Xipeng Qiu. Anygpt: Unified multimodal llm with discrete sequence modeling, 2024.
- [97] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding, 2023.
- [98] Yi-Fan Zhang, Weichen Yu, Qingsong Wen, Xue Wang, Zhang Zhang, Liang Wang, Rong Jin, and Tieniu Tan. Debiasing multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint*, March 2024.
- [99] Ziang Zhang, Zehan Wang, Luping Liu, Rongjie Huang, Xize Cheng, Zhenhui Ye, Huadai Liu, Haifeng Huang, Yang Zhao, Tao Jin, et al. Extending multi-modal contrastive representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:91880–91903, 2024.
- [100] L Zhao, Y Deng, W Zhang, and Q Gu. Mitigating object hallucination in large vision-language models via classifier-free guidance. 2024.
- [101] Zhiyuan Zhao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Xiaoyi Dong, Jiaqi Wang, and Conghui He. Beyond Hallucinations: Enhancing LVLMs through Hallucination-Aware Direct Preference Optimization, February 2024.
- [102] Zhisheng Zhong, Chengyao Wang, Yuqi Liu, Senqiao Yang, Longxiang Tang, Yuechen Zhang, Jingyao Li, Tianyuan Qu, Yanwei Li, Yukang Chen, Shaozuo Yu, Sitong Wu, Eric Lo, Shu Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Lyra: An efficient and speech-centric framework for omni-cognition, 2024.
- [103] Yiyang Zhou, Chenhang Cui, Rafael Rafailov, Chelsea Finn, and Huaxiu Yao. Aligning Modalities in Vision Large Language Models via Preference Fine-tuning, February 2024.
- [104] Lanyun Zhu, Deyi Ji, Tianrun Chen, Peng Xu, Jieping Ye, and Jun Liu. Ibd: Alleviating hallucinations in large vision-language models via image-biased decoding. *arXiv preprint*, February 2024.
- [105] Xin Zou, Yizhou Wang, Yibo Yan, Sirui Huang, Kening Zheng, Junkai Chen, Chang Tang, and Xuming Hu. Look twice before you answer: Memory-space visual retracing for hallucination mitigation in multimodal large language models, 2024.

OMNIDPO: A Preference Optimization Framework to Address Omni-Modal Hallucination

Appendix A: Baseline Methods

VCD VCD [35] is a training-free method that mitigates hallucinations by contrasting the logits derived by the original image and the distorted image, which can reduce over-reliance on statistical bias and unimodal priors.

ICT ICT [8] utilizes a set of pre-calculated intervention vectors during inference time. These vectors capture the directions in activation space that motivate the model to pay more attention to both overall and fine-grained visual information. Through applying these intervention vectors on specific attention heads, ICT mitigates harmful language priors, thereby alleviating hallucinations.

Appendix B: Codes and Datasets

For the official implementation of our OMNIDPO as well as the OMNIDPO-10k, please refer to <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/OmnidPO-7E3C>

Appendix C: More Information About OMNIDPO-10k

In Table 4, we provide some examples of chosen outputs and rejected outputs in our OMNIDPO-10k. All the samples share the same question: <video><audio> What do you see and hear?

Table 4: Example Model Outputs (Chosen vs. Rejected)

Chosen Output	Rejected Output
“a person is explaining something”	“a person is singing something”
“the dogs on Paw Patrol are listening to a mission”	“the dogs on Paw Patrol are watching a mission”
“a man narrates a WF match between two men in a wrestling ring”	“a man gestures enthusiastically while observing a WF match between two men in a wrestling ring”
“a band is singing for a music video”	“a band is posing silently for a photoshoot”

In Figure 5, we provide more statistical information about our dataset.




Figure 5: Key statistical information of our dataset.