

GeoSense: Evaluating Identification and Application of Geometric Principles in Multimodal Reasoning

Liangyu Xu*
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
xuliangyu.xly@taobao.com

Yingxiu Zhao*
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
zhaoyingxiu.zyx@taobao.com

Jingyun Wang
Beihang University
Beijing, China
wangjingyun0730@gmail.com

Yingyao Wang
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
wangyingyao.wyy@taobao.com

Bu Pi
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
bupi.wj@taobao.com

Chen Wang
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
eson.wc@taobao.com

Mingliang Zhang
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
luxing.zml@taobao.com


Jihao Gu
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
gujihao.gjh@taobao.com

Xiang Li
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
yiheng.lx@taobao.com


Xiaoyong Zhu
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
xiaoyong.z@taobao.com

Jun Song[†]
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
jsong.sj@taobao.com


Bo Zheng[†]
Alibaba Group
Beijing, China
bozheng@alibaba-inc.com



(a) GPI Performance.



(b) GPA Performance.



(c) ACC Performance.

Figure 1: The performance of MLLMs in different subjects across (a) GPI, (b) GPA, and (c) ACC.

Abstract

Geometry problem-solving (GPS), a challenging task requiring both visual comprehension and symbolic reasoning, effectively measures the reasoning capabilities of multimodal large language models (MLLMs). Humans exhibit strong reasoning ability in this task through accurate identification and adaptive application of geometric principles within visual contexts. However, existing benchmarks fail to jointly assess both dimensions of the human-like geometric

reasoning mechanism in MLLMs, remaining a critical gap in assessing their ability to tackle GPS. To this end, we introduce **GeoSense**, the first comprehensive bilingual benchmark designed to systematically evaluate the geometric reasoning abilities of MLLMs through the lens of geometric principles. GeoSense features a five-level hierarchical framework of geometric principles spanning plane and solid geometry, an intricately annotated dataset of 1,789 problems, and an innovative evaluation strategy. Through extensive experiments on GeoSense with various open-source and closed-source MLLMs, we observe that Gemini-2.0-pro-flash performs best, achieving an overall score of 65.3. Our in-depth analysis reveals that

*Equally contribution.

[†] Corresponding author.

the identification and application of geometric principles remain a bottleneck for leading MLLMs, jointly hindering their reasoning abilities. These findings underscore GeoSense’s potential to guide future advancements in MLLMs’ geometric reasoning capabilities, paving the way for more robust and human-like reasoning in artificial intelligence.

CCS Concepts

• Theory of computation → Computational geometry.

Keywords

Geometry problem-solving, Multimodal reasoning, Geometric principles, Benchmark

1 Introduction

Geometry Problem-Solving (GPS) involves understanding spatial relationships and employing symbolic reasoning to arrive at logical solutions within complex visual contexts[6, 17, 26, 31, 51]. When faced with geometry problems, humans exhibit exceptional skills by correctly identifying geometric principles¹ and then adaptively applying them to derive solutions, as illustrated in Fig. 2.





Figure 2: Humans solve geometric problems by first identifying the relevant geometric principles and then applying them to derive solutions.

With the rise of multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [1, 24, 29, 36, 40], GPS emerges as a crucial testbed for evaluating the reasoning capabilities of MLLMs. Numerous benchmarks are developed to assess MLLMs’ performance on GPS, with most prior studies [6, 25, 26, 34] primarily focusing on the correctness of final answers. Recent researches shift attention to the reasoning process of MLLMs in GPS [4, 31, 51]. Despite progress, challenges persist. For instance, studies like MathVerse [51] and MathFlow [4] point out that MLLMs’ imprecise perception and interpretation of geometric diagrams can impede subsequent reasoning. Nonetheless, through extensive experiments and analysis, we further reveal that even when MLLMs demonstrate accurate visual perception and logical reasoning steps, their lack of essential geometric principles

¹Geometric principles include foundational geometric concepts such as definitions, theorems, and formulas. See details in Section 2.1.



Question:

AB is tangent to the circle. Find the value of AB.

Answer: $6\sqrt{3}$.

Correct Wrong

(a) Qwen2-VL-7B

According to the property of the tangent, AB is perpendicular to BC, and $\angle ABC = 90^\circ$.

According to the **Pythagorean theorem**, $AB^2 + BC^2 = AC^2$. Thus, $AB^2 = AC^2 - 36$.

Since AC is unknown, **AB cannot be determined**.

(b) GPT-4o

Based on **property of tangent to a circle**, AB is perpendicular to the radius BC at point B, which means $\angle ACB = 90^\circ$.

$\angle CAB = 30^\circ$, triangle ABC is thus a 30° - 60° - 90° right triangle.

According to properties of a 30° - 60° - 90° triangle, **$AB = 2 * BC = 12$** .

Figure 3: MLLMs encounter failures in GPS: Qwen2-VL-7B fails to identify the correct principle and GPT-4o struggles to apply principles to solve questions.

often leads to failure, as shown in Fig. 3 (a). Moreover, while WeMath [31] acknowledges the importance of underlying principles, it falls short of evaluating whether MLLMs correctly apply them within the visual context. For example, even with correct retrieval of geometric principles, incorrect application can still result in reasoning failures, as shown in Fig. 3 (b). These underscore a critical gap in current research: There is a lack of comprehensive evaluation framework to assess simultaneously both the accurate identification of geometric principles and their proper contextual application within complicated visual scenarios.

In light of these limitations, we propose two key questions for evaluating MLLMs in GPS tasks:

Q1: Could MLLMs **accurately identify the required geometric principles** when solving geometric problems?

Q2: Are MLLMs capable of **adaptively applying geometric principles** to visual geometric diagrams?

To address these questions, we propose **GeoSense**, the first comprehensive bilingual benchmark designed to systematically assess the reasoning abilities of MLLMs through the perspective of geometric principles. GeoSense features a hierarchical system of geometric principles, an intricately structured and finely annotated dataset, and an innovative evaluation strategy. It supports both English and Chinese, bridging human intuition and MLLMs’ reasoning. Specifically, we first organize geometric principles into a multi-level framework consisting of 148 unique principles, spanning from plane geometry to solid geometry. This framework encompasses graphical computation, conceptual understanding, and detailed definitions, theorems, and formulas. Next, we curate a dataset of 1,789 geometric math problems sourced from existing benchmarks and the IXL website². To ensure precise annotation, we employ 23 expert annotators and develop a semi-automated annotation pipeline, ultimately generating 5,556 geometric principles and their aligned application within geometric diagrams. Furthermore, we propose a novel evaluation strategy with two key evaluation metrics: *Geometry Principle Identification (GPI)*, which assesses MLLMs’ ability to identify the most relevant geometric principles for a given problem; and *Geometry Principle Application (GPA)*, which evaluates their

²<https://www.ixl.com/math/geometry>

skills in aligning and applying these principles to specific elements in geometric diagrams. Additionally, we use answer accuracy (ACC) as a holistic measure of a model’s overall performance. Table 1 compares GeoSense with other GPS-related reasoning benchmarks.

Extensive experiments on GeoSense are performed with various popular open-source and closed-source MLLMs, yielding several key insights. As shown in Fig. 1, while MLLMs excel in computation tasks, they struggle with understanding tasks, which can be proven by lower GPI scores in plane geometry. Notably, though Gemini-2.0-Pro-Flash outperforms others by final answer accuracy, its GPA scores, representing the capability of adaptively applying geometric principles within visual contexts, are still limited. Such a result further verifies that our proposed GeoSense points out new pathways for MLLMs’ future advancements in GPS.

In summary, our contributions are outlined as follows:

- We develop GeoSense, the first comprehensive bilingual benchmark that systematically evaluates the reasoning abilities of MLLMs rooted in geometric principles.
- We establish a holistic framework for geometric principles, providing a structured hierarchy for geometric reasoning.
- We design an innovative evaluation strategy to thoroughly assess the MLLMs’ ability to identify and effectively apply them within visual diagrams.
- Our extensive experiments and analysis yield valuable insights for enhancing MLLMs reasoning abilities for solving geometry problems.

2 The GeoSense Dataset

We first give a clear definition of geometric principles in Section 2.1. Then, in Section 2.2, we provide an overview of the dataset, including its composition, categorization, and detailed statistical information. We also construct a fine-grained hierarchical framework of geometric principles. Furthermore, in Section 2.3, we introduce a pipeline for the annotation of essential geometric principles and their application in visual contexts for our collected data.

2.1 Definition of Geometric Principles

"Euclid’s elements"³ provides a foundational classification of geometric propositions, including definitions, theorems, postulates, and axioms. Drawing inspiration from Euclid’s systematic approach, we focus on the most commonly utilized categories and define geometric principles as fundamental concepts in geometry. These principles encapsulate definitions, theorems, and formulas, with the latter specifically representing mathematical expressions for calculations, such as the calculation of length, area, and volume.

2.2 Data Collection and Statistics

We present the statistical information of our proposed GeoSense dataset in Table 2. GeoSense consists of 1,789 geometric math problems: 1,116 problems from existing benchmarks [6, 26, 34, 51] and 666 problems from the IXL website⁴. With these geometric math problems, we annotate 5,556 necessary geometric principles (3,235 definitions, 1,714 theorems, and 607 formulas), and their contextual




Figure 4: Diagram of the top-3 levels of geometric principles (5 levels in total). See details in Appendix 4.1.

applications. Furthermore, all geometric principles are categorized into five hierarchical levels, forming a comprehensive framework for geometric knowledge (see Fig. 4 and details in Appendix 4.1). We initially categorize these principles into plane and solid geometry, and then progressively refine the classification from various perspectives, such as graphical computation and understanding. This process ultimately leads to detailed definitions, theorems, and formulas. With this framework, we could evaluate the MLLMs’ mastery of geometric knowledge across different dimensions and granularities for GPS tasks.

2.3 Data Annotation and Review

We develop a rigorous and meticulous semi-automated annotation pipeline to label the necessary geometric principles and their contextual applications within visual geometric images for each problem. Initially, we prompt GPT-4o to generate a detailed geometric problem-solving process for each question, which explicitly specifies the names of the geometric principles and their application. Human annotation experts then review and correct any errors in the responses provided by GPT-4o. After obtaining a standardized reasoning process, we prompt GPT-4o again to extract the geometric principles and their specific application⁵. Human annotation experts then standardize the names of the extracted geometric principles and their applications within the problems, ensuring accuracy and consistency. Finally, human annotation experts use <note></note> tags to mark the key points in the application process of geometric principles, providing references for subsequent evaluations. Notably, our annotation team consists of 23 expert annotators, each holding at least a bachelor’s degree. To ensure data quality, the annotation results are cross-validated a minimum of two times. The complete annotation training and the entire annotation process together spanned a period of 4 weeks.

³https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euclid%27s_Elements
⁴<https://www.ixl.com/math/geometry>

All prompts used during the annotation process are listed in the Supplementary Material.

BenchMark	Size	Language	Category	Level	CoT-E.	P.I.	P.A.	Metric
GeoS [34]	186	EN	-	SAT	×	×	×	Rule-based
Geometry3K [26]	601	EN	4	Middle School	×	×	✓	Rule-based
GeoQA [6]	754	EN&CH	3	Middle School	×	✓	×	Rule-based
GeoQA+ [3]	755	EN&CH	3	Middle School	×	✓	×	Rule-based
PGPS9K [49]	1,000	EN	30	Middle School	×	×	✓	Rule-based
GeoEval [48]	2,000	EN&CH	7	Middle&High School	×	✓	×	Rule-based
GeomVerse [17]	2,000	EN	5	Synthetic	×	×	✓	Rule-based
MathVision [51]	2,612	EN	12	Competitions	✓	×	×	LLM-as-a-judge
MathVista [25]	5,487	EN	19	SAT&Middle School	×	×	×	LLM-as-a-judge
MathVerse [51]	2,612	EN	12	High School	✓	×	×	LLM-as-a-judge
WeMath [31]	1,674	EN	67	Middle&High School	×	✓	×	Rule-based
GeoSense	1,789	EN&CH	148	Middle&High School	✓	✓	✓	LLM-as-a-judge

Table 1: Comparisons between our GeoSense and other GPS-related benchmarks. CoT-E., P.I. and P.A. are short for CoT evaluation, principle identification, and principle application, respectively.

Statistic	Number
Total questions	1,789
- Multiple-choice questions	231 (12.9%)
- Free-form question	1,558 (87.1%)
- Newly collected questions	673 (37.6 %)
- Existing-dataset questions	1,116 (62.4 %)
Annotated geometric principles	5,556
- Definitions	3,235 (58.2%)
- Theorems	1,714 (30.8%)
- Formula	607 (10.9%)
Unique geometric principle	148
- Unique Definitions	65 (43.9%)
- Unique Theorems	47 (31.8%)
- Unique Formula	36 (24.3%)
Average question length	23.4
Average answer length	2.3

Table 2: Key Statistics of our GeoSense.

3 Evaluation Strategy

Geometry problem-solving (GPS) serves as an effective measurement of MLLMs’ reasoning capability, requiring both appropriate identification of geometric principles and correct application within complex visual context. However, existing benchmarks fail to evaluate both aspects, limiting a systematic evaluation of MLLMs on GPS. In this section, we propose a new evaluation system, consisting of Geometric Principles Identification (GPI) score (Section 3.1) and Geometric Principles Application (GPA) score (Section 3.2), to fully evaluate human-like reasoning mechanism of MLLMs in GPS. Fig. 5 illustrates the overall evaluation framework of GeoSense.

3.1 Geometric Principles Identification

In this section, we propose a Geometric Principles Identification (GPI) score to assess a MLLM’s geometric principle identification ability, *i.e.*, whether the MLLM can accurately identify necessary geometric principles to solve the problem. As shown in Figure 5,

given a geometric problem q_i , its corresponding annotation in our dataset explicitly presents the set of necessary geometric principles $P_i = \{p_i^1, p_i^2, \dots, p_i^n\}$. For each principle p_i^j , we prompt GPT-4o to determine whether it appears in the MLLM’s response. The GPI score S_i^I is defined by:

$$S_i^I = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n F(p_i^j)}{n}, \quad (1)$$

where $F(p_i^j) \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether the principle p_i^j is applied in the MLLM’s response. The score S_i^R reflects whether the MLLM can correctly retrieve the appropriate geometric principles when resolving geometric problems. However, the GPI score alone can not reveal whether the model applies these principles appropriately within the visual context. Such a challenge mirrors the limitations in human geometric reasoning, wherein we may grasp accurate principles such as similar triangles yet still struggle to correctly apply it within the geometric diagram.

3.2 Geometric Principles Application

To evaluate and understand more granularly whether MLLMs can proficiently apply geometric principles to solve problems in geometric reasoning, we further analyze the model’s accuracy in applying these principles within a visual context. In our benchmark, we annotate not only the set of geometric principles required for each problem $P_i = \{p_i^1, p_i^2, \dots, p_i^n\}$, but also their corresponding representations in the geometric diagrams $C_i = \{c_i^1, c_i^2, \dots, c_i^n\}$.

We use <note> tags to mark the key elements essential for correct problem-solving, as shown in Figure 1. The key elements within each geometric principle c_i^j are denoted as m_i^j . When $F(p_i^j) = 1$, we use GPT-4o to extract content related to this principle from the model’s response $\hat{y}_i$, denoted as $\hat{c}_i^j$, with its key elements represented as $\hat{m}_i^j$. Next, we compare the key elements in m_i^j and $\hat{m}_i^j$ to calculate precision and recall for each geometric principle and subsequently compute the F1 score. Based on this, we aggregate the results to obtain the overall knowledge application evaluation




Figure 5: Illustration of GenSense evaluation strategy. MLLMs are assessed through three aspects: identification (i.e., GPI), applications (i.e., GPA) of geometric principles, and final answer accuracy.

measure S_i^A :

$$S_i^A = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n F(p_i^j) \cdot \frac{2 \times |\hat{m}_i^j \cap m_i^j|}{|\hat{m}_i^j| + |m_i^j|}}{\sum_{j=1}^n F(p_i^j)}. \quad (2)$$

This measure allows us to effectively evaluate the model’s ability to apply geometric principles appropriately within a visual context.

3.3 Final Answer Evaluation

We also evaluate the correctness of the final answers. Specifically, given a problem q_i and its corresponding geometric image x_i , the final answer generated by the model is denoted as $\hat{y}_i$. We compare $\hat{y}_i$ with the ground truth y_i and define the final answer score S_i^F as follows:

$$S_i^F = \begin{cases} 1, & \hat{y}_i = y_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

This metric quantifies the overall performance of MLLMs on GPS.

4 Experiments

In this section, we systematically evaluate existing MLLMs on GeoSense. First, we introduce the experimental setup in Section 4.1. Then, we detail the experimental results and analysis in Section 4.2, and present the error analysis in Section 4.4.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Evaluation Models. We evaluate the geometric reasoning capabilities of three categories of MLLMs on GeoSense: 1) closed-source MLLMs, including Claude35_Sonnet⁶, Claude37_Sonnet⁷, Gemini-2.0-pro-flash⁸, and GPT-4o⁹; 2) open-source MLLMs, including the InternVL2.5 series [9], Deepseek-VL2 [43] series, Qwen2-VL series [40], Qwen2.5-VL¹⁰ series, Llama-vision-11B/90B¹¹, and LLaVA-onevision-0.6B/72B [19]; and 3) reasoning MLLMs, including InternVL2.5-38B-MPO [41], QVQ-72B-Preview¹².

Implementation Details. All our evaluations adopt CoT prompting technique[42]. Additionally, the models are further required to explicitly identify and apply the necessary geometric principles during the reasoning steps. All experiments are conducted in a zero-shot setting to reveal the models’ general reasoning abilities. Open-source model reasoning is performed on NVIDIA A100 GPUs, while closed-source model reasoning is conducted via their official API calls. The temperature and sampling parameters are set to the official default settings for each model. For evaluation, we use “GPT-4o-0513” as the judge.

⁶<https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>
⁷<https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-7-sonnet>
⁸<https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/flash/>
⁹<https://openai.com/index/>
¹⁰<https://help.aliyun.com/zh/model-studio/developer-reference/use-qwen-by-calling-api>
¹¹<https://ollama.com/library/llama3.2-vision>
¹²<https://qwenlm.github.io/zh/blog/qvq-72b-preview/>

Model	Definitions			Theorems			Formulas			ALL			
	GPI	GPA	ACC.	GPI	GPA	ACC	GPI	GPA	ACC	GPI	GPA	ACC	AVG.
Closed-Sourced MLLMs													
Claude35_Sonnet	56.5	41.2	41.9	54.9	46.8	33.8	82.8	52.5	52.9	63.2	40.8	46.1	50.0
Claude37_Sonnet	62.0	46.7	54.3	60.2	50.0	46.5	92.4	56.1	67.9	68.7	45.2	57.6	57.2
Gemini-1.5-pro-flash	60.2	43.8	53.0	58.7	51.5	45.6	85.9	55.3	56.1	67.9	44.9	55.7	56.2
Gemini-2.0-pro-flash	64.2	47.0	73.3	72.7	59.0	72.4	87.4	60.0	77.9	72.1	49.7	74.1	65.3
GPT-4o	56.3	46.3	48.0	54.1	49.3	37.4	90.8	58.3	61.1	64.4	45.3	51.7	53.8
Open-Sourced MLLMs													
InternVL2.5-8B	43.7	40.7	21.2	38.2	39.3	20.0	67.6	24.7	13.7	46.7	27.3	21.1	31.7
InternVL2.5-38B	48.7	40.6	28.9	44.5	43.9	29.8	74.8	26.4	16.0	52.7	31.1	27.3	37.0
InternVL2.5-38B-MPO [†]	50.7	44.6	29.7	48.2	46.4	30.0	75.6	29.3	16.0	53.9	33.6	27.7	38.4
InternVL2.5-78B	49.0	45.2	29.8	48.6	46.8	32.0	80.2	30.5	18.3	53.7	32.9	28.7	38.4
Deepseek-VL2-small	25.6	35.7	23.3	26.7	36.1	19.5	67.9	48.1	30.2	34.2	23.8	26.3	28.1
Deepseek-VL2	40.1	37.8	33.1	40.6	39.6	26.0	76.3	52.8	42.4	48.4	33.4	35.7	39.2
Llama-vision-11B	43.2	36.1	22.6	37.9	35.6	18.7	74.8	37.5	29.8	47.9	29.2	24.8	34.0
Llama-vision-90B	49.1	39.2	27.3	42.0	36.0	21.2	78.2	43.6	37.0	52.9	31.4	29.8	38.0
LLaVA-onevision-7B	36.3	38.0	22.7	39.2	39.2	22.7	72.9	40.6	42.6	41.4	26.0	22.8	30.1
LLaVA-onevision-72B	47.9	39.0	33.7	49.6	44.8	36.4	68.3	55.9	43.1	52.5	33.2	37.2	41.0
Qwen2-VL-72B	57.2	44.2	46.6	57.7	44.2	46.6	85.5	52.0	50.4	64.0	43.4	49.2	52.2
Qwen2.5-VL-3B	50.5	39.9	33.5	48.8	47.0	27.7	74.8	45.0	41.2	55.2	36.5	34.9	42.2
Qwen2.5-VL-7B	57.7	45.6	43.6	57.4	51.2	37.5	85.9	60.4	53.1	63.1	44.6	46.3	51.3
Qwen2.5-VL-72B	61.5	47.5	61.5	65.1	54.8	57.5	89.7	61.5	63.8	68.5	48.1	63.8	60.1
QVQ-72B-Preview [†]	68.2	56.0	53.1	63.6	58.3	49.6	85.1	58.4	54.2	72.3	53.5	54.3	60.0


Table 3: Mathematical Evaluation on Different Types of Geometric Principles in GeoSense. GPI refers to Geometric Principles Identification, GPA means Geometric Principles Application. MLLMs with [†] are particularly adept at reasoning tasks.

4.2 Experimental results

To systematically examine the multimodal reasoning capabilities grounded in geometric principles, we report the evaluation results of various models on GeoSense for three attributes (i.e., definitions, theorems, and formulas) as depicted in Table 3. Additionally, we measure five detailed topics namely, calculation of solid figures (CSF), understanding of solid figures (USF), transformation and motion of plane figures (TMPF), calculation of plane figures (CPF), and understanding of plane figures (UPF) as illustrated in Table 4.

From the results, we notice that closed-sourced models generally outperform open-source models. Among them, Gemini-2.0-Pro-Flash performs the best, with an average score of 65.3. MLLMs trained specifically for reasoning tasks show significant improvements in reasoning abilities; for example, InternVL2.5-38B-MPO exhibits a 9.1% average performance improvement (AVG) compared to InternVL2.5-38B. QVQ-72B-Preview performs well in GPI and GPA but has a lower ACC than Gemini-2.0-Pro-Flash, primarily due to overthinking leading to incorrect answers. Additionally, larger model sizes contribute to performance enhancements, as seen in the Qwen2.5-VL series, where overall performance improves with increasing model size.

From the results across different subjects in Table 4 and Fig. 1, we observe that models perform better in solid geometry than in plane



(a) Closed-sourced MLLMs. (b) Open-sourced MLLMs.
Figure 6: The performance of (a) Closed-sourced and (b) Open-sourced MLLMs on problems with different number of geometric principles.

geometry, and understanding plane geometric figures is a common weakness among all MLLMs. This is due to the large number of geometric principles involved in plane geometry, which includes many easily confused concepts (such as determining the similarity and congruence of triangles). These factors pose greater challenges to MLLMs in processing visual information and reasoning about spatial relationships.

4.3 Experimental Analysis

We primarily analyze performance of MLLMs on GeoSense, and have the following observations:

GPI and GPA jointly affect MLLMs’ reasoning abilities. MLLMs’ ACC scores on GeoSense are concurrently determined by

Model	CSF			USF			TMPF			CPF			UPF		
	GPI	GPA	ACC	GPI	GPA	ACC	GPI	GPA	ACC	GPI	GPA	ACC	GPI	GPA	ACC
Closed-Sourced MLLMs															
Claude35_Sonnet	85.0	53.5	53.8	80.9	34.7	54.6	65.9	32.5	27.2	68.4	60.5	56.1	45.1	38.7	40.7
Claude37_Sonnet	91.1	62.5	76.8	80.8	36.5	73.5	82.7	39.4	47.3	70.5	63.5	68.5	54.1	44.8	52.0
Gemini-1.5-pro-flash	87.3	62.6	62.1	86.0	33.5	64.2	83.9	44.1	48.4	73.1	65.4	64.8	50.7	43.5	49.3
Gemini-2.0-pro-flash	88.1	58.8	89.9	72.4	35.1	89.9	84.6	47.2	62.1	77.7	69.5	77.0	60.3	51.2	70.9
GPT-4o	91.3	66.8	72.3	73.7	37.0	75.1	83.5	37.0	34.7	72.7	73.1	66.1	49.4	44.8	44.2
Open-Sourced MLLMs															
InterVL2.5-8B	74.3	28.7	14.2	55.0	28.5	21.2	73.6	31.9	17.0	55.9	36.3	29.1	35.0	35.3	21.5
InterVL2.5-38B	82.4	35.3	17.1	67.0	32.9	24.1	82.7	28.0	23.2	57.5	43.3	37.4	39.8	36.7	28.6
InterVL2.5-38B-MPO [†]	84.0	34.8	16.4	62.1	33.5	23.3	87.9	35.7	26.1	56.3	42.8	35.6	41.9	39.7	30.1
InterVL2.5-78B	90.1	34.5	17.4	65.0	35.4	22.5	86.0	34.8	27.6	61.5	46.0	36.2	40.2	41.7	30.8
Deepseek-VL2-small	66.3	51.8	34.1	52.0	25.3	38.9	53.7	22.3	16.3	47.0	59.7	40.1	21.9	28.8	20.0
Deepseek-VL2	79.4	55.0	49.2	53.7	40.3	51.7	49.0	33.6	30.4	58.6	56.0	48.3	33.6	35.6	28.6
Llama-vision-11B	77.9	41.0	33.9	55.0	33.4	37.3	58.9	19.1	14.8	52.6	46.4	42.7	32.2	33.7	20.7
Llama-vision-90B	83.4	52.3	45.8	70.5	32.7	45.1	68.2	21.5	19.7	58.8	52.3	44.3	37.5	34.8	24.1
LLaVA-onevision-7B	79.3	42.6	32.8	57.3	26.2	35.3	52.3	22.4	16.0	51.6	43.8	32.2	28.6	33.6	21.7
LLaVA-onevision-72B	65.7	65.5	50.0	48.1	35.3	56.3	71.4	19.3	24.8	65.5	54.2	43.3	39.1	37.7	35.0
Qwen2-VL-72B	82.5	57.8	57.4	70.7	41.2	67.1	78.6	29.8	22.2	72.1	61.0	67.1	49.1	43.2	43.7
Qwen2.5-VL-3B	77.6	48.9	48.7	68.4	34.3	60.0	73.4	26.8	17.4	66.1	57.1	53.1	40.6	39.5	29.5
Qwen2.5-VL-7B	85.9	63.9	59.6	72.9	43.1	67.9	82.3	36.0	26.3	67.2	71.1	60.3	48.9	44.5	40.6
Qwen2.5-VL-72B	88.2	64.4	74.1	73.9	36.6	78.7	89.7	37.6	42.0	76.1	69.7	77.6	55.2	47.3	56.7
QVQ-72B-Preview [†]	87.3	71.1	66.2	76.7	45.8	67.9	82.5	42.1	47.4	74.0	71.2	65.3	58.5	52.9	48.2

Table 4: Mathematical Evaluation on Different Subjects in GeoSense. GPI = Geometric Principles Identification, GPA= Geometric Principles Application, Calculation of Solid Figures = CSF, Understanding of Solid Figures = USF, Transformation and Motion of Plane Figures = TMPF, Calculation of Plane Figures = CPF and Understanding of Plane Figures = UPF. MLLMs with [†] are typically trained for reasoning tasks.

both GPI and GPA scores. In Table 3, InternVL-2.5-8B and InternVL-2.5-38B achieve similar GPA scores for retrieving geometric principles. However, InternVL-2.5-38B achieves ACC 7.7% higher than InternVL-2.5-8B because of its 5% higher GPI score. Additionally, more examples, such as Claude37_Sonnet and Qwen2.5-VL-72B, further demonstrate that a decrease in GPA also impedes model performance under full-scale evaluation. Across different subjects in Table 4, most MLLMs show minimal variation in GPI scores between CPF and TMPF tasks. However, the ACC scores of MLLMs tend to decrease in TMPF due to lower GPA scores. Moreover, most existing MLLMs show relatively limited GPI and GPA scores on GeoSense, indicating that the identification accuracy and application correctness of geometric principles jointly limit the reasoning ability of MLLMs on GPS.

Why MLLMs perform worse on complex problems. Intuitively, more complex geometric problems require more geometric principles. In Figure 6, we exhibit how our proposed metrics vary with the complexity of geometric problems. We utilize the average scores of open-sourced and closed-sourced models to represent MLLMs’ performance and the numbers of geometric principles to represent the complexity. We observe that both GPI and ACC scores decrease as the complexity increases, while GPA scores show a negligible impact. Such a trend is even more evident in closed-source

MLLMs. These observations suggest that MLLMs’ worse performances on complex problems are mainly caused by the failure to accurately identify essential geometric principles. This experiment highlights the importance of improving the MLLMs’ ability to identify geometric principles more accurately to further enhance their reasoning capabilities.

MLLMs excel in computation but fail in understanding.

From the results in Table 3, the performance of the three metrics for MLLMs under Formulas is significantly higher than under Definitions and Theorems, especially for GPI metric. This indicates that MLLMs can more clearly identify the required geometric principles when faced with computational problems. In contrast, definitions and theorems often contain abstract properties and relationships of geometric elements, which MLLMs struggle to understand.

GPI limits MLLMs’ performance in plane geometry. Fig. 7 illustrates the differences in various metrics for several models on USF and UPF. In terms of the GPI metric, we find that most models perform better on the USF subject compared to UPF. However, for the GPA metric, the performance difference between the two subjects is not significant, with models, except for Deepseek-VL, even being stronger in the UPF domain. Nonetheless, regarding the ACC metric, most models still perform better on USF. These observations suggest that the key factor limiting the models’ ability to solve plane geometry problems is GPI, i.e., the difficulty models




Figure 7: The (a) GPI, (b) GPA, (c) ACC performance of MLLMs on USF and UPF.

face in accurately identifying the necessary geometric principles. This is due to the numerous and easily confusable principles in plane geometry, such as determining similar and congruent triangles. This highlights the need for models to accurately identify necessary principles to enhance their understanding of plane geometry.

4.4 Error Analysis




Figure 8: Error Analysis of Leading Closed-Source and Open-Source MLLMs.

To gain a deeper insight into the performance bottlenecks of state-of-the-art MLLMs on GPS tasks, we analyze the error distribution of the leading closed-source and open-source models: Gemini-2.0-Pro-Flash and Qwen2.5-VL-72B. For each problem, we identify the critical errors in their reasoning process and categorize these errors into four types: geometric principles identification errors, geometric principles application errors, calculation errors, and hallucinations.

As illustrated in Fig. 8, the primary source of errors for the SOTA models is GPA, which involves incorrectly applying geometric principles within visual geometric contexts. Errors in perception and the inability to align geometric principles with visual elements lead to GPA errors. Secondly, GPI represents the second major source of errors, with Gemini-2.0-Pro-Flash and Qwen2.5-VL-72B exhibiting 23.5% and 38.2% of errors due to GPI, respectively. This indicates that enhancing the models’ ability to recognize geometric principles could further improve their reasoning capabilities. Additionally, a small number of errors are attributed to calculation errors and model hallucinations, and addressing these issues is crucial for optimizing overall model performance.

5 Related Work

5.1 Multi-modal Large Language Models

The synergistic evolution of Large Language Models (LLMs)[2, 16, 28, 37, 38] and vision foundation models[18, 32, 50, 52, 53] has formed the core driving force behind the development of MLLMs. Building upon breakthroughs in text-based models [2, 37] and vision frameworks [18, 32], researchers have progressively established fundamental cross-modal interaction capabilities. MLLMs have achieved performance breakthroughs through massive-scale data training, where closed-source models like OpenAI’s GPT-4V[29] and Google’s Gemini[36] have set benchmarks in complex visual reasoning tasks. Concurrently, open-source community initiatives such as LLaVA[22–24] and MiniGPT-4[7, 55] employ frozen CLIP[32] models for image encoding while injecting visual prompts into LLaMA[37] for multimodal instruction tuning. As technology iterates, multimodal architectures continue to evolve: mPLUG-Owl[44, 45] proposes cross-modal collaborative training mechanisms, Qwen-VL[1] enhances fine-grained understanding through spatial-aware modules, and InternLM-XComposer[12] along with SPHINX[20, 21] adopt mixture-of-experts architectures to boost multi-task performance. Recent advancements in large reasoning LLMs like OpenAI o1[30] and DeepSeekR1[11], which demonstrate remarkable progress in complex problem-solving, have spurred numerous explorations to enhance MLLMs’ reasoning capabilities[8, 35]. Specialized algorithms have also been developed to strengthen MLLMs’ mathematical and geometric reasoning capacities. In this paper, we introduce the GeoSense benchmark to comprehensively evaluate MLLMs’ ability to solve geometric problems by leveraging geometric principles.

5.2 Geometry Benchmarks

Mathematical reasoning has become a pivotal area within contemporary AI research, posing significant challenges for LLMs and MLLMs. Initially, datasets in this domain targeted elementary algebra[15] and arithmetic word problems[33], which were relatively limited in scope and number. Subsequent efforts expanded to more complex and diversified mathematical problem sets, exemplified by datasets like MATH[15], GSM8K[10], and MMLU[14]. These datasets notably enhanced the difficulty and breadth of mathematical questions, thereby establishing robust benchmarks for evaluating general-purpose and math-specific language models[13, 27, 39, 47, 54]. Moreover, the rapid advancement of MLLMs has spurred the need for high-quality multimodal benchmarks to assess

the models’ capabilities in solving mathematical problems within visually enriched contexts. For instance, datasets such as GeoQA[6], UniGeo[5], and Geometry3K[26] focus specifically on geometry-related queries. In addition, initiatives like MathVista[25] have broadened the scope to incorporate a range of multimodal tasks involving mathematical reasoning, while MMMU[46] addresses college-level problems requiring intricate domain-specific knowledge. These multimodal benchmarks significantly advance the evaluation of models in complex mathematical reasoning and their application across modalities. Nonetheless, current benchmarks in the geometry problem-solving domain still exhibit notable shortcomings, particularly in systematically evaluating the cross-modal application of geometric principles. Thus, developing comprehensive and systematic benchmarks that fully assess cross-modal capabilities in geometric reasoning remains an imperative research direction.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce GeoSense, the first comprehensive bilingual benchmark to systematically evaluate the reasoning abilities of MLLMs with a focus on identifying and applying geometric principles. We first establish a comprehensive framework that includes 148 unique geometric principles. Additionally, we curate a dataset that comprises 1,789 geometric math problems, annotate 5,556 geometric principles and their application within geometric images. Moreover, we introduce two novel evaluation metrics GPI and GPA to assess MLLMs’ ability to identify correct geometric principles and apply them to specific elements within geometric diagrams, respectively. Extensive experiments reveal insights into the performance of different MLLMs, highlighting their limitations in applying geometric principles within visual contexts.

References

- [1] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-VL: A Versatile Vision-Language Model for Understanding, Localization, Text Reading, and Beyond. arXiv:2308.12966 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12966>
- [2] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, et al. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. arXiv:2005.14165 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>
- [3] Jie Cao and Jing Xiao. 2022. An Augmented Benchmark Dataset for Geometric Question Answering through Dual Parallel Text Encoding. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na (Eds.). International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, 1511–1520. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.130/>
- [4] Felix Chen, Hangjie Yuan, Yunqiu Xu, Tao Feng, Jun Cen, Pengwei Liu, Zeyang Huang, and Yi Yang. 2025. MathFlow: Enhancing the Perceptual Flow of MLLMs for Visual Mathematical Problems. arXiv:2503.16549 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.16549>
- [5] Jiaqi Chen, Tong Li, Jinghui Qin, Pan Lu, Liang Lin, Chongyu Chen, and Xiaodan Liang. 2022. UniGeo: Unifying Geometry Logical Reasoning via Reformulating Mathematical Expression. arXiv:2212.02746 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.02746>
- [6] Jiaqi Chen, Jianheng Tang, Jinghui Qin, Xiaodan Liang, Lingbo Liu, Eric P. Xing, and Liang Lin. 2022. GeoQA: A Geometric Question Answering Benchmark Towards Multimodal Numerical Reasoning. arXiv:2105.14517 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14517>
- [7] Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechun Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2023. MiniGPT-v2: large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning. arXiv:2310.09478 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09478>
- [8] Liang Chen, Lei Li, Haozhe Zhao, Yifan Song, and Vinci. 2025. R1-V: Reinforcing Super Generalization Ability in Vision-Language Models with Less Than \$3. <https://github.com/Deep-Agent/R1-V>. Accessed: 2025-02-02.
- [9] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Ping Luo, Tong Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. 2024. InternVL: Scaling up Vision Foundation Models and Aligning for Generic Visual-Linguistic Tasks. arXiv:2312.14238 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.14238>
- [10] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. arXiv:2110.14168 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>
- [11] DeepSeek-AI. 2025. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:2501.12948 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12948>
- [12] Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Xilin Wei, Songyang Zhang, Haodong Duan, Maosong Cao, Wenwei Zhang, Yining Li, Hang Yan, Yang Gao, Xinyue Zhang, Wei Li, Jingwen Li, Kai Chen, Conghui He, Xingcheng Zhang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. 2024. InternLM-XComposer2: Mastering Free-form Text-Image Composition and Comprehension in Vision-Language Large Model. arXiv:2401.16420 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.16420>
- [13] Jiahui Gao, Renjie Pi, Jipeng Zhang, Jiacheng Ye, Wanjuan Zhong, Yufei Wang, Lanqing Hong, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Zhenguo Li, and Lingpeng Kong. 2023. G-LLaVA: Solving Geometric Problem with Multi-Modal Large Language Model. arXiv:2312.11370 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11370>
- [14] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. arXiv:2009.03300 [cs.CY] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300>
- [15] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. arXiv:2103.03874 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03874>
- [16] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, et al. 2024. Mixtral of Experts. arXiv:2401.04088 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04088>
- [17] Mehran Kazemi, Hamidreza Alvari, Ankit Anand, Jialin Wu, Xi Chen, and Radu Soricut. 2023. GeoVerse: A Systematic Evaluation of Large Models for Geometric Reasoning. arXiv:2312.12241 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.12241>
- [18] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C. Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. 2023. Segment Anything. arXiv:2304.02643 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.02643>
- [19] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Peiyuan Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. 2024. LLaVA-OneVision: Easy Visual Task Transfer. arXiv:2408.03326 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.03326>
- [20] Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Longtian Qiu, Han Xiao, Han Qiu, Chen Lin, Wenqi Shao, Keqin Chen, Jiaming Han, Siyuan Huang, Yichi Zhang, Xuming He, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. 2023. SPHINX: The Joint Mixing of Weights, Tasks, and Visual Embeddings for Multi-modal Large Language Models. arXiv:2311.07575 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07575>
- [21] Dongyang Liu, Renrui Zhang, Longtian Qiu, Siyuan Huang, Weifeng Lin, Shitian Zhao, Shijie Geng, Ziyi Lin, Peng Jin, Kaipeng Zhang, Wenqi Shao, Chao Xu, Conghui He, Junjun He, Hao Shao, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, Yu Qiao, and Peng Gao. 2024. SPHINX-X: Scaling Data and Parameters for a Family of Multi-modal Large Language Models. arXiv:2402.05935 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05935>
- [22] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024. Improved Baselines with Visual Instruction Tuning. arXiv:2310.03744 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03744>
- [23] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024. LLaVA-NeXT: Improved reasoning, OCR, and world knowledge. <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>
- [24] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. Visual Instruction Tuning.
- [25] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. MathVista: Evaluating Mathematical Reasoning of Foundation Models in Visual Contexts. arXiv:2310.02255 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.02255>
- [26] Pan Lu, Ran Gong, Shibiao Jiang, Liang Qiu, Siyuan Huang, Xiaodan Liang, and Song-Chun Zhu. 2021. Inter-GPS: Interpretable Geometry Problem Solving with Formal Language and Symbolic Reasoning. arXiv:2105.04165 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.04165>
- [27] Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianshuang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, Yansong Tang, and Dongmei

- Zhang. 2025. WizardMath: Empowering Mathematical Reasoning for Large Language Models via Reinforced Evol-Instruct. arXiv:2308.09583 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.09583>
- [28] OpenAI. 2023. Chatgpt. <https://chat.openai.com>
- [29] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4V(ision) system card. <https://openai.com/research/gpt-4v-system-card>
- [30] OpenAI. 2024. Learning to reason with LLMs. <https://openai.com/index/learning-to-reason-with-llms/>
- [31] Runqi Qiao, Qiuna Tan, Guanting Dong, Minhui Wu, Chong Sun, Xiaoshuai Song, Zhuoma GongQue, Shanglin Lei, Zhe Wei, Miaoxuan Zhang, Runfeng Qiao, Yifan Zhang, Xiao Zong, Yida Xu, Muxi Diaio, Zhimin Bao, Chen Li, and Honggang Zhang. 2024. We-Math: Does Your Large Multimodal Model Achieve Human-like Mathematical Reasoning? arXiv:2407.01284 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01284>
- [32] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. arXiv:2103.00020 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020>
- [33] Subhro Roy and Dan Roth. 2016. Solving General Arithmetic Word Problems. arXiv:1608.01413 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.01413>
- [34] Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, Oren Etzioni, and Clint Malcolm. 2015. Solving Geometry Problems: Combining Text and Diagram Interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Luis Márquez, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jian Su (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Lisbon, Portugal, 1466–1476. doi:10.18653/v1/D15-1171
- [35] Haozhan Shen, Zilun Zhang, Qianqian Zhang, Ruochen Xu, and Tiancheng Zhao. 2025. VLM-R1: A stable and generalizable R1-style Large Vision-Language Model. <https://github.com/om-ai-lab/VLM-R1>. Accessed: 2025-02-15.
- [36] Gemini Team. 2024. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. arXiv:2312.11805 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>
- [37] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2302.13971 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>
- [38] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. arXiv:2307.09288 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>
- [39] Ke Wang, Houxing Ren, Aojun Zhou, Zimu Lu, Sichun Luo, Weikang Shi, Renrui Zhang, Linqi Song, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. 2023. MathCoder: Seamless Code Integration in LLMs for Enhanced Mathematical Reasoning. arXiv:2310.03731 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03731>
- [40] 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. 2024. Qwen2-VL: Enhancing Vision-Language Model's Perception of the World at Any Resolution. arXiv:2409.12191 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12191>
- [41] Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, Wenhui Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Jinguo Zhu, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. 2024. Enhancing the Reasoning Ability of Multimodal Large Language Models via Mixed Preference Optimization. arXiv:2411.10442 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.10442>
- [42] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv:2201.11903 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>
- [43] Zhiyu Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zizheng Pan, Xingchao Liu, Wen Liu, Damai Dai, Huazuo Gao, Yiyang Ma, Chengyue Wu, Bingxuan Wang, Zhenda Xie, Yu Wu, Kai Hu, Jiawei Wang, Yaofeng Sun, Yukun Li, Yishi Piao, Kang Guan, Aixin Liu, Xin Xie, Yuxiang You, Kai Dong, Xingkai Yu, Haowei Zhang, Liang Zhao, Yisong Wang, and Chong Ruan. 2024. DeepSeek-VL2: Mixture-of-Experts Vision-Language Models for Advanced Multimodal Understanding. arXiv:2412.10302 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.10302>
- [44] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, Chenliang Li, Yuanhong Xu, Hehong Chen, Junfeng Tian, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. mPLUG-Owl: Modularization Empowers Large Language Models with Multimodality. arXiv:2304.14178 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.14178>
- [45] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Anwen Hu, Haowei Liu, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. mPLUG-Owl2: Revolutionizing Multi-modal Large Language Model with Modality Collaboration. arXiv:2311.04257 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.04257>
- [46] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruochi 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. 2024. MMMU: A Massive Multi-discipline Multimodal Understanding and Reasoning Benchmark for Expert AGI. arXiv:2311.16502 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16502>
- [47] Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. 2023. MAmmoTH: Building Math Generalist Models through Hybrid Instruction Tuning. arXiv:2309.05653 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05653>
- [48] Jiaxin Zhang, Zhongzhi Li, Mingliang Zhang, Fei Yin, Chenglin Liu, and Yashar Moshfeghi. 2024. GeoEval: Benchmark for Evaluating LLMs and Multi-Modal Models on Geometry Problem-Solving. arXiv:2402.10104 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10104>
- [49] Ming-Liang Zhang, Fei Yin, and Cheng-Lin Liu. 2023. A Multi-Modal Neural Geometric Solver with Textual Clauses Parsed from Diagram. arXiv:2302.11097 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11097>
- [50] Renrui Zhang, Xiangfei Hu, Bohao Li, Siyuan Huang, Hanqiu Deng, Hongsheng Li, Yu Qiao, and Peng Gao. 2023. Prompt, Generate, then Cache: Cascade of Foundation Models makes Strong Few-shot Learners. arXiv:2303.02151 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.02151>
- [51] Renrui Zhang, Dongzhi Jiang, Yichi Zhang, Haokun Lin, Ziyu Guo, Pengshuo Qiu, Aojun Zhou, Pan Lu, Kai-Wei Chang, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. 2024. MathVerse: Does Your Multi-modal LLM Truly See the Diagrams in Visual Math Problems? arXiv:2403.14624 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.14624>
- [52] Renrui Zhang, Zhengkai Jiang, Ziyu Guo, Shilin Yan, Juntong Pan, Xianzheng Ma, Hao Dong, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. 2023. Personalize Segment Anything Model with One Shot. arXiv:2305.03048 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03048>
- [53] Renrui Zhang, Liuhui Wang, Yu Qiao, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. 2022. Learning 3D Representations from 2D Pre-trained Models via Image-to-Point Masked Autoencoders. arXiv:2212.06785 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.06785>
- [54] Aojun Zhou, Ke Wang, Zimu Lu, Weikang Shi, Sichun Luo, Zipeng Qin, Shaoqing Lu, Anya Jia, Linqi Song, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. 2023. Solving Challenging Math Word Problems Using GPT-4 Code Interpreter with Code-based Self-Verification. arXiv:2308.07921 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07921>
- [55] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2023. MiniGPT-4: Enhancing Vision-Language Understanding with Advanced Large Language Models. arXiv:2304.10592 [cs.CV] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.10592>