

MiD-VLM: Detecting and Grounding Global Semantic Misinformation in Image-Caption Pairs

Tarunya Prasad, Bharatesh Chakravarthi
Arizona State University

tprasad6@asu.edu, bharatesh@asu.edu

Abstract

Semantic misinformation can arise when an authentic image is paired with a caption that changes or distorts its narrative. Because the image itself may contain no visible signs of manipulation, methods designed to detect pixel-level artifacts can miss these misleading image-caption pairs. We study this problem using DGM4+, a dataset designed to evaluate the detection of global scene and semantic inconsistencies. We propose a multimodal model that combines image-text representations from SigLIP with visual scene features from DINOv2 through a projection MLP, and adapts Qwen2-VL-7B using LoRA. The model jointly predicts whether an image-caption pair is authentic, identifies the manipulation type, and grounds the misleading caption tokens. On the DGM4+ validation split, the model achieves an F1 score of 0.9679 for binary authenticity classification. These results suggest that parameter-efficient adaptation of vision-language models is promising for detecting semantic inconsistencies, while also motivating further work on precise token-level grounding.

1. Introduction

Images in news and social media are often interpreted together with their captions. A genuine photograph paired with a caption describing a different event, location, or action can convey a misleading narrative even when the image itself is unaltered. In these cases, the image and caption may each appear plausible in isolation, the inconsistency emerges from their semantic relationship. Detecting such misinformation therefore requires reasoning across modalities. Methods that rely primarily on visual artifacts, such as blending boundaries or face-swap traces, may not capture these scene-level or narrative-level inconsistencies. Prior work has investigated multimodal media manipulation through both detection and localization. The DGM⁴ dataset and its associated HAMMER model provide a framework for identifying and grounding manipulations in image-text




Figure 1. Examples from the DGM4+ dataset. The top row shows authentic image-caption pairs while the bottom row shows semantically manipulated pairs, with their tokens.

pairs [8, 9].

However, global inconsistencies pose a distinct challenge, an image may be visually coherent while its caption describes an implausible scene or alters the meaning of the depicted event. To study this setting, DGM⁴+ extends DGM⁴ with 5,000 additional image-caption pairs designed to evaluate global scene and semantic mismatches [10]. Figure 1 shows a few examples from the dataset. We focus on this extension and investigate methods for detecting these mismatches and identifying the caption content associated with them. Given an image and a caption, our task is to predict whether the pair is authentic or manipulated, classify the manipulation type, and identify the misleading caption tokens. The DGM⁴+ data includes two manipulation types, `text_swap`, which introduces a substantially different narrative, and `text_attribute`, which changes descriptive details while retaining the core event. These tasks require a model to assess both the overall compatibility of the image and caption and the local textual evidence that contributes to a mismatch.

We present MiD-VLM, a multimodal framework for this identification task. It combines image-text representations from SigLIP [13] with visual scene representations

from DINOv2 [7]. A projection MLP fuses these features, which are used alongside a LoRA-adapted Qwen2-VL-7B model for task-specific prediction [11]. The model has separate prediction heads for binary authenticity classification, manipulation-type prediction, and token-level caption grounding. LoRA updates approximately 0.12% of the 8.3 billion parameters in Qwen2-VL-7B, providing a parameter-efficient approach to adaptation. This work makes three primary contributions.

- We investigate multimodal detection of global scene and narrative inconsistencies using the DGM⁴+ image-caption dataset.
- We implement a joint prediction framework for pair authenticity, manipulation type, and misleading caption-token grounding using fused SigLIP and DINOv2 features with a LoRA-adapted vision-language model.
- We evaluate the framework on the DGM⁴+ validation split and analyze encoder ablations and token-grounding behavior.

On the DGM⁴+ validation split, MiD-VLM achieves a binary authenticity-classification F1 score of 0.9679. Our ablation results examine the contribution of the visual encoders, while the grounding analysis highlights the challenge of locating specific misleading tokens even when the model correctly classifies an image-caption pair.

2. Related Work

Multimodal misinformation can arise when authentic visual content is paired with text that changes its narrative, without visible pixel-level manipulation. This motivates methods that assess cross-modal semantic consistency alongside image editing artifacts.

2.1. Multimodal Misinformation Detection

Multimodal misinformation detection not only considers the authenticity of individual modalities, but also whether the semantic information conveyed across modalities is mutually consistent. NewsCLIPpings [6] studies out of context image-caption pairs, where the image and text are individually authentic but pairing conveys misleading information. This demonstrates an important limitation of purely unimodal approaches since detecting misinformation requires reasoning about the relationship between visual and textual context.

DGM⁴ and the HAMMER model [8] introduce joint detection and grounding of manipulations across image and text. Rather than producing only a sample level authenticity prediction, the task also requires identifying manipulated regions or textual context, encouraging models to learn better. UFAFormer [4] further explores this direction by incorporating frequency domain visual information as well as cross modal features. More recently, DGM⁴+ [10] shifts to global scene/semantic inconsistencies. In these cases, an

Table 1. Reported binary accuracy and F1 on DGM⁴ [9] and DGM⁴+ [10]. Our result is on the DGM⁴+ validation split.

Method	Dataset	Acc (%)	F1 (%)
HAMMER [8]	DGM ⁴	93.19	86.39
UFAFormer [4]	DGM ⁴	86.80	72.02
HAMMER [8]	DGM ⁴ +	19.10	–
MiD - VLM	DGM⁴+	96.13	96.54

image may remain visually realistic while becoming inconsistent with the expressed narrative in its caption. Models like hammer when tested on the extended dataset have very poor performance and accuracies of less than 20% as seen in Table 1.

2.2. Vision-Language Models

Vision Language Models [1], popularly referred to as VLMs are multimodal, generative AI models, capable of understanding and processing video, image and text. Building upon large-scale vision language pretraining, recent VLMs combine visual encoders with large language models to support contextual reasoning over images and natural language. Models such as Qwen2-VL [11] extend these capabilities through unified multimodal representations, providing a foundation for adapting large pretrained models to specific cross modal reasoning tasks. They provide a general multipurpose backbone proving to be useful foundations for specialized cross modal reasoning without training a model from scratch. However, their large parameter counts make full fine tuning computationally expensive, particularly when the dataset is relatively small. This motivates the use of parameter efficient strategies.

2.3. Parameter Efficient Fine Tuning

Adapting large pretrained models to specialized downstream tasks through full fine tuning requires updating and storing billions of model parameters, resulting in significant usage of computation, memory and time. Parameter efficient fine tuning (PEFT) methods [12] address this limitation by adapting only a small subset of parameters while leaving majority of the pretrained backbone frozen. LoRA [2] is a noteworthy PEFT approach that learns low-rank updates to frozen weights and introduces trainable low rank matrices into selected layers. It freezes the original model weights and represents task specific weight updates using low rank matrices, thus reducing the number of trainable parameters. In this work, we employ LoRA to adapt attention projections of Qwen2-VL while keeping most of the backbone frozen. Based on this, we designed and built a model to solve the problem of identification of global inconsistencies from multi media as discussed in Section 3.

3. Misinformation Detection with VLMs

Given an input consisting of an image-caption pair, the model is expected to output a label being either authentic or manipulated with a confidence level and if it is manipulated, the manipulation type which includes text swap or text attribute. The output is also expected to have a set of token indices $G \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ marking misleading tokens.

3.1. Problem Formulation and Dataset

Given an image I and a caption $T = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$, the model predicts pair authenticity, manipulation type, and misleading-token indices:

$$(I, T) \mapsto (\hat{y}_b, \hat{y}_t, \hat{G}), \quad \hat{G} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\hat{y}_b \in \{\text{authentic}, \text{manipulated}\}$, while $\hat{y}_t \in \{\text{origin}, \text{text_swap}, \text{text_attribute}\}$. The binary head also provides a confidence score.

DGM⁴⁺ contains approximately 5K curated image-caption pairs targeting global scene and narrative inconsistencies [10]. It extends DGM⁴ (Detecting and Grounding Multi-Modal Media Manipulation), a VisualNews-based dataset of more than 230K samples [3]. While DGM⁴ focuses on local manipulations, DGM⁴⁺ includes broader inconsistencies, such as implausible scene context. We use the DGM⁴⁺ extension, split into 3,500 training, 750 validation, and 750 test pairs (70/15/15). The training set contains 1,400 authentic, 1,050 text_swap, and 1,050 text_attribute examples. The validation set contains 254 authentic and 446 manipulated examples, test set labels are withheld. Each record includes an image-caption pair and annotations for the manipulation class and affected text tokens, with image region metadata where available.

3.2. Architecture Overview

The proposed architecture consists of three stages: feature extraction, feature fusion and conditioning, and multitask prediction as seen in Figure 2. The image and caption pass through two frozen encoders in parallel, the outputs are concatenated and projected by a fusion multilayer perceptron (MLP) which is then injected as a learned prefix into the LoRA adapted Qwen2-VL-7B. Three shallow heads produce binary, type and grounding outputs. We will see each stage in detail below.

3.3. Dual Encoder Feature Extraction

The Dual encoder is used for cross modal alignment and yields image and text embeddings.

$$(s_I, s_T) = f_{\text{SigLIP}}(I, T), \quad (2)$$

$$s_I, s_T \in \mathbb{R}^{1152}. \quad (3)$$




Figure 2. The three stage architecture of the MiD-VLM system.

We concatenate the SigLIP image embedding, SigLIP text embedding and DINOv2 CLS (classification) token into a single feature vector. A two layer MLP with Gaussian error linear unit (GELU) activation and layer normalization projects the features into a fused representation.

$$\mathbf{d}_I = f_{\text{DINOv2}}(I), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_I \in \mathbb{R}^{1024}. \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_I = f_{\text{DINOv2}}^{\text{CLS}}(I) \in \mathbb{R}^{1024}. \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{z} = [s_I; s_T; \mathbf{d}_I] \in \mathbb{R}^{3328}. \quad (7)$$

3.4. Multi-Task Prediction Heads

Given the shared representation $\mathbf{h}$, three task-specific heads predict pair authenticity, manipulation type, and misleading caption tokens. The binary head outputs

$$\hat{y}_b = \text{softmax}(g_b(\mathbf{h})) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (8)$$

with predicted label $\hat{y}_b = \arg \max_c \hat{y}_{b,c}$ and confidence $C = \max_c \hat{y}_{b,c}$. The manipulation-type head predicts one of origin, text_swap, or text_attribute:

$$\hat{y}_t = \text{softmax}(g_t(\mathbf{h})) \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (9)$$

The grounding head assigns a score to each of 64 token positions:

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}} = \sigma(g_g(\mathbf{h})) \in [0, 1]^{64}, \quad \hat{G} = \{i \mid \hat{g}_i > \tau\}, \quad \tau = 0.3, \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function and $\hat{G}$ is the set of predicted misleading-token indices. We train the model with a weighted sum of the binary classification, token-grounding, and manipulation-type losses. Their respective weights are 0.5, 0.3, and 0.2.




Figure 3. DGM⁴+ validation examples: correct predictions with accurate grounding, partial grounding, and a false negative.

4. Experiments and Results

We implemented the models in PyTorch and trained them on four NVIDIA A100 GPUs (80 GB each) using the Sol supercomputer. Training used AdamW [5], a learning rate of 2×10^{-4} , weight decay of 10^{-2} , and a cosine annealing schedule. Training was capped at 100 epochs with early stopping, which terminated after five epochs. Each GPU used a batch size of 4 with gradient accumulation over four steps. SigLIP and DINOv2 remained frozen. We adapted Qwen2-VL-7B with LoRA ($r = 16$, $\alpha_{\text{LoRA}} = 32$) on the query, key, value, and output projections. This trained approximately 0.12% of the model’s 8.3 billion parameters. Training took approximately six minutes.

4.1. Evaluation Metrics

Performance was evaluated using the PP-MisDet Challenge metric, which combines binary detection, textual grounding, and manipulation-type classification:

$$\text{Score} = \alpha F1_{\text{binary}} + \beta F1_{\text{text}} + \gamma F1_{\text{type}}, \quad (11)$$

where $\alpha = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.3$, and $\gamma = 0.2$.

4.2. Validation Performance

Figure 3 shows representative successful, partial and failed predictions illustrating the model’s strengths in classification and limitations in textual grounding. Performance improved through epoch 4, reaching 96.13% accuracy and an F1 score of 0.9679 with the lowest validation loss of 0.0818 (see Table 2). Performance declined slightly at epoch 5, and the epoch 4 checkpoint was selected. The rapid convergence suggests that the pretrained representations require limited task-specific adaptation.

Table 2. Validation performance across training epochs.

Epoch	Val. Loss	Accuracy	F1
1	0.1636	93.20	0.9438
2	0.1153	94.40	0.9541
3	0.0975	95.87	0.9654
4	0.0818	96.13	0.9679
5	0.0844	95.87	0.9660

4.3. Encoder Ablation

Table 3. Encoder ablation on the DGM⁴+ validation set.

Encoder	F1 _{binary}	F1 _{text}	F1 _{type}	Score
DINOv2 only	0.9073	0.4192	0.4888	0.6772
SigLIP only	0.9767	0.8050	0.9778	0.9254
SigLIP + DINOv2	0.9654	0.8375	0.9711	0.9282

We compare the full dual-encoder architecture against DINOv2-only and SigLIP-only variants in Table 3. SigLIP alone achieves the highest binary F1, while adding DINOv2 improves textual grounding from 0.8050 to 0.8375 and yields the highest overall score of 0.9282. DINOv2 alone performs substantially worse, suggesting that SigLIP provides the primary cross-modal signal while DINOv2 contributes complementary visual information, particularly for grounding.

4.4. Text Grounding Analysis

Despite achieving the strongest grounding F1, the dual-encoder model produces no grounded tokens for 207 of 446 manipulated validation samples at $\tau = 0.3$. This suggests that detecting a semantic inconsistency is easier than localizing the specific tokens responsible for it. A possible explanation is that the grounding head operates on a global fused representation, while token-level localization requires finer cross-modal correspondence.

5. Conclusion

We presented a multimodal framework for semantic misinformation detection on DGM⁴+, combining frozen SigLIP and DINOv2 representations with a LoRA-adapted Qwen2-VL backbone for joint detection, manipulation type classification, and textual grounding. The model achieved a best validation F1 of 0.9679 while training only a small fraction of the backbone parameters. Encoder ablations further showed that DINOv2 complements SigLIP by improving textual grounding and the overall challenge score. However, difficulties in token-level grounding indicate that strong global detection does not necessarily translate to precise localization, motivating future work on finer-grained cross-modal representations.

References

- [1] Florian Bordes, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Anurag Ajay, Alexander C. Li, Adrien Bardes, Suzanne Petryk, Oscar Mañas, Zhiqiu Lin, Anas Mahmoud, Bargav Jayaraman, Mark Ibrahim, Melissa Hall, Yuniyang Xiong, Jonathan Lebensold, Candace Ross, Srihari Jayakumar, Chuan Guo, Diane Bouchacourt, Haider Al-Tahan, Karthik Padthe, Vasu Sharma, Hu Xu, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Megan Richards, Samuel Lavoie, Pietro Astolfi, Reyhane Askari Hemmat, Jun Chen, Kushal Tirumala, Rim Assouel, Mazda Moayeri, Arjang Talattof, Kamalika Chaudhuri, Zechun Liu, Xilun Chen, Quentin Garrido, Karen Ullrich, Aishwarya Agrawal, Kate Saenko, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Vikas Chandra. An introduction to vision-language modeling, 2024. [2](#)
- [2] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, 2021. [2](#)
- [3] Fuxiao Liu, Yinghan Wang, Tianlu Wang, and Vicente Ordonez. Visual news: Benchmark and challenges in news image captioning, 2021. [3](#)
- [4] Huan Liu, Zichang Tan, Qiang Chen, Yunchao Wei, Yao Zhao, and Jingdong Wang. Unified frequency-assisted transformer framework for detecting and grounding multi-modal manipulation, 2023. [2](#)
- [5] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019. [4](#)
- [6] Grace Luo, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. Newsclippings: Automatic generation of out-of-context multimodal media, 2021. [2](#)
- [7] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Mahmoud Assran, Nicolas Ballas, Wojciech Galuba, Russell Howes, Po-Yao Huang, Shang-Wen Li, Ishan Misra, Michael Rabbat, Vasu Sharma, Gabriel Synnaeve, Hu Xu, Hervé Jegou, Julien Mairal, Patrick Labatut, Armand Joulin, and Piotr Bojanowski. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision, 2024. [2](#)
- [8] Rui Shao, Tianxing Wu, and Ziwei Liu. Detecting and grounding multi-modal media manipulation. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6904–6913, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)
- [9] Rui Shao, Tianxing Wu, and Ziwei Liu. Detecting and grounding multi-modal media manipulation, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)
- [10] Gagandeep Singh, Samudi Amarsinghe, Priyanka Singh, and Xue Li. Dgm⁴+: Dataset extension for global scene inconsistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.26047*, 2025. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [11] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution, 2024. [2](#)
- [12] Lingling Xu, Haoran Xie, Si-Zhao Joe Qin, Xiaohui Tao, and Fu Lee Wang. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods for pretrained language models: A critical review and assessment, 2023. [2](#)
- [13] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training, 2023. [1](#)