

Optical Context Compression Is Just (Bad) Autoencoding

Ivan Yee Lee¹ Cheng Yang¹ Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick¹

Abstract

DeepSeek-OCR demonstrates that rendered text can be reconstructed with high fidelity from a small number of vision tokens. This finding has sparked excitement about vision-based context compression for language models. But the evaluation stops at reconstruction; whether these representations help language modeling remains untested. We test two assumptions implicit in the optical-compression narrative: that vision-based compression provides unique advantages for text reconstruction from compressed representations, and that DeepSeek-OCR’s reconstruction results are evidence that vision-based compression will be useful for language modeling. Comparing their vision encoder against simple alternatives—parameter-free mean pooling and a learned hierarchical encoder—we find that these simple approaches match or surpass vision for reconstruction at matched compression ratios, and outperform it for language modeling—where vision-based compression fails to beat truncation. The excitement around optical context compression outpaces the evidence. Code and checkpoints are available at <https://github.com/ivnle/bad-autoencoding>.

1. Introduction

DeepSeek-OCR (Wei et al., 2025) has drawn attention for achieving state-of-the-art optical character recognition while demonstrating a surprising property: long passages of text rendered as images can be reconstructed with nearly lossless accuracy from a small number of vision tokens—roughly one-tenth as many as the original text tokens. This finding has been widely interpreted as evidence that visual encoders might offer a new pathway for addressing the growing cost of long textual contexts in large language models. Yet the evaluation focuses exclusively on reconstruction from existing images—documents that are already visual. The sug-

¹Department of Computer Science, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. Correspondence to: Ivan Yee Lee <iylee@ucsd.edu>.




Figure 1. DeepSeek-OCR viewed as an autoencoder. **Direct compression** (left, blue) operates on learned embeddings, while the **vision path** (right, orange) renders tokens to pixels—a non-parametric detour—then compresses. Both produce compressed representations for the decoder to reconstruct.

gested application to long-context compression would require rendering text to images and back, a pipeline the paper does not test. Whether vision-based compression helps with language modeling remains an open question.

Consider what the proposed context compression pipeline requires: text is rendered to an image, the image is encoded to a small number of vision tokens, and those tokens are decoded back to text. For reconstruction—recovering the original text—this is autoencoding with extra steps: com-

press to a bottleneck, then reconstruct (Figure 1). The rendering is an unlearned transformation: it discards pretrained text embeddings and expands a sequence of token indices into millions of pixels. The vision encoder then compresses this back down. This roundabout path raises a question: does the vision detour provide any benefit, or could we achieve the same compression by operating directly on text embeddings?

The autoencoding framework connects to extensive prior work, from classical dimensionality reduction (Hinton & Salakhutdinov, 2006; Kingma & Welling, 2013) and text variational autoencoders (Bowman et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2017) to recent context compression methods for language models (Chevalier et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2024; Feldman & Artzi, 2025; Liu et al., 2025). We state upfront that we do not evaluate state-of-the-art compression architectures; see Section 5 for a full survey. Instead, we deliberately test simple baseline methods—parameter-free mean pooling and a learned hierarchical encoder—to isolate the effect of the vision pathway. If vision-based compression cannot outperform these direct baselines, it seems unlikely vision would compete with state-of-the-art compression architectures, though this remains to be tested.

We test two assumptions implicit in the optical-compression narrative. **(A1)** Vision-based compression provides unique advantages for text reconstruction from compressed representations. **(A2)** DeepSeek-OCR’s reconstruction results are evidence that vision-based compression will be useful for language modeling.

To test these, we compare DeepSeek-OCR’s vision encoder against simple direct alternatives—parameter-free mean pooling and a learned hierarchical encoder—using the same decoder architecture and training data. We conduct a two-phase evaluation. First, we train each encoder-decoder pair for text reconstruction, testing A1. Second, we finetune for language modeling and compare against a truncation baseline at matched token budgets to test A2.

Neither assumption holds. For reconstruction, simple direct methods match or surpass vision—mean pooling achieves comparable fidelity with near-zero parameters, and the hierarchical encoder outperforms vision at all compression ratios. For language modeling, vision-based compression fails to beat simple truncation at matched token budgets, while the hierarchical encoder succeeds. The excitement around optical context compression outpaces the evidence.

2. Is Vision Compression Special for Reconstruction?

To test whether vision offers unique advantages for reconstruction from compressed representations (A1), we compare DeepSeek-OCR’s vision encoder against direct alterna-




Figure 2. Reconstruction perplexity across compression ratios for vision (DeepSeek-OCR), mean pooling (parameter-free), and hierarchical (learned) encoders. Hierarchical achieves lowest perplexity at all ratios; mean pooling is comparable to vision at moderate compression. See Table 1 for complete data.

tives under matched conditions. All methods implement the same autoencoding pipeline:

$$\text{text} \xrightarrow{\text{encoder}} z \xrightarrow{\text{decoder}} \hat{\text{text}}$$

The difference is what happens inside the encoder: vision renders text to pixels then encodes; direct methods operate directly on token embeddings.

2.1. Experimental Setup

Dataset. We sample 510,000 segments of 2,000 tokens each from English Wikipedia (Penedo, 2025), using 500,000 for training and 10,000 for validation. For the reconstruction task, we use only the first 1,000 tokens of each segment.

Encoders. We test three compression approaches: a **vision** encoder, where we render text to images and encode them using DeepSeek-OCR’s vision pipeline, **mean pooling**, a near-zero-parameter baseline that compresses token embeddings via sliding window averaging (the only learned component is a 1,280-parameter separator token), and a **hierarchical** encoder, a trainable convolutional encoder operating directly on token embeddings. For each encoder, we sweep across compression ratios, producing compressed representations of varying lengths. We define *compression ratio* as input tokens divided by encoder output length (e.g., 10× means 1000 tokens compressed to 100); all encoders output vectors in the decoder’s 1280-dimensional embedding space. See Section A.1 for encoder details.

Decoder. We use DeepSeek-OCR’s pre-trained decoder, a 12-layer transformer with mixture-of-experts architecture

(3B total parameters, 570M active per token). The decoder was originally pretrained for language modeling, then finetuned jointly with the vision encoder for optical character recognition. Using the same decoder for all encoders isolates the effect of the encoding pathway. See Section A.2 for decoder architecture details.

Training and Evaluation. We train end-to-end to minimize reconstruction loss: given the compressed representation, predict the original input tokens. Unless otherwise noted, we train all encoder and decoder parameters; the decoder and vision encoder are initialized from DeepSeek-OCR pretrained weights, while hierarchical encoders are randomly initialized. Exceptions (e.g., frozen encoder) are indicated in figure labels. Formally, we learn an encoder and decoder to minimize:

$$\min_{\text{Enc}, \text{Dec}} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [-\log p_{\text{Dec}}(x \mid \text{Enc}(x))]$$

where x is a text sequence and $\text{Enc}(x)$ is its compressed representation. We train for one epoch and evaluate reconstruction quality using perplexity on the held-out validation set. We report perplexity, which is monotonic with cross-entropy (bits-per-token) and thus directly measures information preservation. Lower perplexity indicates higher-fidelity reconstruction.

2.2. Results

Vision encoding provides no advantage over direct compression for reconstruction quality. Figure 2 shows reconstruction perplexity across compression ratios. Mean pooling—a parameter-free baseline—achieves comparable performance at moderate compression to the 380-million-parameter vision encoder, comprising SAM ViT-B (Kirillov et al., 2023) and CLIP-L (Radford et al., 2021) in sequence (trained on 11 million segmentation images and 400 million image-text pairs respectively) and further trained on 100 million samples. Moreover, the decoder is DeepSeek’s own, trained to work with their vision encoder—a setup that, if anything, should favor vision-based compression. Without finetuning on the reconstruction task described in Section 2.1, vision performs even worse—mean pooling beats the pretrained vision encoder across all compression ratios. The hierarchical encoder outperforms both approaches across all compression ratios, achieving the lowest perplexity with 13–100M parameters, substantially fewer than the vision encoder’s 380M. These results refute A1: vision provides no unique advantage for text reconstruction after compression.

The hierarchical encoder’s strong performance highlights the core issue with vision-based compression: the text-to-image rendering step discards learned embeddings and forces reconstruction from pixels, an artificial bottleneck that adds no benefit when starting from text. However, reconstruction quality only measures whether the decoder can




Figure 3. Language modeling perplexity as a function of compression ratio (compression-only, $k = 0$). Truncation—keeping only the most recent tokens—is the baseline to beat. Vision (DeepSeek-OCR) and mean pooling fail; hierarchical succeeds at all compression ratios. See Table 2 for complete data.

regenerate the original text—not whether the compressed representation supports language modeling. A method could achieve perfect reconstruction while discarding information critical for prediction. We next test whether vision compression helps language modeling (A2).

3. Is Vision Compression Special for Language Modeling?

Having shown that vision offers no unique advantage for text reconstruction after compression, a natural question remains: are these compressed representations useful for language modeling? The connection seems obvious—if a representation enables high-fidelity reconstruction, the information must be preserved, so why wouldn’t it transfer to next-token prediction? This intuition underlies A2: that DeepSeek-OCR’s reconstruction results are evidence that vision-based compression will be useful for language modeling. But “obvious” is not the same as validated.

3.1. Experimental Setup

Our experimental setup tests whether reconstruction-optimized representations transfer to language modeling. We predict the continuation given an encoded context:

$$\hat{y} = \text{Decoder}([\text{Encoder}(x_{1:m}), x_{m-k+1:m}])$$

where $x_{1:m}$ is the full m -token context, Encoder compresses all m tokens to a shorter representation, and $x_{m-k+1:m}$ are the last k tokens in uncompressed form. We evaluate two settings. **Compression only** ($k = 0$): the decoder sees

only the compressed representation. **Compression with recent text** ($k = 100$): the decoder sees both compressed context and the last 100 text tokens. The second setting reflects a more realistic use case—recent context is kept uncompressed while older history is compressed—and tests whether compressed representations of older context add value beyond the recent text alone.

Dataset. We use the same 510,000 segments from Section 2.1, but now utilize the full 2,000 tokens per segment. Where Section 2 used only the first 1,000 tokens for reconstruction, we now split each segment into a 1,000-token context ($m = 1000$) and a 1,000-token continuation. The task is to predict the continuation given an encoding of the context.

Encoders and Decoders. We use the encoder-decoder pairs trained for reconstruction in Section 2: vision, mean pooling, and hierarchical encoders. We add a **truncation** baseline: the encoder outputs an empty representation, and the decoder sees only the last k tokens (i.e., earlier context is discarded rather than compressed). For truncation, the decoder is initialized from the original DeepSeek-OCR decoder, while the other encoder-decoder pairs are initialized from their reconstruction checkpoints.

Training and Evaluation. We initialize encoder-decoder pairs from their reconstruction checkpoints (Section 2) and finetune end-to-end to minimize cross-entropy loss on the continuation tokens, following the same parameter training policy as Section 2 (all encoder and decoder parameters trained unless otherwise noted). Formally, we learn an encoder and decoder to minimize:

$$\min_{\text{Enc}, \text{Dec}} \mathbb{E}_{(x_{1:m}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [-\log p_{\text{Dec}}(y \mid \text{Enc}(x_{1:m}), x_{m-k+1:m})]$$

using the same context notation as above; here y is the continuation. We train for one epoch and evaluate continuation perplexity on the held-out validation set.

3.2. Results

Figure 3 shows the main result: in the compression-only setting ($k = 0$), vision fails to beat truncation at any compression ratio, performing even worse than parameter-free mean pooling. This holds whether the vision encoder is trained end-to-end or frozen to preserve its pretrained representations. Hierarchical succeeds, indicating that the task is solvable; vision simply fails to solve it. One might object that compression-only is unrealistic—in practice, recent context would remain as text. Figure 4 tests this ($k = 100$): even with recent tokens preserved as text, vision and mean pooling still underperform truncation.

These findings refute A2: vision’s strong reconstruction performance does not translate to language modeling utility. Despite matching other methods on reconstruction




Figure 4. Language modeling perplexity with compression plus 100 text tokens ($k = 100$). Even with recent context preserved as text, vision and mean pooling fail to beat truncation. See Table 2 for complete data.

(Section 2.2), vision offers no advantage for next-token prediction. Vision and mean pooling do preserve some information—combining them with text outperforms text alone (Table 3)—but not enough to outperform simply keeping more text (Figure 4).

4. Limitations

Our experiments use a specific configuration that constrains generalization. We evaluate on 1000-token contexts, matching the upper range of DeepSeek-OCR’s own evaluation (600–1300 tokens), but at longer scales (8k, 32k, or beyond) the tradeoff between compression and truncation might shift—compressing distant context might become more valuable than the information lost by discarding it. We test only on English Wikipedia, which consists of clean, encyclopedic prose; vision-based compression might perform differently on code, dialogue, or noisy web text. And we tested only DeepSeek-OCR’s vision encoder—other encoders might behave differently, though our critique targets the render-then-encode approach rather than any specific architecture. We do use DeepSeek’s own decoder, pretrained jointly with their vision encoder, a setup that if anything should favor vision-based compression.

Perplexity also measures information preservation, not task utility. Real-world applications often require extracting specific information from long contexts: answering questions, following instructions, retrieving facts. While truncation achieves better perplexity, downstream tasks requiring access to distant context (question answering, fact retrieval) may favor compression over deletion, even with

degraded signals. Future work should evaluate compression approaches on downstream tasks where access to distant context, even degraded, may prove more valuable than high-fidelity recent tokens.

5. Related Work

Context Compression. To reduce context window usage and computational cost, context compression aims to compress context into more compact sequences. Existing approaches fall into two categories (Liu et al., 2025): hard compression (Li et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Chuang et al., 2024) and soft compression (Mu et al., 2023; Chevalier et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2024; Feldman & Artzi, 2025). Hard compression methods produce compressed natural language sequences through strategies such as pruning (Li et al., 2023) and learned compression (Chuang et al., 2024). In contrast, soft compression methods compress context into compressed hidden vector sequences through techniques such as learned autoencoders (Ge et al., 2024) and pooling operations (Feldman & Artzi, 2025). Concurrent work by Feldman & Artzi (Feldman & Artzi, 2025) independently demonstrates that mean pooling achieves strong compression performance on QA tasks, comparing favorably to compression-token architectures. While their work focuses on RAG applications, our investigation addresses whether vision-based compression provides advantages over direct text compression for language modeling, with both studies confirming mean pooling as an effective baseline. Recent work on long-context compression (Chevalier et al., 2023; Mu et al., 2023) focuses on learned methods that directly compress token representations without modality conversion, while other work (Wei et al., 2025; Cheng et al., 2025) has explored optical context compression—rendering text as images to encode compact vision tokens. While DeepSeek-OCR demonstrates promising compression ratios, it primarily focuses on training a Vision-Language Model for OCR tasks. Our work systematically analyzes whether optical context compression provides advantages compared to direct compression methods.

Autoencoding. The goal of autoencoding is to learn to compress input data into a latent representation that enables faithful reconstruction (Hinton & Salakhutdinov, 2006; Kingma & Welling, 2013). To optimize latent representations to accurately capture textual information, autoencoding approaches have evolved from variational autoencoders (Bowman et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2017) to discrete vector quantization methods (Kaiser et al., 2018) and large-scale pretraining (Lewis et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Ge et al., 2024). However, autoencoding optimizes representations for reconstruction fidelity; prior work (Li et al., 2020; Ge et al., 2024) has shown that such representations often require adaptation for downstream applications. The training

process of DeepSeek-OCR can be formalized as autoencoding with a non-parametric modality transformation followed by a vision encoder to obtain latent representation. Our experimental results further demonstrate that strong reconstruction performance does not necessarily translate to high utility for language modeling tasks.

6. Conclusion

DeepSeek-OCR’s reconstruction results appear impressive in isolation, but this impression fades against straightforward baselines: mean pooling, with near-zero trainable parameters, achieves comparable reconstruction at moderate compression ratios, and a simple hierarchical encoder outperforms vision across the board.

The more significant finding concerns language modeling. Here the methods diverge sharply: vision and mean pooling fail to beat truncation at any compression ratio, while the hierarchical encoder succeeds. The task is solvable—hierarchical proves that—but vision fails to solve it. Strong reconstruction does not translate to language modeling utility; a representation that recovers the original text is not necessarily one that supports next-token prediction.

The enthusiasm surrounding optical context compression appears to stem from conflating OCR with compression. Vision encoders excel at extracting text from images, but compressing text that originated as tokens—rendering to pixels, then encoding—solves a problem that need not exist. Our experiments suggest this detour offers no benefit when the goal is language modeling.

References

- Bowman, S. R., Vilnis, L., Vinyals, O., Dai, A. M., Jozefowicz, R., and Bengio, S. Generating sentences from a continuous space. In *Proceedings of The 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pp. 10–21, 2016.
- Cheng, J., Liu, Y., Zhang, X., Fei, Y., Hong, W., Lyu, R., Wang, W., Su, Z., Gu, X., Liu, X., et al. Glyph: Scaling context windows via visual-text compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.17800*, 2025.
- Chevalier, A., Wettig, A., Ajith, A., and Chen, D. Adapting language models to compress contexts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 3829–3846, 2023.
- Chuang, Y.-N., Xing, T., Chang, C.-Y., Liu, Z., Chen, X., and Hu, X. Learning to compress prompt in natural language formats. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Com-*

- putational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 7749–7760, 2024.
- Feldman, Y. and Artzi, Y. Simple context compression: Mean-pooling and multi-ratio training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.20797*, 2025.
- Ge, T., Jing, H., Wang, L., Wang, X., Chen, S.-Q., and Wei, F. In-context autoencoder for context compression in a large language model. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Hinton, G. E. and Salakhutdinov, R. R. Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks. *Science*, 313 (5786):504–507, 2006.
- Jiang, H., Wu, Q., Lin, C.-Y., Yang, Y., and Qiu, L. Llm-lingua: Compressing prompts for accelerated inference of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 13358–13376, 2023.
- Kaiser, L., Roy, A., Vaswani, A., Parmar, N., Bengio, S., Uszkoreit, J., and Shazeer, N. Fast decoding in sequence models using discrete latent variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03382*, 2018.
- Kingma, D. P. and Welling, M. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- Kirillov, A., Mintun, E., Ravi, N., Mao, H., Rolland, C., Gustafson, L., Xiao, T., Whitehead, S., Berg, A. C., Lo, W.-Y., Dollár, P., and Girshick, R. Segment anything, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.02643>.
- Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., Stoyanov, V., and Zettlemoyer, L. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pp. 7871–7880, 2020.
- Li, C., Gao, X., Li, Y., Peng, B., Li, X., Zhang, Y., and Gao, J. Optimus: Organizing sentences via pre-trained modeling of a latent space. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 4678–4699, 2020.
- Li, Y., Dong, B., Guerin, F., and Lin, C. Compressing context to enhance inference efficiency of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pp. 6342–6353, 2023.
- Liu, Y., Yu, J., Xu, Y., Li, Z., and Zhu, Q. A survey on transformer context extension: Approaches and evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13299*, 2025.
- Mu, J., Li, X., and Goodman, N. Learning to compress prompts with gist tokens. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:19327–19352, 2023.
- Penedo, G. Finewiki, 2025. URL <https://huggingface.co/datasets/HuggingFaceFW/finewiki>. Source: Wikimedia Enterprise Snapshot API (<https://api.enterprise.wikimedia.com/v2/snapshots>). Text licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0 with attribution to Wikipedia contributors.
- Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., Krueger, G., and Sutskever, I. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020>.
- Wei, H., Sun, Y., and Li, Y. Deepseek-ocr: Contexts optical compression, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.18234>.
- Yang, Z., Hu, Z., Salakhutdinov, R., and Berg-Kirkpatrick, T. Improved variational autoencoders for text modeling using dilated convolutions. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 3881–3890. PMLR, 2017.

A. Experimental Setup

A.1. Encoder Architecture Details

Mean Pooling. The mean pooling encoder compresses token embeddings using sliding window averaging with no learned parameters beyond a single separator token. Given a sequence of token embeddings $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and window size w with stride s , the encoder produces pooled embeddings:

$$\mathbf{p}_i = \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} \mathbf{e}_{is+j+1}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, \lfloor (n-w)/s \rfloor$. Any remainder tokens after the last complete window are pooled into an additional embedding. A learnable separator token (1280 dimensions, matching the decoder’s hidden size) is appended to mark the boundary between compressed context and subsequent tokens.

Hierarchical. The hierarchical encoder compresses token embeddings through a pyramid of residual convolutional blocks. Each block contains two 1D convolutions with a skip connection:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h} &= \text{GELU}(\text{GroupNorm}(\text{Conv}_{k=5, s=1}(\mathbf{x}))) \\ \mathbf{m} &= \text{GroupNorm}(\text{Conv}_{k=3, s=2}(\mathbf{h})) \\ \mathbf{y} &= \text{GELU}(\mathbf{m} + \text{AvgPool}(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned}$$

where the skip connection uses adaptive average pooling to match the downsampled length. Each block halves the sequence length; stacking L blocks yields $2^L \times$ compression. A learnable separator token is appended after compression.

Vision (DeepSeek-OCR). The vision encoder follows DeepSeek-OCR’s architecture: text is first rendered to an image, then processed through a three-stage pipeline. **Stage 1:** A SAM ViT-B encoder (12 layers, 768 dimensions, 12 heads) extracts spatial features from the rendered image. **Stage 2:** A CLIP-L vision transformer (24 layers, 1024 dimensions, 16 heads) processes these features with global attention. **Stage 3:** A projector maps the concatenated SAM and CLIP features to the decoder’s embedding space (1280 dimensions). The number of vision tokens depends on image resolution: 73 tokens at 512×512 (tiny), 111 at 640×640 (small), 273 at 1024×1024 (base), and 421 at 1280×1280 (large). The vision encoder contains approximately 400M parameters.

A.2. Decoder Architecture Details

The decoder is a 12-layer transformer based on DeepSeek-V2 architecture with 1280 hidden dimensions, 10 attention heads (128 dimensions per head), and 6848 FFN intermediate dimensions. The model uses rotary position embeddings (RoPE) with base frequency 10000 and applies RMSNorm in a pre-norm configuration (normalization before attention and feed-forward layers). The decoder contains approximately 570M active parameters per token (3B total with mixture-of-experts).

A.3. Training Hyperparameters

Hyperparameter	Value
Optimizer	AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999$)
Learning rate	10^{-4}
Vision encoder learning rate	10^{-5} (when trained)
LR schedule	Linear warmup \rightarrow Cosine decay
Warmup ratio	0.1
Effective batch size	48
Epochs	1
Weight decay	0.01
Gradient clipping	1.0 (max norm)
Precision	bfloat16

Table 1. Reconstruction experiment data. Enc Init and Dec Init show encoder/decoder initialization: DS (DeepSeek-OCR original checkpoint), Random (randomly initialized); (frozen) indicates frozen during training. Config specifies: image resolution for vision (tiny/small/base/large), window size and stride (w,s) for mean pooling, and target tokens (t) for hierarchical achieved by stacking residual blocks (each block halves sequence length). Tokens shows actual context length after compression. Params shows trainable encoder parameters in millions. PPL is validation perplexity for reconstructing original text from compressed representation.

Encoder	Enc Init	Dec Init	Config	Tokens	Comp.	Params (M)	PPL
Vision	DS (frozen)	DS (frozen)	large	426	2.3×	-	1.20
			base	278	3.6×	-	1.20
			small	116	8.6×	-	1.29
			tiny	78	12.8×	-	1.77
Vision	DS	DS	large	426	2.3×	401	1.03
			base	278	3.6×	401	1.03
			small	116	8.6×	401	1.06
			tiny	78	12.8×	401	1.14
Mean pool	Random	DS	w=2,s=2	502	2.0×	-	1.01
			w=4,s=4	252	4.0×	-	1.04
			w=5,s=5	202	5.0×	-	1.06
			w=10,s=10	102	9.8×	-	1.16
			w=20,s=20	52	19.2×	-	1.38
			w=100,s=100	12	83.3×	-	3.17
			w=4,s=2	501	2.0×	-	1.01
			w=8,s=4	251	4.0×	-	1.04
			w=16,s=8	126	7.9×	-	1.12
			w=20,s=10	101	9.9×	-	1.17
Hierarchical	Random	DS	w=40,s=20	51	19.6×	-	1.42
			t=500	502	2.0×	13	1.00
			t=250	252	4.0×	26	1.00
			t=125	127	7.9×	39	1.00
			t=63	65	15.4×	52	1.01
			t=32	34	29.4×	66	1.24
			t=16	18	55.6×	79	2.56
			t=8	10	100.0×	92	4.64

B. Detailed Results

Table 3 shows that compressed representations retain useful information from earlier context, even though vision and mean pooling fail to beat truncation at matched token budgets. Table 4 shows how much adding 100 text tokens improves each compression method.

Table 2. Language modeling experiment data. Enc Init and Dec Init show encoder/decoder initialization: DS (DeepSeek-OCR), Recon. (reconstruction checkpoint trained on Wikipedia), Random (randomly initialized), - (not applicable); (frozen) indicates frozen during training. Config specifies: image resolution for vision (tiny/small/base/large), window size and stride (w,s) for mean pooling, and target tokens (t) for hierarchical achieved by stacking residual blocks (each block halves sequence length). Configs with +100 are hybrid: compressed context plus last 100 text tokens. Tokens shows total context length. Params shows trainable encoder parameters in millions. Δ PPL is relative to full context baseline (4.80 PPL, 1001 tokens).

Encoder	Enc Init	Dec Init	Config	Tokens	Comp.	Params (M)	PPL	Δ PPL
Vision	DS (frozen)	DS	large	426	2.3×	-	5.05	+0.25
			base	278	3.6×	-	5.13	+0.33
			small	116	8.6×	-	5.27	+0.47
			tiny	78	12.8×	-	5.35	+0.55
			large, TT=100	526	1.9×	-	4.96	+0.16
			base, TT=100	378	2.6×	-	5.02	+0.22
			small, TT=100	216	4.6×	-	5.07	+0.27
			tiny, TT=100	178	5.6×	-	5.13	+0.34
Vision	DS	DS	large	426	2.3×	401	5.03	+0.23
			base	278	3.6×	401	5.08	+0.29
			small	116	8.6×	401	5.18	+0.38
			tiny	78	12.8×	401	5.26	+0.46
			large, TT=100	526	1.9×	401	4.94	+0.15
			base, TT=100	378	2.6×	401	5.01	+0.21
			small, TT=100	216	4.6×	401	5.03	+0.24
			tiny, TT=100	178	5.6×	401	5.11	+0.31
Vision	Recon.	Recon.	large	426	2.3×	401	5.04	+0.24
			base	278	3.6×	401	5.06	+0.27
			small	116	8.6×	401	5.21	+0.41
			tiny	78	12.8×	401	5.29	+0.49
Mean pool	Random	Recon.	w=2,s=2	502	2.0×	-	4.95	+0.16
			w=4,s=4	252	4.0×	-	5.02	+0.23
			w=5,s=5	202	5.0×	-	5.07	+0.27
			w=10,s=10	102	9.8×	-	5.19	+0.39
			w=20,s=20	52	19.2×	-	5.28	+0.48
			w=2,s=2, TT=100	602	1.7×	-	4.94	+0.14
			w=4,s=4, TT=100	352	2.8×	-	4.96	+0.16
			w=5,s=5, TT=100	302	3.3×	-	4.99	+0.19
			w=10,s=10, TT=100	202	5.0×	-	5.06	+0.26
			w=20,s=20, TT=100	152	6.6×	-	5.10	+0.31
Hierarchical	Recon.	Recon.	t=500	502	2.0×	13	4.87	+0.07
			t=250	252	4.0×	26	4.96	+0.16
			t=125	127	7.9×	39	5.05	+0.25
			t=63	65	15.4×	52	5.14	+0.34
			t=500, TT=100	602	1.7×	13	4.85	+0.05
			t=250, TT=100	352	2.8×	26	4.91	+0.11
			t=125, TT=100	227	4.4×	39	4.97	+0.17
			t=63, TT=100	165	6.1×	52	5.03	+0.23
Truncation	-	DS	n=1001	1001	1.0×	-	4.80	+0.00
			n=601	602	1.7×	-	4.90	+0.10
			n=525	526	1.9×	-	4.92	+0.13
			n=425	426	2.3×	-	4.97	+0.17
			n=277	278	3.6×	-	5.02	+0.22
			n=115	116	8.6×	-	5.13	+0.33
			n=77	78	12.8×	-	5.18	+0.38

Table 3. Do compressed full-context representations add value beyond simple truncation? All hybrid approaches combine a compressed encoding of the full 1000-token context with the last 100 text tokens. The Ctx. Tokens column shows compressed + text tokens. Baseline (deletion, keeping last 100 tokens only): 6.04 PPL.

Encoder type	Ctx. Tokens	Comp.	PPL	Δ PPL
Truncation (n=900)	0 + 100	9.9x	6.04	-
Vision	526 + 100	1.6x	4.96	+1.09
	378 + 100	2.1x	5.02	+1.02
	216 + 100	3.2x	5.07	+0.97
	178 + 100	3.6x	5.13	+0.91
Vision	526 + 100	1.6x	4.94	+1.10
	378 + 100	2.1x	5.01	+1.03
	216 + 100	3.2x	5.03	+1.01
	178 + 100	3.6x	5.11	+0.93
Mean pool	602 + 100	1.4x	4.94	+1.11
	302 + 100	2.5x	4.99	+1.05
	202 + 100	3.3x	5.06	+0.98
	152 + 100	4.0x	5.10	+0.94
Hierarchical	602 + 100	1.4x	4.85	+1.19
	352 + 100	2.2x	4.91	+1.13
	227 + 100	3.1x	4.97	+1.07
	165 + 100	3.8x	5.03	+1.02

Table 4. Does adding 100 raw text tokens improve compression methods? Compares pure compression vs hybrid (adding 100 text tokens). Efficiency = actual Δ PPL / expected Δ PPL, where expected is 0.14 based on linear interpolation between full context and deletion-100. Efficiency >1 means text tokens are more valuable than average; <0 means hybrid hurts.

Encoder	Compression	Pure	Hybrid	Δ	Eff.
Vision (enc. frozen)	2.3x \rightarrow 1.9x	5.05	4.96	+0.10	0.7x
	3.6x \rightarrow 2.6x	5.13	5.02	+0.11	0.8x
	8.6x \rightarrow 4.6x	5.27	5.07	+0.20	1.4x
	12.8x \rightarrow 5.6x	5.35	5.13	+0.22	1.6x
Vision	2.3x \rightarrow 1.9x	5.03	4.94	+0.09	0.6x
	3.6x \rightarrow 2.6x	5.06	5.01	+0.06	0.4x
	8.6x \rightarrow 4.6x	5.18	5.03	+0.15	1.1x
	12.8x \rightarrow 5.6x	5.26	5.11	+0.15	1.1x
Mean pool	2.0x \rightarrow 1.7x	4.95	4.94	+0.02	0.1x
	5.0x \rightarrow 3.3x	5.07	4.99	+0.08	0.6x
	9.8x \rightarrow 5.0x	5.19	5.06	+0.13	0.9x
	19.2x \rightarrow 6.6x	5.28	5.10	+0.18	1.3x
Hierarchical	2.0x \rightarrow 1.7x	4.87	4.85	+0.02	0.1x
	4.0x \rightarrow 2.8x	4.96	4.91	+0.05	0.4x
	7.9x \rightarrow 4.4x	5.05	4.97	+0.08	0.6x
	15.4x \rightarrow 6.1x	5.14	5.03	+0.11	0.8x