

# RefBench-PRO: Perceptual and Reasoning Oriented Benchmark for Referring Expression Comprehension

Tianyi Gao<sup>1,2\*</sup> Hao Li<sup>2,3\*</sup> Han Fang<sup>2</sup> Xin Wei<sup>2</sup> Xiaodong Dong<sup>2</sup>  
Hongbo Sun<sup>2</sup> Ye Yuan<sup>2</sup> Zhongjiang He<sup>2</sup> Jinglin Xu<sup>4</sup> Jingmin Xin<sup>1†</sup> Hao Sun<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Key Laboratory of Human-Machine Hybrid Augmented Intelligence,  
National Engineering Research Center for Visual Information and Applications,  
Institute of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics, Xi'an Jiaotong University

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Artificial Intelligence (TeleAI), China Telecom

<sup>3</sup>Shanghai Jiao Tong University <sup>4</sup>University of Science and Technology Beijing



Project Page



Evaluation Code



Dataset

## Abstract

*Referring Expression Comprehension (REC) is a vision-language task that localizes a specific image region based on a textual description. Existing REC benchmarks primarily evaluate perceptual capabilities and lack interpretable scoring mechanisms, which cannot reveal the grounding capability of Multi-modal Large Language Model (MLLM) across different cognitive abilities. To address this limitation, we introduce RefBench-PRO, a comprehensive REC benchmark, which decomposes referring expressions into two core dimensions, i.e., perception and reasoning, and further subdivides them into six progressively challenging tasks, such as attribute, position, interaction, commonsense, relation and reject. We also develop a fully automated data-generation pipeline that produces diverse referring expressions across these six sub-dimensions. Furthermore, We propose Ref-RL, an RL-based learning scheme, which incorporates Dynamic IoU-based GRPO to improve localization accuracy under increasingly complex reasoning conditions, establishing a stronger baseline for REC. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our RefBench-PRO enables interpretable evaluation of MLLM on referring expression comprehension, presenting greater challenges in both perception and reasoning.*

## 1. Introduction

Referring Expression Comprehension (REC) [5, 12–14, 17, 22, 27, 35] is a fine-grained visual grounding task that requires models to process region-specific inputs and localize the corresponding target region within an image. Due to limited vision-language understanding, specialized detection models such as Grounding DINO [22] struggle to accurately localize objects described by highly expressive and semantically complex referring expressions. In contrast, multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [4, 7, 9, 16, 18, 24, 30, 38, 50] have demonstrated remarkable generalization in both fine-grained perception and understanding, attracting growing interest in REC.

While recent MLLMs have achieved promising performance on existing REC benchmarks, particularly on RefCOCO+/g [28, 47, 47], They are still challenged by visually complex scenes or compositional vision-language reasoning. Several benchmarks are proposed to enable more robust evaluation. FineCops-Ref [21] introduces difficulty levels based on the complexity of visual content, while Ref-L4 [6] emphasizes the construction of more detailed referring expressions. However, these works still frame REC as a perceptual task, using more detailed descriptions but without incorporating compositional reasoning. Consequently, the lack of comprehensive task definitions and high-diversity visual contexts limits MLLMs' ability to develop fine-grained and reasoning-aware visual grounding.

To address this gap, we propose **RefBench-PRO**, a holistic benchmark designed to comprehensively and interpretably evaluate the perception and reasoning capabilities of MLLMs. First, the evaluation encompasses two core di-

\*Equal Contributions.

†Corresponding Authors.




Figure 1. Comparison of the proposed RefBench-PRO and the RefCOCO benchmark. (a) Existing REC benchmarks focus on images with dominant or few objects and use explicit, highly specific referring expressions, evaluated by a single aggregate metric. This design leads to near-saturation performance in MLLMs, obscuring their true capabilities in REC tasks. (b) We propose RefBench-PRO, a comprehensive and holistic benchmark across six critical dimensions. By systematically revealing the specific limitations of current MLLMs in REC tasks, it provides new insights for designing MLLMs with improved localized understanding capabilities.

mensions: visual-cue perception and compositional reasoning. Specifically, visual-cue perception is structured into three aspects: (1) Attribute, which includes intrinsic visual properties; (2) Position, defined as spatial relationships among different objects; and (3) Interaction, referring to relative relationships among objects of the same category. This dimension evaluates the model’s ability to accurately perceive relevant visual cues with the explicit textual description. In contrast, compositional reasoning involves more challenging aspects: (4) Relation, which involves compositional referring that requires analyzing multiple objects; (5) Commonsense, which refers to objects via contextual descriptions rather than explicit naming; and (6) Rejection, which handles referring to describing objects absent from the image. Therefore, models must jointly reason over visual evidence and textual cues to infer the correct referent.

Second, unlike conventional benchmarks that focus on dominant, few-object scenes, RefBench-PRO employs high-resolution images with diverse object categories, targeting small, spatially scattered regions. This design provides fine-grained visual context while introducing a new

challenge to accurately integrate various cues. Finally, RefBench-PRO comprises six specific tasks, each containing 1,000 question-answer pairs, covering over 1,000 distinct objects, with an average target object area ratio of 10%.

Furthermore, based on the above design and to mitigate the risk of data leakage, we adopt FineHARD [44] as our source data and propose a fine-grained referential annotation pipeline. This pipeline generates over 200k high-quality training pairs, named RefObjects-200k. To progressively improve the perception and reasoning ability of MLLMs, we employ Ref-R1, a two-stage training strategy. First, Chain-of-Thought based tuning is adopted to guide the model to capture text-related visual cues. Second, we propose Dynamic IoU-based Group Relative Policy Optimization (DyIoU-GRPO) to fuse visual and textual evidence into the reasoning chain, thereby enhancing perceptual localization and complex reasoning.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose RefBench-PRO, a holistic benchmark comprising six critical aspects designed to evaluate the referring expression comprehension capabilities of MLLMs.
- We introduce a fine-grained referential annotation pipeline and present RefObjects-200k, a large-scale referring expression training set, alongside the training framework Ref-R1 to establish a competitive baseline.
- We evaluate a range of widely used SOTA MLLMs on RefBench-PRO to gain deeper insights into their limitations in fine-grained, reasoning-aware visual grounding.

## 2. Related Work

**REC Benchmarks.** Referring Expression Comprehension (REC) [15, 26, 28, 32, 49, 51] is the task of localizing a unique region in an image based on the description. Widely adopted benchmarks such as RefCOCO [47], RefCOCO+ [47], and RefCOCOg [28] are built upon MSCOCO [19], leveraging its dense annotations. These benchmarks extend MSCOCO [19] with diverse referring expressions, establishing REC as a standard benchmark for evaluating the perception capability of MLLMs. However, performance on these benchmarks has saturated due to limited visual diversity, driving recent work toward harder, more diverse challenges. FineCops-Ref [21] introduced difficulty levels based on the complexity of content. Ref-L4 [6] introduced more descriptive expressions. C-REC [48] proposed counterfactual negative examples to increase visual ambiguity. GREC [10] tackled the multi-target REC task. Migician [17] introduced a multi-image grounding task requiring multi-context understanding. However, these benchmarks still treat REC as a multimodal perception task and lack interpretable metrics to diagnose models’ fine-grained understanding of local regions. Instead, we propose RefBench-PRO to evaluate models’ perception and reasoning capabilities jointly.



Figure 2. Visualizations of the six tasks in the RefBench-PRO. The three tasks on the left (Attribute, Position, Interaction) belong to Visual-cue Perception, while the three on the right (Commonsense, Relation, Reject) belong to Vision-language Interleaved Reasoning.

**MLLM-based REC Methods.** Recent advances in MLLMs [1, 4, 7, 9, 16, 18, 24, 30, 38, 42, 50] have demonstrated promising grounding capabilities through the fusion of visual and textual content. To further strengthen these capabilities, recent works have explored several methods. Groma [27], ChatRex [12], and RexSeek [14] reformulated REC as a region-token retrieval task using an additional specialist model. PAM [20] extends the SAM 2 framework with LLM to support both semantic understanding and visual perceptual capabilities. Visual CoT [33] utilizes CoT to fully leverage the reasoning capabilities of MLLMs. Reinforcement learning, such as GRPO [34], has been employed to further enhance complex reasoning capabilities [5, 23, 35, 45]. VLM-R1 [35] and Visual-Rft [23] enhance model capabilities by adjusting the reward function. Deepeyes [35] and Chain-of-Focus [23] introduce an image zoom-in tool to capture visual details. However, existing methods have not sufficiently explored compositional referring expressions. To this end, we propose a fine-grained annotation pipeline with RL-based framework, Ref-R1, to establish a more comprehensive baseline for REC.

### 3. RefBench-PRO

RefBench-PRO is a holistic benchmark for Referring Expression Comprehension (REC), designed to offer diverse evaluation dimensions and challenging scenarios. As shown

in Figure 2, it focuses on evaluating two critical capabilities of MLLMs: **Visual-cue Perception** and **Compositional Reasoning**, each further subdivided into three subcategories. Visual-cue perception requires models to capture sufficient visual evidence given specific referring queries. Beyond that, Compositional Reasoning demands to integrate implicit textual references with contextual visual relations.

#### 3.1. RefBench-PRO Construction

To construct RefBench-PRO, we leverage FineHARD [44], a large-scale dataset annotated with bounding boxes across a wide range of resolutions. Source images are filtered based on resolution variability and the distribution of Grounding DINO-detected bounding boxes, retaining only those exhibiting high resolution, multiple diverse objects, and rich visual content. To generate high-quality query-bounding box pairs across six tasks, we propose the fine-grained annotation pipeline as depicted in Figure 3:

**Image Parsing and Region Generation.** For each image  $I$ , we prompt Qwen2.5-VL-72B to generate a structured property dictionary encoding the visual elements, including the object category  $c$ , inherent attributes  $a$ , interactive relationships with other objects  $r$ , and a brief description phrase  $d$ . Then, we use Grounding DINO [22] to ground the description phrase  $d$  to obtain the bounding boxes  $b$ . To ensure visual complexity, we retain images containing at least






Figure 3. The fine-grained referential annotation pipeline to construct RefObjects-200k and RefBench-PRO.

two distinct object categories and five total objects. Consequently, the property for each image  $I$  is structured as:

$$\mathcal{E}_I = \{(a_j, b_j, c_j, d_j, r_j)\}_{j=1}^N, \text{ with } |c_j| > 2, N \geq 5, \quad (1)$$

where  $j$  indicates the index of specific object.

**Region Correction.** For each object  $j$ , we convert each element of  $\mathcal{E}_I$  into a verification checklist. Qwen2.5-VL-72B is then prompted to evaluate whether the visual content within the target region aligns with the corresponding property in the checklist. Only objects that are fully consistent across all properties are retained, as they provide reliable spatial coordinates and diverse property descriptions.

**Referring Expression Generation.** Once the properties are verified, we design a task selection mechanism to automatically assign each retained object to a specific task type, formalized by the selection function  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{select}}$  as follows:

$$T_j = \mathcal{F}_{\text{select}}(t_j, \mathcal{E}_I). \quad (2)$$

where  $t_j$  is the target object to be assigned.  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{select}}$  is a human-defined rule-based selection function designed to identify challenging instances for each task by defining specific visual conditions. For example, we assign objects that belong to the same category but exhibit distinct inherent attributes to *Attribute* task, providing more fine-grained visual cues as the priors. These rules intentionally introduce visual complexity, thereby curating a set of high-quality, task-relevant seed objects. Then we prompt Qwen2.5-VL-72B to reformulate the property to generate candidate expressions for the assigned object in specific task  $T_j$ .

**Referring Expression Correction.** Each referring expression is validated through a two-stage verification process. First, a consistency check is adopted to verify that the visual content within the bounding box semantically aligns

RefBench-PRO							
type	Attribute	Position	Interaction	Relation	Commonsense	Reject	Total
Images	701	735	642	695	715	764	3102
Phrases	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	6,000
Img Size	1602x1301	1588x1294	1608x1292	1619x1282	1627x1280	1629x1301	1612x1292
Box Size	10.76%	8.34%	9.43%	6.15%	6.14%	N/A	8.16%
Length	9.3	11.0	10.3	14.4	15.5	13.8	12.4

RefObjects-200k							
type	Attribute	Position	Interaction	Relation	Commonsense	Reject	Total
Images	14,284	11,083	7,696	7,945	21,055	18,670	28,541
Phrases	37,257	24,380	16,903	17,193	59,106	49,146	203,985
Img Size	1629x1274	1636x1275	1603x1287	1633x1268	1605x1295	1608x1294	1616x1286
Box Size	11.27%	8.66%	9.54%	8.33%	8.27%	N/A	9.68%
Length	8.6	9.3	9.3	15.3	16.2	14.3	12.88

Table 1. The distribution of RefBench-PRO and RefObjects-200k.




Figure 4. A comparative analysis of RefBench-PRO against established benchmarks (RefCOCO [47], RefCOCO+ [47], RefCOCOG [28], and Ref-L4 [6]) evaluates (a) target object area ratios and (b) average expression length and semantic density, defined as the number of visual cues per word.

with the expression, filtering out hallucinated descriptions. Second, a uniqueness check ensures that the expression unambiguously refers to a single, distinct region in the image. **More details regarding the dataset construction will be provided in the supplemental material.**



### 3.2. Data statistics

We construct RefObjects-200k via our annotation pipeline. A subset of pairs across six dimensions is then sampled, further corrected by ten annotators to establish RefBench-PRO. Additional details are provided in Table 1. Specifically, REFbench-PRO contains 6,000 pairs distributed across six sub-categories: Attribute, Position, Interaction, Relation, Commonsense, and Rejection. The benchmark features high-resolution images, covers over 1,000 distinct object types, and emphasizes small or marginally visible targets, with an average target object area ratio of 10%. In Figure 4a, our RefBench-PRO exhibits a broader distribution, with greater emphasis on objects with small relative size. Additionally, we depict object density and find that Ref-L4 [6] generates longer expressions containing context-irrelevant content, whereas our RefBench-PRO produces comparably long descriptions by incorporating discriminative visual cues, achieving higher information density.

## 4. Methodology

RefBench-PRO, a comprehensive REC benchmark that emphasizes visually cluttered scenes and compositional reasoning, reveals new challenges in the visual grounding capabilities of MLLMs. To address these challenges, we propose **Ref-R1**, a training framework designed to establish a foundational baseline for future research.

### 4.1. Chain-of-Thought Cold Start.

Using the RefObjects-200k dataset, we leverage Qwen2.5-VL-72B [4] to generate chain-of-thought reasoning for each sample. Guided by a predefined prompt, the model produces multiple reasoning paths, from which the highest-quality chain is selected as the final output. We curate 180K high-quality reasoning traces for first-stage supervised fine-tuning, yielding a cold-start model capable of generating bounding boxes through coherent, step-by-step reasoning.

### 4.2. DyIoU-GRPO

In the second stage, to improve generalization by exploring diverse reasoning trajectories, we propose Dynamic IoU-based GRPO (DyIoU-GRPO) for post-training. For each query  $q$ , GRPO samples a set of  $N$  reasoning responses. For each response  $o_i$ , the rule-based reward  $R_i = R(q, o_i)$  is computed to derive group-relative advantages:

$$A_i = \frac{R_i - \text{mean}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N\})}{\text{std}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N\})}. \quad (3)$$

The policy  $\pi_\theta$  is then optimized to maximize the expected advantage as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}_{GRPO}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{q \sim P(Q), \{o_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}(O|q)} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\pi_\theta(o_i|q)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_i|q)} A_i - \beta \mathbb{D}_{KL}(\pi_\theta || \pi_{ref}) \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta$  is a hyperparameter that controls the KL divergence penalty. Inspired by human cognition, where observers first perform a global scan to identify coarse regions of interest and then shift attention to explore fine-grained details, we design a hierarchical attention-based reward function to guide models in step-by-step reasoning, progressively integrating perception and reasoning as:

**Format Reward ( $R_{format}$ ).** This reward ensures that the response strictly conforms to the required format as ‘<think>reasoning process</think><answer>[x1, y1, x2, y2]</answer>’. It assigns a value of 1 if the format is correct and 0 otherwise.

**Dynamic IoU Reward ( $R_{DyIoU}$ ).** Given the ground-truth bounding box coordinates  $B_{GT}$  and the model’s predicted coordinates  $B_{pred}$ , we compute the IoU score as  $\text{IoU}(B_{GT}, B_{pred})$ . The prediction is assigned a reward of 1 if its IoU score exceeds the threshold, and 0 otherwise. The threshold is defined as follows:

$$\tau_{IoU}(t, s) = \max(\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) \cdot \frac{t}{T} - d_{\max} \cdot (1 - s), \alpha), \quad (5)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  represent the start and end threshold values.  $t$  indicates the current training step, ranging from 0 to  $T$ .  $s$  denotes the ratio of the bounding box area to the total image area.  $d_{\max}$  controls the threshold penalty. As training progresses, the threshold increases to raise localization difficulty and encourage precise spatial predictions. Meanwhile, smaller targets receive lower thresholds to promote attention to fine-grained visual cues.

**Group Quality Reward.** To enhance discriminative group-relative advantages, we introduce the Group Quality Reward. We define a dynamic quality threshold  $\tau_q$  that gradually increases during training to identify hard groups, where the number of correct responses is below  $\tau_q$ . For each hard group, the Group Quality Reward is computed as  $\frac{k}{n}$ , where  $n$  is the group size and  $k$  is the number of correct responses. This value is added to the reward of every correct response and subtracted from that of every incorrect response. By widening the reward gap within the group, this adjustment strengthens the model’s preference for correct answers, especially in challenging cases with high error rates.

Overall, the final reward  $R$  is formulated as:

$$R_i = \begin{cases} R_{format} + R_{DyIoU} \pm \frac{k}{n} \cdot p & \text{if } n_{\text{correct}} < \tau_q, \\ R_{format} + R_{DyIoU} & \text{if } n_{\text{correct}} \geq \tau_q, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Table 2. Performance of state-of-the-art models on the RefBench-PRO across six aspects. The best results are in bold, and the second-best results are underlined.

Models	Size	Overall		Visual-cue Perception				Compositional Reasoning			
		Acc <sub>p</sub>	Acc <sub>o</sub>	Attribute	Position	Interaction	Acc <sub>API</sub>	Relation	Commonsense	Reject	Acc <sub>RC</sub>
Open-vocabulary Grounding Models											
GLEE [41]	-	36.1	31.2	48.2	38.4	34.5	40.4	31.4	27.9	7.1	29.7
Grounding DINO L [22]	-	37.6	31.3	47.5	43.3	31.8	40.9	35.0	30.3	0.1	32.7
Proprietary MLLMs											
Gemini-2.5-pro [8]	-	9.6	8.0	10.4	11.5	10.8	10.9	7.2	8.2	-	7.7
GPT-4o [11]	-	12.1	10.1	11.7	12.8	11.9	12.1	12.4	11.6	-	12.0
GPT-5 [31]	-	26.1	21.8	29.2	25.5	27.0	27.2	26.2	22.9	-	24.6
Specialist MLLMs											
PaDT [36]	3B	26.6	22.2	30.4	28.0	30.4	29.6	23.7	20.8	-	22.3
VLM-R1 [35]	3B	54.4	45.3	59.0	58.0	54.1	57.0	47.8	53.2	-	50.5
ChatRex [12]	7B	49.5	41.3	54.7	51.1	53.2	53.0	45.1	43.4	-	44.2
Migician [17]	7B	52.3	43.6	57.3	59.7	52.8	56.6	45.4	46.1	-	45.7
UniVG-R1 [5]	7B	53.0	44.2	59.4	57.2	55.1	57.2	48.3	44.9	-	46.6
Rex-Thinker [13]	7B	63.6	53.0	67.1	64.5	61.7	64.4	59.3	65.6	-	62.4
CogVLM-Grounding [39]	17B	57.1	47.5	62.4	62.4	55.9	60.2	49.4	55.2	-	52.3
Open-source General MLLMs											
Qwen2-VL [38]	7B	45.4	42.6	55.3	47.8	37.8	47.0	39.4	46.5	28.5	43.0
Mimo-VL-RL [43]	7B	56.3	46.9	60.9	58.4	57.3	58.9	51.8	52.9	0.1	52.4
Qwen2.5-VL [4]	7B	57.6	48.5	61.7	63.0	58.6	61.1	49.1	55.6	3.1	52.3
InternVL3 [52]	8B	20.1	20.3	24.9	18.4	22.3	21.9	19.8	15.0	21.3	17.4
InternVL3.5 [40]	8B	41.5	34.6	45.7	41.2	45.3	44.1	37.8	37.3	-	37.5
LLaVA-OneVision-1.5 [2]	8B	50.7	42.3	54.5	54.0	48.4	52.3	48.1	48.6	-	48.3
Qwen3-VL [3]	8B	71.4	62.2	76.6	76.1	67.3	73.3	68.9	68.3	15.8	68.6
Ovis2.5 [25]	9B	61.7	51.5	65.7	63.6	59.7	63.0	58.7	61.0	-	59.9
GLM-4.1V-Base [37]	9B	60.1	50.1	62.9	61.0	57.7	60.5	57.0	61.9	-	59.4
LLaVA-OneVision [16]	72B	56.5	47.1	60.1	59.4	53.7	57.7	54.2	55.0	-	54.6
Qwen2.5-VL [4]	72B	66.7	59.5	68.6	69.1	69.4	69.1	61.6	64.8	23.6	63.2
InternVL3 [52]	78B	21.8	22.3	35.0	24.9	28.2	29.4	24.3	20.8	24.8	22.5

where  $p$  is the weight of  $\frac{k}{n}$  and the sign of the  $\pm$  term is positive for a correct response  $o_i$  and negative otherwise.

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Experimental Settings

**Models and Baselines.** To comprehensively evaluate our proposed benchmark, we conduct experiments across 24 representative models, categorized into four groups: Open-vocabulary Grounding Models, Proprietary MLLMs, Specialist MLLMs, and Open-source General MLLMs. The open-vocabulary grounding models include Grounding Dino L [22] and GLEE [41]. The proprietary MLLMs comprise GPT-4o [11], GPT-5 [31], and Gemini-2.5-Pro [8]. We further evaluate a set of specialist MLLMs tailored for REC tasks, including PaDT [36], Vlm-R1 [35], ChatRex [12], Migician [17], UniVG-R1 [5], Rex-Thinker [13] and CogVLM [39]. Finally, we incorporate several general-purpose MLLMs, such as Qwen series [3, 4, 38], InternVL series [40, 52], Mimo-VL [43], LLaVA-OneVision-1.5 [2] and Ovis2.5 [25]. For all baseline methods, we conducted experiments based on their official code.

**Evaluation Metrics.** We evaluate performance using two metrics: rejection accuracy (RejAcc) and mean accu-

racy (mAcc). For the *Reject* category, a prediction is correct if the model outputs no bounding box or explicitly states that the target is absent. For the other five tasks, mAcc is computed as the average accuracy across IoU thresholds from 0.5 to 0.9 in steps of 0.05. To provide a overall assessment, we report additional metrics:  $Acc_o$ , the mean accuracy over all six tasks;  $Acc_p$ , the mean accuracy over the five non-rejection tasks;  $Acc_{API}$ , the mean accuracy over the three perception tasks; and  $Acc_{RC}$ , the mean accuracy over Relation and Commonsense.

**Training Details.** We conduct experiments on Qwen-2.5-VL-7B [4]. In the first stage, we train on 180K samples generated from RefObjects-200k for one epoch, using a learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-6}$  and an accumulated batch size of 16. In the second stage, we select 80k samples and train for 5,000 steps with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  and an accumulated batch size of 16. For reward design, we set  $\alpha = 0.5$ ,  $\beta = 0.8$ , and  $d_{\max} = 0.15$  for the dynamic IoU reward, and  $p = 0.5$  for the group quality reward. All experiments are conducted on 8 NVIDIA A800-80G GPUs.

### 5.2. Benchmarking on RefBench-PRO

**Overall Performance.** The overall performance is summarized in Table 2. Although most models have reached per-




Figure 5. A comprehensive evaluation of model performance across three key aspects on the perception dimension: (a) the number of visual distractors that share the same category as the target, (b) the target object area ratio, and (c) the number of visual hops which is defined as the number of intermediate reference objects mentioned to locate the target .

Table 3. Comparisons on RefBench-PRO, RefCOCO+/g, and Ref-L4 [6]. RefCOCO+/g denotes the average score across: RefCOCO [46], RefCOCO+ [46], and RefCOCOg [29].

	RefBench-PRO		RefCOCO+/g	Ref-L4
	Acc <sub>p</sub>	Acc <sub>o</sub>		
Grounding Dino L	37.58	31.34	86.59	41.75
VLM-R1-3B	54.41	45.34	86.23	82.56
CogVLM-Grounding-17B	57.05	47.54	88.97	81.70
Qwen2.5-VL-7B	57.58	48.50	86.68	81.24
Ovis2.5-9B	61.74	51.45	90.06	90.29
Qwen3-VL-8B	71.44	62.16	89.93	81.70

formance saturation on RefCOCO [46] (Table 3), they all exhibit a substantial decline in RefBench-PRO, with none exceeding  $Acc_p$  of 72%. Furthermore, a clear performance gap is observed between Visual-cue Perception ( $Acc_{API}$ ) and reasoning in relation and commonsense ( $Acc_{RC}$ ), with an average drop of 6.02%. This highlights a critical limitation in current models: failure to bridge basic visual perception with compositional reasoning. Moreover, most models lack reliable rejection capability because they are trained on positive instances and consistently generate localization hallucinations when objects are absent.

**Comparisons with Open-vocabulary Grounding Models.** Although open-vocabulary grounding models such as Grounding DINO have fewer parameters, they remain competitive in perceiving visual cues, achieving 0.47 on Attribute and 0.43 on Position. This performance is attributed to their training on large-scale open-vocabulary data and region-text alignment. However, when presented with referring expressions requiring compositional reasoning, their performance drops by 11%. In contrast, MLLMs demonstrate superior grounding generalization across diverse referring expressions, enabled by cross-modal understanding. **The effectiveness of MLLMs in REC.** Proprietary mod-

els such as GPT-5 exhibit limitations on the REC task, despite their strong general-purpose capabilities. In contrast, open-source MLLMs consistently achieve higher accuracy by incorporating visual grounding tasks to refine fine-grained perceptual understanding. Meanwhile, results for several RL-based specialist MLLMs, including VLM-R1, UniVG-R1, and Rex-Thinker, are reported. The RL-based framework enables them to generate interpretable reasoning traces, thereby improving the faithfulness of object referring. While these methods are commonly evaluated on simpler benchmarks such as the RefCOCO series, they also achieve strong performance on RefBench-PRO, particularly on tasks that require compositional reasoning. These results demonstrate that RefBench-PRO provides a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating RL-based methods in REC and holds significant potential to advance the field.

### 5.3. Perceptual-aware Evaluation

To investigate the underlying causes of unsatisfactory performance in perception of RefBench-PRO, we explore three factors including: **the number of visual distractors** which is defined as objects belonging to the same category as the target, **the target object area ratio**, and **the number of object hops**, which is defined as the number of intermediate reference objects mentioned to locate the target. We divide the perception of RefBench-PRO into different difficulty levels and select representative models for evaluation. Experimental results are presented in Figure 5.

As shown in Figure 5, model performance declines with increasing difficulty level. Under the easiest level, most models maintain accuracy above 60%, suggesting that their performance on simple tasks is comparable to that on existing benchmarks. Under the most challenging difficulty level, only Qwen3-VL-8B maintains an accuracy above 60%. The average model performance declines by 20.77%



Table 4. Performance of models with and without thinking mode.

Model	Relation	Commonsense
Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct	68.93	68.29
Qwen3-VL-8B-Thinking	<b>70.41(↑1.48)</b>	<b>69.29(↑1.00)</b>
Ovis2.5-9B	58.66	61.04
Ovis2.5-9B <sup>thinking</sup>	<b>62.29(↑3.63)</b>	<b>61.71(↑0.67)</b>
GLM4.1V-9B-Base	57.03	61.83
GLM4.1V-9B-Thinking	<b>67.89(↑10.86)</b>	<b>69.37(↑7.54)</b>

Table 5. Performance comparisons across two rejection settings.

Model	$Acc_{RC}$	Rejection setting	
		Grounding	Classification
InternVL3-8B	17.4	21.3	46.8
InternVL3.5-8B	37.5	-	49.2
Qwen2-VL-7B	43.0	28.5	51.7
Qwen2.5-VL-7B	52.3	3.1	55.1
Qwen3-VL-8B	68.6	15.8	64.2

as the number of visual distractors increases, by 25.64% as the target bounding box size decreases, and by 10.88% as the number of object hops increases. These findings indicate that current models still exhibit limitations in referential grounding under visually complex scenes.

#### 5.4. Reasoning-aware Evaluation

**Effectiveness of Thinking.** We adopt three models: Qwen3-VL-8B [3], Ovis2.5-9B [24], and GLM4.1V-9B [37], all of which support a thinking mode, to investigate their effectiveness on Relation and Commonsense reasoning. Detailed results are reported in Table 4. Across all three models, enabling the thinking mode yields consistent and substantial improvements. These results indicate that explicit reasoning traces significantly improve performance on reasoning tasks, demonstrating that the construction of reliable thinking chains enhances the generalization of predictions.

**Grounding Hallucination.** In the Rejection task, we find that the query formulation significantly affects model performance. To further evaluate whether models possess the ability to determine the presence of a target object, we design two evaluation settings. In the standard setting, the model is instructed to output a bounding box if the object exists. In the alternative setting, the task is reformulated as a binary classification problem, where the model is asked to respond with “yes” or “no” to indicate whether the target object is present in the image. The results, presented in Table 5, show that performance remains close to random chance (approximately 50%) under the binary classification setting. This indicates that models suffer from grounding hallucination when presented with rich visual cues in image and high-density target references in the text.




Figure 6. Visual comparisons of Ref-R1 and state-of-the-art MLLMs, including Qwen2.5-VL (our baseline model) and Qwen3-VL, across the six tasks of RefBench-PRO.

#### 5.5. Ablation Study

We investigate the impact of different components in the proposed Ref-R1 and report ablation results in Table 6, including evaluations on widely used benchmarks: Ref-COCO/+g [29, 46] and Ref-L4 [6]. In the SFT stage, the model achieves superior performance by incorporating explicit chain-of-thought supervision. In the RL stage, we compare against VLM-R1 [35], which uses a fixed-threshold IoU reward. Our dynamic IoU reward outperforms this baseline. This gain arises from a dynamic threshold that progressively increases localization difficulty while placing greater emphasis on small objects, thereby encouraging attention to fine-grained visual details. Additionally, the group quality reward plays a crucial role in performance improvement. By identifying hard groups and amplifying the relative advantage of correct responses over incorrect ones within each group, this reward reinforces the model’s preference for accurate predictions. Furthermore, we present several visualizations in Figure 6, which demonstrate that our model, Qwen2.5-VL trained with Ref-R1, has learned to detect small objects more effectively and to integrate visual evidence with textual cues.

#### 6. Conclusion

In this work, we observe that current REC benchmarks focus mainly on perception and do not provide interpretable score to measure how MLLMs combine perception with higher-level reasoning during referring expression comprehension. To address this, we introduce RefBench-PRO,

Table 6. Ablation experiments of Ref-R1 on several benchmarks, where RefCOCO+/g denotes the average score across three datasets: RefCOCO [46], RefCOCO+ [46], and RefCOCOg [29].

Methods	RefBench-PRO		RefCOCO+/g	Ref-L4
	Acc <sub>p</sub>	Acc <sub>r</sub>		
Qwen2.5-VL	57.58	48.50	86.68	81.24
SFT	62.05	61.46	87.10	83.57
SFT-CoT	64.11	63.68	87.02	84.09
GRPO+ $R_{IoU}$	66.69	65.21	87.78	84.77
GRPO+ $R_{DyIoU}$	68.15	66.41	88.30	85.14
GRPO+ $R_{GroupQuality} + R_{IoU}$	68.07	66.29	87.96	85.10
<b>Ref-R1</b>	<b>69.35(↑11.77)</b>	<b>67.49(↑18.99)</b>	<b>88.82(↑2.14)</b>	<b>85.67(↑4.43)</b>

a new REC benchmark that organizes referring expressions along two core dimensions, perception and reasoning, and breaks them down into six increasingly difficult tasks: attribute, position, interaction, commonsense, relation, and rejection. We also present RefObjects-200K, a large-scale referring expression dataset, generated via a fine-grained referential annotation pipeline, along with Ref-R1, a reinforcement learning–based training framework that establishes a strong baseline. Our experiments show that RefBench-PRO offers a more comprehensive and challenging evaluation for REC, and can help guide the development of MLLMs with stronger perception and reasoning abilities.

## References

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *NeurIPS*, 35: 23716–23736, 2022. 3
- [2] Xiang An, Yin Xie, Kaicheng Yang, Wenkang Zhang, Xiuwei Zhao, Zheng Cheng, Yirui Wang, Songcen Xu, Changrui Chen, Chunsheng Wu, et al. Llava-onevision-1.5: Fully open framework for democratized multimodal training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23661*, 2025. 6
- [3] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025. 6, 8
- [4] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2.5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 1, 3, 5, 6
- [5] Sule Bai, Mingxing Li, Yong Liu, Jing Tang, Haoji Zhang, Lei Sun, Xiangxiang Chu, and Yansong Tang. Univ-r1: Reasoning guided universal visual grounding with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14231*, 2025. 1, 3, 6
- [6] Jierun Chen, Fangyun Wei, Jinjing Zhao, Sizhe Song, Bohuai Wu, Zhuoxuan Peng, S-H Gary Chan, and Hongyang Zhang. Revisiting referring expression comprehension evaluation in the era of large multimodal models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 513–524, 2025. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8
- [7] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Jinguo Zhu, Shenglong Ye, Hao Tian, Zhaoyang Liu, et al. Expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with model, data, and test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05271*, 2024. 1, 3
- [8] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Noveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blisstein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261*, 2025. 6
- [9] Matt Deitke, Christopher Clark, Sangho Lee, Rohun Tripathi, Yue Yang, Jae Sung Park, Mohammadreza Salehi, Niklas Muennighoff, Kyle Lo, Luca Soldaini, et al. Molmo and pixmo: Open weights and open data for state-of-the-art multimodal models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2409, 2024. 1, 3
- [10] Shuting He, Henghui Ding, Chang Liu, and Xudong Jiang. Grc: Generalized referring expression comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16182*, 2023. 2
- [11] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024. 6
- [12] Qing Jiang, Gen Luo, Yuqin Yang, Yuda Xiong, Yihao Chen, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, and Lei Zhang. Chatrex: Taming multimodal llm for joint perception and understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18363*, 2024. 1, 3, 6
- [13] Qing Jiang, Xingyu Chen, Zhaoyang Zeng, Junzhi Yu, and Lei Zhang. Rex-thinker: Grounded object referring via chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.04034*, 2025. 6
- [14] Qing Jiang, Lin Wu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Yuda Xiong, Yihao Chen, Qin Liu, and Lei Zhang. Referring to any person. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08507*, 2025. 1, 3
- [15] Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg. Referitgame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 787–798, 2014. 2
- [16] Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07895*, 2024. 1, 3, 6
- [17] You Li, Heyu Huang, Chi Chen, Kaiyu Huang, Chao Huang, Zonghao Guo, Zhiyuan Liu, Jinan Xu, Yuhua Li, Ruixuan Li, et al. Migician: Revealing the magic of free-form multi-image grounding in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.05767*, 2025. 1, 2, 6
- [18] Zhiqi Li, Guo Chen, Shilong Liu, Shihao Wang, Vibashan VS, Yishen Ji, Shiyi Lan, Hao Zhang, Yilin Zhao, Subhashree Radhakrishnan, et al. Eagle 2: Building post-training data strategies from scratch for frontier vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14818*, 2025. 1, 3
- [19] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence

- Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 2
- [20] Weifeng Lin, Xinyu Wei, Ruichuan An, Tianhe Ren, Tingwei Chen, Renrui Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Wentao Zhang, Lei Zhang, and Hongsheng Li. Perceive anything: Recognize, explain, caption, and segment anything in images and videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05302*, 2025. 3
- [21] Junzhuo Liu, Xuzheng Yang, Weiwei Li, and Peng Wang. Finecops-ref: A new dataset and task for fine-grained compositional referring expression comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.14750*, 2024. 1, 2
- [22] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Qing Jiang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 38–55. Springer, 2024. 1, 3, 6
- [23] Ziyu Liu, Zeyi Sun, Yuhang Zang, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Cao, Haodong Duan, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. Visual-rft: Visual reinforcement fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.01785*, 2025. 3
- [24] Shiyin Lu, Yang Li, Qing-Guo Chen, Zhao Xu, Weihua Luo, Kaifu Zhang, and Han-Jia Ye. Ovis: Structural embedding alignment for multimodal large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20797*, 2024. 1, 3, 8
- [25] Shiyin Lu, Yang Li, Yu Xia, Yuwei Hu, Shanshan Zhao, Yanqing Ma, Zhichao Wei, Yinglun Li, Lunhao Duan, Jianshan Zhao, et al. Ovis2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.11737*, 2025. 6
- [26] Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Xiaoshuai Sun, Liujuan Cao, Chenglin Wu, Cheng Deng, and Rongrong Ji. Multi-task collaborative network for joint referring expression comprehension and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10034–10043, 2020. 2
- [27] Chuofan Ma, Yi Jiang, Jiannan Wu, Zehuan Yuan, and Xiaojuan Qi. Groma: Localized visual tokenization for grounding multimodal large language models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 417–435. Springer, 2024. 1, 3
- [28] Junhua Mao, Jonathan Huang, Alexander Toshev, Oana Camburu, Alan L Yuille, and Kevin Murphy. Generation and comprehension of unambiguous object descriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11–20, 2016. 1, 2, 4
- [29] Junhua Mao, Jonathan Huang, Alexander Toshev, Oana Camburu, Alan L Yuille, and Kevin Murphy. Generation and comprehension of unambiguous object descriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11–20, 2016. 7, 8, 9
- [30] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. [https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV\\_System\\_Card.pdf](https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV_System_Card.pdf), 2023. 1, 3
- [31] OpenAI. Gpt-5 system card. <https://cdn.openai.com/gpt-5-system-card.pdf>, 2025. 6
- [32] Yanyuan Qiao, Chaorui Deng, and Qi Wu. Referring expression comprehension: A survey of methods and datasets. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 23:4426–4440, 2020. 2
- [33] Hao Shao, Shengju Qian, Han Xiao, Guanglu Song, Zhuofan Zong, Letian Wang, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. Visual cot: Unleashing chain-of-thought reasoning in multi-modal language models. *CoRR*, 2024. 3
- [34] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024. 3
- [35] Haozhan Shen, Peng Liu, Jingcheng Li, Chunxin Fang, Yibo Ma, Jiajia Liao, Qiaoli Shen, Zilun Zhang, Kangjia Zhao, Qianqian Zhang, et al. Vlm-r1: A stable and generalizable r1-style large vision-language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07615*, 2025. 1, 3, 6, 8
- [36] Yongyi Su, Haojie Zhang, Shijie Li, Nanqing Liu, Jingyi Liao, Junyi Pan, Yuan Liu, Xiaofen Xing, Chong Sun, Chen Li, et al. Patch-as-decodable-token: Towards unified multi-modal vision tasks in mllms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.01954*, 2025. 6
- [37] V Team, Wenyi Hong, Wenmeng Yu, Xiaotao Gu, Guo Wang, Guobing Gan, Haomiao Tang, Jiale Cheng, Ji Qi, Junhui Ji, Lihang Pan, Shuaiqi Duan, Weihang Wang, Yan Wang, Yean Cheng, Zehai He, Zhe Su, Zhen Yang, Ziyang Pan, Aohan Zeng, Baoxu Wang, Bin Chen, Boyan Shi, Changyu Pang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Fan Yang, Guoqing Chen, Jiazheng Xu, Jiale Zhu, Jiali Chen, Jing Chen, Jinhao Chen, Jinghao Lin, Jinjiang Wang, Junjie Chen, Leqi Lei, Letian Gong, Leyi Pan, Mingdao Liu, Mingde Xu, Mingzhi Zhang, Qinkai Zheng, Sheng Yang, Shi Zhong, Shiyu Huang, Shuyuan Zhao, Siyan Xue, Shangqin Tu, Shengbiao Meng, Tianshu Zhang, Tianwei Luo, Tianxiang Hao, Tianyu Tong, Wenkai Li, Wei Jia, Xiao Liu, Xiaohan Zhang, Xin Lyu, Xinyue Fan, Xuancheng Huang, Yanling Wang, Yadong Xue, Yanfeng Wang, Yanzi Wang, Yifan An, Yifan Du, Yiming Shi, Yiheng Huang, Yilin Niu, Yuan Wang, Yuanchang Yue, Yuchen Li, Yutao Zhang, Yuting Wang, Yu Wang, Yuxuan Zhang, Zhao Xue, Zhenyu Hou, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Peng Zhang, Debing Liu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Minlie Huang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Glm-4.5v and glm-4.1v-thinking: Towards versatile multimodal reasoning with scalable reinforcement learning, 2025. 6, 8
- [38] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 1, 3, 6
- [39] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Song XiXuan, et al. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:121475–121499, 2024. 6
- [40] Weiyun Wang, Zhangwei Gao, Lixin Gu, Hengjun Pu, Long Cui, Xingguang Wei, Zhaoyang Liu, Linglin Jing, Shenglong Ye, Jie Shao, et al. Internvl3. 5: Advancing open-source multimodal models in versatility, reasoning, and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18265*, 2025. 6



- [41] Junfeng Wu, Yi Jiang, Qihao Liu, Zehuan Yuan, Xiang Bai, and Song Bai. General object foundation model for images and videos at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3783–3795, 2024. [6](#)
- [42] Zhiyu Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zizheng Pan, Xingchao Liu, Wen Liu, Damai Dai, Huazuo Gao, Yiyang Ma, Chengyue Wu, Bingxuan Wang, et al. Deepseek-vl2: Mixture-of-experts vision-language models for advanced multimodal understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10302*, 2024. [3](#)
- [43] LLM Xiaomi, Bingquan Xia, Bowen Shen, Dawei Zhu, Di Zhang, Gang Wang, Hailin Zhang, Huaqiu Liu, Jiebao Xiao, Jinhao Dong, et al. Mimo: Unlocking the reasoning potential of language model—from pretraining to posttraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07608*, 2025. [6](#)
- [44] Chunyu Xie, Bin Wang, Fanjing Kong, Jincheng Li, Dawei Liang, Gengshen Zhang, Dawei Leng, and Yuhui Yin. FG-CLIP: Fine-grained visual and textual alignment. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. [2](#), [3](#)
- [45] En Yu, Kangheng Lin, Liang Zhao, Jisheng Yin, Yana Wei, Yang Peng, Haoran Wei, Jianjian Sun, Chunrui Han, Zheng Ge, et al. Perception-rl: Pioneering perception policy with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07954*, 2025. [3](#)
- [46] Licheng Yu, Patrick Poirson, Shan Yang, Alexander C Berg, and Tamara L Berg. Modeling context in referring expressions. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 69–85. Springer, 2016. [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- [47] Licheng Yu, Patrick Poirson, Shan Yang, Alexander C Berg, and Tamara L Berg. Modeling context in referring expressions. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part II 14*, pages 69–85. Springer, 2016. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#)
- [48] Zhihan Yu and Ruifan Li. Revisiting counterfactual problems in referring expression comprehension. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13438–13448, 2024. [2](#)
- [49] Chao Zhang, Weiming Li, Wanli Ouyang, Qiang Wang, Woo-Shik Kim, and Sunghoon Hong. Referring expression comprehension with semantic visual relationship and word mapping. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 1258–1266, 2019. [2](#)
- [50] Haotian Zhang, Mingfei Gao, Zhe Gan, Philipp Dufter, Nina Wenzel, Forrest Huang, Dhruvi Shah, Xianzhi Du, Bowen Zhang, Yanghao Li, et al. Mm1. 5: Methods, analysis & insights from multimodal llm fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.20566*, 2024. [1](#), [3](#)
- [51] Duo Zheng, Tao Kong, Ya Jing, Jiaan Wang, and Xiaojie Wang. Towards unifying reference expression generation and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.13076*, 2022. [2](#)
- [52] Jinguo Zhu, Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, Zhaoyang Liu, Shenglong Ye, Lixin Gu, Hao Tian, Yuchen Duan, Weijie Su, Jie Shao, et al. Internvl3: Exploring advanced training and test-time recipes for open-source multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10479*, 2025. [6](#)

# RefBench-PRO: Perceptual and Reasoning Oriented Benchmark for Referring Expression Comprehension

## Supplementary Material

### 7. Detailed Definition for Each Subcategory of RefBench-PRO

**Attribute.** The Attribute category focuses on the intrinsic and directly observable visual properties of objects, which includes characteristics such as an object’s color, texture, material, shape, and state.

**Position.** The Position sub-category captures the spatial relationships between different objects within an image. The emphasis is on localizing an object based on its placement with respect to other, different kinds of objects in the scene.

**Interaction.** The Interaction category assesses the model’s ability to understand relative relationships and arrangements among objects of the same category. Unlike the Position sub-category, this often involves ordinal references or relative positioning within a homogeneous group.

**Relation.** The Relation category requires compositional reasoning, where the target object is identified by establishing a comparative link to a distinct ‘anchor’ object based on shared or contrasting visual attributes. Unlike simple spatial relations, this involves reasoning about properties like color, material, or texture, challenging the model to ground multiple entities and then perform a comparative judgment.

**Commonsense.** The Commonsense category challenges the model to identify objects based on contextual or functional descriptions rather than their explicit visual attributes. The referring expression describes an object by its purpose, potential use, or context within the scene.

**Reject.** The Reject category evaluates the model’s ability to handle negation and non-existent references. In these cases, the referring expression contains one or more attributes that do not match any object in the image.

### 8. Details of RefBench-PRO Construction

**Data Processing** We source images from the FineHARD dataset, a large-scale, high-quality dataset comprising 12 million images based on the GRiT dataset. We filtered the images based on their resolution, retaining only those within the range of 1024x1024 to 2048x2048 pixels. This criterion was established to ensure a consistent quality standard by excluding images with either insufficient visual detail or excessive computational demands.

**Prompts Used in RefBench-PRO Construction** Prompts used in RefBench-PRO and RefObjects-200k are presented in Figure 7 and Figure 8. The prompt detailed in Figure 7 guides the initial Image Parsing stage to deconstruct the image into structured visual elements. Subsequently, the spe-

Table 7. Detailed selection rules for target object.

Task Category	Selection Rules for Target object
Attribute	The visual context must contain multiple instances of the object’s semantic category. The target object is selected if it possesses an intrinsic, observable property (e.g., color, texture, material) that is not shared by any other instance within that same category, thereby making the attribute a unique and fine-grained visual identifier.
Position	The target object must be uniquely localizable through an unambiguous spatial relationship (e.g., ‘to the left of’, ‘above’, ‘between’) with one or more distinct, <b>heterogeneous</b> anchor objects. The visual context must contain multiple instances of the object’s semantic category. The presence of other same-category instances makes simple category naming insufficient, necessitating spatial reasoning.
Interaction	The selection requires a group of three or more instances of the same semantic category. The target object is selected if its identity is determined by its ordinal position or relative arrangement within this <b>homogeneous</b> set (e.g., ‘the third from the left’, ‘the one in the middle’).
Relation	This selection requires a structure for compositional, comparative reasoning. The target object is identified by establishing a relational link to a distinct ‘anchor’ object. This link is based on a comparison of their attributes, either through <b>similarity</b> (e.g., sharing the same color) or <b>contrast</b> (e.g., having a different material).
Commonsense	An object is assigned to this category when its most salient identifier is not a direct visual property or structural relationship, but rather its function, affordance, or context-implied purpose (e.g., ‘something used for cutting’).
Reject	Others.

cialized prompts in Figure 8 are employed for the Referring Expression Generation stage to craft a unique expression for each target object based on its assigned category.

**Task Selection Mechanism** The detailed human-defined rule-based selection function designed to identify challenging instances for each task is shown in Table 7.

### 9. More Results of Ref-R1

As shown in Table 8, Ref-R1 demonstrates comprehensive performance gains across all sub-categories. The improvements are most pronounced in Compositional Reasoning, especially within the Relation sub-category. Furthermore, the model achieves a significant uplift in the Reject task, showcasing a more robust ability to handle invalid queries.

### 10. Case Study

More cases are shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10. These figures provide a visual comparison of several representative models across challenging examples from all six categories.

Table 8. Detailed results of ablation experiments of Ref-R1 on RefBench-PRO.

Models	Overall		Visual-cue Perception				Compositional Reasoning			
	Acc <sub>p</sub>	Acc <sub>o</sub>	Attribute	Position	Interaction	Acc <sub>API</sub>	Relation	Commonsense	Reject	Acc <sub>RC</sub>
Qwen2.5-VL	57.58	48.50	61.66	63.03	58.56	61.08	49.06	55.58	03.10	52.32
SFT	62.05	61.46	67.38	67.63	61.50	65.50	53.46	60.28	58.49	56.87
SFT-CoT	64.11	63.68	67.43	68.29	63.95	66.56	57.66	63.22	61.50	60.44
GRPO+ $R_{IoU}$	66.69	65.21	69.13	69.90	67.27	68.77	60.27	66.89	57.80	63.58
GRPO+ $R_{DyIoU}$	68.15	66.41	70.84	71.75	67.52	70.04	62.96	67.68	57.70	65.32
GRPO+ $R_{GroupQuality} + R_{IoU}$	68.07	66.29	71.25	70.40	68.05	69.90	63.77	66.87	57.40	65.32
Ref-R1	69.35	67.49	72.96	72.50	68.13	71.20	67.74	65.40	58.20	66.57

You are an expert in visual intelligence and compositional scene analysis, functioning as a sophisticated AI engine. Your primary mission is to meticulously analyze the provided image and deconstruct it into its fundamental visual elements. For each distinct object, you will generate a structured property dictionary that encodes its core characteristics. Your output must be a single, valid JSON object.

Follow these implementation steps with extreme precision:

1. Comprehensive Object Identification:

Your first step is to perform a thorough scan of the entire image to identify every distinct, tangible object.

Assign a clear and concise class label to each object (e.g., 'person', 'laptop', 'coffee mug', 'dog').

Do not omit objects, even if they are small or in the background. Focus strictly on concrete items and ignore abstract concepts like 'shadow', 'light', or 'emptiness'.

2. Handling Multiple Instances:

If you identify multiple objects of the same class (e.g., two chairs, three books), you MUST treat each one as a separate and unique entry in the output list. Each instance requires its own property dictionary.

3. Detailed Inherent Attribute Extraction:

For each identified object, you must create a nested attributes object.

Populate this object with all observable visual properties. Be as descriptive as possible. Key attributes to consider include, but are not limited to: color: (e.g., 'blue', 'pale yellow', 'multi-colored').

material: (e.g., 'polished wood', 'brushed metal', 'transparent glass', 'ceramic'). state: (e.g., 'open', 'closed', 'full', 'empty', 'on', 'off', 'ripe'). texture: (e.g., 'smooth', 'rough', 'fluffy', 'glossy'). Other relevant details like shape, pattern, or specific markings.

4. Interactive Relationship Mapping:

After describing an object's inherent attributes, identify its spatial connections to *other* identified objects.

If such relationships exist, add an `interactive_relationships` field. This field must be a list of strings.

Each string must describe a relationship from the perspective of the current object.

Examples: ["to the left of the monitor"], ["behind the window on the left"].

5. Brief Descriptive Phrase Generation:

For every object, you must provide a description phrase.

This should be a concise, natural-language summary that captures the essence of the object within its specific context in the image.

Examples: For a cup, "a white ceramic mug filled with dark coffee". For a person, "a woman with brown hair smiling at the camera".

6. Strict JSON Output Format:

Your final and only output MUST be a single, valid JSON object.

The root of the object must have one key: "scene\_properties".

The value of "scene\_properties" must be a list (JSON array) containing the property dictionaries for every visual element you detected.

Each dictionary in the list must contain:

"class": The object's category.

"attributes": A nested JSON object of key-value pairs for visual properties.

"interactive\_relationships": This field is optional and should only be included if clear, meaningful relationships are observed.

"description\_phrase": The concise description phrase.

Figure 7. Prompt for Image Parsing.



You are a specialist in the art of linguistic distinction. Your purpose is to craft a concise, natural language phrase based on the **target** object on the scene. To succeed, you must adopt the following analytical mindset.

#### Attribute

**Deconstruct the Target:** Begin by thoroughly understanding all the given properties of the target object. What is its core identity? What are its defining features?

**Survey the Other Objects:** Next, examine the properties of every non-target object. Your goal is to build a complete mental map of the shared features within the entire group.

**Identify the Unique Signature:** This is the most critical step. Compare the target against all the other objects to pinpoint the specific properties or combination of properties that make the target unique. Ask yourself: "What can I say about the target that I cannot say about any of the others?"

#### Position

**Begin with the Spatial Clue:** First examine the target object and select a spatial relationship from its properties. This relationship will be the foundation of your entire phrase. The final expression must hinge on its meaning.

**Engineer Necessary Ambiguity:** This is the art of the puzzle. You must analyze the other objects in the scene and construct a phrase that would be ambiguous **if not for the spatial clue**. The description must intentionally apply to at least one other object. Your goal is to create a situation where others are forced to resolve the ambiguity by correctly interpreting the spatial part of the phrase.

#### Interaction

**Analyze the Group's Spatial Layout:** First, survey all objects of the same kind to understand their complete arrangement. Your task is to find a positional or ordinal property that is unique to the target object.

**Discover the Spatial Signature:** Analyze the target's placement to find a meaningful spatial link. This link will be :

**A Link of Relative Position:** Where the target's placement within the group is unique (e.g., it is the *leftmost one*). **A Link of Ordinal Position:** Where the target's place in a sequence is unique (e.g., it is the *second from the left*).

**Ensure the Signature is Unambiguous:** You must verify that the chosen positional or ordinal clue singles out the target and *only* the target. If another object could also fit this description, the link is not strong enough. You must not use attributes like color or texture to resolve ambiguity.

#### Relation

**Find a Reference Point:** First, survey the other objects in the scene. Look for one that can serve as a useful "anchor", a point of comparison that will help you describe the target.

**Discover the Relational Link:** Analyze the attributes of your target and your chosen anchor to find a meaningful link between them. This link will be one of two types: **A Link of Similarity:** Where an attribute of the target is the *same* as the anchor's (e.g., its color is identical). **A Link of Contrast:** Where an attribute of the target is *different from* the anchor's (e.g., its material is different).

**Ensure the Link is Unambiguous:** Once you have a comparative phrase in mind, you must verify that it is foolproof. Does this comparison single out the target and *only* the target? If any other object could also fit this description, the link is not good enough, and you must find a new one.

#### Commonsense

**Isolate the Target Visually:** Before you consider the object's function, first understand its visual context. Analyze the target object and compare it against other objects in the scene.

**Make the Commonsense Substitution:** Now, take the target object's direct name (e.g., "chair," "cup," "keyboard"). Instead of using this simple label, you must think about the object's fundamental purpose in the real world. A "chair" becomes -> "something designed for sitting on." A "cup" becomes -> "an object used for drinking." A "keyboard" becomes -> "the tool for typing on a computer." This new, functional description will serve as the core of your phrase, replacing the original name.

#### Reject

**Start with a Real Foundation:** Your process begins with a real target object. This object is the template you will modify.

**Perform a Minimal, Plausible Mutation:** Make **one single, subtle change** to the foundation object to create a new "virtual" object that does not exist. Good strategies include:

**Altering an attribute:** Change its color from "red" to "green."

**Swapping its identity:** Change "cup" to the closely related "mug." **Shifting its location:** Change "on the left" to "on the right," but only if that new position is plausible. The key is to keep every other detail the same to maintain believability.

**Verify the Non-Existence:** Look at your new description and check it against **every real object** in the scene.

Figure 8. Prompts for Referring Expression Generation.





Figure 9. Visual case studies for the Visual-cue Perception subcategories (Attribute, Position, and Interaction). Each row presents a challenging example, its ground truth, and the corresponding predictions from representative models.



Commonsense

Image

Ground Truth

Expression

a thing that prevents liquid from spilling out of a bottle

ChatRex

Qwen3-VL-8B

InternVL 3.5

Qwen2.5-VL-7B

RexThinker

Grounding DINO L

Migician

UniVG-R1

Reject

Image

Ground Truth

Expression

the outdoor chair with a black frame, dark gray cushion, and light blue pillow next to the table and to the left of the umbrella pole

ChatRex

UniVG-R1

Qwen3-VL-8B

Qwen2.5-VL-7B

Migician

RexThinker

InternVL 3.5

Grounding DINO L

Figure 10. Visual case studies for the Compositional Reasoning subcategories (Relation, Commonsense, and Reject). Each row presents a challenging example, its ground truth, and the corresponding predictions from representative models.