
MMRPT: MultiModal Reinforcement Pre-Training via Masked Vision-Dependent Reasoning

Xuhui Zheng^{*†}

SenseTime, Nanjing University
zhengxuhui@smail.nju.edu.cn

Kang An^{*†}

SenseTime, Shenzhen University
ankang@gml.ac.cn

Ziliang Wang^{*}

SenseTime
wangziliang1@sensetime.com

Yuhang Wang

SenseTime
wangyuhang@sensetime.com

Faqiang Qian

SenseTime
qianfaqiang@sensetime.com

Yichao Wu[‡]

SenseTime
wuyichao@sensetime.com

Abstract

Multimodal pre-training remains constrained by the descriptive bias of image–caption pairs, leading models to favor surface linguistic cues over grounded visual understanding. We introduce **MMRPT**, a masked multimodal reinforcement pre-training framework that strengthens visual reasoning in MLLMs. **We are the first to incorporate reinforcement learning directly into the pre-training of large vision–language models**, enabling learning signals that reward visual grounding rather than caption imitation. MMRPT constructs masked multimodal data by estimating sentence-level visual dependency via attention over visual tokens and masking highly vision-dependent segments; the model reconstructs these spans through vision-grounded reasoning guided by a semantic–visual reward. Experiments show consistent zero-shot gains across diverse benchmarks and substantially improved robustness under supervised fine-tuning, demonstrating that reinforcement-driven masked reasoning provides a more reliable and generalizable pre-training objective for multimodal models.

1 Introduction

Multimodal large language models (MLLMs) have rapidly advanced the integration of vision and language[1, 2, 3, 4, 5], achieving strong performance on tasks such as image captioning, visual question answering, and instruction following. These models typically rely on large-scale image–text corpora[6], where the dominant training paradigm is to align visual features with descriptive captions and optimize autoregressive objectives[7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] by next token predictions or contrastive learning[13, 14, 15]. While effective for learning general vision–language correspondences, this paradigm exhibits a fundamental limitation: the model’s **visual understanding capacity is bounded by the descriptive quality, granularity, and bias of captions**[16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. Captions often provide partial, object-centric, or stylistically constrained descriptions, leaving substantial portions of the visual scene underexplored.

^{*}Equal contribution.

[†]Work done during internship at SenseTime.

[‡]Corresponding author

Consequently, MLLMs trained in this manner tend to adopt *text-first strategies*[19, 22], relying on learned linguistic priors or dataset biases rather than deeply grounding their predictions in visual evidence[23, 24, 25]. This leads to well-documented issues such as visual hallucination, shallow cross-modal alignment, and limited abstraction abilities when reasoning about fine-grained or implicit visual content[26, 27, 28]. As the field pushes toward human-level visual reasoning[29, 30], these limitations reveal a growing mismatch between current pre-training pipelines and the cognitive processes required for genuine visual understanding[22, 31].

A key question therefore arises: **How can we move beyond imitation-driven, caption-limited learning and enable MLLMs to acquire deeper, inference-driven visual reasoning capabilities during pre-training?** A solution must not only reduce the over-reliance on captions but also provide a scalable mechanism for encouraging models to actively infer visual information, rather than passively mimic textual patterns.

To address these challenges, we propose **MMRPT**, a *Masked Multimodal Reinforcement Pre-Training framework* that rethinks how visual understanding should be acquired during multimodal pre-training. Instead of learning passively from captions, MMRPT encourages models to *actively infer* missing visual information by embedding reinforcement learning directly into the pre-training pipeline. This shift transforms multimodal pre-training from a descriptive, imitation-driven process into a reasoning-centered paradigm.

The key idea behind MMRPT is to leverage the model’s own decoding behavior to identify which parts of the text genuinely depend on visual evidence. We estimate a **visual dependency score** for each sentence by analyzing attention distributions over visual tokens in selected Transformer layers. Sentences identified as highly vision-dependent are then masked, forming a large-scale corpus of *vision-sensitive masked reasoning tasks* constructed automatically from ordinary image–text data. Unlike traditional masked modeling, where missing tokens can often be reconstructed through language priors, MMRPT ensures that the masked segments require **vision-grounded reasoning**, pushing the model to engage with the image rather than rely on textual co-occurrence.

A reinforcement learning objective further strengthens this process. A reward model evaluates both the semantic correctness and visual faithfulness of reconstructed segments, guiding the policy toward deeper perceptual reasoning during the later stages of pre-training. This mechanism allows MMRPT to scale naturally with existing multimodal corpora, without requiring curated annotations or synthetic reasoning traces.

Through this design, MMRPT introduces three conceptual advances to multimodal pre-training:

- (1) **Active visual inference:** enabling models to reason about masked content that truly depends on visual evidence;
- (2) **Attention-driven data construction:** leveraging the model’s own attention patterns to automatically create vision-sensitive training signals;
- (3) **Reinforcement-based semantic grounding:** using reward-driven optimization to cultivate deeper, meta-level visual reasoning abilities beyond imitation learning.

Together, these improvements move MLLMs closer to genuine visual understanding, reducing reliance on caption priors and enhancing their ability to interpret implicit, fine-grained, or abstract visual concepts that captions typically omit.

2 Method

2.1 Identifying Vision-Dependent Language Units

A core challenge in multimodal pre-training is that many caption tokens can be predicted without relying on the image. To ensure our masked RL tasks genuinely require visual reasoning, we identify visually dependent language at two granularities: sentence-level (coarse) and token-level (refined).

(1) Sentence-Level Visual Dependency Estimation: Given an image–text pair $((I, T = s_1, \dots, s_n))$, where each (s_i) is a sentence, we feed the model in autoregressive mode and extract cross-attention matrices from selected Transformer layers. Let:

(V) denote visual tokens after encoding the image (T) denote text tokens ($\text{Attn}_\ell(t, x)$) denote the attention weight from text token (t) to token (x) at layer (ℓ)

For a sentence (s_i), we compute its **visual dependency score**:

$$D_{\text{vis}}(s_i) = \frac{1}{|s_i| |\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{t \in s_i} \frac{\sum_{v \in V} \text{Attn}_\ell(t, v)}{\sum_{x \in V \cup T} \text{Attn}_\ell(t, x)}, \quad (1)$$

where (\mathcal{L}) is a set of attention layers chosen for visual grounding.

A sentence is classified as **vision-dependent** if:

$$D_{\text{vis}}(s_i) \geq \tau, \quad (2)$$

where (τ) is an adaptive threshold (e.g., mean + γ ·std over the entire caption). This formulation avoids token-level noise and captures semantic groups that genuinely require visual grounding.

(2) Token-Level Visual-Need Refinement via a Text-Only LLM: Even in a highly visual sentence, not all tokens require image evidence. We therefore refine candidate masks using a **text-only LLM** (f_{text}).

Given a sentence (s_i), we prompt the LLM to produce a binary label for each token (w):

$$y_w = f_{\text{text}}(w \mid s_i, \text{instruction}), \quad (3)$$

where ($y_w = 1$) indicates that humans would need the image to determine the meaning of (w). We keep only tokens satisfying:

$$y_w = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\text{vis}}(s_i) \geq \tau. \quad (4)$$

This two-step pipeline ensures that mask units are both **cognitively aligned** (from textual reasoning) and **model-grounded** (from visual attention).

2.2 Constructing Vision-Sensitive Masked Data for RL

Simply masking tokens in captions is insufficient because models may reconstruct them using textual shortcuts or accidental exposure during training. We design a principled construction mechanism to guarantee that each masked sample requires **vision-dependent inference**, forming high-quality input for RL.

(1) Masking Constraints to Prevent Shortcut Learning.

a) *Only one masked token per generated RL sample.*

For each caption (T), assume we identify maskable positions (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k). Instead of masking all at once, we produce k **independent RL samples**, each masking a **single** unit:

$$T^{(j)} = T \setminus m_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k. \quad (5)$$

This prevents mutual inference between masked locations.

b) *Only mask the **first** occurrence of repeated tokens.*

While sentence-level visual dependency identifies which sentences likely require visual grounding, not every token within such sentences is genuinely vision-dependent. To further refine the masking targets, we employ an external **text-only LLM** that operates purely on the original caption text without access to the image.

The LLM is instructed to identifies token spans within image captions that exhibit generative visual necessity-i.e., segments that cannot be contextually inferred from linguistic priors alone and require direct visual input for coherent generation.

c) *Truncating samples to avoid exposure of answers.*

Let (s_i) be the sentence containing the masked token. We define the final RL input as:

$$T_{\text{RL}}^{(j)} = s_1, \dots, s_i^{\text{masked}}, \quad (6)$$

discarding all subsequent sentences (s_{i+1}, \dots, s_n) . This prevents leakage of the unmasked token later in the caption.

d) Maintain sequential order for samples derived from the same caption.

If a caption yields multiple masked samples $(T_{\text{RL}}^{(1)}, \dots, T_{\text{RL}}^{(k)})$, their internal training order satisfies:

$$T_{\text{RL}}^{(1)} \prec T_{\text{RL}}^{(2)} \prec \dots \prec T_{\text{RL}}^{(k)}. \quad (7)$$

Globally, the dataset is shuffled, but within each caption group, ordering prevents premature exposure to future information.

(2) Resulting Dataset Properties

The final dataset $(\mathcal{D}_{\text{mask}})$ satisfies:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{mask}} = \bigcup_{i,j} (I_i, T_{i,\text{RL}}^{(j)}, m_{i,j}), \quad (8)$$

where each entry forces the model to reconstruct $(m_{i,j})$ **only from image evidence**, enabling the subsequent reinforcement learning stage to optimize visual reasoning behavior.

2.3 Masked Multimodal Reinforcement Pre-Training

After constructing the vision-sensitive masked dataset $(\mathcal{D}_{\text{mask}})$, we train the model to actively infer the masked visual content using **masked span reasoning**. Unlike standard supervised masked-prediction objectives, we formulate the task as a reinforcement learning (RL) problem [12, 32, 33], enabling the model to learn deeper visual reasoning behaviors rather than merely fitting textual co-occurrence patterns.

(1) Masked Span Reasoning with Structured Reason→Answer Outputs.

For each masked sample $((I, T_{\text{mask}}, m))$, where (m) is the masked span, the model generates two structured segments:

- **a reasoning trace**, enclosed in a special tag (e.g., ‘<think> ... </think>’), and
- **a final answer**, placed inside ‘<answer> ... </answer>’.

This format encourages the model to explicitly articulate its visual reasoning process before committing to an answer. Let the generative trajectory be (o) , consisting of (o_{think}) and (o_{answer}) .

(2) RL Objective design.

The RL objective is:

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(I,T,m) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{mask}}} \mathbb{E}_{o \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot | I, T)} [r(o, m)].$$

We design reward $(r(o, m))$ using **structure**, **semantic**, and **token-level correctness**.

To ensure the model truly infers the masked span using visual evidence, we revise the answer reward to incorporate **strict prefix matching** between the predicted answer and the ground-truth span, in addition to string-level **Exact Match(EM)**. The reward now becomes:

$$r(o, m) = r_{\text{format}}(o) + r_{\text{ans}}(o_{\text{answer}}, m). \quad (9)$$

a) String-level Exact Match (EM).

As before, EM checks whether the normalized decoded answer exactly matches the ground-truth masked content:

$$\text{EM}(o_{\text{answer}}, m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if normalized strings are identical,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

b) Strict Prefix Token Matching

Let $(\mathbf{y} = \text{tok}(m))$ be the tokenized ground-truth span, $(\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \text{tok}(o_{\text{answer}}))$ be the tokenized answer. We define **strict prefix match** as:

$$\text{PrefixMatch}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \hat{\mathbf{y}} \text{ is a strict prefix of } \mathbf{y}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

This design serves two important purposes: 1) It avoids penalizing the model when it predicts an **incomplete but correct beginning** of the masked span. 2) It reduces brittleness caused by minor tokenizer-level variations, while still preventing over-generous scoring for semantically unrelated outputs.

c) Final Answer Reward

The correctness score is then:

$$r_{\text{ans}} = \max(\text{EM}, \text{PrefixMatch}), \quad (12)$$

ensuring that the model receives reward as long as it produces a **correct prefix** of the masked content-even if the full span is not reproduced verbatim.

This softer yet principled correctness metric is particularly useful when the masked unit is long or contains tokens whose boundaries are tokenizer-dependent.

3 Experiment

3.1 Experiment Setup

Masked-pretraining data: We use the publicly available image-caption set **ALLaVA-Caption-LAION-4V**[34] as the source corpus for mask construction, which provides sufficiently diverse visual contexts and rich natural language descriptions.

Proxy Multimodal Model for Visual Attention Measurement: To compute sentence-level visual dependency scores (Section 2.1), we adopt Qwen2.5-VL-7B [9] as the proxy vision-language model. Following analyses in prior work on attention grounding and multimodal interpretability[35, 36, 37], we use several last few layers of all the decoder layers (*e.g.*, the last 3 to 6 of all the 36 layers) for visual dependency computation. These bottom layers have been shown to best capture *semantic-level cross-modal interactions*, making them appropriate for identifying genuinely vision-critical language spans.

Text-Only LLM for Fine-Grained Visual-Need Annotation: To refine visually dependent units within each sentence (Section 2.1), we employ **Qwen2.5-Instruct-72B** [9], a high-capacity text-only LLM with strong semantic reasoning abilities. The model receives the raw caption text and outputs a version annotated with $\{\dots\}$ brackets marking tokens or phrases that cannot be reliably inferred without visual information.

RL Framework: Our reinforcement learning pipeline is built on Easy-R1[38, 39], a training framework designed for scalable reasoning-oriented RL, combined with Verl[39], a modular and production-grade RL engine for large language models.

Benchmarks: We evaluate models, using VLMEvalKit [40], on a diverse suite of seven multimodal reasoning benchmarks spanning perception, visual grounding, language-vision alignment, and numerical or symbolic inference.

- **MMVet** [41], **MMBench-v1.1** [42], and **MMStar** [43] measure general-purpose visual understanding and multi-step reasoning across real-world images;
- **BLINK** [44] evaluates fine-grained visual grounding and disambiguation under minimal textual priors.;
- **MathVista-MINI** [45] and **WeMath** [46] focus on visual-mathematical reasoning involving diagrams, equations, and implicit numeric cues;
- **ChartQA** [47] examines structured comprehension of charts and plots, emphasizing cross-modal parsing and factual consistency.




Figure 1: Layer-wise within- and between-sentence variance of token-level visual dependency in Qwen2.5-VL-7B. Both metrics peak in the upper-middle decoder layers (29–31), indicating that these layers best differentiate visually grounded content from language-only content. We therefore adopt this layer region for dependency estimation in MMRPT.

Together, these benchmarks cover a broad spectrum of multimodal competencies and provide a comprehensive assessment of visual grounding, cross-modal reasoning, and robustness.

3.2 Layer-wise Analysis of Visual Dependency

To determine which decoder layers provide the most reliable signal for visual-dependency estimation, we probe Qwen2.5-VL-7B on 5k captions and compute token-level visual attention ratios for every layer. For each caption, we segment the text into sentences and derive two simple statistics at layer (l):

- **Within-Sentence Variance** ($\sigma_{\text{within}}(l)$): the average token-level variance inside each sentence, measuring how strongly a layer highlights **localized visual-dependent spans** within a sentence;
- **Between-Sentence Variance** ($\sigma_{\text{between}}(l)$): the variance of sentence-level means within the same caption, indicating how well a layer separates **vision-driven sentences** from **language-driven ones**.

The ideal layers for estimating visual dependency should (i) show **clear token-level contrast** inside truly vision-dependent sentences, and (ii) yield **large differences** across sentences of a caption, since mixed captions typically contain both visually grounded and purely linguistic segments.

Figure 1 reports ($\sigma_{\text{within}}(l)$) and ($\sigma_{\text{between}}(l)$) across all decoder layers. Both within-sentence and between-sentence variance exhibit a characteristic “semantic-alignment pattern”: early layers remain low, mid layers gradually increase, and upper-middle layers (roughly layer 29–31) reach the highest contrast. This matches the common observation that cross-modal alignment emerges in the upper-middle decoder layers of VL models, whereas the final layers increasingly favor linguistic decoding. Qualitative inspection further confirms that these high-contrast spans correspond to salient objects, on-image text, or simple visual attributes. Based on this trend, we select the last 4–6 layers for visual-dependency estimation.

3.3 Main Results

To assess the effect of MMRPT as a *pre-training paradigm* rather than as a tuning trick, we directly compare the original model (**Base**) and the model after masked multimodal reinforcement pre-training (**MMRPT**) under identical conditions. Neither model receives supervised fine-tuning in this comparison. Both models are evaluated in the zero-shot setting.

	MMVet	MMBench	MMStar	BLINK	MathVista	WeMath	ChartQA
Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct							
Base	0.5940	0.7996	0.5604	0.4890	0.6230	0.2381	0.8408
MMRPT	0.6062↑	0.8056↑	0.5819↑	0.4940↑	0.6350↑	0.2464↑	0.8396↓
Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct							
Base	0.6740	0.8259	0.6390	0.5513	0.6820	0.3596	0.8725
MMRPT	0.6812↑	0.8336↑	0.6524↑	0.5589↑	0.6904↑	0.3688↑	0.8733↑

Table 1: Zero-shot comparison between the original Base model and the MMRPT-enhanced model across multiple Qwen2.5-VL scales. Green (↑) indicates performance improvement; red (↓) indicates a decrease.

	MMVet	MMBench	MMStar	BLINK	MathVista	WeMath	ChartQA
Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct							
Base+SFT	0.6422↑	0.7908↓	0.5834↑	0.5016↑	0.5920↓	0.2502↑	0.6769↓
MMRPT+SFT	0.6508↑	0.8074↑	0.6012↑	0.5114↑	0.6406↑	0.2614↑	0.8366↑
Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct							
Base+SFT	0.7266↑	0.8150↓	0.6477↑	0.5724↑	0.6612↓	0.3962↑	0.8125↓
MMRPT+SFT	0.7398↑	0.8296↑	0.6561↑	0.5788↑	0.7023↑	0.4006↑	0.8798↑

Table 2: Fine-tuned performance comparison between the original Base models (**Base+SFT**) and the MMRPT-enhanced models (**MMRPT+SFT**) under identical supervised training conditions across multiple Qwen2.5-VL scales. All models are evaluated on the same set of multimodal reasoning benchmarks.

Results in Table 1 show that MMRPT delivers consistent zero-shot gains over the Base model across nearly all benchmarks, with absolute improvements typically in the 0.5–1% range. While the magnitude is modest, the uniformity of the gains indicates that masked multimodal reinforcement pre-training strengthens the model’s ability to extract and use visual evidence without additional supervision. The only task showing no clear benefit is ChartQA, whose highly structured chart-parsing nature relies less on the visual grounding mechanisms targeted by MMRPT. Overall, these results demonstrate that MMRPT provides a stable and generalizable enhancement to multimodal reasoning.

To assess whether MMRPT provides a better initialization for downstream learning, we fine-tune both the original model (Base+SFT) and the MMRPT-pretrained model (MMRPT+SFT) on a 100k curated WeMath-style corpus distilled from the WeThink [48] dataset using GLM-4.5V [10] and Seed-1.5VL [49], ensuring high-quality multi-step visual–math reasoning traces under identical optimization settings. Both variants use the same architecture, tokenizer, multimodal adapters, training corpus, optimization schedule, and hyperparameters; the only difference lies in whether MMRPT is applied before fine-tuning. We evaluate all models again, as Table 2 shows, on the same benchmark suite as in the zero-shot setting.

After supervised fine-tuning on domain-specific data (e.g., WeMath), the Base model exhibits substantial in-domain gains but suffers pronounced degradation on out-of-distribution benchmarks such as MMBench, MathVista, and ChartQA, indicating a clear overfitting tendency and a loss of general multimodal competence. In contrast, the MMRPT-pretrained model maintains stable performance across all OOD evaluations under the same fine-tuning setup, while still achieving comparable or slightly higher in-domain improvements. This demonstrates that MMRPT provides a more robust initialization for downstream learning, effectively preventing catastrophic degradation and preserving general reasoning ability even after task-specialized fine-tuning.

4 Conclusion

We introduced MMRPT, a masked multimodal reinforcement pre-training framework designed to strengthen visual grounding and cross-modal reasoning in large vision–language models. By identify-

ing vision-dependent spans and training the model to reconstruct them through RL-guided reasoning, MMRPT pushes the model beyond caption imitation toward more faithful visual understanding. Experiments across diverse multimodal benchmarks show consistent zero-shot gains and substantially improved robustness under supervised fine-tuning, where MMRPT prevents the degradation commonly observed in standard models. These results demonstrate that integrating reinforcement-driven masked reasoning into the pre-training pipeline offers a simple yet effective path toward more reliable and generalizable multimodal intelligence.

References

- [1] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models. *National Science Review*, 11(12):nwae403, 2024.
- [2] Akash Ghosh, Arkadeep Acharya, Sriparna Saha, Vinija Jain, and Aman Chadha. Exploring the frontier of vision-language models: A survey of current methodologies and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07214*, 2024.
- [3] Yizhang Jin, Jian Li, Yexin Liu, Tianjun Gu, Kai Wu, Zhengkai Jiang, Muyang He, Bo Zhao, Xin Tan, Zhenye Gan, et al. Efficient multimodal large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10739*, 2024.
- [4] Davide Caffagni, Federico Cocchi, Luca Barsellotti, Nicholas Moratelli, Sara Sarto, Lorenzo Baraldi, Marcella Cornia, and Rita Cucchiara. The revolution of multimodal large language models: a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12451*, 2024.
- [5] Gongwei Chen, Leyang Shen, Rui Shao, Xiang Deng, and Liqiang Nie. Lion: Empowering multimodal large language model with dual-level visual knowledge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26540–26550, 2024.
- [6] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:25278–25294, 2022.
- [7] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [8] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 24185–24198, 2024.
- [9] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibor Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025.
- [10] 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.

- [11] Tianyu Yu, Zefan Wang, Chongyi Wang, Fuwei Huang, Wenshuo Ma, Zhihui He, Tianchi Cai, Weize Chen, Yuxiang Huang, Yuanqian Zhao, Bokai Xu, Junbo Cui, Yingjing Xu, Liqing Ruan, Luoyuan Zhang, Hanyu Liu, Jingkun Tang, Hongyuan Liu, Qining Guo, Wenhao Hu, Bingxiang He, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Ji Qi, Zonghao Guo, Chi Chen, Guoyang Zeng, Yuxuan Li, Ganqu Cui, Ning Ding, Xu Han, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Minicpm-v 4.5: Cooking efficient mllms via architecture, data, and training recipe, 2025.
- [12] Yi Zhang, Che Liu, Xiancong Ren, Hanchu Ni, Shuai Zhang, Zeyuan Ding, Jiayu Hu, Hanzhe Shan, Zhenwei Niu, Zhaoyang Liu, Shuang Liu, Yue Zhao, Junbo Qi, Qinfan Zhang, Dengjie Li, Yidong Wang, Jiachen Luo, Yong Dai, Zenglin Xu, Bin Shen, Qifan Wang, Jian Tang, and Xiaozhu Ju. Pelican-vl 1.0: A foundation brain model for embodied intelligence, 2025.
- [13] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PmLR, 2021.
- [14] Jiahui Yu, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Legg Yeung, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, and Yonghui Wu. Coca: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01917*, 2022.
- [15] Core Team, Zihao Yue, Zhenru Lin, Yifan Song, Weikun Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Shuhao Gu, Shicheng Li, Peidian Li, Liang Zhao, Lei Li, Kainan Bao, Hao Tian, Hailin Zhang, Gang Wang, Dawei Zhu, Cici, Chenhong He, Bowen Ye, Bowen Shen, Zihan Zhang, Zihan Jiang, Zhixian Zheng, Zhichao Song, Zhenbo Luo, Yue Yu, Yudong Wang, Yuanyuan Tian, Yu Tu, Yihan Yan, Yi Huang, Xu Wang, Xinzhe Xu, Xingchen Song, Xing Zhang, Xing Yong, Xin Zhang, Xiangwei Deng, Wenyu Yang, Wenhan Ma, Weiwei Lv, Weiwei Zhuang, Wei Liu, Sirui Deng, Shuo Liu, Shimao Chen, Shihua Yu, Shaohui Liu, Shande Wang, Rui Ma, Qiantong Wang, Peng Wang, Nuo Chen, Menghang Zhu, Kangyang Zhou, Kang Zhou, Kai Fang, Jun Shi, Jinhao Dong, Jiebao Xiao, Jiaming Xu, Huaqiu Liu, Hongshen Xu, Heng Qu, Haochen Zhao, Hanglong Lv, Guoan Wang, Duo Zhang, Dong Zhang, Di Zhang, Chong Ma, Chang Liu, Can Cai, and Bingquan Xia. Mimo-vl technical report, 2025.
- [16] Mong Yuan Sim, Wei Emma Zhang, Xiang Dai, and Biaoyan Fang. Can vlms actually see and read? a survey on modality collapse in vision-language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 24452–24470, 2025.
- [17] Yuhui Zhang, Alyssa Unell, Xiaohan Wang, Dhruva Ghosh, Yuchang Su, Ludwig Schmidt, and Serena Yeung-Levy. Why are visually-grounded language models bad at image classification? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:51727–51753, 2024.
- [18] An Vo, Khai-Nguyen Nguyen, Mohammad Reza Taesiri, Vy Tuong Dang, Anh Totti Nguyen, and Daeyoung Kim. Vision language models are biased. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23941*, 2025.
- [19] Haozhe Zhao, Shuzheng Si, Liang Chen, Yichi Zhang, Maosong Sun, Baobao Chang, and Minjia Zhang. Looking beyond text: Reducing language bias in large vision-language models via multimodal dual-attention and soft-image guidance. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 19677–19701, 2025.
- [20] Junnan Li, Ramprasaath Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:9694–9705, 2021.
- [21] Martha Lewis, Nihal Nayak, Peilin Yu, Jack Merullo, Qinan Yu, Stephen Bach, and Ellie Pavlick. Does clip bind concepts? probing compositionality in large image models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*, pages 1487–1500, 2024.
- [22] Woohyeon Park, Woojin Kim, Jaeik Kim, and Jaeyoung Do. Second: Mitigating perceptual hallucination in vision-language models via selective and contrastive decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08391*, 2025.

- [23] Zhiqiu Lin, Xinyue Chen, Deepak Pathak, Pengchuan Zhang, and Deva Ramanan. Revisiting the role of language priors in vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01879*, 2023.
- [24] Jianfei Zhao, Feng Zhang, Xin Sun, and Chong Feng. Mitigate language priors in large vision-language models by cross-images contrastive decoding. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2505, 2025.
- [25] Haohan Zheng and Zhenguo Zhang. Modality bias in lvlms: Analyzing and mitigating object hallucination via attention lens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02419*, 2025.
- [26] Zechen Bai, Pichao Wang, Tianjun Xiao, Tong He, Zongbo Han, Zheng Zhang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Hallucination of multimodal large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18930*, 2024.
- [27] Xuweiyi Chen, Ziqiao Ma, Xuejun Zhang, Sihan Xu, Shengyi Qian, Jianing Yang, David Fouhey, and Joyce Chai. Multi-object hallucination in vision language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:44393–44418, 2024.
- [28] Ziyun Dai, Xiaoqiang Li, Shaohua Zhang, Yuanchen Wu, and Jide Li. See different, think better: Visual variations mitigating hallucinations in lvlms. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 3310–3319, 2025.
- [29] Chenyue Zhou, Mingxuan Wang, Yanbiao Ma, Chenxu Wu, Wanyi Chen, Zhe Qian, Xinyu Liu, Yiwei Zhang, Junhao Wang, Hengbo Xu, et al. From perception to cognition: A survey of vision-language interactive reasoning in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25373*, 2025.
- [30] Mohammed Saidul Islam, Raian Rahman, Ahmed Masry, Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, Mir Tafseer Nayeem, and Enamul Hoque. Are large vision language models up to the challenge of chart comprehension and reasoning? an extensive investigation into the capabilities and limitations of lvlms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00257*, 2024.
- [31] Haojie Zheng, Tianyang Xu, Hanchi Sun, Shu Pu, Ruoxi Chen, and Lichao Sun. Thinking before looking: Improving multimodal llm reasoning via mitigating visual hallucination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.12591*, 2024.
- [32] Ziliang Wang, Xuhui Zheng, Kang An, Cijun Ouyang, Jialu Cai, Yuhang Wang, and Yichao Wu. Stepsearch: Igniting llms search ability via step-wise proximal policy optimization, 2025.
- [33] Ziliang Wang, Kang An, Xuhui Zheng, Faqiang Qian, Weikun Zhang, Cijun Ouyang, Jialu Cai, Yuhang Wang, and Yichao Wu. Erase to improve: Erasable reinforcement learning for search-augmented llms, 2025.
- [34] Guiming Hardy Chen, Shunian Chen, Ruifei Zhang, Junying Chen, Xiangbo Wu, Zhiyi Zhang, Zhihong Chen, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang. Allava: Harnessing gpt4v-synthesized data for a lite vision-language model, 2024.
- [35] Seil Kang, Jinyeong Kim, Junhyeok Kim, and Seong Jae Hwang. Your large vision-language model only needs a few attention heads for visual grounding. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 9339–9350, 2025.
- [36] Parsa Esmaeilkhani and Longin Jan Latecki. Direct visual grounding by directing attention of visual tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.12738*, 2025.
- [37] Ryan L Yang, Dipkamal Bhusal, and Nidhi Rastogi. Learning to look: Cognitive attention alignment with vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.21247*, 2025.
- [38] Juntong Lu Yaowei Zheng, Shenzhi Wang, Zhangchi Feng, Dongdong Kuang, and Yuwen Xiong. Easyr1: An efficient, scalable, multi-modality rl training framework. <https://github.com/hiyouga/EasyR1>, 2025.
- [39] Guangming Sheng, Chi Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Xibin Wu, Wang Zhang, Ru Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Haibin Lin, and Chuan Wu. Hybridflow: A flexible and efficient rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2409.19256*, 2024.

- [40] Haodong Duan, Xinyu Fang, Junming Yang, Xiangyu Zhao, Yuxuan Qiao, Mo Li, Amit Agarwal, Zhe Chen, Lin Chen, Yuan Liu, Yubo Ma, Hailong Sun, Yifan Zhang, Shiyin Lu, Tack Hwa Wong, Weiyun Wang, Peiheng Zhou, Xiaozhe Li, Chaoyou Fu, Junbo Cui, Jixuan Chen, Enxin Song, Song Mao, Shengyuan Ding, Tianhao Liang, Zicheng Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Vlmevalkit: An open-source toolkit for evaluating large multi-modality models, 2025.
- [41] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities, 2024.
- [42] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?, 2024.
- [43] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, and Feng Zhao. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models?, 2024.
- [44] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A. Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive, 2024.
- [45] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts, 2024.
- [46] Runqi Qiao, Qiuna Tan, Guanting Dong, Minhui Wu, Chong Sun, Xiaoshuai Song, Zhuoma GongQue, Shanglin Lei, Zhe Wei, Miaoxuan Zhang, Runfeng Qiao, Yifan Zhang, Xiao Zong, Yida Xu, Muxi Diao, Zhimin Bao, Chen Li, and Honggang Zhang. We-math: Does your large multimodal model achieve human-like mathematical reasoning?, 2024.
- [47] Ahmed Masry, Do Xuan Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. Chartqa: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning, 2022.
- [48] Jie Yang, Feipeng Ma, Zitian Wang, Dacheng Yin, Kang Rong, Fengyun Rao, and Ruimao Zhang. Wethink: Toward general-purpose vision-language reasoning via reinforcement learning, 2025.
- [49] Dong Guo, Faming Wu, Feida Zhu, Fuxing Leng, Guang Shi, Haobin Chen, Haoqi Fan, Jian Wang, Jianyu Jiang, Jiawei Wang, Jingji Chen, Jingjia Huang, Kang Lei, Liping Yuan, Lishu Luo, Pengfei Liu, Qinghao Ye, Rui Qian, Shen Yan, Shixiong Zhao, Shuai Peng, Shuangye Li, Sihang Yuan, Sijin Wu, Tianheng Cheng, Weiwei Liu, Wenqian Wang, Xianhan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Xiaobo Qin, Xiaohan Ding, Xiaojun Xiao, Xiaoying Zhang, Xuanwei Zhang, Xuehan Xiong, Yanghua Peng, Yangrui Chen, Yanwei Li, Yanxu Hu, Yi Lin, Yiyuan Hu, Yiyuan Zhang, Youbin Wu, Yu Li, Yudong Liu, Yue Ling, Yujia Qin, Zhanbo Wang, Zhiwu He, Aoxue Zhang, Bairan Yi, Bencheng Liao, Can Huang, Can Zhang, Chaorui Deng, Chaoyi Deng, Cheng Lin, Cheng Yuan, Chenggang Li, Chenhui Gou, Chenwei Lou, Chengzhi Wei, Chundian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Deyao Zhu, Donghong Zhong, Feng Li, Feng Zhang, Gang Wu, Guodong Li, Guohong Xiao, Haibin Lin, Haihua Yang, Haoming Wang, Heng Ji, Hongxiang Hao, Hui Shen, Huixia Li, Jiahao Li, Jialong Wu, Jianhua Zhu, Jianpeng Jiao, Jiashi Feng, Jiaze Chen, Jianhui Duan, Jihao Liu, Jin Zeng, Jingqun Tang, Jingyu Sun, Joya Chen, Jun Long, Junda Feng, Junfeng Zhan, Junjie Fang, Junting Lu, Kai Hua, Kai Liu, Kai Shen, Kaiyuan Zhang, Ke Shen, Ke Wang, Keyu Pan, Kun Zhang, Kunchang Li, Lanxin Li, Lei Li, Lei Shi, Li Han, Liang Xiang, Liangqiang Chen, Lin Chen, Lin Li, Lin Yan, Liying Chi, Longxiang Liu, Mengfei Du, Mingxuan Wang, Ningxin Pan, Peibin Chen, Pengfei Chen, Pengfei Wu, Qingqing Yuan, Qingyao Shuai, Qiuyan Tao, Renjie Zheng, Renrui Zhang, Ru Zhang, Rui Wang, Rui Yang, Rui Zhao, Shaoqiang Xu, Shihao Liang, Shipeng Yan, Shu Zhong, Shuaishuai Cao, Shuangzhi Wu, Shufan Liu, Shuhan Chang, Songhua Cai, Tenglong Ao, Tianhao Yang, Tingting Zhang, Wanjuan Zhong, Wei Jia, Wei Weng, Weihao Yu, Wenhao Huang, Wenjia Zhu, Wenli Yang, Wenzhi Wang, Xiang Long, XiangRui Yin, Xiao Li, Xiaolei Zhu, Xiaoying Jia, Xijin Zhang, Xin Liu, Xincheng Zhang, Xinyu Yang, Xiongcai Luo, Xiuli Chen, Xuandong Zhong, Xuefeng Xiao, Xujing Li, Yan Wu, Yawei Wen, Yifan Du,

Yihao Zhang, Yining Ye, Yonghui Wu, Yu Liu, Yu Yue, Yufeng Zhou, Yufeng Yuan, Yuhang Xu, Yuhong Yang, Yun Zhang, Yunhao Fang, Yuntao Li, Yurui Ren, Yuwen Xiong, Zehua Hong, Zehua Wang, Zewei Sun, Zeyu Wang, Zhao Cai, Zhaoyue Zha, Zhecheng An, Zhehui Zhao, Zhengzhuo Xu, Zhipeng Chen, Zhiyong Wu, Zhuofan Zheng, Zihao Wang, Zilong Huang, Ziyu Zhu, and Zuquan Song. Seed1.5-v1 technical report, 2025.