

Towards Accurate UAV Image Perception: Guiding Vision-Language Models with Stronger Task Prompts

Mingning Guo, Mengwei Wu, Shaoxian Li, Haifeng Li, *Member, IEEE*, Chao Tao

Abstract—Existing image perception methods based on Vision-Language Models (VLMs) generally follow a paradigm wherein models extract and analyze image content based on user-provided textual task prompts. However, such methods face limitations when applied to UAV imagery, which presents challenges like target confusion, scale variations, and complex backgrounds. These challenges arise because VLMs’ understanding of image content depends on the semantic alignment between visual and textual tokens. When the task prompt is simplistic and the image content is complex, achieving effective alignment becomes difficult, limiting the model’s ability to focus on task-relevant information. To address this issue, we introduce *AerialVP* (*Aerial Visual Perception*), the first agent framework for task prompt enhancement in UAV image perception. *AerialVP* proactively extracts multi-dimensional auxiliary information from UAV images to enhance task prompts, overcoming the limitations of traditional VLM-based approaches. Specifically, the enhancement process includes three stages: (1) analyzing the task prompt to identify the task type and enhancement needs, (2) selecting appropriate tools from the tool repository, and (3) generating enhanced task prompts based on the analysis and selected tools. To evaluate *AerialVP*, we introduce *AerialSense*, a comprehensive benchmark for UAV image perception that includes Aerial Visual Reasoning, Aerial Visual Question Answering, and Aerial Visual Grounding tasks. *AerialSense* provides a standardized basis for evaluating model generalization and performance across diverse resolutions, lighting conditions, and both urban and natural scenes. Experimental results demonstrate that *AerialVP* significantly enhances task prompt guidance, leading to stable and substantial performance improvements in both open-source and proprietary VLMs. By facilitating finer image-text alignment, the enhanced prompts significantly improve accuracy and robustness in UAV image perception tasks. Our work will be available at <https://github.com/lostwolves/AerialVP>.

I. INTRODUCTION

UAV image perception aims to extract key visual information such as object coordinates, semantics, and spatial relationships [1] which serve as essential inputs for advanced UAV operations, including autonomous obstacle avoidance [2] and path planning [3]. However, UAV imagery is characterized by varying perspectives [4], significant scale differences [5], [6], complex lighting [7], [8] and weather conditions [9], [10], as well as cluttered backgrounds [11]. These factors result

This work was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of Hunan for Distinguished Young Scholars under Grant 2022JJ10072; in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 42471419 and Grant 42171376.

The authors are with the School of Geosciences and InfoPhysics, Central South University, Changsha 410083, China. (e-mail: 225007012@csu.edu.cn, 235007016@csu.edu.cn, lishaoxian@csu.edu.cn, lihaifeng@csu.edu.cn, kingtaochao@csu.edu.cn)




Fig. 1: Impact of task prompt design on VLM perception accuracy under different environments. (a) In simple natural scenes, a basic prompt effectively guides the VLM to focus on the correct target and generate accurate results. (b) In complex UAV scenes, a simple prompt lacking auxiliary information fails to direct attention, leading to incorrect results. (c) An enhanced prompt guides the VLM to focus on the correct target and achieve accurate perception.

in significant visual diversity of objects within the image. Traditional vision-based methods rely on large-scale annotated datasets for supervised training to improve perception accuracy in specific scenarios [12], [13], [14]. However, these datasets often fail to capture the diverse and dynamic environmental conditions of real UAV applications, limiting the vision-based methods’ ability to generalize to unseen scenarios and restricting its practical usability.

With the rapid development of Vision-Language Models (VLMs), image perception has made remarkable progress in recent years [15], [16], [17]. By performing cross-modal alignment on large-scale image-text pairs [18], VLMs align visual features with high-level semantics, thereby enabling the learning of robust and generalizable representations [19]. The language modality introduces category attributes and contextual knowledge, allowing the model to maintain stable understanding in scenarios with varying perspectives, scales, and lighting conditions [20]. Leveraging the general image-text alignment

capabilities established during pre-training, VLMs require only a small number of samples to achieve effective few-shot generalization, significantly reducing the reliance on large-scale annotated data and enhancing their practicality in complex task scenarios [21]. For example, CLIP [22] achieves zero-shot transfer capability through contrastive learning on large-scale image-text pairs, significantly improving the model’s image recognition and semantic alignment performance in open-vocabulary scenarios. Eco-VLM [23] fine-tunes a VLM on the ImageNet1K-E dataset, using semantic extensions of species names and text augmentation, which improves the model’s robustness and generalization in complex field scenarios like lighting variations, occlusion, and background interference. In the autonomous driving domain, VLM-C4L [24] introduces extreme scene data to help VLMs adapt to adverse conditions like strong sunlight and fog, greatly improving the stability and generalization of autonomous driving systems in complex open environments.

However, the ability of VLMs to realize these advantages fundamentally relies on a critical assumption: *visual tokens and textual tokens must maintain precise and consistent semantic alignment within a shared representation space across diverse task scenarios* [25], [26], [27]. This is because the reasoning capability of VLMs originates from their internal Large Language Models (LLMs). Before reasoning, task images are transformed into interpretable feature representations and processed together with textual prompt embeddings within the LLM [28], [29]. During this process, the LLM projects visual tokens into a shared semantic space with text tokens and aligns them to enable cross-modal reasoning [30], [31]. For natural images, the foreground and background are typically simple and distinct, allowing relatively precise token alignment between visual and textual representations [32]. As shown in Fig. 1 (a), the foreground target (“rabbit”) is clear and simple, enabling effective alignment between sparse visual tokens and concise textual prompts. In contrast, UAV imagery often contains densely distributed targets and complex backgrounds, resulting in substantially increased visual complexity. As illustrated in Fig. 1 (b), VLMs often struggle to associate task-relevant image regions with textual prompts, resulting in weak alignment between abundant visual tokens and limited textual context, ultimately leading to incorrect perception results. Traditional alignment-based training methods typically involve collecting images from various task scenarios and pairing them with corresponding textual descriptions to enhance the image-text alignment capability of VLMs [33], [34], [35]. However, this approach offers limited benefits in the domain of UAV imagery, where large-scale image-text datasets are scarce and there are significant style discrepancies. Moreover, it fails to fundamentally resolve the problem that overly simplistic user-provided prompts prevent the VLM from effectively focusing on task-relevant information in the image. Consequently, enhancing the image-text alignment capability of VLMs in UAV perception remains a critical and unresolved challenge.

In this paper, we shift the focus from alignment-based training of VLMs to the design of perception task prompts.

As illustrated in Fig. 1 (c), we argue that *even without additional training, enhancing the descriptive granularity of textual prompts can effectively improve the alignment between visual and textual tokens, thereby enabling more accurate image perception across diverse UAV task scenarios*. Our perspective is inspired by several recent studies that emphasize the impact of task prompt design rather than model training on the performance of VLMs [36]. Kaduri et al. [37] conducted an in-depth study on how VLMs interpret visual information and found that these models do not directly extract useful information from image tokens. Instead, query text tokens function as global visual descriptors within the VLM, serving as key components for compressing and storing visual information. This finding underscores the great potential of enhancing task prompts to improve the alignment between visual and textual tokens. Similarly, Sclar et al. [38] quantified the effect of prompt formatting on the performance of LLMs, showing that variations in prompt format can lead to unpredictable and non-monotonic changes in performance, with sensitivity differing across both models and tasks. Zhang et al. [39] found that textual prompts can serve as information selectors during reasoning, enabling LLMs to focus on the most relevant information within a vast implicit knowledge space. Collectively, these studies highlight the critical role of task-specific prompt design in enhancing model reasoning and perception capabilities. Inspired by these insights, this work introduces task prompt enhancement into UAV image perception to address the image-text alignment inconsistency problem. By guiding VLMs with structured enhanced prompts tailored to UAV-specific tasks, we aim to achieve more precise visual understanding under complex UAV perception conditions.

Building upon these findings, this paper proposes *AerialVP (Aerial Visual Perception)*, an agent framework designed for task prompt enhancement in UAV image perception. As shown in Fig. 2, AerialVP consists of two core modules: an LLM-based Task Engine that controls and manages the prompt enhancement process, and a Tool Repository that manages tools and performs tool calling. The framework enhances task prompts through three key stages: task analysis, tool selection, and enhanced prompt generation. In **Stage 1 (Task Prompt Analysis)**, the Task Engine invokes the prompt analysis model to parse the input prompt, identifying the task type, target category, and enhancement requirements across semantic, spatial position, and spatial relationship dimensions. In **Stage 2 (Tool Selection)**, the Task Engine automatically retrieves and matches appropriate tools from the repository based on these requirements. In **Stage 3 (Enhanced Prompt Generation)**, the Task Engine integrates the original task prompt with the outputs of the selected models to generate an executable enhancement program. Once the program is executed, it generates an enhanced textual prompt. When combined with UAV imagery, this enhanced prompt activates the reasoning capability of the VLM, enabling more accurate and robust visual perception. The scalable architecture of AerialVP supports dynamic adjustment of enhancement strategies and flexible integration of tools, ensuring consistent performance




Fig. 2: Overall architecture of the AerialVP agent framework.

across diverse UAV perception scenarios. To the best of our knowledge, AerialVP is the first agent framework specifically designed for task prompt enhancement.

To evaluate AerialVP, we constructed *AerialSense*, a large-scale benchmark built from multiple publicly available UAV datasets. It includes three representative perception tasks: Aerial Visual Reasoning, Aerial Visual Question Answering, and Aerial Visual Grounding, containing 7,119 UAV images and 53,374 test samples. Compared with existing UAV datasets, AerialSense offers significantly greater scale and diversity. It covers a broad range of target types, including ground-based moving objects such as cars and pedestrians, stationary targets such as buildings and parking lots, and waterborne moving objects such as ships. Moreover, the dataset emphasizes visual diversity by incorporating variations in illumination, scene complexity, and resolution, providing a realistic representation of real-world UAV operating conditions. This design enables a systematic and fair evaluation of model adaptability and generalization across terrestrial and aquatic scenes. Experimental results based on AerialSense demonstrate that AerialVP substantially enhances the robustness and accuracy of VLMs under complex UAV perception scenarios.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- This work is the first to examine the image-text alignment inconsistency problem in UAV image perception from the perspective of task prompt enhancement. Through a systematic analysis of UAV imagery characteristics, we argue that the inconsistency problem arises from the disparity between the limited information in short text prompts and the complex content of UAV imagery. Building upon this analysis, we further explore task prompt enhancement as an effective approach to improve the

perception capability of VLMs, offering a new research direction for advancing UAV image understanding.

- We propose AerialVP, the first agent framework specifically designed for task prompt enhancement in UAV image perception. By systematically integrating semantic, spatial position, and spatial relationship information into task prompts, AerialVP enables VLMs to activate their inherent visual perception and reasoning capabilities without additional training. This enhancement achieves finer image-text alignment and improves model robustness under scale variations and object ambiguity.
- We develop AerialSense, a comprehensive benchmark for UAV image perception that includes three representative tasks: Aerial Visual Grounding, Aerial Visual Reasoning, and Aerial Visual Question Answering. Compared with existing UAV datasets, AerialSense offers higher data scale, diversity, and scene complexity, providing a standardized basis for assessing the adaptability and generalization of VLMs in UAV perception.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Image-Text Alignment Methods for VLMs

Traditional alignment-based training methods typically use large-scale image-text pairs and optimize alignment losses to help VLMs learn semantic alignment between visual and textual tokens [40], [41], [42]. Building on this model-centric framework, several advanced methods have been proposed to improve alignment granularity and feature quality. For example, FG-CLIP [43] develops the FineHARD dataset containing 12 million images, 40 million region-level bounding boxes, and corresponding fine-grained textual descriptions to support detailed alignment between long-text and local visual content. DC-CLIP [44] builds a large-scale bilingual Chinese-English image-text corpus for multilingual feature distil-

lation and alignment training, improving model generalization across languages. FLAVARS [45] introduces paired remote-sensing satellite images and geospatial context descriptions, incorporating positional encoding for spatially aware alignment. DAPT [46] adopts a foreground–background decoupling mechanism to construct object-level texts and background category labels separately, achieving more balanced modality alignment.

Despite these advances, applying such methods to UAV image perception remains challenging. Firstly, there is a lack of large-scale UAV-specific datasets, resulting in data scarcity for effective alignment training. The unique perspectives and scene complexity of UAV data limit the representation of environmental diversity, thereby reducing model robustness. Secondly, traditional alignment training usually provides only global textual descriptions. Without target-level prompts such as coordinates, semantic attributes, or spatial relations, the alignment precision decreases in tasks involving similar or overlapping objects. Finally, although training-based approaches employ rich prompts during training to enhance the VLM’s comprehension of complex images, the trained VLM continues to rely on brief prompts at the inference stage (e.g., in visual grounding tasks). Consequently, the mismatch between complex visual content and limited textual context persists, leaving the alignment problem fundamentally unresolved.

These limitations highlight that while alignment-based training improves general image understanding, it remains insufficient for the fine-grained perception and reasoning required in UAV imagery, motivating the task prompt enhancement strategy proposed in this work.

B. Prompt Enhancement in Multimodal Learning

Recent studies have highlighted the crucial role of prompt design in enhancing VLM performance across multimodal tasks. In the field of computer vision, several studies have demonstrated that well-structured task prompts can effectively guide VLMs to attend to task-relevant regions and achieve stronger image-text alignment. For instance, AdaptCLIPZS [47] incorporates category descriptions generated by LLMs into textual prompts, substantially improving zero-shot classification accuracy on fine-grained categories such as birds and flowers. Similarly, FGVP [48] introduces fine-grained visual prompts derived from segmentation models to suppress attention to irrelevant regions, thereby enhancing visual grounding performance. Building on this idea, FGVTP [49] integrates fine-grained visual prompts with a consistency-based textual enhancement strategy. Using image masks and textual captions, it refines image–text alignment and improves accuracy in part-level detection tasks.

Beyond general visual tasks, prompt-guided enhancement has also proven effective in other fields. In robotics, PIVOT [50] employs auxiliary visual prompts such as candidate actions, positions, and trajectories to iteratively guide zero-shot robotic control via VLMs, improving decision-making and task execution without additional training. In the medical field,

MedVP [51] introduces specialized modules for medical entity extraction and visual prompt generation, leveraging region-level information to strengthen model attention and diagnostic reasoning in medical visual question answering tasks.

Collectively, these studies demonstrate that high-quality prompts can substantially activate the reasoning capability of VLMs without additional training [52], [53], [54]. However, most existing prompt-enhancement methods are designed for specific tasks, making them highly constrained and difficult to generalize across various perception scenarios. In contrast, this work introduces a unified task prompt enhancement agent for UAV image perception, which considers both the commonalities and distinctions among different UAV perception tasks. By enabling adaptive prompt enhancement, the proposed agent effectively addresses the image–text alignment inconsistency in complex UAV environments.

III. AERIALVP: A PROMPT-ENHANCEMENT AGENT FOR UAV IMAGE PERCEPTION TASKS

In this section, we introduce the AerialVP agent, which is designed to perform task prompt enhancement for UAV image perception tasks. We first present the problem formulation in Section III-A, and then provide an overview of the proposed AerialVP framework in Section III-B. Building on this foundation, we conduct a systematic comparison between the Model-Centric UAV Perception Framework and the Prompt-Centric UAV Perception Framework to highlight the advantages of our AerialVP in Section III-C.

A. Problem Formulation

In VLM-based image perception methods [55], the entire perception task is handled by a VLM, denoted as f_{VLM} . The f_{VLM} receives a natural language prompt T and an image I as inputs, and produces a task-specific output R . This process can be formally expressed as:

$$R = f_{\text{VLM}}(T, I) \quad (1)$$

However, the LLM within f_{VLM} cannot directly interpret visual inputs. As noted in previous studies, its understanding of image highly depends on the semantic alignment between visual and textual tokens. Therefore, when the user-provided task prompt is overly brief and lacks clear target descriptions, the high visual complexity of UAV imagery and limited prompt information make it difficult to achieve precise semantic alignment, leading to degraded perception performance.

To address the problem, we propose a prompt-enhancement framework that replaces user-provided under-informative task prompts with enhanced well-specified prompts for UAV image perception. Unlike conventional methods that directly perform perception tasks based on user-provided prompts, our framework conducts adaptive task prompt enhancement prior to perception. Subsequently, the enhanced prompt and the task image are jointly fed into the VLM for perception task. Accordingly, the overall task execution process is reformulated




Fig. 3: Structure of the Tool Repository in the AerialVP framework. The repository consists of two main categories of tools: Prompt Analysis Tools for task understanding and subtask planning, and Prompt Enhancement Tools for generating semantic and spatial descriptions that enhance task prompts.

as follows:

$$R = f_{\text{VLM}}(\hat{T}, I) \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{T} = \text{Agent}(T, I) \quad (3)$$

Here, \hat{T} denotes the enhanced text prompt, and $\text{Agent}(\cdot)$ represents the proposed AerialVP agent responsible for task prompt enhancement. It generates the enhanced prompt \hat{T} based on the user-provided text prompt T and the UAV image I . Specifically, the proposed AerialVP agent consists of an LLM-based Task Engine f_{LLM} and a Tool Repository $M = \{M_1, M_2, \dots\}$:

$$\text{Agent} = (f_{\text{LLM}}, M), \quad M = \{M_1, M_2, \dots\} \quad (4)$$

Where M_1, M_2, \dots denote the tools in the Tool Repository responsible for different tasks.

B. Overview of the AerialVP Agent

1) *Module 1: LLM-Based Task Engine*: In the AerialVP framework, the Task Engine f_{LLM} serves as the core module responsible for control and scheduling. Built upon an LLM foundation, the Task Engine f_{LLM} leverages advanced capabilities in natural language understanding, task planning, and instruction generation. Its primary functions encompass two key aspects: **designing prompt enhancement strategies** and **coordinating tool call execution**.

In order to design prompt enhancement strategies, the Task Engine invokes various prompt analysis tools to parse the user-provided prompt, identifying the task type and task-focused objects. Based on this, the Task Engine further infers and plans a workflow for subsequent prompt enhancement.

The tool call execution function focuses on realizing the planned prompt enhancement workflow through targeted tool calls. Specifically, for each enhancement subtask, the Task Engine selects appropriate task tools from the Tool Repository by referencing the functional descriptions of available tools and the requirements specified in the enhancement plan. It

also determines the execution order of the selected tools and configures their input parameters according to predefined model specifications. This process enables the Task Engine to construct a structured enhancement program that defines the input–output logic and operational sequence of each tool, ensuring the final output is high-quality enhanced task prompts.

2) *Module 2: Tool Repository*: The Tool Repository $M = \{M_1, M_2, \dots\}$ functions as the central hub for managing all specialized tools within the AerialVP framework. It is designed to organize, maintain, and coordinate the use of multiple task-oriented tools that facilitate prompt analysis and enhancement. Built upon the Model Context Protocol (MCP) [56] standard, the repository ensures standardized communication between the Task Engine and individual tools. This protocol allows each tool to operate as an independent module with a well-defined input–output interface, enabling the Task Engine to dynamically select and execute tools as needed. As illustrated in Fig. 3, it primarily encompasses two types of tools: **Prompt Analysis Tools** and **Prompt Enhancement Tools**.

The Prompt Analysis Tools are designed to parse user-provided prompts and extract key information for subsequent enhancement. They focus on two fundamental aspects of UAV image perception: the task type and the task-focused objects. Based on the extracted information, the Task Engine then constructs and plans an appropriate workflow for prompt enhancement. Thus, it primarily encompasses three types of tools as follows:

- **Task Type Analysis Tool (task_type_analysis)**: This tool categorizes the perception task according to the user-provided prompt, and returns the corresponding task type, such as Aerial Visual Grounding, Aerial Visual Reasoning, or Aerial Visual Question Answering.
- **Task-focused Objects Analysis Tool (task_focused_objects_analysis)**: This tool extracts the task-focused perception targets mentioned in the user-provided prompt and returns a structured list of object categories such as

TABLE I: The detailed definition and usage of the tools in the Tool Repository.

Type	Tool	Description
Prompt Analysis Tool	task_type_analysis	Input: user-provided task prompt $T \rightarrow$ Output: task type analysis result R_{type} Return the task type corresponding to the user-provided task prompt T .
	task_focused_objects_analysis	Input: user-provided task prompt $T \rightarrow$ Output: task-focused objects set $\{R_{objects}\}$ Return the task-focused objects set corresponding to the user-provided task prompt T .
	enhancement_task_planning	Input: task type analysis result R_{type} , task-focused objects set $\{R_{objects}\} \rightarrow$ Output: prompt enhancement-oriented task plan set $\{R_{task}\}$ Return the prompt enhancement-oriented task plan set corresponding to the user-provided task prompt T .
Prompt Enhancement Tool	semantic_description	Input: UAV image I , task-focused objects set $\{R_{objects}\} \rightarrow$ Output: semantic description set $\{Sem_t\}$ Return the semantic description set $\{Sem_t\}$, which contains the semantic descriptions of all task-focused objects in the UAV image.
	spatial_position_description	Input: UAV image I , task-focused objects set $\{R_{objects}\} \rightarrow$ Output: spatial position set $\{Cord_t\}$ Return the spatial position set $\{Cord_t\}$, which contains the image coordinates of all task-focused objects in the UAV image.
	spatial_relationship_description	Input: UAV image I , task-focused objects set $\{R_{objects}\} \rightarrow$ Output: spatial description set $\{Spa_t\}$ Return the spatial relationship description set $\{Spa_t\}$, which contains the spatial relationship descriptions of all task-focused objects in the UAV image.

[“house”, “car”, “building”].

- **Prompt Enhancement-Oriented Task Planning Tool (enhancement_task_planning):** By integrating outputs from the two tools above, this tool determines the necessary enhancement subtasks for the given perception task and returns a structured list of these subtasks for downstream processing.

The Prompt Enhancement Tools are designed to enrich user-provided prompts by generating supplementary information across multiple dimensions. In the context of UAV image perception, enhancement is primarily performed along two key dimensions: semantic and spatial. The spatial dimension is further decomposed into spatial position and spatial relationship, which collectively represent object locations and their relative arrangements in the scene. To address these aspects, three specialized tools have been developed:

- **Semantic Description Tool (semantic_description):** This tool enhances prompts at the semantic level by generating fine-grained textual descriptions of visual objects. These include object categories, appearance attributes (e.g., color, texture, and shape), and functional roles within the scene.
- **Spatial Position Description Tool (spatial_position_description):** This tool delivers precise coordinate-based information by detecting targets in UAV imagery and outputting bounding box coordinates for each recognized object.
- **Spatial Relationship Description Tool (spatial_relationship_description):** This tool captures inter-object spatial configurations by describing their relative layouts, including position, distance, ordinal, and neighborhood relations.

Table I presents a comprehensive summary of the tools, including their definitions and use cases. As all tools conform

to a unified specification for functionality and communication, the Tool Repository in AerialVP allows for flexible extension and customization to meet evolving demands in UAV perception.

C. AerialVP’s Advantage Against Model-Centric UAV Perception Framework

In this section, we refer to the conventional practice of applying targeted fine-tuning to VLMs for specific perception tasks as the **Model-Centric UAV Perception Framework**. In contrast, we term the approach introduced in this work the **Prompt-Centric UAV Perception Framework**, which enhances task prompts while retaining the original perception model without any additional training. As shown in Fig. 4, we systematically compare the two frameworks across multiple dimensions to highlight their fundamental distinctions. Through this comparative analysis, we underscore the unique benefits offered by our AerialVP agent over existing methodologies.

Firstly, the two frameworks diverge fundamentally in their diagnosis of the core challenges in UAV perception. The Model-Centric Framework attributes performance limitations primarily to the VLM’s own insufficient training, thus advocating for targeted fine-tuning to enhance its cross-modal alignment capabilities. In contrast, the Prompt-Centric Framework operates on the premise that pre-trained VLMs inherently possess strong perceptual potential, which can be fully unlocked through sufficiently detailed and context-rich textual prompts. This shifts the focus from modifying the model parameters to refining the instructional prompts, thereby giving rise to divergent optimization principles. The Model-Centric approach relies on alignment training with task-specific datasets to optimize model parameters. While effective in general scenarios, this strategy encounters significant difficulties in the UAV domain, where high-resolution aerial imagery presents unique

Framework	Model-Centric UAV Perception Framework	Prompt-Centric UAV Perception Framework
Hypothesis	<i>Align image and text tokens in a shared representation space for reasoning.</i>	
Principle	<i>Optimizing model parameters through fine-tuning to enhance alignment capability.</i>	<i>Optimizing user prompts through prompt enhancement to activate inherent model alignment.</i>
Method	<p>Alignment-Training Based</p>	<p>Prompt-Enhancement Based</p>
Formula	$Answer = VLM_{\text{training-required}}(I, T)$	$Answer = VLM_{\text{training-free}}(I, Agent(I, T))$
Paradigm		

Fig. 4: Comparison between the Model-Centric UAV Perception Framework and the Prompt-Centric UAV Perception Framework. Here, $VLM_{\text{training-required}}$ denotes a VLM trained on both large-scale general datasets and task-specific datasets, while $VLM_{\text{training-free}}$ denotes a VLM that has not been trained on any task-specific datasets.

complexities and labeled data are often scarce. The Prompt-Centric Framework, conversely, circumvents the need for task-specific training altogether. Instead, it employs a structured enhancement of task prompts: prior to execution, the AerialVP agent analyzes task requirements, identifies necessary augmentations, and dynamically generates informative prompts by leveraging appropriate tools from its Tool Repository. This process enables even off-the-shelf VLMs to achieve accurate UAV image perception, offering a streamlined and data-efficient paradigm that bypasses the demands of conventional, training-intensive methods.

Secondly, regarding methodology, the two frameworks differ substantially in how they establish vision-language alignment. The Model-Centric Framework, despite leveraging large-scale datasets for alignment training, often relies on samples with only image-level captions that lack fine-grained object characteristics. This setup essentially forces information-poor text tokens to match their information-rich visual counterparts, creating a fundamental representational gap. As a result, even after fine-tuning, the models remain prone to semantic ambiguity in complex scenes involving multiple or visually similar objects, which ultimately constrains the efficacy of training-based optimization. By contrast, the Prompt-Centric Framework explicitly enriches semantic representation by generating comprehensive, multi-dimensional descriptions for each task-relevant object. It effectively elevates originally vague or generic text prompts to an information-rich level. This transformation facilitates a more direct and efficient alignment process—now occurring between information-rich text tokens and information-rich image tokens. As a result,

the framework significantly improves both the accuracy and robustness of VLMs when applied to challenging UAV perception scenarios.

IV. WORKFLOW OF TASK PROMPT ENHANCEMENT IN AERIALVP

This section details the task prompt enhancement process in AerialVP, which comprises three stages: Task Prompt Analysis, Tool Selection, and Enhanced Prompt Generation. To illustrate this workflow, we use the vehicle localization task from Fig. 5 as an example.

A. Task Prompt Analysis

The Task Prompt Analysis stage aims to parse the user-provided task prompt to identify the key information needed for enhancement. This step is essential as the prompt enhancement needs are task-dependent. For example, visual grounding tasks prioritize spatial positions for coordinate determination, supplemented by semantic and relational cues to disambiguate visually similar objects. In contrast, tasks like visual reasoning and visual question answering, which operate on predefined objects, rely more heavily on semantic and relational information to refine the VLM's semantic understanding.

Thus, the core challenge lies in enabling the Task Engine to accurately extract this essential information from prompts that vary widely in content, style, and length. To address this, AerialVP introduces a multi-tool collaborative analysis mechanism within its Task Engine. As shown in Fig. 5, instead of relying on a single model, the engine decomposes




Fig. 5: Workflow of the AerialVP agent for task prompt enhancement, consisting of three stages: Task Prompt Analysis, Tool Selection, and Enhanced Prompt Generation. The process is illustrated with the example of a vehicle localization task.

analysis into three subtasks: task type identification, task-focused object analysis, and enhancement-oriented task planning. Each subtask is handled by a dedicated, specialized tool to ensure robust adaptability. Formally, the workflow proceeds as follows: Initially, the Task Engine executes both the Task Type Analysis Tool ($M_{\text{type_analysis}}$) and the Task-focused Objects Analysis Tool ($M_{\text{objects_analysis}}$) upon receiving the user-provided prompt, thereby acquiring their respective structured results. Subsequently, it orchestrates the Prompt Enhancement-Oriented Task Planning Tool ($M_{\text{task_planning}}$), which synthesizes these outputs to generate the final task plan set. The

complete process is formalized below:

$$R_{\text{type}} = M_{\text{type_analysis}}(T) \quad (5)$$

$$\{R_{\text{objects}}\} = M_{\text{objects_analysis}}(T) \quad (6)$$

$$\{R_{\text{task}}\} = M_{\text{task_planning}}(R_{\text{type}}, \{R_{\text{objects}}\}) \quad (7)$$

Here, R_{type} , $\{R_{\text{objects}}\}$, and $\{R_{\text{task}}\}$ represent the task type result, the task-focused objects set, and the prompt enhancement-oriented task plan set, respectively. In the vehicle localization task example shown in Fig. 5, the task type result is "Visual Grounding", the task-focused objects set is ["car"],

and the prompt enhancement-oriented task plan set is [*“spatial position description”*, *“semantic description”*, *“spatial relationship description”*]. These three types of results are ultimately merged into a dictionary and output as the final task prompt analysis result.

B. Tool Selection

After task prompt analysis, the AerialVP agent proceeds to the tool selection stage, where the Task Engine determines the set of tools required for subsequent prompt enhancement tasks based on the analysis results. The primary goal of this stage is to establish a precise mapping between the enhancement requirements identified in the task analysis and the available tools in the repository, ensuring that each enhancement subtask is executed by the most suitable tool. Specifically, upon receiving the structured output from the task prompt analysis module, the Task Engine first focuses on the prompt enhancement-oriented task plan set. Based on the task types to be executed, it systematically collects all corresponding tools from the Tool Repository as candidates for each task. This preliminary screening is conducted by matching the prefixes in the tools’ names. For example, if the Semantic Description task is required, all tools prefixed with *semantic_description* are included as candidates.

Subsequently, leveraging the task-focused object set and the functional description of each candidate tool, the Task Engine selects the most suitable tool for each task. Taking the example illustrated in Fig. 5, where the target object is a “car”, the Task Engine prioritizes tools capable of fine-grained depiction of small objects for the Semantic Description task. Consequently, the DAM [57] model is chosen due to its ability to capture detailed visual characteristics necessary for discriminating compact targets. Based on the same selection rationale, the Yolo-world [58] and SpaceOm [59] models are selected for the spatial position description and spatial relationship description tasks, respectively. Finally, the tool selections for all tasks, along with their invocation parameters, are compiled into a unified dictionary. This resultant data structure thereby serves as both the structured output of the current stage and the deterministic input required for the subsequent enhanced prompt generation.

To ensure interoperability and scalability, all models in the tool repository are registered and invoked under the MCP standard, which unifies model interfaces and guarantees cross-model compatibility. This standardized mechanism enables the Task Engine to seamlessly replace or augment models without modifying the core framework architecture.

C. Enhanced Prompt Generation

In the enhanced prompt generation stage, AerialVP synthesizes the outputs from the preceding stages along with the original task image and prompt to produce an enhanced task prompt. Specifically, the Task Engine compiles all relevant information into an executable program, whose final output constitutes the enhanced prompt. The core mechanism operates by first extracting a directed reasoning chain from the

analysis results, where each node corresponds to a specific enhancement subtask. The system then generates corresponding function calls by invoking the models selected in the previous stage, organizing them sequentially along the reasoning chain to form a structured and executable workflow. During program assembly, the system initializes all model inputs, including the image path, tool-specific prompts, and output directories. It then procedurally generates and links the function calls, ultimately constructing a coherent enhancement pipeline that fully encapsulates the complete reasoning process.

Taking the task in Fig. 5 as an example, the prompt enhancement logic follows the sequence: “1. *spatial position description*; 2. *semantic description*; 3. *spatial relationship description*; 4. *prompt fusion*.” Prompt fusion is designated as the final step by default, as the discrete outputs generated by individual tools cannot directly enhance the original prompt. In the first step, the Task Engine invokes the function (*spatial_position_description_yoloworld*), corresponding to the YOLO-World model selected for spatial position description. This function requires the image path and a list of target categories as inputs. Accordingly, the Task Engine supplies the path to the task image and the task-focused object set obtained during the task analysis stage. Following the same mechanism, the Task Engine sequentially provides appropriate inputs to the semantic description function (*semantic_description_DAM*) and the spatial relationship description function (*spatial_relationship_description_SpaceOm*). Finally, the Task Engine executes its internal prompt fusion function to integrate all intermediate outputs, producing the final enhanced task prompt. A complete program example is illustrated in Fig. 6.

During prompt fusion, the Task Engine adopts a structured integration strategy to prevent the downstream reasoning model from being distracted by excessive auxiliary information and deviating from the core task. To this end, the original task prompt is retained as the central component, placed at the beginning of the enhanced prompt, while supplementary enhancement information is appended afterward. This design ensures that task comprehension is strengthened without compromising focus or controllability. In practice, a template-based filling strategy is employed. The prompt fusion function sequentially integrates the original task prompt, task analysis results, and enhancement information into a predefined template, resulting in a structured and semantically coherent final prompt. The template is formulated as follows:

“You are an assistant responsible for UAV Image [task_type] Task. The target objects you need to pay attention to include: [task_object]. [Original_task_instruction]. Here is some additional information: [Enhancement_information]”

Here, [task_type] and [task_object] are derived from the results of the task prompt analysis stage, [Original_task_instruction] represents the original task instruction provided by the user, and [Enhancement_information] encompasses the




Fig. 6: Example of the program used for task prompt enhancement, illustrated with a vehicle localization task. For brevity, the guiding prompts used to invoke the semantic and spatial tools are omitted from the illustration.

supplementary details generated by various tools within the AerialVP agent.

When the enhanced prompt and the original UAV image are provided to the responsible VLM for perception, the model can then generate the final task output. This process highlights a distinctive strength of the AerialVP framework: it does not necessitate any additional model training. Instead, by serving as an intelligent plug-in between the user and the model, it elevates performance purely through sophisticated prompt enhancement, establishing a training-free methodology for performance enhancement.

V. AERIALSENSE: A COMPREHENSIVE BENCHMARK FOR UAV IMAGE PERCEPTION

Here we propose AerialSense, a unified benchmark for UAV visual perception. As illustrated in Fig. 7, it encompasses three core tasks: Aerial Visual Reasoning (VR), Aerial Visual Question Answering (VQA), and Aerial Visual Grounding (VG), constructed through repurposed aerial imagery and newly curated textual annotations. AerialSense provides a foundational platform for evaluating and advancing VLM-based perception in UAVs, paving the way for more capable and intelligent aerial agents.

A. Dataset Source

(1) **AerialVG** [60]: AerialVG is a high-quality visual grounding dataset developed specifically for UAV-based scenarios. Constructed from high-resolution images in the VisDrone dataset [61], it captures diverse and complex urban environments. The dataset comprises 5,000 high-definition aerial images with nearly 50,000 manually annotated instances. Each annotation includes a target bounding box paired with a fine-grained natural language description. These descriptions incorporate semantic attributes, such as color, category, and spatial orientation, as well as relational cues between objects. In contrast to visual grounding datasets built on natural images, AerialVG offers higher image resolution, wider viewing angles, and increased task complexity, making it particularly suitable for evaluating multimodal alignment capabilities in

realistic UAV operating conditions. To ensure a consistent and challenging evaluation benchmark, AerialVG is integrated into the AerialSense framework as one of its core task components.

(2) **refGeo** [62]: The refGeo dataset is a large-scale remote sensing visual grounding benchmark designed to enhance the generalization capacity of VLMs in aerial scenarios. It integrates multiple established remote sensing VG datasets, such as GeoChat [63] and VRSBench [64], containing 623 UAV images with approximately 161,675 referring expressions. Notably, the textual expressions in refGeo are concise, averaging fewer than 10 words in length. In terms of annotation format, refGeo combines both Horizontal Bounding Box (HBB) and Oriented Bounding Box (OBB) annotations, and further enriches localization granularity by incorporating high-quality segmentation masks automatically generated by SAM [65]. As one of the pioneering benchmarks in the remote sensing visual grounding domain, refGeo consists of samples that are relatively less challenging than those in AerialVG, while still maintaining strong representativeness for evaluating grounding performance under typical UAV operating conditions.

(3) **CODrone** [66]: CODrone is a high-quality dataset specifically designed for rotating object detection in aerial contexts. It comprises 10,004 high-resolution images annotated across 12 object categories, including vehicles, traffic facilities, pedestrians, and light transportation types, with a total of 443,592 annotated object instances. This extensive annotation scheme ensures broad coverage of diverse urban and transportation scenarios. CODrone is integrated into AerialSense to address the category imbalance observed in existing UAV visual grounding datasets such as AerialVG and refGeo, where annotations are predominantly vehicle-centric. By incorporating CODrone, AerialSense achieves enhanced object category diversity and broader instance coverage, thereby strengthening the comprehensiveness and representativeness of the benchmark for evaluating UAV perception systems.

(4) **VisDrone**: VisDrone is a widely recognized large-scale dataset comprising UAV-captured images and videos. It includes 288 video clips, 261,908 extracted frames, and 10,209



Fig. 7: Overview of the AerialSense dataset. This benchmark is designed to evaluate a model’s capability to accurately associate descriptive information with corresponding targets in aerial imagery, thereby assessing its effectiveness in UAV-based visual perception tasks.

static images, capturing diverse urban and rural environments across 14 Chinese cities. The dataset contains over 2.6 million manually annotated instances of common objects such as pedestrians, cars, and bicycles, with each annotation providing precise bounding box coordinates and category information. VisDrone supports five principal computer vision tasks: image-based object detection, video-based object detection, single-object tracking, multi-object tracking, and crowd counting. In this study, we primarily leverage samples from the image-based object detection subset for benchmark construction. Although AerialVG also originates from VisDrone, we conducted careful reselection and refinement of detection samples to prevent overlap with AerialVG while simultaneously enhancing the diversity and representativeness of test samples within the AerialSense benchmark.

(5) **University-1652** [67]: University-1652 is a multi-view, multi-source benchmark dataset specifically designed for UAV-based geo-localization tasks. It comprises imagery from 72 universities worldwide, captured from three distinct perspectives: drone view (aerial), satellite view (top-down), and street view (ground-level). The UAV images in its test set are organized into a query set (37,855 images) and a gallery set (51,355 images) to support retrieval-based evaluation. During the construction of AerialSense, approximately 10% of the UAV images were sampled from the University-1652 test set, with particular attention given to incorporating diverse architectural categories. The inclusion of University-1652 enhances AerialSense through its rich variety of building structures, multi-perspective imagery, and substantial scene complexity. These characteristics significantly improve the benchmark’s object diversity, resolution coverage, and environmental variability, enabling more comprehensive assessment of model generalization in realistic and challenging UAV perception

scenarios.

B. Dataset Construction

To establish a representative and diverse benchmark for UAV image perception, we developed a structured four-stage data construction pipeline. The process comprises: (1) multi-source image selection, (2) visual grounding instruction generation, (3) visual reasoning and question answering instruction generation, and (4) manual quality verification. This integrated pipeline simultaneously supports three key UAV perception tasks, including Aerial Visual Grounding, Aerial Visual Reasoning, and Aerial Visual Question Answering, while ensuring consistency and validity across all task-specific datasets.

Stage 1: Image Selection. In the first stage, we selected raw UAV images from several public datasets, including AerialVG, refGeo, CODrone, VisDrone, and University-1652. To ensure diversity and representativeness, the collected images were manually filtered and balanced across multiple dimensions: scene type (e.g., urban roads, rural areas, ports, campuses, and markets), lighting condition (e.g., bright, dim, nighttime), object category (e.g., vehicles, pedestrians, vessels, and buildings), and image resolution. This curated image collection not only guarantees task executability but also enhances the generalization capacity and challenge level of the AerialSense benchmark under realistic UAV conditions.

Stage 2: Task Instruction Generation for Aerial Visual Grounding. For datasets with existing visual grounding annotations, specifically AerialVG and refGeo, we directly retained the original bounding boxes and corresponding natural language expressions after image filtering. For datasets lacking such annotations, namely CODrone, VisDrone, and University-1652, we created grounding task samples through manual target selection and instruction generation. Throughout this process, we consistently applied an observer perspective

principle to ensure all descriptions reflect natural human scene understanding. Each instruction incorporates fine-grained natural language descriptions covering target category, appearance attributes such as color and size, and spatial relationships with surrounding objects. This methodology ensures all generated instructions maintain both readability and executability, establishing a reliable foundation for accurate UAV visual grounding evaluation.

Stage 3: Task Instruction Generation for Aerial Visual Reasoning and Aerial Visual Question Answering. Building upon the Aerial Visual Grounding results from Stage 2, this stage utilizes the identified target regions within annotated images as inputs for reasoning and question answering tasks. The original visual grounding instructions are semantically reconstructed to transition from description to interpretation and interaction. For visual reasoning, expressions are converted into declarative statements. For example, “the red car closest to the building on the left” becomes “This is a red car positioned near the building on the left side of the image” with a “True” label, while modified versions such as “This is a black car positioned near the building on the left side of the image” receive “False” labels. For visual question answering, these descriptions are reformulated into interrogative formats. A sample question is: “Which of the following statements about the red car inside the blue bounding box is correct?” with multiple-choice options including “A. It is close to the building on the left; B. It is located in the upper right corner of the image; C. It is parked above a white car.” After completing the basic instruction transformation, we further expand the instructions based on the annotated images to enrich the sample diversity and volume. Specifically, we generate multiple descriptive variants based on two dimensions: semantic attributes (e.g., category, color, material) and spatial relations (e.g., neighboring objects, regional position). This strategy enriches the diversity of reasoning and question-answering samples. In addition, it strengthens the benchmark’s capacity to assess model generalization under diverse perceptual and reasoning conditions.

Stage 4: Manual Verification and Instruction Quality Control. To ensure the accuracy, clarity, and objectivity of all generated task instructions, we implemented a rigorous manual verification and filtering protocol. For visual grounding tasks, annotators verified whether each instruction could uniquely and accurately identify the intended target in the image. An instruction was retained only when all annotators independently localized the same target without accessing ground-truth labels. For visual reasoning and visual question answering tasks, each instruction was required to achieve an inter-annotator agreement rate of at least 90%, meaning a strong majority of evaluators provided consistent correct responses. Any samples exhibiting ambiguity, vague descriptions, or inconsistent answers were either refined or eliminated. This systematic quality control process significantly enhanced the reliability of the task samples, reduced semantic ambiguity in instructions, and established a robust and consistent benchmark for subsequent model evaluation and comparison.

C. Dataset Statistics

Table II provides a comparative analysis of AerialSense against existing UAV image perception datasets across multiple dimensions, including task coverage, number of images, sample size, object category diversity, and instruction length. All statistics are based on publicly available samples from the respective datasets. As illustrated in Fig. 8 (a), AerialSense demonstrates clear advantages in both comprehensiveness and research value.

- **Task Coverage:** AerialSense is the only dataset that simultaneously supports three core aerial perception tasks: Aerial Visual Reasoning, Aerial Visual Question Answering, and Aerial Visual Grounding. In contrast, existing datasets such as HurMic-VQA [68], FloodNet-VQA [69], and FloodNet-VQA V2.0 [70] are limited to VQA tasks, while refGeo and AerialVG focus exclusively on VG. By integrating multiple tasks within a unified framework, AerialSense enables the systematic evaluation of reasoning, question answering, and object localization capabilities, offering a comprehensive platform for multimodal UAV perception research.
- **Data Scale:** AerialSense significantly surpasses existing datasets in both sample quantity and task density. It comprises 7,119 UAV images and 53,374 task samples, substantially exceeding refGeo (26,482 samples) and AerialVG (4,723 samples). In particular, it includes 27,663 VQA samples—nearly three times the number in HurMic-VQA (9,591) and FloodNet-VQA (7,355). This extensive scale supports balanced task distribution and enhances evaluation reliability across diverse UAV perception scenarios.
- **Object Category Coverage:** AerialSense incorporates 40 distinct object categories, substantially exceeding the diversity of existing datasets such as refGeo (1 category), HurMic-VQA (4 categories), and AerialVG (26 categories). As illustrated in Fig. 8 (b), it covers a wide range of common UAV targets, including vehicles, buildings, and fine-grained land objects, enabling realistic and balanced evaluation of cross-scene generalization capability.
- **Image Resolution Diversity:** AerialSense exhibits broad coverage across multiple resolution scales, as illustrated in Fig. 8 (c). The dataset includes images ranging from 512×512 to 4000×2250, displaying a clear multi-peak distribution. Prominent peaks are observed at 3840×2160 and 512×512, representing high-resolution detailed scenes and standardized small-scale samples, respectively, with substantial representation also at medium resolutions such as 2000×1500. This multi-resolution design facilitates multi-scale target perception and provides a reliable basis for evaluating model adaptability under varying imaging conditions.
- **Instruction Complexity:** AerialSense exhibits a notable advantage in instruction length and linguistic complexity. The average instruction length is 20.76 words, far exceed-

TABLE II: Comparison between Different UAV Image Perception Task Datasets

Dataset Name	Task Types	Number of UAV Images	Number of Questions	Number of Target Categories	Average Word Count in Questions
HurMic-VQA [68]	VQA	3,197	9,591	4	7.11
FloodNet-VQA [69]	VQA	2,188	7,355	9	7.89
FloodNet-VQA V2.0 [70]	VQA	2,348	10,480	9	7.93
refGeo [62]	VG	623	26,482	1	5.58
AerialVG [60]	VG	4,211	4,723	26	19.75
AerialSense	VG, VQA, VR	7,119	53,374	40	20.76







Fig. 8: Statistical overview of the AerialSense dataset, including comparative analysis with existing datasets, question word cloud, and distributions of image resolutions and question lengths.

ing that of HurMic-VQA (7.11 words) and refGeo (5.58 words). As shown in Fig. 8 (d), instruction lengths are concentrated between 15 and 25 words, with a right-tailed distribution extending beyond 80 words. Furthermore, the word cloud in Fig. 8 (b) reveals that task instructions frequently emphasize key object attributes such as spatial position, object category, and functional state. This linguistic richness supports a thorough evaluation of models' natural language reasoning, visual understanding, and cross-modal alignment abilities in complex UAV perception scenarios.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

This paper presents AerialVP, a task prompt enhancement agent framework developed to improve VLM performance in UAV image perception. To systematically evaluate the proposed framework, we conducted comprehensive quantitative and qualitative experiments addressing the following research questions:

Q1. Can enhanced task prompts alone significantly improve the performance of VLMs in UAV image perception tasks?

Q2. Do enhanced prompts enable more precise alignment between visual and textual tokens, thereby guiding the model to focus more accurately on task-relevant regions within the

TABLE III: Experimental results on Aerial Visual Grounding (VG) tasks

Task Model	Semantic Enhancement	Spatial Position Enhancement	Spatial Relationship Enhancement	Acc	Mean IoU
<i>Proprietary Models</i>					
GPT-4o	×	×	×	2.04%	3.69%
	✓	✓	✓	45.05%	41.26%
GPT-4.1	×	×	×	3.60%	11.91%
	✓	✓	✓	49.28%	44.87%
Gemini-2.0	×	×	×	10.17%	14.99%
	✓	✓	✓	51.09%	46.22%
Claude-3.7	×	×	×	8.80%	12.94%
	✓	✓	✓	44.93%	41.08%
Qwen2.5-Max	×	×	×	1.22%	7.17%
	✓	✓	✓	43.87%	39.87%
<i>Open-Source Models</i>					
InternVL3-8B	×	×	×	2.40%	7.38%
	✓	✓	✓	14.21%	14.50%
InternVL3-14B	×	×	×	11.62%	18.36%
	✓	✓	✓	26.59%	24.48%
SAILVL-8B	×	×	×	6.15%	10.93%
	✓	✓	✓	34.23%	31.82%
Qwen2-VL-7B	×	×	×	17.94%	19.43%
	✓	✓	✓	37.94%	34.79%
LLaVA-OneVision-7B	×	×	×	8.63%	14.26%
	✓	✓	✓	38.65%	35.69%
LLaVA-1.5-7B	×	×	×	7.60%	13.57%
	✓	✓	✓	22.88%	21.61%

image?

Q3. What are the respective contributions of semantic, spatial position, and spatial relationship enhancement information to performance improvement within the AerialVP framework?

A. Implementation Details

(1) Evaluation Models: To thoroughly evaluate the performance enhancement brought by AerialVP to VLMs, we selected a diverse set of both proprietary and open-source models, covering state-of-the-art and representative baselines. The proprietary models include GPT-4o, GPT-4.1, Gemini-2.0, and Claude-3.7, while the open-source models comprise Qwen2.5-Max, InternVL3-8B/14B, SAILVL-8B, Qwen2-VL-7B [71], LLaVA-OneVision-7B [72], and LLaVA-1.5-7B. To clearly attribute performance improvements to specific components of the framework, we adopted a controlled experimental configuration: the Task Engine is implemented using GPT-4.1, while the Tool Repository integrates fixed modules—all Prompt Analysis Tools use GPT-4o, the Semantic Description Tool uses DAM, the Spatial Position Description Tool employs YoloWorld-X, and the Spatial Relationship Description Tool leverages SpaceOm. Each tool category includes only one registered model in this evaluation to ensure reproducibility and controllability.

(2) Evaluation Metrics: For Aerial Visual Reasoning and Aerial Visual Question Answering tasks where outputs are deterministic, Accuracy is adopted as the primary evaluation metric. For the Aerial Visual Grounding task, given the inherent subjectivity in bounding box annotations, we compute the Intersection over Union (IoU) between model predictions and ground-truth boxes. Predictions are considered correct when IoU exceeds a predefined threshold β . In our experiments, this threshold is set to 0.5. Consequently, both Accuracy (the proportion of correctly localized instances) and Mean IoU (the average overlap across all samples) are used to provide a comprehensive assessment of grounding performance.

(3) Experimental Settings: To directly evaluate the impact of the AerialVP agent on VLM performance, we designed two comparative experimental configurations. In the Baseline Configuration, the evaluated VLM receives the original task prompt and UAV image as input and directly generates perception results. In the Prompt-Enhanced Configuration, the task prompt and UAV image are first processed by the AerialVP agent to produce an enhanced prompt, which is then provided to the same VLM along with the image to generate perception results. We performed both quantitative and qualitative experiments covering all three perception tasks in the AerialSense benchmark. Quantitative analysis compares

TABLE IV: Experimental results on Aerial Visual Reasoning (VR) and Aerial Visual Question Answering (VQA) tasks

Task Model	Semantic Enhancement	Spatial Relationship Enhancement	Acc(VR)	Acc(VQA)
<i>Proprietary Models</i>				
GPT-4o	×	×	50.72%	60.03%
	✓	✓	80.71%	80.53%
GPT-4.1	×	×	70.40%	82.94%
	✓	✓	90.32%	96.73%
Gemini-2.0	×	×	75.65%	73.82%
	✓	✓	90.40%	95.35%
Claude-3.7	×	×	62.78%	71.70%
	✓	✓	85.48%	90.38%
Qwen2.5-Max	×	×	77.03%	65.95%
	✓	✓	90.48%	77.54%
<i>Open-Source Models</i>				
InternVL3-8B	×	×	56.60%	74.91%
	✓	✓	78.85%	95.40%
InternVL3-14B	×	×	63.22%	74.93%
	✓	✓	80.30%	96.66%
SAILVL-8B	×	×	46.64%	25.84%
	✓	✓	73.84%	82.76%
Qwen2-VL-7B	×	×	56.40%	69.76%
	✓	✓	85.60%	93.74%
LLaVA-OneVision-7B	×	×	69.48%	73.37%
	✓	✓	83.91%	94.48%
LLaVA-1.5-7B	×	×	53.89%	51.64%
	✓	✓	90.44%	90.06%

model performance between the two configurations using the defined evaluation metrics, while qualitative assessment utilizes heatmap-based attention visualization [73] to examine how enhanced prompts alter the VLM’s visual attention patterns and influence perception performance.

B. Statistical Analysis of UAV Perception Results

As shown in Table III, we present the performance comparison of various VLMs under two configurations for the Aerial VG task, while Table IV reports the results for Aerial VR and Aerial VQA tasks. For each model, the two rows correspond to the results obtained with and without prompt enhancement.

Experimental results across the three UAV perception tasks clearly demonstrate that the task prompt enhancement mechanism in AerialVP significantly improves the overall performance of existing VLMs. As shown in Table III, the improvement is particularly prominent in the VG task. Most proprietary models exhibit substantial gains in both Accuracy and Mean IoU, with overall improvements concentrated between 30% and 45%. For example, the accuracy of GPT-4o increases from 2.04% to 45.05%, while that of Claude-3.7 rises from 8.80% to 44.93%. Similar trends can be observed in open-source models, such as Qwen2-VL-7B, whose accuracy improves from 17.94% to 37.94%. Overall, regardless of model type or configuration, the enhanced

prompts substantially improve the models’ spatial alignment and target localization performance. As illustrated in Fig. 9, the enhanced task prompts integrate semantic, spatial position, and spatial relationship information into the original prompt, enabling the models to better interpret task intent and focus on relevant targets. For instance, semantic and spatial relationship information direct the models’ attention to key objects (e.g., “*taxi3*” and “*taxi4*”), while spatial position information provides precise positional references. The experimental results demonstrate that enhanced prompts effectively improve the models’ ability to recognize and match targets in complex UAV scenes, significantly mitigating the ambiguity that occurs when models rely solely on original prompts.

The results presented in Table IV further validate the generality and robustness of the enhanced prompts in VR and VQA tasks. In VR, most proprietary models achieve accuracy improvements of over 20%, with some approaching 30%. For example, GPT-4.1 improves from 70.40% to 90.32%, representing an increase of about 20%. Open-source models also exhibit consistent gains, with Qwen2-VL-7B improving from 56.40% to 85.60%, an increase of approximately 29%. In the VQA task, this trend remains clear, with most models achieving improvements in the range of 15%-25%. These findings confirm that the prompt enhancement mechanism

Aerial Visual Grounding

Original Task Prompt: "Please provide the correct coordinates of the target based on the query: A blue taxi is parked on the road, with a red sedan at the bottom left it."

Prompt Analysis Result: "Task Type: Visual Grounding; Task Object: [taxi, sedan]; Enhancement Task Plan: [Spatial Position Description, Semantic Description, Spatial Relationship Description]."

Enhanced Task Prompt: "You are an assistant responsible for... Please provide the correct coordinates of the target based on the query: A blue taxi is parked on the road, with a red sedan at the bottom left it."

Here is some additional information:

Spatial Position Description: taxi1: (261, 831, 578, 1054); taxi2: (1088, 505, 1303, 751); taxi3: (1173, 1064, 1589, 1361); **taxi4: (1594, 707, 1868, 979)**

Semantic Description: taxi1 is ... **taxi3 is a red sedan with a sleek, aerodynamic design. The car features a four-door configuration ... taxi4 is a blue sedan with a roof-mounted taxi sign. It has a white "TAXI" sign on the roof and**

Spatial Relationship Description: taxi1 is ... **taxi3 is located at the bottom right corner of the image. taxi4 is located on the right side of the image**

Ground Truth: (1601, 712, 1872, 977)

Answer to Original Task Prompt vs. Answer to Enhanced Task Prompt:

- GPT-4.1: (1530, 726, 1764, 880) vs (1594, 707, 1868, 979)
- Claude-3.7: (1640, 765, 1840, 870) vs (1594, 707, 1868, 979)
- InternVL3-14B: (1620, 660, 1820, 1035) vs (1594, 707, 1868, 979)
- Qwen2-VL-7B: (1520, 735, 1860, 930) vs (1594, 707, 1868, 979)
- Gemini-2.0: (1620, 1185, 1940, 1380) vs (1594, 707, 1868, 979)
- Qwen2.5-Max: (400, 450, 1000, 900) vs (1088, 505, 1303, 751)
- SAILVL-8B: (1580, 600, 1840, 765) vs (1088, 505, 1303, 751)
- LLaVA-OneVision-7B: (1390, 723, 1834, 1107) vs (1594, 707, 1868, 979)

* Results marked with " _ " indicate that their calculated IoU with the Ground Truth is greater than 0.5, meaning they are correct answers.



Task Image

Fig. 9: Illustration of the Aerial Visual Grounding task guided by enhanced prompts. Experimental results demonstrate that the enhanced prompts enable most tested models to accurately locate the task targets.

Aerial Visual Reasoning

Original Task Prompt: "Please evaluate the correctness of the description regarding the object within the blue box, and respond with True or False: This building is L-shaped and white, and it is located at the top right corner of the image."

Prompt Analysis Result: "Task Type: Visual Reasoning; Task Object: [building]; Enhancement Task Plan: [Semantic Description, Spatial Relationship Description]."

Enhanced Task Prompt: "You are an assistant responsible for... Please evaluate the correctness of the description regarding the object within the blue box, and respond with True or False: This building is L-shaped and white, and it is located at the top right corner of the image."

Here is some additional information:

Semantic Description: The blue box highlights **a large L-shaped building with a white roof. The side of the building features multiple windows, and the wall surface shows areas of red and green. The front façade has a series of horizontal white bands, and there are several balconies with railings on the lower floors.**

Spatial Relationship Description: The target within the blue box is **located in the top-right corner of the image, surrounded by several buildings. It is positioned in the middle among the three buildings in the upper-right corner of the image.**

Ground Truth: True

Answer to Original Task Prompt vs. Answer to Enhanced Task Prompt:

- GPT-4.1: True vs True
- Gemini-2.0: False vs True
- Claude-3.7: True vs True
- Qwen2.5-Max: False vs True
- InternVL3-14B: False vs True
- SAILVL-8B: False vs True
- Qwen2-VL-7B: False vs True
- LLaVA-OneVision-7B: False vs True



Task Image with Marked Target

Fig. 10: Illustration of the Aerial Visual Reasoning task guided by prompt enhancement. The results indicate that the enhanced prompts help most tested models achieve more accurate perception of visual information.

consistently enhances multimodal reasoning and question-answering performance by improving semantic alignment and linguistic coherence. As shown in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11, AerialVP supplements the original task prompts in VR and VQA tasks with semantic and spatial relationship enhancement descriptions. Semantic information primarily characterizes the visual appearance and categorical attributes of targets, such as vehicle color or building structure, while spatial relationship information depicts relative positions and layout relationships, such as "the first vehicle moving downward" or "the L-shaped building in the upper-right corner." The combination of these two forms of information reinforces the models' perception of fine-grained object attributes, allowing them to establish more accurate semantic-spatial relationships and generate reasoning outcomes that better align with the task context. Overall, AerialVP significantly strengthens the models' image-text alignment and semantic reasoning capability, enabling them to

achieve higher accuracy and consistency under complex UAV imaging conditions.

The experimental results across the three tasks reveal three key observations that directly address our research questions:

Firstly, the prompt enhancement mechanism delivers stable and substantial performance improvements across both proprietary and open-source models. As evidenced in Table III and Table IV, models including GPT-4o, Claude-3.7, InternVL3-8B, and Qwen2-VL-7B all show significant accuracy gains ranging from 15% to 45%, regardless of their architectural differences or parameter scales. This consistent enhancement pattern indicates that the effectiveness of AerialVP stems not from model-specific optimizations but from its structured integration of spatial position, semantic, and spatial relationship information. By reformulating task semantics into enriched, context-aware representations, AerialVP guides VLMs toward clearer task interpretation and more reliable cross-modal alignment.

Aerial Visual Question Answering

Original Task Prompt: "Please answer the question regarding the object within the blue box in the image and provide the correct option: Which description accurately corresponds to the car in the blue box? A.From the bottom up on the left, the first vehicle facing downwards; B.From the bottom up on the left, the second vehicle facing downwards; C.The white car parked at the top right corner; D.The black car parked at the bottom left corner."

Prompt Analysis Result: "Task Type: Visual Question Answering; Task Object: [car]; Enhancement Task Plan: [Semantic Description, Spatial Relationship Description]."

Enhanced Task Prompt: "You are an assistant responsible for... Please answer the question regarding the object within the blue box in the image and provide the correct option: Which description accurately corresponds to the car in the blue box? A.From the bottom up on the left, the first vehicle facing downwards; B.From the bottom up on the left, the second vehicle facing downwards; C.The white car parked at the top right corner; D.The black car parked at the bottom left corner."

Here is some additional information:

Semantic Description: A stylish and modern white car with a slightly curved roof, light-colored windows, and a prominent front grille. **The vehicle is facing downward**, has a sleek and smooth overall profile, and is compact in size.

Spatial Relationship Description: The highlighted vehicle is located near the center of the image, slightly to the left. It is positioned in the left column of vehicles, fifth from the top and **second from the bottom**."

Ground Truth: B

Answer to Original Task Prompt vs. Answer to Enhanced Task Prompt:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • GPT-4.1: A vs B | • Gemini-2.0: A vs B | • Claude-3.7: A vs B | • Qwen2.5-Max: C vs B |
| • InternVL3-14B: A vs B | • SAILVL-8B: A vs B | • Qwen2-VL-7B: D vs B | • LLaVA-OneVision-7B: A vs B |



Task Image with Marked Target

Fig. 11: Illustration of the Aerial Visual Question Answering task guided by prompt enhancement. Similar to the Aerial Visual Reasoning task, the enhanced prompts improve the accuracy of image information perception for most tested models.

Secondly, the most notable improvements occur in tasks requiring precise target localization and spatial reasoning, particularly in visual grounding. Models achieve over 30% gains in Mean IoU under the enhanced configuration, as demonstrated in Table III. This underscores the critical role of explicit spatial position and spatial relationship cues in addressing inherent challenges of UAV imagery—such as oblique viewpoints, scale variance, and cluttered scenes. Enhanced prompts mitigate localization ambiguity by establishing object-level relationships and offering fine-grained references, leading to more discriminative and interpretable perception under complex conditions.

Thirdly, enhanced prompts significantly bolster models' capacity for multi-step reasoning and saliency-aware analysis in VR and VQA tasks. As shown in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11, the incorporation of semantic attributes and spatial layouts assists models in constructing coherent reasoning chains—from recognizing key objects and their properties to inferring functional or positional relationships. This reduces dependence on brief or ambiguous instructions and fosters more structured, context-grounded inference. The result is not only higher accuracy but also improved logical consistency, especially in multi-object scenarios.

These results provide a clear answer to Q1: the task prompt enhancement mechanism demonstrates strong generality and stability in UAV image perception tasks, significantly improving the perception capability of VLMs across all three task types. By systematically integrating spatial position, semantic, and spatial relationship information into enhanced prompts, AerialVP enables models to establish more accurate cross-modal alignment, achieve finer-grained spatial understanding, and conduct more coherent semantic reasoning. This approach offers a practical and scalable pathway toward robust UAV image perception in complex aerial scenarios, without requiring additional model training.

C. Qualitative Analysis Based on Attention Heatmaps

In addition to quantitative experiments, we conducted attention heatmap analysis to address Q2, using LLaVA-1.5-7B as the test model across Aerial VG, VR, and VQA tasks.

Firstly, the results demonstrate that enhanced task prompts significantly improve the model's focus on task-relevant targets in all three UAV perception tasks. In Aerial VG (Fig. 12), models using original prompts show dispersed attention across irrelevant areas, failing to consistently localize correct regions. For example, when identifying the "blue taxi" and its reference object "red sedan", attention is scattered among multiple vehicles under original prompts. With enhanced prompts, however, the model accurately localizes both targets and maintains stable focus, achieving clearer image-text alignment. Similar improvements are observed in Aerial VR and VQA tasks (Fig. 13), where enhanced prompts guide precise attention to key objects like the "red bus" and "small blue boat", confirming that prompt enhancement stabilizes and concentrates visual attention on task-critical regions.

Secondly, enhanced prompts strengthen the model's perception of auxiliary reference objects that support reasoning and localization. In Aerial VG, when identifying the "blue taxi" and reference "red sedan", the model not only focuses on the primary target but also correctly attends to the auxiliary reference object. This improved capacity to capture inter-object relationships enables more precise spatial disambiguation in dense urban scenes. Comparable effects are seen in Aerial VR and VQA tasks, where enhanced prompts facilitate recognition of contextual anchors such as neighboring objects and relative spatial positions. This expanded attention to auxiliary references enhances visual-semantic grounding and reduces errors caused by ambiguous or overlapping targets, demonstrating that prompt enhancement provides comprehensive contextual guidance for improved interpretability and reasoning accuracy.

The heatmap analysis provides clear evidence support-




Fig. 12: Heatmap visualization of the Aerial Visual Grounding task on the LLaVA-1.5-7B model. (a) Task Description; (b) UAV Image with Ground Truth; (c) UAV Image with Answer to Original Task Prompt; (d) UAV Image with Answer to Enhanced Task Prompt; (e) Heatmap to Original Task Prompt; (f) Heatmap to Enhanced Task Prompt. The information below (b) represents the ground-truth answer, while the information below (c) and (d) shows the model’s responses to the corresponding task prompts.




Fig. 13: Heatmap visualization of the Aerial Visual Reasoning and Aerial Visual Question Answering tasks on the LLaVA-1.5-7B model. (a) Task UAV Image; (b) VR Task Description (the information in brackets indicates the correct answer); (c) Heatmap to Original VR Task Prompt; (d) Heatmap to Enhanced VR Task Prompt; (e) VQA Task Description (the bolded option indicates the correct answer); (f) Heatmap to Original VQA Task Prompt; (g) Heatmap to Enhanced VQA Task Prompt.

ing Q2: enhanced task prompts enable more precise visual-textual token alignment by effectively guiding the model’s attention toward task-relevant regions in UAV imagery. This improvement not only reduces random visual attention but also enhances spatial alignment and region correspondence. These findings confirm that the prompt enhancement mechanism improves not only model accuracy but also the interpretability and reliability of its reasoning process.

D. Ablation Study

In this ablation study, we systematically modified the analysis prompts within the AerialVP agent to regulate the types of enhancement tasks required for the three UAV perception tasks. Using proprietary Qwen2.5-Max and open-source Qwen2-VL-7B as test models, we evaluated the individual and combined contributions of spatial position, semantic, and spatial relationship enhancement tools. The detailed results are presented in Table V and Table VI.

Firstly, the Aerial VG results in Table V reveal distinct effects of different enhancement tools. The spatial position tool

TABLE V: Ablation Study on Aerial Visual Grounding tasks

Task Model	Semantic Enhancement	Spatial Position Enhancement	Spatial Relationship Enhancement	Acc	Mean IoU
<i>Proprietary Models</i>					
Qwen2.5-Max	×	×	×	1.22%	7.17%
	✓	×	×	7.18%	6.34%
	×	✓	×	22.40%	19.85%
	×	×	✓	0.07%	0.14%
	✓	✓	×	38.33%	33.88%
	×	✓	✓	24.93%	22.07%
	✓	✓	✓	43.87%	39.87%
<i>Open-Source Models</i>					
Qwen2-VL-7B	×	×	×	17.94%	19.43%
	✓	×	×	23.73%	21.04%
	×	✓	×	27.70%	24.64%
	×	×	✓	4.92%	6.80%
	✓	✓	×	32.17%	28.57%
	×	✓	✓	21.57%	19.37%
	✓	✓	✓	37.94%	34.79%

TABLE VI: Ablation Study on Aerial Visual Reasoning (VR) and Aerial Visual Question Answering (VQA) tasks

Task Model	Semantic Enhancement	Spatial Relationship Enhancement	Acc(VR)	Acc(VQA)
<i>Proprietary Models</i>				
Qwen2.5-Max	×	×	77.03%	65.95%
	✓	×	87.29%	73.66%
	×	✓	82.71%	70.66%
	✓	✓	90.48%	77.54%
<i>Open-Source Models</i>				
Qwen2-VL-7B	×	×	56.40%	69.76%
	✓	×	76.17%	88.06%
	×	✓	65.69%	76.57%
	✓	✓	85.60%	93.74%

brings the most substantial improvement, typically increasing Accuracy and Mean IoU by 10%–20%. This demonstrates that spatial position information provides essential constraints for precise region localization in complex UAV scenes. In contrast, the spatial relationship tool alone not only fails to enhance performance but even causes degradation—as seen with Qwen2.5-Max, where both Accuracy and IoU dropped below baseline. This indicates that spatial relationship descriptions require support from spatial position and semantic information; without such priors, they may introduce noise and hinder alignment. When the spatial position tool is combined with the semantic tool, performance further improves by 15%–25%, confirming that semantic attributes effectively complement positional cues. Integrating all three tools yields the best results, with additional gains of approximately 5% in Accuracy and 4–6% in IoU, highlighting the synergistic effect of multi-dimensional enhancements.

Secondly, in Aerial VR and VQA tasks (Table VI), both semantic and spatial relationship tools significantly enhance performance, though to varying degrees. For Qwen2.5-Max, adding the semantic tool raises VR accuracy from 77.03% to 87.29% and VQA accuracy from 65.95% to 73.66%, while the spatial relationship tool alone improves VR to 82.71% and VQA to 70.66%. A similar trend is observed with Qwen2-VL-7B. This variation reflects task design characteristics: semantic enhancement excels in tasks emphasizing object attributes, whereas spatial relationship enhancement contributes more to relational reasoning. When both tools are combined, performance surpasses that of individual configurations, demonstrating their complementary nature in supporting integrated semantic-spatial reasoning.

This ablation study provides a clear answer to Q3 by validating the distinct and complementary roles of the three enhancement types. The spatial position tool is most crit-

TABLE VII: Performance Improvements of Different VLMs on UAV Perception Tasks under Enhanced Task Prompts

Model	Acc (VG)	Mean IoU (VG)	Acc (VR)	Acc (VQA)
<i>Proprietary Models</i>				
GPT-4o	+43.01%	+37.57%	+29.99%	+20.50%
GPT-4.1	+45.68%	+32.96%	+19.92%	+13.79%
Gemini-2.0	+40.92%	+31.23%	+14.75%	+21.53%
Claude-3.7	+36.13%	+28.14%	+22.70%	+18.68%
Qwen2.5-Max	+42.65%	+32.70%	+13.45%	+11.59%
<i>Open-Source Models</i>				
InternVL3-8B	+11.81%	+7.12%	+22.25%	+20.49%
InternVL3-14B	+14.97%	+6.12%	+17.08%	+21.73%
SAILVL-8B	+28.08%	+20.89%	+27.20%	+56.92%
Qwen2-VL-7B	+20.00%	+15.36%	+29.20%	+23.98%
LLaVA-OneVision-7B	+30.02%	+21.43%	+14.43%	+21.11%
LLaVA-1.5-7B	+15.28%	+8.04%	+36.55%	+38.42%

ical for grounding tasks, offering essential position priors; the semantic tool enhances discriminative capability through fine-grained descriptions; and the spatial relationship tool strengthens relational understanding in multi-object scenarios. While each tool alone brings limited gains, their integration yields substantial synergistic improvements, confirming the effectiveness and necessity of AerialVP’s multi-dimensional enhancement mechanism for robust UAV perception.

VII. DISCUSSION

A. Relationship Between Prompt Enhancement and the Reasoning Ability of Different VLMs

The AerialVP framework is designed to enhance the structure and informational richness of task prompts, while relying on external VLMs such as GPT-4o and Qwen2.5-Max to perform the final perception and reasoning. Since the effectiveness of these enhanced prompts inherently depends on each VLM’s comprehension and inference capabilities, it is essential to analyze how different models respond to such structural improvements. Based on the quantitative results in [Section VI-B](#), we statistically evaluated the performance variation across multiple VLMs on three UAV perception tasks, measuring the relative gains achieved under the enhanced prompt configuration. These results are summarized in [Table VII](#).

Firstly, all evaluated models exhibited substantial performance improvements across tasks. Without any model retraining, the prompt enhancement approach consistently activated latent perceptual capabilities in each VLM. For instance, both GPT-4o and Qwen2-VL-7B achieved marked accuracy gains in all UAV perception tasks. This suggests that large-scale pre-trained VLMs inherently possess cross-modal alignment abilities that can be effectively elicited through structured prompt enhancement rather than parameter updates. This outcome highlights a promising research direction: improving

VLM performance through inference-stage prompting rather than conventional finetuning-based approaches.

Secondly, the degree of improvement is closely tied to the model’s intrinsic reasoning capacity. High-capacity proprietary models such as GPT-4o, GPT-4.1, and Gemini-2.0 achieved performance gains exceeding 40% in Aerial Visual Grounding, along with consistent improvements in reasoning and question-answering tasks. These models demonstrate a superior ability to interpret and utilize spatial, semantic, and relational information embedded in the enhanced prompts, resulting in more accurate cross-modal alignment. By contrast, open-source models with relatively weaker reasoning and instruction-following abilities showed more modest gains, generally below 30%, particularly in complex tasks such as VG and VR.

B. The Effect of Tool Selection on Model Performance Improvement

Within the AerialVP framework, enhancement tools serve as core components for generating enriched task prompts, with their performance directly determining the quality of the enhanced information and the resulting perception accuracy. Benefiting from the framework’s modular architecture, different tools can be flexibly interchanged, enabling systematic investigation into how tool selection influences overall performance. To examine this relationship, we conducted comparative experiments on the Aerial Visual Grounding task, replacing the semantic, spatial position, and spatial relationship tools with functionally equivalent alternatives under identical enhancement settings. The corresponding results are summarized in [Tables VIII - X](#), with representative visualizations provided in [Fig. 14](#).

Firstly, the experimental results reveal that tool selection leads to significant performance variations, with gaps between configurations reaching 5–15%. This underscores the decisive role of tool capability in determining AerialVP’s

TABLE VIII: Comparison between Different **Semantic Tools** on Visual Grounding tasks

Task Model	Prompt Enhancement Tool			Acc	Mean IoU
	Semantic	Spatial Position	Spatial Relationship		
Proprietary Models					
GPT-4.1	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	49.28%	44.87%
	LLaVA-1.5-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	44.00%	40.56%
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	47.58%	43.39%
Gemini-2.0	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	51.09%	46.22%
	LLaVA-1.5-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	46.55%	42.27%
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	48.74%	44.12%
Qwen2.5-Max	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	43.87%	39.87%
	LLaVA-1.5-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	37.33%	34.39%
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	41.45%	37.83%
Open-Source Models					
InternVL3-14B	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	26.59%	24.48%
	LLaVA-1.5-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	23.43%	21.84%
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	24.95%	23.16%
SAILVL-8B	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	34.23%	31.82%
	LLaVA-1.5-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	32.72%	30.65%
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	33.37%	31.20%

TABLE IX: Comparison between Different **Spatial Position Tools** on Visual Grounding tasks

Task Model	Prompt Enhancement Tool			Acc	Mean IoU
	Semantic	Spatial Position	Spatial Relationship		
Proprietary Models					
GPT-4.1	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	49.28%	44.87%
	DAM	Grounding-DINO	SpaceOm	40.21%	37.21%
Gemini-2.0	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	51.09%	46.22%
	DAM	Grounding-DINO	SpaceOm	42.65%	38.90%
Qwen2.5-Max	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	43.87%	39.87%
	DAM	Grounding-DINO	SpaceOm	35.62%	32.89%
Open-Source Models					
InternVL3-14B	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	26.59%	24.48%
	DAM	Grounding-DINO	SpaceOm	21.64%	20.18%
SAILVL-8B	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	34.23%	31.82%
	DAM	Grounding-DINO	SpaceOm	30.78%	28.81%

enhancement effectiveness. As shown in Table IX, YoloWorld-X outperforms Grounding-DINO by approximately 8–10% in both Accuracy and IoU when integrated with GPT-4.1 or Gemini-2.0. Table VIII indicates that DAM achieves stronger gains than the LLaVA series in semantic enhancement, while Table X shows that LLaVA exhibits superior performance to SpaceOm in spatial relationship modeling. These findings collectively confirm that more capable tools enable AerialVP to deliver more effective and consistent perception improvements through higher-quality auxiliary information.

Secondly, the magnitude of improvement strongly depends

on the granularity and quality of the descriptions generated by each tool. As visualized in Fig. 14 (a), YoloWorld-X provides more comprehensive spatial position coverage, ensuring that relevant objects are captured for downstream reasoning, whereas Grounding-DINO frequently misses small or occluded targets, resulting in incomplete enhancement inputs. For semantic enhancement (Fig. 14 (b)), DAM produces fine-grained descriptions encompassing category, color, and neighboring relations, while LLaVA’s more generic outputs offer weaker discriminative power. In spatial relationship enhancement (Fig. 14 (c)), LLaVA generates context-aware

TABLE X: Comparison between Different **Spatial Relationship Tools** on Visual Grounding tasks

Task Model	Prompt Enhancement Tool			Acc	Mean IoU
	Semantic	Spatial Position	Spatial Relationship		
Proprietary Models					
GPT-4.1	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	49.28%	44.87%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-1.5-7B	62.00%	55.53%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	58.32%	52.64%
Gemini-2.0	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	51.09%	46.22%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-1.5-7B	59.58%	53.48%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	58.36%	52.50%
Qwen2.5-Max	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	43.87%	39.87%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-1.5-7B	49.52%	44.75%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	49.81%	44.85%
Open-Source Models					
InternVL3-14B	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	26.59%	24.48%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-1.5-7B	30.32%	27.73%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	33.37%	30.23%
SAILVL-8B	DAM	YoloWorld-X	SpaceOm	34.23%	31.82%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-1.5-7B	38.04%	35.20%
	DAM	YoloWorld-X	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	38.15%	35.41%

expressions such as “next to” or “in the upper right”, whereas SpaceOm primarily supplies absolute distance information with limited semantic integration. These observations validate that fine-grained, semantically coherent, and context-sensitive descriptions are crucial for enhancing cross-modal alignment and reasoning performance.

VIII. CONCLUSION

To address the challenge of image–text alignment inconsistency in UAV image perception, this paper introduces AerialVP, an intelligent agent framework for task prompt enhancement. The framework integrates an LLM-based Task Engine with a modular Tool Repository to systematically incorporate spatial position, semantic, and spatial relationship information into enhanced task prompts. This approach significantly strengthens the perception and reasoning capabilities of VLMs when processing complex UAV imagery. Unlike model-centric UAV perception frameworks, AerialVP operates without additional model training, supports flexible adaptation across different VLM architectures, and enables task-specific tool composition.

To support comprehensive evaluation of UAV perception models, we constructed AerialSense, a multi-task benchmark encompassing Aerial Visual Reasoning, Aerial Visual Question Answering, and Aerial Visual Grounding. Compared to existing datasets, AerialSense offers greater diversity in data distribution, broader object category coverage, and higher scene complexity. Extensive experiments demonstrate that the enhanced prompts generated by AerialVP substantially improve VLM performance across all three perception tasks. By

refining the alignment between visual and textual representations, the framework enhances VLM accuracy, robustness, and interpretability in object recognition, semantic reasoning, and spatial relationship understanding. The modular architecture of AerialVP further enables flexible component integration and extension, providing a scalable solution for perception enhancement in low-altitude remote sensing and UAV-based intelligent systems.

Despite these contributions, AerialVP has certain limitations that warrant discussion. Firstly, the quality of enhanced prompts remains dependent on the performance of constituent tools, which may restrict applicability in resource-constrained scenarios. Secondly, the current validation covers a limited range of task types and operational environments, necessitating further investigation into the framework’s scalability under more complex multi-task conditions. Future work will expand AerialVP to support broader UAV perception tasks through integration of more diverse tools and prompt generation strategies, while developing adaptive enhancement mechanisms to improve generalizability across scenarios. These directions are expected to further enhance cross-modal alignment efficiency and strengthen comprehensive perception capabilities for next-generation UAV intelligence.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Wang, W. Li, X. Liu, N. Li, and C. Zhang, “Uav environmental perception and autonomous obstacle avoidance: A deep learning and depth camera combined solution,” *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, vol. 175, p. 105523, 2020.
- [2] G. Xu, W. Jiang, Z. Wang, and Y. Wang, “Autonomous obstacle avoidance and target tracking of uav based on deep reinforcement learning,” *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 104, no. 4, p. 60, 2022.




Fig. 14: Description comparison of different enhancement tools in the Aerial Visual Grounding task. For clear visualization of enhancement effects, each subfigure highlights representative targets (e.g., “taxi3” and “taxi4” in (a)) that critically influence task performance.

- [3] J. Li, Y. Xiong, and J. She, “Uav path planning for target coverage task in dynamic environment,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 20, pp. 17734–17745, 2023.
- [4] H. Li, C. Xu, W. Yang, L. Mi, H. Yu, H. Zhang, and G.-S. Xia, “Unsupervised multi-view uav image geo-localization via iterative rendering,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2025.
- [5] H. Fang, L. Ding, L. Wang, Y. Chang, L. Yan, and J. Han, “Infrared small uav target detection based on depthwise separable residual dense network and multiscale feature fusion,” *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 71, pp. 1–20, 2022.
- [6] L. Jiang, B. Yuan, J. Du, B. Chen, H. Xie, J. Tian, and Z. Yuan, “Mffsodnet: Multiscale feature fusion small object detection network for uav aerial images,” *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 73, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [7] J. Ye, C. Fu, G. Zheng, Z. Cao, and B. Li, “Darklighter: Light up the darkness for uav tracking,” in *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 3079–3085.
- [8] C. Fu, H. Dong, J. Ye, G. Zheng, S. Li, and J. Zhao, “Highlightnet: Highlighting low-light potential features for real-time uav tracking,” in *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 12 146–12 153.
- [9] Z. Qiu, T. Gong, Z. Liang, T. Chen, R. Cong, H. Bai, and Y. Zhao, “Perception-oriented uav image dehazing based on super-pixel scene prior,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 62, pp. 1–19, 2024.
- [10] W. Pikun, W. Ling, Q. Jiangxin, and D. Jiashuai, “Unmanned aerial vehicles object detection based on image haze removal under sea fog conditions,” *IET Image Processing*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 2709–2721, 2022.
- [11] J. Xu, X. Fan, H. Jian, C. Xu, W. Bei, Q. Ge, T. Zhao, and R. Han, “Tamt: Text-guided attention multi-modal transformer for object detection in uav images,” *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, vol. 227, pp. 170–184, 2025.
- [12] A. Rouhi, S. Arezoomandian, R. Kapoor, J. Klohoker, S. Patal, P. Shah, H. Umare, and D. Han, “An overview of deep learning in uav perception,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [13] A. Bouguettaya, H. Zarzour, A. Kechida, and A. M. Taberkit, “Deep learning techniques to classify agricultural crops through uav imagery: A review,” *Neural computing and applications*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 9511–9536, 2022.
- [14] A. Couturier and M. A. Akhloufi, “A review on deep learning for uav absolute visual localization,” *Drones*, vol. 8, no. 11, p. 622, 2024.
- [15] X. Weng, C. Pang, and G.-S. Xia, “Vision-language modeling meets remote sensing: Models, datasets, and perspectives,” *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Magazine*, 2025.
- [16] J. Ye, J. He, X. Zhang, Y. Lin, H. Lin, C. He, and W. Li, “Satellite image synthesis from street view with fine-grained spatial textual guidance: A novel framework,” *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Magazine*, 2025.
- [17] Y. Hu, Y. Zhou, Z. Zhu, X. Yang, H. Zhang, K. Bian, and H. Han, “Llvm-drone: A synergistic framework integrating large language models and vision models for visual tasks in unmanned aerial vehicles,” *Knowledge-Based Systems*, p. 114190, 2025.
- [18] H. Wu, W. Mu, D. Zhong, Z. Du, H. Li, and C. Tao, “Farmseg_vlm: A farmland remote sensing image segmentation method considering vision-language alignment,” *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, vol. 225, pp. 423–439, 2025.
- [19] F. Lin, Y. Tian, Y. Wang, T. Zhang, X. Zhang, and F.-Y. Wang, “Airvista: Empowering uavs with 3d spatial reasoning abilities through a multi-modal large language model agent,” in *2024 IEEE 27th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 476–481.
- [20] K. Zhang, L. Wu, K. Yu, G. Lv, and D. Zhang, “Evaluating and improving robustness in large language models: A survey and future directions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.11111*, 2025.
- [21] Y. Zeng, X. Zhang, H. Li, J. Wang, J. Zhang, and W. Zhou, “X²-VLM: All-in-one pre-trained model for vision-language tasks,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 3156–3168, 2023.
- [22] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International conference on machine learning*. Pmlr, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [23] Z. Yang, Y. Tian, L. Wang, and J. Zhang, “Enhancing generalization in camera trap image recognition: Fine-tuning visual language models,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 634, p. 129826, 2025.
- [24] H. Hu, J. Zuo, Y. Lou, Y. Cui, J. Wang, N. Guan, J. Wang, Y.-H. Li, and C. J. Xue, “Vlm-c4l: Continual core dataset learning with corner case optimization via vision-language models for autonomous driving,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23046*, 2025.
- [25] T. Wu, M. Li, J. Chen, W. Ji, W. Lin, J. Gao, K. Kuang, Z. Zhao, and

- F. Wu, "Semantic alignment for multimodal large language models," in *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2024, pp. 3489–3498.
- [26] T.-D. Truong, H.-T. Tran, T. T. Son, B. Raj, and K. Luu, "Directed-tokens: A robust multi-modality alignment approach to large language-vision models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.14264*, 2025.
- [27] M. Guo, M. Wu, Y. Shen, H. Li, and C. Tao, "Ifship: Interpretable fine-grained ship classification with domain knowledge-enhanced vision-language models," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 166, p. 111672, 2025.
- [28] Y. Zeng, X. Zhang, and H. Li, "Multi-grained vision language pre-training: Aligning texts with visual concepts," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.08276*, 2021.
- [29] Z. Li, X. Wu, H. Du, F. Liu, H. Nghiem, and G. Shi, "A survey of state of the art large vision language models: Alignment, benchmark, evaluations and challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02189*, 2025.
- [30] D. Wang, J. Cui, M. Li, W. Lin, B. Chen, and H. Zhang, "Instruction tuning-free visual token complement for multimodal llms," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 446–462.
- [31] X. Xiao, B. Wu, J. Wang, C. Li, H. Guo *et al.*, "Seeing the image: Prioritizing visual correlation by contrastive alignment," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 30 925–30 950, 2024.
- [32] C. Sitaula, Y. Xiang, S. Aryal, and X. Lu, "Scene image representation by foreground, background and hybrid features," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 182, p. 115285, 2021.
- [33] J. Dong, P. Koniusz, Y. Zhang, H. Zhu, W. Liu, X. Qu, and Y.-S. Ong, "Improving zero-shot adversarial robustness in vision-language models by closed-form alignment of adversarial path simplices," in *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [34] J. Yan, X. Guan, W.-S. Zheng, H. Chen, and R. Wang, "Global and local vision-language alignment for few-shot learning and few-shot ood detection," in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2025, pp. 208–218.
- [35] Y. Wang, J. Guan, J. Liang, and R. He, "Do we really need curated malicious data for safety alignment in multi-modal large language models?" in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 19 879–19 889.
- [36] Z. Zhang, S. Yadav, F. Han, and E. Shutova, "Cross-modal information flow in multimodal large language models," in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 19 781–19 791.
- [37] O. Kaduri, S. Bagon, and T. Dekel, "What's in the image? a deep-dive into the vision of vision language models," in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 14 549–14 558.
- [38] M. Sclar, Y. Choi, Y. Tsvetkov, and A. Suhr, "Quantifying language models' sensitivity to spurious features in prompt design or: How i learned to start worrying about prompt formatting," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11324*, 2023.
- [39] X. Zhang, J. Cao, C. You, and D. Ding, "Why prompt design matters and works: A complexity analysis of prompt search space in llms," in *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2025, pp. 32 525–32 555.
- [40] M. Maniparambil, R. Akshulakov, Y. A. D. Djilali, M. El Amine Seddik, S. Narayan, K. Mangalam, and N. E. O'Connor, "Do vision and language encoders represent the world similarly?" in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 14 334–14 343.
- [41] L. Zhang, Q. Yang, and A. Agrawal, "Assessing and learning alignment of unimodal vision and language models," in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 14 604–14 614.
- [42] Y. Gao, J. Chen, and M. Li, "Vlms bridging-enhanced scene semantic reasoning framework for image-text matching," in *Proceedings of the 2025 International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, 2025, pp. 330–339.
- [43] C. Xie, B. Wang, F. Kong, J. Li, D. Liang, G. Zhang, D. Leng, and Y. Yin, "Fg-clip: Fine-grained visual and textual alignment," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05071*, 2025.
- [44] W. Zhang, Y. Zhang, J. Lin, B. Huang, J. Zhang, and W. Yu, "Dc-clip: Multilingual clip compression via vision-language distillation and vision-language alignment," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 164, p. 111547, 2025.
- [45] I. Corley, S. F. Nsutezo, A. Ortiz, C. Robinson, R. Dodhia, J. M. L. Ferres, and P. Najafirad, "Flavars: A multimodal foundational language and vision alignment model for remote sensing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08490*, 2025.
- [46] F. Zhang, T. Zhou, J. Yao, Y. Zhang, I. W. Tsang, and Y. Wang, "Decouple before align: Visual disentanglement enhances prompt tuning," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2025.
- [47] O. Saha, G. Van Horn, and S. Maji, "Improved zero-shot classification by adapting vlms with text descriptions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2024, pp. 17 542–17 552.
- [48] L. Yang, Y. Wang, X. Li, X. Wang, and J. Yang, "Fine-grained visual prompting," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 24 993–25 006, 2023.
- [49] L. Yang, X. Li, Y. Wang, X. Wang, and J. Yang, "Fine-grained visual text prompting," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [50] S. Nasiriany, F. Xia, W. Yu, T. Xiao, J. Liang, I. Dasgupta, A. Xie, D. Driess, A. Wahid, Z. Xu *et al.*, "Pivot: Iterative visual prompting elicits actionable knowledge for vlms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07872*, 2024.
- [51] K. Zhu, Z. Qin, H. Yi, Z. Jiang, Q. Lao, S. Zhang, and K. Li, "Guiding medical vision-language models with explicit visual prompts: Framework design and comprehensive exploration of prompt variations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02385*, 2025.
- [52] D. Wu, W. Han, Y. Liu, T. Wang, C.-z. Xu, X. Zhang, and J. Shen, "Language prompt for autonomous driving," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 39, no. 8, 2025, pp. 8359–8367.
- [53] Y. Cao, X. Xu, Y. Cheng, C. Sun, Z. Du, L. Gao, and W. Shen, "Personalizing vision-language models with hybrid prompts for zero-shot anomaly detection," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2025.
- [54] M. J. Mirza, L. Karlinsky, W. Lin, S. Doveh, J. Micorek, M. Kozinski, H. Kuehne, and H. Possegger, "Meta-prompting for automating zero-shot visual recognition with llms," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 370–387.
- [55] B. Zhao, Z. Wang, J. Fang, C. Gao, F. Man, J. Cui, X. Wang, X. Chen, Y. Li, and W. Zhu, "Embodied-r: Collaborative framework for activating embodied spatial reasoning in foundation models via reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2025, pp. 11 071–11 080.
- [56] X. Hou, Y. Zhao, S. Wang, and H. Wang, "Model context protocol (mcp): Landscape, security threats, and future research directions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23278*, 2025.
- [57] L. Lian, Y. Ding, Y. Ge, S. Liu, H. Mao, B. Li, M. Pavone, M.-Y. Liu, T. Darrell, A. Yala *et al.*, "Describe anything: Detailed localized image and video captioning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.16072*, 2025.
- [58] T. Cheng, L. Song, Y. Ge, W. Liu, X. Wang, and Y. Shan, "Yolo-world: Real-time open-vocabulary object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2024, pp. 16 901–16 911.
- [59] B. Chen, Z. Xu, S. Kirmani, B. Ichter, D. Sadigh, L. Guibas, and F. Xia, "Spatialvlm: Endowing vision-language models with spatial reasoning capabilities," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 14 455–14 465.
- [60] J. Liu, Q. Chen, Z. Wang, Y. Tang, Y. Zhang, C. Yan, D. Wang, X. Li, and B. Zhao, "Aerialvg: A challenging benchmark for aerial visual grounding by exploring positional relations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07836*, 2025.
- [61] P. Zhu, L. Wen, D. Du, X. Bian, H. Fan, Q. Hu, and H. Ling, "Detection and tracking meet drones challenge," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 7380–7399, 2021.
- [62] Y. Zhou, M. Lan, X. Li, L. Feng, Y. Ke, X. Jiang, Q. Li, X. Yang, and W. Zhang, "Geoground: A unified large vision-language model for remote sensing visual grounding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11904*, 2024.
- [63] K. Kuckreja, M. S. Danish, M. Naseer, A. Das, S. Khan, and F. S. Khan, "Geochat: Grounded large vision-language model for remote sensing," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 27 831–27 840.
- [64] X. Li, J. Ding, and M. Elhoseiny, "Vrsbench: A versatile vision-language benchmark dataset for remote sensing image understanding," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 3229–3242, 2024.

- [65] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo *et al.*, “Segment anything,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2023, pp. 4015–4026.
- [66] K. Ye, H. Tang, B. Liu, P. Dai, L. Cao, and R. Ji, “More clear, more flexible, more precise: A comprehensive oriented object detection benchmark for uav,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.20032*, 2025.
- [67] Z. Zheng, Y. Wei, and Y. Yang, “University-1652: A multi-view multi-source benchmark for drone-based geo-localization,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 2020, pp. 1395–1403.
- [68] A. Sarkar and M. Rahnemounfar, “Vqa-aid: Visual question answering for post-disaster damage assessment and analysis,” in *2021 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium IGARSS*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 8660–8663.
- [69] M. Rahnemounfar, T. Chowdhury, A. Sarkar, D. Varshney, M. Yari, and R. R. Murphy, “Floodnet: A high resolution aerial imagery dataset for post flood scene understanding,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 89 644–89 654, 2021.
- [70] A. Sarkar, T. Chowdhury, R. R. Murphy, A. Gangopadhyay, and M. Rahnemounfar, “Sam-vqa: Supervised attention-based visual question answering model for post-disaster damage assessment on remote sensing imagery,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 61, pp. 1–16, 2023.
- [71] P. Wang, S. Bai, S. Tan, S. Wang, Z. Fan, J. Bai, K. Chen, X. Liu, J. Wang, W. Ge *et al.*, “Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024.
- [72] B. Li, Y. Zhang, D. Guo, R. Zhang, F. Li, H. Zhang, K. Zhang, P. Zhang, Y. Li, Z. Liu *et al.*, “Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024.
- [73] X. Xing, C.-W. Kuo, L. Fuxin, Y. Niu, F. Chen, M. Li, Y. Wu, L. Wen, and S. Zhu, “Where do large vision-language models look at when answering questions?” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13891*, 2025.