

HLTCOE Evaluation Team at TREC 2025: VQA Track

Dengjia Zhang^{1*} Charles Weng^{1*} Katherine Guerrierio¹ Yi Lu¹
 Kenton Murray^{1,2} Alexander Martin¹ Reno Kriz^{1,2} Benjamin Van Durme^{1,2}
¹Johns Hopkins University ²Human Language Technology Center of Excellence
 {dzhang98, amart233}@jhu.edu

Abstract

The HLTCOE Evaluation team participated in TREC VQA’s Answer Generation (AG) task, for which we developed a listwise learning framework that aims to improve semantic precision and ranking consistency in answer generation. Given a video–question pair, a base multimodal model first generates multiple candidate answers, which are then reranked using a model trained with a novel Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy Loss with Rank Weights. This objective integrates pointer-based candidate selection, rank-dependent weighting, and masked cross-entropy under vocabulary restriction, enabling stable and interpretable listwise optimization. By bridging generative modeling with discriminative ranking, our method produces coherent, fine-grained answer lists. Experiments reveal consistent gains in accuracy and ranking stability, especially for questions requiring temporal reasoning and semantic disambiguation.¹

1. Introduction

The TREC VQA answer generation (AG) task requires systems to generate multiple plausible answers per query and return them as a ranked list. Such tasks continue to pose difficulties for current VLMs, which often struggle to generate diverse, well-ranked answer candidates and to maintain stable orderings in open-ended settings [4, 6, 10].

To address these limitations, we adopt a listwise learning framework for answer generation and ranking. Our approach is inspired by multi-hypothesis generation methods [5, 7, 9, 11], which encourage diverse and expressive candidate answers, as well as listwise reranking techniques [3, 12, 13], which provide principled mechanisms for ordering candidate outputs. Given a video and an associated question, our system first generates multiple candidate answers using a base VLM, and then reorders them using a reranker. For reranking, we introduce a

novel **Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy Loss with Rank Weights**, which integrates three key mechanisms. First, rank-labeled candidate representation explicitly encodes ordinal relations among answer candidates. Next, masked pointer cross-entropy facilitates permutation-consistent optimization through selective supervision of ranked outputs. Finally, rank-dependent weighting enhances the learning signal for higher-priority predictions, while maintaining balanced gradient propagation. Together, these mechanisms allow the model to capture both ranking consistency and linguistic fluency, effectively bridging the gap between generative modeling and discriminative ranking.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We propose a generate-and-rerank setting for producing diverse ranked lists in open-ended Video QA.
2. We introduce **Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy Loss with Rank Weights**, explicitly incorporating ranking information into the optimization process.
3. We present detailed experiments demonstrating that our proposed pipeline yields consistent improvements over baseline models across multiple evaluation metrics.

2. Method

Our approach consists of two main components: (1) a **generator** that produces multiple candidate answers given a query, and (2) a **reranker** that refines these candidates into a ranked list using a masked pointer-based objective. An overview of the full pipeline is shown in Figure 1.

2.1. Generator

The generator module is responsible for producing a diverse set of candidate answers for each input query q . For each query, we generate N candidates $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\}$, which are subsequently used as input to the reranker.

To encourage diversity, we employ a collection of prompt templates that differ in phrasing, structure, and reasoning cues. Instead of tuning model parameters or sampling hyperparameters, we rely on prompt variation as a lightweight and reproducible way to obtain diverse candidates. These prompts are empirically evaluated on a valida-

*Equal Contribution.

¹Code: <https://github.com/Charles201428/2025-VQA-AG/tree/research-framework-vqa>




Figure 1. Overview of the proposed generate-rank framework. The framework comprises two key components: a Generator, which produces a set of candidate responses given an input prompt, and a Reranker, which assigns relevance scores to these candidates and orders them accordingly. (a) **Inference Pipeline**: The generator outputs multiple candidate responses, which are subsequently reordered by the reranker based on their predicted relevance to the query. (b) **Reranker Training**: The reranker is trained using ground-truth rankings, where token-level weighting is incorporated into the loss function to emphasize more informative tokens. Darker colors denote higher token weights, indicating a greater contribution to the overall loss.

tion set, and the template that yields the best reranking performance is selected and fixed for both training and evaluation. This setup ensures that the generation process remains deterministic and reproducible, while the resulting candidate pool maintains sufficient diversity.

2.2. Reranker

The reranker aims to reorder the generated candidates $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\}$ into a coherent ranked list that aligns with ground-truth relevance. It is trained using a **Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy Loss with Rank Weights**, which integrates three key mechanisms: (1) Rank-Labeled Candidate Representation, (2) Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy, and (3) Rank-Dependent Weighting.

2.2.1. Rank-Labeled Candidate Representation

For each query q with its reference answer a^* , we first compute the BERTScore [15] between each generated candidate a_i and a^* . Candidates are then ordered to form a ranked sequence in a fixed way:

```

<R1> = <CAND_...>
<R2> = <CAND_...>
...
<RN> = <CAND_...>
<ENDLIST>

```

Each token in this sequence represents either a rank marker ($\langle Rn \rangle$), a candidate pointer ($\langle CAND_m \rangle$), or regular textual content. This rank-labeled sequence serves as the target supervision for the reranker.

2.2.2. Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy

The reranker is trained to autoregressively generate the rank-labeled sequence. At each decoding step t , the model produces logits $\mathbf{z}_t \in \mathbb{R}^V$ over the vocabulary. When the target token corresponds to a candidate pointer (e.g., $\langle CAND_3 \rangle$ or the termination token $\langle ENDLIST \rangle$), the prediction space is restricted to the subset of valid, unselected candidates \mathcal{C}_k :

$$P(y^{(k)} | \mathcal{C}_k) = \frac{\exp(z_{y^{(k)}}^{(k)})}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} \exp(z_j^{(k)})}. \quad (1)$$

The corresponding pointer loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ptr}}^{(k)} = -\log P(y^{(k)} | \mathcal{C}_k). \quad (2)$$

For non-pointer tokens (e.g., rank markers or normal text), the model computes standard cross-entropy over the full vocabulary:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{text}}^{(t)} = -\log \frac{\exp(z_{y_t}^{(t)})}{\sum_{v=1}^V \exp(z_v^{(t)})}. \quad (3)$$

2.2.3. Rank-Dependent Weighting

To emphasize higher-ranked predictions, we assign a weight w_k to each pointer step corresponding to rank k :

$$w_k = \begin{cases} \alpha_k, & \text{if } k \leq 3, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Split	Settings	nDCG		BERTScore		METEOR	
		BERTScore Rank	METEOR Rank	Mean	Max	Mean	Max
Dev Data	QwenOmni Generator	0.997	0.772	0.869	0.875	0.145	0.182
	QwenVL Generator	0.995	0.664	0.904	0.905	0.175	0.183
	QwenVL Generator+Reranker	0.998	0.742	0.904	0.916	0.175	0.250
Test Data	QwenVL Generator	0.995	0.708	0.896	0.896	0.157	0.159
	QwenVL Generator+Reranker	0.995	0.718	0.896	0.897	0.156	0.161

Table 1. Comprehensive evaluation of different generator configurations on the TRECVID AG task. Results are reported on both the development and test splits under three metrics: NDCG, BERTScore, and METEOR. QwenVL achieves superior overall performance compared to QwenOmni, particularly in semantic similarity metrics (BERTScore and METEOR). The inclusion of a reranker further refines ranking quality, yielding the most notable gains under the METEOR metric.

where $\alpha_k > 1$ are hyperparameters controlling the relative importance of top-ranked predictions. These weights are applied directly to the loss terms at respective rank steps.

2.2.4. Final Objective

The final training objective aggregates all weighted losses:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \frac{1}{\sum_t w_t} \sum_t w_t \mathcal{L}_t, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{L}_t is either $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ptr}}^{(k)}$ or $\mathcal{L}_{\text{text}}^{(t)}$. This formulation ensures:

1. candidate tokens are compared only within the subset of valid remaining candidates;
2. higher-ranked predictions receive stronger supervision;
3. gradient flow remains stable without in-place masking.

The proposed **Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy with Rank Weights** thus enables the model to learn fine-grained correspondences between candidate order and predicted likelihood, achieving stable and consistent listwise reranking performance.

3. Experiment

Data and Models We designate the first 30 examples of the official training data provided for the TREC VQA AG task as an ad-hoc dev split and use the remainder as our actual train split. We report results both on this ad-hoc dev split and on the official test split. For the **generator**, we evaluate both Qwen2.5-VL-7B [1] and Qwen2.5-Omni-7B [14] to compare their generative capabilities. For the **reranker**, we employ Qwen2.5-VL-7B as the backbone model and fine-tune it specifically for ranking refinement.

3.1. Results

The overall results are presented in Table 1. We evaluate two main configurations:

1. **Generator**: a single-stage model that directly generates candidate answers.

Prompt	ROUGE-L	METEOR	STS
PROMPT1	0.224	0.222	0.469
PROMPT2	0.334	0.216	0.607
PROMPT3	0.389	0.228	0.631
PROMPT4	0.383	0.227	0.623
PROMPT5	0.407	0.251	0.638
PROMPT6	0.390	0.246	0.620
PROMPT7	0.352	0.245	0.595
PROMPT5 w/ lora	0.394	0.239	0.636

Table 2. Ablation results of different prompt templates and their LoRA variants on our ad-hoc dev split.

2. **Generator + Reranker**: a two-stage framework where the generator produces candidate answers and the reranker refines their ranking.

For the dev split, we additionally test the Qwen Omni Generator to investigate the performance of the Omni variant. Although Qwen Omni achieves slightly higher NDCG scores, it performs worse in BERTScore and METEOR. Since our goal is to achieve a balanced improvement across all evaluation metrics, and as shown in subsection 3.2, fine-tuning the generator alone does not substantially enhance semantic alignment, *we ultimately adopt Qwen-VL as the generator in our final system.*

3.2. Prompt Study

To further examine the influence of instruction formulation and fine-tuning strategies, we conduct an ablation study on prompt templates and LoRA-based fine-tuning.² Each prompt variant represents a distinct instruction template used during generation.

Table 2 reports ROUGE-L [8], METEOR [2], and STS on our ad-hoc dev split. Among all prompt variants, Prompt5 consistently achieves the best overall performance

²See Appendix A for the parameters used in training. The prompt variants can be found in Appendix B.

across metrics. Accordingly, we adopt Prompt5 as the final instruction template for the generator in our final system.

4. Conclusion/Discussion

Our experiments have aimed to assess the effectiveness of our proposed framework on the TREC VQA AG task, examining the influence of prompt design on the generator’s performance and the usefulness of weighted reranking for optimizing the ordering of candidate answers. Results demonstrate that well-crafted prompts play a crucial role in producing semantically accurate and contextually relevant responses. Moreover, the proposed **Masked Pointer Cross-Entropy Loss with Rank Weights** substantially enhances ranking consistency and improves the quality of top-ranked answers. We believe that this training paradigm provides valuable insights for future research on rank-list optimization and could serve as a general framework for learning-to-rank in multimodal generation tasks.

References

- [1] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhao-hai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report, 2025. [3](#)
- [2] Satandeep Banerjee and Alon Lavie. METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, pages 65–72, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2005. Association for Computational Linguistics. [3](#)
- [3] Zhe Cao, Tao Qin, Tie-Yan Liu, Ming-Feng Tsai, and Hang Li. Learning to rank: from pairwise approach to listwise approach. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 129–136, 2007. [1](#)
- [4] Yangyi Chen, Karan Sikka, Michael Cogswell, Heng Ji, and Ajay Divakaran. Measuring and improving chain-of-thought reasoning in vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 192–210, 2024. [1](#)
- [5] Radhika Dua, Sai Srinivas Kancheti, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Beyond vqa: Generating multi-word answers and rationales to visual questions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1623–1632, 2021. [1](#)
- [6] Chaoyou Fu, Yuhao Dai, Yongdong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 24108–24118, 2025. [1](#)
- [7] Xingyu Fu, Sheng Zhang, Gukyeong Kwon, Pramuditha Perera, Henghui Zhu, Yuhao Zhang, Alexander Hanbo Li, William Yang Wang, Zhiguo Wang, Vittorio Castelli, et al. Generate then select: Open-ended visual question answering guided by world knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18842*, 2023. [1](#)
- [8] Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain, 2004. Association for Computational Linguistics. [3](#)
- [9] Alexander Martin, Reno Kriz, William Gantt Walden, Kate Sanders, Hannah Recknor, Eugene Yang, Francis Ferraro, and Benjamin Van Durme. Wikivideo: Article generation from multiple videos, 2025. [1](#)
- [10] Jean Park, Kuk Jin Jang, Basam Alasaly, Sriharsha Mopidevi, Andrew Zolensky, Eric Eaton, Insup Lee, and Kevin Johnson. Assessing modality bias in video question answering benchmarks with multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 19821–19829, 2025. [1](#)
- [11] Ashwin K Vijayakumar, Michael Cogswell, Ramprasad R Selvaraju, Qing Sun, Stefan Lee, David Crandall, and Dhruv Batra. Diverse beam search: Decoding diverse solutions from neural sequence models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02424*, 2016. [1](#)
- [12] Oriol Vinyals, Meire Fortunato, and Navdeep Jaitly. Pointer networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015. [1](#)
- [13] Fen Xia, Tie-Yan Liu, Jue Wang, Wensheng Zhang, and Hang Li. Listwise approach to learning to rank: theory and algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 1192–1199, 2008. [1](#)
- [14] Jin Xu, Zhifang Guo, Jinzheng He, Hangrui Hu, Ting He, Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Jialin Wang, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Bin Zhang, Xiong Wang, Yunfei Chu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-omni technical report, 2025. [3](#)
- [15] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. BERTscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019. [2](#)

A. Model Parameters

For Generator, we use Qwen2.5-VL 7B as the generator model, with the decoding parameters set to `temperature = 0.7` and `top_p = 0.9`.

For Reranker Training, we adopt LoRA Fine-tuning. The training dataset is from TREC VQA AG dataset, containing a total 500 samples and we choose 90% of them for training and rest of them for evaluating. The reranker’s weights are set as $w_1 = 3$, $w_2 = 1.5$, and $w_3 = 1.2$. The training hyperparameters are as follows: `learning rate = 2e-6`, `batch size = 1`, and `epochs = 5`.

For the LoRA configuration, we set `lora_r = 16`, `lora_alpha = 32`, and `lora_dropout = 0.05`.

B. Prompts

In this section we provide the prompt variations used in [subsection 3.2](#) for Prompts 1-7 in [Figure 2](#), [Figure 3](#), [Figure 4](#), [Figure 5](#), [Figure 6](#), [Figure 7](#), and [Figure 8](#), respectively.

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence:
question: question

Figure 2. Prompt1

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence, you should follow the points:
1. You should answer the question as simple as possible, some questions may just need a word or two.
2. You don't need to answer the question in a very detailed way, just give a concise answer.
question: question

Figure 3. Prompt2

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence, you should follow the points:
1. You should answer the question as simple as possible, some questions may just need a word or two.
2. You don't need to answer the question in a very detailed way, just give a concise answer.
3. For the answer in number, you should answer the number (one, two, three, etc.) but not 1,2,3, etc. in the question.
question: question

Figure 4. Prompt3

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence, you should follow the points:
1. You should answer the question as simple as possible, some questions may just need a word or two.
2. You don't need to answer the question in a very detailed way, just give a concise answer.
3. For the answer in number, you should answer the number (one, two, three, etc.) but not 1,2,3, etc. in the question.
4. You need to think about the question and answer it carefully.
question: question

Figure 5. Prompt4

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence, you should follow the points:
1. You should answer the question as simple as possible, some questions may just need a word or two.
2. You don't need to answer the question in a very detailed way, just give a concise answer.
3. For the answer in number, you should answer the number (one, two, three, etc.) but not 1,2,3, etc. in the question.
the transcript of the video is: transcript
question: question

Figure 6. Prompt5

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence, you should follow the points:

1. You should answer the question as simple as possible, some questions may just need a word or two.
2. You don't need to answer the question in a very detailed way, just give a concise answer.
3. For the answer in number, you should answer the number (one, two, three, etc.) but not 1,2,3, etc. in the question.
4. You need to think about the question and answer it carefully.
5. If the question is about the audio, you should answer the question based on the transcript of the video.
6. The transcript can be in different languages, you should answer the question in English.

the transcript of the video is: transcript
question: question

Figure 7. Prompt6

Answer the following question concisely in one sentence, you should follow the points:

1. You should answer the question as simple as possible, some questions may just need a word or two.
2. You don't need to answer the question in a very detailed way, just give a concise answer.
3. For the answer in number, you should answer the number (one, two, three, etc.) but not 1,2,3, etc. in the question.
4. The ASR transcript can be in different languages, you should answer the question in English.
5. Base your answer on both the ASR transcript and the video frames; if needed, use reasoning or general knowledge to give the most reasonable answer.

the ASR transcript of the video is: transcript
the question is: question

Figure 8. Prompt7