



Perception Before Supervision: Self-Contained Visual Distillation from Counterfactual Blind Spots

Shravan Venkatraman^{1*}, Omkar Thawakar¹, Ritesh Thawkar¹,
Abdelrahman Shaker¹, Rao Muhammad Anwer^{1,2}

¹Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence ²Aalto University

🔗 Code: <https://github.com/mbzuai-oryx/CVPD>

🌐 Project Page: <https://mbzuai-oryx.github.io/CVPD/>

😊 Model: <https://huggingface.co/shravvvv/CVPD>

Abstract

Self-improvement for multimodal large language models (MLLMs) is typically driven by reward-based methods that provide only coarse scalar feedback. Distillation offers a richer alternative through dense token-level supervision, but in the visual domain it usually depends on privileged context constructed using external annotations and tools, or stronger models. We introduce **CVPD** (Contrastive Counterfactual Visual Process Distillation), which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first fully self-contained framework for dense, on-policy, token-level visual self-distillation for MLLMs. CVPD identifies visual blind spots where zooming into a region changes and sharpens the model’s answer distribution, while removing the same region leaves the full-image behavior largely unchanged. Such regions reveal perceptual information that the model can encode but fails to consistently utilize under full-image conditioning. We propose a three-gate Counterfactual Criterion that identifies these regions directly from the model’s own responses and converts them into dense contrastive supervision for self-distillation. On Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct, CVPD outperforms six self-evolving baselines across twelve benchmarks, including methods that rely on external GPT-4o supervision, without a single regression. It achieves gains of +3.60 on OCRBench, +3.38 on MMStar Fine-Grained Perception, and +3.08 on MMStar Logical Reasoning, while maintaining or improving performance on broader multimodal benchmarks.

1 Introduction

Self-improvement has become a central post-training objective for multimodal large language models (MLLMs), and two broad approaches have emerged. Reward- and correctness-based methods train models on their own generated responses, selecting examples using verifiable outcomes or preference signals [39, 23, 26, 29, 27]. These methods avoid human annotation, but the training signal remains coarse. An entire rollout or trajectory receives a scalar reward or advantage rather than dense token-level feedback. Distillation-based methods provide a richer alternative by matching a teacher’s next-token distributions on trajectories generated by the student [1, 42, 11]. This supplies token-level corrective supervision that scalar rewards cannot provide.

The challenge is that distillation requires privileged context, namely a version of the input that induces a meaningful behavior gap between teacher and student. Historically, constructing this context has relied on information external to the model. In text domains, the problem is relatively straightforward. Appending a reference solution, compiler error, or feedback trace to the prompt is often sufficient to create the desired gap. In vision, however, providing the model with a better perceptual view of the same image is considerably harder. Doing so typically requires external recognition systems, segmentation models, or stronger annotators. This dependence on external tools has remained a major obstacle to fully self-contained dense self-distillation for visual MLLMs.

Prior work has approached this challenge from both directions without fully resolving it. On the distillation side, Vision-OPD [37] shows that the same MLLM can often answer a fine-grained question correctly when given an evidence-centered crop while failing on the full image. It leverages this regional-to-global gap for on-policy visual distillation and achieves strong results. However, the approach depends on external annotation and segmentation models to identify evidence regions, generate crop-answerable questions, and provide consensus answer labels. As a result, the supervision is dense and on-policy, but the privileged context remains externally constructed. On the

*Correspondence: shravan.venkatraman@mbzuai.ac.ae




Figure 1: **CVPD turns visual blind spots into dense self-supervision.** Reward-based self-evolution can identify better or worse responses, but it does not provide token-level corrective distributions. Standard visual distillation can provide dense supervision, but typically relies on externally constructed privileged views. CVPD instead uses the model’s own responses to identify regions where a crop sharpens the answer distribution while a ghosted image preserves the model’s default behavior. The crop view serves as a positive teacher and the ghost view serves as a counterfactual negative teacher, enabling dense visual self-distillation without external region proposals, labels, or stronger annotators.

self-improvement side, methods that remove external annotation by training on reward-filtered or preference-ranked self-generated data [39, 38, 23] eliminate this dependency but revert to a much coarser learning signal. Responses or trajectories receive scalar scores rather than token-level corrective supervision. Consequently, dense, on-policy, token-level self-distillation for visual perception without externally constructed privileged context remains an open problem.

To address this gap, we introduce **CVPD** (Contrastive Counterfactual Visual Process Distillation), a framework that recovers privileged visual context directly from the model’s own counterfactual behavior. Our key insight is that a region provides useful privileged context when zooming into it shifts and sharpens the model’s answer distribution, while removing the same region does not. This indicates that the model already possesses the relevant perceptual capability but fails to fully utilize it under full-image conditioning. CVPD identifies such regions entirely from the model’s own responses and uses them for contrastive training. The crop-conditioned view acts as a positive teacher, guiding the student toward its latent perceptual capacity, while the ghost-conditioned view acts as a negative teacher that captures the model’s inattentive default behavior. Together, these signals provide dense supervision at every token position of the student’s own rollout (Figure 1). By deriving privileged context entirely from the model’s own behavior, CVPD enables self-contained dense visual self-distillation without external annotations, tools, or stronger models, as shown in Figure 1.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We introduce a three-gate Counterfactual Blind-Spot Criterion that identifies image regions containing perceptual information the model can use but fails to exploit under full-image conditioning. The criterion relies solely on the model’s own counterfactual responses, enabling privileged context construction without external tools, annotations, or stronger models.
- We develop a Contrastive Self-Distillation objective that converts each discovered region into paired positive and negative teacher signals derived from the same backbone. This provides dense, per-token, on-policy supervision without requiring external rewards, verifiers, or annotators.
- We show that the proposed criterion reliably identifies regions where crop and ghost signals are maximally opposed, and that CVPD delivers consistent improvements across twelve visual perception and reasoning benchmarks. The largest gains occur on tasks that require precise localized attention, while general multimodal capabilities are maintained or improved.

2 Related Work

Self-Improvement for Multimodal LLMs. Self-improvement for large language models (LLMs) and multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) is commonly framed as post-training from model-generated data, verifiable outcomes, or intrinsic consistency. Reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards is a widely adopted route. GRPO [23] removes PPO’s

learned critic by estimating advantages from groups of sampled responses, and DAPO [36] refines this objective for large-scale reasoning RL. In the multimodal setting, R1-style methods extend this paradigm with rule-based, step-wise, or shared rewards for visual reasoning, as in VLM-R1 [24], R1-VL [40], and R1-ShareVL [35]. These methods make reward-based post-training practical, but their feedback is still mediated through rewards and relative advantages rather than dense next-token distributions. Even when rewards are reliable, they indicate which rollout or reasoning step is preferable, not how the model’s next-token distribution should change at each visited state.

Self-evolving systems reduce annotation dependence by closing the loop between task generation, solving, and evaluation. In text-only settings, bootstrapping methods such as STaR [39], ReST [5], and Self-Rewarding Language Models [38] train on model-generated rationales, filtered samples, or self-judged preferences. Recent MLLM variants instantiate this loop through proposer–solver or questioner–solver agents with continuous or intrinsic rewards [26, 25, 33], self-consistency and judge-based trajectory reweighting [31], strategic visual self-play [30], and synthetic or actively retrieved visual environments [14, 6]. These works demonstrate the feasibility of improving MLLMs under limited human supervision. However, the training signal remains aggregate. Responses, trajectories, questions, or agent roles receive rewards, scores, or advantages rather than token-level supervision. This motivates the complementary problem of obtaining token-level corrective feedback for visual perception without relying on an external teacher or verifier.

On-Policy Self-Distillation. Knowledge distillation [9] offers a different supervision regime in which the student matches a teacher’s next-token distribution rather than optimizing only terminal or trajectory-level rewards. For autoregressive models, ordinary offline distillation suffers from exposure bias because the student is trained on teacher- or dataset-induced prefixes. Generalized Knowledge Distillation (GKD) [1] addresses this mismatch by querying the teacher on student-generated trajectories, turning distillation into an on-policy objective. More recent on-policy self-distillation methods show that the teacher need not be a separate external model. OPSD [42] conditions the same LLM on privileged reasoning traces or reference solutions, while SDPO [11] conditions the model on rich textual feedback and distills the resulting feedback-aware predictions back into the unconditioned policy. Further variants calibrate or localize this dense signal, for example through outcome-guided logit steering [34], reflection-guided error-localized distillation [43], and contrastive evidence policy optimization [8]. The common principle is that a context-induced behavior gap within the same model can be converted into dense token-level supervision on the student’s own sampled prefixes.

The vision setting lacks an equally direct source of privileged context. A reference solution, compiler error, or feedback message can be appended to an LLM prompt, but giving an MLLM a better perceptual view of the same image requires constructing that view. Vision-OPD [37] identifies the regional-to-global gap: the same MLLM may answer a fine-grained question correctly from an evidence-centered crop while failing on the full image. It uses this gap to distill a crop-conditioned teacher into a full-image student with token-level on-policy divergence, and closely related concurrent work studies visual-advantage weighting for VLM distillation [15]. Vision-OPD is the closest prior work to ours. However, its regional data synthesis is not derived solely from the target model’s own behavior. Object-recognition and segmentation systems propose evidence regions, an MLLM generates crop-answerable questions, and Qwen3.5-397B provides consensus answer labels used for filtering and alternative training baselines. Thus, although the teacher distribution used during distillation comes from the same backbone, the crop-question supervision is externally constructed rather than self-discovered from the target model’s counterfactual behavior.

This leaves open whether dense visual self-distillation can be achieved without externally constructed privileged context. Existing methods either rely on reward-based supervision, which provides only coarse training signals, or on dense distillation objectives whose privileged context is produced through external data synthesis, annotation pipelines, or stronger models. As a result, dense token-level supervision and fully self-contained self-improvement have remained largely separate directions in visual MLLM training. We address this gap by deriving privileged visual context directly from the model’s own behavior rather than from externally generated regions, questions, labels, or verifiers. In doing so, our work combines the dense token-level supervision of on-policy self-distillation with a fully self-contained training process, enabling visual self-improvement without external annotations, reward signals, segmentation systems, or stronger annotators.

3 Preliminaries

On-policy distillation trains a student p_S to match a privileged teacher p_T along the student’s own generated trajectories, avoiding the prefix-distribution mismatch of offline distillation [1]. At inference, the student conditions on its own prefixes; training on teacher-induced prefixes instead introduces a state-distribution shift that can compound errors over long generation horizons [22]. For a multimodal input (I, q) and a rollout $y \sim p_S(\cdot \mid I, q)$,




Figure 2: **Overview of CVPD.** CVPD derives all supervision from the model’s own responses over unlabeled images, without external labels, annotation tools, segmentation models, or stronger annotators. **Phase 1 (Counterfactual Blind-Spot Discovery):** The model generates a fine-grained question–answer pair (q, a) for each image and proposes candidate regions through self-grounding (Track A), a 3×3 grid (Track B), and a 2×2 grid (Track C). The three-gate Counterfactual Criterion (Eqs. (2)–(4)) selects regions where a crop changes and sharpens the answer distribution while a ghosted image preserves the original behavior, producing curated tuples (I, q, R, a) . **Phase 2 (Contrastive Self-Distillation):** Each tuple instantiates four policies from the same backbone under different visual views. The online student π_s learns from a crop-conditioned teacher π_+ , a ghost-conditioned teacher π_- , and a frozen reference policy π_{ref} . Their latent-transfer, contrastive-ranking, and KL-anchor objectives together form $\mathcal{L}_{CVPD}$ (Eq. (7)).

the objective is

$$\mathcal{L}_{OPD}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(I, q) \sim \mathcal{D}, y \sim p_S(\cdot | I, q)} \left[\frac{1}{|y|} \sum_{t=1}^{|y|} D\left(p_T(\cdot | \tilde{I}, q, y_{<t}) \parallel p_S(\cdot | I, q, y_{<t})\right) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{I}$ is a privileged visual context available to the teacher but withheld from the student at inference, and D is a per-token divergence. Unlike reinforcement-learning approaches that optimize scalar rewards, on-policy distillation provides dense token-level supervision along the student’s own trajectory.

The effectiveness of Eq. (1) depends on the existence of a meaningful asymmetry between teacher and student. In self-distillation settings, where both share the same backbone, this asymmetry must arise from the conditioning context rather than model capacity. For visual tasks, prior work has shown that the same MLLM can answer a question correctly from an evidence-centered crop while failing on the full image [37], revealing a regional-to-global perception gap that can serve as privileged context. However, existing approaches construct such context using external segmentation pipelines, region proposals, or stronger models. Constructing a privileged visual context directly from the model’s own behavior, without any external supervision, is the central problem addressed by CVPD.

Throughout the paper, we use $D = D_{JS}$, approximated over the union of the top- K logit indices from teacher and student at each token position [37], with $K=100$.

4 Method: CVPD

Fully unsupervised on-policy self-distillation requires a region where the model underuses its own perceptual capacity, together with a way to locate and verify that gap using only the model itself. CVPD identifies such regions

through counterfactual probing. A region is treated as a blind spot when zooming into it changes and sharpens the model’s answer distribution, while erasing it leaves the full-image behavior largely unchanged. This three-gate criterion (Section 4.1) verifies that a meaningful teacher–student gap exists and makes the ghost-conditioned view a principled proxy for the model’s inattentive default. CVPD then trains with two teachers: a crop-conditioned positive teacher that pulls the student toward sharper regional perception, and a ghost-conditioned negative teacher that pushes it away from its measured default behavior at every token position. By deriving both signals from the model’s own counterfactual behavior, CVPD enables self-contained, contrastive, on-policy self-distillation for fine-grained visual perception in MLLMs.

4.1 Self-discovered visual blind spots

Let I be an image, q a question generated by the model itself, and R a candidate region specified by an axis-aligned bounding box. We define three views using the same model p_θ . The *full view* $p_{\text{full}} = p_\theta(\cdot \mid I, q)$ conditions on the unmodified image. The *crop view* $p_{\text{crop}} = p_\theta(\cdot \mid \text{crop}(I, R), q)$ conditions on R , extracted with a 20% margin and upsampled to the original resolution. The *ghost view* $p_{\text{ghost}} = p_\theta(\cdot \mid \text{ghost}(I, R), q)$ conditions on the full image after replacing pixels inside R with their Gaussian blur. Each divergence is computed token by token over a short probe answer a , using the top- K union approximation of D_{JS} with $K=100$.

We call R a **visual blind spot** for (I, q) when it satisfies three counterfactual conditions:

$$(G1) \text{ Latent Capability Divergence: } D_{\text{JS}}(p_{\text{crop}} \| p_{\text{full}}) \geq \tau_{\text{crop}}, \quad (2)$$

$$(G2) \text{ Default Perceptual Invariance: } D_{\text{JS}}(p_{\text{ghost}} \| p_{\text{full}}) \leq \tau_{\text{ghost}}, \quad (3)$$

$$(G3) \text{ Epistemic Sharpening: } H[p_{\text{crop}}(y_0)] < H[p_{\text{full}}(y_0)]. \quad (4)$$

Gate (G1) requires the crop view to move the answer distribution away from the full-image baseline, ensuring that the crop-conditioned teacher carries information the student does not already express. Gate (G2) requires that suppressing the region does not substantially alter the full-image distribution. This confirms that the model is not using R under full-image conditioning and makes p_{ghost} a reliable proxy for its inattentive default behavior. Gate (G3) requires the crop to sharpen the model’s prediction rather than merely perturb it, filtering out regions that destroy useful context or increase uncertainty. Together, the gates select regions where the crop and ghost views provide opposing signals: the crop captures what the model can perceive when it attends to the right region, while the ghost captures what it defaults to when it does not.

When multiple regions pass all three gates, we rank them by

$$\text{score}(R) = D_{\text{JS}}(p_{\text{crop}} \| p_{\text{full}}) - D_{\text{JS}}(p_{\text{ghost}} \| p_{\text{full}}) + (H[p_{\text{full}}(y_0)] - H[p_{\text{crop}}(y_0)]), \quad (5)$$

which rewards large crop-side divergence, low ghost-side perturbation, and a large entropy reduction under the crop. We retain the highest-scoring region per image.

To isolate the effect of the Counterfactual Criterion before full training, Figure 3 analyzes 6,791 candidate regions sampled from 500 raw images. Without curation, arbitrary regions produce high JSDs under both crop and ghost interventions (0.359 and 0.387) and a negative entropy delta ($\Delta H = -0.211$). In other words, they perturb the model but do not sharpen its prediction. Regions passing Eqs. (2)–(4) retain strong crop-side sensitivity (0.265), suppress ghost-side noise by $24\times$ to 0.016, and reverse the entropy delta to $+0.378$. The crop-versus-ghost gap rises from -0.028 to $+0.249$ after curation, supporting the view that the criterion isolates regions where the two teachers provide genuine and opposing supervision.

4.2 Contrastive visual process distillation

CVPD uses the Curated Blind-Spot Pool in two phases, illustrated in Figure 2 and summarized in Algorithm 1. Phase 1 discovers blind-spot tuples from raw images using the counterfactual criterion, and Phase 2 trains the online student with paired crop and ghost teachers at each discovered region.

Counterfactual blind-spot sourcing. For each raw image I , the model generates a fine-grained question q targeting a small attribute, a count, or a textual element, and then samples a short deterministic probe answer a . The pair (q, a) fixes the teacher-forcing target for all subsequent forward passes on that image. Candidate regions are collected from three tracks. Track A obtains self-grounding proposals by querying the same model for a bounding box on (I, q) . Track B partitions I into a 3×3 uniform grid, and Track C uses a coarser 2×2 grid. Every component of the pipeline, including question generation, region proposal, answer generation, and region scoring, uses only the model being trained. This self-contained design avoids the supervision bottleneck that would be reintroduced by annotation tools, segmentation models, or larger query models. Candidates covering less than 1% or more than 50%




Figure 3: **Distributional signature of counterfactual blind-spot curation.** We sample 6,791 candidate regions from 500 raw images. (a) Uncurated regions produce similar crop/full and ghost/full divergences (0.359 vs. 0.387), indicating that both interventions perturb the model in comparable ways. Regions passing the Counterfactual Criterion retain strong crop-side divergence (0.265) while reducing ghost-side divergence to 0.016, a $24\times$ suppression of irrelevant perturbation. (b) Curation also reverses the entropy change from -0.211 to $+0.378$, showing that selected crops sharpen the model’s answer distribution rather than merely changing it. Together, these results show that the Counterfactual Criterion isolates regions where crop and ghost views provide strongly separated and informative supervision signals.

Algorithm 1 CVPD: Contrastive Counterfactual Visual Process Distillation

Require: Unlabeled image pool $\mathcal{I}$; model p_θ ; thresholds τ_{crop} , τ_{ghost}

// Phase 1: Counterfactual Blind-Spot Discovery (offline)

```

1:  $\mathcal{D}_{CVPD} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  do
3:    $q \leftarrow p_\theta(I)$ ;  $a \leftarrow p_\theta(I, q)$  ▷ fine-grained question; deterministic probe answer
4:    $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \text{Track A proposals on } (I, q) \cup \text{Track B } 3 \times 3 \text{ grid} \cup \text{Track C } 2 \times 2 \text{ grid, filtered to area } \in [1\%, 50\%]$ 
5:    $\mathcal{R}^* \leftarrow \{R \in \mathcal{R} : \text{Eqs. (2)–(4) hold}\}$  ▷ Counterfactual Criterion
6:   if  $\mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$  then
7:      $\mathcal{D}_{CVPD} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{CVPD} \cup \{(I, q, \text{argmax}_{R \in \mathcal{R}^*} \text{score}(R), a)\}$  ▷ Eq. (5)
8:   end if
9: end for

```

// Phase 2: Contrastive Self-Distillation (online)

```

10:  $\bar{\theta} \leftarrow \theta$ ;  $\beta_0 \leftarrow 10^{-3}$ 
11: for step = 1, 2, ... do
12:    $(I, q, R, a) \sim \mathcal{D}_{CVPD}$ 
13:   Compute  $\pi_s$  (grad),  $\pi_+$ ,  $\pi_-$  (Momentum Teacher Pair, EMA  $\bar{\theta}$ , no grad),  $\pi_{ref}$  (Reference Policy, no grad)
14:    $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{CVPD}(\theta)$  ▷ Eq. (7)
15:    $\bar{\theta} \leftarrow (1 - \alpha) \bar{\theta} + \alpha \theta$ ; adapt  $\beta_t$  toward  $\kappa=0.03$ 
16: end for

```

of the image area are discarded as degenerate. The Counterfactual Criterion in Eqs. (2)–(4) is then applied to the remaining candidates, and the top-scoring blind spot is retained for each image. Images with no passing region are skipped.

Applied to 15,000 unlabeled images, the pipeline yields $|\mathcal{D}_{CVPD}| \approx 2,590$ curated tuples, corresponding to a 17.2% yield. Of the retained blind spots, 27% come from Track A self-grounding proposals, 53% from Track B 3×3 grid regions, and 30% from Track C 2×2 grid regions. Since an image may contribute candidates from multiple tracks

under multi-region retention, these percentages describe track membership rather than a mutually exclusive partition (see Section 5).

Contrastive distillation objective. Given the Curated Blind-Spot Pool $\mathcal{D}_{\text{CVPD}} = \{(I_i, q_i, R_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, Phase 2 instantiates four policies from the same backbone p_θ under different visual conditions. The *online student* $\pi_s = p_\theta(\cdot \mid I, q)$ observes the full image with gradients enabled. The *Momentum Teacher Pair* π_+ and π_- share an exponential moving average (EMA) of the LoRA parameters with coefficient $\alpha=0.05$ [37], with gradients stopped: $\pi_+ = p_{\bar{\theta}}(\cdot \mid \text{crop}(I, R), q)$ conditions on the crop view, and $\pi_- = p_{\bar{\theta}}(\cdot \mid \text{ghost}(I, R), q)$ conditions on the ghost view. The *reference policy* $\pi_{\text{ref}} = p_{\theta_0}(\cdot \mid I, q)$ uses the same full-image input with the LoRA adapter disabled.

The per-token loss combines three objectives:

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \underbrace{D_{\text{JS}}(\pi_+ \parallel \pi_s)}_{\text{latent transfer}} + \lambda_{\text{rank}} \cdot \underbrace{\max(0, m + D_{\text{JS}}(\pi_+ \parallel \pi_s) - D_{\text{JS}}(\pi_- \parallel \pi_s))}_{\text{contrastive ranking}} + \beta_t \cdot \underbrace{D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_s \parallel \pi_{\text{ref}})}_{\text{KL anchor}}, \quad (6)$$

and the training objective averages over rollout tokens:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CVPD}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(I, q, R, a) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{CVPD}}} \left[\frac{1}{|a|} \sum_{t=1}^{|a|} \mathcal{L}_t \right], \quad (7)$$

with margin $m=0.1$ and rank weight $\lambda_{\text{rank}}=0.5$.

The *Latent Transfer Objective* draws the online student π_s toward the crop-conditioned teacher π_+ at each token position, transferring the model’s regional perceptual capacity into its full-image policy. The *Contrastive Ranking Objective* makes the ghost-conditioned teacher π_- an active part of training, rather than only a filtering condition during discovery. Without this margin loss, the ghost view would be used in Phase 1 and discarded afterward. With it, gate (G2)’s guarantee that π_- reflects the model’s inattentive default becomes a per-token pressure that pushes π_s away from that default throughout the rollout. The *KL Anchor Regularization* constrains π_s to remain close to the reference policy π_{ref} on the same full-image distribution, preventing targeted perception updates from eroding general language and multimodal capabilities. The coefficient β_t is adapted online to maintain a target KL divergence of $\kappa=0.03$. Because the teacher-forcing target a is shared across all four conditioning contexts, all policies are evaluated at identical token positions, which makes the per-position divergences in Eq. (6) well-defined.

5 Experiments

Implementation Details. We instantiate policy π as Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [2], with a LoRA adapter [10] of rank 32 and $\alpha=64$ applied to the attention and MLP projections of the language model backbone; the vision encoder is frozen. For blind-spot discovery, we set $\tau_{\text{crop}} = \tau_{\text{ghost}} = 0.05$. Question generation uses temperature 0.7, top- p 0.9, and a maximum of 64 tokens, while the probe answer is decoded at temperature 0 and capped at 24 tokens. Training uses the AdamW optimizer [18] with learning rate 2×10^{-5} , weight decay 0.01, and gradient clipping at 1.0, for one epoch over the Curated Blind-Spot Pool. The KL anchor coefficient is initialized to $\beta_0 = 10^{-3}$ and adapted online to maintain a target KL divergence of $\kappa=0.03$. All images (full, crop, and ghost) are resized to 448×448 , keeping the number of vision tokens identical across the four forward passes. All models are trained on $8 \times$ AMD MI250X GPUs using bfloat16 precision.

Training Data. CVPD operates on entirely unlabeled images with no captions, bounding boxes, semantic labels, ground-truth answers, reward signals, or external models are used at any stage. We draw from two unlabeled pools processed by the offline Counterfactual Blind-Spot Discovery pipeline. Stage 1 consists of 10,000 natural-scene images. Stage 2 consists of 5,000 images in a 40:60 mix of reasoning-domain content (charts, scientific diagrams, and structured document figures) and natural scenes. The discovery pipeline processes all 15,000 images and yields $\sim 2,590$ curated (I, q, R, a) tuples (17.2% pass rate through the Counterfactual Criterion). Of the retained blind-spot regions, 53% derive from Track B (3×3 partition), 30% from Track C (2×2 partition), and 27% from Track A self-grounding proposals.

Baselines and Evaluation. We compare CVPD against six self-evolving baselines on two base models, Qwen3-VL-4B-Instruct and Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [2]. The baselines include VisPlay [7], EvoLMM [26], and iReasoner [25], which are fully self-supervised and do not rely on external rewards, verifiers, or annotated data, as well as VisionZero [30] in its CLEVR, Chart, and Real-World (RW) variants. Among these, VisionZero-CLEVR is label-free, whereas the Chart and Real-World variants use GPT-4o [21] during dataset construction. All methods are trained on the same base models and evaluated under identical conditions using the lmms-eval framework [41], HuggingFace Transformers v4.38, and bfloat16 precision on AMD MI250X GPUs. For each baseline, we follow

Table 1: **Comparison of CVPD against six self-evolving baselines across twelve visual perception and reasoning benchmarks at the 4B and 8B scales.** CVPD achieves the best performance on every benchmark at both scales and is the only method that improves over the base model without regression. The largest gains occur on OCRBench, MMStar Fine-Grained Perception, and MMStar Logical Reasoning, which require precise localized visual attention. Consistent improvements on broader benchmarks indicate that these perception gains do not come at the expense of general multimodal capabilities. Higher is better in all columns. Best result within each scale block is shown in **bold**.

Method	AI2D	InfoVQA	SciQA	OCR-B	CV-B	RWQA	MMB-EN	MME-P	SEED-I	MMStar		
										FG	Inst	Log
<i>Qwen3-VL-4B-Instruct</i>												
Base	80.10	77.73	87.51	81.70	85.45	71.24	83.51	1702.9	78.05	60.86	69.83	62.96
VisPlay [7]	80.34	77.96	87.30	81.85	85.55	72.09	83.56	1706.4	77.95	61.26	70.08	63.31
VisionZero-CLEVR [30]	80.04	78.28	88.46	81.55	85.60	71.85	83.92	1704.4	77.65	61.16	69.98	63.26
VisionZero-Chart [30]	80.76	78.74	88.50	82.05	85.65	71.33	83.87	1707.9	78.00	61.01	69.93	63.16
VisionZero-RW [30]	80.31	77.94	87.73	81.80	85.65	72.16	83.41	1707.9	77.80	61.46	70.18	63.51
EvoLMM [26]	81.13	78.58	88.46	81.95	85.75	72.07	84.30	1709.4	78.05	61.51	70.28	63.56
iReasoner [25]	81.22	78.76	88.62	82.15	85.90	72.34	84.43	1711.4	78.10	61.81	70.53	63.91
CVPD (Ours)	82.35	79.15	89.05	84.35	87.15	73.45	84.60	1715.5	78.20	63.35	71.20	65.25
<i>Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct</i>												
Base	83.31	81.23	90.88	82.80	86.13	69.28	84.71	1716.5	78.18	60.25	73.03	61.69
VisPlay [7]	83.45	81.35	91.10	82.95	86.20	69.65	84.90	1720.5	78.55	60.70	73.35	62.10
VisionZero-CLEVR [30]	83.15	81.25	90.95	82.65	86.25	69.45	84.78	1718.0	78.25	60.55	73.25	62.00
VisionZero-Chart [30]	83.75	82.55	91.00	83.15	86.30	69.45	84.85	1721.0	78.60	60.40	73.20	61.90
VisionZero-RW [30]	83.35	81.25	90.95	82.90	86.30	69.75	84.95	1721.5	78.45	60.85	73.45	62.30
EvoLMM [26]	83.70	81.55	91.45	83.05	86.35	69.70	85.05	1723.0	78.65	60.95	73.55	62.35
iReasoner [25]	83.82	81.85	91.85	83.25	86.50	69.85	85.20	1725.0	78.72	61.25	73.80	62.70
CVPD (Ours)	84.63	82.82	92.81	86.40	88.27	71.07	86.10	1733.1	78.78	63.63	74.87	64.77

the training setup reported in the original paper: VisPlay (10 epochs), EvoLMM (1 epoch), iReasoner (1 epoch), and all VisionZero variants (100 epochs).

We evaluate on twelve benchmarks. Five directly target the fine-grained visual grounding capabilities that CVPD is designed to improve: OCRBench [17] (localized text understanding), InfoVQA [20] (information extraction from dense infographics), and three MMStar [3] subscales: Fine-Grained Perception, Instance Reasoning, and Logical Reasoning. These tasks require identifying, extracting, and reasoning over specific image regions rather than relying on holistic scene understanding.

The remaining seven benchmarks evaluate broader multimodal capabilities and serve as a check that CVPD’s targeted perception improvements do not come at the expense of general performance: ScienceQA [19], RealWorldQA [32], CV-Bench [28], AI2D [12], MMBench-EN [16], MME-Perception [4], and SEED-Image [13]. Together, these benchmarks cover scientific reasoning, real-world visual understanding, diagram interpretation, vision-centric reasoning, holistic perception, and general multimodal competence.

5.1 Main Results

Table 1 compares CVPD against six self-evolving baselines across twelve benchmarks at both the 4B and 8B scales. CVPD achieves the best performance on every benchmark at both scales and is the only method that does not regress on any benchmark relative to the base model. The gains are largest on tasks that require precise localization and extraction of visual evidence, while benchmarks emphasizing global scene understanding and general multimodal reasoning show smaller but consistent improvements. This pattern aligns with the design of CVPD, which strengthens the model’s ability to utilize visual details that are often overlooked under standard full-image conditioning.

The largest gains on Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct are observed on OCRBench (82.80 $\rightarrow$ 86.40, +3.60), MMStar Fine-Grained Perception (60.25 $\rightarrow$ 63.63, +3.38), and MMStar Logical Reasoning (61.69 $\rightarrow$ 64.77, +3.08).

Table 2: **Ablation study of CVPD components on Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct.** Each row removes or modifies a single component while holding all others fixed. Replacing curation with random regions (row d) and removing the contrastive ranking objective (row a) produce the two largest performance drops, directly validating the Counterfactual Criterion and the ghost-conditioned negative teacher as the primary contributors to CVPD’s gains. All values are accuracy (%) except MME-P (sum score, 0–2000). Best result per column in **bold**.

Configuration	AI2D	InfoVQA	SciQA	OCR-B	CV-B	RWQA	MMB-EN	MME-P	SEED-I	MMStar		
										FG	Inst	Log
Base (Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct)	83.31	81.23	90.88	82.80	86.13	69.28	84.71	1716.5	78.18	60.25	73.03	61.69
(a) $\lambda_{\text{rank}}=0$ (no contrastive)	83.55	81.80	91.58	84.10	86.36	69.52	84.94	1722.5	78.52	61.47	73.69	62.80
(b) frozen teacher ($\alpha=0$)	83.64	82.02	91.85	84.60	86.45	69.67	85.06	1724.8	78.61	61.94	73.95	63.23
(c) high-quality subset only	83.72	82.22	92.08	85.03	86.53	69.77	85.14	1726.8	78.68	62.35	74.17	63.60
(d) no curation (random regions)	83.45	81.50	91.50	83.80	86.25	69.45	84.83	1721.0	78.45	61.10	73.50	62.60
(e) unfrozen vision encoder	83.76	82.31	92.19	85.25	86.57	69.82	85.18	1727.8	78.72	62.55	74.28	63.78
Full CVPD (Ours)	84.63	82.82	92.81	86.40	88.27	71.07	86.10	1733.1	78.78	63.63	74.87	64.77

OCRBench directly evaluates the ability to identify and read localized text regions, making it particularly sensitive to improvements in visual attention. Similar gains are observed on MMStar Instance Reasoning (+1.84) and InfoVQA (+1.59), both of which require reasoning over specific visual evidence within the image. ScienceQA also improves substantially (+1.93), as many questions depend on correctly interpreting labeled components and spatial relationships in scientific diagrams. The same trend holds at the 4B scale, where the largest gains again appear on OCRBench (+2.65), MMStar FG (+2.49), and MMStar Log (+2.29), indicating that the benefits of CVPD are consistent across model sizes.

CVPD also improves performance across broader benchmarks, including AI2D, MMBench-EN, MME-Perception, SEED-Image, RealWorldQA, and CV-Bench, without any loss in general capability. At the 8B scale, gains range from +0.60 (SEED-Image) to +1.93 on ScienceQA, alongside a +16.6 point improvement on MME-P. These results are consistent with the role of KL Anchor Regularization (Eq. (6)), which constrains the student to remain close to the reference policy on full-image inputs while allowing targeted perception improvements to be incorporated. In contrast, several baselines exhibit regressions on individual benchmarks. For example, VisionZero-CLEVR falls below the base model on AI2D and OCRBench at both scales, while VisionZero-RW regresses on multiple general benchmarks at the 4B scale. CVPD avoids such trade-offs across the entire evaluation suite.

It is worth noting that VisionZero-Chart and VisionZero-RW rely on GPT-4o during dataset construction, whereas CVPD derives its training signal entirely from unlabeled images and the model’s own counterfactual responses. Despite using no external annotator, verifier, or reward model, CVPD outperforms both methods on every benchmark at both scales. This suggests that dense self-discovered distributional supervision provides a stronger learning signal than externally constructed reward-based feedback in this setting.

5.2 Ablation Study

Table 2 evaluates the contribution of each component of CVPD on Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct by removing or modifying one design choice at a time. We focus on OCRBench, MMStar Fine-Grained Perception, and MMStar Logical Reasoning, as these benchmarks exhibit the largest variation across configurations and are most sensitive to improvements in fine-grained visual perception.

Counterfactual Criterion (d). Replacing the three-gate criterion with randomly selected regions results in the largest performance drop among all ablations. OCRBench decreases by 2.60 points (86.40 $\rightarrow$ 83.80), while MMStar FG drops by 2.53 points (63.63 $\rightarrow$ 61.10). This identifies the Counterfactual Criterion as the primary source of CVPD’s gains. Figure 3 provides further evidence: random regions produce nearly identical crop- and ghost-side divergences (0.359 and 0.387) and a negative entropy delta (−0.211), indicating that arbitrary crops introduce noise rather than informative supervision. In contrast, the proposed criterion suppresses ghost-side divergence to 0.016 while preserving crop-side sensitivity (0.265), yielding a positive entropy delta of +0.378. These results prove that the criterion identifies regions that provide strong and complementary positive and negative training signals.

Contrastive Ranking Objective (a). Setting $\lambda_{\text{rank}} = 0$ removes the ranking loss while retaining the crop-conditioned teacher. Performance drops substantially, with OCRBench falling to 84.10 (−2.30) and MMStar FG to 61.47 (−2.16), representing the second-largest degradation in the table. This shows that learning solely from the crop-conditioned teacher is insufficient. The additional signal from the ghost-conditioned teacher provides

Table 3: **Hyperparameter sensitivity of CVPD on Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct.** We vary one hyperparameter at a time around the default configuration and report the metrics most sensitive to the contrastive visual distillation objective: MMStar fine-grained perception, OCRBench, and MMStar logical reasoning. The default setting, $\lambda_{\text{rank}}=0.5$, $m=0.10$, and $\kappa=0.03$, gives the best overall trade-off. Weaker contrastive ranking under-separates the crop and ghost teachers, while overly strong ranking or KL relaxation slightly degrades the dense perception signal.

Hyperparameter	Value	MMStar FG	OCRBench	MMStar Log
Rank weight λ_{rank}	0.0	61.47	84.10	62.80
	0.25	62.85	85.55	64.02
	0.5 (default)	63.63	86.40	64.77
	1.0	63.00	85.65	64.16
Margin m	0.05	63.10	86.15	64.50
	0.10 (default)	63.63	86.40	64.77
	0.20	62.85	86.00	64.30
KL target κ	0.01	63.12	85.80	64.30
	0.03 (default)	63.63	86.40	64.77
	0.10	63.40	86.20	64.55

an important contrastive pressure that helps the student move away from inattentive behaviors rather than merely imitating improved ones.

Supporting design choices (b, c, e). Removing EMA stabilization (row b, $\alpha = 0$) causes a moderate performance drop, suggesting that the momentum teacher provides more stable distributional targets as the student evolves during training. Restricting training to only the highest-scoring curated tuples (row c) performs better than random region selection but remains below full CVPD, indicating that broad coverage from the complete curated set contributes additional learning signal beyond a small set of highly confident examples. Finally, unfreezing the vision encoder (row e) slightly reduces performance. This suggests that the pre-trained visual representations are already well aligned with the language model, and that updating the encoder using the relatively small curated dataset provides little benefit while introducing mild instability.

5.3 Sensitivity Analysis

Table 3 evaluates the sensitivity of CVPD to its three training hyperparameters, varying one parameter at a time while keeping all others fixed. Results are reported on the three benchmarks most affected by the ablation study.

Rank weight λ_{rank} . Performance peaks at the default value of $\lambda_{\text{rank}} = 0.5$ and degrades slightly when moved in either direction. At 0.25, performance remains strong (MMStar FG: 62.85, OCRBench: 85.55), indicating that CVPD is effective across a reasonably broad range of values. Increasing the weight to 1.0 leads to a small decline (63.00, 85.65), suggesting that over-emphasizing the contrastive objective can partially interfere with the underlying distillation signal. Overall, the method is relatively robust within the 0.25–0.50 range.

Margin m and KL target κ . Both parameters exhibit limited sensitivity across the tested ranges, with variations below one point on all three benchmarks. The default settings are consistently at or near the best-performing configuration. These results indicate that CVPD does not require precise tuning of either parameter and remains stable across a broad range of values.

5.4 Blind-Spot Source Analysis

Table 4 evaluates the contribution of each candidate region source by training CVPD using blind spots derived from a single track in isolation.

All three tracks improve upon the base model (MMStar FG: 60.25 $\rightarrow$ 62.50/62.80/63.20; OCRBench: 82.80 $\rightarrow$ 84.90/85.30/85.95), indicating that each source is capable of identifying useful training regions. Among the individual tracks, Track B (3×3 grid) performs best, reaching 63.20 on MMStar FG and 85.95 on OCRBench. A likely explanation is that the finer spatial partitioning produces more candidate regions per image, increasing the chance of capturing informative localized evidence.

Table 4: **Candidate region source ablation on Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct.** Each row trains CVPD using blind spots derived from a single region-generation track in isolation. All three tracks individually improve over the base model, with Track B (3×3 grid) as the strongest standalone source. Combining all three tracks achieves the best results on all benchmarks, confirming that self-grounding proposals, coarse-grid crops, and fine-grid partitions surface complementary blind spots at different spatial granularities. Best result per column in **bold**.

Source	Samples	MMStar FG	OCRBench	MMStar Log
Grounding only	~ 699	62.50	84.90	63.30
2×2 grid only	~ 777	62.80	85.30	63.80
3×3 grid only	$\sim 1,373$	63.20	85.95	64.45
All combined (Ours)	$\sim 2,590$	63.63	86.40	64.77

Combining all three tracks yields the strongest overall performance across every benchmark (63.63, 86.40, 64.77), consistently outperforming any individual source, implying that self-grounding proposals, coarse 2×2 crops, and fine 3×3 partitions capture complementary regions that are not fully covered by any single strategy. Track A self-grounding proposals account for only 27% of the retained blind spots, the smallest share among the three sources. This is consistent with the intuition behind blind spots: regions that the model fails to attend to are also less likely to be identified through its own grounding predictions. In contrast, grid-based partitioning systematically explores the image and is therefore more likely to uncover regions that the model would otherwise overlook.

6 Conclusion

We introduced CVPD, a fully self-contained framework for dense on-policy visual self-distillation in MLLMs. By identifying visual blind spots directly from the model’s own counterfactual responses, CVPD recovers dense supervision without relying on external annotations, segmentation tools, reward signals, or stronger models. Across twelve benchmarks and multiple model scales, CVPD consistently improves over the base model and all self-evolving baselines, achieving the largest gains on tasks that require precise localized visual attention while preserving broader multimodal capabilities. These results suggest that a major bottleneck in fine-grained visual perception is not simply model capacity or the availability of labeled data, but the model’s ability to reliably utilize perceptual information it already encodes. More broadly, our findings show that dense supervision for visual self-improvement can emerge from the model’s own latent perceptual capabilities, without any external source of supervision. This work takes a step toward fully self-contained visual self-distillation and suggests promising future directions for deriving dense supervision directly from a model’s own capabilities.

7 Acknowledgment

The computations were enabled by resources provided by LUMI hosted by CSC (Finland) and LUMI consortium, and by Berzelius resource provided by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation at the NSC.

References

- [1] Rishabh Agarwal, Nino Vieillard, Yongchao Zhou, Piotr Stanczyk, Sabela Ramos, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Bachem. On-policy distillation of language models: Learning from self-generated mistakes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [2] Shuai Bai et al. Qwen3-VL technical report, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631.
- [3] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, and Feng Zhao. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models?, 2024. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20330.
- [4] Chaoyou Fu et al. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [5] Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, et al. Reinforced self-training (ReST) for language modeling, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08998.

- [6] Jinghan He, Junfeng Fang, Feng Xiong, Zijun Yao, Fei Shen, Haiyun Guo, Jinqiao Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. Active-Zero: Self-evolving vision-language models through active environment exploration, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.11241.
- [7] Yicheng He, Chengsong Huang, Zongxia Li, Jiaxin Huang, and Yonghui Yang. VisPlay: Self-evolving vision-language models from images, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.15661.
- [8] Ahmed Heakl, Abdelrahman M. Shaker, Youssef Mohamed, Rania Elbadry, Omar Fetouh, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Salman Khan. Cepo: Rlvr self-distillation using contrastive evidence policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19436*, 2026.
- [9] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network, 2015. arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531.
- [10] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [11] Jonas Hübner, Frederike Lübeck, Lejs Behric, et al. Reinforcement learning via self-distillation, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20802.
- [12] Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mike Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. A diagram is worth a dozen images. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 235–251. Springer, 2016.
- [13] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16125*, 2023.
- [14] Zongxia Li, Hongyang Du, Chengsong Huang, Xiyang Wu, Lantao Yu, Yicheng He, Jing Xie, Xiaomin Wu, Zhichao Liu, Jiarui Zhang, and Fuxiao Liu. MM-Zero: Self-evolving multi-model vision language models from zero data, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.09206.
- [15] Ruiqi Liu, Xiaolei Lv, Gengsheng Li, Ximo Zhu, Zhiheng Wang, Zhengbo Zhang, Junkai Chen, Zhiheng Li, Bo Li, Jun Gao, and Shu Wu. Visual-advantage on-policy distillation for vision-language models, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.21924.
- [16] Yuan Liu et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2024.
- [17] Yuliang Liu, Zhang Li, Mingxin Huang, Biao Yang, Wenwen Yu, Chunyuan Li, Xu-Cheng Yin, Cheng-Lin Liu, Lianwen Jin, and Xiang Bai. Ocrbench: on the hidden mystery of ocr in large multimodal models. *Science China Information Sciences*, 67(12), December 2024.
- [18] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019.
- [19] Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tony Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering, 2022.
- [20] Minesh Mathew, Viraj Bagal, Rubèn Tito, Dimosthenis Karatzas, Ernest Valveny, and C.V. Jawahar. Info-graphicvqa. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1697–1706, 2022.
- [21] OpenAI et al. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [22] Stephane Ross, Geoffrey Gordon, and Drew Bagnell. A reduction of imitation learning and structured prediction to no-regret online learning. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 15 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 627–635, 2011.
- [23] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models, 2024. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300.
- [24] Haozhan Shen, Peng Liu, Jingcheng Li, Chunxin Fang, Yibo Ma, Jiajia Liao, Qiaoli Shen, Zilun Zhang, Kangjia Zhao, Qianqian Zhang, Ruochen Xu, and Tiancheng Zhao. VLM-R1: A stable and generalizable R1-style large vision-language model, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07615.

- [25] Meghana Sunil, Manikandarajan Venmathimaran, and Muthu Subash Kavitha. iReasoner: Trajectory-aware intrinsic reasoning supervision for self-evolving large multimodal models, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.05877.
- [26] Omkar Thawakar, Shravan Venkatraman, Ritesh Thawkar, Abdelrahman Shaker, Hisham Cholakkal, Rao Muhammad Anwer, Salman Khan, and Fahad Khan. EvoLMM: Self-evolving large multimodal models with continuous rewards, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.16672.
- [27] Ritesh Thawkar, Shravan Venkatraman, Omkar Thawakar, Abdelrahman Shaker, Fahad Khan, Hisham Cholakkal, Salman Khan, and Rao Muhammad Anwer. Ask, solve, generate: Self-evolving unified multimodal understanding and generation via self-consistency rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.27376*, 2026.
- [28] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai C Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, et al. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:87310–87356, 2024.
- [29] Shravan Venkatraman, Ritesh Thawkar, Omkar Thawakar, Rao Muhammad Anwer, Hisham Cholakkal, Salman Khan, and Fahad Khan. Paying more attention to visual tokens in self-evolving large multimodal models. In *ECCV*. Springer, 2026.
- [30] Qinsi Wang, Bo Liu, Tianyi Zhou, Jing Shi, Yueqian Lin, Yiran Chen, Hai Helen Li, Kun Wan, and Wentian Zhao. Vision-Zero: Scalable VLM self-improvement via strategic gamified self-play, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25541.
- [31] Zhengxian Wu, Kai Shi, Chuanrui Zhang, et al. When models judge themselves: Unsupervised self-evolution for multimodal reasoning, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.21289.
- [32] xAI and visheratin. Realworldqa. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/visheratin/realworldqa>, 2024.
- [33] Chaoran Xu, Yingmao Miao, Pengfei Zhang, Hao Dou, Lei Sun, and Xiangxiang Chu. RISE: Reliable improvement in self-evolving vision-language models, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.20914.
- [34] Yuxiao Yang, Xiaoyun Wang, and Weitong Zhang. OGLS-SD: On-policy self-distillation with outcome-guided logit steering for LLM reasoning, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.12400.
- [35] Huanjin Yao, Qixiang Yin, Jingyi Zhang, Min Yang, Yibo Wang, Wenhao Wu, Fei Su, Li Shen, Minghui Qiu, Dacheng Tao, and Jiaxing Huang. R1-ShareVL: Incentivizing reasoning capability of multimodal large language models via Share-GRPO, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16673.
- [36] Qiying Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, et al. DAPO: An open-source LLM reinforcement learning system at scale, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.14476.
- [37] Qianhao Yuan, Jie Lou, Xing Yu, Hongyu Lin, Le Sun, Xianpei Han, and Yaojie Lu. Vision-OPD: Learning to see fine details for multimodal LLMs via on-policy self-distillation, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18740.
- [38] Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [39] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah D. Goodman. STaR: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [40] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaxing Huang, Huanjin Yao, Shunyu Liu, Xikun Zhang, Shijian Lu, and Dacheng Tao. R1-VL: Learning to reason with multimodal large language models via step-wise group relative policy optimization, 2025. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.12937.
- [41] Kaichen Zhang, Bo Li, Peiyuan Zhang, Fanyi Pu, Joshua Adrian Cahyono, Kairui Hu, Shuai Liu, Yuanhan Zhang, Jingkang Yang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Lmms-eval: Reality check on the evaluation of large multimodal models, 2024.
- [42] Siyan Zhao, Zhihui Xie, Mengchen Liu, Jing Huang, Guan Pang, Feiyu Chen, and Aditya Grover. Self-distilled reasoner: On-policy self-distillation for large language models, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.18734.
- [43] Ziqi Zhao, Xinyu Ma, Liu Yang, Yujie Feng, Daiting Shi, Jingzhou He, Xin Xin, Zhaochun Ren, and Xiaoming Wu. ROSD: Reflective on-policy self-distillation for language model reasoning across domains, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.28014.