
AGENTIC REASONING FOR ROBUST VISION SYSTEMS VIA INCREASED TEST-TIME COMPUTE

Chung-En (Johnny) Yu
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida, USA
cy31@students.uwf.edu

Brian Jalaian
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida, USA
bjalaian@uwf.edu

Nathaniel D. Bastian
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York, USA
nathaniel.bastian@westpoint.edu

ABSTRACT

Developing trustworthy intelligent vision systems for high-stakes domains, *e.g.*, remote sensing and medical diagnosis, demands broad robustness without costly retraining. We propose **Visual Reasoning Agent (VRA)**, a training-free, agentic reasoning framework that wraps off-the-shelf vision-language models *and* pure vision systems in a *Think-Critique-Act* loop. While VRA incurs significant additional test-time computation, it achieves up to 40% absolute accuracy gains on challenging visual reasoning benchmarks. Future work will optimize query routing and early stopping to reduce inference overhead while preserving reliability in vision tasks.

Keywords Agentic AI, Reasoning AI, Vision-Language Model, AI Robustness, Test-time Compute

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) enabled vision systems—including pure vision models and large vision-language models (LVLMs)—often fail to generalize reliably across high-stakes tasks such as remote sensing and medical diagnosis. Fine-tuning can be prohibitively expensive, demands extensive labeled data, and offers no robustness guarantees, while many teams lack retraining resources. A training-free, modular framework that leverages existing off-the-shelf models can immediately bolster task reliability without extra data or parameter updates. Current LVLMs often struggle with complex visual reasoning and intricate perceptual tasks requiring deep understanding [1]. Prior research on enhancing LVLM factuality through post-hoc correction methods (*e.g.*, Visual Fact Checker [2], LogicCheckGPT [3]) typically employs rigid, predefined pipelines. These methods are limited in adapting to varied visual tasks demanding complex reasoning, as they lack autonomous, dynamic decision-making.

Agentic AI offers a promising alternative. Recent advances in Large Language Model (LLM)-based agentic reasoning (*e.g.*, ReAct [4], CRITIC [5]) show potential for self-correcting AI agents that iteratively refine outputs via multi-step reasoning and external tool integration, leading to improved robustness. While explored in text-based tasks, agentic AI enhancing general robustness across diverse vision tasks in LVLMs remains underexplored [6].

We posit that robustifying end-to-end vision tasks—such as remote sensing and medical diagnosis—poses unique challenges: fine-tuning requires large, domain-specific labeled datasets with no guarantee of improved resilience, and many teams lack the resources or expertise for model retraining. In contrast, a training-free, modular framework can be deployed immediately using off-the-shelf commercial or open-source vision-language models, enhancing reliability on the final task without data collection or tuning costs.

To address these challenges, we introduce the **Visual Reasoning Agent (VRA)**, an agentic framework that wraps plug-in LVLMs in an adaptive *Think-Critique-Act* loop. VRA orchestrates multiple vision-language models in a modular pipeline—leveraging cross-model verification and iterative self-correction over visual inputs—to trade additional test-time computation for substantial robustness gains. By orchestrating cross-model reasoning and self-critique at inference time, VRA further enables responsible and reliable AI deployment, providing transparent, auditable decision flows rather than opaque single-model outputs.




Figure 1: The architecture and workflow of our proposed framework, VRA.

Our key contributions are: a novel *Think–Critique–Act* agentic loop that dynamically coordinates multiple plug-in LVLMs and vision models for enhanced visual reasoning, operating effectively with minimal prompts and enabling transparent, auditable inference flows for responsible AI deployment; empirical validation on the VRSBench VQA dataset showing up to 40% absolute accuracy improvements across challenging remote sensing benchmarks, confirming that inference-time reasoning markedly boosts reliability; and a training-free, composable design deployable via existing commercial APIs or local open-source models, lowering the barrier to entry and laying the groundwork for responsible, reliable vision deployments in high-stakes domains.

2 Proposed Agent Framework

We propose the VRA framework to enhance the general robustness of LVLMs across diverse visual tasks (perception and reasoning). VRA integrates a *Think-Critique-Act* loop, inspired by the ReAct [4] and Reflexion [7], for iterative refinement and self-correction. The VRA framework operates through specialized LLM-based agents, each contributing to a dynamic, iterative reasoning process. The agent maintains a shared memory space for retrieved information and critiques. The workflow as shown in Figure 1 is structured as follows: **Captioner:** An initial LVLM generates a preliminary image caption, providing foundational visual context. **Drafter:** An LLM formulates an initial answer to the user’s query based on the caption. The drafter’s response includes this initial answer, a self-critique, and a proposed follow-up question intended for a visual AI model. **Inquirer:** An LLM takes the question generated by the drafter and queries one or multiple LVLMs for further visual information. **Vision-Language Suite:** One or multiple vision models answer the same query, providing diverse visual information. This multi-model approach is central to VRA’s robustness through cross-verification and reduced reliance on a single model. **Revisor:** The revisor, an LLM, refines the previous answer by incorporating the new visual information. Similar to the drafter, its response includes a revised answer, an updated self-critique, and another question for further verification. This forms a core part of the iterative refinement. **Spokesman:** An LLM determines the final answer, integrating insights from the last revisor’s conversation history.

We posit that increasing test-time compute through such iterative agentic reasoning significantly enhances robustness. Instead of relying on a single inference pass, the agent’s ability to “think”, “critique”, then “act” by querying multiple models and refining its understanding over several steps leads to more accurate and reliable outputs. This is particularly beneficial for complex visual reasoning tasks where a superficial understanding is insufficient. The computational cost, while higher, is justifiable in high-stakes domains like medical imaging, where accuracy and robustness outweigh throughput. Note that we set three iterations for the loop. The agents’ prompt templates are in Appendix B.

3 Preliminary Experiments and Results

3.1 Experiment Setup

To validate our hypothesis, we conducted preliminary experiments on visual reasoning tasks within the remote sensing (RS) domain, a high-stakes application area where is critical for applications like disaster response. **Dataset.** We evaluated VRA on the VRSBench VQA dataset [8], which offers comprehensive satellite imagery understanding tasks (object-level perception and complex visual reasoning). We sampled 50 questions per question type (ten total types).




Figure 2: Overall accuracy comparison between standalone LVLMs and VRA-augmented variants, showing consistent performance improvement.

Model	obj_quantity	obj_position	obj_direction	obj_size	reasoning	obj_color	obj_existence	obj_category	obj_shape	scene_type	overall
LVLm alone (avg)	16.67	50.00	39.33	47.33	60.67	56.67	74.67	66.00	51.33	65.33	52.80
VRA (+1 LVLm avg)	54.00	78.67	69.33	73.33	78.00	68.00	63.33	65.33	60.00	67.33	67.73
VRA (+2 LVLms)	40.00	82.00	70.00	70.00	82.00	74.00	90.00	92.00	70.00	86.00	75.60
VRA (+3 LVLms)	56.00	82.00	80.00	72.00	76.00	80.00	82.00	84.00	78.00	98.00	78.80

Table 1: Performance comparison between average baseline LVLms and VRA variants. The metric is accuracy in %

Performance is measured by accuracy per question type and overall accuracy is computed as the average across all evaluated question types. **Models.** To demonstrate VRA’s adaptability and robustness, we integrated it with multiple established LVLms as plug-in components. These baseline LVLms include: GeoChat (7B) [9], LLaVA-v1.5 (7B) [10], and Gemma 3 (12B) [11]. Note that GeoChat is a specialized RS-LVLm, fine-tuned on LLaVA-v1.5 using RS datasets. The core agent backbone is QwQ (32B) [12], a reasoning model solely operating on textual inputs. Also, Phi-4 [13] is used in VRSBench VQA dataset for evaluating free-form answers. **VRA Variants.** VRA is designed to be modular, allowing for the integration of single or multiple plug-in LVLms as visual information providers. We define the following VRA variants for comparison: *VRA (LVLm-Name)*, which denotes VRA with only the specified LVLm (e.g., GeoChat, LLaVA-1.5, Gemma 3) as the visual information source. In Figure 3 and 4, *VRA (+1 LVLm avg)* represents the average of VRA (GeoChat), VRA (LLaVA-1.5), and VRA (Gemma 3). Also, *LVLm alone (avg)* in the figures refers to the average performance of the three baseline LVLms (GeoChat, LLaVA-1.5, and Gemma 3) without VRA. *VRA (+2 LVLms)* utilizes GeoChat and LLaVA-1.5 within VRA. Lastly, *VRA (+3 LVLms)* integrates all three baseline LVLms (GeoChat, LLaVA-1.5, and Gemma 3) concurrently.

3.2 Results Analysis

Overall Accuracy Improvement. As illustrated in Figure 2, VRA consistently and significantly improves the overall accuracy of various plug-in LVLms. For instance, GeoChat’s standalone overall accuracy of 46.40% increased to 66.80% (20.40% improvement) when integrated with VRA. Similarly, LLaVA-1.5 saw a 14.20% increase (57.60% to 71.80%), and Gemma 3 rose by 15.60% (54.40% to 70.00%). These results indicate substantial enhancement in both factual and reasoning-intensive VQA tasks when augmented with our agentic reasoning framework.

Enhanced Performance Across Question Types. Figure 3 shows VRA variants consistently outperform the LVLm alone (avg) baseline across nearly all ten question types. This confirms our agentic approach significantly improves overall performance on challenging perceptual and reasoning tasks. Table 1 shows that in “object quantity” and “object direction” question types, VRA demonstrated accuracy improvements of up to 40% compared to the baseline average. Further detailed numerical results are in Appendix A.

Runtime Analysis Figure 4 illustrates the trade-off between increased robustness and computational cost. While standalone baseline LVLms average 1.52 minutes per task, incorporating our agentic framework substantially increases this duration. *VRA (+1 LVLm avg)* averages 155.44 minutes, increasing to 155.59 minutes for *VRA (+2 LVLms)* and 189.09 minutes for *VRA (+3 LVLms)*. This demonstrates that robustness gains from extensive multi-model interactions and iterative reasoning, demanding higher test-time compute, come at the cost of increased inference time.

4 Discussion

Our preliminary findings from VRA provide compelling evidence that agentic reasoning significantly enhances the general robustness of LVLms across diverse visual tasks. The substantial accuracy improvements in remote sensing for




Figure 3: Per-question-type accuracy of averaged baseline LVL M versus VRA configurations, demonstrating enhanced robustness across most question types. Refer to Section 3.1 for the definitions of VRA variants.




Figure 4: Overall runtime comparison between averaged baseline LVL Ms and VRA configurations, highlighting increased runtime with higher test-time compute. Refer to Section 3.1 for the definitions of VRA variants.

both perceptual and reasoning tasks, coupled with VRA’s architectural components, underscore the potential for more reliable and trustworthy LVL M deployments.

4.1 Iterative Agentic Reasoning and Diverse Models

The *Think–Critique–Act* Loop allows VRA to dynamically refine its understanding and outputs. Unlike static inference, the agent’s ability to recursively draft, inquire, and revise enables it to navigate complex visual information and resolve inconsistencies. This dynamic adaptation is crucial for high accuracy across visual reasoning challenges, as evidenced by VRA’s consistent outperformance of baseline LVL Ms. The robustness gained is from iterative self-correction.

By leveraging a vision-language suite with multiple plug-in LVL Ms, VRA inherently mitigates risks associated with reliance on a single model. Each integrated LVL M offers a distinct visual encoder and training bias, enabling cross-model verification. This multi-expert approach detects and addresses inconsistencies, enhancing factual consistency and reducing susceptibility to individual model failures. Our experiments showed robust performance gains even when LVL Ms share features.

The agent backbone (e.g., QwQ) plays a pivotal role by contributing its intrinsic reasoning capabilities. VRA leverages the agent’s powerful “thinking” to formulate intelligent follow-up questions, critique responses, and synthesize information from disparate sources. This enables effective visual reasoning even with basic initial prompts, highlighting

that robustness stems from the agentic workflow, the underlying reasoning model, and effective orchestration of diverse vision model interactions, also contributing to make the agent’s decision-making process more transparent.

4.2 Responsibility and Reliability

Our results show that VRA improves various LVLMs up to 40% across multiple complex visual tasks, which provides a strong indicator of reliability and generalizability. Also, the agentic reasoning inherently provides auditable process, which paves the path toward responsible AI. Moreover, VRA’s multi-expert nature, where information is cross-verified, potentially provides an inherent defense against adversarial attacks. Other than malicious perturbations, the intrinsic model errors, so-called hallucinations might be able to be mitigated by systematically evaluating consistency and factual accuracy across multiple visual information sources in VRA. This indicates the potential of VRA in a broader spectrum of robustness. However, further rigorous evaluation of both adversarial robustness and hallucination mitigation is required.

4.3 Limitations and Future Directions

Our VRA framework is not without limitations, primarily related to computational overhead. As shown in runtime analysis, leveraging a long-thinking process reasoning model and increasing the number of integrated LVLMs leads to a substantial increase in inference time, which could be a barrier for real-time applications.

Future work will focus on: (1) Investigating more efficient agentic frameworks that retain robustness while significantly reducing computational overhead (e.g., intelligent query routing, early stopping when VRA reaches high confidence). (2) Evaluating VRA on hallucination benchmarks (e.g., Throne [14]) for intrinsic errors assurance. (3) Rigorously validating VRA’s adversarial robustness against a wider array of state-of-the-art attacks, exploring adaptive, training-free defense mechanisms. (4) Further testing on diverse visual domains (e.g., medical imaging) to assess VRA’s generalizability for real-world reliability.

5 Conclusion

Robust vision systems-whether pure vision models or vision-language models-are essential for high-stakes tasks such as remote sensing and medical diagnosis. We have introduced **VRA**, a training-free, agentic reasoning framework that wraps off-the-shelf vision models and LVLMs in a *Think-Critique-Act* loop. Empirical results on remote sensing benchmarks demonstrate up to 40% absolute accuracy gains, confirming that increased test-time compute via agentic reasoning is a justifiable trade-off for reliability. VRA’s modular, training-free design democratizes access to robust vision deployments, even for teams lacking fine-tuning resources. Moreover, its multi-expert verification and iterative self-correction principles point toward promising defenses against adversarial perturbations and hallucinations. Future work will focus on optimizing query routing and early stopping to reduce inference overhead and extending validation to medical imaging and other critical vision domains.

References

- [1] Zijiang Liang, Yanjie Xu, Yifan Hong, Penghui Shang, Qi Wang, Qiang Fu, and Ke Liu. A survey of multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Computer, Artificial Intelligence and Control Engineering*, pages 405–409, 2024.
- [2] Yunhao Ge, Xiaohui Zeng, Jacob Samuel Huffman, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ming-Yu Liu, and Yin Cui. Visual fact checker: enabling high-fidelity detailed caption generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14033–14042, 2024.
- [3] Junfei Wu, Qiang Liu, Ding Wang, Jinghao Zhang, Shu Wu, Liang Wang, and Tieniu Tan. Logical closed loop: Uncovering object hallucinations in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11622*, 2024.
- [4] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- [5] Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11738*, 2023.
- [6] Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jinhao Liu, Dengyun Peng, Jiannan Guan, Peng Wang, Mengkang Hu, Yuhang Zhou, Te Gao, and Wanxiang Che. Towards reasoning era: A survey of long chain-of-thought for reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09567*, 2025.

- [7] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8634–8652, 2023.
- [8] Xiang Li, Jian Ding, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Vrsbench: A versatile vision-language benchmark dataset for remote sensing image understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12384*, 2024.
- [9] Kartik Kuckreja, Muhammad Sohail Danish, Muzammal Naseer, Abhijit Das, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Geochat: Grounded large vision-language model for remote sensing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 27831–27840, 2024.
- [10] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26296–26306, 2024.
- [11] Gemma Team, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Rivière, et al. Gemma 3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19786*, 2025.
- [12] Qwen Team. Qwq-32b: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning, March 2025.
- [13] Marah Abdin, Sahaj Agarwal, Ahmed Awadallah, Vidhisha Balachandran, Harkirat Behl, Lingjiao Chen, Gustavo de Rosa, Suriya Gunasekar, Mojan Javaheripi, Neel Joshi, et al. Phi-4-reasoning technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21318*, 2025.
- [14] Prannay Kaul, Zhizhong Li, Hao Yang, Yonatan Dukler, Ashwin Swaminathan, CJ Taylor, and Stefano Soatto. Throne: An object-based hallucination benchmark for the free-form generations of large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 27228–27238, 2024.

Model	obj_quantity	obj_position	obj_direction	obj_size	reasoning	obj_color	obj_existence	obj_category	obj_shape	scene_type	overall
GeoChat	10.00	68.00	34.00	22.00	60.00	24.00	84.00	76.00	34.00	52.00	46.40
VRA (GeoChat)	52.00	76.00	70.00	74.00	86.00	50.00	78.00	70.00	62.00	50.00	66.80
LLaVA-1.5	30.00	42.00	36.00	60.00	56.00	68.00	78.00	74.00	60.00	72.00	57.60
VRA (LLaVA-1.5)	48.00	88.00	72.00	72.00	72.00	80.00	70.00	74.00	62.00	80.00	71.80
Gemma 3	10.00	40.00	48.00	60.00	66.00	78.00	62.00	48.00	60.00	72.00	54.40
VRA (Gemma 3)	62.00	72.00	66.00	74.00	76.00	74.00	42.00	52.00	56.00	72.00	64.60
VRA (+2 LVLMs)	40.00	82.00	70.00	70.00	82.00	74.00	90.00	92.00	70.00	86.00	75.60
VRA (+3 LVLMs)	56.00	82.00	80.00	72.00	76.00	80.00	82.00	84.00	78.00	98.00	78.80

Table 2: VRSBench VQA Subset (50 questions per type) Accuracy in %

Model	obj_quantity	obj_position	obj_direction	obj_size	reasoning	obj_color	obj_existence	obj_category	obj_shape	scene_type	overall
GeoChat	0.79	0.83	0.79	0.81	1.05	0.84	0.81	0.91	0.78	1.24	0.89
VRA (GeoChat)	135.26	145.62	144.87	133.42	142.09	144.86	143.71	141.49	142.27	134.08	140.77
LLaVA-1.5	0.56	0.71	0.84	0.80	1.08	0.68	0.74	0.79	0.73	0.93	0.79
VRA (LLaVA-1.5)	149.32	155.86	155.37	157.06	142.53	139.65	143.76	145.92	138.23	143.66	147.14
Gemma 3	2.29	2.63	2.64	4.46	3.28	1.72	2.40	3.08	2.46	3.92	2.89
VRA (Gemma 3)	170.06	163.17	183.04	189.95	185.91	194.74	174.01	179.46	179.34	186.15	180.58
VRA (+2 LVLMs)	156.53	166.21	155.29	160.79	152.47	159.94	154.45	160.59	140.46	149.14	155.59
VRA (+3 LVLMs)	190.03	196.92	195.75	212.28	197.24	184.62	174.63	197.11	164.74	177.57	189.09

Table 3: VRSBench VQA Subset (50 questions per type) Runtime in minutes

A Comprehensive Results Details

The following tables present the comprehensive evaluation results on the VRSBench VQA subset, consisting of 50 questions per type and overall performance of all question types. Table 2 reports the accuracy results (%) across different question types, comparing various baseline LVLMs and their corresponding VRA-augmented variants. Table 3 summarizes the runtime statistics, illustrating the computational costs associated with each model configuration. These results provide a holistic view of the performance trade-offs between accuracy and efficiency across diverse vision tasks.

B Prompt Templates

Table 4: Prompt template of the evaluation model in VRSBench VQA Dataset

System Prompt

(No system prompt)

User Prompt

Question: {question}

Ground Truth Answer: {ground_truth}

Predicted Answer: {prediction}

Does the predicted answer match the ground truth? Answer 1 for match and 0 for not match.

Use semantic meaning not exact match. Synonyms are also treated as a match, e.g., football and soccer, playground and ground track field, building and rooftop, pond and swimming pool.

Do not explain the reason.

Table 5: Prompt template for the VRA agent - Captioner user prompt

<p>System Prompt (No system prompt)</p> <hr/> <p>User Prompt <image> Describe every details in the image.</p>

Table 6: Prompt template for the VRA agent – Drafter prompts

<p>System Prompt You are expert in remote sensing and geospatial image analysis.</p> <p>Task:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a ~50 word answer to the user’s question based on the conversation. 2. Reflect and critique your answer. 3. Provide one question to ask vision model for retrieving more visual information. Your question should be straightforward and relevant to the answer and user question. <p>Current time: {time}</p> <hr/> <p>User Prompt Reflect on the user’s original question and the actions taken thus far.</p>

Table 7: Prompt template for the VRA agent – Inquirer prompt

<p>System Prompt (No system prompt)</p> <hr/> <p>User Prompt Extract one question from the latest response and invoke the tool with the question.</p>

Table 8: Prompt template for Vision Models in the Vision-Language Suite

<p>System Prompt (No system prompt)</p> <hr/> <p>User Prompt <image> {inquirer_question}</p>
--

Table 9: Prompt template for the VRA agent – Revisor prompts

System Prompt

You are expert in remote sensing and geospatial image analysis. In the preceding messages, you will find multiple tools' outputs providing visual information.

Task:

Revise your previous answer using the new visual information provided by multiple tools' outputs.

- You should use the previous critique to add important information to your answer.
 - You MUST include numerical citations in your revised answer to ensure it can be verified.
 - Add a "References" section to the bottom of your answer (which does not count towards the word limit). In form of:
 - [1] visual information here
 - [2] visual information here
 - More visual information here if there is any...
- You should use the previous critique to remove superfluous information from your answer and make SURE it is not more than 50 words.
- You should provide one question to ask vision model for retrieving more visual information. Your question should be straightforward without repeating previous questions.

Current time: {time}

User Prompt

Reflect on the user's original question and the actions taken thus far.

Table 10: Prompt template for the VRA agent – Spokesman prompts

System Prompt

You are a helpful AI assistant that good at reasoning out the answer.

Current time: {time}

User Prompt

Directly answer the user's question based on the last revision.