

CoViPAL: Layer-wise Contextualized Visual Token Pruning for Large Vision-Language Models

Zicong Tang^{2,†}, Ziyang Ma², Suqing Wang², Zuchao Li^{1,†*}, Lefei Zhang², Hai Zhao³, Yun Li⁴ and Qianren Wang⁴

¹School of Artificial Intelligence, Wuhan University

²School of Computer Science, Wuhan University

³School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

⁴Cognitive AI Lab, Shanghai Huawei Technologies, China

{tangzc,maziyang,wangsuqing,zcli-charlie,zhanglefei}@whu.edu.cn
zhaohai@cs.sjtu.edu.cn,lychina@139.com,wangqr2019@qq.com

Abstract

Large Vision-Language Models (LVLMs) process multimodal inputs consisting of text tokens and vision tokens extracted from images or videos. Due to the rich visual information, a single image can generate thousands of vision tokens, leading to high computational costs during the prefilling stage and significant memory overhead during decoding. Existing methods attempt to prune redundant vision tokens, revealing substantial redundancy in visual representations. However, these methods often struggle in shallow layers due to the lack of sufficient contextual information. We argue that many visual tokens are inherently redundant even in shallow layers and can be safely and effectively pruned with appropriate contextual signals. In this work, we propose CoViPAL, a layer-wise contextualized visual token pruning method that employs a Plug-and-Play Pruning Module (PPM) to predict and remove redundant vision tokens before they are processed by the LVLM. The PPM is lightweight, model-agnostic, and operates independently of the LVLM architecture, ensuring seamless integration with various models. Extensive experiments on multiple benchmarks demonstrate that CoViPAL outperforms training-free pruning methods under equal token budgets and surpasses training-based methods with comparable supervision. CoViPAL offers a scalable and efficient solution to improve inference efficiency in LVLMs without compromising accuracy. Our code is available in <https://github.com/tyxqc/CoViPAL>.

1 Introduction

Large Vision-Language Models (LVLMs, Chiang et al., 2023; Anil et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2023; Yang

* Corresponding author. † Equal contribution. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62306216) and the Technology Innovation Program of Hubei Province (No. 2024BAB043).




Figure 1: Illustration for CoViPAL at inference stage.

et al., 2024) have recently demonstrated remarkable capabilities in understanding and generating content grounded in visual inputs, including both images and videos. To effectively capture the rich spatial and semantic details inherent in visual signals, these models often rely on generating hundreds or even thousands of visual tokens per image or video. For instance, LLaVA-OneVision (Li et al., 2024a) explicitly allocates up to 7,290 visual tokens per image, leveraging a large corpus of high-quality images to maximize visual comprehension.

Although dense visual token representations enhance the model’s capacity to understand fine-grained visual content, they come at the cost of substantial computational and memory overhead (Zhang et al., 2025). This leads to reduced inference efficiency and makes it difficult to apply LVLMs in scenarios where resources are limited or real-time performance is required.

To address this issue, prior work has explored reducing the number of visual tokens or compressing their corresponding key-value (KV) cache (Bolya et al., 2022), highlighting the substantial redundancy present in visual representations. Token eviction methods discard less informative tokens based




Figure 2: Prune tokens in different layers and based on different attention weights.

on importance scores (Chen et al., 2024b), while token merging approaches group similar tokens and consolidate them to reduce token number (Chen et al., 2024a). Empirical observations suggest that pruning visual tokens in shallow layers can significantly hurt performance and every visual token matters in these layers (Xing et al., 2024). Despite their effectiveness to some extent, these methods largely fail to prune tokens in the shallow layers.

Visual token reduction is less effective in shallow layers, primarily because tokens in these layers interact with fewer transformer decoder layers, resulting in limited contextual information. This makes it challenging to identify unimportant tokens, leading to significant performance degradation when attempting to prune visual tokens at these stages (Shi et al., 2024). However, we observe that some visual tokens are inherently redundant and can be effectively and safely pruned when guided by appropriate contextual information. Based on this insight, we propose CoViPAL, a contextualized visual token pruning method that operates across all layers, as illustrated in Figure 1. CoViPAL implements the PPM module using a small classifier trained on limited data to identify and remove less important tokens before they are passed to the base model of LLaVA, thereby reducing the number of visual tokens while maintaining model performance.

We conducted experiments on two models: LLaVA-OneVision and LLaVA-Video. For LLaVA-

OneVision, we trained the classifier using only 0.46% of the pretraining dataset, while for LLaVA-Video, we extended its capabilities to handle video inputs using just 7.4% of the video instruction-following dataset. Additionally, we performed extensive experiments on various image and video benchmarks. The results demonstrate that our method reduces the prefilling time by up to 60% compared to the original model, with only minimal performance degradation when pruning 75% of the visual tokens. Furthermore, our approach outperforms both training-free methods, FastV and SparseVLM, and training-based method Pyramid-Drop, with the same visual token budget.

2 Related Works

2.1 Token Pruning

Token pruning methods aim to remove tokens with low attention or feature similarity after early or intermediate layers (Chen et al., 2024b; Lin et al., 2025; Xing et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2025), or optimize pruning schedules using small inference batches to meet FLOPs budgets (Ye et al., 2025; Yao et al., 2024b). These methods generally prioritize the preservation of early tokens to avoid information loss (Ma et al., 2025; Yao et al., 2024a).

2.2 Token Merging

Alternatively, similarity-based merging techniques fuse redundant tokens either spatially or cross-

modally to reduce token count while maintaining semantic integrity and accuracy (Chen et al., 2024a; Shi et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2025). These methods achieve compression without compromising downstream performance. They typically leave the tokens in shallow layers unmerged to maintain overall performance.

2.3 Hybrid Methods

Recent methods combine pruning and merging by ranking tokens based on attention, pruning low-importance tokens, and merging redundant ones to recycle information (Zhong et al., 2024; Shang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2025). For instance, LOOK-M (Wan et al., 2024) addresses long-context inference by compressing the KV cache through text-guided merging of similar key-value pairs, thereby reducing memory usage and improving decoding speed (Luohe et al., 2025).

These approaches generally retain visual tokens in shallow layers to minimize significant performance degradation. In contrast, our method demonstrates that visual token redundancy exists across all layers and can be safely pruned using a lightweight classifier trained on a small dataset. This approach facilitates earlier and more efficient pruning without sacrificing critical information.

3 Preliminary

3.1 Notations

In LVLMS, a vision encoder is typically employed to extract visual features, while a projector is used to map these features into the word embedding space. We denote the vision encoder and projector as $g(\cdot)$, so the visual tokens are represented as $\mathbf{H}_v = g(\mathbf{X}_v)$, where \mathbf{X}_v is the visual input. The textual input is represented by the text tokens \mathbf{H}_t , which are concatenated with the visual tokens, forming the input to the LLM as $f(\cdot)$.

For token pruning, we assign an importance score \mathbb{S} to each visual token. This score serves as the guiding criterion for the pruning process, directly determining the relevance of each token. Based on this score, we select the most important tokens to retain, while pruning those deemed less relevant, thereby reducing the overall number of visual tokens in the input.

3.2 Preliminary Experiment

We conduct a preliminary study using LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat (Li et al., 2024a) on the

MVBench dataset (Li et al., 2024c), where token pruning is applied at decoder layer L_p , guided by attention weights from an earlier layer L_g .

As shown in Figure 2, the choice of guidance layer L_g has a stronger impact on pruning effectiveness than the pruning layer L_p itself. This underscores the importance of selecting a semantically rich guidance layer. In particular, the 16th layer in LLaVA-OneVision proves to be a strong candidate for generating token importance scores.

Prior work often assumes $L_p = L_g$, attributing pruning performance to the pruning layer rather than the quality of the guidance (Zhong et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2025; Lin et al., 2025). Our results challenge this assumption, showing that such coupling may lead to suboptimal pruning.

We observe that many visual tokens are inherently redundant and can be pruned with minimal performance loss when guided effectively. However, using deeper layers for guidance ($L_g > L_p$) introduces a trade-off: the model must prefill up to L_g to compute attention scores A_g , then reprocess from L_p after pruning. This two-step procedure adds significant inference overhead.

4 Method

4.1 Inference

Our observations indicate that some visual tokens are inherently redundant across layers, while the attention weights in shallow layers are not sufficiently effective at guiding the pruning. To address this, we employ a plug-and-play pruning classifier (referred to as the *classifier*) to capture the inherent redundancy of the visual features for pruning.

We denote the classifier as $p_\theta(\cdot)$. It is positioned just before the LLM $f(\cdot)$. During inference, we compute the importance score for each visual token with the classifier as follows:


$$\mathbb{S} = p_\theta(\mathbf{H}_v, \mathbf{H}_t), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbb{S} represents the importance scores. Based on these scores, we perform pruning with a given reserve ratio r . The indices of the visual tokens to be retained are determined by:


$$\mathbb{I} = \text{TopK}(\mathbb{S}, r \times n_v), \quad (2)$$

where n_v is the total number of visual tokens.

Note that \mathbb{S} is computed over visual and text tokens, but only the scores for visual tokens. This is because visual token redundancy depends not



(a) Stage 1: attention guided training.



(b) Stage 2: end-to-end training.

Figure 3: Two stage training strategy.

0	-inf	-inf	-inf	-inf	-inf	-inf
M1	0	-inf	-inf	-inf	-inf	-inf
M1	M2	0	-inf	-inf	-inf	-inf
M1	M2	M3	0	-inf	-inf	-inf
M1	M2	M3	M4	0	-inf	-inf
M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	0	-inf
M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	0

Figure 4: Attention mask at the training stage 2.

only on visual features but also on textual context, which guides the model in identifying more relevant visual tokens (Sun et al., 2025).

4.2 Training Stage 1

Our observations indicate that attention weights in deeper layers of the LLM effectively guide the pruning process. Attention weights in these layers contain significant contextual information, which highlights the tokens that need to be attended by the attention mechanism. Therefore, we leverage the information to train the classifier as in Figure 3a.

We denote the guiding attention weights as A_g , and the specific layer from which these weights are derived as l_g . For training, we use the accumulated attention weights, denoted as A_l , as the target labels. The label for the k -th token is computed by accumulating the attention weights over the relevant layers:

$$A_{l,k} = \sum_{i=1}^h \sum_{j=n-n_v}^n A_{g,i,j,k}, \quad (3)$$

where h represents the number of attention heads, n is the number of tokens.

The classifier outputs \hat{S} represents the predicted importance scores for the visual tokens. To train the classifier, we optimize the model using the mean squared error (MSE) loss function, aiming to minimize the discrepancy between the predicted scores \hat{S} and the accumulated attention labels A_l . The MSE loss is computed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mse}} = \frac{1}{n_v} \sum_{k=1}^{n_v} (\hat{S}_k - A_{l,k})^2, \quad (4)$$

where \hat{S}_k , $A_{l,k}$ are the predicted and true importance scores, respectively, for the k -th visual token.

The goal is to train the classifier to output scores that align with the accumulated attention weights, which will guide the pruning operation effectively.

This training is efficient, as only a small classifier $p_{\theta}(\cdot)$ is optimized. The LLM parameters before layer l_g remain fixed, avoiding gradient computation, while those after layer l_g are dropped, greatly reducing both computation and memory overhead.

4.3 Training Stage 2

To further improve the model's capacity to capture contextual information and accurately identify important visual tokens, we introduce an end-to-end training phase as Figure 3b, incorporating a differentiable approximation of the pruning operation.

Direct pruning of less-relevant visual tokens during training using hard indexing (e.g., $\mathbf{H}_v[\mathbb{I}]$) is non-differentiable and thus breaks the backpropagation process. To address this, we simulate the

pruning effect by modifying the attention mechanism through a soft attention mask.

We apply a sigmoid activation to the classifier outputs $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ to normalize the predicted importance scores into the range $[0, 1]$:

$$\mathbb{P} = \sigma(\hat{\mathbb{S}}). \quad (5)$$

Here, \mathbb{P}_i can be interpreted as the retention probability for the i -th visual token. To simulate pruning, we convert the normalized importance scores into attention biases using a logarithmic transformation:

$$B = \log(\mathbb{P}). \quad (6)$$

This transformation ensures that tokens with low importance scores receive large negative biases, thus masking them during attention computation.

We then construct the final attention mask in Figure 4 by adding the attention bias B_j to the standard causal attention mask:

$$M_{i,j} = M_{i,j}^{\text{causal}} + B_j, \quad \text{for } i > j, \quad (7)$$

where M^{causal} is the standard causal mask.

The model outputs predictions \hat{y} , and the ground truth labels are denoted as y . We define the training objective as a combination of the cross-entropy loss and a regularization term:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{ce}}(y, \hat{y}) + k \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(\mathbb{P}), \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(\mathbb{P})$ enforces the model to retain a predefined ratio r of visual tokens and encourages the model to approximate the token pruning patterns during inference. The parameter k controls the weight of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(\mathbb{P})$ in the overall loss function.

A naive regularization (Nawrot et al., 2024) such as: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} = \mathcal{L}_1(r, \text{mean}(\mathbb{P}))$ enforces a global retention rate r , but tends to collapse all probabilities \mathbb{P}_i to values near r , harming discriminative capacity.

To promote a clearer distinction between important and unimportant visual tokens, we introduce a contrastive style regularization objective that explicitly separates their predicted importance scores.

We first compute the indices of the top and bottom tokens based on the classifier’s normalized outputs $\mathbb{P} \in [0, 1]^{n_v}$, where n_v is the number of visual tokens:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{\text{high}} &= \text{TopK}(\mathbb{P}, \lfloor r \cdot n_v \rfloor), \\ \mathbb{P}_{\text{high}} &= \mathbb{P}[\mathbb{I}_{\text{high}}], \\ \mathbb{I}_{\text{low}} &= \text{DTopK}(\mathbb{P}, \lfloor (1 - r) \cdot n_v \rfloor), \\ \mathbb{P}_{\text{low}} &= \mathbb{P}[\mathbb{I}_{\text{low}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Then we define the regularization loss as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} = \mathcal{L}_1(1, \text{mean}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{high}}) - \text{mean}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{low}})). \quad (10)$$

This objective aims to maximize the average margin between the most and least important tokens. Specifically: $\text{TopK}(\cdot)$ returns the indices of the top $r \cdot n_v$ visual tokens with the highest importance scores, $\text{DTopK}(\cdot)$ returns the indices of the bottom $(1 - r) \cdot n_v$ tokens, $\mathcal{L}_1(1, \cdot)$ penalizes deviation from the target margin of 1 between high and low importance scores.

This regularization guides the classifier to assign high retention scores to top-ranked tokens and low scores to less relevant ones, aligning with the inference-time selection and enabling pruning-aware learning in a fully differentiable way.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setup

Baselines We evaluate our methods with three baseline approaches: FastV (Chen et al., 2024b), SparseVLM (Zhang et al., 2025), and PyramidDrop (Xing et al., 2024), all of which performing token pruning. FastV prunes visual tokens in a specific layer using self-attention scores of that layer. PyramidDrop prunes tokens in predefined layers based on attention weights. SparseVLM also prunes tokens in predefined layers but merges part of the pruned tokens and reserve them. FastV and SparseVLM are plug-and-play methods, while PyramidDrop offers both training-free and training-based strategies.

Base Models We conduct experiments on two state-of-the-art LVLMs: LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat (Xiong et al., 2024) and LLaVA-Video-7b (Zhang et al., 2024). LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat is trained on a combination 4.8M dataset of image and video. LLaVA-Video-7b is fine-tuned from LLaVA-OneVision using a joint dataset, including LLaVA-Video-178K. For evaluating image tasks, we use LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat, while LLaVA-Video-7b is used for video tasks.

Classifier Model We design a compact classifier with two projection layers and 8 encoder layers. The first projection maps LVLM embeddings to the classifier input, and the second outputs a scalar score $\mathbb{S} = 1$. The encoder comprises 8 layers, each with a hidden size of 768, intermediate size of 3072, 16 attention heads, and 4 key-value heads, resulting in a total of 71.20M parameters.

Models	GQA	MME	SEED	MMStar	AI2D	OCRvQA	TextVQA	InfoVQA	Avg(%)
LLaVA-OV-7b	61.70	1605.41	76.59	61.67	82.77	59.83	75.02	65.52	100.00%
reserve ratio = 0.5									
FastV	60.89	1586.18	74.95	57.20	80.70	<u>58.56</u>	71.69	49.58	94.34%
SparseVLM	59.35	1560.75	74.40	54.67	78.69	45.96	69.49	42.06	88.49%
PDrop	<u>61.02</u>	1590.56	<u>75.75</u>	<u>59.00</u>	80.83	57.19	<u>74.71</u>	60.90	<u>97.29%</u>
PDrop*	59.97	1532.82	75.89	58.00	80.24	59.90	70.64	46.83	93.56%
CoViPAL	61.31	1613.37	75.48	59.07	82.12	57.85	74.08	<u>59.66</u>	97.48%
reserve ratio = 0.25									
FastV	56.12	1523.37	65.88	47.23	73.25	46.29	57.29	35.18	80.54%
SparseVLM	52.85	1415.58	67.42	45.40	70.30	32.09	43.61	28.03	71.88%
PDrop	<u>58.02</u>	1470.22	67.50	49.80	73.06	48.83	68.32	41.90	84.93%
PDrop*	57.77	<u>1531.10</u>	<u>70.47</u>	49.80	<u>74.31</u>	49.22	64.95	34.47	84.12%
CoViPAL	59.93	1559.29	73.22	54.33	79.47	<u>48.92</u>	<u>65.99</u>	47.28	89.48%

Table 1: Image benchmark results. PDrop and PDrop* represent the training-free and training-based versions of PyramidDrop, respectively, which is consistent in the subsequent tables.

Models	MVBench	MMBVideo	MLVU ^m	MLVU ^g	LongVB	WorldSense	Avg(%)
LLaVA-Video-7b	58.32	1.71	62.40	4.16	52.50	38.20	100.00%
reserve ratio = 0.5							
FastV	56.87	1.67	60.60	4.89	52.60	37.60	<u>101.41%</u>
SparseVLM	55.29	1.63	59.20	4.51	50.10	37.30	97.74%
PDrop	55.21	1.63	56.80	<u>4.96</u>	<u>52.10</u>	34.80	98.43%
PDrop*	55.74	1.60	61.50	4.73	49.60	38.90	99.62%
CoViPAL	<u>56.66</u>	<u>1.66</u>	<u>61.40</u>	4.97	51.80	<u>38.10</u>	101.75%
reserve ratio = 0.25							
FastV	52.74	1.55	<u>55.90</u>	4.68	48.20	36.50	95.08%
SparseVLM	50.00	1.52	54.50	4.33	47.00	36.30	91.77%
PDrop	50.50	1.55	53.30	4.70	<u>48.90</u>	33.50	92.74%
PDrop*	<u>53.03</u>	<u>1.58</u>	59.20	<u>4.72</u>	<u>48.30</u>	37.70	<u>97.06%</u>
CoViPAL	55.42	1.61	55.80	4.85	51.30	<u>37.20</u>	98.38%

Table 2: Results of video benchmarks.

Training Implementation In training stage 1, we use 3% of LLaVA-NeXT-Data (which is 0.46% of the training data of LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat), totaling 22.2K samples, to train the classifier with base model LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat. After stage 1, we proceed to Stage 2, initializing the classifier from Stage 1. During the training stage 2, we trained two classifiers. One is trained on the same data as training stage 1 with the base model LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat, which is used for image benchmark evaluation. And another on 20% of the 0_30_s_academic_v0_1 (13.2K samples) dataset with LLaVA-Video-7b for video benchmark. For PyramidDrop, we fine-tune two models with LoRA (Hu et al., 2022): one on 10% of LLaVA-NeXT-Data with LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat for image evaluation, and the other on 60% of 0_30_s_academic_v0_1 with LLaVA-Video-7b

for video benchmark. The larger dataset for PyramidDrop ensures consistent training time, as Stage 2 is incompatible with Flash Attention (Dao et al., 2022), which doesn’t support this type of custom attention mask currently. Detailed compatibility of Flash Attention is available in Appendix B.

Training Hyperparameters Each run is trained for one epoch using Bfloat16 precision. The learning rate is set to 1e-5, except in Stage 2 where it is reduced to 0.5e-5 to preserve parameters in Stage 1. We set $k = 0.01$ in Eq. 8, and apply a cosine scheduler. For PyramidDrop, we use a LoRA rank of 32 (97.72M trainable params). The input length is capped at 3000 tokens. For image input, we use the anyres-max-2 setting, producing up to 2189 visual tokens-leaving room for text to avoid truncation. For video input, we allow 8 frames (max 1568 visual tokens). The reserve ratio is fixed at 0.25,




Figure 5: Efficiency Results of CoViPAL on LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat.

Method	16Frame	32Frame	48Frame	64Frame
Prefilling overhead (ms, ↓)				
FullKV	745.0	1482.1	2236.2	OOM
FastV	340.4	513.8	1056.0	OOM
SparseVLM	464.6	677.4	1494.3	OOM
PDrop	433.1	<u>602.5</u>	795.9	OOM
CoViPAL	<u>416.4</u>	616.8	<u>865.2</u>	1058.3
Decoding speed (tokens/second, ↑)				
FullKV	<u>25.18</u>	24.65	22.83	OOM
FastV	24.64	24.55	23.10	OOM
SparseVLM	24.17	24.23	24.10	OOM
PDrop	24.45	24.61	<u>24.18</u>	OOM
CoViPAL	25.41	25.22	24.90	24.81

Table 3: Prefilling overhead and decoding speed of CoViPAL and baselines.

as we believe that a training-based method should be robust enough to accommodate differences in reserve ratio between training and inference.

Evaluation Benchmarks We evaluate our methods on eight image and five video benchmarks spanning visual reasoning, multimodal comprehension, temporal understanding and so on. This diverse set ensures a comprehensive assessment across visual inputs. Details are provided in the Appendix D. All evaluations use VLMEvalKit (Duan et al., 2024).

5.2 Evaluation Results

Image Benchmarks We evaluate CoViPAL on eight widely used image benchmarks, with the results reported in Table 1. Our results indicate that CoViPAL effectively preserves the model’s

Reserve Ratio	Classifier	Prefilling	Decoding
FullKV 100%	-	17679	16817
CoViPAL 90%	16323	17804	16795
CoViPAL 75%	16323	17534	16699
CoViPAL 50%	16323	16723	16539
CoViPAL 25%	16323	16639	16377
CoViPAL 10%	16323	16378	16281

Table 4: Memory consumption of CoViPAL.

image comprehension capabilities on tasks of real-world scenarios. CoViPAL consistently surpasses the three baseline methods when retaining 50% or only 25% of the image tokens. Particularly, when the reserve ratio is set to 25%, which significantly challenges the model’s token selection capability, CoViPAL demonstrates superior performance by accurately identifying and preserving the most crucial visual tokens. Additionally, results confirm the robustness of CoViPAL, as performance remains stable even when the inference reserve ratio (50%) differs from the training reserve ratio (25%).

Video Benchmarks We further evaluate CoViPAL on five widely recognized video benchmarks, with the results summarized in Table 2. The experimental results demonstrate that CoViPAL effectively eliminates redundant or less relevant visual tokens, leading to performance improvements under various conditions. CoViPAL consistently outperforms the three comparative

Models	GQA	MME	SEED	MMStar	AI2D	OCRvQA	TextVQA	InfoVQA
LLaVA-OV-7b	61.70	1605.41	76.59	61.67	82.77	59.83	75.02	65.52
reserve ratio = 0.5								
p_{θ}^1	60.85	1547.10	74.85	58.20	81.22	52.77	68.35	52.12
p_{θ}^8	61.31	1613.37	75.48	59.07	82.12	57.85	74.08	59.66
reserve ratio = 0.25								
p_{θ}^1	57.21	1446.89	70.67	51.20	76.91	37.43	48.21	35.55
p_{θ}^8	59.93	1559.29	73.22	54.33	79.47	48.92	65.99	47.28

Table 5: Performance comparison of image benchmarks on two model architectures.

Depth	Reserve Ratio		Hidden Size	Reserve Ratio	
	0.5	0.25		0.5	0.25
2	61.00	57.75	384	61.42	57.75
4	61.05	58.53	768	61.31	59.93
8	61.31	59.93	1536	60.91	59.96

(a) Different model depth.

(b) Different model width.

Table 6: GQA benchmark results for different model depth and model width.

baselines, exhibiting only a minor performance degradation of 1.62% when pruning 75% of the visual tokens. Moreover, the results suggest that videos are more information-sparse compared to images, containing a higher proportion of redundant visual tokens, thereby making video tasks inherently more robust to token pruning.

Efficiency Results We evaluate the efficiency of CoViPAL on LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat with video input on a single RTX 3090 24G GPU. The sample frame size ranges from 16 to 64, resulting in input tokens ranging from 3k to 13k. With a reserve ratio of 0.25, we measure prefilling time, decoding speed and memory consumption for generating 1k tokens, and the classifier’s overhead during prefilling. All methods are integrated with FlashAttention. Results are shown in Figure 5, Table 3 and Table 4.

Our method substantially reduces prefilling time and accelerates decoding. In terms of decoding speed, our method consistently outperforms all baseline approaches. For the prefilling stage, the introduction of the classifier model incurs negligible time overhead, and the overall performance of our method is comparable to the baselines. Notably, for 48-frame inputs, CoViPAL reduces prefilling time by over 60% and enables 64-frame inference on a 24GB GPU, whereas the original model and all baselines fail due to memory limitations.

CoViPAL consistently reduces the decoding

Models	$r = 50\%$	$r = 25\%$
LLaVA-OV-7b	61.70	
$k = 0.1$	61.19	59.31
$k = 0.01$	61.31	59.94
$k = 0.0001$	61.11	58.73

Table 7: Ablation study on k .

peak memory, achieving over 1 GiB memory savings when pruning 75% of tokens. This demonstrates CoViPAL’s promise for high-throughput LVLm applications.


5.3 Ablation Study

Model Structure for Contextual Information Capture We first compare two classifier models: a multi-layer encoder with 71.2M parameters (p_{θ}^8) and a single-layer encoder with 165.18M parameters (p_{θ}^1), in which the latter uses the same settings as LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat decoder.

Trained with the same two-stage strategy on 3% of LLaVA-NeXT-Data, p_{θ}^8 consistently outperforms p_{θ}^1 on image tasks, as shown in Table 5. Despite its smaller size, the deeper model captures redundant token patterns more effectively, highlighting the advantage of deeper attention layers in modeling contextual information for pruning.

Subsequently, we evaluate the impact of varying model depth and hidden size on the GQA benchmark. As shown in Table 6, more encoder layers or a larger hidden size help the classifier better capture visual features and classify redundant tokens. The classifier architecture with different hyperparameters shows consistent performance trends, which proves the generality of our method.

k for Training Stage 2 The hyperparameter k in Eq. 8 is crucial in Stage 2. A large k causes early sharp separation of retain probabilities \mathbb{P} which hindering the subsequent training, while a small k



(a) \mathbb{S} of classifier after training stage 1. (b) \mathbb{P} of classifier after training stage 2.

Figure 6: The distribution of classifier outputs after two training stages.

keeps \mathbb{P} continuous, misaligned with the discrete selection required during inference. The distribution of classifier outputs are showed in Appendix C.4.

We train with k values from 0.0001 to 0.1 using LLaVA-OneVision-7b-Chat and evaluate on GQA (Hudson and Manning, 2019). For $k = 0.0001$, we warm up with $k = 0.01$ to avoid continuous distribution throughout training. As shown in Table 7, $k = 0.01$ yields the best performance.

Effectiveness of the Training Strategy Training Stage 2 from a randomly initialized model led to a collapse of retain probabilities \mathbb{P} to 0 throughout training, even with $k = 0.1$, as shown in Figure 7c. In contrast, initializing from the Stage 1 model Figure 6a allowed \mathbb{P} to stabilize and discretize effectively Figure 6b.

These results underscore the value of the two-stage strategy: Stage 1 captures contextual attention patterns, providing a strong initialization for Stage 2 to identify redundant tokens and simulate pruning under smaller k .

More experiment results and analysis are available in Appendix C.

6 Conclusion

We propose CoViPAL, a novel contextualized visual token pruning method that efficiently reduces the computational and memory overhead of Large Vision-Language Models by leveraging a lightweight and plug-and-play pruning module. CoViPAL identifies and removes redundant visual tokens across all layers with minimal supervision, achieving up to 50% reduction in pre-filling time

and pruning 75% of visual tokens while maintaining competitive performance. Our method outperforms both training-free and training-based approaches, offering a scalable and adaptable solution for efficient multimodal inference. This work provides new insights into visual token redundancy and paves the way for deploying LVLMs in resource-constrained settings.

Limitations

While our approach has been validated on representative LVLMs, the diversity of model backbones explored so far remains limited. In future work, we plan to extend our method to a broader range of architectures, including base models from the LLaMA and Mistral families, to assess its applicability across different LVLm paradigms and better understand its architectural generality.

In addition, the current experiments are conducted on models of moderate scale. Scaling up to larger model sizes will allow us to further investigate the generalization and effectiveness of our pruning framework in high-capacity settings. These extensions will provide deeper insights into the scalability and robustness of our approach.

References

- Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M. Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, David Silver, Slav Petrov, Melvin Johnson, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Amelia Glaese, Jilin Chen, Emily Pitler, Timothy P. Lillicrap, and 33 others. 2023. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2312.11805.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. [Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities](#). *CoRR*, abs/2308.12966.
- Daniel Bolya, Cheng-Yang Fu, Xiaoliang Dai, Peizhao Zhang, Christoph Feichtenhofer, and Judy Hoffman. 2022. Token merging: Your vit but faster. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09461*.
- Jieneng Chen, Luoxin Ye, Ju He, Zhao-Yang Wang, Daniel Khoshabi, and Alan Yuille. 2024a. Efficient large multi-modal models via visual context compression. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Liang Chen, Haozhe Zhao, Tianyu Liu, Shuai Bai, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Baobao Chang. 2024b. [An image is worth 1/2 tokens after layer 2: Plug-and-play inference acceleration for large vision-language](#)

- models. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2024 - 18th European Conference, Milan, Italy, September 29-October 4, 2024, Proceedings, Part LXXXI*, volume 15139 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 19–35. Springer.
- Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, and 1 others. 2024c. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20330*.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).
- Tri Dao, Dan Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:16344–16359.
- Haodong Duan, Junming Yang, Yuxuan Qiao, Xinyu Fang, Lin Chen, Yuan Liu, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, and 1 others. 2024. Vlmevalkit: An open-source toolkit for evaluating large multi-modality models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 11198–11201.
- Xinyu Fang, Kangrui Mao, Haodong Duan, Xiangyu Zhao, Yining Li, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. 2024. Mmbench-video: A long-form multi-shot benchmark for holistic video understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:89098–89124.
- Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. 2024. [Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.13394.
- Jack Hong, Shilin Yan, Jiayin Cai, Xiaolong Jiang, Yao Hu, and Weidi Xie. 2025. Worldsense: Evaluating real-world omnimodal understanding for multimodal llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.04326*.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, and 1 others. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3.
- Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. 2019. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709.
- Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. 2024a. [Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer](#). *CoRR*, abs/2408.03326.
- Bohao Li, Yuying Ge, Yi Chen, Yixiao Ge, Ruimao Zhang, and Ying Shan. 2024b. Seed-bench-2-plus: Benchmarking multimodal large language models with text-rich visual comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16790*.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR.
- Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, and 1 others. 2024c. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22195–22206.
- Zhihang Lin, Mingbao Lin, Luxi Lin, and Rongrong Ji. 2025. Boosting multimodal large language models with visual tokens withdrawal for rapid inference. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 5334–5342.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024. [Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge](#).
- Shi Luohe, Zuchao Li, Lefei Zhang, Baoyuan Qi, Liu Guoming, and Hai Zhao. 2025. [KV-latent: Dimensional-level KV cache reduction with frequency-aware rotary positional embedding](#). In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1535–1550, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziyang Ma, Zuchao Li, Lefei Zhang, Gui-Song Xia, Bo Du, Liangpei Zhang, and Dacheng Tao. 2025. [Model hemorrhage and the robustness limits of large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2503.23924.
- Minesh Mathew, Viraj Bagal, Rubèn Tito, Dimosthenis Karatzas, Ernest Valveny, and CV Jawahar. 2022. Infographicvqa. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1697–1706.
- Anand Mishra, Shashank Shekhar, Ajeet Kumar Singh, and Anirban Chakraborty. 2019. Ocr-vqa: Visual question answering by reading text in images. In *2019 international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 947–952. IEEE.
- Piotr Nawrot, Adrian Lancucki, Marcin Chochowski, David Tarjan, and Edoardo M. Ponti. 2024. [Dynamic memory compression: Retrofitting llms for accelerated inference](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Min Joon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Oren Etzioni. 2014. Diagram understanding in geometry questions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 28.

- Yuzhang Shang, Mu Cai, Bingxin Xu, Yong Jae Lee, and Yan Yan. 2024. Llava-prumerge: Adaptive token reduction for efficient large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15388*.
- Dachuan Shi, Chaofan Tao, Anyi Rao, Zhendong Yang, Chun Yuan, and Jiaqi Wang. 2023. Cross-get: Cross-guided ensemble of tokens for accelerating vision-language transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17455*.
- Luohe Shi, Hongyi Zhang, Yao Yao, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. 2024. Keep the cost down: A review on methods to optimize llm’s kv-cache consumption. *CoRR*, abs/2407.18003.
- Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. 2019. Towards vqa models that can read. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8317–8326.
- Yizheng Sun, Yanze Xin, Hao Li, Jingyuan Sun, Chenghua Lin, and Riza Batista-Navarro. 2025. Lvpruning: An effective yet simple language-guided vision token pruning approach for multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13652*.
- Zicong Tang, Shi Luohe, Zuchao Li, Baoyuan Qi, Liu Guoming, Lefei Zhang, and Ping Wang. 2025. SpindleKV: A novel KV cache reduction method balancing both shallow and deep layers. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 28428–28442, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhongwei Wan, Ziang Wu, Che Liu, Jinfa Huang, Zhihong Zhu, Peng Jin, Longyue Wang, and Li Yuan. 2024. Look-m: Look-once optimization in kv cache for efficient multimodal long-context inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18139*.
- Haoning Wu, Dongxu Li, Bei Chen, and Junnan Li. 2024. Longvideobench: A benchmark for long-context interleaved video-language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:28828–28857.
- Long Xing, Qidong Huang, Xiaoyi Dong, Jiajie Lu, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Wu, and Dahua Lin. 2024. Pyramid-drop: Accelerating your large vision-language models via pyramid visual redundancy reduction. *CoRR*, abs/2410.17247.
- Tianyi Xiong, Bo Li, Dong Guo, Huizhuo Yuan, Quanquan Gu, and Chunyuan Li. 2024. Llava-onevision-chat: Improving chat with preference learning.
- Yifei Yang, Runhan Shi, Zuchao Li, Shu Jiang, Bao-Liang Lu, Yang Yang, and Hai Zhao. 2024. Batgpt-chem: A foundation large model for retrosynthesis prediction. *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.10285.
- Yao Yao, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. 2024a. GKT: A novel guidance-based knowledge transfer framework for efficient cloud-edge collaboration LLM deployment. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 3433–3446. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yao Yao, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. 2024b. Sirlm: Streaming infinite retentive LLM. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024, pages 2611–2624. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weihao Ye, Qiong Wu, Wenhao Lin, and Yiyi Zhou. 2025. Fit and prune: Fast and training-free visual token pruning for multi-modal large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 22128–22136.
- Yuan Zhang, Chun-Kai Fan, Junpeng Ma, Wenzhao Zheng, Tao Huang, Kuan Cheng, Denis Gudovskiy, Tomoyuki Okuno, Yohei Nakata, Kurt Keutzer, and 1 others. 2025. Sparsevlm: Visual token sparsification for efficient vision-language model inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Yuanhan Zhang, Jinming Wu, Wei Li, Bo Li, Zejun Ma, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. 2024. Video instruction tuning with synthetic data. *CoRR*, abs/2410.02713.
- Yi Zhao, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. 2025. IAM: Efficient inference through attention mapping between different-scale LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 19522–19533, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yiwu Zhong, Zhuoming Liu, Yin Li, and Liwei Wang. 2024. Aim: Adaptive inference of multi-modal llms via token merging and pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03248*.
- Junjie Zhou, Yan Shu, Bo Zhao, Boya Wu, Zhengyang Liang, Shitao Xiao, Minghao Qin, Xi Yang, Yongping Xiong, Bo Zhang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. 2025. Mlvu: Benchmarking multi-task long video understanding. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.04264.

A Related Work

A.1 Large Vision-Language Models

Large vision-language models (LVLMs) combine vision encoders with large language models to jointly process image and text inputs. This multimodal architecture has achieved strong performance on tasks like visual question answering and captioning, with representative models including BLIP-2(Li et al., 2023), Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023), and the LLaVA series (Liu et al., 2024). LLaVA-OneVision (Li et al., 2024a) extends LVLMs to handle single-image, multi-image, and video inputs in a unified framework, while LLaVA-Video (Zhang et al., 2024) adapts to the video domain via instruction tuning. However, rich visual inputs often produce thousands of tokens, leading to high computational and memory costs. This bottleneck limits inference efficiency and practical deployment, highlighting the need for token compression to make LVLMs more scalable and efficient.

B Flash Attention Compatibility

Our method is compatible with Flash Attention during both inference and Stage 1 of training (for both the classifier model and the LVLM). The only incompatibility arises in Stage 2 of LVLM: Flash Attention currently does not support the custom attention mask depicted in Figure 4. Consequently, we fall back to eager (standard) attention for the LVLM in Stage 2, while the classifier model remains Flash-Attention-compatible throughout.

C More Experiments and Analysis

C.1 Training with Different Guidance Layer

we conduct two-stage training with different guidance layers in stage 1 (stage 2 does not need the guidance any more). We evaluate the performance on the GQA benchmark and the results are indicated in Table 8. Aligned with our preliminary experiment, attention weights in deeper layers include more contextual information and thus can better guide the pruning process.

C.2 Comparison with Pruning at 8-th Layer

we use the attention from layer 8 of the LLM to guide the pruning, and layers 8+ use the pruned tokens during training and inference. We fine-tune LLaVA-OneVision-7B with LoRA, with 97.72M

Guidance Layer	Reserve Ratio	
	0.5	0.25
0	61.01	59.34
8	60.88	58.76
16	61.31	59.93

Table 8: Training CoViPAL with Different Guidance Layer.

trainable parameters (more than 71.20M of the classifier model). Other experimental settings are the same as those used to train our classifier model. The reserve ratio is 0.5 (pruning 70% of the visual tokens at layer 8) because pruning at layer 8 cannot achieve a total reserve ratio of 0.25.

As shown in Table 9, with the same depth of 8, CoViPAL achieves a better balance between KV cache size and model performance through pruning visual tokens before the LLM, further proving that some visual tokens are inherently redundant and can be pruned safely when guided by appropriate contextual signals.

C.3 Comparison with PDrop with the Same Dataset

To fairly compare with PyramidDrop, we need to ensure the same training time or dataset. We chose the former: we provided more data for PyramidDrop to ensure the same training time. Our method outperforms PyramidDrop with only 1/3 of the training data.

We also train PyramidDrop on 3% image datasets and reserve 25% visual tokens. Results are reported on Table 10. With the same dataset, PyramidDrop performs far worse than our method. However, this comparison is unfair because PyramidDrop consumed less training time.

C.4 Classifier Output Distribution

We provide the distribution of the classifier model outputs after training stage 2, which highlights the influence of different settings for the hyperparameter k during this stage. The hyperparameter k plays a crucial role in the second stage of training. When k is set to 0.1, the retain probabilities \mathbb{P} become sharply separated at the beginning of stage 2, as shown in Figure 7a, which can hinder subsequent training. On the other hand, when k is set to 0.0001, a large portion of the \mathbb{P} values remain continuous, as seen in Figure 7c, which prevents the values from approximating the discrete selection patterns

Models	GQA	MME	SEED	MMStar	AI2D	OCR-VQA	TextVQA	InfoVQA
LLaVA-OV-7b	61.70	1605.41	76.59	61.67	82.77	59.83	75.02	65.52
Prune at Layer8	58.95	1572.62	74.42	54.45	78.95	56.41	69.18	40.71
CoViPAL	61.31	1613.37	75.48	59.07	82.12	57.85	74.08	59.66

Table 9: Performance comparison of image benchmarks on CoViPAL and pruning at the 8 – *th* layer of LVLM.

Models	GQA	MME	SEED	MMStar	AI2D	OCR-VQA	TextVQA	InfoVQA
LLaVA-OV-7b	61.70	1605.41	76.59	61.67	82.77	59.83	75.02	65.52
PDrop*(3% data)	56.77	1482.83	69.33	<u>49.80</u>	73.41	49.51	64.67	<u>35.80</u>
PDrop*(10% data)	<u>57.77</u>	<u>1531.10</u>	<u>70.47</u>	<u>49.80</u>	<u>74.31</u>	<u>49.22</u>	<u>64.95</u>	34.47
CoViPAL	59.93	1559.29	73.22	54.33	79.47	48.92	65.99	47.28


Table 10: Performance comparison of image benchmarks on CoViPAL and PyramidDrop with the same training time or the same dataset.

needed during inference. When $k = 0.1$, the distribution of the classifier’s output in Figure 7b aligns with the pruning operation during the inference stage, allowing the model to gradually identify redundant tokens and simulate pruning under smaller values of k .

D Benchmark Detail

We evaluate our method on a diverse collection of vision-language benchmarks, covering both image and video modalities. As summarized in Table 11, the image-based benchmarks include GQA (Hudson and Manning, 2019), MME (Fu et al., 2024), SEED-Bench (Li et al., 2024b), MMStar (Chen et al., 2024c), AI2D (Seo et al., 2014), OCR-VQA (Mishra et al., 2019), TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019), and InfographicVQA (Mathew et al., 2022).

For video-based evaluation, we adopt MVBench (Li et al., 2024c), MMBench-Video (Fang et al., 2024), MLVU (Zhou et al., 2025), LongVideoBench (Wu et al., 2024), and WorldSense (Hong et al., 2025). These benchmarks collectively provide a comprehensive testbed for assessing both the effectiveness and generalizability of our proposed method.



(a) \mathbb{P} of classifier after training stage 2 when $k = 0.1$.

(b) \mathbb{P} of classifier after training stage 2 when $k = 0.01$.

(c) \mathbb{P} of classifier after training stage 2, $k = 0.0001$.

Figure 7: The distribution of classifier outputs after training stages 2 when setting different k .

Modality	Benchmark	Short Name	Task Feature
Image	GQA	GQA	Visual attribute reasoning
	MME	MME	Multimodal evaluation across modalities
	SEED-Bench	SEED	Generative multimodal comprehension
	MMStar	MMStar	Vision tasks with minimal data leakage
	AI2D	AI2D	Diagram understanding
	OCR-VQA	OCRVQA	Text-based image reasoning
	TextVQA	TextVQA	Scene text understanding
	InfographicVQA	InfoVQA	Multimodal infographic reasoning
Video	MVBench	MVBench	Temporal understanding in videos
	MMBench-Video	MMBenchV	Long-form video reasoning
	MLVU	MLVU	Multi-task video understanding
	LongVideoBench	LongVB	Interleaved video-language reasoning
	WorldSense	WorldSense	Omni-modal (visual/audio/text) understanding

Table 11: Detailed Evaluation Benchmarks