

UniMIC: Token-Based Multimodal Interactive Coding for Human–AI Collaboration

Qi Mao, Tinghan Yang, Jiahao Li, Bin Li, Libiao Jin, Yan Lu

Abstract—The rapid progress of Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) and cloud-based AI agents is transforming human–AI collaboration into bidirectional, multimodal interaction. However, existing codecs remain optimized for unimodal, one-way communication, resulting in repeated degradation under conventional compress–transmit–reconstruct pipelines. To address this limitation, we propose UniMIC, a **Unified token-based Multimodal Interactive Coding** framework that bridges edge devices and cloud AI agents. Instead of transmitting raw pixels or plain text, UniMIC employs compact tokenized representations as the communication medium, enabling efficient low-bitrate transmission while maintaining compatibility with LMMs. To further enhance compression, lightweight Transformer-based entropy models with scenario-specific designs—generic, masked, and text-conditioned—effectively minimize inter-token redundancy. Extensive experiments on text-to-image generation, text-guided inpainting, outpainting, and visual question answering show that UniMIC achieves substantial bitrate savings and remains robust even at ultra-low bitrates (< 0.05 bpp), without compromising downstream task performance. These results establish UniMIC as a practical and forward-looking paradigm for next-generation multimodal interactive communication.

Index Terms—Multimodal Interactive Coding, Ultra-Low Bitrate Compression, Human–AI Collaboration Compression, Token-Based Transmission.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI), particularly Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) and autonomous AI agents, are fundamentally reshaping the paradigm of human–AI collaboration. As AI systems—typically deployed in the cloud—evolve from passive analytical tools to interactive collaborators (e.g., generative design assistants that co-create content with users or diagnostic agents that conduct multimodal consultations), the interaction pattern between humans and machines is shifting from **one-way send–receive communication to iterative, bidirectional, and multimodal dialogue**. In such collaborative settings, *edge devices* (i.e., user terminals) transmit text instructions and upload images for analysis, while *cloud-based AI agents* respond by generating new content (e.g., text or images) or performing multimodal reasoning according to the given instructions. This process inherently involves both humans and AI as senders and

Qi Mao, Tinghan Yang, and Libiao Jin are with the State Key Laboratory of Media Convergence and Communication, Communication University of China, Beijing 100024, China (e-mail: qimao@cuc.edu.cn; yangtinghan@cuc.edu.cn; libiao@cuc.edu.cn).

Jiahao Li, Bin Li, and Yan Lu are with Microsoft Research Asia, Beijing 10080, China (e-mail: li.jiahao@microsoft.com; libin@microsoft.com; yanlu@microsoft.com).

This work was done when Qi Mao was a visiting scholar at Microsoft Research Asia.




Fig. 1. Comparison of pixel- and token-level transmission in human–AI interaction. Illustrated with the inpainting task (text prompts omitted for simplicity). (a) Pixel-based pipelines accumulate distortion due to repeated image compression–decompression. (b) Token-based pipelines exchange losslessly compressed tokens, preserving fidelity even at ultra-low bitrates.

receivers, with repeated multimodal exchanges over multiple rounds, thereby demanding a new communication paradigm for human–AI collaboration.

However, existing compression paradigms are not well-suited to this interactive setting. Most traditional frameworks are designed either for human perception (e.g., minimizing visual distortion) [1]–[5] or for machine understanding [6], [7] in limited recognition tasks, but they typically treat humans and machines as isolated endpoints. Recent works [8]–[14] have begun to consider both humans and machines as receivers, yet these designs still assume *unidirectional, unimodal* transmission and fail to support iterative multimodal interaction. As a result, conventional pipelines often compress raw pixels before sending them to cloud LLMs for processing, and then re-compress the generated results before delivering them back to users, causing repeated degradation and latency (see Fig. 1(a)).

To address these limitations, we propose *UniMIC*, a unified *token-based multimodal interactive coding framework* tailored for human–AI collaboration. Different from existing codecs that only optimize rate–distortion in pixels or features, UniMIC establishes an **AI-native communication protocol** where *tokens serve as the native medium of exchange*. This protocol enables edge devices and cloud agents to exchange only the task-relevant token subsets. For instance, as illustrated in Fig. 2, in inpainting, the edge transmits unmasked tokens and editing instructions, while the cloud returns only the generated tokens for masked regions; in outpainting, the edge uploads full tokens and the cloud transmits only extrapolated




Fig. 2. Application scenarios of the proposed UniMIC framework. All tasks share the same token-based transmission pipeline but transmit different token subsets, enabling efficient and flexible multimodal communication.

tokens back. Such task-adaptive and asymmetric transmission is fundamentally different from traditional compress–transmit–reconstruct loops. UniMIC incurs only a one-time tokenization loss, while all subsequent exchanges are lossless, thereby avoiding cumulative degradation and preserving semantic fidelity even at ultra-low bitrates, as shown in Fig. 1(b).

Building on this protocol, we further develop lightweight Transformer-based entropy models specialized for different scenarios, including autoregressive, masked-token, and text-conditional variants. These models reduce token redundancy and align probability estimation with generative statistics, ensuring efficiency across diverse multimodal tasks. Consequently, UniMIC supports a broad range of downstream applications, including text-to-image (T2I) generation, text-guided inpainting, outpainting, and visual question answering (VQA), with consistent gains in both compression efficiency and task performance.

The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We establish *UniMIC*, a unified token-based multimodal interactive coding framework that treats tokens as the native medium of exchange between edge devices and cloud AI agents. This paradigm enables bidirectional, task-adaptive communication while avoiding cumulative degradation inherent in pixel-based codecs.
- We develop a family of lightweight Transformer-based entropy models, including autoregressive, masked-token, and text-conditional variants, together with scenario-specific training strategies to minimize redundancy and adapt to diverse interaction settings.
- We extensively validate UniMIC on T2I generation, text-guided inpainting, outpainting, and VQA, showing consistent bitrate savings and improved task performance over existing pixel-based baselines at ultra-low bitrates (< 0.05 bpp).

II. RELATED WORK

A. Image/Video Compression

Classical image and video compression has evolved over several decades, resulting in standardized formats such as JPEG [1], JPEG2000 [2], MPEG-4, AVC/H.264 [3], AVS [4],

and HEVC [5]. The latest standard, VVC [15], further improves rate–distortion efficiency through more flexible coding tools. However, classic codecs are built upon a modular pipeline in which each stage—including prediction, transform, quantization, and entropy coding—relies on handcrafted design choices. These modules are typically optimized in isolation, leading to locally optimal solutions that cannot fully exploit cross-module dependencies.

The emergence of deep learning has enabled a new paradigm in which the entire compression pipeline can be learned end-to-end. Deep neural network (DNN)-based codecs [16]–[18] replace handcrafted transforms and entropy models with trainable components, jointly optimized for global rate–distortion objectives. This approach offers better adaptability to image content and supports flexible bitrate control [19]. However, most DNN-based codecs remain primarily distortion-oriented and may struggle to preserve perceptual quality at extremely low bitrates.

To address this, deep generative models have been integrated into learned compression frameworks. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) [20] excel at synthesizing high-resolution details from compact latent codes [21]–[23], while diffusion-based models further improve perceptual fidelity in ultra-low bitrate regimes [24]–[26]. Nevertheless, both DNN- and generative-based codecs largely follow a compress-then-analyze (CTA) paradigm [27], requiring full image reconstruction before any downstream visual analysis. This design introduces unnecessary decoding overhead and is suboptimal for machine-oriented applications. In contrast, our work departs from the CTA paradigm by leveraging token-based transmission to jointly support efficient machine analysis and high-quality human perception.

B. Human–Machine Collaborative Compression

As outlined in the previous subsection, conventional machine-oriented codecs often follow a CTA paradigm, which requires full image decoding before downstream analysis and is inefficient for many AI-driven applications. An alternative, the *analyze-then-compress* (ATC) paradigm [27], reduces transmission costs in machine vision tasks by transmitting task-specific features [6], but this approach severely limits reconstruction quality, making results unsuitable for human inspection.




Fig. 3. Overall architecture of the proposed UniMIC framework. (a) In edge-to-cloud transmission, multimodal inputs are tokenized and entropy-coded before being sent to the cloud. (b) In cloud-to-edge transmission, the Unified Transformer processes the tokens, and the generated outputs are entropy-coded and reconstructed at the user side.

To address this limitation, the *Human–Machine Collaborative Compression* (HMCC) paradigm [8] jointly optimizes for both human and machine receivers. Existing works adopt scalable coding architectures that decompose content into semantic and perceptual layers. Examples include face-recognition-based residual enhancement [9], unified decoders for gradual reconstruction [28], task-specific latent partitions [11], and semantics-driven hierarchical schemes for progressive decoding [12], [13], [29].

Despite these advances, two major challenges remain: (1) current HMCC frameworks assume fixed sender–receiver roles, lacking flexibility for interactive bidirectional communication, in which both human and machine serve as sender and receiver; (2) they largely focus on visual-only data, offering limited support for multimodal tasks that involve cross-modal reasoning or generation. Our work addresses these gaps by introducing a discrete token-based coding framework that unifies multimodal information. This design supports flexible role reversals and enables efficient, high-quality reconstructions for both human and machine receivers in diverse human–AI collaborative tasks.

C. Large Multimodal Models

LMMs have recently demonstrated unprecedented capabilities in both understanding and generation, enabled by unified representation learning across visual, textual, and auditory modalities [30]–[32]. By mapping heterogeneous inputs into a shared embedding space, they can seamlessly perform diverse cross-modal tasks—such as image captioning and visual ques-

tion answering [33]–[35]—without relying on separate task-specific models.

Building on this foundation, recent works such as Chameleon [36], Transfusion [37], Show-o [38] and UniTok [39] employ discrete tokenization to represent multimodal data streams within a unified vocabulary, enabling simultaneous comprehension and generation in Transformer-based architectures. This establishes discrete tokens as a fundamental unit for scalable multimodal reasoning and generation.

Motivated by these advances, we introduce the first multimodal *interactive* coding framework that operates directly on LMM tokens. By compressing discrete token sequences—rather than raw pixels or text—we achieve low-bitrate transmission while fully preserving the semantic fidelity and generative capabilities of large cloud-based models, thus enabling efficient, high-quality human–AI collaboration.

III. UNIMIC: TOKEN-BASED MULTIMODAL INTERACTIVE CODING

We present **UniMIC**, an efficient and unified multimodal interactive coding framework that enables seamless edge–cloud communication between humans and AI agents. Unlike traditional pixel-based pipelines, UniMIC adopts a token-based paradigm that is natively compatible with LMMs, yielding substantial gains in both compression efficiency and downstream task performance. On the edge side, multimodal inputs—including images and text—are converted into discrete token sequences via modality-specific tokenizers. These tokens are entropy-coded and transmitted to the cloud, where a unified Transformer-based model directly processes them for diverse

generation and understanding tasks, such as text-to-image synthesis, text-guided image editing, and VQA. After cloud-side processing, only the resulting tokens are entropy-coded and sent back to the edge, where they are reconstructed into final images or text outputs.

Fig. 3 provides an overview of the UniMIC architecture. In Section III-A, we describe the end-to-end workflow of UniMIC. We then introduce a lightweight Transformer-based entropy model in Section III-B, designed to accurately estimate token probabilities and fully exploit redundancy across different transmission scenarios. Finally, Section III-C details how UniMIC adapts to various multimodal tasks, demonstrating its flexibility and efficiency in real-world human–AI collaboration.

A. Overview of the UniMIC Framework

We refer to the human-operated device as the *edge side* and the AI-agent host as the *cloud side*. The edge side is assumed to have limited computational and memory resources, whereas the cloud side runs large-scale multimodal models, such as Transformer-based LMMs.

Depending on the task, the edge transmits different multimodal inputs. For T2I generation, only a text prompt T_s is sent; for tasks such as text-guided image editing or VQA, both a text prompt T_s and an image I_s are required. We define the edge-side input as

$$\mathcal{X}_s = \{T_s, I_s\}, \quad (1)$$

where either element may be absent depending on the task.

These inputs are mapped into a *unified token space* via modality-specific tokenizers:

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{text}}(T_s) = \{t_1, \dots, t_N\}, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{img}}(I_s) = \{u_1, \dots, u_M\}, \quad (3)$$

The resulting text tokens \mathbf{t} and image tokens \mathbf{u} are concatenated as

$$\mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{u}], \quad (4)$$

then entropy-encoded into a bitstream B_{up} for *edge-to-cloud* transmission (with text and image tokens coded separately; see Section III-B).

On the cloud side, B_{up} is decoded to recover

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}} = [\hat{\mathbf{t}}; \hat{\mathbf{u}}], \quad (5)$$

to which a task token T_{task} is prepended, yielding

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}' = [T_{\text{task}}; \hat{\mathbf{z}}], \quad (6)$$

the input to the *Unified Transformer* $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$. The model outputs a token sequence

$$\mathbf{o} = \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}'), \quad (7)$$

which is entropy-encoded as B_{down} for *cloud-to-edge* transmission.

Upon receiving B_{down} , the edge decodes $\hat{\mathbf{o}}$ and reconstructs either an image $\hat{I}_t = \mathcal{D}_{\text{img}}(\hat{\mathbf{o}})$ or text $\hat{T}_t = \mathcal{D}_{\text{text}}(\hat{\mathbf{o}})$, depending on the task.




Fig. 4. Entropy modeling strategies for image tokens in UniMIC, including (a) autoregressive, (b) masked-token, and (c) text-conditional mode.

This token-centric pipeline avoids repeated pixel-level compression–decompression, preserves structural and semantic integrity, and minimizes transmission overhead while maintaining fidelity for both human viewing and downstream machine analysis.

B. Entropy Modeling in Unified Token Space

Although UniMIC represents all multimodal inputs in a unified token space, the statistical properties of text tokens and image tokens differ significantly, necessitating modality-specific entropy coding strategies on both the edge and cloud sides.

Text Tokens. Unlike conventional approaches that directly compress textual prompts, UniMIC first tokenizes text prompts into discrete tokens using a text tokenizer $\mathcal{E}_{\text{text}}(\cdot)$. The resulting token sequence \mathbf{t} is then compressed losslessly using the Brotli [40] algorithm, which is lightweight and well-suited for the typically small size of text token sequences:

$$B_{\text{text}} = \text{Brotli}(\mathbf{t}). \quad (8)$$

Image Tokens. Image tokens constitute the majority of the bitstream and exhibit much higher entropy, requiring specialized modeling to achieve efficient compression. To this end, we design a lightweight transformer-based entropy model, denoted as $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$, which estimates the probability distribution of image tokens to support arithmetic coding. Importantly, $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$ is designed to be sufficiently lightweight to be deployed on both the edge side and the cloud side, ensuring symmetric probability estimation and exact reconstruction.

Depending on the nature of the downstream task, we employ three variants of image-token entropy modeling, as illustrated in Fig. 4 :

- **Autoregressive Mode $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$.** For standard image token sequences, the joint probability is factorized autoregressively as:

$$p(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{i=1}^M p(u_i | \mathbf{u}_{<i}; \theta_{\text{lite}}), \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{u} is the image token sequence and θ_{lite} denotes the parameters of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$.

- **Masked-Token Mode** $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}$. For tasks that require localized image editing, such as inpainting, only a subset of the image tokens needs to be updated. To efficiently handle these scenarios, we adopt a masked image transformer, $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}$, pre-trained using random masking strategies to learn the distribution of partially visible image token sequences. During training, we randomly select a subset of tokens in the original image token sequence $\mathbf{u} = \{u_1, \dots, u_M\}$ to be masked, producing a binary mask $\mathbf{m} = \{m_1, \dots, m_M\}$, where $m_i = 1$ denotes a masked position. These positions are replaced with a special mask token $\langle \text{MASK} \rangle$, yielding the masked sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$:

$$\tilde{u}_i = \begin{cases} \langle \text{MASK} \rangle, & \text{if } m_i = 1, \\ u_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Importantly, although the masked tokens are not themselves targets for prediction, they remain in the context sequence as placeholders, providing positional and semantic cues to the transformer. Thus, the joint probability of all unmasked tokens is modeled as:

$$p(\mathbf{u}_{\text{valid}} | \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{U}} p(u_i | \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{<i}; \theta_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}), \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{U} = \{i | m_i = 0\}$ denotes the indices of unmasked tokens. Accordingly, the entropy modeling loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{entropy}} = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \log p(u_i | \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{<i}; \theta_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}). \quad (12)$$

During encoding, only the unmasked tokens $\mathbf{u}_{\text{valid}}$ are entropy-coded and transmitted:

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{valid}} = \{u_i | m_i = 0\}, \quad (13)$$

On the decoder side, the binary mask \mathbf{m} is reconstructed from the bitstream and used to re-insert mask tokens $\langle \text{MASK} \rangle$ at the masked positions, forming the reconstructed masked sequence \mathbf{u}_{mask} :

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{mask}}(i) = \begin{cases} u_i, & \text{if } m_i = 0, \\ \langle \text{MASK} \rangle, & \text{if } m_i = 1. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

This masked sequence is then used as context for decoding the bitstream, ensuring that all unmasked tokens can be reconstructed precisely while avoiding the need to transmit unchanged image regions. This approach significantly improves compression efficiency by leveraging partial information while preserving spatial and semantic consistency.

- **Text-Conditional Mode** $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$. In many multimodal applications, textual information is semantically correlated with visual content. A prime example is T2I generation, where the textual prompt T_s serves as a direct description of the visual scene to be synthesized. During cloud-to-edge transmission, returning generated images from the cloud side to the edge side, both transmission directions contain textual information that can serve as powerful

TABLE I
TASK-SPECIFIC TOKEN-BASED CODING PROTOCOLS IN UNIMIC. AR: AUTOREGRESSIVE MODE. MASK-T: MASKED-TOKEN MODE. TEXT-T: TEXT-CONDITIONAL MODE. BROTLI: LOSSLESS COMPRESSION FOR TEXT TOKENS. EPAC: EQUI-PROBABLE ARITHMETIC CODING.

Task	Edge-to-Cloud	Cloud-to-Edge
T2I	\mathbf{t} (Brotli)	$\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ (Text-T)
Inpainting	\mathbf{u}_{mask} (Mask-T), \mathbf{t} (Brotli), mask (EPAC)	$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{inpaint}}$ (Text-T)
Outpainting	\mathbf{u} (Text-T), \mathbf{t} (Brotli)	$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{outpaint}}$ (Text-T)
VQA	\mathbf{u} (AR), \mathbf{t} (Brotli)	$\hat{\mathbf{t}}_{\text{ans}}$ (Brotli)

contextual priors for modeling the image token distribution. To exploit these cross-modal relationships and reduce redundancy between the textual and visual modalities, we propose a *text-conditional* entropy modeling strategy, where the probability of each image token u_i is conditioned not only on its preceding image tokens $u_{<i}$, but also on the full text token sequence \mathbf{t} :

$$p(\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{t}) = \prod_{i=1}^M p(u_i | \mathbf{u}_{<i}, \mathbf{t}; \theta_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}), \quad (15)$$

where $\theta_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ denotes the parameters of the text-conditional lightweight transformer. This formulation allows the model to leverage semantic cues from the text tokens to more accurately predict the probabilities of image tokens, effectively reducing entropy and achieving better compression efficiency in multi-modal scenarios such as T2I generation.

C. Task-Adaptive Transmission Protocols

In this section, we describe how UniMIC adapts its token-based coding framework to different multimodal human-AI collaborative tasks. Each task requires transmitting different combinations of tokenized modalities and employs corresponding entropy modeling strategies, yet all share the same unified token-based pipeline. Table I summarizes the token-based transmission protocols in UniMIC for different tasks, combining transmitted modalities with the corresponding entropy models used in both edge-to-cloud and cloud-to-edge directions.

T2I Generation. The edge side transmits only text tokens \mathbf{t} , compressed losslessly using the Brotli [40] algorithm. On the cloud side, the Unified Transformer takes \mathbf{t} as input and generates the corresponding image token sequence $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$. Since the generated image tokens are strongly conditioned on the text prompt, the output sequence $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is entropy-coded using the text-conditional transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ before transmission back to the edge side. Upon receiving $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$, the edge side decodes and reconstructs the final synthesized image I_t via the image detokenizer.

Text-Guided Image Inpainting. Only the image tokens corresponding to regions that do not require editing (i.e., unmasked tokens with $m_i = 0$), together with a binary mask \mathbf{m} indicating the positions of masked regions ($m_i = 1$), and the text tokens \mathbf{t} describing the desired edits are transmitted on the edge side. The text tokens \mathbf{t} are compressed using the Brotli [40] algorithm. The unmasked image tokens are entropy-coded via the masked-token transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}$, since their encoding context

includes placeholder mask tokens for the masked regions. On the cloud side, the Unified Transformer processes these inputs and predicts the token sequence $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{inpaint}}$ corresponding to the masked regions. These predicted tokens $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{inpaint}}$ are entropy-coded using the text-conditional transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ before being transmitted back to the user on the edge side. Finally, the user merges the received inpainted tokens into the original sequence according to the binary mask, reconstructing the complete inpainted image.

Text-Guided Image Outpainting. Both text tokens \mathbf{t} and full image tokens \mathbf{u} are transmitted from the edge to the cloud. The text tokens \mathbf{t} are compressed losslessly with Brotli [40], while the image tokens \mathbf{u} are entropy-coded using the text-conditional transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$, which leverages semantic cues from \mathbf{t} to improve compression efficiency. The Unified Transformer then generates additional tokens $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{outpaint}}$ representing the extrapolated regions. These new tokens $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{outpaint}}$ are likewise compressed using $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ and transmitted back to the user. Finally, the user merges the received tokens with the original image tokens to reconstruct the outpainted image.

VQA. The user on the edge side transmits both text tokens \mathbf{t} (representing the question) and image tokens \mathbf{u} . The text tokens \mathbf{t} are compressed using Brotli [40], while the image tokens \mathbf{u} are entropy-coded via the autoregressive model $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$. On the cloud side, the Unified Transformer jointly processes these multimodal tokens and generates answer text tokens $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_{\text{ans}}$. The answer tokens are compressed with Brotli [40] for efficient transmission. Once received, the user decodes the tokens to reconstruct the natural-language answer T_i .

IV. EXPERIMENTS

We conduct extensive experiments to comprehensively validate the effectiveness of the proposed UniMIC framework across four representative multimodal human–AI collaborative tasks: T2I generation, text-guided image inpainting, text-guided image outpainting, and VQA. Although these tasks share the same unified token-based communication infrastructure, they differ in terms of token compositions and entropy coding strategies, offering a diverse evaluation setting for our method.

A. Implementation Details

Tokenizers and Unified Transformer Backbone. UniMIC is designed as a modular framework that can interface with unified multimodal transformer models capable of processing tokenized text and image inputs. In our experiments, we instantiate the backbone using the pretrained Show-o model [38] for empirical validation, as it provides a strong off-the-shelf autoregressive transformer supporting both text-to-image generation and understanding. Text inputs are tokenized via a GPT-style Byte Pair Encoding (BPE) tokenizer [41], while images are encoded using MagViT-v2 [42], which maps latent visual features into discrete tokens via an 8,192-entry codebook and Lookup-Free Quantization. While Show-o [38] is adopted here for validation, the framework is not limited to this specific choice. It can be integrated with other unified multimodal architectures with minimal adaptation, typically

TABLE II
QUANTITATIVE COMPARISONS ON THE T2I TASK. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN **BOLD** AND THE SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE UNDERLINED. “LOSSLESS” INDICATES PERFECT RECONSTRUCTION, CORRESPONDING TO INFINITE PSNR.

Stage	Cloud-to-Edge			Overall Process	
	BPP ↓	PSNR ↑	LPIPS ↓	FID ↓	CLIP-T ↑
BPG [46]	0.0414	23.13	0.354	176.74	0.286
VVC [15]	<u>0.0337</u>	23.12	0.343	180.19	0.286
MS-ILLM [47]	0.0647	<u>25.76</u>	<u>0.075</u>	85.07	0.310
VQ-Kmeans [48]	0.0431	22.03	0.102	82.53	<u>0.314</u>
DiffEIC [49]	0.0587	20.13	0.179	81.95	0.308
UniMIC	0.0296	lossless	0	80.61	0.315

requiring retraining of the entropy modeling component to match the token distributions of a new backbone.

Entropy Models and Training. A key innovation of UniMIC lies in its entropy modeling strategy, which enables efficient compression of multimodal token sequences while preserving semantic fidelity. Text tokens are directly compressed using the Brotli [40] lossless algorithm, while image tokens are handled by a lightweight autoregressive Transformer entropy estimator (0.6B parameters) combined with arithmetic coding, making it practical for deployment on both edge and cloud sides. To support diverse transmission scenarios, we employ three variants of this model: a standard Image Transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$ for generic sequences, a Masked Image Transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}$ for localized editing, and a Text-Conditional Image Transformer $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ for text-guided generation. All models are implemented in PyTorch and trained on two NVIDIA A100 GPUs using a two-stage strategy: (1) **Pretraining** on large-scale datasets, where $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}$ are trained on ImageNet-2012 [43] (with random masking for the masked variant), and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ is pretrained on MS COCO [44] and CC3M [45] to capture text–image dependencies; (2) **Domain adaptation** to the Show-o token distribution via the synthetic *Show-COCO* dataset, where images are re-tokenized by Show-o using their captions. The pretrained $\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$ is fine-tuned on this dataset to yield $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$, ensuring the entropy model aligns with the actual token statistics in cloud-to-edge transmission.

B. Evaluation Details

Baseline Compression Methods. We benchmark UniMIC against a set of representative codecs spanning both conventional and generative paradigms. For conventional compression, we adopt BPG [46] (an HEVC-Intra-based image codec) and the latest VVC standard [15]. For learned generative approaches, we include three representative methods: MS-ILLM [47], a GAN-based codec; VQ-Kmeans [48], based on VQGAN representations; and DiffEIC [49], which leverages diffusion models for image compression. All baselines are evaluated using publicly available pretrained weights and are configured to achieve bitrate levels comparable to UniMIC, ensuring a fair and consistent comparison.

Common Compression Metrics. We adopt standard metrics to assess rate–distortion performance. Compression efficiency is measured in bits per pixel (bpp). Reconstruction quality is evaluated using Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) for pixel-level fidelity and Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS) for perceptual similarity. These metrics are applied




Fig. 5. **Qualitative comparison of T2I generation.** Compared with traditional codecs and recent generative baselines, UniMIC preserves semantic details and visual fidelity while achieving lower bitrates (bpp values shown under each result).

consistently across all tasks to provide an objective assessment of the underlying compression schemes.

C. Compression Evaluation for Text-to-Image Generation

We evaluate UniMIC on the T2I generation task, focusing on (i) the efficiency of image token compression during the cloud-to-edge transmission stage and (ii) the overall impact on text-conditioned image generation quality.

Evaluation Protocol. We randomly sample 1,000 human-annotated text prompts from the MS COCO 2017 validation set [44] as inputs to the T2I generation pipeline. In the UniMIC pipeline, the edge side transmits only the tokenized text instructions, which are compressed using Brotli [40]. On the cloud side, the Unified Transformer synthesizes the corresponding image tokens, which are then entropy-coded and transmitted back to the edge for reconstruction. For comparison, we follow the baseline selection in Section IV-B and benchmark UniMIC against both conventional codecs (BPG [46], VVC [15]) and generative codecs (MS-ILLM [47], VQ-Kmeans [48], DiffEIC [49]). Unlike UniMIC, these codecs cannot operate directly on tokens. Instead, the cloud-generated image tokens must first be decoded into full-resolution images before pixel-level compression is applied, and the compressed bitstream is then transmitted back to the edge side.

Task-Specific Metrics. In addition to the common compression metrics introduced in Section IV-B (bpp, PSNR, LPIPS), we report two task-specific measures for T2I generation. Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [50] evaluates the perceptual realism of generated images by measuring distributional

divergence from real images, while CLIP-T [51] quantifies semantic alignment between generated images and input text prompts.

Results and Analysis. Table II reports quantitative results under comparable bitrate conditions. UniMIC achieves near-lossless reconstruction even at extremely low bitrates (~ 0.03 bpp), consistently outperforming all baselines in PSNR and LPIPS. This advantage stems from directly entropy-coding discrete image tokens, which avoids pixel-domain re-encoding and the quantization losses inherent to other codecs. In addition, UniMIC obtains the lowest FID and highest CLIP-T scores, indicating superior preservation of both perceptual realism and semantic alignment with input prompts. As shown in Fig. 11, traditional codecs exhibit blurring and blocking artifacts, while generative codecs often introduce semantic shifts or structural distortions. In contrast, UniMIC reconstructs images that remain visually indistinguishable from their original cloud-generated counterparts, delivering perceptually lossless quality while maintaining high compression efficiency.

D. Compression Evaluation for Text-Guided Image Inpainting

We evaluate UniMIC on the text-guided image inpainting task with two primary objectives: (i) assessing the compression efficiency of image tokens across both edge-to-cloud and cloud-to-edge transmissions, and (ii) evaluating its effectiveness in text-conditioned editing.

Evaluation Protocol. We employ the MagicBrush dataset, which provides 535 raw images and 1,053 edited samples with semantically masked regions and corresponding text instructions [52], as inputs to the text-guided inpainting pipeline.




Fig. 6. **Qualitative comparison of text-guided inpainting.** Baseline codecs suffer cumulative degradation: compression loss from Edge-to-Cloud is amplified during Cloud-to-Edge retransmission. In contrast, UniMIC incurs only a one-time tokenization loss, avoiding repeated degradation while preserving fidelity at ultra-low bitrates. For clarity, note that the Cloud Rec and Cloud Gen stages do not exist in UniMIC’s actual pipeline; we reconstruct them here using original tokens and edited tokens solely to enable fair visual comparison with baselines.

TABLE III

QUANTITATIVE COMPARISON RESULTS ON TEXT-GUIDED IMAGE INPAINTING. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN **BOLD** AND THE SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE UNDERLINED. “LOSSLESS” INDICATES PERFECT RECONSTRUCTION, CORRESPONDING TO INFINITE PSNR.

Stage	Edge-to-Cloud			Cloud-to-Edge			Overall Process			
	Metric	BPP ↓	PSNR ↑	LPIPS ↓	BPP ↓	PSNR ↑	LPIPS ↓	Total BPP ↓	FID ↓	CLIP-T ↑
BPG	0.0514	<u>22.35</u>	0.440	0.0381	<u>25.98</u>	<u>0.245</u>	0.0895	209.05	0.237	0.691
VVC	<u>0.0370</u>	21.88	0.481	<u>0.0160</u>	20.52	0.486	0.0530	254.76	0.206	0.662
MS-ILLM	0.0734	23.68	0.120	0.0230	19.24	0.381	0.0964	184.76	0.227	0.711
VQ-Kmeans	0.0391	19.85	0.149	0.0118	16.90	0.284	<u>0.0509</u>	<u>95.51</u>	<u>0.261</u>	<u>0.779</u>
DiffEIC	0.0493	15.53	0.282	0.0306	12.71	0.534	<u>0.0799</u>	248.71	0.206	<u>0.675</u>
UniMIC	0.0369	20.42	<u>0.134</u>	0.0063	lossless	0	0.0432	57.30	0.298	0.903

In UniMIC, the edge side transmits only the unedited image tokens, along with the binary mask and text prompt. Conditioned on these inputs, the Unified Transformer generates tokens for the masked regions, which are entropy-coded and returned to the edge, where they are merged with the unedited

tokens to reconstruct the final inpainted image. We also follow the baseline selection in Section IV-B and evaluate UniMIC against conventional codecs and generative codecs. Since these codecs cannot process tokens directly, the full image must be compressed and transmitted to the cloud for decompression

and editing. After editing, the result is re-compressed and sent back to the edge.

Task-Specific Metrics. We adopt the general compression metrics defined in Section IV-B, including bpp, PSNR, and LPIPS, to evaluate reconstruction fidelity across both transmission stages. We compare reconstruction quality at two stages: edge-to-cloud reconstruction is evaluated against the original input image, while cloud-to-edge reconstruction is evaluated against the generated edited image. In UniMIC, the edge-to-cloud stage transmits only the tokens of unedited regions rather than the full image. To ensure fair evaluation, we reconstruct the complete image on the edge side from the full token sequence and report PSNR/LPIPS on this reconstruction, while the bpp is computed using only the transmitted unedited-region tokens. For the cloud-to-edge stage, we further assess the quality of the inpainted outputs by reporting FID [50] for perceptual realism, CLIP-T [51] for semantic alignment with text prompts, and R-CLIP-I [51] for structural consistency with the original unedited regions.

Results and Analysis. Table III reports the quantitative results on the text-guided image inpainting task under comparable bitrate conditions. UniMIC achieves the lowest transmission cost in both directions (0.0369 bpp for edge-to-cloud and 0.0063 bpp for cloud-to-edge), while also attaining the best overall performance on semantic and perceptual metrics (FID = 57.30, CLIP-T = 0.298, R-CLIP-I = 0.903). Although the reconstructed images in the edge-to-cloud stage inevitably show some degradation due to the tokenizer, this loss is fixed and does not propagate further, since token sequences are transmitted and compressed losslessly. In contrast, baseline codecs must process pixel-level images: compression artifacts are introduced during edge-to-cloud transmission, which then propagate through the pipeline and significantly impair the quality of inpainting and final reconstructions.

Fig. 12 provides qualitative comparisons under similar bitrates. *For fair visualization, we additionally reconstruct the intermediate stages (Cloud Rec, Cloud Gen) for UniMIC by using the complete token set, even though in the actual pipeline the cloud side does not have access to all tokens and only the final edge-side output is observable.* For baseline methods, these stages are naturally available since they operate on pixel-level images. In all cases, the reported bitrates strictly correspond to the actual tokens transmitted in UniMIC and the actual compressed images in baselines. The visual results further confirm the quantitative findings: traditional codecs (VVC [15] and BPG [46]) already suffer from severe blurring and blocking artifacts in the edge-to-cloud reconstruction, and these distortions are further amplified during the cloud-to-edge transmission, leading to heavily degraded final outputs. Generative codecs (DiffEIC [49], MS-ILLM [47], and VQ-Kmeans [48]) produce more natural details, but the artifacts and inconsistencies introduced in the first stage also propagate into the second, often causing semantic shifts or unintended changes in unedited regions, resulting in noticeable divergence from the original content. In contrast, UniMIC avoids this cumulative degradation since tokens are transmitted losslessly after the one-time tokenizer step, ensuring that the inpainted content generated in the cloud is faithfully preserved in the

final edge-side reconstruction.

E. Compression Evaluation for Text-Guided Image Outpainting

We evaluate UniMIC on the text-guided image outpainting task, focusing on (i) the compression efficiency of image tokens during both edge-to-cloud and cloud-to-edge transmissions, and (ii) its effectiveness in generating high-quality extrapolated content conditioned on textual instructions.

Evaluation Protocol. We construct a large-scale test set based on the Flickr Scenery dataset [53], from which 1,000 high-resolution landscape images are randomly selected. To enable text-guided outpainting, we employ Qwen-VL [54] to generate descriptions for extrapolated regions, forming paired inputs of original images and text prompts. Following the baseline selection in Section IV-B, we compare UniMIC against conventional codecs (BPG, VVC) and generative codecs (MS-ILLM [47], VQ-Kmeans [48], DiffEIC [49]) under a unified two-stage transmission pipeline comprising edge-to-cloud and cloud-to-edge communication. In UniMIC, the edge side compresses and transmits image tokens—rather than pixel-level images—to the cloud, where the Unified Transformer performs outpainting directly in the token space conditioned on the received tokens and text prompt. The generated tokens for the extrapolated regions are then entropy-coded and transmitted back to the edge, where they are seamlessly merged with the original tokens to reconstruct the final image. In contrast, baseline codecs cannot operate on tokens. The edge-side image must first be compressed and sent to the cloud, where it is decompressed, outpainted based on the input prompt, and the resulting full-resolution image is re-compressed for cloud-to-edge transmission. We report reconstruction quality at both stages: edge-to-cloud reconstruction is measured against the original input image, while cloud-to-edge reconstruction is evaluated against the generated outpainted image.

Task-Specific Metrics. We adopt the same evaluation metrics as in the T2I generation task (cf. Section IV-C), including bpp, PSNR, LPIPS, FID, and CLIP-T. While bpp, PSNR, and LPIPS jointly reflect the reconstruction fidelity during both transmission stages, FID specifically quantifies the semantic and perceptual quality of the extrapolated content conditioned on textual prompts. CLIP-T further evaluates the alignment between the extrapolated image regions and the guiding text, measuring whether the generated visual content faithfully follows the textual instructions.

Results and Analysis. Table IV reports the quantitative results for text-guided image outpainting under comparable bitrate settings. In the edge-to-cloud stage, UniMIC achieves the lowest bitrate while retaining competitive perceptual quality and distortion performance. Unlike conventional codecs that must decode the original image before compression, UniMIC directly operates on discrete tokens without reconstructing pixel-level images. For fairness, we employ an auxiliary image detokenizer to visualize cloud-side reconstructions; the slight degradation observed arises from the inherent lossy tokenizer-detokenizer process, rather than the token-level compression itself. In the cloud-to-edge stage, UniMIC delivers lossless reconstruction even below 0.03 bpp, its discrete




Fig. 7. **Qualitative comparison of text-guided image outpainting.** Baseline methods accumulate distortion across transmission stages and often lose semantic consistency in the extended regions. UniMIC avoids repeated degradation and generates coherent outpainting at ultra-low bitrates.

TABLE IV

QUANTITATIVE COMPARISONS ON THE TEXT-GUIDED IMAGE OUTPAINTING TASK. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN **BOLD** AND THE SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE UNDERLINED. “LOSSLESS” INDICATES PERFECT RECONSTRUCTION, CORRESPONDING TO INFINITE PSNR.

Stage	Edge-to-Cloud			Cloud-to-Edge			Overall Process		
	BPP↓	PSNR↑	LPIPS↓	BPP↓	PSNR↑	LPIPS↓	Total BPP↓	FID↓	CLIP-T↑
BPG [46]	0.0610	24.39	0.484	<u>0.0387</u>	28.69	0.274	0.0997	213.36	0.232
VVC [15]	0.0576	24.84	0.524	<u>0.0387</u>	<u>29.69</u>	0.184	0.0963	216.88	0.252
MS-ILLM [47]	0.0622	<u>24.50</u>	0.126	0.0396	27.60	<u>0.083</u>	0.1018	56.41	0.280
VQ-Kmeans [48]	<u>0.0431</u>	20.12	0.139	0.0313	23.45	0.105	0.0744	<u>39.16</u>	<u>0.290</u>
DiffEIC [49]	0.0437	16.37	0.228	0.0401	19.69	0.187	0.0838	66.73	0.287
UniMIC	0.0416	22.07	<u>0.127</u>	0.0273	lossless	0	0.0689	30.04	0.291

token design allows transmission of only the newly generated tokens for extrapolated regions, which are seamlessly merged with unedited tokens on the edge side, substantially reducing bandwidth while preserving semantic coherence. As a result, UniMIC also achieves the lowest FID score, demonstrating superior perceptual realism of the extrapolated content.

Beyond these quantitative improvements, qualitative results further highlight UniMIC’s advantages. Fig. 13 compares different methods across edge-to-cloud reconstruction, cloud-side outpainting, and cloud-to-edge reconstruction. Baseline codecs introduce compression artifacts during edge-to-cloud transmission, which degrade the cloud input and subsequently impair the extrapolated content despite identical text prompts. Pixel-level re-compression of the outpainted image further accumulates distortions, producing visible inconsistencies in the final reconstructions. In contrast, UniMIC maintains structural fidelity and stylistic consistency, yielding natural and coherent extensions aligned with both the original image and the guiding prompt. Among conventional codecs, VVC [15] and BPG [46] often cause blurring, color shifts, and discontinuities

between original and extrapolated regions, while generative methods such as DiffEIC [49], MS-ILLM [47], and VQ-Kmeans [48] improve perceptual quality but still suffer from semantic drifts and texture inconsistencies, leading to stylistic deviations from the source image.

F. Compression Evaluation for Visual Question Answering

We evaluate UniMIC on the VQA task, focusing on the efficiency of image token compression during the edge-to-cloud transmission stage and the overall performance of answer generation.

Evaluation Protocol. We evaluate UniMIC on the VQA task using four benchmark datasets: **POPE** [56], built on MS COCO with 9,000 questions requiring precise object localization alongside adversarial distractors; **GQA** [57], comprising 20M reasoning questions paired with real-world images annotated with detailed scene graphs; **Flickr30k** [55], containing 31,783 images with descriptive captioning tasks; and **Vizwiz-val** [58], featuring 4,319 real-world image-question pairs collected from blind users, covering recognition, reading,



Fig. 8. **Qualitative comparison of VQA capability on examples from the Flickr30k dataset [55].** We show two representative cases with input questions and the corresponding answers generated by different methods. Baseline codecs (BPG, VVC, MS-ILLM, VQ-Kmeans, DiffEIC) either produce generic or semantically incorrect responses, whereas UniMIC generates contextually rich and accurate captions that align closely with the visual content.

TABLE V

QUANTITATIVE COMPARISON RESULTS ACROSS MULTIPLE VQA DATASETS. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN **BOLD** AND THE SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE UNDERLINED. “LOSSLESS” INDICATES PERFECT RECONSTRUCTION, CORRESPONDING TO INFINITE PSNR.

Stage	POPE [56]		GQA [57]		Flickr-30k [55]				Vizwiz-val [58]	
	BPP↓	ACC↑	BPP↓	EM↑	BPP↓	BLEU↑	CIDEr↑	ROUGE-L↑	BPP↓	EM↑
BPG [46]	0.0565	0.5290	0.0569	0.3357	0.0535	<u>0.1072</u>	<u>0.0193</u>	<u>0.2232</u>	0.0470	0.0156
VVC [15]	<u>0.0465</u>	<u>0.5348</u>	0.0529	0.3318	0.0500	0.0968	0.0166	0.2142	0.0429	0.0125
MS-ILLM [47]	0.0752	0.5267	0.0754	0.3312	0.0793	0.0969	0.0167	0.2145	0.0578	0.0107
VQ-Kmeans [48]	0.0470	0.5312	<u>0.0470</u>	0.3348	<u>0.0470</u>	0.1022	0.0176	0.2203	0.0470	0.0128
DiffEIC [49]	0.0740	0.5309	0.0747	0.0339	0.0770	0.1010	0.0177	0.2189	0.0620	0.0110
UniMIC	0.0424	0.7710	0.0422	0.4915	0.0429	0.2807	0.3398	0.4200	0.0394	0.0674

and reasoning tasks. In UniMIC, the edge compresses and sends image and question tokens to the cloud, where VQA is performed directly in the token space. The cloud then returns entropy-coded answer tokens, which are decoded on the edge into natural-language responses. In contrast, baseline codecs operate at the pixel level: the original image must first be compressed and transmitted to the cloud, decompressed for VQA, and the resulting answer subsequently transmitted back.

Task-Specific Metrics. In line with the previous tasks, we report the edge-to-cloud image bpp to measure compression efficiency. For task performance, different metrics are adopted depending on the dataset and the nature of the text responses:

- **POPE [56]:** Accuracy is used to assess the model’s ability to correctly recognize objects and their spatial relationships in the presence of distractors. Higher accuracy reflects stronger fine-grained visual grounding.
- **GQA [57]:** We use Exact Match (EM) to measure the proportion of generated answers that exactly match the reference answers, where higher EM indicates stronger multimodal reasoning and semantic faithfulness.
- **Flickr30k [55]:** Captioning performance is evaluated with BLEU, CIDEr, and ROUGE-L. Higher scores reflect better semantic alignment and descriptive quality relative to human-written captions.
- **Vizwiz-val [58]:** Similar to GQA [57], EM is employed to evaluate answer quality on this real-world dataset, where higher scores indicate stronger robustness to diverse and noisy visual–linguistic inputs.

Results and Analysis. Table V reports quantitative comparisons across all datasets under comparable bitrate settings, while Fig. 10 illustrates representative qualitative results. Baseline codecs significantly impair the semantic understanding of the cloud model after decompression, leading to degraded reasoning and inaccurate answers to textual queries. In contrast, UniMIC preserves the token-level information required by the cloud-based model, maintaining robust performance. Notably, UniMIC consistently achieves higher task-specific scores at substantially lower bitrates (~0.04 bpp), demonstrating that operating directly on discrete tokens eliminates the information loss caused by pixel-level compression and ensures stable end-to-end VQA performance. These results further validate the generality of UniMIC, showing that its token-based interactive coding framework extends beyond generation and editing tasks to support complex multimodal reasoning in real-world scenarios.

G. Ablation Studies

We conduct ablation experiments to quantify the contribution of key components in UniMIC. Specifically, we first evaluate different Transformer-based entropy modeling strategies and then investigate the effect of text tokenization on transmission efficiency.

Impact of Transformer-Based Entropy Models. We conduct the ablation study in two stages to validate the effectiveness of Transformer-based entropy models in UniMIC. First, compared to the baseline without Transformer modeling,

TABLE VI
ABLATION STUDY RESULTS OF TRANSFORMER-BASED ENTROPY MODELS. RESULTS FOR OUR FINAL SCHEME ARE SHOWN WITH A BLUE BACKGROUND. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN **BOLD** AND THE SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE UNDERLINED.

Methods	T2I		Inpainting		Outpainting		VQA
	Cloud-to-Edge	Edge-to-Cloud	Cloud-to-Edge	Edge-to-Cloud	Cloud-to-Edge	Edge-to-Cloud	
w/o Transformer	0.0509	0.0429	0.0081	0.0509	0.0382	0.0509	
$\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}$	0.0347	0.0385	0.0064	<u>0.0423</u>	<u>0.0274</u>	0.0424	
$\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{mask}}$	0.0368	0.0369	0.0065	0.0432	0.0276	0.0438	
$\mathcal{T}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$	<u>0.0336</u>	<u>0.0384</u>	<u>0.0063</u>	0.0416	0.0273	<u>0.0425</u>	
$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{lite}}^{\text{text}}$	0.0296	0.0398	0.0062	0.0432	0.0277	0.0440	

TABLE VII
ABLATION STUDY OF TEXT COMPRESSION METHODS ACROSS DIFFERENT MULTIMODAL TASKS. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN **BOLD**.

Task	Text Type	Brotli (CR↓)	Ours (CR↓)
T2I	Prompt	0.905	0.745
Inpainting	Prompt	0.824	0.656
Outpainting	Prompt	0.728	0.548
VQA	Question	0.733	0.632
VQA	Answer	0.843	0.691

all variants achieve clear bitrate reductions, e.g., lowering T2I (Cloud-to-Edge) from 0.0509 to 0.0296, confirming the advantage of probabilistic modeling over a uniform token distribution. Second, we evaluate the three proposed variants—Image Transformer, Masked Image Transformer, and Text-Conditional Transformer—under their respective task settings. Each shows superior performance in its intended scenario: the Text-Conditional model excels in text-to-image and outpainting, the Masked model is most effective for inpainting (Edge-to-Cloud), and the Image Transformer performs best on VQA. These results verify that our task-specific designs provide consistent gains across diverse transmission directions. Finally, domain adaptation of the Text-Conditional Transformer on the Show-COCO dataset further reduces the bitrate for T2I (from 0.0336 bpp to 0.0296 bpp, an 11.9% improvement), highlighting the importance of adapting entropy models to the token distributions of generative models.

Effect of Text Tokenization on Compression Efficiency. UniMIC transmits textual inputs by first converting them into discrete tokens and then applying entropy coding, rather than compressing raw text directly. To assess the effectiveness of this design, we compare UniMIC with a baseline where Brotli [40] is directly applied to raw text sequences without tokenization. We evaluate text compression efficiency using Compression Ratio (CR) across different multimodal tasks. As shown in Table VII, UniMIC achieves consistently better compression than the Brotli baseline, with improvements ranging from 13.8% to 24.7% across tasks. These results validate that tokenizing text before entropy coding yields more compact representations and thus more efficient transmission in multimodal communication pipelines.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we presented UniMIC, a unified token-based multimodal interactive coding framework for next-generation

human–AI collaboration. By replacing conventional pixel- or text-based transmission with compact tokenized representations, UniMIC enables efficient bidirectional communication while preserving structural alignment with LMMs. To further enhance efficiency, we designed lightweight Transformer-based entropy models with scenario-specific strategies that effectively reduce redundancy and adapt to diverse tasks. Extensive experiments across T2I generation, text-guided inpainting, outpainting, and VQA validate the robustness of UniMIC, demonstrating substantial bitrate savings and stable performance even under ultra-low bitrate conditions. Beyond compression efficiency, UniMIC establishes a paradigm shift from pixel-centric coding to token-based communication protocols, paving the way for future AI-native multimedia transmission systems. Nevertheless, UniMIC still relies on the quality and compatibility of upstream tokenizers, and adapting the entropy models to different LMM backbones may require lightweight retraining to mitigate domain gaps. We leave these aspects as promising directions for future work.

REFERENCES

- [1] William B Pennebaker and Joan L Mitchell, *JPEG: Still image data compression standard*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1992.
- [2] Majid Rabbani, “JPEG2000: Image compression fundamentals, standards and practice,” *JEI*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 286, 2002.
- [3] Thomas Wiegand, Gary J Sullivan, Gisle Bjontegaard, and Ajay Luthra, “Overview of the H.264/AVC video coding standard,” *IEEE TCSVT*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 560–576, 2003.
- [4] Wen Gao and Siwei Ma, “An overview of AVS2 standard,” in *Advanced Video Coding Systems*, pp. 35–49, 2014.
- [5] Gary J Sullivan, Jens-Rainer Ohm, Woo-Jin Han, and Thomas Wiegand, “Overview of the high efficiency video coding (HEVC) standard,” *IEEE TCSVT*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 1649–1668, 2012.
- [6] Ling-Yu Duan, Vijay Chandrasekhar, Jie Chen, Jie Lin, Zhe Wang, Tiejun Huang, Bernd Girod, and Wen Gao, “Overview of the mpeg-cdvs standard,” *IEEE TIP*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 179–194, 2015.
- [7] Ling-Yu Duan, Yihang Lou, Yan Bai, Tiejun Huang, Wen Gao, Vijay Chandrasekhar, Jie Lin, Shiqi Wang, and Alex Chichung Kot, “Compact descriptors for video analysis: The emerging mpeg standard,” *IEEE MM*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 44–54, 2018.
- [8] Lingyu Duan, Jiaying Liu, Wenhan Yang, Tiejun Huang, and Wen Gao, “Video coding for machines: A paradigm of collaborative compression and intelligent analytics,” *IEEE TIP*, vol. 29, pp. 8680–8695, 2020.
- [9] Shurun Wang, Shiqi Wang, Wenhan Yang, Xinfeng Zhang, Shanshe Wang, Siwei Ma, and Wen Gao, “Towards analysis-friendly face representation with scalable feature and texture compression,” *TMM*, vol. 24, pp. 3169–3181, 2021.
- [10] Yueyu Hu, Shuai Yang, Wenhan Yang, Ling-Yu Duan, and Jiaying Liu, “Towards coding for human and machine vision: A scalable image coding approach,” in *ICME*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [11] Hyomin Choi and Ivan V Bajić, “Scalable image coding for humans and machines,” *IEEE TIP*, vol. 31, pp. 2739–2754, 2022.

- [12] Ning Yan, Changsheng Gao, Dong Liu, Houqiang Li, Li Li, and Feng Wu, "Sssic: semantics-to-signal scalable image coding with learned structural representations," *IEEE TIP*, vol. 30, pp. 8939–8954, 2021.
- [13] Hanyue Tu, Li Li, Wengang Zhou, and Houqiang Li, "Semantic scalable image compression with cross-layer priors," in *ACM MM*, 2021, pp. 4044–4052.
- [14] Kang Liu, Dong Liu, Li Li, Ning Yan, and Houqiang Li, "Semantics-to-signal scalable image compression with learned revertible representations," *IJCV*, vol. 129, no. 9, pp. 2605–2621, 2021.
- [15] Benjamin Bross, Ye-Kui Wang, Yan Ye, Shan Liu, Jianle Chen, Gary J Sullivan, and Jens-Rainer Ohm, "Overview of the versatile video coding (VVC) standard and its applications," *IEEE TCSVT*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 3736–3764, 2021.
- [16] Lucas Theis, Wenzhe Shi, Andrew Cunningham, and Ferenc Huszár, "Lossy image compression with compressive autoencoders," *arXiv:1703.00395*, 2017.
- [17] Zhengxue Cheng, Heming Sun, Masaru Takeuchi, and Jiro Katto, "Learned image compression with discretized gaussian mixture likelihoods and attention modules," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 7939–7948.
- [18] Jun-Hyuk Kim, Byeongho Heo, and Jong-Seok Lee, "Joint global and local hierarchical priors for learned image compression," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 5992–6001.
- [19] Chenjian Gao, Tongda Xu, Dailan He, Yan Wang, and Hongwei Qin, "Flexible neural image compression via code editing," in *NIPS*, 2022, vol. 35, pp. 12184–12196.
- [20] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," in *NeurIPS*, 2014, pp. 2672–2680.
- [21] Eirikur Agustsson, Michael Tschannen, Fabian Mentzer, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool, "Generative adversarial networks for extreme learned image compression," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 221–231.
- [22] Jianhui Chang, Qi Mao, Zhenghui Zhao, Shanshe Wang, Shiqi Wang, Hong Zhu, and Siwei Ma, "Layered conceptual image compression via deep semantic synthesis," in *ICIP*, 2019, pp. 694–698.
- [23] Jianhui Chang, Zhenghui Zhao, Chuanmin Jia, Shiqi Wang, Lingbo Yang, Qi Mao, Jian Zhang, and Siwei Ma, "Conceptual compression via deep structure and texture synthesis," *IEEE TIP*, vol. 31, pp. 2809–2823, 2022.
- [24] Oren Rippel and Lubomir Bourdev, "Real-time adaptive image compression," in *ICML*, 2017, pp. 2922–2930.
- [25] Jooyoung Lee, Donghyun Kim, Younhee Kim, Hyoungjin Kwon, Jongho Kim, and Taejin Lee, "A training method for image compression networks to improve perceptual quality of reconstructions," in *CVPR Workshops*, 2020, pp. 144–145.
- [26] Shoma Iwai, Tomo Miyazaki, Yoshihiro Sugaya, and Shinichiro Omachi, "Fidelity-controllable extreme image compression with generative adversarial networks," in *ICPR*, 2021, pp. 8235–8242.
- [27] Alessandro Redondi, Luca Baroffio, Matteo Cesana, and Marco Tagliasacchi, "Compress-then-analyze vs. analyze-then-compress: Two paradigms for image analysis in visual sensor networks," in *MMSp*, 2013, pp. 278–282.
- [28] Shuai Yang, Yueyu Hu, Wenhan Yang, Ling-Yu Duan, and Jiaying Liu, "Towards coding for human and machine vision: Scalable face image coding," *IEEE TMM*, vol. 23, pp. 2957–2971, 2021.
- [29] Qi Mao, Chongyu Wang, Meng Wang, Shiqi Wang, Ruijie Chen, Libiao Jin, and Siwei Ma, "Scalable face image coding via stylegan prior: Toward compression for human-machine collaborative vision," *IEEE TIP*, vol. 33, pp. 408–422, 2023.
- [30] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al., "Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways," *JMLR*, vol. 24, no. 240, pp. 1–113, 2023.
- [31] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al., "Language models are few-shot learners," in *NeurIPS*, 2020, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901.
- [32] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al., "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models," *arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [33] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee, "Visual instruction tuning," in *NeurIPS*, 2023, pp. 34892–34916.
- [34] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale N Fung, and Steven Hoi, "Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning," in *NeurIPS*, 2023, vol. 36, pp. 49250–49267.
- [35] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua, "Next-gpt: Any-to-any multimodal llm," in *ICML*, 2024.
- [36] Chameleon Team, "Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models," *arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024.
- [37] Chunting Zhou, Lili Yu, Arun Babu, Kushal Tirumala, Michihiro Yasunaga, Leonid Shamis, Jacob Kahn, Xuezhe Ma, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy, "Transfusion: Predict the next token and diffuse images with one multi-modal model," *arXiv:2408.11039*, 2024.
- [38] David Junhao Zhang, Jay Zhangjie Wu, Jia-Wei Liu, Rui Zhao, Lingmin Ran, Yuchao Gu, Difei Gao, and Mike Zheng Shou, "Show-1: Marrying pixel and latent diffusion models for text-to-video generation," *IJCV*, pp. 1–15, 2024.
- [39] Chuofan Ma, Yi Jiang, Junfeng Wu, Jihan Yang, Xin Yu, Zehuan Yuan, Bingyue Peng, and Xiaojuan Qi, "Unitok: A unified tokenizer for visual generation and understanding," *arXiv:2502.20321*, 2025.
- [40] Jyrki Alakuijala, Andrea Farruggia, Paolo Ferragina, Eugene Kliuchnikov, Robert Obryk, Zoltan Szabadka, and Lode Vandevenne, "Brotli: A general-purpose data compressor," *TOIS*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 1–30, 2018.
- [41] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al., "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners," *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, pp. 9, 2019.
- [42] Lijun Yu, José Lezama, Nitesh B Gundavarapu, Luca Versari, Kihyuk Sohn, David Minnen, Yong Cheng, Vignesh Birodkar, Agrim Gupta, Xiuye Gu, et al., "Language model beats diffusion—tokenizer is key to visual generation," *arXiv:2310.05737*, 2023.
- [43] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," in *CVPR*, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [44] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick, "Microsoft coco: Common objects in context," in *ECCV*, 2014, pp. 740–755.
- [45] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut, "Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning," in *ACL*, 2018.
- [46] Fabrice Bellard, "Bpg image format," *URL https://bellard.org/bpg*, 2015.
- [47] Matthew J. Muckley, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Karen Ullrich, Hervé Jégou, and Jakob Verbeek, "Improving statistical fidelity for neural image compression with implicit local likelihood models," in *ICML*, 2023.
- [48] Qi Mao, Tinghan Yang, Yinuo Zhang, Zijian Wang, Meng Wang, Shiqi Wang, Libiao Jin, and Siwei Ma, "Extreme image compression using fine-tuned vqgans," in *DCC*, 2024, pp. 203–212.
- [49] Zhiyuan Li, Yanhui Zhou, Hao Wei, Chenyang Ge, and Jingwen Jiang, "Toward extreme image compression with latent feature guidance and diffusion prior," *IEEE TCSVT*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 888–899, 2025.
- [50] Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter, "GANs trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium," in *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [51] Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi, "Clipscore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning," *arXiv:2104.08718*, 2021.
- [52] Kai Zhang, Lingbo Mo, Wenhui Chen, Huan Sun, and Yu Su, "Mag-icbrush: A manually annotated dataset for instruction-guided image editing," in *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [53] Chieh Hubert Lin, Yen-Chi Cheng, Hsin-Ying Lee, Sergey Tulyakov, and Ming-Hsuan Yang, "InfinityGAN: Towards infinite-pixel image synthesis," in *ICLR*, 2022.
- [54] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al., "Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model's perception of the world at any resolution," *arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024.
- [55] Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier, "From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions," *TACL*, vol. 2, pp. 67–78, 2014.
- [56] Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jinpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen, "Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models," in *EMNLP*, 2023.
- [57] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning, "Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering," in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 6700–6709.
- [58] Danna Gurari, Qing Li, Abigale J Stangl, Anhong Guo, Chi Lin, Kristen Grauman, Jiebo Luo, and Jeffrey P Bigham, "Vizwiz grand challenge: Answering visual questions from blind people," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 3608–3617.

VI. SUPPLEMENTARY

In this supplementary material, we provide detailed implementation details, additional analyses, limitations, and qualitative results as follows:

- In Section VI-A, we describe the baseline configurations used in our experiments.
- In Section VI-B, we demonstrate how our method enables flexible rate control without compromising performance.
- In Section VI-C, we provide additional qualitative results, including comparisons on visual question answering (VQA), text-to-image (T2I) generation, text-guided image inpainting, and outpainting tasks.

A. Details of Comparisons with Baselines

For fair comparison, we configure traditional codecs (BPG [46], VVC [15]) and generative codecs (MS-ILLM [47], VQ-Kmeans [48], DiffEIC [49]) under settings that yield bitrates comparable to UniMIC across different tasks. Specifically:

- 1) **Text-to-Image Generation:** BPG uses HEVC-Intra 18.0 with QP = 51, while VVC adopts VVC-Intra 11.0 with QP = 52. Generative codecs are tested with publicly available pretrained models: MS-ILLM with `msillm_quality_1`, VQ-Kmeans with a 2048-entry codebook, and DiffEIC with the `1_2_4` configuration.
- 2) **Text-Guided Image Inpainting:** BPG is evaluated at QP = 50 (edge-to-cloud) and QP = 51 (cloud-to-edge), while VVC is evaluated at QP = 52 and QP = 69, respectively. For generative codecs, MS-ILLM uses `msillm_quality_1` (edge-to-cloud) and `msillm_vlov1_1` (cloud-to-edge); VQ-Kmeans employs a 2048-entry codebook for edge-to-cloud and a 256-entry codebook for cloud-to-edge; DiffEIC is tested with `1_2_8` and `1_2_16`, respectively.
- 3) **Text-Guided Image Outpainting:** BPG is evaluated at QP = 47 (edge-to-cloud) and QP = 46 (cloud-to-edge), while VVC is evaluated at QP = 47 and QP = 45, respectively. For generative codecs, MS-ILLM employs `msillm_quality_1` for both directions; VQ-Kmeans uses a 2048-entry codebook (cloud-to-edge) and a 256-entry codebook (edge-to-cloud); DiffEIC is evaluated with the `1_2_8` configuration for both directions.
- 4) **Visual Question Answering:** BPG is evaluated at QP = 51, while VVC version 11.0 (intra coding) is evaluated at QP = 49. Generative codecs are tested using MS-ILLM (`msillm_quality_1`), VQ-Kmeans (2048-entry codebook), and DiffEIC (`1_2_4`).

B. Flexible Bitrate Control

The proposed Uni-MIC framework enables flexible bitrate control without the need for additional training. Specifically, we can mask image tokens corresponding to less informative regions of the original image based on a predefined ratio, thereby effectively reducing the transmission bitrate. As illustrated in the Fig. 9, even when most image tokens are masked during the user-to-cloud stage in the text-guided inpainting task, our method still significantly outperforms

various baseline approaches in terms of CLIP-T, CLIP-I, and FID metrics.

C. Additional Results

Fig. 10, Fig. 11, Fig. 12, and Fig. 13 provide further visual comparisons between UniMIC and baseline methods on VQA, T2I generation, text-guided image inpainting, and outpainting tasks.




Fig. 9. The R-D performance of BPG, VVC, MS-ILLM, VQ-Kmeans, DiffEIC, and our method on the MagicBrush dataset. (a) A higher CLIP-T score indicates better semantic consistency between the generated or edited images and their corresponding text descriptions; (b) A higher R-CLIP-I score reflects better structural preservation between the original and edited images; (c) A lower FID score suggests improved overall image quality and a closer match between the distributions of the generated (or edited) images and real images.




Fig. 10. Qualitative comparison of VQA capability on examples from the Flickr30k dataset [55]. We show two representative cases with input questions and the corresponding answers generated by different methods. Baseline codecs (BPG, VVC, MS-ILLM, VQ-Kmeans, DiffEIC) either produce generic or semantically incorrect responses, whereas UniMIC generates contextually rich and accurate captions that align closely with the visual content.

Edge Input	Cloud Gen	Edge Output					
Prompt	Image	BPG	VVC	VQ-Kmeans	MS-ILLM	DiffEIC	Ours
A man on his skis on a snowy slope.		 0.0382	 0.0363	 0.0391	 0.0557	 0.0581	 0.0291
A woman with a snowboard with a man standing next to her on a ski slope.		 0.0629	 0.0549	 0.0391	 0.0819	 0.0786	 0.0319
Two twin beds with no comforters on them.		 0.0350	 0.0304	 0.0391	 0.0513	 0.0518	 0.0259
An image of a very cute girl with face piercings.		 0.0349	 0.0310	 0.0391	 0.0604	 0.0664	 0.0310
A cat that is standing looking through a glass.		 0.0325	 0.0314	 0.0391	 0.0547	 0.0547	 0.0306
three different donuts one is pink one is brown and one has white sprinkles		 0.0253	 0.0256	 0.0391	 0.0425	 0.0337	 0.0238
A group of red, yellow and orange fruit mixed together.		 0.0359	 0.0298	 0.0391	 0.0518	 0.0443	 0.0277
a small boat in a body of water		 0.0332	 0.0280	 0.0391	 0.0405	 0.0469	 0.0256
A white refrigerator freezer sitting inside of a kitchen.		 0.0303	 0.0276	 0.0391	 0.0415	 0.0332	 0.0245

Fig. 11. **Qualitative comparison of T2I generation.** Compared with traditional codecs and recent generative baselines, UniMIC preserves semantic details and visual fidelity while achieving lower bitrates (bpp values shown under each result).



Fig. 12. Quantitative comparison results on text-guided image inpainting.




Fig. 13. **Qualitative comparison results of text-guided image outpainting.** Specifically, the encoding method used to generate each image is indicated above, and the white box at the bottom denotes the decoding bitrate (bits per pixel, bpp) for each image. The red box highlights the reconstructions of the original image at different stages.