



BEACON: KNOWING WHEN AND HOW TO PERFORM AGENTIC VISUAL REASONING

Qixun Wang^{1,2*} Yang Shi^{1,2*} Letian Cheng¹ Zhuoran Zhang¹ Yan He¹

Yuqi Tang³ Qi Zhang¹ Xinlei Yu⁴ Ruizhe Chen⁵ Tianrun Xu⁶

Yuanxing Zhang^{2†} Pengfei Wan² Haotian Wang⁶ Xianghua Ying^{1‡}

¹Peking University ²Kling Team ³HKUST(GZ) ⁴CUHK ⁵ZJU ⁶THU

* Equal Contribution † Project Lead ‡ Corresponding Author

🔗 Code 🤖 Model




Figure 1: Agentic visual reasoning models should use tools *adaptively* and *effectively*.

ABSTRACT

The fundamental goal of agentic visual reasoning is to improve the success rate of multimodal large language models (MLLMs) on complex tasks, rather than merely equipping them with a sophisticated yet inefficient reasoning paradigm. In this work, we rethink agentic visual reasoning through two key dimensions of tool use: *Mode Adaptiveness* and *Tool Effect*. *Mode Adaptiveness* characterizes whether an MLLM can recognize when tools are truly necessary and invoke them accordingly, thereby avoiding unnecessary computational overhead while improving performance on challenging problems that require tool assistance. *Tool Effect* characterizes the actual impact of tool use: tools should extend the model’s capabilities on problems unsolvable through text-only reasoning, while avoiding additional errors on problems that the model can already solve without tools. We conduct a comprehensive analysis to quantify these two properties and empirically reveal that existing agentic visual reasoning models exhibit limited *MA*, while the gains produced by tool use on hard examples are largely offset by the harm introduced on easy examples that the models can already solve. Motivated by these observations, we propose **Beacon**, a novel agentic visual reasoning model that achieves stronger overall performance, improved *Mode Adaptiveness*, and genuine tool-induced performance gains. At the core of Beacon are the *Necessity-Aware Adaptive Reward* and the *Hint-Guided Capability Expansion* mechanism in the reinforcement learning stage, which respectively encourage adaptive tool invocation based on task necessity and strengthen the model’s tool-use capability on the most challenging problems. Extensive experiments across diverse bench-




Figure 2: (a) The tool-call ratio at different levels of text-only accuracy. (b) Average performance across 13 benchmarks. (c) Tool-induced performance gains and harms (see Section 3.1 for details). **Takeaway 1 (a):** Beacon exhibits adaptive tool-invocation behavior that is largely absent from existing agentic visual reasoning models, invoking tools more frequently on samples that are difficult to solve through tool-free reasoning. **Takeaway 2 (b–c):** Beacon achieves the best average performance and the largest gap between tool gain and tool harm, indicating that its tool use more effectively extends the model’s capabilities beyond text-only reasoning. In contrast, for prior models, the gains from tool use are largely offset by the errors it introduces, resulting in little improvement over text-only reasoning.

1 INTRODUCTION

Agentic visual reasoning [44, 41, 10, 11], which leverages external tools to produce intermediate multimodal results that support final-answer generation, has emerged as an important paradigm for multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [1, 7, 25, 37]. Although prior studies have demonstrated empirical gains, they often overlook two critical aspects of tool use: (1) *tool-invocation adaptiveness*, namely, whether a model can determine when tools are necessary based on factors such as tool-free solvability; and (2) *tool effect*, namely, whether tool use extends the model’s capabilities on problems that cannot be solved without tools while avoiding performance degradation on problems that are already solvable through tool-free reasoning.

To investigate these aspects, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of representative agentic visual reasoning models. Our analysis reveals that existing models generally exhibit limited adaptiveness in tool invocation, while the gains from tool use are often offset by the errors it introduces, yielding little improvement over text-only reasoning. Motivated by these findings, we propose **Beacon**, an agentic visual reasoning model with improved tool-invocation adaptiveness and stronger tool-use capability, enabling genuine gains beyond text-only reasoning.

During inference, Beacon can autonomously generate Python code to perform diverse visual and numerical operations, including image cropping, annotation, enhancement, rotation, stitching, pixel-level computation, and complex numerical calculations. To train Beacon, we first construct a high-quality data synthesis pipeline that equips the model with fundamental code-use capabilities. We then introduce a reinforcement learning (RL) framework consisting of a necessity-aware adaptive reward, which encourages tool use only when needed, and a hint-guided rollout strategy, which exposes the model to effective tool-use trajectories on problems that cannot be solved without tools.

Experiments on 13 benchmarks show that Beacon achieves the best average performance. Further analysis demonstrates that Beacon exhibits stronger tool-invocation adaptiveness and the largest gap between tool-induced gain and harm, indicating that our RL framework improves both the adaptiveness and effectiveness of tool use.

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- We systematically analyze tool-invocation adaptiveness and the effects of tool use in representative agentic visual reasoning models. Our results reveal that existing models generally lack adaptive tool-use behavior, while the gains achieved on hard problems are largely offset by the errors introduced on problems that are already solvable through text-only reasoning (Section 3.1).
- We develop a high-quality supervised fine-tuning (SFT) data synthesis pipeline, an RL data curation strategy, and a novel RL framework to train Beacon. These designs improve the model’s tool-invocation adaptiveness and strengthen its ability to use tools to extend its capabilities beyond text-only reasoning (Section 4).
- We evaluate Beacon on 13 benchmarks spanning diverse visual reasoning tasks. Beacon achieves the best average performance and exhibits stronger tool-invocation adaptiveness, together with the largest margin between tool-induced gain and harm, demonstrating that our RL framework improves both the adaptiveness and effectiveness of tool use (Section 5).

2 RELATED WORK

Agentic Visual Reasoning. Recent MLLMs have moved beyond static visual inputs by interleaving textual reasoning with intermediate visual interactions. Existing approaches enable models to revisit image regions, crop or edit images, generate auxiliary visual representations, or execute code for visual manipulation and numerical computation [19, 29, 48, 49, 22, 30, 44, 10, 20, 27]. These studies have demonstrated the potential of external tools for fine-grained perception and complex multimodal reasoning. However, most evaluations primarily report aggregate task accuracy, providing limited evidence about whether the model can appropriately choose between direct reasoning and tool-augmented reasoning, and whether tool use genuinely extends the model’s capabilities beyond tool-free reasoning.

Adaptive and Efficient Tool Use. Several recent studies have recognized that indiscriminate tool invocation can introduce unnecessary computation and propose various RL strategies to encourage more adaptive tool use [27, 34, 41]. While these works provide pioneering insights, their adaptive goals may still suffer from several limitations. CodeDance [27] uses group-level accuracy to determine the optimization direction of its adaptive reward: high or low group accuracy indicates that tools should be used less or more frequently, respectively. However, this design does not condition the reward on whether a particular trajectory has actually invoked a tool. As a result, it may incorrectly penalize the tool-use behavior of a successful tool-assisted trajectory simply because it belongs to a high-accuracy group. AdaTooler-V [34] instead labels training samples as requiring or not requiring tools according to the tool-induced performance gain of a teacher model, Qwen2.5-VL-72B [2]. Such teacher-derived supervision may suffer from distribution mismatch between the policy and the teacher, while also being constrained by the teacher’s own tool-use capability. Metis [41] adopts a simpler strategy that generally encourages fewer tool calls, but this objective lacks task-dependent adaptiveness and may suppress tool use even when it is necessary for solving difficult problems.

Our adaptive reward design (Section 4.4.1) addresses these limitations by following two principles: (1) mode-conditioned labeling, which labels each problem as requiring or not requiring tools based on both tool-free and tool-assisted performance, and (2) online labeling, which labels each problem based on the current policy’s performance rather than a fixed teacher model, avoiding off-policy issues.

Understanding the Actual Benefit of Visual Tools. A growing line of diagnostic work questions whether the gains of agentic visual reasoning genuinely arise from intermediate visual tools. [42] find that interleaved visual results contribute marginally over tool-free reasoning and that improvements mainly originate from SFT. [16] show that tool-use RL mainly reduces errors introduced by

tool use, while making limited progress in correcting problems that remain unsolved without tools. Similarly, [8] find that tool-induced performance gains and harms both contribute only marginally to the overall performance. Despite these important observations, existing analyses do not provide a unified characterization of the reasoning-mode adaptiveness and the effect of tool execution. Moreover, they typically study tool-free solvability through a binary outcome from a single inference run, which is intrinsically unstable and could be easily perturbed by stochasticity, meanwhile obscuring how autonomous invocation behavior varies across different levels of tool-free solvability. Lastly, no prior work has proposed an explicit solution to improve the genuine benefit of tool use.

In contrast, our analysis framework (Section 3.1) considers both adaptiveness and the effect of tool use, meanwhile providing a more robust evaluation with multiple inference runs. We also propose a novel RL framework to improve both aspects (Section 4.4).

3 ANALYSIS

In this section, we conduct comprehensive experiments to analyze two different aspects of the tool use of agentic visual models: (1) *Mode Adaptiveness*: whether current agentic visual reasoning models’ can adaptively call tools for different problems, and (2) the effect of tool use: whether the tool use can extend the model’s capabilities on hard problems that the model cannot solve without tools, and whether the tool use harm the model’s performance on easy problems that the model can already solve without tools.

3.1 THE PROPOSED METRICS

Mode Adaptiveness (MA) measures a model’s ability to determine when tools are necessary and select the appropriate reasoning mode accordingly. This ability has two complementary aspects: the model should avoid tool use when a problem can be reliably solved through text-only reasoning, while invoking tools when text-only reasoning is insufficient.

To assess whether a problem can be reliably solved through text-only reasoning, we require the model to answer using Prompt 1 (denoted as p_{text}) in Appendix A.1, which prohibits tool use. Unlike prior analyses that determine text-only solvability from a single response [8], a procedure that can be sensitive to sampling stochasticity, we sample five text-only responses for each problem. We classify a problem as “text-easy” if at least four responses are correct and as “text-hard” if at most one response is correct. Problems with two or three correct responses are regarded as ambiguous and excluded from the analysis.

For tool-enabled reasoning, we adopt the official tool-use prompt of each model, denoted as p_{tool} . We minimally modify these prompts to permit, rather than mandate, tool use, thereby revealing each model’s intrinsic mode-adaptation behavior.

Let x denote a problem sample and π_θ denote the model. Denote the “text-easy” and “text-hard” samples as $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. Let $u_{x,i}$ denote the usage of tools for the i -th answer of sample x under the tool-enabled prompt p_{tool} , i.e., $u_{x,i} = 1$ if the model uses tools for the i -th answer of sample x and $u_{x,i} = 0$ otherwise. *MA* consists of the following sub-metrics.

$$MA_{\text{text}} = \frac{1}{5|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{i=1}^5 (1 - u_{x,i}), \quad MA_{\text{tool}} = \frac{1}{5|\mathcal{H}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^5 u_{x,i}.$$

MA_{text} measures the average ratio of tool-free responses on the “text-easy” samples. A higher value indicates that the model is better at avoiding unnecessary tool use. MA_{tool} measures the average ratio of tool-assisted responses on the “text-hard” samples. A higher value indicates that the model is better at invoking tools when text-only reasoning fails frequently.

Tool Effects (TE) measures how tool use affects the model’s task-solving performance compared to tool-free reasoning, including both the gains obtained on “text-hard” samples and harms introduced on “text-easy” samples. Let $c_{x,i}$ the correctness of the i -th response for sample x , i.e., $c_{x,i} = 1$ if the model answers correctly and $c_{x,i} = 0$ otherwise. Denote the total number of test samples as N . *Tool Effect* consists of the following sub-metrics:

$$Tool-Gain = \frac{1}{5N} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^5 u_{x,i} c_{x,i}, \quad Tool-Harm = \frac{1}{5N} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{i=1}^5 u_{x,i} (1 - c_{x,i}).$$

Tool-Gain measures the proportion of samples that are “text-hard” and successfully solved by tools under the tool-enabled prompt. A higher value indicates that tool use is more effective at extending the model’s problem-solving capability beyond tool-free reasoning. *Tool-Harm* measures the proportion of all samples that are “text-easy” and incorrectly answered under the tool-enabled prompt. A lower value indicates that the model is better at avoiding performance degradation caused by ineffective tool use.

Accuracy metrics. We also compute several other metrics to better depict the behavior of agentic visual reasoning. To measure the overall performance of the two reasoning modes, we compute the accuracy under the tool-enabled prompt p_{tool} and the enforced-text prompt p_{text} averaged on five runs, denoted as *Tool-Available Acc.* and *Tool-Free Acc.*, respectively.

3.2 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

We evaluate several representative agentic visual reasoning models: Thyme [44], DeepEyesV2 [10], CodeV [11], and Metis [41]. We present the overall results of the metrics in Figure 3 and summarize the key observations below. We leave the detailed results and analysis in Section 5.3.




Figure 3: (a) The accuracy of tool-available and tool-free reasoning. (b) The MA_{text} , MA_{tool} , and MA_{mean} of different models. (c) The *Tool-Gain* and *Tool-Harm* of different models.

Observation 1 (Figure 3(a)): Tool-enabled reasoning provides little improvement over tool-free reasoning for most existing agentic visual reasoning models. This finding is consistent with prior studies [8, 42]. By averaging results over five runs, we further show that this limited gain is robust to sampling stochasticity.

Observation 2 (Figure 3(b)): Existing agentic visual reasoning models exhibit limited reasoning-mode adaptiveness. A model that always uses tools or never uses tools achieves an MA_{mean} of 50%. Most evaluated models obtain an MA_{mean} close to or even below this baseline. Moreover, many consistently favor a single reasoning mode, either tool-free or tool-assisted reasoning, indicating that they fail to adapt their mode selection to the tool-free difficulty of each problem.

Observation 3 (Figure 3(c)): Tool use provides limited benefit on “text-hard” samples for existing agentic visual reasoning models. Most evaluated models exhibit a low *Tool-Gain*. Although

their *Tool-Harm* is also limited, *Tool-Gain* does not substantially exceed *Tool-Harm*. Consequently, tool use yields little net performance benefit.

Issue attribution. We attribute this issue to two primary factors: (1) the absence of an explicit objective that promotes adaptive behavior, and (2) a fundamental limitation of RL with verifiable rewards—its difficulty in expanding the model’s capabilities beyond those acquired from the pre-training distribution.

4 METHOD

4.1 OVERVIEW

Motivated by the observations in Section 3.1, we propose Beacon, which adopts an SFT-then-RL training paradigm. During SFT, we equip the model with fundamental code-use capabilities using synthesized trajectories spanning diverse visual reasoning tasks. During RL, we introduce adaptive reward shaping and a hint-guided rollout mechanism to further improve reasoning-mode adaptiveness and enhance the genuine performance gains brought by code use.

Given a visual query consisting of an image and a question, Beacon autonomously decides whether code execution is necessary. When code is invoked, the model generates a Python snippet enclosed in `<tool_call>...</tool_call>` to manipulate the image or perform numerical computation. After execution, the resulting output is returned as an observation enclosed in `<observation>...</observation>`. Based on this observation, the model may continue reasoning, invoke code again, or produce the final answer.

4.2 TRAINING DATA CONSTRUCTION

Overview. We construct a training data pool from open-source datasets. For SFT, we first evaluate the base model, Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [1], on the source data and retain challenging examples. We then use Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] to generate code-assisted reasoning trajectories for these examples and further refine the generated trajectories with the same model. For RL, we evaluate the resulting SFT model on the same data pool and select the remaining unsolved examples for reinforcement learning. Statistics of the constructed training data are reported in Table 5, with additional details provided in Appendix B.

1. Source data selection. We select source datasets according to three principles: **1) Diversity:** the data should span a broad range of tasks and domains to promote generalization; **2) Quality:** the ground-truth annotations should be reliable and minimally noisy; and **3) Difficulty:** the tasks should be sufficiently challenging to benefit from tool use and expand the model’s capabilities. Following these principles, we collect data from 16 benchmarks and datasets (see Appendix B), covering real-world perception, chart understanding, OCR, STEM, spatial reasoning, and real-world agentic reasoning. Most of these datasets contain human-annotated labels. To prevent evaluation contamination, we remove all samples that overlap with the test sets used in our experiments.

2. SFT data synthesis. We construct the SFT data in three stages. (1) We sample five responses from the base model, Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct, and retain examples that are answered correctly at most twice. (2) For these hard examples, we use Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] to generate code-assisted reasoning trajectories containing Python code and the corresponding execution outputs, retaining only trajectories that yield correct answers. (3) Because the generated trajectories may still contain low-quality reasoning or tool-use steps, we introduce an additional refinement procedure using Gemini 3.1 Pro. Further details of the synthesis and refinement pipeline are provided in Appendix B.3.

3. RL data construction. We evaluate the SFT model on the same data pool and retain the examples that answered correctly no more than three times out of five attempts. These hard examples constitute the RL training set, on which the model is further optimized using reward signals that account for both answer correctness and the effectiveness of tool use.




Figure 4: **Illustration of the RL process of Beacon.** The *Necessity-Aware Adaptive Reward* (NAAR) and *Hint-Guided Capability Expansion* (HCE) are designed to improve reasoning-mode adaptiveness and expand the model’s tool-use capabilities on the most challenging problems, respectively.

4.3 COLD-START SFT

We use a standard cross-entropy loss for cold-start SFT, and mask the code output (i.e., the content between `<tool_call>...</tool_call>`). To avoid biasing the model towards code use and mitigate forgetting, we inject some correct pure-text trajectories generated by the base model of the samples with accuracy ≥ 0.6 among five rollouts into the SFT training data. See Appendix C.1 for more details of SFT training.

4.4 REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

In this section, we will describe the core design of our RL framework. We adopt GRPO [23] as the base RL algorithm, with our designed *Necessity-Aware Adaptive Reward* and *Hint-guided Capability Expansion* mechanism to further improve the model’s reasoning mode adaptiveness and the true gain of code use.

4.4.1 NECESSITY-AWARE ADAPTIVE REWARD

A central challenge in adaptive reasoning is to discourage unnecessary tool use without suppressing the model’s ability to solve difficult problems with code. A strict binary preference for text-only reasoning may over-penalize code-based responses even when they produce correct answers, which can introduce conflicts between the adaptive objective and the task-accuracy objective. To balance reasoning efficiency and task success, we introduce the *Necessity-Aware Adaptive Reward* (NAAR), which prioritizes text-only reasoning when it is sufficient, while still assigning partial credit to correct code-based solutions.

For each rollout group $\mathcal{G}$, let $\mathbb{I}_{\text{text}}(\mathcal{G})$ indicate whether the group contains at least one correct text-only response. The adaptive reward for a response y_i is defined as

$$R_{\text{adaptive}}(y_i; \mathcal{G}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbb{I}_{\text{text}}(\mathcal{G}) = 1, y_i \text{ is text-only and correct,} \\ 0.25, & \mathbb{I}_{\text{text}}(\mathcal{G}) = 1, y_i \text{ uses code and is correct,} \\ 1, & \mathbb{I}_{\text{text}}(\mathcal{G}) = 0, y_i \text{ uses code and is correct,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

When a problem can be solved through text-only reasoning, NAAR assigns the highest reward to correct text-only responses and a reduced reward to correct code-based responses, thereby encouraging the model to avoid unnecessary tool calls. Importantly, correct code-based responses are not assigned zero reward, since they still demonstrate successful reasoning and may provide useful learning signals. When no text-only response in the group is correct, correct code-based responses

receive the full reward, encouraging the model to use tools when they are necessary for solving the problem. Therefore, NAAR implements a soft preference for text-only reasoning rather than a hard prohibition on tool use, preserving task-solving capability while improving necessity awareness.

In practice, we use the same prompt for SFT, RL rollouts, and evaluation to avoid distribution shift (see Appendix C.3 for the prompt). The prompt instructs the model to autonomously decide whether to use code.

4.4.2 HINT-GUIDED CAPABILITY EXPANSION

A fundamental limitation of conventional RLVR is that hard examples are often “wasted” when the policy fails to solve them within a limited number of rollouts. In this case, all responses receive similarly low rewards and thus provide little useful group-relative learning signal. Nevertheless, these hard examples are particularly valuable for expanding the capability boundary of the policy, which aligns with the goal of tool use. To better exploit such examples, we propose *Hint-guided Capability Expansion* (HCE), which injects expert-generated hints into the rollout process to help the policy discover successful reasoning and tool-use trajectories on the hard examples.

Concretely, for each problem, we first sample a group $\mathcal{G}^n = \{y_i^n\}_{i=1}^N$ from the policy using the original prompt x , where $N = 8$ in our experiments. If none of these responses is correct, we regard the problem as a hard example and invoke a strong expert model (Gemini-3.1-Pro) to construct an answer-free hint. The generated hint is then injected into the rollout prompt, allowing the policy to explore reasoning and tool-use behaviors that are difficult to discover from its original policy distribution. During policy optimization, we remove the hint from the model input while retaining the trajectories generated with the hint, thereby transferring the hint-assisted behaviors back to the original, hint-free policy and avoiding reliance on hints at inference time.

Hint generation. Directly prompting the expert model to produce a hint may result in unreliable guidance for two reasons. First, the expert model may itself fail to solve the problem correctly. Second, hint steps produced without actual execution may be impractical or unhelpful. We therefore adopt a two-stage hint-generation procedure. First, the expert model is prompted to solve the hard example by producing a complete code-assisted reasoning trajectory, and we retain only the correct ones. Second, the expert model extracts the crucial reasoning steps (text or code-use steps) and the expected subgoal of each step from the verified trajectory and converts them into an answer-free hint. Details of the hint-generation prompts are provided in Appendix C.4.

Hinted rollout. Let h denote the hint generated for a hard example with original question prompt x . We append the hint to the original question to construct the hinted prompt $x^h = x \oplus h$, where $\oplus$ denotes prompt concatenation. The hint contains only intermediate instructions, expected subgoals, and useful tool-use strategies; it does not contain the final answer. We then sample another group of N responses from the policy model π_θ under the hinted prompt x^h :

$$y_i^h \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | x^h), \quad \mathcal{G}^h = \{y_i^h\}_{i=1}^N. \quad (2)$$

The hinted groups x^h are combined with normal groups x^n , i.e., groups sampled from the original prompt x for policy optimization. For the hinted groups, when computing the policy update, we preserve the generated trajectory y_i^h but replace x^h with the original prompt x to avoid the model relying on hints at inference time.

4.4.3 POLICY OPTIMIZATION WITH NORMAL AND HINTED ROLLOUTS

Let $\mathcal{B}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_h$ denote the sets of retained responses from normal and hinted groups, respectively. For either type of group $\mathcal{G}$, we combine the format reward R_{format} with the previously defined necessity-aware adaptive reward:

$$R(y_i; \mathcal{G}) = 0.1R_{\text{format}}(y_i) + 0.9R_{\text{adaptive}}(y_i; \mathcal{G}), \quad (3)$$

in which the format reward is defined as $R_{\text{format}}(y_i) = 1$ if each code block is followed by a corresponding observation block and the final answer is put in `<answer>...</answer>`, and $R_{\text{format}}(y_i) = 0$ otherwise.

For each group, we compute the group-relative advantage for response y_i as

$$A_i = \frac{R(y_i; \mathcal{G}) - \mu_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}} + \varepsilon_{\text{adv}}}, \quad \varepsilon_{\text{adv}} = 10^{-6}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mu_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ are the mean and standard deviation of the rewards in group $\mathcal{G}$, respectively.

Let $y_{i,t}$ be the t -th trainable token and let $\tau_{i,<t}$ denote the preceding interaction history, including previous model tokens and environment observations. We use different importance-sampling ratios for normal and hinted groups. For a response in a normal group, the importance-sampling ratio is

$$\rho_{i,t}^n(\theta) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_{i,t} \mid x, \tau_{i,<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(y_{i,t} \mid x, \tau_{i,<t})}. \quad (5)$$

where θ_{old} is the model parameter before the current update. For a hinted response, we use the following importance sampling ratio:

$$\rho_{i,t}^h(\theta) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_{i,t} \mid x, \tau_{i,<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(y_{i,t} \mid x^h, \tau_{i,<t})}. \quad (6)$$

By removing the hint from the input prompt, we transfer the capability obtained through hint-guided exploration into the hint-free policy. Following [18], we retain the hint in the context of the old policy to mitigate off-policy issues and stabilize training.

Final Training Objective. The final actor loss follows the standard clipped GRPO objective:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = -\frac{1}{Z} \sum_{b \in \{\text{n,h}\}} \sum_{y_i \in \mathcal{B}_b} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i} \min(\rho_{i,t}^b(\theta) A_i, \text{clip}(\rho_{i,t}^b(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) A_i), \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon = 0.2$ and $Z = \sum_{b \in \{\text{n,h}\}} \sum_{y_i \in \mathcal{B}_b} |\mathcal{T}_i|$. Here, $\mathcal{T}_i$ contains only trainable tokens and excludes tool responses.

4.4.4 OTHER IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

We filter out groups with zero accuracy advantages, i.e., groups with all responses correct or wrong (even after the hinted rollout), and those with zero adaptive advantages, i.e., groups in which all responses share the same reasoning mode, as they do not provide useful learning signals for the corresponding reward.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In the experiment section, we aim to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: *How does Beacon perform on perception, general visual understanding, and reasoning benchmarks compared to existing open-source and closed-source models?*

RQ2: *How do the components of Beacon contribute to the Mode Adaptiveness, Tool Effect, and overall performance of the model?*

5.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Training details. We take Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [1] as the base model. For SFT, we train the model for 4 epochs with a peak learning rate of $1e^{-5}$. For the RL stage, we train the model for 1 epoch with a learning rate of $1e^{-6}$ and a rollout-group size of 128. See Appendix C for more details.

Evaluation Benchmarks. As [42] suggested, the evaluation for agentic visual reasoning models should consider challenging benchmarks that necessitate visual tool use. Therefore, we evaluate our model on a wide range of tasks, including high-resolution visual search: V* [39], HRBench [38], Visual Probe [12] (hard); spatial and perceptual reasoning: RealWorldQA [40], BLINK [5], BabyVision [3]; quantitative and diagrammatic reasoning: ChartQAPro [17], MathVista [15], MathVision [36], compositional and agentic visual reasoning: VisualPuzzles [28], GameQA [32], TIRBench [13]. These benchmarks go beyond simple object recognition or local perception, requiring models to perform complex visual search, spatial transformation, diagrammatic interpretation, intermediate-state imagination, etc.

Table 1: **Comparison on high-resolution visual search, spatial, and perceptual reasoning benchmarks.** Averages are computed over all available reported results. **Bold** and underline indicate the best and second-best performance among open-source models, respectively. Gray indicates that the result is reported in the original paper.

Model	High-Resolution Visual Search				Spatial & Perceptual Reasoning			Avg.
	V*	HR-Bench 4K	HR-Bench 8K	VisualProbe	RealWorldQA	BLINK	BabyVision	
Closed-Source models								
Gemini 3.1 pro	89.00	90.75	86.38	40.57	79.25	81.22	48.45	73.66
Open-Source models								
Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct	84.85	78.13	75.75	37.74	72.29	62.86	12.37	60.57
Pixel-Reasoner-7B	78.01	71.25	67.75	33.96	70.20	55.97	11.86	55.57
Thyme-7B	82.72	77.50	72.13	47.17	70.59	54.81	14.43	59.91
DeepEyesV2-7B	80.63	75.62	65.88	32.08	62.35	54.29	14.18	55.00
CodeV-7B	84.29	75.62	67.50	40.57	70.58	58.13	12.37	58.44
PyVision-7B	88.7	78.1	74.3	—	—	—	—	—
Metis-8B	90.58	83.50	81.63	48.11	71.90	62.09	14.17	64.57
Beacon-8B (Ours)	89.00	84.30	81.88	50.00	73.20	65.96	18.04	66.05
Δ over Qwen3-VL-8B-Inst.	+4.15	+6.17	+6.13	+12.26	+0.91	+3.10	+5.67	+5.48

Table 2: **Comparison on quantitative, diagrammatic, compositional, and agentic visual reasoning benchmarks.** Averages are computed over all available reported results.

Model	Quantitative & Diagrammatic Reasoning			Compositional & Agentic Visual Reasoning			Avg.
	ChartQAPro	MathVista	MathVision	VisualPuzzles	GameQA	TIR-Bench	
Closed-Source Models							
Gemini 3.1 Pro	75.46	90.40	89.47	73.46	81.00	47.57	76.23
Open-Source Models							
Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct	41.66	76.40	<u>53.81</u>	36.22	36.70	19.01	43.97
Pixel-Reasoner-7B	51.03	70.80	28.09	33.90	28.10	16.71	38.11
Thyme-7B	38.66	68.90	25.82	24.14	26.00	19.01	33.76
DeepEyesV2-7B	50.92	67.30	27.30	34.33	27.50	17.04	37.40
CodeV-7B	46.06	69.80	26.02	34.85	28.00	17.70	37.07
PyVision-7B	—	—	28.7	—	—	19.8	—
Metis-8B	<u>52.79</u>	77.80	53.49	<u>40.50</u>	<u>38.50</u>	<u>21.65</u>	<u>47.46</u>
Beacon-8B (Ours)	58.48	<u>77.10</u>	54.57	42.89	47.30	24.03	50.73
Δ over Qwen3-VL-8B-Inst.	+16.82	+0.70	+0.76	+6.67	+10.60	+5.02	+6.76

Baselines. We compare our model with both strong open-source and closed-source models. For open-source models, we include Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [1], PixelReasoner [29], Thyme [44], DeepEyesV2 [10], CodeV [11], PyVision-RL [46], and Metis [41]. For closed-source models, we include Gemini3.1-pro [7].

5.2 MAIN RESULTS

The evaluation results are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Beacon-RL-8B achieves the highest average performance among all open-source models, ranking first on 11 of the 13 benchmarks and outperforming its base model by an average of 6.07 points.

5.3 ANALYSIS

In this section, we present detailed results and analysis of *Mode Adaptiveness* and *Tool Effect*. Besides the metrics in Section 3.1, we further define *Text-Retain* as the proportion of samples that can be solved through text-only reasoning under p_{text} and remain correctly answered without tools under p_{tool} . A higher value indicates greater robustness of tool-free reasoning across prompts. The results are shown in Table 3. We summarize the key observations below.

Observation 1: Beacon can further improve its already strong tool-free reasoning by using tools. When tools are available, Beacon consistently outperforms tool-free reasoning across all datasets and shows the largest performance gain Δ_{Acc} (+1.96%), while other models exhibit weaker Δ_{Acc} with tools (below +1%). Note that the tool-free reasoning of Beacon still shows clear improvements over the base model (51.57%, compared to the average accuracy of Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct

Table 3: **The metrics that reflect the *Mode Adaptiveness* and *Tool Effect* of agentic visual reasoning models (%).** The definition of all metrics can be found in 3.1. $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ indicate that higher and lower values are better, respectively. The parentheses after the accuracies indicate the proportion of samples that actually use tools under the two different prompts (p_{tool} and p_{text}). $\Delta_{\text{Acc}} = \text{Tool-Available Acc.} - \text{Tool-Free Acc.}$ and $\Delta_{\text{TE}} = \text{Tool-Gain} - \text{Tool-Harm}$. Positive and non-positive deltas are shown in **green** and **red**, respectively.

Dataset	Method	Accuracy			Mode Adaptiveness			Tool Effects			
		Tool-Available Acc. $\uparrow$	Tool-Free Acc. $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{\text{Acc}} \uparrow$	$MA_{\text{tool}} \uparrow$	$MA_{\text{text}} \uparrow$	$MA_{\text{mean}} \uparrow$	Tool-Gain $\uparrow$	Tool-Harm $\downarrow$	$\Delta_{\text{TE}} \uparrow$	Text-Retain $\uparrow$
HRBench4K	Thyme	76.70 (12.77)	76.88 (0.00)	-0.18	11.52	86.81	49.16	0.20	0.38	-0.18	96.06
	DeepEyesV2	75.33 (98.87)	73.90 (0.00)	+1.43	99.51	1.36	50.44	7.47	6.20	+1.27	100.00
	CodeV	74.05 (61.08)	74.78 (0.23)	-0.73	43.90	33.31	38.61	3.12	3.05	+0.07	83.73
	Metis	84.12 (46.87)	83.80 (0.00)	+0.32	41.77	51.85	46.81	0.75	0.33	+0.42	96.81
	Beacon (Ours)	83.38 (70.65)	80.53 (0.00)	+2.85	97.24	37.18	67.21	9.98	4.47	+5.51	100.00
BLINK	Thyme	57.41 (0.68)	55.35 (0.00)	+2.06	1.00	99.50	50.25	0.16	0.00	+0.16	84.32
	DeepEyesV2	53.83 (99.80)	55.27 (0.00)	-1.44	99.92	0.35	50.13	10.06	9.76	+0.30	87.50
	CodeV	58.56 (14.66)	55.98 (0.00)	+2.58	16.10	85.89	51.00	2.29	1.90	+0.39	79.85
	Metis	62.09 (24.51)	64.67 (0.00)	-2.58	23.09	74.42	48.76	1.27	2.25	-0.98	87.78
	Beacon (Ours)	65.49 (79.79)	64.22 (0.00)	+1.27	93.78	28.30	61.04	13.11	11.15	+1.96	95.28
BabyVision	Thyme	12.27 (0.62)	11.55 (0.00)	+0.72	0.72	100.00	50.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	52.00
	DeepEyesV2	11.39 (99.90)	1.44 (0.00)	+9.95	99.90	0.00	49.95	10.98	0.88	+10.10	—
	CodeV	13.76 (0.57)	14.74 (0.00)	-0.98	0.69	100.00	50.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.51
	Metis	15.52 (15.72)	15.93 (0.00)	-0.41	17.65	94.55	56.10	0.62	0.46	+0.16	54.23
	Beacon (Ours)	16.70 (95.36)	15.36 (0.00)	+1.34	95.99	10.77	53.38	6.44	2.42	+4.02	85.71
MathVista	Thyme	71.22 (0.10)	71.64 (0.00)	-0.42	0.08	99.88	49.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	93.57
	DeepEyesV2	72.22 (99.88)	73.68 (0.00)	-1.46	100.00	0.17	50.08	5.32	7.28	-1.96	83.33
	CodeV	71.70 (0.30)	72.08 (0.00)	-0.38	0.76	99.86	50.31	0.04	0.04	0.00	92.01
	Metis	77.36 (17.34)	78.02 (0.00)	-0.66	21.22	83.52	52.37	0.84	1.16	-0.32	95.44
	Beacon (Ours)	77.80 (78.52)	77.18 (0.00)	+0.62	92.34	25.84	59.09	5.98	6.36	-0.38	98.46
TIRBench	Thyme	20.53 (10.45)	19.05 (0.02)	+1.48	8.07	78.57	43.32	0.58	0.25	+0.33	81.21
	DeepEyesV2	15.80 (99.11)	20.15 (0.00)	-4.35	99.22	1.25	50.24	5.43	6.45	-1.02	63.64
	CodeV	18.11 (15.60)	17.04 (0.00)	+1.07	12.76	68.64	40.70	0.82	0.95	-0.13	65.86
	Metis	21.84 (54.32)	21.23 (0.00)	+0.61	59.32	59.23	59.27	2.21	1.28	+0.93	80.66
	Beacon (Ours)	24.28 (92.74)	20.56 (0.00)	+3.72	94.40	12.44	53.42	10.96	6.37	+4.59	75.56
Average	Thyme	47.63	46.89	+0.73	4.28	92.95	48.61	0.19	0.13	+0.06	81.43
	DeepEyesV2	45.71	44.89	+0.83	99.71	0.63	50.17	7.85	6.11	+1.74	—
	CodeV	47.24	46.92	+0.31	14.84	77.54	46.19	1.25	1.19	+0.07	71.39
	Metis	52.19	52.73	-0.54	32.61	72.71	52.66	1.14	1.10	+0.04	82.98
	Beacon (Ours)	53.53	51.57	+1.96	94.75	22.91	58.83	9.29	6.15	+3.14	91.00

on these five datasets, which is 49.75%), indicating that the clear performance gain of the tool use of Beacon does not come at the cost of weakening the tool-free reasoning capability.

Observation 2: Beacon shows the best reasoning-mode adaptiveness among evaluated models. Although Beacon shows a preference towards using codes (the MA_{text} of Beacon is relatively low), it exhibits the best average MA_{mean} , demonstrating that it can adaptively choose the appropriate reasoning mode for different problems.

Observation 3: Beacon shows the largest gap between the tool-induced performance gain and harm, along with the highest *Text-Retain*. Compared to other models of which the Δ_{TE} is almost zero, Beacon shows a clear advantage of tool use with a Δ_{TE} of +3.14%, which indicates it can effectively leverage tools to solve problems that are difficult for text-only reasoning while controlling the performance degradation caused by ineffective tool use in a reasonable range.

5.4 ABLATION STUDY

We conduct a comprehensive ablation study to evaluate the contribution of each component of Beacon to the overall performance, *Mode Adaptiveness*, and *Tool Effect*. The results are presented in Table 4. We observe that our full method has the best overall performance, while using the necessity-aware adaptive reward alone achieves the best *Mode Adaptiveness*. Additionally, adding the HCE module improves Δ_{TE} compared to GRPO. We leave the complete results of the ablation study in Appendix D.1.

5.5 TRAINING DYNAMICS OF THE RL STAGE

In this section, we provide a comprehensive analysis of the training dynamics of the RL stage of Beacon.

Training rewards and adaptive behavior. We present the reward dynamics during the RL stage in Figure 5, where all reward signals exhibit a steady upward trend. Figure 6(a) shows the proportions of pure-text and code-assisted responses, which remain relatively stable throughout training,

Table 4: **Component-wise ablation study of Beacon.** “Overall Acc.” indicates the average accuracy across all 13 benchmarks. The other metrics are defined in Section 3.1 and are averaged over the five benchmarks in Table 3.

SFT	GRPO	NAAR	HCE	Overall Acc. $\uparrow$	Tool-Available Acc. $\uparrow$	Tool-Free Acc. $\uparrow$	MA _{mean} $\uparrow$	Δ_{TE} $\uparrow$
✓				56.91	—	—	—	—
✓	✓			57.10	52.25	51.40	56.30	+1.40
✓		✓		57.75	53.25	52.24	59.68	+2.54
✓	✓		✓	57.62	52.94	51.83	58.36	+2.96
✓	✓	✓	✓	58.98	53.53	51.57	58.83	+3.14




Figure 5: **Training accuracy and rewards of the RL stage.** (a) Mean training accuracy. (b) Adaptive reward. (c) Format reward.

with no clear shift toward either reasoning mode. In contrast, Figure 6(c) reports the reasoning-mode alignment accuracy, defined as the proportion of rollout trajectories whose actual reasoning mode matches the adaptive label assigned to their group. This accuracy consistently improves over the course of training, suggesting that the model gradually learns an adaptive tool-invocation policy rather than simply developing a preference for one reasoning mode. Figure 6 (b) further shows that the ratio between the adaptive labels of both reasoning modes remains steady during training.

Training Group Composition and All-Wrong Group Transformation. Figure 7(a) presents the composition of training rollout groups during the RL stage. We categorize the groups into three types: groups containing at least one correct pure-text response (“w/ text correct”), groups containing no correct pure-text response but at least one correct code-assisted response (“w/o text correct & w/ code correct”), and hint-induced groups whose responses are initially all incorrect (“hinted”). These three categories account for relatively stable proportions of approximately 50%, 35%, and 15%, respectively. Figure 7(b) further reports the proportion of initially all-incorrect groups that are converted into groups with non-zero accuracy advantages through hint-guided re-rollouts. Approximately 40% of such groups can be successfully recycled by our HCE mechanism, demonstrating its effectiveness in recovering useful learning signals from otherwise uninformative rollout groups.

5.6 ANSWERS TO RQ1 AND RQ2

Based on the above experiments and analyses, we are now ready to answer the two research questions posed in the beginning of this section.

RQ1. Beacon achieves the strongest overall performance among all evaluated open-source models across perception, general visual understanding, and reasoning benchmarks. It ranks first on 11 of the 13 benchmarks and improves over the Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct base model by an average of 6.07 points. These results demonstrate that Beacon generalizes effectively across diverse task types and substantially narrows the gap between open-source and leading closed-source models.

RQ2. The ablation results show that the proposed components contribute complementary improvements to Beacon. The *Necessity-Aware Adaptive Reward* primarily improves *Mode Adaptiveness* by encouraging the model to select the reasoning mode according to task necessity, while *Hint-Guided Capability Expansion* strengthens *Tool Effect* by recovering useful learning signals from all-wrong




Figure 6: **(a)** Proportions of pure-text and code-assisted responses during training. **(b)** Proportions of training groups assigned the “text” and “code” adaptive labels for reward computation. **(c)** Accuracy of reasoning-mode selection, measured as the proportion of responses whose reasoning mode matches the adaptive label of their corresponding group.




Figure 7: **(a)** Proportions of groups containing at least one correct pure-text response (“w/ text correct”), groups containing no correct pure-text response but at least one correct code-assisted response (“w/o text correct & w/ code correct”), and hint-induced groups (“hinted”). **(b)** Proportion of initially all-incorrect groups that are converted into groups with non-zero accuracy advantages through hint-guided re-rollouts.

rollout groups and improving the effectiveness of tool use on challenging problems. Their combination yields the best overall accuracy and the largest positive gap between tool-induced gains and harms. The training dynamics further confirm that these improvements arise from increasingly accurate reasoning-mode selection rather than a simple shift toward either pure-text or code-assisted reasoning.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we revisit agentic visual reasoning from the perspective of whether tools are used both *appropriately* and *effectively*. We introduce two complementary dimensions, *Mode Adaptiveness* and *Tool Effect*, to characterize whether a model can select the appropriate reasoning mode for each problem and whether tool use genuinely extends its capabilities beyond tool-free reasoning. Through a systematic evaluation of representative agentic visual reasoning models, we find that existing models often exhibit a strong preference for a single reasoning mode, while the gains brought by tools are largely offset by errors introduced through ineffective tool use.

Motivated by these findings, we propose Beacon, an agentic visual reasoning model trained with a high-quality data synthesis pipeline and a tailored reinforcement learning framework. In particular, the *Necessity-Aware Adaptive Reward* encourages the model to avoid unnecessary tool calls without suppressing useful tool-assisted reasoning, while *Hint-guided Capability Expansion* recovers informative learning signals from difficult examples that conventional RL fails to solve. Extensive experiments across 13 diverse benchmarks demonstrate that Beacon achieves strong overall perfor-

mance while substantially improving reasoning-mode adaptiveness and the relative gain of tool use. These results suggest that the progress of agentic visual reasoning should be measured not merely by how frequently models use tools, but by whether they know *when* tools are necessary and *how* to use them to produce genuine capability gains.

REFERENCES

- [1] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025.
- [2] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025.
- [3] Liang Chen, Weichu Xie, Yiyan Liang, Hongfeng He, Hans Zhao, Zhibo Yang, Zhiqi Huang, Haoning Wu, Haoyu Lu, Yiping Bao, et al. Babyvision: Visual reasoning beyond language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.06521*, 2026.
- [4] Haodong Duan, Junming Yang, Yuxuan Qiao, Xinyu Fang, Lin Chen, Yuan Liu, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, et al. Vlmevalkit: An open-source toolkit for evaluating large multi-modality models. In *ACM MM*, 2024.
- [5] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 148–166. Springer, 2024.
- [6] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3 flash. <https://deepmind.google/models/model-cards/gemini-3-flash/>, 2025.
- [7] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.1 Pro: Model Card. <https://deepmind.google/models/model-cards/gemini-3-1-pro/>, 2026.
- [8] Garvin Guo, Donglei Yu, Yu Chen, Xiang Wang, Shuai Li, Xinpei Zhao, Huaxing Liu, Qinghao Wang, and Minpeng Liao. Do multimodal agents really benefit from tool use? a systematic study of capability gains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.02357*, 2026.
- [9] Chaoqun He, Renjie Luo, Yuzhuo Bai, Shengding Hu, Zhen Thai, Junhao Shen, Jinyi Hu, Xu Han, Yujie Huang, Yuxiang Zhang, et al. Olympiadbench: A challenging benchmark for promoting agi with olympiad-level bilingual multimodal scientific problems. In *ACL*, 2024.
- [10] Jack Hong, Chenxiao Zhao, ChengLin Zhu, Weiheng Lu, Guohai Xu, and XingYu. Deep-eyesv2: Toward agentic multimodal model. In *ICLR*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yDKawwfJ50>.
- [11] Xinhai Hou, Shaoyuan Xu, Manan Biyani, Mayan Li, Jia Liu, Todd C Hollon, and Bryan Wang. Codev: Code with images for faithful visual reasoning via tool-aware policy optimization. In *CVPR*, 2026.
- [12] Xin Lai, Junyi Li, Wei Li, Tao Liu, Tianjian Li, and Hengshuang Zhao. Mini-o3: Scaling up reasoning patterns and interaction turns for visual search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.07969*, 2025.
- [13] Ming Li, Jike Zhong, Shitian Zhao, Haoquan Zhang, Shaoheng Lin, Yuxiang Lai, Chen Wei, Konstantinos Psounis, and Kaipeng Zhang. Tir-bench: A comprehensive benchmark for agentic thinking-with-images reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.01833*, 2025.
- [14] Pan Lu, Ran Gong, Shibiao Jiang, Liang Qiu, Siyuan Huang, Xiaodan Liang, and Song-Chun Zhu. Inter-gps: Interpretable geometry problem solving with formal language and symbolic reasoning. In *ACL*, 2021.

- [15] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- [16] Yan Ma, Weiyu Zhang, Tianle Li, Du Linge, Xuyang Shen, and Pengfei Liu. What does vision tool-use reinforcement learning really learn? disentangling tool-induced and intrinsic effects for crop-and-zoom. In *ICML*, 2026.
- [17] Ahmed Masry, Mohammed Saidul Islam, Mahir Ahmed, Aayush Bajaj, Firoz Kabir, Aaryaman Kartha, Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, Mizanur Rahman, Shadikur Rahman, Mehrad Shahmohammadi, et al. Chartqapro: A more diverse and challenging benchmark for chart question answering. In *ACL Findings*, 2025.
- [18] Vaskar Nath, Elaine Lau, Anisha Gunjal, Manasi Sharma, Nikhil Baharte, and Sean Hendryx. Adaptive guidance accelerates reinforcement learning of reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13923*, 2025.
- [19] Ji Qi, Ming Ding, Weihang Wang, Yushi Bai, Qingsong Lv, Wenyi Hong, Bin Xu, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Cogcom: A visual language model with chain-of-manipulations reasoning. In *ICLR*, 2025.
- [20] Runqi Qiao, Qiuna Tan, Minghan Yang, Guanting Dong, Peiqing Yang, Shiqiang Lang, Enhui Wan, Xiaowan Wang, Yida Xu, Lan Yang, et al. V-thinker: Interactive thinking with images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.04460*, 2025.
- [21] Gabriel Sarch, Linrong Cai, Qunzhong Wang, Haoyang Wu, Danqi Chen, and Zhuang Liu. Vero: An open rl recipe for general visual reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.04917*, 2026.
- [22] Gabriel Herbert Sarch, Snigdha Saha, Naitik Khandelwal, Ayush Jain, Michael J. Tarr, Aviral Kumar, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Grounded reinforcement learning for visual reasoning. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.
- [23] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [24] Guangming Sheng, Chi Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Xibin Wu, Wang Zhang, Ru Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Haibin Lin, and Chuan Wu. Hybridflow: A flexible and efficient rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2409.19256*, 2024.
- [25] Yang Shi, Jiaheng Liu, Yushuo Guan, Zhenhua Wu, Yuanxing Zhang, Zihao Wang, Weihong Lin, Jingyun Hua, Zekun Wang, Xinlong Chen, et al. Mavors: Multi-granularity video representation for multimodal large language model. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pp. 10994–11003, 2025.
- [26] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- [27] Qi Song, Honglin Li, Yingchen Yu, Haoyi Zhou, Lin Yang, Song Bai, Qi She, Zilong Huang, and Yunqing Zhao. Codedance: A dynamic tool-integrated mllm for executable visual reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.17312*, 2025.
- [28] Yueqi Song, Tianyue Ou, Yibo Kong, Zecheng Li, Graham Neubig, and Xiang Yue. Visualpuzzles: Decoupling multimodal reasoning evaluation from domain knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10342*, 2025.
- [29] Alex Su, Haozhe Wang, Weiming Ren, Fangzhen Lin, and Wenhui Chen. Pixel reasoner: Incentivizing pixel space reasoning via curiosity-driven reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.
- [30] Zhaochen Su, Linjie Li, Mingyang Song, Yunzhuo Hao, Zhengyuan Yang, Jun Zhang, Guanjie Chen, Jiawei Gu, Juntao Li, Xiaoye Qu, and Yu Cheng. Openthinking: Learning to think with images via visual tool reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08617*, 2025.

- [31] Zhaochen Su, Jincheng Gao, Hangyu Guo, Zhenhua Liu, Lueyang Zhang, Xinyu Geng, Shijue Huang, Peng Xia, Guanyu Jiang, Cheng Wang, et al. Agentvista: Evaluating multimodal agents in ultra-challenging realistic visual scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.23166*, 2026.
- [32] Jingqi Tong, Jixin Tang, Hangcheng Li, Yurong Mou, Ming Zhang, Jun Zhao, Yanbo Wen, Fan Song, Jiahao Zhan, Yuyang Lu, et al. Game-rl: Synthesizing multimodal verifiable game data to boost vlms’ general reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13886*, 2025.
- [33] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai C Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, et al. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal llms. *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [34] Chaoyang Wang, Kaituo Feng, Dongyang Chen, Zhongyu Wang, Zhixun Li, Sicheng Gao, Meng Meng, Xu Zhou, Manyuan Zhang, Yuzhang Shang, and Xiangyu Yue. Adatooler-v: Adaptive tool-use for images and videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.16918*, 2026.
- [35] Fei Wang, Xingyu Fu, James Y Huang, Zekun Li, Qin Liu, Xiaogeng Liu, Mingyu Derek Ma, Nan Xu, Wenxuan Zhou, Kai Zhang, et al. Muirbench: A comprehensive benchmark for robust multi-image understanding. In *ICLR*, 2025.
- [36] Ke Wang, Juntao Pan, Weikang Shi, Zimu Lu, Houxing Ren, Aojun Zhou, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. Measuring multimodal mathematical reasoning with math-vision dataset. *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [37] Qixun Wang, Yang Shi, Yifei Wang, Yuanxing Zhang, Pengfei Wan, Kun Gai, Xianghua Ying, and Yisen Wang. Monet: Reasoning in latent visual space beyond images and language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21395*, 2025.
- [38] Wenbin Wang, Liang Ding, Minyan Zeng, Xiabin Zhou, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Wei Yu, and Dacheng Tao. Divide, conquer and combine: A training-free framework for high-resolution image perception in multimodal large language models. In *AAAI*, 2025.
- [39] Penghao Wu and Saining Xie. V*: Guided visual search as a core mechanism in multimodal llms. In *CVPR*, pp. 13084–13094, 2024.
- [40] xAI. RealWorldQA. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/xai-org/RealworldQA>, 2024. A benchmark for evaluating real-world spatial understanding.
- [41] Shilin Yan, Juntao Tong, Hongwei Xue, Xiaojun Tang, Yangyang Wang, Kunyu Shi, Guannan Zhang, Ruixuan Li, and Yixiong Zou. Act wisely: Cultivating meta-cognitive tool use in agentic multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.08545*, 2026.
- [42] Wenjie Yang, Siqi Zhu, and Zengfeng Huang. Position: Your VLM may not be thinking with interleaved images. In *ICML Position Paper Track*, 2026.
- [43] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- [44] Yi-Fan Zhang, Xingyu Lu, Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Wei Chen, Xiao Hu, Bin Wen, Kaiyu Jiang, Changyi Liu, Tianke Zhang, Haonan Fan, Kaibing Chen, Jiankang Chen, Haojie Ding, Kaiyu Tang, Zhang Zhang, Liang Wang, Fan Yang, Tingting Gao, and Guorui Zhou. Thyme: Think beyond images. In *ICLR*, 2026.
- [45] Yusen Zhang, Wenliang Zheng, Aashrith Madasu, Peng Shi, Ryo Kamoi, Hao Zhou, Zhuoyang Zou, Shu Zhao, Sarkar Snigdha Sarathi Das, Vipul Gupta, et al. Hrscene: How far are vlms from effective high-resolution image understanding? In *ICCV*, 2025.
- [46] Shitian Zhao, Shaoheng Lin, Ming Li, Haoquan Zhang, Wenshuo Peng, Kaipeng Zhang, and Chen Wei. Pyvision-rl: Forging open agentic vision models via rl. *arxiv preprint arxiv:2602.20739*, 2026.

- [47] Yuze Zhao, Jintao Huang, Jinghan Hu, Xingjun Wang, Yunlin Mao, Daoze Zhang, Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhikai Wu, Baole Ai, Ang Wang, Wenmeng Zhou, and Yingda Chen. Swift:a scalable lightweight infrastructure for fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05517*, 2024.
- [48] Jiyang Zheng, Jialiang Shen, Yu Yao, Min Wang, Yang Yang, Dadong Wang, and Tongliang Liu. Chain-of-focus prompting: Leveraging sequential visual cues to prompt large autoregressive vision models. In *ICLR*, 2025.
- [49] Xuanyu Zhu, Yuhao Dong, Rundong Wang, Yang Shi, Zhipeng Wu, Yinlun Peng, YiFan Zhang, Yihang Lou, Yuanxing Zhang, Ziwei Liu, et al. Vtc-bench: Evaluating agentic multi-modal models via compositional visual tool chaining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.15030*, 2026.

APPENDIX CONTENTS

A	Experimental Details	19
A.1	Details of the Metric Analysis Experiments	19
A.2	Details of the Evaluation Experiments	19
B	Training Data Details	19
B.1	Overview	19
B.2	Data Sources	19
B.3	SFT Data Synthesis	20
C	Training Details	26
C.1	Details of Cold-start SFT	26
C.2	Details of RL	26
C.3	System Prompts for SFT, RL, and Evaluation	26
C.4	Details for Hint Generation	26
D	Additional Experimental Results	28
D.1	Detailed Results of Ablation Study	28
E	Discussion	28
E.1	Failed Attempts	28
F	Case Study	28
F.1	Reasoning Trajectory Examples	28
F.2	Hint Examples	28

A EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

A.1 DETAILS OF THE METRIC ANALYSIS EXPERIMENTS

Prompt Box 1: Prompt to enforce text-only answers

You are a helpful assistant.

Solve the following problem step by step by reasoning directly from the provided image and question.

You must not use any external tools, code execution, Python, or search. Do not output `<code>` blocks or any tool-call format.

Output format must be:
`<think>...</think>`
`<answer>...</answer>`

A.2 DETAILS OF THE EVALUATION EXPERIMENTS

We build our evaluation framework on the open-source VLMEvalKit toolkit [4]. For each model, we implement the tool-use inference pipeline following its official implementation, including the prompts, tool-call format, and execution procedure. For all agentic models, including Beacon, we allow up to three retries when a valid final answer is not produced because of code execution errors or a missing `<boxed{}>` tag. Each model may perform at most 20 rounds of tool calls. We set the decoding temperature to 0.1 for all models.

For answer evaluation, we first apply rule-based matching between the model’s final prediction and the ground-truth answer. If the rule-based matching fails, we provide both the prediction and the ground-truth answer to Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] or Gemini 3 Flash [6] for semantic answer judgment.

B TRAINING DATA DETAILS

B.1 OVERVIEW

Table 5: **Training data statistics.** We report both the total number of raw samples and the number of samples retained after data filtering.

Data Type	Original	Filtered & Retained
SFT Data	212,353	15,705
RL Data	45,886	15,709

Table 5 summarizes the statistics of the training data.

B.2 DATA SOURCES

Beacon leverages a diverse collection of publicly available multimodal data sources spanning mathematical reasoning, chart understanding, embodied interaction, spatial perception, game reasoning, and general visual reasoning.

Specifically, the training data are collected from Geometry3K [14], OlympiadBench [9], AgentVista [31], MuirBench [35], HRScene [45], CV-Bench [33], MMMU [43], and Vero [21]. These data sources cover a broad range of task formats and visual reasoning requirements, enabling Beacon to expose models to heterogeneous scenarios with different levels of tool dependency.

Mathematical and geometry-oriented sources, including Geometry3K [14] and OlympiadBench [9], provide training samples that require visual mathematical reasoning, geometric diagram understanding, symbolic manipulation, and multi-step scientific problem solving. HRScene [45] and CV-Bench [33] enrich the training corpus with high-resolution image understanding, region-sensitive perception, object counting, spatial relation reasoning, and 2D/3D visual understanding.

Figure 8: **Training data sources of Beacon.**

AgentVista [31] provides tool-oriented and agentic visual reasoning data, where models are encouraged to perform long-horizon reasoning with intermediate visual operations. Finally, MMMU [43], MuirBench [35], and Vero [21] introduce broader multimodal reasoning scenarios across academic, multi-image, and general visual reasoning tasks.

As shown in Figure 8, the resulting corpus spans a broad spectrum of task types, reasoning complexity, and tool requirements. While some samples can be solved through direct multimodal reasoning, others inherently benefit from external tools for operations such as visual manipulation, geometric analysis, or structured information extraction. This diversity exposes models to both tool-necessary and tool-optional scenarios, providing a foundation for learning not only how to use tools effectively, but also when tool invocation is genuinely beneficial. We present the task distribution of the training data in Figure 9. Figures 10 and 11 further show the number of samples from each dataset in the SFT and RL data before and after filtering, respectively.

B.3 SFT DATA SYNTHESIS

The synthesis of the SFT data consists of two steps: 1) generating code-based reasoning trajectories for the source problems with Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] and retaining only those whose final answers match the ground-truth labels; and 2) refining the retained trajectories using the same model.

1. Prompt for SFT code-reasoning trajectory synthesis. The prompt is provided in Box 2. Its key design choices are summarized below:

- **Representative code actions.** We provide five representative code actions, including `crop`, `draw_line`, `draw_box`, `numeric_calculation`, and `rotation`, covering common visual reasoning operations. For each action, we specify its purpose, recommended library, required imports, input convention, and a concrete example. These examples serve as guidance rather than constraints; in practice, Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] generates a much broader variety of code patterns beyond the provided examples.
- **Mandatory code use.** We explicitly instruct Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] to invoke code for obtaining visual evidence or other useful intermediate information. Since the model may still directly answer some questions without using code, we discard trajectories that do not contain valid tool execution.




Figure 9: Task category distribution of the SFT and RL data.




Figure 10: Detailed statistics of the SFT data. The numbers in the bars indicate the number of samples retained after rejection sampling, which removes easy samples, and refinement, which removes code trajectories where code does not actually help to derive the answer. “Retention” denotes the percentage of retained samples relative to the original samples.

- **Structured trajectory format.** We require the model to generate trajectories in a structured format, using `<tool_call>...</tool_call>` for code execution, `<tool_response>...</tool_response>` for execution results, `<observation>...</observation>` for interpreting the returned evidence, and `<answer>...</answer>` for the final prediction. This structured format improves interpretability, enables reliable automatic parsing, and encourages explicit reasoning over tool outputs before producing the final answer.
- **Sandbox protocols.** We define several execution protocols to reduce ambiguity and simplify parsing. Question images and code-generated images are assigned unique identifiers




Figure 11: **Detailed statistics of the RL data.** The numbers in the bars indicate the number of samples retained after rejection sampling, which removes easy samples. “Retention” denotes the percentage of retained samples relative to the original samples.

(e.g., `q0`, `q1`, `g0`, and `g1`), which can be accessed through `get_image(ref)`. The final line within each `<tool_call>...</tool_call>` block must be the executable expression, returning either a PIL image object or a numeric value. In addition, the model is instructed to obtain image dimensions via `img.size`, ensuring that coordinate-based operations are grounded in the actual image resolution.

Prompt Box 2: Prompt for SFT Data Synthesis

You are an image reasoning assistant. You may write Python code to obtain visual evidence or any helpful information before answering. This includes but is not limited to zooming in, drawing auxiliary lines, rotating, adjusting contrast, computing statistics, etc. Put the executable Python code inside `<tool_call></tool_call>` tags. When you give the final answer, you must wrap it inside `<answer></answer>` tags.

Code Actions

Here are representative code patterns for acting on images and numbers. They are recommended starting points, not an exhaustive list. You may use other valid Python operations, library calls, or parameter choices as long as they fit the runtime constraints.

crop

Purpose: Crop a rectangular region from an image using Pillow.

Recommended library: Pillow

Required imports:

from PIL import Image

Input convention:

- Read the source image from `get_image("q0")` / `get_image("g0")` or from `images[index]`.

- Use a 4-tuple (left, top, right, bottom) as the crop box.

- The last line should be the cropped PIL image object.

Example:

`<tool_call>`

`img = get_image("q0")`

```

cropped = img.crop((120, 180, 420, 620))
cropped
</tool_call>

## draw_line
Purpose: Draw one or more auxiliary line segments on an image using Pillow.

Recommended library: Pillow

Required imports:
from PIL import ImageDraw

Input convention:
- Read the source image from get_image("q0") / get_image("g0") or from images[
index].
- Always call copy() before drawing.
- Use ImageDraw.Draw(annotated).line((x1, y1, x2, y2), fill="red", width=4).
- The last line should be the annotated PIL image object.
Example:
<tool_call>
from PIL import ImageDraw
annotated = get_image("q0").copy()
draw = ImageDraw.Draw(annotated)
draw.line((118, 214, 612, 248), fill="red", width=4)
draw.line((132, 486, 628, 520), fill="red", width=4)
annotated
</tool_call>

## draw_box
Purpose: Draw one or more bounding boxes on an image using Pillow.

Recommended library: Pillow

Required imports:
from PIL import ImageDraw

Input convention:
- Read the source image from get_image("q0") / get_image("g0") or from images[
index].
- Always call copy() before drawing.
- Use ImageDraw.Draw(annotated).rectangle((x1, y1, x2, y2), outline="red",
width=3).
- The last line should be the annotated PIL image object.
Example:
<tool_call>
from PIL import ImageDraw
annotated = get_image("q0").copy()
draw = ImageDraw.Draw(annotated)
for box in [(42, 38, 128, 124), (150, 38, 236, 124)]:
    draw.rectangle(box, outline="red", width=3)
annotated
</tool_call>

## numeric_calculation
Purpose: Evaluate a mathematical expression using Python and math, instead of
mental arithmetic.

Recommended library: math

Required imports:
import math

Input convention:
- Write the calculation directly in Python, such as result = 5 / 8 * 100 or
result = math.sqrt(2) * 10.
- Import math only when you actually need math functions or constants.
- The last line should be the numeric result itself.
Example:
<tool_call>
import math
result = math.sqrt(2) * 10
result
</tool_call>

## rotation
Purpose: Rotate an image using Pillow to correct orientation or inspect a
different view.

Recommended library: Pillow

```

```

Required imports:
from PIL import Image

Input convention:
- Read the source image from get_image("q0") / get_image("g0") or from images[
index].
- Use img.rotate(angle, expand=True).
- Positive angles rotate counterclockwise.
- The last line should be the rotated PIL image object.
Example:
<tool_call>
img = get_image("q0")
rotated = img.rotate(90, expand=True)
rotated
</tool_call>

Additional reminders:

1. Even if you can already guess or know the answer from the image, you should
still use sandboxed Python snippets to mark, isolate, or verify the relevant
visual evidence before answering.
2. Use get_image(ref) to access runtime images. Original question images use
stable ids like q0, q1, and images returned by earlier code calls use stable
ids like g0, g1.
3. If you need to draw on an image, call copy() first so you do not modify the
source image directly. For example: annotated = get_image("q0").copy().
4. If the current call should return an image result, the last line inside <
tool_call> should be the PIL image object itself, such as cropped, rotated, or
annotated. If the current call should return a numeric result, the last line
should be the numeric object itself, such as result.
5. Do not do arithmetic mentally. Use Python code. You may import math when
needed.
6. <tool_response>...</tool_response> is inserted by the system after the code
finishes running. It is not something you should generate yourself. Never
output <tool_response> tags on your own.
7. After each code execution returns a result, you must immediately output an <
observation>...</observation> tag that explicitly analyzes the returned result
before deciding whether to call code again.
8. The order must be strictly <tool_call>...</tool_call> -> <tool_response
>...</tool_response> -> <observation>...</observation>. After that, you may
continue with additional <tool_call> -> <tool_response> -> <observation> cycles
.
9. Your final answer must be grounded in the tool results and observations you
obtained. If a tool result is insufficient, unclear, or unhelpful, explicitly
say so in <observation> and call code again to get better evidence instead of
relying on your own unaided visual guess.

Full example:
Question: Is the man phone both blue and closed?
Assistant:
<tool_call>
img = get_image("q0")
img.size
</tool_call>
[The system then inserts a tool result wrapped in <tool_response>...</
tool_response>]
<observation>I first checked the image size so that later coordinates are
grounded in the actual canvas. I still need localized visual evidence for the
phone itself.</observation>
<tool_call>
from PIL import ImageDraw
annotated = get_image("q0").copy()
draw = ImageDraw.Draw(annotated)
draw.rectangle((600, 290, 660, 380), outline="red", width=3)
annotated
</tool_call>
[The system then inserts a tool result wrapped in <tool_response>...</
tool_response>]
<observation>The box covers the phone in the man's hand. The phone is visibly
blue, and because he is actively holding it to his ear in use, it is not closed
.</observation>
<answer>No</answer>

```

2. Prompt for refining synthesized code-reasoning trajectories. Although Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] can synthesize high-quality code-reasoning trajectories using the prompt in Box 2, the generated trajectories still exhibit several common issues:

- **✗ Redundant or repetitive tool calls.** The model may repeatedly invoke similar code operations or generate unnecessary intermediate results, resulting in unnecessarily long and inefficient trajectories.
- **✗ Insufficient reliance on tool outputs.** Although the model executes code to obtain visual evidence, the returned results are sometimes only weakly utilized. Consequently, the final answer is still primarily based on the model’s direct visual reasoning rather than evidence obtained through tool execution.
- **✗ Uninformative reasoning.** Some trajectories contain repetitive or low-quality reasoning loops, where the model repeatedly produces similar thoughts or observations without making meaningful progress toward the final answer.
- **✗ Missing observations of tool responses.** The model may omit explicit observations after tool execution, making it unclear how the returned evidence is interpreted or how it supports the final prediction.

To address these issues, we further refine the synthesized trajectories with Gemini 3.1 Pro [7] using the prompt in Box 3. The refinement aims to remove trajectories whose final answers bypass tool outputs, eliminate redundant or uninformative code calls and reasoning, and enforce a cleaner trajectory structure. Manual inspection shows that the refined trajectories are substantially higher in quality, featuring more concise code execution, more informative reasoning, and stricter adherence to the prescribed format. These observations highlight the importance of trajectory refinement for high-quality automatic data synthesis.

Prompt Box 3: Prompt for SFT Data Refinement

You are refining a visual reasoning trajectory with tool calls.
Do not call tools again. Do not invent tool outputs. Only refine the trajectory text while keeping the final answer unchanged.
You will see the original question first, then the trajectory messages after the question.
The trajectory uses the following conventions:

1. Tool returns are wrapped in `<tool_response>...</tool_response>` and images are inserted in place.
2. `<tool_call>...</tool_call>` is executable code.
3. `<observation>...</observation>` is the observation after a tool returns.
4. `<answer>...</answer>` is the final answer.
5. Text thoughts may be interleaved anywhere in the trajectory.

Your task:

1. Check whether the trajectory actually relied on useful tool information to answer the question. If the tools did not provide helpful information and the answer was effectively derived from tool-free reasoning, especially in the last step, discard the trajectory.
2. Check whether the same tool was called repeatedly with unhelpful retries. Remove the unhelpful repeated tool-call steps and keep only the step that produced the key useful information.
3. For each tool call, if the tool result is followed by no meaningful `<observation>`, add one.
4. Remove clearly meaningless tool calls or meaningless code, such as trivial assignments, like `"<tool_call>result = 1result</tool_call>"`.
5. Remove meaningless thought fragments.
6. Note that `'img.size'` is necessary for the model to know the image size, so keep the `'img.size'` tool call that corresponds to it even if it looks trivial.
7. Check whether each `<observation>` block precisely describes the preceding tool call result. If not, try to refine the `<observation>` to make it more accurate and specific to the actual tool response.

Output requirements:

1. Output JSON only.
2. If no refinement is needed, output `{"decision": "keep"}`.
3. If the trajectory should be discarded, output `{"decision": "drop", "reason": "..."}.`
4. If refinement is needed, output JSON in this schema:

```
{
  "decision": "refine",
  "messages": [
    {"kind": "assistant", "text": "... assistant message text ..."},
    {"kind": "original_message", "source_message_id": "M3"}
  ]
}
```

5. In "messages", do not repeat the question or system prompt. Only output the messages after the original question.

```

6. Use {"kind":"original_message","source_message_id":"Mx"} only for original
non-assistant messages that should be kept exactly, especially tool-response
user messages.
7. For assistant messages, put the full assistant text in "text". If a tool-
response step is kept, keep its <tool_response> in the corresponding
original_message instead of rewriting it.
8. Keep the final answer unchanged.
9. If a <tool_call> step is removed, also remove the corresponding <
tool_response> and <observation>.

```

C TRAINING DETAILS

C.1 DETAILS OF COLD-START SFT

For SFT, we train Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct for 4 epochs using Megatron [26] on the ms-swift framework [47]. We optimize the model with Adam using a peak learning rate of 1×10^{-5} , a weight decay of 0.1, and a cosine learning-rate schedule with a 5% warm-up ratio. Gradients are accumulated over 128 micro-batches before each parameter update.

C.2 DETAILS OF RL

We use VeRL [24] as the RL training framework. RL training is conducted for 1 epoch on 64 NVIDIA H200 GPUs. For each prompt, the policy generates 8 rollouts, with a batch size of 128 prompt groups and a PPO mini-batch size of 128. We use an actor learning rate of 1×10^{-6} and the vanilla token-mean PPO objective with symmetric clipping bounds of 0.2, while disabling both KL and entropy regularization. The maximum sequence length is 30,720 tokens, including up to 20,480 prompt tokens and 10,240 response tokens, with at most 12 tool calls per rollout. For all-wrong prompt groups, structured hints are generated using up to three expert attempts and 15 expert tool calls with 32 parallel workers. Training is performed in bfloat16 precision with gradient checkpointing and a frozen vision encoder.

C.3 SYSTEM PROMPTS FOR SFT, RL, AND EVALUATION

To avoid distribution mismatch, we use the same system prompt for SFT, RL training, and evaluation. The prompt is shown in Box 4. It is identical to the system prompt used for SFT data synthesis (Box 2), except that the mandatory code-use instruction is replaced with an optional one ("You should decide whether to use code...").

Prompt Box 4: The system prompt for SFT, RL, and evaluation

```

...the same as the system prompt used for SFT data synthesis...

Additional reminders:

1. You should decide whether to use code to solve the problem. Only write codes
   when necessary. If you can directly solve the problem, don't use code.
2. ...

...the same as the system prompt used for SFT data synthesis...

```

C.4 DETAILS FOR HINT GENERATION

The system prompt for hint generation is shown in Box 5. The generated hint consists of a sequence of reasoning steps, each containing an instruction and an expected subgoal. The instruction specifies the reasoning, observation, or tool action to perform, while the subgoal describes the intermediate evidence or outcome to be obtained without revealing the final answer. In our current implementation, we retain only the "hint" field as the training hint. The remaining fields, "tool_steps" and "subgoals", are preserved for analysis and may serve as fine-grained supervision or reward signals in future work.

Prompt Box 5: The system prompt for hint generation

You will convert a correct multimodal reasoning trajectory into a hint for a weaker policy model.

The hint must NOT include the final answer, the reference answer, or an explicit restatement of either answer. It should describe the useful method, evidence to seek, and tool-use plan only.

First identify which steps in the Gemini trajectory are truly necessary for reaching the answer, then condense only those key steps into a short plan. Do NOT copy the full trajectory, every tool call, or incidental observations. Keep only the reasoning, visual observation, or tool steps that are most useful for solving the task.

The hint field itself must be a numbered list. Each item must use exactly this pattern: "1. [Instruction] xxx; [Expected Subgoal] xxx;". The Instruction should state the reasoning, observation, or tool action to perform. The Expected Subgoal should state what intermediate evidence or result that step should obtain, without revealing the final answer.

Prefer actionable tool steps over vague advice. Describe code actions at a high level rather than copying large code blocks from the trajectory. The tool field should be a concise semantic operation label derived from the Python code content, not merely the word python. Use exact canonical labels from the code-action prompt when applicable: crop, draw_line, draw_box, numeric_calculation, rotation.

For each tool step, subgoal_result must summarize the actual evidence or result obtained after the code ran. Do not write imperative sentences such as 'crop the image' or 'check the labels' in subgoal_result; write factual statements such as 'the crop shows ...' or 'the calculation returns ...'. If a tool result contains exact numeric values, coordinates, counts, OCR strings, table cells, or other precise evidence, include them explicitly in subgoal_result. Make subgoal_result as informative as needed to show what was learned and why it matters for that step's subgoal, while keeping it answer-free.

Extraction mode:

Extract the critical tool-use sequence and, for each step, state what information that tool step was meant to obtain. Omit tool calls or observations that did not help. If the trajectory did not use tools, extract the key reasoning idea instead.

Subgoal instruction:

Return subgoals as exactly the ordered list of subgoal_result strings from tool_steps. This keeps the training-facing subgoals grounded in actual tool results rather than intended actions.

Return exactly one JSON object with this schema:

```
{
  "hint": "1. [Instruction] key reasoning, observation, or tool step; [Expected Subgoal] answer-free intermediate evidence or result;\n2. [Instruction] next key step; [Expected Subgoal] next answer-free intermediate evidence or result\n";
  "tool_steps": [
    {
      "step": 1,
      "tool": "semantic operation name such as crop, draw_line, draw_box, numeric_calculation, rotation, zoom_in, or read_text",
      "action": "high-level tool action, no large code block",
      "expected_subgoal": "one concise paragraph describing the intermediate evidence this step is meant to obtain",
      "subgoal_result": "detailed factual answer-free result actually obtained, including exact numeric/textual evidence when available and why it matters for this subgoal"
    }
  ],
  "subgoals": ["same ordered strings as tool_steps[*].subgoal_result"]
}
```

Question:
{question}

Reference final answer, for filtering only. Do not reveal it in the hint:
{ground_truth}

Correct trajectory:
{trajectory}

D ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

D.1 DETAILED RESULTS OF ABLATION STUDY

Table 6: **Detailed ablation results for Mode Adaptiveness and Tool Effect (%)**. Metric definitions and notation follow Table 3.

Dataset	Method	Accuracy			Mode Adaptiveness			Tool Effects			
		Tool-Available Acc. $\uparrow$	Tool-Free Acc. $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{\text{Acc}} \uparrow$	$MA_{\text{tool}} \uparrow$	$MA_{\text{text}} \uparrow$	$MA_{\text{mean}} \uparrow$	Tool-Gain $\uparrow$	Tool-Harm $\downarrow$	$\Delta_{\text{TE}} \uparrow$	Text-Retain $\uparrow$
HRBench4K	GRPO	82.55 (70.85)	80.10 (0.00)	+2.45	94.29	33.94	64.12	9.23	4.48	+4.75	99.82
	GRPO+NAAR	82.70 (70.33)	80.50 (0.00)	+2.20	97.72	38.00	67.86	9.15	4.53	+4.62	99.22
	GRPO+HCE	83.20 (70.88)	80.01 (0.00)	+3.19	98.05	37.91	67.98	9.65	4.00	+5.65	99.56
	Beacon	83.38 (70.65)	80.53 (0.00)	+2.85	97.24	37.18	67.21	9.98	4.47	+5.51	100.00
BLINK	GRPO	65.48 (79.55)	63.91 (0.00)	+1.57	92.79	23.78	58.29	11.06	9.36	+1.70	95.70
	GRPO+NAAR	65.70 (79.66)	64.06 (0.00)	+1.64	93.85	29.13	61.49	11.36	10.11	+1.25	95.37
	GRPO+HCE	65.24 (79.48)	64.18 (0.00)	+1.06	92.70	27.31	60.01	11.29	9.21	+2.08	96.05
	Beacon	65.49 (79.79)	64.22 (0.00)	+1.27	93.78	28.30	61.04	13.11	11.15	+1.96	95.28
BabyVision	GRPO	15.10 (94.69)	14.59 (0.00)	+0.51	92.46	8.36	50.41	5.94	5.36	+0.58	68.00
	GRPO+NAAR	16.96 (95.10)	16.60 (0.00)	+0.36	95.79	14.71	55.25	5.73	3.97	+1.76	80.00
	GRPO+HCE	16.89 (94.76)	15.23 (0.00)	+1.66	95.23	9.49	52.36	7.59	4.56	+3.03	82.01
	Beacon	16.70 (95.36)	15.36 (0.00)	+1.34	95.99	10.77	53.38	6.44	2.42	+4.02	85.71
MathVista	GRPO	76.60 (78.76)	77.50 (0.00)	-0.90	90.64	23.59	57.12	5.26	7.04	-1.78	98.23
	GRPO+NAAR	77.22 (78.50)	77.68 (0.00)	-0.46	93.95	26.49	60.22	5.64	6.44	-0.80	98.39
	GRPO+HCE	76.30 (78.20)	77.28 (0.00)	-0.98	92.61	26.97	59.79	5.50	7.00	-1.50	98.32
	Beacon	77.80 (78.52)	77.18 (0.00)	+0.62	92.34	25.84	59.09	5.98	6.36	-0.38	98.46
TIRBench	GRPO	21.53 (92.11)	20.89 (0.00)	+0.64	93.15	10.01	51.58	9.08	7.35	+1.73	70.03
	GRPO+NAAR	23.65 (93.19)	22.35 (0.00)	+1.30	95.18	12.02	53.60	12.15	6.26	+5.89	71.76
	GRPO+HCE	23.05 (91.80)	22.44 (0.00)	+0.61	93.21	10.14	51.68	11.85	6.33	+5.52	72.69
	Beacon	24.28 (92.74)	20.56 (0.00)	+3.72	94.40	12.44	53.42	10.96	6.37	+4.59	75.56
Average	GRPO	52.25	51.40	+0.85	92.67	19.94	56.30	8.11	6.72	+1.40	86.36
	GRPO+NAAR	53.25	52.24	+1.01	95.30	24.07	59.68	8.81	6.26	+2.54	88.95
	GRPO+HCE	52.94	51.83	+1.11	94.36	22.36	58.36	9.18	6.22	+2.96	89.73
	Beacon	53.53	51.57	+1.96	94.75	22.91	58.83	9.29	6.15	+3.14	91.00

We provide detailed results of the ablation study in Table 6.

E DISCUSSION

E.1 FAILED ATTEMPTS

We also explored a more aggressive adaptive reward scheme. In addition to the standard rollout group, we force the model to generate a group of pure-text reasoning trajectories. If either the standard rollout group or the forced-text rollout group contains at least one correct pure-text trajectory, the adaptive label is assigned as “text.” However, this strategy strongly biases the policy toward pure-text reasoning, causing the code-use ratio to collapse and substantially degrading performance on perception-intensive benchmarks such as V* and HRBench.

The root cause is that the additional forced-text rollouts artificially increase the probability of observing at least one successful pure-text trajectory, even when pure-text reasoning is not the most reliable strategy on average. Consequently, the group-level label reflects the best outcome across multiple attempts rather than the reasoning mode most likely to succeed in a single rollout. This introduces a mismatch between training and evaluation: a problem may produce one correct pure-text trajectory among multiple training rollouts, yet still have a low probability of being solved by a single pure-text rollout at test time. As a result, the model becomes overly biased toward pure-text reasoning, leading to inferior test-time performance.


F CASE STUDY

F.1 REASONING TRAJECTORY EXAMPLES

As illustrated in Tables 7, 8, and 9, Beacon effectively leverages a diverse set of visual tools to solve complex reasoning tasks.

F.2 HINT EXAMPLES

Tables 10, 11, and 12 demonstrate that training-time hint supervision enables Beacon to extend its reasoning capabilities and tackle more challenging tasks.

**Question**

How many blue marbles are there on the track?

Beacon Reasoning

```
<tool.call>
img = get_image("q0")
img.size
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
[352, 369]
Available image refs:  q0
</tool.response>
<observation>
The image size is 352x369. I will now
write a script to detect
the blue marbles by finding connected
components of blue pixels
and filtering them based on size and
color.
</observation>
<tool.call>
import numpy as np
from PIL import Image
img = get_image("q0")
img_np = np.array(img)
# Create a mask for blue pixels
blue_mask = (img_np[:, :, 0] < 100) &
             (img_np[:, :, 1] < 150) &
             (img_np[:, :, 2] > 200)
# Simple connected components using BFS
def count_components(mask):
    visited = np.zeros_like(mask,
dtype=np.bool_)
    count = 0
    h, w = mask.shape
    for i in range(h):
        for j in range(w):
            if mask[i, j] and not visited[i,
j]:
                count += 1
                queue = [(i, j)]
                visited[i, j] = True
    ...
Available image refs:  q0, g0, g1
</tool.response>
<observation>
The bounding boxes for the 22 valid
components perfectly
enclose all the blue marbles on the track.
There are no
missed marbles and no false positives.
The count is exactly 22.
</observation>
<answer>
22
</answer>
```

Beacon Answer

22 (✓)

Table 7: Reasoning Trajectory Example: Case 1



Original Image (q0)



g0



g1



g2



g3



g4

Question

How many cars are white in this picture?

Beacon Reasoning

```

<tool.call>
img = get_image("q0")
img.size
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
[1448, 938]
Available image refs:  q0
</tool.response>
<observation>
The image size is 1448x938. I will crop
the middle section
to get a better look at the cars in the
distance.
</observation>
<tool.call>
img = get_image("q0")
cropped = img.crop((300, 450, 750, 550))
cropped
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
Returned image ref:  g0
Available image refs:  q0, g0
</tool.response>
<observation>
In the cropped image, I can see several
cars. Let's look closer
at the cars in the distance to determine
their colors.
</observation>
<tool.call>
img = get_image("q0")
cropped = img.crop((600, 450, 800, 550))
cropped
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
Returned image ref:  g1
Available image refs:  q0, g0, g1
...
Returned image ref:  g4
Available image refs:  q0, g0, g1, g2, g3,
g4
</tool.response>
<observation>
The car on the right side of the
foreground is dark grey or black.
So, the only white cars are the two parked
on the right side of
the street in the distance.
Therefore, there are 2 white cars in the
picture.
</observation>
<answer>
B
</answer>

```

Beacon Answer

B (✓)

Table 8: Reasoning Trajectory Example: Case 2



Original Image (q0)



Original Image (q1)



Original Image (q2)



g0

Question

Given the first image with the lower right corner missing, can you tell which one of the second image or the third image is the missing part?

Beacon Reasoning

```
<tool.call>
import numpy as np
from PIL import Image
img1 = get_image("q0")
img2 = get_image("q1")
img3 = get_image("q2")
print(f"Image 1 size: {img1.size}")
print(f"Image 2 size: {img2.size}")
print(f"Image 3 size: {img3.size}")
# Let's crop the bottom-right corner of
Image 1 and compare
# it with Image 2 and Image 3.
# The missing part is a black rectangle in
the lower-right
# corner. Let's find its coordinates.
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
Image 1 size: (400, 222)
Image 2 size: (200, 111)
Image 3 size: (200, 111)
Available image refs: q0, q1, q2
</tool.response>
<observation>
The images are all 200x111 in size. The
first image has a
black rectangle in the lower-right corner
(from x=200 to 400,
y=111 to 222). The second and third
images are exactly half
the size of the first image. I will
extract the bottom-right
quadrant of the first image and compare it
with the second
and third images.
...
<observation>
Pasting Image 3 into the missing spot of
Image 1 creates a
seamless and logical continuation of the
protest scene. The
banner with "cebo" crossed out perfectly
aligns with the text
seen in Image 1, and the hands of the
protesters also align
well. The second image, showing two men,
would not fit this
context at all. Therefore, Image 3 is the
correct missing part.
</observation>
<answer>
B
</answer>
```

Beacon Answer

B (✓)

Table 9: Reasoning Trajectory Example: Case 3



Original Image (q0)



g0



g1



g2



g3

Question

In which year was this event held? The player in the blue jersey is from India, and she is executing a badminton smash. If the shuttlecock lands inside the red circle, what will the new match score be?

Hint

- [Instruction] Crop the scoreboard and red circle areas from the image; [Expected Subgoal] Determine the current score, event name, and the boundary status of the red circle;
- [Instruction] Calculate the new score based on the out-of-bounds rule and identify the year of the event; [Expected Subgoal] Find the updated match score and the year the event took place;

Beacon Reasoning

```
<tool.call>
img = get_image("q0")
...
<tool.call>
from PIL import ImageDraw
annotated = get_image("q0").copy()
draw = ImageDraw.Draw(annotated)
draw.line((0, 385, 928, 385),
fill="yellow", width=2)
draw.line((0, 420, 928, 420),
fill="yellow", width=2)
annotated
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
generated_images: g3
Original image refs: q0
Generated image refs: g0, g1, g2, g3
</tool.response>
```

<observation>
The red circle is located at the bottom-right corner of the court, which is outside the singles court boundary and in the alley. A smash that lands in the alley is considered out of bounds, so it is a fault for the player who hit it.

The current score is IND 20, TPE 15. This means IND has won Game 1 (20--15) and is serving in Game 2. The score for Game 2 is currently 0--15.

If the player in blue (IND) smashes out of bounds, TPE wins the point. The score will remain IND 20, and TPE's score in Game 2 will change from 0 to 1. The new score will be IND 1 20, TPE 0 16.

</observation>

<answer>

The new match score will be IND 1 20, TPE 0 16.


The event was held in 2023.

</answer>

Beacon Answer

The new match score will be IND 1 20, TPE 0 16. The event was held in 2023. (✓)

Table 10: Hint Example: Case 1



Question
Identify all hidden text content in the image


Hint
1. Hint: [Instruction] Resize the image to a much smaller scale (e.g., 1/10th or 1/20th of the original size); [Expected Subgoal] Reveal any hidden text or patterns that become visible at a lower resolution;

Beacon Reasoning
<tool.call>
img = get_image("q0")
img_resized = img.resize((img.width // 20,
img.height // 20))
img_resized
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
generated_images: g0
</tool.response>
...
Original image refs: q0
Generated image refs: g0
</tool.response>
<observation>
The resized image clearly shows the text
"CVPR" in the center
of the spiral pattern. The text was
hidden by the high-frequency
spiral lines at the original resolution.
</observation>
<answer>
CVPR
</answer>

Beacon Answer
CVPR (✓)

Table 11: **Hint Example: Case 2**


<image1>:



<image2>:

A) B) C) D) E)

Original Image (q0)

**Question**

The number 4 is reflected twice in the picture. What appears in the field with the question mark if we do the same with the number 5?

Hint

1. [Instruction] Observe the transformation applied to the number 4, noting that two reflections are equivalent to a 180-degree rotation; [Expected Subgoal] Understand the geometric transformation rule to apply to the number 5;
2. [Instruction] Crop the number 5 from the image and rotate it 180 degrees using a tool; [Expected Subgoal] Obtain the visual result of applying the same transformation to the number 5;
3. [Instruction] Compare the rotated number 5 with the given options A through E; [Expected Subgoal] Identify which option matches the transformed number 5;

Beacon Reasoning

```
...
img = get_image("q0")
rotated_5 = img.crop((420, 130, 580,
350)).rotate(180)
# Option C is around x=380 to 450, y=580
to 650
opt_c = img.crop((380, 580, 450, 650))
# Create a side-by-side comparison
comp = Image.new('RGB', (100, 70))
comp.paste(rotated_5.resize((50, 70)), (0,
0))
comp.paste(opt_c.resize((50, 70)), (50, 0))
comp
</tool.call>
<tool.response>
generated_images: g1
</tool.response>
```

```
...
Original image refs: q0
Generated image refs: g0, g1
</tool.response>
<observation>
The side-by-side comparison shows that the
rotated 5 perfectly
matches Option C.
The top bar is at the bottom, pointing
left.
The vertical stem is on the right,
pointing up.
The belly is on the left, curving down and
right.
This is exactly what happens when you
rotate a 5 by 180 degrees.
The question asks "What appears in the
field with the question
mark if we do the same with the number 5?"
The transformation is two reflections,
which is equivalent to a
180-degree rotation. Therefore, the
result is Option C.
</observation>
<answer>
C
</answer>
```

Beacon Answer

C(✓)

Table 12: **Hint Example: Case 3**