
PixelWorld: Towards Perceiving Everything as Pixels

Zhiheng Lyu^{1,2} Xueguang Ma¹ Wenhua Chen^{1,2}

<https://tiger-ai-lab.github.io/PixelWorld/>

Abstract

Existing foundation models typically process visual input as pixels and textual input as tokens, a paradigm that contrasts with human perception, where both modalities are processed in a unified manner. With the rise of embodied and agentic AI, where inputs primarily come from camera pixels, the need for a unified perception framework becomes increasingly evident. In this paper, we propose to unify all modalities (text, tables, code, diagrams, images, etc) as pixel inputs, i.e. “Perceive Everything as Pixels” (PEAP). We introduce PIXELWORLD, a novel evaluation suite that unifies all the mentioned modalities into pixel space to gauge the existing models’ performance. Our findings show that (1) PEAP outperforms baseline with token-based input in multimodal datasets, benefiting from unified input for better disambiguation, (2) significant declines in reasoning and coding capabilities across all models when processing pixel-based input, underscoring the need to enhance foundation models’ perceptual abilities, (3) larger models can maintain strong performance on non-reasoning tasks under PEAP, while smaller models like Phi-3.5-V suffer significant performance degradation, (4) the attention pattern of PEAP is highly aligned with text token input, (5) PEAP can be accelerated significantly by exploiting the spatial sparsity. We conclude that the existing frontier models are competent in pixel perception, however, there is still headroom for improvement in the future work.

1. Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2025; Team, 2024) have achieved impressive results across

¹Department of Computer Science, University of Waterloo ²Vector Institute, Toronto. Correspondence to: Zhiheng Lyu <z63lyu@uwaterloo.ca>, Wenhua Chen <wenhuchen@uwaterloo.ca>.

diverse real-world tasks. With advancements in training techniques and model architectures (Brown et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023), LLMs process textual data by tokenizing words into subword units and applying causal attention. However, this token-based method differs from how humans and AI agents (e.g., embodied robots (Tellex et al., 2020)) perceive text—namely, through pixel-based visual inputs such as images or screenshots.

This mismatch poses key challenges. First, heuristic preprocessing can be domain- and modality-sensitive (Dagan et al., 2024). Second, morphologically rich or underrepresented languages are often split into disproportionately long sequences (Liang et al., 2023), leading to inefficiencies. Third, even minor typographical errors can significantly degrade performance (Chai et al., 2024). Moreover, crucial format or layout information is usually lost during tokenization. As a result, there is growing interest in vision-language models (VLMs) that directly process text as visual input, potentially improving robustness and preserving spatial or layout cues essential to real-world tasks. This is particularly prominent in areas like embodied agents (Tellex et al., 2020; Driess et al., 2023) and computer-based agents (Zheng et al., 2024; Koh et al., 2024), textual inputs are often captured as pixel-based representations, such as images or video frames obtained via cameras or screenshots.

Although existing foundation models demonstrate strong generalization capabilities, most evaluations in the multimodal domain have primarily focused on image-based semantic understanding, with limited emphasis on understanding and reasoning capabilities for text-rich contexts. This discrepancy highlights the misalignment between current evaluation methodologies and the broader demands of real-world multimodal applications. To bridge this gap, we introduce PIXELWORLD, an evaluation suite designed to systematically analyze and compare LLMs’ performance on both textual and multimodal tasks when text is perceived as pixel-based input. In Section 2, we describe our dataset collection process, categorizing tasks into three major types: **Text-Only**, **Structural**, and **Multimodal**. For the first two categories, we develop an image synthesis pipeline to transform textual inputs into pixel representations, while for multimodal datasets, we leverage OCR pipeline to extract




Figure 1. PEAP framework: we investigate the possibility of perceive everything as pixels. This framework aligns better with human perception reducing the need for excessive pre-processing. Evaluated on our benchmark PIXELWORLD, PEAP boosts performance on multimodal tasks (e.g., websites, slides, documents) but struggles with complex, text-centric tasks (e.g., reasoning and coding). Larger models achieve better transferability between pixel- and token-based performance compared to smaller ones. We also observed that text and images exhibit similar attention patterns, and reduced the overhead of model reasoning through patch pruning by PEAP-Fast.

the text (see Table 1).

In Section 3, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of models with varying scales on PIXELWORLD. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 show that applying PEAP to pure-text inputs can degrade performance, but this effect is strongly correlated with task difficulty. No significant decline is observed in simpler tasks such as semantic understanding, whereas more complex tasks like knowledge reasoning and code generation experience substantial drops. This aligns with **Insight 2** in Figure 1. Furthermore, larger PEAP models align better with text inputs, while smaller models struggle with instruction following, warranting further investigation. This corresponds to **Insight 3** in Figure 1. In Section 3.3, we demonstrate that PEAP excels in intrinsically multimodal tasks, such as website rendering, slide comprehension, and document understanding. Traditional OCR-based preprocessing often introduces errors and information loss, whereas PEAP mitigates these issues, supporting **Insight 1** in Figure 1. However, smaller models still exhibit limitations in long-context tasks when using PEAP.

Building on these observations, we provide a deeper discussion in Section 4. In Section 4.1, we visualize the attention patterns of the final layer in Qwen2VL-7B. Despite differences in tokenization (words vs. visual patches), our

attention visualizations reveal that PEAP maintains a high degree of consistency in the attention mechanism, corresponding to the **Insight 4** in the Figure 1. This insight highlights the feasibility of using a vision encoder as a generic universal tokenizer, which could potentially address some of the known issues associated with existing text tokenizers. Furthermore, in Section 4.2, we conduct a quantitative analysis of the potential time overhead using SuperGLUE as an example. We observe that PEAP can lead to increased latency, with processing times up to 3x longer due to larger token sizes. To mitigate this, we implemented a sparsification algorithm, **PEAP-Fast**, which removes blank pixel regions, significantly accelerating processing times. This approach also aligns more closely with how humans perceive visual content, as empty patches mostly serve to maintain layout (which is already preserved by position embeddings of non-empty patches) and do not warrant additional attention. Section 4.3 evaluates PEAP’s prompt sensitivity, showing that Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting boosts performance more effectively than standard methods.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

1. PixelWorld: This is a comprehensive evaluation suite designed to evaluate pixel-based models across text, structural, and multimodal tasks, enabling direct comparisons

between PEAP and token-based approaches.

2. Task Performance Analysis: PEAP can enhance structural and multimodal understanding (e.g., website, document) but degrade performance on complex text-centric tasks (e.g., code generation, reasoning). Notably, larger models exhibit better transferability between pixel- and token-based performance, while smaller models struggle with instruction following under PEAP.
3. Efficiency and Attention Analysis: We propose PEAP-Fast to optimize the inference speed by removing blank pixel regions, reducing computation overhead without accuracy loss. Additionally, we show that PEAP and token-based models exhibit similar attention patterns, suggesting the possibility of adopting vision encoders as a universal multimodal tokenizer.

2. Datasets

Several representative datasets covering different skill domains are selected, as shown in Table 1. We primarily utilize the prompts provided by the datasets. If no prompts are available, we apply a default prompt. By default, we employ Direct Prompting; however, for more complex and mathematical datasets such as MBPP (Austin et al., 2021), MMLU-Pro (Wang et al., 2024b), and MathVerse (Zhang et al., 2025), we adopt Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting to enhance performance. All evaluations are conducted in a zero-shot manner to mitigate potential performance degradation caused by the sensitivity of instruction-tuned large models to few-shot prompting.

To evaluate both Token-based and Pixel-based methods, we require paired Text-input and Image-input prompts. We adopted modality transfer strategies to reduce reliance on the information modality provided by existing datasets, as detailed in Table 1. For datasets categorized as *Text-Only* and *Structured*, all data is originally in plain text format, necessitating image synthesis prior to evaluation. For *Multimodal* datasets, textual content embedded in images is extracted using OCR, or the textual components provided by the original datasets are directly utilized for evaluation. Notably, the MathVerse dataset (Zhang et al., 2025) inherently includes a Text-Only modality, offering detailed textual descriptions of image-based information.

Image Data Synthesis For text-only and structured datasets, we developed an image data synthesis pipeline to generate diverse image inputs for evaluation. Image widths were adaptively adjusted between 512 and 1024 pixels based on text length, with a fixed height of 256 pixels. Font sizes ranged from 15 to 25 points, and padding varied from 5 to 30 pixels. To enhance robustness, we applied various types of noise, including radial, horizontal, vertical, and Multi-Gaussian noise, as well as high-frequency

Gaussian noise to simulate distortions commonly introduced by real-world cameras. For structured datasets, such as tables, data was rendered as images using the Python package `dataframe_image`. Example inputs from different tasks are provided in Appendix A.

3. Experiments

In this section, we will detail our baseline, metrics and models. The experimental results will be organized by ‘Text Input’, ‘Structured Input’ and ‘Multimodal Input’.

Baseline We establish the baseline by using the same VLMs with text-only prompts. To ensure fairness, we employ identical prompts and add the instruction “*Please follow the instruction in the image*” when applying PEAP. This ensures that the VLMs can correctly process instructions embedded within images. Ideally, the baseline and PEAP should yield equivalent performance. This comparison helps identify areas for improvement in existing VLMs.

Metrics For question-answering tasks such as *WikiSS-QA*, *SlidesVQA*, and *TableBench*, we adopt *ROUGE-L* as our primary metric, as it effectively captures the alignment between generated answers and ground truth by measuring the longest common subsequence. For classification benchmarks, including *MMLU-Pro*, *GLUE*, *SuperGLUE*, *ARC*, and *MathVerse*, we use accuracy, which directly reflects the model’s performance in selecting correct options. For *GLUE* and *SuperGLUE*, we follow their standard evaluation protocols, utilizing task-specific metrics such as Matthews correlation, F1 score, and Pearson correlation. For the code generation task *MBPP*, we evaluate performance using the pass@1 rate, which measures whether the generated code successfully passes all test cases. For the mathematical reasoning dataset *GSM8K*, we employ exact match accuracy, as these problems require precise numerical answers. For the visualization subtask of *TableBench*, following the original codebase, we treat it as a code generation task and evaluate the correctness of the generated visualizations.

Model Selection To validate PIXELWORLD, we selected a diverse set of vision-language models (VLMs) with varying scales to ensure the robustness and generalizability of our findings. It also allowed us to analyze the behavior of models across different sizes. We evaluated several widely used vision-language models (VLMs), including Qwen2VL-2B (Wang et al., 2024a), Phi-3.5-3.2B (Abdin et al., 2024), Qwen2VL-7B (Wang et al., 2024a), Gemini-Flash (Team, 2024), and GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2025).

3.1. Text Input

Figure 2 reports model accuracy on text-only datasets (e.g., ARC, MMLU-Pro, GLUE, GSM8K, SuperGLUE, MBPP). Two major insights emerge:

Dataset Name	Size	Task	Modality Transfer	Split
Text-only				
GLUE (Wang, 2018)	59,879	Natural language understanding	Synthesis	test
SuperGLUE (Sarlin et al., 2020)	19,294	Natural language understanding	Synthesis	test
MMLU-Pro (Wang et al., 2024b)	12,032	Domain knowledge and reasoning	Synthesis	test
ARC (Clark et al., 2018)	3,548	Science question answering	Synthesis	test
GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021)	1,319	Math problem solving	Synthesis	test
MBPP (Austin et al., 2021)	757	Programming tasks	Synthesis	test
Structured				
TableBench (Wu et al., 2024)	888	Table data understanding and analysis	Synthesis	test
Multimodal				
MathVerse (Zhang et al., 2025)	788	Math and visual reasoning	Natural	test
MMMU-Pro (Yue et al., 2024)	1,730	Multimodal reasoning	Synthesis	test
SlidesVQA (Tanaka et al., 2023)	2,136	Multimodal question answering	OCR	test
Wiki-SS (Ma et al., 2024)	3,000	Multimodal retrieval question answering	OCR	train

Table 1. Overview of datasets categorized by modality, usage, size, and split. Modality Transfer means the method to adopt the dataset into counterpart modality. For OCR, we adopt the result from the origin datasets. For WikiSS-QA, since the positive document of the test set is not released, we subsample 3,000 training data points randomly to evaluate.

Better Transferability in Larger Models Larger language models (e.g., GPT-4o, Gemini-Flash) exhibit better transferability between text and image-based performance, while smaller models struggle with both transferability and instruction following. For instance, on the ARC dataset, GPT-4o’s performance declines by only 0.59 points when transitioning from text to synthetic images, whereas the smaller Qwen2-VL-2B suffers a substantial 21.73-point drop (from approximately 68.61 to 46.88). This trend suggests that more capable models preserve their reasoning abilities across modalities, while smaller models face greater difficulty. Additionally, smaller models (e.g., Phi-3.5-vision) not only show weaker overall performance on standard benchmarks but also struggle significantly when instructions are presented as images. Their performance consistently lags behind that of larger models, particularly on tasks like MBPP. This supports *Insight 3* in Figure 1.

Performance Degradation with More Complex Tasks We observe significant drops on benchmarks requiring advanced reasoning, such as mathematical, coding or domain-specific tasks. For example, when moving from text to image inputs on the MMLU-Pro dataset, GPT-4o exhibits a drop of more than 25 points. In contrast, on GLUE and SuperGLUE, the decline remains under 5 points. These findings indicate that while existing large models achieve comparable performance between text and visual modalities on simpler tasks, a gap still exists at a deeper level in visual-based and text-based understanding, demonstrating room for improvement in modality adaptation training.

3.2. Structured Input

Figure 3 summarizes model performance on four TableBench subsets: Fact Checking, Data Analysis, Numerical Reasoning, and Visualization.

Reasoning Complexity Impacts Performance Fact Checking and Data Analysis show moderate performance drops, as they rely on semantic understanding. In contrast, Numerical Reasoning and Visualization—requiring more intricate reasoning and coding—exhibit larger declines when switching to synthetic images. Combined with “*Performance Degradation with More Complex Tasks*” in Section 3.1, this supports *Insight 2* in Figure 1.

Smaller Performance Gaps with Structured Data Compared to text-only tasks, structured tasks show smaller performance gaps between text and image inputs. Notably, Qwen2VL-2B even outperforms its text-based results on Fact Checking, suggesting robust visual representations can aid semantic tasks in smaller models.

Challenges with Mixed-Modality Inputs The “semi” format—where tables appear as images while questions remain text-based—performs worse than either fully text-based or fully image-based formats. This suggests that conventional VQA approaches, which process text and images using separate encoders, may be more susceptible to performance bottlenecks. As multimodal scenarios become increasingly prevalent, PEAP is expected to demonstrate superior performance compared to mixed-modality methods.




Figure 2. The performance of **text-only** datasets. The comparison is made between text input and synthesized image input. Most models demonstrate comparable performance on language understanding datasets such as SuperGLUE, GLUE, and ARC. However, notable performance disparities emerge between text-based input and synthesized image input on mathematical reasoning tasks (e.g., MMLU-Pro, GSM8K) and programming tasks (e.g., MBPP). Phi-3.5-Vision exhibits consistently poor performance across all vision tasks, primarily due to its insufficient instruction-following capabilities.

3.3. Multimodal Input

Figure 5 presents model performance on multimodal datasets, including text-only and vision-only subsets of Mathverse and VQA tasks like SlidesVQA and WikiSS-QA. Results on MMMU-Pro (Figure 4) use reported values from the original paper. Three key observations emerge:

Image Inputs Enhance Disambiguation Incorporating images improves performance by reducing ambiguity compared to text-only benchmarks. In SlidesVQA, all models outperform their text-only baselines, while in WikiSS-QA and MMLU-Pro, visual context provides clarifying information, leading to accuracy gains in larger models. Combined with “*Smaller Performance Gaps with Structured Data*” in Section 3.2, this supports *Insight 1* in Figure 1.

Challenges in Complex Reasoning While multimodal inputs aid basic tasks, complex reasoning remains a bottleneck. In Mathverse, visual cues help but fail to support multi-step logical deductions. Even Gemini-Flash shows accuracy drops on intricate reasoning tasks. Additionally, WikiSS-QA poses challenges due to its long-context nature. Smaller models struggle with PEAP, and GPT-4o underperforms in token-based tasks, highlighting difficulties in processing extended contextual dependencies. This aligns with Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

Larger Models Benefit More from Multimodal Data Larger models gain more from multimodal inputs. On SlidesVQA, Gemini.Flash improves by 34.24 points, compared to Qwen2-VL-7B’s 23.55-point boost. This suggests that larger models, with more extensive prior knowledge and advanced architectures, leverage multimodal data more effectively than smaller models.

4. Discussion

4.1. Q1: Does PEAP have the same attention?

To investigate whether VLMs behaves similarly on textual and image inputs, we visualized the Average Attention of Qwen2-VL-7B’s final layer using a heatmap (see Figure 6). Concretely, we examined its responses on a SuperGLUE *BoolQ* example, comparing the model’s attention maps for text-based versus image-based inference.

As shown in Figure 6, the model largely focuses on task-relevant elements such as the question prompt (“will there be a sequel ...”), the key words in the passage (e.g., “film”, “starring”, “Alice”), and the required answer format (“Answer: True/False”). This holds true across both textual and visual representations, indicating Qwen2-VL-7B exhibits comparable attention patterns irrespective of input modality. However, we also observe that certain blank patches in the image-based input can receive disproportionately high attention. This suggests that while the visual encoder parallels the text encoder in many respects, it still has redundancy.

4.2. Q2: How to make PEAP more efficient?

As a trade-off for generalization, image-based inference often requires significantly more computational resources than text-based inference. This is partly due to the additional overhead from the ViT backbone and higher redundancy in image tokens. To estimate the performance gap quantitatively, we conducted experiments on SuperGLUE (Table 2). The results show that inference latency for image-based inputs can exceed text-based methods by 150% to 250%.

To reduce redundancy in visual inputs, we propose **PEAP-Fast**, which first identifies empty patches via a simple




Figure 3. The performance of the **structured** dataset. We report all the subsets for the TableBench. In the *semi* setting, questions were presented as text, while tables were rendered as synthetic images. We observed that for tasks involving reasoning (numerical reasoning) and coding (visualization subset), synthetic images yielded inferior performance compared to text. However, for tasks emphasizing semantic understanding, such as data analysis and fact checking, synthetic images achieved performance comparable to or even surpassing text. Additionally, we found that the semi approach often performed worse than either text or synthetic images individually, providing insights into potential limitations and future directions for leveraging vision-language models (VLMs).




Figure 4. The performance of the **multimodal** dataset (MMMU-Pro). We adopt the result reported by the origin paper. We can observe that strong models perform better in PEAP.

variance-based threshold—if the pixel-value variance in a patch is lower than a preset threshold, that patch is treated as empty and is pruned from all attention computations. Crucially, we preserve the original positional embeddings for the remaining tokens, ensuring no loss of spatial layout perception. This strategy aligns with how humans naturally focus on salient regions rather than blank spaces, thereby significantly reducing context length without sacrificing structural information. Testing PEAP-Fast on SuperGLUE reveals a minor accuracy drop of only 1.17% (Table 2). More importantly, the average overhead decreases from 205.27% to 123.19%, yielding an 82.98% reduction (Table 3). These results demonstrate that removing empty patches offers sub-

Task	Text	PEAP	PEAP-Fast
BoolQ	79.69%	82.11%	80.89%
CB	67.70%	40.77%	39.57%
COPA	93.00%	91.00%	86.00%
MultiRC	65.90%	61.28%	60.80%
ReCoRD	12.54%	5.94%	6.08%
RTE	82.31%	72.92%	77.26%
WiC	53.29%	55.80%	55.64%
WSC	63.46%	65.38%	59.62%
Final Score	64.74%	59.40%	58.23%

Table 2. Performance of *Qwen2VL-7B* on SuperGLUE dataset by Text, PEAP and PEAP-Fast. We can observe the comparable performance between PEAP and PEAP-Fast.

stantial computational savings while maintaining strong performance, making image-based inference more practical for real-world deployments. Attention heatmap between PEAP and PEAP-Fast are shown in Appendix B.

4.3. Q3: Is PEAP sensitive to the prompting method?

Massive experimental results in Section 3 show that the performance gap between image and text inputs still exists, potentially due to domain gaps in datasets or insufficient instruction following in image inputs. To address this, we applied CoT-style prompts to the SuperGLUE dataset to enhance cross-domain instruction following (Table 4). Notably, Qwen2VL-7B showed significant improvements in tasks where image input underperformed compared to text input, such as CB and RTE. Overall, CoT prompts improved image input performance by 2.58%, surpassing the 0.3%




Figure 5. The performance of the **multimodal** datasets (except MMMU-Pro). We compare text-only and vision-only subsets in Mathverse, while SlidesVQA and WikiSS-QA are evaluated as VQA tasks. Larger models perform better on text-based tasks with more modalities. GPT-4o tends to generate longer responses in long-context QA, leading to performance degradation on WikiSS-QA.

Subset	Inference Time (s)			Overhead (%)	
	Text	PEAP	PEAP-Fast	PEAP	PEAP-Fast
BoolQ	369	1,381	906	274.80	145.55
CB	8	22	15	175.00	87.50
COPA	39	38	22	-2.56	-43.59
MultiRC	609	3,861	2,550	534.80	318.71
ReCoRD	7,016	19,012	14,288	171.01	103.72
RTE	68	117	92	72.06	35.29
WiC	69	224	157	224.64	127.54
WSC	11	36	27	227.27	145.45
Total	8,089	24,690	18,051	205.27	123.19

Table 3. Inference Time (s) of *Qwen2VL-7B* on SuperGLUE dataset with single A100 server by PEAP and PEAP-Fast. We can observe a 82.08% overhead reduce on PEAP-Fast method. Overhead is calculated as the percentage increase in time relative to the text method.

improvement observed for text input.

5. Related Work

Multimodal Large Language Models and Benchmarks

Recent progress in multimodal AI has led to the development of models like GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2025), Gemini (Team, 2024), and Claude-3.5 (Anthropic, 2025), which integrate vision-based training to improve instruction-following capabilities. Benchmarks for these models have evolved from task-specific datasets, such as VQA (Agrawal et al., 2016) and DocVQA (Mathew et al., 2021), to more comprehensive evaluations, including MMMU-Pro (Yue et al., 2024), MMBench (Liu et al., 2024), and MegaBench (Chen et al., 2024). However, most current research focuses on the semantic understanding of visual content, with only a few benchmarks—such as MathVerse (Zhang et al., 2025) and

MMMU-Pro (Yue et al., 2024)—addressing text recognition and comprehension within images. Our work shifts the focus towards evaluating how well large language models understand language through visual input compared to traditional token-based input.

Screenshot LMs Recent studies have demonstrated that pretraining on synthetic screenshots can enable vision-language models (VLMs) to achieve performance comparable to that of BERT on language modeling tasks (Lee et al., 2022; Rust et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2024). This approach allows models to better capture text structures without relying on OCR-based methods. Furthermore, our analysis highlights a performance gap between existing VLMs on vision-based tasks and their text-only counterparts, particularly in the absence of relevant pretraining. Interestingly, in certain scenarios, VLMs perform as well as or even better than text-only models, underscoring the potential of this research direction. In the context of document retrieval, recent advancements (Faysse et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024) have shown that large-scale pretraining on screenshots can outperform traditional OCR-based methods, further reinforcing the advantages of vision-language pretraining.

Language Tokenization Tokenization methods, such as Byte Pair Encoding (BPE) (Shibata et al., 1999; Sennrich et al., 2016), are widely used in language modeling, but recent studies suggest that they may not always be optimal. For instance, MegaByte (Yu et al., 2023) demonstrated that fixed-length tokenization can improve both computational efficiency and cross-modal capabilities. Similarly, BLT (Pagnoni et al., 2024) proposed entropy-based tokenization, while LCM (team et al., 2024) emphasized the benefits of processing higher-level semantic concepts rather than in-

Task: BoolQ

The BoolQ task requires the model to answer a yes/no question based on a given passage.

Question: will there be a sequel to the movie predators

Passage: Predators (film) -- Predators is a 2010 American science-fiction action film directed by Nimród Antal and starring Adrien Brody, Topher Grace, Alice Braga, Walton Goggins, and Laurence Fishburne. It was distributed by 20th Century Fox. It is the third installment of the Predator franchise (the fifth counting the two Alien vs. Predator films), following Predator (1987) and Predator 2 (1990). Another film, The Predator, is set for release in 2018.

Your final answer must be exactly 'True' or 'False'.

Please only provide your final answer after 'Answer:'.

Please use the following template:

Answer:[TODO]




Figure 6. Last Layer Attention Heatmap on QWen2VL-7B between token-based (left) and pixel-based (right) inference.

Metric	Direct		CoT		Improve (CoT - Direct)	
	Text	PEAP	Text	PEAP	Text	PEAP
BoolQ	79.88%	81.71%	81.13%	80.73%	1.25%	-0.98%
CB	67.70%	34.78%	81.04%	59.57%	13.34%	24.79%
COPA	93.00%	87.00%	89.00%	83.00%	-4.00%	-4.00%
MultiRC	65.73%	62.28%	69.08%	60.41%	3.35%	-1.87%
ReCoRD	12.50%	5.88%	6.37%	4.66%	-6.13%	-1.22%
RTE	82.31%	72.92%	83.03%	77.26%	0.72%	4.34%
WiC	52.82%	54.39%	54.39%	53.92%	1.57%	-0.47%
WSC	65.38%	61.54%	57.69%	61.54%	-7.69%	0.00%
Overall	64.92%	57.56%	65.22%	60.14%	0.30%	2.58%

Table 4. Comparison of Direct and CoT performance across Text and Image modalities, along with their respective improvements (CoT - Direct), presented as percentages.

dividual tokens. Inspired by these approaches, we explore whether adaptive image patches can effectively infer textual meaning. At a higher level, we investigate the unification of text and image inputs into a shared representation space, enabling reasoning through abstract semantic concepts rather than traditional token-based methods.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce PIXELWORLD, an evaluation suite that unifies text, tables, code, and images into pixel-based inputs to bridge the gap between tokenized text processing and human-like visual perception. Our comprehensive experiments with PEAP show that while pixel-based input improves performance on structurally complex and inherently multimodal tasks (e.g., websites and slides) by

reducing OCR errors and preserving contextual layout, it underperforms compared to token-based approaches on challenging text-centric tasks, such as advanced knowledge reasoning and coding. Additionally, attention visualizations reveal a high transferability between pixel patches and textual tokens, indicating the feasibility of future “vision-as-token” approaches. However, pixel-based input incurs higher computational overhead, which we mitigate with PEAP-Fast by removing blank pixel regions, significantly speeding up inference. These findings highlight both the promise and trade-offs of perceiving everything as pixels, offering a unified framework for multimodal understanding while underscoring the need for further research to optimize efficiency and address performance gaps in complex reasoning and coding tasks.

References

- Abdin, M., Aneja, J., Awadalla, H., Awadallah, A., Awan, A. A., Bach, N., Bahree, A., Bakhtiari, A., Bao, J., Behl, H., Benhaim, A., Bilenko, M., Bjorck, J., Bubeck, S., Cai, M., Cai, Q., Chaudhary, V., Chen, D., Chen, D., Chen, W., Chen, Y.-C., Chen, Y.-L., Cheng, H., Chopra, P., Dai, X., Dixon, M., Eldan, R., Fragoso, V., Gao, J., Gao, M., Gao, M., Garg, A., Giorno, A. D., Goswami, A., Gunasekar, S., Haider, E., Hao, J., Hewett, R. J., Hu, W., Huynh, J., Iyer, D., Jacobs, S. A., Javaheripi, M., Jin, X., Karampatziakis, N., Kauffmann, P., Khademi, M., Kim, D., Kim, Y. J., Kurilenko, L., Lee, J. R., Lee, Y. T., Li, Y., Li, Y., Liang, C., Liden, L., Lin, X., Lin, Z., Liu, C., Liu, L., Liu, M., Liu, W., Liu, X., Luo, C., Madan, P., Mahmoudzadeh, A., Majercak, D., Mazzola, M., Mendes, C. C. T., Mitra, A., Modi, H., Nguyen, A., Norick, B., Patra, B., Perez-Becker, D., Portet, T., Pryzant, R., Qin, H., Radmilac, M., Ren, L., de Rosa, G., Rosset, C., Roy, S., Ruwase, O., Saarikivi, O., Saied, A., Salim, A., Santacrose, M., Shah, S., Shang, N., Sharma, H., Shen, Y., Shukla, S., Song, X., Tanaka, M., Tupini, A., Vaddamanu, P., Wang, C., Wang, G., Wang, L., Wang, S., Wang, X., Wang, Y., Ward, R., Wen, W., Witte, P., Wu, H., Wu, X., Wyatt, M., Xiao, B., Xu, C., Xu, J., Xu, W., Xue, J., Yadav, S., Yang, F., Yang, J., Yang, Y., Yang, Z., Yu, D., Yuan, L., Zhang, C., Zhang, C., Zhang, J., Zhang, L. L., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., and Zhou, X. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14219>.
- Agrawal, A., Lu, J., Antol, S., Mitchell, M., Zitnick, C. L., Batra, D., and Parikh, D. Vqa: Visual question answering, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.00468>.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.5: A sonnet of progress, 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>. Accessed: 2025-01-13.
- Austin, J., Odena, A., Nye, M., Bosma, M., Michalewski, H., Dohan, D., Jiang, E., Cai, C., Terry, M., Le, Q., et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901, 2020.
- Chai, Y., Fang, Y., Peng, Q., and Li, X. Tokenization falling short: On subword robustness in large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 1582–1599, 2024.
- Chen, J., Liang, T., Siu, S., Wang, Z., Wang, K., Wang, Y., Ni, Y., Zhu, W., Jiang, Z., Lyu, B., Jiang, D., He, X., Liu, Y., Hu, H., Yue, X., and Chen, W. Mega-bench: Scaling multimodal evaluation to over 500 real-world tasks, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10563>.
- Clark, P., Cowhey, I., Etzioni, O., Khot, T., Sabharwal, A., Schoenick, C., and Tafjord, O. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv:1803.05457v1*, 2018.
- Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., Hesse, C., and Schulman, J. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Dagan, G., Synnaeve, G., and Roziere, B. Getting the most out of your tokenizer for pre-training and domain adaptation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Driess, D., Xia, F., Sajjadi, M. S., Lynch, C., Chowdhery, A., Ichter, B., Wahid, A., Tompson, J., Vuong, Q., Yu, T., et al. Palm-e: an embodied multimodal language model. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8469–8488, 2023.
- Faysse, M., Sibille, H., Wu, T., Omrani, B., Viaud, G., Hudelot, C., and Colombo, P. Colpali: Efficient document retrieval with vision language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01449>.
- Gao, T., Wang, Z., Bhaskar, A., and Chen, D. Improving language understanding from screenshots, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14073>.
- Koh, J. Y., Lo, R., Jang, L., Duvvur, V., Lim, M. C., Huang, P.-Y., Neubig, G., Zhou, S., Salakhutdinov, R., and Fried, D. Visualwebarena: Evaluating multimodal agents on realistic visual web tasks. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*, 2024.
- Lee, K., Joshi, M., Turc, I., Hu, H., Liu, F., Eisenschlos, J., Khandelwal, U., Shaw, P., Chang, M.-W., and Toutanova, K. Pix2struct: Screenshot parsing as pretraining for visual language understanding, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.03347>.
- Liang, D., Gonen, H., Mao, Y., Hou, R., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Zettlemoyer, L., and Khabsa, M. Xlm-v: Overcoming the vocabulary bottleneck in multilingual masked language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 13142–13152, 2023.

- Liu, Y., Duan, H., Zhang, Y., Li, B., Zhang, S., Zhao, W., Yuan, Y., Wang, J., He, C., Liu, Z., Chen, K., and Lin, D. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.06281>.
- Ma, X., Lin, S.-C., Li, M., Chen, W., and Lin, J. Unifying multimodal retrieval via document screenshot embedding. In Al-Onaizan, Y., Bansal, M., and Chen, Y.-N. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 6492–6505, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.373. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.373/>.
- Mathew, M., Karatzas, D., and Jawahar, C. V. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.00398>.
- OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o, 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>. Accessed: 2025-01-13.
- Pagnoni, A., Pasunuru, R., Rodriguez, P., Nguyen, J., Muller, B., Li, M., Zhou, C., Yu, L., Weston, J., Zettlemoyer, L., et al. Byte latent transformer: Patches scale better than tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09871*, 2024.
- Rust, P., Lotz, J. F., Bugliarello, E., Salesky, E., de Lhoneux, M., and Elliott, D. Language modelling with pixels. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=FkSp8VW8RjH>.
- Sarlin, P.-E., DeTone, D., Malisiewicz, T., and Rabinovich, A. SuperGlue: Learning feature matching with graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 4938–4947, 2020.
- Sennrich, R., Haddow, B., and Birch, A. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In Erk, K. and Smith, N. A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 1715–1725, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P16-1162. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P16-1162/>.
- Shibata, Y., Kida, T., Fukamachi, S., Takeda, M., Shinohara, A., Shinohara, T., and Arikawa, S. Byte pair encoding: A text compression scheme that accelerates pattern matching. 1999.
- Tanaka, R., Nishida, K., Nishida, K., Hasegawa, T., Saito, I., and Saito, K. Slidevqa: A dataset for document visual question answering on multiple images, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.04883>.
- Team, G. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>.
- team, L., Barrault, L., Duquenne, P.-A., Elbayad, M., Kozhevnikov, A., Alastruey, B., Andrews, P., Coria, M., Couairon, G., Costa-jussà, M. R., Dale, D., Elshahar, H., Heffernan, K., Janeiro, J. M., Tran, T., Ropers, C., Sánchez, E., Roman, R. S., Mourachko, A., Saleem, S., and Schwenk, H. Large concept models: Language modeling in a sentence representation space, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.08821>.
- Tellex, S., Gopalan, N., Kress-Gazit, H., and Matuszek, C. Robots that use language. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 3(1):25–55, 2020.
- Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.-A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- Wang, A. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*, 2018.
- Wang, P., Bai, S., Tan, S., Wang, S., Fan, Z., Bai, J., Chen, K., Liu, X., Wang, J., Ge, W., Fan, Y., Dang, K., Du, M., Ren, X., Men, R., Liu, D., Zhou, C., Zhou, J., and Lin, J. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024a.
- Wang, Y., Ma, X., Zhang, G., Ni, Y., Chandra, A., Guo, S., Ren, W., Arulraj, A., He, X., Jiang, Z., et al. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01574*, 2024b.
- Wu, X., Yang, J., Chai, L., Zhang, G., Liu, J., Du, X., Liang, D., Shu, D., Cheng, X., Sun, T., et al. Tablebench: A comprehensive and complex benchmark for table question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09174*, 2024.
- Yu, L., Simig, D., Flaherty, C., Aghajanyan, A., Zettlemoyer, L., and Lewis, M. Megabyte: Predicting million-byte sequences with multiscale transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:78808–78823, 2023.
- Yue, X., Zheng, T., Ni, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, K., Tong, S., Sun, Y., Yu, B., Zhang, G., Sun, H., Su, Y., Chen,

W., and Neubig, G. Mmmu-pro: A more robust multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.02813>.

Zhang, R., Jiang, D., Zhang, Y., Lin, H., Guo, Z., Qiu, P., Zhou, A., Lu, P., Chang, K.-W., Qiao, Y., et al. Mathverse: Does your multi-modal llm truly see the diagrams in visual math problems? In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 169–186. Springer, 2025.

Zheng, B., Gou, B., Kil, J., Sun, H., and Su, Y. Gpt-4v (ision) is a generalist web agent, if grounded. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

Task: main

The main task requires the model to solve the given math problem and provide an answer that is either an integer or a float.

Question: A new program had 60 downloads in the first month. The number of downloads in the second month was three times as many as the downloads in the first month, but then reduced by 30% in the third month. How many downloads did the program have total over the three months?

Your final answer must be a numerical value, either an integer or a float, and it should not include any units or additional text. Examples of valid answers: 13, 7.5.

Please only provide your final answer after 'Answer:'.

Please use the following template:

Answer:[TODO]

Figure 7. An example input of GSM8K dataset, using Direct Prompt.

A. Example Input

Figure 7 and Figure 8 gives two examples about the vision input.

B. Attention Heatmap before and after ImageFast Method

Figure 9 presents a heatmap comparison between PEAP and PEAP-Fast. PEAP-Fast effectively reduces redundant patches while preserving attention on key regions.

PixelWorld: Towards Perceiving Everything as Pixels

You are a table analyst. Your task is to answer questions based on the table content.

The answer should follow the format below:

[Answer Format]

Final Answer: AnswerName1, AnswerName2...

Ensure the final answer format is the last output line and can only be in the "Final Answer: AnswerName1, AnswerName2..." form, no other form. Ensure the "AnswerName" is a number or entity name, as short as possible, without any explanation.

Give the final answer to the question directly without any explanation.

Read the table in the below image.

0	Unnamed: 0	airdate	episode	rating	share	rating / share (1849)	viewers (millions)	rank (timeslot)	rank (night)
1	1	february 14 , 2010	nanna is kickin' your butt	5.100000	8	2.8 / 7	9.070000	1	1
2	2	february 21 , 2010	when the cow kicked me in the head	5.200000	8	2.9 / 7	9.110000	1	1
3	3	february 28 , 2010	run like scalded dogs!	5.800000	9	3.2 / 8	10.240000	2	4
4	4	march 7 , 2010	we are no longer in the bible belt	4.500000	7	2.6 / 7	8.050000	2	4
5	5	march 14 , 2010	i think we 're fighting the germans , right	5.800000	10	3.0 / 9	10.100000	1	3
6	6	march 21 , 2010	cathy drone	6.900000	11	3.8 / 9	11.990000	1	4
7	7	march 28 , 2010	anonymous	7.200000	11	3.9 / 10	12.730000	1	3
8	8	april 4 , 2010	you 're like jason bourne , right	5.200000	9	2.7 / 8	9.140000	1	3
9	9	april 11 , 2010	dumb did us in	6.900000	11	3.4 / 10	11.880000	1	3
10	10	april 25 , 2010	i feel like i'm in , like , sicily	6.300000	10	3.2 / 9	10.690000	1	3
11	11	may 2 , 2010	they don't even understand their own language	6.000000	10	3.0 / 9	10.290000	1	3

Let's get start!

Question: How many episodes had a rating of 5.3 or higher?

Figure 8. An example input of TableBench dataset, using Direct Prompt.



Figure 9. Last Layer Attention Heatmap on Qwen2VL-7B between PEAP (left) and PEAP-Fast (right).