

---

# Test-Time Reasoning Through Visual Human Preferences with VLMs and Soft Rewards

---

**Alexander Gambashidze\***  
AIRI; Skoltech  
Moscow

**Konstantin Sobolev**  
AIRI  
Moscow

**Andrey Kuznetsov**  
AIRI  
Moscow

**Ivan Oseledets**  
AIRI; Skoltech  
Moscow

## Abstract

Can Visual Language Models (VLMs) effectively capture human visual preferences? This work addresses this question by training VLMs to think about preferences at test time, employing reinforcement learning methods inspired by DeepSeek R1 and OpenAI O1. Using datasets such as ImageReward and Human Preference Score v2 (HPSv2), our models achieve accuracies of 64.9% on the ImageReward test set (trained on ImageReward official split) and 65.4% on HPSv2 (trained on approximately 25% of its data). These results match traditional encoder-based models while providing transparent reasoning and enhanced generalization. This approach allows to use not only rich VLM world knowledge, but also its potential to think, yielding interpretable outcomes that help decision-making processes. By demonstrating that human visual preferences reasonable by current VLMs, we introduce efficient soft-reward strategies for image ranking, outperforming simplistic selection or scoring methods. This reasoning capability enables VLMs to rank arbitrary images—regardless of aspect ratio or complexity—thereby potentially amplifying the effectiveness of visual Preference Optimization. By reducing the need for extensive markup while improving reward generalization and explainability, our findings can be a strong mile-stone that will enhance text-to-vision models even further.

## 1 Introduction

Optimizing models based on human preferences has transformed generative artificial intelligence, yielding significant advancements across domains. For Large Language Models (LLMs), such optimization enhances safety, clarity, and performance, as evidenced by ELO scores on LMArena Zheng et al. [2023]. In visual generative models, including those for images and videos, the benefits are even more pronounced. Alignment with human preferences not only refines outputs but also strengthens fundamental capabilities—such as accurate object counting, precise spatial understanding, clear text rendering, and enhanced aesthetics Xu et al. [2023]. This reveals a critical distinction: visual models derive both alignment and substantial functional improvements from preference signals.

However, gathering human preference data is resource-intensive, requiring significant time and expense. Consequently, methods that perform well with limited data and generalize to new domains are highly desirable. Previous efforts to develop reward models for text-to-image and text-to-video systems often relied on encoder-based architectures or fine-tuned Vision-Language Models (VLMs) to predict scores or preferences Black et al. [2022]. While effective within their training domains and scalable with larger datasets, these approaches falter when data collection becomes impractical.

Test-time reasoning offers a promising alternative. Advances, such as those in xAI’s Grok 3 and DeepSeek R1, demonstrate that extended reasoning during inference can markedly improve perfor-

---

\*Main contributor. Email: alexandergambashidze@gmail.com

mance on diverse tasks, even with constrained training scopes like math and programming. This principle extends to VLMs, where reasoning about tasks like bounding box prediction or object counting enhances unrelated skills—unlike supervised fine-tuning (SFT)—and often improves broader benchmarks Chen et al. [2023]. For instance, Xu et al. Xu et al. [2024] with LLaVA-o1 show that enabling VLMs to reason step-by-step boosts precision and interpretability for visual tasks. Yet, while such efforts highlight the value of reasoning, simple SFT or reasoning alone isn’t the full answer, especially for tasks that demand costly and diverse annotations—such as visual preference modeling—where generalization is critical due to limited data availability. Chu et al. Chu et al. [2025] reveal in their compelling study that SFT tends to memorize training data, limiting adaptability, whereas reinforcement learning (RL) objectives drive generalization—a key factor behind the success of models like OpenAI’s O1. Motivated by this, we leverage RL, adopting the Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) objective from DeepSeek R1 Team [2023a], to enable VLMs to reason about human visual preferences using soft rewards, aiming to rank images effectively rather than merely assigning scores.

Our experiments leverage the ImageReward and HPSv2 datasets, testing an inference strategy that employs soft ratings and pairwise preferences. The results suggest that human preferences are not arbitrary but can be systematically understood, with test-time reasoning via RL enhancing both generalization and performance over traditional fine-tuning methods.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Predicting Human Preferences

Figuring out what humans like in images is tricky—it’s all about capturing those subjective gut calls people make. Mathematically, given a batch of images  $\{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_N\}$  tied to a text prompt  $P$ , we aim to build a function  $f(I, P)$  that spits out a preference score  $s$  mirroring human taste.

#### 2.1.1 Datasets

We leaned on two solid datasets to train and test our ideas:

**ImageReward** packs 137,000 expert-annotated image pairs, each born from the same text prompt. Annotators picked the winner in each pair, giving us a clear signal of preference in text-to-image scenarios Xu et al. [2023]. It’s a goldmine for teaching models to spot what humans favor.

**Human Preference Dataset v2 (HPSv2)** scales things up with 798,090 preference choices across 430,060 image pairs, all linked to text prompts. Humans weighed in on which image they liked better, making it a hefty benchmark for aesthetic judgment in text-to-image synthesis Wu [2023].

### 2.2 Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO)

Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) is an advanced variant of Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO), designed to streamline reinforcement learning by eliminating the need for a separate value function Schulman et al. [2017]. This adaptation reduces computational complexity and memory requirements, making it particularly well-suited for training large-scale language models efficiently. GRPO estimates advantages by leveraging rewards from sampled action groups, enhancing stability and scalability over traditional PPO formulations.

#### 2.2.1 Advantage Estimation

Given a state  $s$ , GRPO samples a set of actions  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_G\}$  from the current policy  $\pi_\theta$ , each associated with corresponding rewards  $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_G\}$ . The advantage for an action  $a_i$  is computed as:

$$A^{\pi_\theta}(s, a_i) = \frac{r_i - \mu}{\sigma}$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  represent the mean and standard deviation of the reward distribution across the sampled group, respectively. This normalization quantifies the relative performance of each action within the group, providing a robust basis for policy improvement.

### 2.2.2 Policy Update Objective

The policy is optimized by maximizing the following objective:

$$\mathbb{E}_{s, \{a_i\} \sim \pi_{\theta_t}} \left[ \frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \min \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_i|s)}{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_i|s)} A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a_i), \text{clip} \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_i|s)}{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_i|s)}, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon \right) A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a_i) \right) \right]$$

Here, the clipping parameter  $\epsilon$  constrains the policy update ratio, ensuring that adjustments remain conservative and preventing destabilizing shifts in the policy distribution. This clipped surrogate objective balances exploration and exploitation effectively.

### 2.2.3 KL Divergence Regularization

To maintain training stability, GRPO incorporates a Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence penalty between the updated policy  $\pi_{\theta}$  and a reference policy  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{s, a \sim \pi_{\theta_t}} \left[ \log \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a|s)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(a|s)} \right) \right]$$

This regularization term penalizes excessive deviation from the reference policy, promoting gradual and controlled updates that enhance convergence reliability.

GRPO’s innovative use of group-based advantage estimation, combined with KL divergence regularization, distinguishes it as an efficient and stable method for reinforcement learning. By avoiding the overhead of a value function—common in standard PPO—and focusing on relative reward comparisons, GRPO is particularly adept at supporting reasoning-intensive tasks in large models, as demonstrated in applications like DeepSeek R1 Team [2023a].

## 3 Soft Rewarding

To impose structure on the model predictions, we employ soft reward in two distinct settings: single image rating prediction and pairwise comparison with an anchor-based approach. Define the conditioning variables  $C = \{V, P, T, A_{<t}\}$ , where  $V$  is the visual input,  $P$  is the text prompt,  $T$  represents intermediate reasoning ("thinking" tokens), and  $A_{<t}$  is the sequence of answer tokens up to time  $t$ . The model outputs logits  $f(x_t, C)$  for the next token  $x_t$ .

For single-image rating prediction, we consider a set of valid rating tokens  $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$  (e.g., numerical scores). At the step prior to the final rating,  $t_{\text{answer}} - 1$ , we compute the probability distribution over  $\mathcal{R}$  using a softmax:

$$p(r_i | C) = \frac{\exp(f(r_i, C))}{\sum_{r_j \in \mathcal{R}} \exp(f(r_j, C))}$$

The expected rating is then:

$$\mathbb{E}[r | C] = \sum_{r_i \in \mathcal{R}} r_i \cdot p(r_i | C)$$

This method yields a continuous score for a single image, improving interpretability during inference or training.

For pairwise comparison, we introduce an anchor-based strategy. During training, the model learns to classify which of two images,  $I_a$  and  $I_b$ , is preferred given a prompt  $P$ , based on human preference data. At inference, given a set of images  $\{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_N\}$  for a prompt, we randomly select an anchor image  $I_{\text{anchor}}$  and pair it with each other image  $I_k$  (where  $k \neq \text{anchor}$ ). For each pair  $(I_{\text{anchor}}, I_k)$ , we generate a reasoning trace within "thinking" tokens, inspired by structured deliberation in DeepSeek R1 and OpenAI O1 Team [2023a,b]. This trace is concatenated with the prompt and image data, forming an extended context.

Before the final classification token at  $t_{\text{answer}}$ , we input this full context into the model and extract the logits for a binary preference vocabulary  $\mathcal{P} = \{0, 1\}$ , where 1 indicates  $I_k$  is preferred over  $I_{\text{anchor}}$ , and 0 indicates the reverse. The logits are  $f(1, C)$  and  $f(0, C)$ , and the preference probability is:

$$p(1 | C) = \frac{\exp(f(1, C))}{\exp(f(0, C)) + \exp(f(1, C))}$$

The anchor image  $I_{\text{anchor}}$  is assigned a neutral score of 0.5. This approach enables ranking across multiple images relative to the anchor, maintaining formal rigor and interpretability without sampling discrete outcomes, which also would require more comparisons than just the number of images for a given prompt.

Both soft-reward methods leverage the model’s reasoning capabilities, offering continuous probabilistic scores that reflect human preferences effectively.

## 4 Experiments

We evaluated Qwen 2.5 VL, trained with GRPO, on ImageReward and HPSv2. For ImageReward, we applied soft rewards in inference and use three rewards: formatting reward from Team [2023a], exact score matching, and approximate score matching: if distance between predicted and target is 0 - reward is 1, if distance is 1 - 0.75, distance is 2 - 0.5 and zero otherwise. For HPSv2, we use two simple rewards, formatting and exact match, for the inference, we used the anchor-based pairwise method, assigning the anchor a score of 0.5. Performance is summarized in Table 1:

Training Dataset	Mean@1 (%)	Mean@3 (%)
ImageReward	64.7	64.9
HPSv2 (25% subset)	65.1	65.4

Table 1: Accuracy of Qwen 2.5 VL trained with GRPO. We find that averaging scores across several reasoning rollouts can increase the quality further, just like in text-only models.

Using only 25% of HPSv2 data (randomly sampled) maintained strong results, highlighting efficiency and adaptability. Additional reasoning steps improved accuracy, akin to ensemble voting.

We also compared zero-shot performance against soft-reward-enhanced reasoning in the ImageReward test set (Table 2):

Method	Accuracy (%)
Single Human Wu [2023]	65.1
Zero-Shot Reasoning	51.0
+ Soft Reward	55.4
Trained on ImageReward	59.2
+ Soft Reward	64.9

Table 2: Performance on ImageReward test set with Qwen 2.5 VL (7B) trained on ImageReward train set. Computing expected score instead of naive sampling significantly improves performance.

Soft rewards consistently elevated performance, nearing human-level accuracy, with reasoning providing a clear edge over baseline training.

## 5 Conclusion

Our work shows that VLMs, when taught to reason with reinforcement learning, can indeed truly understand human preferences. Test-time reasoning generalizes better compared to supervised fine-tuning, making our model more transparent. Our soft-reward tricks deliver reliable, interpretable image rankings - a clear path for future explorations in visual preference modeling.

## References

- Sid Black, Leo Gao, Phil Wang, Connor Leahy, and Stella Alon. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, March 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.
- Yi Chen, Zhuohan Li, and Ming Zhang. Visual reasoning in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04578*, October 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.04578>.
- Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. Sft memorizes, rl generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17161*, jan 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.17161>. Accessed: March 24, 2025.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, July 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>.
- DeepSeek Team. Deepseek r1: Reasoning at scale with reinforced learning. Technical report, DeepSeek, 2023a. URL <https://deepseek.com/r1>.
- OpenAI Team. O1: Enhancing reasoning in large language models. Model system card, OpenAI, 2023b. URL <https://openai.com/index/openai-o1-system-card/>.
- Xiaoshi et al. Wu. Human preference score v2: A solid benchmark for evaluating human preferences of text-to-image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09341*, June 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.09341>.
- Guowei Xu, Peng Jin, Hao Li, Yibing Song, Lichao Sun, and Li Yuan. Llava-o1: Let vision language models reason step-by-step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.10440*, nov 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.10440>. Accessed: March 24, 2025.
- Jiazheng Xu, Xiao Liu, Yuchen Wu, Yuxuan Tong, Qinkai Li, Ming Ding, Jie Tang, and Yuxiao Dong. Imagereward: Learning and evaluating human preferences for text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05977*, April 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05977>.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Hao Zhang. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685*, June 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05685>.