


# Cropper: Vision-Language Model for Image Cropping through In-Context Learning

Seung Hyun Lee<sup>1,2</sup>, Junjie Ke<sup>1</sup>, Yinxiao Li<sup>1</sup>,  
Junfeng He<sup>1</sup>, Steven Hickson<sup>1</sup>, Katie Datsenko<sup>1</sup>, Sangpil Kim<sup>2</sup>,  
Ming-Hsuan Yang<sup>1</sup>, Irfan Essa<sup>1</sup>, Feng Yang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Google Research, <sup>2</sup>Korea University



**Fig. 1:** Cropper is a unified framework for various cropping tasks, including free-form cropping, subject-aware cropping, and aspect ratio-aware cropping built on top of a pretrained large vision-language model through in-context learning. Given the input image, top-K semantically similar images are retrieved as in-context learning prompt, and fed to pretrained vision-language model to generate crops. The crop candidates are iteratively refined to yield the final visually pleasing output crop.

**Abstract.** The goal of image cropping is to identify visually appealing crops within an image. Conventional methods rely on specialized architectures trained on specific datasets, which struggle to be adapted to new requirements. Recent breakthroughs in large vision-language models (VLMs) have enabled visual in-context learning without explicit training. However, effective strategies for vision downstream tasks with VLMs remain largely unclear and underexplored. In this paper, we propose an effective approach to leverage VLMs for better image cropping. First, we propose an efficient prompt retrieval mechanism for image cropping to automate the selection of in-context examples. Second, we introduce an iterative refinement strategy to iteratively enhance the predicted crops. The proposed framework, named Cropper, is applicable to a wide range of cropping tasks, including free-form cropping, subject-aware cropping, and aspect ratio-aware cropping. Extensive experiments and a user study demonstrate that Cropper significantly outperforms state-of-the-art methods across several benchmarks.

## 1 Introduction

Existing cropping methods [4–8, 18, 20, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 42, 43, 46] typically train neural networks on images and ground-truth crops to automatically localize aesthetic crops. However, these approaches often depend on specially designed networks or features, which struggle to generalize effectively when confronted with new requirements or diverse datasets. Additionally, for specialized cropping tasks such as subject-aware cropping with subject masks or aspect ratio-aware cropping with target aspect ratio, unique networks must be developed and retrained, further complicating the process. This limitation underscores the need for more generalizable and versatile techniques in the field of image cropping.

Recent advancements in large vision-language models (VLM), such as GPT-4V [1] and Gemini [12], have unlocked new potential for various vision tasks. Unfortunately, in a lot of cases, users are not be able to fine-tune the VLM for downstream tasks. Effectively adapting large blackbox models for downstream tasks is very difficult. Luckily, in-context learning (ICL) ability is observed in large models [28]. Given a test instance and a few in-context example demonstrations as input, the model directly infers the output without any parameter update or explicit training for the unseen task. ICL originates from natural language processing (NLP), and it has only recently been explored in the vision realm, mainly in image-to-image tasks [2, 33, 41, 45]. In this paper, we undertake an investigation aimed at harnessing the power of VLMs through ICL for image cropping, which, to our knowledge, has not been explored before.

Despite the remarkable capabilities of VLMs, challenges persist. First, the effectiveness of visual ICL heavily relies on the quality of the in-context examples (*i.e.* prompts) [41, 45]. Manual selection of these examples would be laborious and difficult to scale. Moreover, how to incorporate aesthetics in VLM for image cropping is not straight forward. Leveraging VLM in-context learning for image cropping presents a novel research area requiring effective strategies.

To address these challenges, we propose an effective framework to adapt VLM for image cropping through in-context learning, referred to as Cropper. It not only addresses the inherent challenges in traditional image cropping methods but also demonstrates versatility across various cropping tasks, including free-form cropping, subject-aware cropping, and aspect ratio-aware cropping. Illustrated in Fig. 1, our approach begins with an efficient prompt retrieval mechanism for image cropping tasks, automating the selection of relevant in-context examples to enhance efficiency. To further improve the performance, we introduce an iterative refinement strategy designed to enhance the quality of the predicted crops produced by the VLM. To validate the efficacy of Cropper, we conduct extensive experiments on various benchmark datasets and supplement our findings with user studies. Our results demonstrate that Cropper significantly outperforms existing state-of-the-art methods across various performance metrics. Notably, with only a few in-context examples, Cropper achieves superior performance without the need for training. It also provides a unified framework for various cropping tasks, a milestone previously unattained by existing methods. The main contributions of this work are:


- We introduce a unified visual in-context-learning framework Cropper for image cropping tasks, including free-form, subject-aware, and aspect ratio-aware cropping.
- Our prompt retrieval strategy automates the effective selection of ICL examples for cropping tasks.
- The proposed iterative refinement strategy enables the model to progressively enhance the output crop.
- With a few in-context examples and no explicit training, Cropper surpasses the existing supervised learning methods across various benchmarks and user studies.

## 2 Related Work

**Image Cropping.** Image cropping is a critical operation for various photography-related applications. From the perspective of constraints, there are three commonly studied types of cropping problems. The first category is free-form cropping, where the objective is to directly identify the best crop without imposing additional constraints. Numerous techniques have been explored to tackle this problem, including saliency maps [31], learning-based methods [5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22, 24, 31, 34, 38, 39], and reinforcement learning [18]. Another cropping task is subject-aware image cropping [15, 37], where an additional subject mask is provided to indicate the subject of interest. The third cropping task is aspect ratio-aware cropping [9], where the crops are expected to adhere to a specified aspect ratio. Most existing image cropping approaches rely on training neural networks on specific datasets, requiring retraining to accommodate different data distributions and requirements. In contrast, our method requires only a few in-context examples and does not need explicit training. Moreover, none of the methods are flexible enough to handle all three cropping tasks in a unified manner, while our method can do so.

**In-Context Learning.** In-context learning is a recent paradigm originating from NLP, where large-scale models perform inference on unseen tasks by conditioning on a few in-context examples and the test instance. This paradigm is effective because users can directly adapt the model to different downstream tasks without the hassle of fine-tuning or changing the model parameters in any way. Numerous methods based on ICL have been developed for various tasks such as text classification [44] and machine translation [40]. ICL is still relatively new in computer vision, and most visual ICL works focus on using large-scale image-to-image vision models for tasks such as image inpainting [2] and segmentation [33, 41]. Empowered by recent breakthroughs in VLMs such as OpenAI GPT-4V [1] and Google Gemini [12], we investigate effective strategies for in-context learning for cropping for the first time.

**Prompt Retrieval.** NLP researchers have discovered that the selection and arrangement of in-context examples, also known as prompts, significantly impacts the output performance [21, 23]. These findings have sparked interest in



**Fig. 2: Cropper Overview.** Cropper consists of two main steps: visual prompt retrieval and iterative crop refinement. Through visual prompt retrieval, top- $K$  ICL examples are retrieved using an image similarity metric. In the iterative crop refinement stage, the VLM generates candidate crops based on these ICL examples and then these crops are subsequently scored by an aesthetic scorer. The VLM iteratively refines the crop candidates using the feedback from the scorer  $N$  times.

prompt retrieval, where in-context learning examples are retrieved based on similarity metrics given a test instance. Liu *et al.* [21] have demonstrated success in selecting semantically similar in-context examples based on nearest neighbors measured by embeddings from a pretrained languages model. Rubin *et al.* [29] propose selecting examples using a supervised prompt retriever to maximize downstream performance. For visual ICL for image-to-image tasks, Zhang *et al.* [45] utilize CLIP [28]-based unsupervised embedding similarity measure, and demonstrate further improvement with a supervised prompt retrieval approach.

### 3 Method

#### 3.1 Overview

Figure 2 illustrates the structure of Cropper, which consists of two main steps: visual prompt retrieval on the left and feedback-based iterative refinement on the right. Given the input image, Cropper automatically retrieves the top- $K$  suitable context-learning examples along with their ground-truth crop coordinates. Both the input image and the retrieved in-context learning examples are then fed into the vision-language model. The model is prompted to propose several potential crop candidates represented by their coordinates. In the iterative refinement process, crops are generated based on the output of the vision-language model. These candidate crops are then evaluated using an off-the-shelf aesthetic scorer, which provides feedback guidance for the vision-language model. The model then iteratively refines the crop candidates based on this feedback. The iterative refinement process repeats  $N$  times, and the final top-ranked result is selected as the ultimate crop.

### 3.2 Visual Prompt Retrieval for Cropping

The simplest method for retrieving in-context learning examples is random selection, where one or multiple samples are randomly chosen from the training dataset. However, previous studies have demonstrated that the ICL performance of such random selection is highly sensitive to the chosen samples [21, 23, 45]. In our experiments on image cropping (detailed in Sec. 4), we empirically confirm that random prompt selection often leads to suboptimal results. Therefore, our objective is to explore an effective strategy for automatically selecting the most suitable examples for various cropping tasks.

Intuitively, images that are similar are more likely to be cropped similarly. Thus, we aim to retrieve the top- $K$  images and their most relevant ground-truth crops based on some similarity metric. Formally, given an image query  $z_q$  and a dataset  $\mathcal{D} = (z_i, C_i)_{i=1}^M$  containing  $M$  pairs of image  $z_i$  and crop ground-truth  $C_i$ , where  $C_i$  contains multiple crops  $c_1, \dots, c_s$  for some datasets, we seek to retrieve the most relevant in-context examples and crop ground-truth as:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \arg \max_{z_i \in \mathcal{D}} Q(z_q, z_i), \quad |\mathcal{Z}| = K \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{H} = \arg \max_{c_j \in C_j} G(z_q, c_j), \quad z_j \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{Z}$  represents the set of top- $K$  relevant images selected from the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  based on the similarity metric  $Q(z_q, z_i)$ .  $\mathcal{H} = (z_j, c_j)_{j=1}^K$  represents the selected in-context images  $z_j$  along with their most relevant crop ground-truths based on metric  $G(z_q, c_j)$ .  $Q$  and  $G$  are designed differently to accommodate different cropping tasks, including free-form cropping, subject-aware cropping, and aspect ratio-aware cropping.

**Free-form cropping** aims to identify the best crop without additional constraints regarding aspect ratio or target subject. For this cropping task, we use the CLIP [28] image embeddings as an off-the-shelf image feature extractor, and  $Q$  corresponds to the cosine similarity between the input image  $z_q$  and each training example  $z_i \in \mathcal{D}$ . In free-form cropping datasets, such as GAICD [39], each image  $z_i$  is associated with multiple ground-truth crops  $c_i$ , each with its mean opinion score (MOS) aggregated from human evaluation. We use the MOS score as  $G$  for selecting the ground-truth crops. Therefore, after obtaining  $\mathcal{Z}$ , we select the top-ranked crops based on their MOS. Each crop ground-truth  $c_i$  is represented five tuples,  $(s, x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ , indicating the MOS and the leftmost, top, rightmost, and bottom positions, respectively.

**Subject-aware cropping** intends to identify an aesthetic crop containing the subject of interest, which is represented by binary masks provided by users. In this task, the query image  $z_q$  is accompanied by a binary mask  $m_q$  indicating the subject of interest. Similarly, we first use CLIP image embedding similarity as  $Q$  for retrieving the top- $K$  relevant images. Since each image in this task is associated with multiple target subject masks and their corresponding ground-truth crops, we further refine it by choosing the most similar mask areas to provide better guidance.  $G$  is defined as  $-L^2$  distance between the center points of the target mask  $m_q$  and the masks from image  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  to select the crop

Prompt & Output Instruction	
Initial Prompt	<p>“Localize the aesthetic part of the image. <math>(s, x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)</math> represents the region. <math>x_1</math> and <math>x_2</math> are the left and right most positions, normalized into 0 to 1, where 0 is the left and 1 is the right. <math>y_1</math> and <math>y_2</math> are the top and bottom positions, normalized into 0 to 1 where 0 is the top and 1 is the bottom. <math>s</math> is MOS score. We provide several images here.</p> <p>{image 1} <math>(s_1^1, x_1^{1,1}, y_1^{1,1}, x_2^{1,1}, y_2^{1,1}), (s_1^2, x_1^{1,2}, y_1^{1,2}, x_2^{1,2}, y_2^{1,2}), \dots,</math>  <math>(s_1^5, x_1^{1,5}, y_1^{1,5}, x_2^{1,5}, y_2^{1,5}),</math>            {image 2}, <math>(s_2^1, x_1^{2,1}, y_1^{2,1}, x_2^{2,1}, y_2^{2,1}), (s_2^2, x_1^{2,2}, y_1^{2,2}, x_2^{2,2}, y_2^{2,2}), \dots,</math>  <math>(s_2^5, x_1^{2,5}, y_1^{2,5}, x_2^{2,5}, y_2^{2,5}),</math>            ...            {image 10}, <math>(s_{10}^1, x_1^{10,1}, y_1^{10,1}, x_2^{10,1}, y_2^{10,1}), (s_{10}^2, x_1^{10,2}, y_1^{10,2}, x_2^{10,2}, y_2^{10,2}), \dots,</math>  <math>(s_{10}^5, x_1^{10,5}, y_1^{10,5}, x_2^{10,5}, y_2^{10,5}),</math>            {Query image},  <math>(\hat{s}_1, \hat{x}_1^1, \hat{y}_1^1, \hat{x}_2^1, \hat{y}_2^1), (\hat{s}_2, \hat{x}_1^2, \hat{y}_1^2, \hat{x}_2^2, \hat{y}_2^2), \dots, (\hat{s}_5, \hat{x}_1^5, \hat{y}_1^5, \hat{x}_2^5, \hat{y}_2^5)</math></p>
Output	
Iterative Crop	Initial Prompt + {Cropped image 1} $(\hat{s}_1, \hat{x}_1^1, \hat{y}_1^1, \hat{x}_2^1, \hat{y}_2^1)$ , Score is {VILA score 1}
Refinement Prompt	{Cropped image 2} $(\hat{s}_2, \hat{x}_1^2, \hat{y}_1^2, \hat{x}_2^2, \hat{y}_2^2)$ , Score is {VILA score 2} ... {Cropped image 5} $(\hat{s}_5, \hat{x}_1^5, \hat{y}_1^5, \hat{x}_2^5, \hat{y}_2^5)$ , Score is {VILA score 5} Please propose new region $(s, x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ ; Score is high as much as possible.
Output	$(\hat{s}, \hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{y}_2)$

**Table 1:** VLM prompt used for free-form cropping. The goal is to achieve accurate coordinates of the crop  $(\hat{s}, \hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{y}_2)$ . In the initial prompt, we use ten in-context (ICL) examples for image cropping. Using five crops for our task, the format of image  $i$ 's  $j$ -th crop is defined as  $(s_i^j, x_1^{i,j}, y_1^{i,j}, x_2^{i,j}, y_2^{i,j})$ . Intermediate results of initial prompt are coordinates of five crops. Subsequently, the crop is iteratively refined by accumulating the context into prompts, using refinement prompt. Note that {ViLAscore} is calculated with the aesthetic scorer.

with the closest masks. As a result the ground-truth crop for the closest mask is provided as the in-context learning example label, and each crop ground-truth  $c_i$  is represented  $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ .

**Aspect ratio-aware cropping** requires the generated crop to conform to a specified aspect ratio  $r_q$  given the query image  $z_q$ . Each image in the dataset for this task is associated with ground-truth crops using different aspect ratios, such as 16:9, 3:4, and 1:1. Similarly, CLIP-based image similarity is adopted as  $Q$ .  $G$  is defined as the similarity between the crop  $c_i$ 's aspect ratio and the target aspect ratio  $r_q$ . In other words, for each image  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , only the crop that has the similar target aspect ratio is used as in-context learning ground-truth. To enforce the aspect ratio constraint in VLM output, we represent the example crops as  $(x, y, w)$  instead, denoting the top left corner  $x, y$  and the width  $w$  of the crop. The height of the crop can subsequently be calculated by the target aspect ratio.

### 3.3 Iterative Crop Refinement

Without explicit supervision, VLM lacks a deep understanding of the context of the cropping task, such as the provided coordinate system and intended aesthetics. Consequently, it often produces nonsensical outputs even when provided with good in-context learning cropping examples. Empirically, we observe that the initial crop candidates generated by the VLM lack diversity and sometimes

fail to make sense (*e.g.* being too small or too large). Yang et al. [36] have shown that large language models can optimize the output by iteratively incorporating feedback. Motivated by this, we propose an iterative crop refinement mechanism to further guide the VLM in generating aesthetic crops. Concretely, the VLM is prompted to generate several crop candidates (we use 5 in experiments) based on the in-context learning examples retrieved using the method described in Sec. 3.2. Subsequently, we crop the image according to each proposal and feed the cropped image into an off-the-shelf aesthetic scorer to obtain corresponding scores. In the refinement phase, we iteratively provide such feedback to the VLM by scoring the crop candidates and prompting it to generate new candidates to improve the aesthetic score. This iterative process is repeated  $N$  times, and the top output is selected as the final result. Table 1 shows the prompt design for free-form cropping with the two phases of Cropper. In terms of subject-aware cropping and aspect ratio aware cropping, the only difference depends on whether MOS is predicted together.

## 4 Experimental Results

We first describe the implementation details and experimental setups before presenting quantitative and qualitative results with comparisons to state-of-the-art schemes as well as ablation studies.

### 4.1 Implementation Details

**Dataset.** We assess the effectiveness of Cropper across four cropping benchmarks, comprising two free-form cropping datasets (GAICD [39] and FCDB [5]), one subject-aware cropping dataset (SACD [37]), and one aspect ratio-aware cropping dataset (GNMC [9]).

GAICD dataset has 3,336 images, with 2,636 for training, 200 for validation, and 500 for testing, containing 288,069 densely annotated crops. For evaluation, we retrieve in-context learning examples from the GAICD training set (the validation set is not used). Among the 90 annotations available for each retrieved image, we select the top 5 crops ranked by MOS. Additionally, employing the same retrieval strategy on the GAICD training set, we further evaluate the performance on 348 test images from the FCDB dataset, measuring the out-of-domain performance.

The subject-aware cropping dataset SACD contains 2,906 images, with 2,326 for training, 290 for validation, and 290 for testing. The aspect ratio-aware dataset GNMC provides bounding box with different aspect ratios (16:9, 3:4, 4:3, 2:2, 1:1), containing over 8,000 images for training, over 1,000 images for validation and over 2,000 images for testing.

**Metrics.** We use standard metrics widely used in the image cropping community [39], including the Spearman’s rank-order correlation coefficient ( $SRCC$ ), the Pearson correlation ( $PCC$ ), and  $Acc_{K/N}$ . These metrics quantify the alignment of the generated crops with aesthetic preferences, using the ground-truth

mean opinion score (MOS). Specifically,  $\overline{PCC}$  assesses the linear correlation between the predicted MOS and the ground-truth MOS, whereas  $\overline{SRCC}$  measures the correlation of ranking order. Given that Cropper generates five candidate crops per each iteration step on the GAICD dataset, we compute  $\overline{SRCC}$  and  $\overline{PCC}$  using the best five crops instead of considering all crops.  $Acc_{K/N}$  indicates whether top- $K$  from predictions could be involved among top- $N$  crops from the ground-truth based on MOS.  $Acc_{1/5}$ ,  $Acc_{2/5}$ ,  $Acc_{3/5}$ ,  $Acc_{4/5}$ ,  $Acc_{1/10}$ ,  $Acc_{2/10}$ ,  $Acc_{3/10}$ ,  $Acc_{4/10}$  are measured with  $N \in \{5, 10\}$  and  $K \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  to return  $K$  of top- $N$  accuracy. Additionally, we use Intersection-over-Union (IoU) and Boundary-displacement-error (Disp) metrics to compare with other approaches on the FCDB, SACD, and GNMC datasets. Disp represents the average L1 distance between the ground-truth coordinates and the predicted values.

**Visual Prompt Retrieval for Cropping.** Similarity measurement  $Q$  in Eq. 1 is implemented using cosine similarity between image embeddings extracted from the ViT-B/32 variant of CLIP [28]. Unless otherwise specified, we set  $K$  to 10 by default, meaning that the top 10 similar in-context learning images are retrieved.

**Iterative Crop Refinement.** By default, we employ the Gemini-pro-vision [12] model via the Vertex AI API for the VLM. This model stands out as it can process up to 16 images as input, unlike other vision-language models that have a more limited capacity. We also experiment with the GPT-4V [1] chat API. The number of candidate crops is set to 5 during the iterative refinement stage.

**Aesthetic Scorer.** For evaluating the aesthetics of each crop, we utilize the VILA-R [17] model as our aesthetic scorer. Trained on the AVA [25] dataset, this model specializes in image aesthetic assessment, providing evaluations based on factors such as perspectives, compositions, and color contrast.

## 4.2 Comparison with Baselines

**Free-form Image Cropping.** Tab 2 presents a quantitative comparison on the GAICD dataset of Cropper with other training-based baselines (top section), which require supervised training on all available training data in the dataset. Remarkably, Cropper outperforms the training-based methods by a large margin with only a few in-context learning examples and no training. In the bottom section of Tab 2, we additionally assess the performance of two ablated variants of Cropper, labeled as “Cropper w/ Random Retrieval”, and “Cropper w/o Iterative Refinement”. “Cropper Random Retrieval” uses randomly selected in-context examples without further iterative refinement. The variant “Cropper w/o Iterative Refinement” employs visual prompt retrieval but without iterative refinement, meaning that the initial inference from the VLM based on the in-context learning examples is directly used as the output. Moreover, compared to “Cropper w/ Random Retrieval”, “Cropper w/o Iterative Refinement” shows a notable improvement, indicating that visual prompt retrieval cropping is effective. Additionally, the gap between Cropper and “Cropper w/o Iterative Refinement” highlights the advancement of iterative refinement. These variations demonstrate the effectiveness of visual prompt retrieval and iterative refinement.



Model	$Acc_{1/5}$	$Acc_{2/5}$	$Acc_{3/5}$	$Acc_{4/5}$	$\overline{Acc}_5$	$Acc_{1/10}$	$Acc_{2/10}$	$Acc_{3/10}$	$Acc_{4/10}$	$\overline{Acc}_{10}$	$\overline{SRCC}$	$\overline{PCC}$
A2RL [18]	23.2	-	-	-	-	39.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
VPN [34]	36.0	-	-	-	-	48.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
VFN [6]	26.6	26.5	26.7	25.7	26.4	40.6	40.2	40.3	39.3	40.1	0.485	0.503
VEN [34]	37.5	35.0	35.3	34.2	35.5	50.5	49.2	48.4	46.4	48.6	0.616	0.662
GAIC [39]	68.2	64.3	61.3	58.5	63.1	84.4	82.7	80.7	78.7	81.6	0.849	0.874
CGS [20]	63.0	62.3	58.8	54.9	59.7	81.5	79.5	77.0	73.3	77.8	0.795	-
TransView [26]	69.0	66.9	61.9	57.8	63.9	85.4	84.1	81.3	78.6	82.4	0.857	0.880
Chao et al. [32]	70.0	66.9	62.5	59.8	64.8	86.8	84.5	82.9	79.8	83.3	0.872	<b>0.893</b>
Cropper w/ Random Retrieval	80.0	76.5	72.0	65.5	73.5	88.0	87.0	85.5	85.0	86.4	0.877	0.848
Cropper w/o Iterative Refinement	87.0	82.0	78.0	75.0	80.5	95.0	92.5	91.5	89.5	92.1	0.892	0.851
Cropper (Ours)	<b>89.2</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>94.4</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>0.900</b>	0.858


**Table 2:** Quantitative comparison to existing methods on the GAICD [39] dataset. Cropper demonstrates significant superiority over other baselines despite using only a few in-context learning examples and no explicit training.

Model	Training-Free	Training Set	IoU $\uparrow$	Disp $\downarrow$
A2RL [18]	$\times$	AVA	0.663	0.089
A3RL [19]	$\times$	AVA	0.696	0.077
VPN [34]	$\times$	CPC	0.711	0.073
VEN [34]	$\times$	CPC	0.735	0.072
ASM [31]	$\times$	CPC	0.749	0.068
GAIC [39]	$\times$	GAICD	0.672	0.084
CGS [20]	$\times$	GAICD	0.685	0.079
TransView [26]	$\times$	GAICD	0.682	0.080
Chao et al. [32]	$\times$	GAICD	0.695	0.075
Gemini-pro-vision [12]	$\checkmark$	-	0.554	0.121
Cropper w/ Random Retrieval	$\checkmark$	GAICD	0.635	0.092
Cropper w/o Iterative Refinement	$\checkmark$	GAICD	0.736	0.070
Cropper (Ours)	$\checkmark$	GAICD	<b>0.752</b>	<b>0.062</b>

**Table 3:** Quantitative comparison of free-form image cropping on the FCDB [5] dataset. Cropper is only training-free for image cropping.

Tab 3 shows quantitative comparison on the FCDB [5] dataset, where Cropper achieves the best performance. The variants of Cropper in the bottom section utilize the training split of GAICD as the prompt retrieval dataset. Additionally, we include the zero-shot cropping performance from Gemini-pro-vision [12], which is unsatisfactory. Without good in-context learning examples and the iterative crop refinement, its IoU score and Disp are very low. This highlights that although VLMs are trained on large-scale data and have strong generalization ability, proper guidance is still necessary to enhance performance in specific vision tasks. Our proposed Cropper demonstrates its value in addressing this challenge.

Fig 3 shows a visual comparison between Cropper and other free-form image cropping baselines, namely A2RL [18], VPN [34], GAIC [39], CGS [20]. The images are generated using the released codes of these methods. Overall, we observe that our generated results more closely resemble the ground truth (indicated by the yellow bounding box) compared to the cropping results from other baselines. Particularly noteworthy is the fourth row, where only our method successfully excludes the right side of the tree from the crop, resulting in better composition.



**Fig. 3:** Qualitative comparison of Cropper on the GAICD [39] test set. We show the annotated best crop (yellow bounding box) in the source image in the left column and top-1 crops obtained by different methods in the rest of the columns.


Model	Training-Free	IoU $\uparrow$	Disp $\downarrow$
A2RL [18]	$\times$	0.6674	0.0887
VFN [6]	$\times$	0.6690	0.0887
VPN [34]	$\times$	0.7036	0.0699
VEN [34]	$\times$	0.6911	0.0765
LVRN [22]	$\times$	0.6962	0.0765
GAIC [39]	$\times$	0.7124	0.0696
SAC-Net [37]	$\times$	0.7665	0.0491
Cropper (Ours)	$\checkmark$	<b>0.7727</b>	<b>0.0483</b>

**Table 4:** Quantitative comparison on the SACD [37] dataset for subject-aware cropping task.

Model	Training-Free	IoU $\uparrow$	Disp $\downarrow$
GAIC [39]	$\times$	0.723	0.058
GNMC [9]	$\times$	0.867	0.023
Cropper (Ours)	$\checkmark$	<b>0.879</b>	<b>0.022</b>

**Table 5:** Quantitative comparison on the GNMC [9] dataset for aspect ratio-aware cropping task.

**Subject-aware Image Cropping.** Tab 4 shows the quantitative comparison on the SACD dataset, where Cropper surpasses other training-based baselines. The reported numbers are directly taken from the baseline papers. To visually demonstrate the effectiveness of Cropper, we provide visual samples from Cropper in Fig 4. Additionally, we display the zero-shot inference results from GPT-4V [1] and Gemini-pro-vision [12]. Both GPT-4V and Gemini-pro-vision are prompted with chain-of-thoughts to crop out the main subject within the image, such as “Think step-by-step about finding visually pleasing crops .” However, both models struggle to generate good crops. For example, the crop from GPT-4V in the first row fails to capture the main subject "clock" and instead



**Fig. 4:** Visual comparisons on the subject-aware image cropping dataset SACD [37]. Yellow bounding box shows the ground-truth.

cropped a completely different area. Conversely, our cropped image exhibits better symmetry and successfully captures the subject of interest.

**Aspect Ratio-aware Image Cropping.** Tab 5 shows quantitative comparison results on the GNMC [9] dataset for the aspect ratio-aware cropping task. Cropper outperforms other baselines in both IoU and Disp, indicating that Cropper is more adept at cropping the image according to the desired aspect ratio. Fig 5 displays example crops from Cropper for each aspect ratio, along with the corresponding ground-truth (yellow bounding box), illustrating qualitatively that Cropper can generate crops that possess both good aesthetics and adhere to the specified aspect ratio.


### 4.3 Ablation Study

**Number of ICL Samples and Candidate Crops.** We conduct an ablation study to empirically determine the optimal combinations of two key parameters: 1) the number of retrieved in-context learning examples and 2) the number of candidate crops during iterative refinement. Fig 6 illustrates the mean IoU score on the GAICD test set with different combinations. Empirically, we find that using 10 in-context examples and 5 candidate crops yields the best result.


**Analysis of Iterative Crop Refinement.** Fig 7 (a) illustrates the effect of the number of iterative crop refinement iterations. As the number of iterations increases, the mIoU scores gradually converge, and the performance saturates after approximately 10 steps. Consequently, we choose 10 iterations as the default in our experiments. Additionally, Fig 7 (b) demonstrates the effect of the number of in-context learning (ICL) examples while holding other parameters constant. The performance also gradually converges as the number of examples increases to 10. Fig 7 (c) presents the effect of the number of candidate crops, indicating that using five crops is more advantageous than using fewer than five. Fig 8 provides visual examples of how the crop candidates change throughout the iterative refinement process, with the best crop gradually converging. Fig 9 compares the scores from the aesthetic scorer before and after the iterative refinement process, showing significant improvement in the aesthetic score for both the GAICD [39] and FCDB [5] datasets. This confirms the feasibility of employing the VLM



**Fig. 5:** Example crops from Cropper for aspect ratio-aware cropping on the GNMC [9] dataset. Yellow bounding box denotes the ground-truth.




**Fig. 6:** Ablation study on the combinations of 1) the number of ICL examples and 2) the number of candidate crops on the GAICD [39] test dataset. The IoU score of the top-1 crop is reported to evaluate the effectiveness of each combination.




**Fig. 7:** Ablation study on (a) the number of iterative crop refinement iterations, (b) the number of ICL examples, and (c) the number of candidate crops on the GAICD [39] test dataset. For each experiment, we measure the mean IoU score of Top-1 crop.


as an optimizer and validates the effectiveness of the proposed iterative crop refinement process.



**Fig. 8:** Visual changes according to iterative crop refinement. As the number of iterations increases, the crop is close to the ground truth (yellow box).



**Fig. 9:** Ablation study of our main components. We calculate the VILA-R [17] score on the in-domain GAICD [39] and the out-domain FCDB [5] dataset.




**Fig. 10:** User study on the GAICD [38] dataset shows that Cropper produces the most preferred crop.

#### 4.4 User Study

To further assess the effectiveness of Cropper, we conduct a user study using Amazon MTurk [10] on a sample of 100 images randomly selected from the GAICD [39] dataset. Five models are compared: A2RL [18], VPN [34], CGS [20], GAIC [39], and Cropper. In the questionnaire, ten different raters were asked to select the best image from the set of five cropped images generated from all methods, with the images shuffled. Fig 10 shows the ratio of times each method was chosen as the best one. The results demonstrates that Cropper generates crops that are most preferred by the users.

## 5 Other Vision Applications

To assess the versatility of our method, we briefly explore its application to other vision tasks. Specifically, we test its effectiveness in color enhancement, using the MIT-Adobe FiveK [3] dataset. Similar to the approach in Distort-and-recover [27], we aim to predict a sequence of image processing operations, such as contrast, brightness, and color saturation adjustments. Since the dataset lacks



**Fig. 11:** Visual demonstration of applying Cropper on the color enhancement task on the MIT-Adobe FiveK [3] dataset.

ground-truth editing operations, we first construct a retrieval database. This involves randomly sampling 30 operation sequences for each training image and selecting the editing sequence that achieves the highest VILA-R [17] score as the ground truth. With this retrieval database in place, we apply Cropper to predict the image processing sequence. Visual comparisons in Fig 11 against GPT-4V and Distort-and-recover [27] show that Cropper demonstrates visible improvement. Notably, while Distort-and-recover still relies on a fine-tuning scheme with manually edited images to minimize pixel-wise differences between image pairs, our method operates in a ground-truth-free manner using in-context learning. This demonstrates that Cropper can effectively enhance images without relying on ground-truth annotations, highlighting the broad utility and generalization capability of the proposed framework.

## 6 Conclusion

The paper presents Cropper, a novel approach to image cropping that leverages in-context learning and vision-language models to achieve superior performance across various cropping tasks. It presents a novel training-free unified approach for tasks like free-form cropping, subject-aware cropping, and aspect ratio-aware cropping. Through extensive experimentation and comparison with existing baselines, Cropper demonstrates remarkable effectiveness and efficiency, outperforming counterparts with only a few in-context learning examples. Furthermore, the user study confirms the preference of Cropper-generated crops, highlighting its practical applicability. Ablation studies show that the proposed visual prompt retrieval strategy and iterative crop refinement approach effectively harness the power of VLMs for effective ICL for cropping. The versatility of Cropper is showcased through successful application to additional vision tasks beyond cropping, underscoring its broad utility and generalization ability. Overall, Cropper represents a significant advancement in image cropping, offering a state-of-the-art solution with wide-ranging potential for practical use in diverse visual applications.

## References

1. Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al.: Gpt-4 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774 (2023)
2. Bar, A., Gandelsman, Y., Darrell, T., Globerson, A., Efros, A.: Visual prompting via image inpainting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 25005–25017 (2022)
3. Bychkovsky, V., Paris, S., Chan, E., Durand, F.: Learning photographic global tonal adjustment with a database of input / output image pairs. In: *The Twenty-Fourth IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2011)
4. Chen, J., Bai, G., Liang, S., Li, Z.: Automatic image cropping: A computational complexity study. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. pp. 507–515 (2016)
5. Chen, Y.L., Huang, T.W., Chang, K.H., Tsai, Y.C., Chen, H.T., Chen, B.Y.: Quantitative analysis of automatic image cropping algorithms: A dataset and comparative study. In: *2017 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision (WACV)*. pp. 226–234. IEEE (2017)
6. Chen, Y.L., Klopp, J., Sun, M., Chien, S.Y., Ma, K.L.: Learning to compose with professional photographs on the web. In: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. pp. 37–45 (2017)
7. Cheng, B., Ni, B., Yan, S., Tian, Q.: Learning to photograph. In: *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. pp. 291–300 (2010)
8. Cheng, Y., Lin, Q., Allebach, J.P.: Re-compose the image by evaluating the crop on more than just a score. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. pp. 1–9 (2022)
9. Christensen, C.L., Vartakavi, A.: An experience-based direct generation approach to automatic image cropping. *IEEE Access* **9**, 107600–107610 (2021)
10. Crowston, K.: Amazon mechanical turk: A research tool for organizations and information systems scholars. In: *Shaping the Future of ICT Research. Methods and Approaches: IFIP WG 8.2, Working Conference, Tampa, FL, USA, December 13-14, 2012. Proceedings*. pp. 210–221. Springer (2012)
11. Deng, Y., Loy, C.C., Tang, X.: Aesthetic-driven image enhancement by adversarial learning. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. pp. 870–878 (2018)
12. Gemini Team Google: Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805 (2023)
13. Guo, G., Wang, H., Shen, C., Yan, Y., Liao, H.Y.M.: Automatic image cropping for visual aesthetic enhancement using deep neural networks and cascaded regression. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* **20**(8), 2073–2085 (2018)
14. Hong, C., Du, S., Xian, K., Lu, H., Cao, Z., Zhong, W.: Composing photos like a photographer. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 7057–7066 (2021)
15. Hong, J., Yuan, L., Gharbi, M., Fisher, M., Fatahalian, K.: Learning subject-aware cropping by outpainting professional photos. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12080 (2023)
16. Kao, Y., He, R., Huang, K.: Automatic image cropping with aesthetic map and gradient energy map. In: *2017 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*. pp. 1982–1986. IEEE (2017)

17. Ke, J., Ye, K., Yu, J., Wu, Y., Milanfar, P., Yang, F.: Vila: Learning image aesthetics from user comments with vision-language pretraining. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 10041–10051 (2023)
18. Li, D., Wu, H., Zhang, J., Huang, K.: A2-rl: Aesthetics aware reinforcement learning for image cropping. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 8193–8201 (2018)
19. Li, D., Wu, H., Zhang, J., Huang, K.: Fast a3rl: Aesthetics-aware adversarial reinforcement learning for image cropping. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **28**(10), 5105–5120 (2019)
20. Li, D., Zhang, J., Huang, K., Yang, M.H.: Composing good shots by exploiting mutual relations. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 4213–4222 (2020)
21. Liu, J., Shen, D., Zhang, Y., Dolan, B., Carin, L., Chen, W.: What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06804 (2021)
22. Lu, W., Xing, X., Cai, B., Xu, X.: Listwise view ranking for image cropping. *IEEE Access* **7**, 91904–91911 (2019)
23. Lu, Y., Bartolo, M., Moore, A., Riedel, S., Stenetorp, P.: Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity pp. 8086–8098 (2022)
24. Mai, L., Jin, H., Liu, F.: Composition-preserving deep photo aesthetics assessment. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 497–506 (2016)
25. Murray, N., Marchesotti, L., Perronnin, F.: Ava: A large-scale database for aesthetic visual analysis. In: CVPR (2012)
26. Pan, Z., Cao, Z., Wang, K., Lu, H., Zhong, W.: Transview: Inside, outside, and across the cropping view boundaries. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 4218–4227 (2021)
27. Park, J., Lee, J.Y., Yoo, D., Kweon, I.S.: Distort-and-recover: Color enhancement using deep reinforcement learning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 5928–5936 (2018)
28. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al.: Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In: International conference on machine learning. pp. 8748–8763. PMLR (2021)
29. Rubin, O., Herzig, J., Berant, J.: Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning pp. 2655–2671 (2022)
30. Sun, J., Ling, H.: Scale and object aware image thumbnailing. *International journal of computer vision* **104**, 135–153 (2013)
31. Tu, Y., Niu, L., Zhao, W., Cheng, D., Zhang, L.: Image cropping with composition and saliency aware aesthetic score map. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. vol. 34, pp. 12104–12111 (2020)
32. Wang, C., Niu, L., Zhang, B., Zhang, L.: Image cropping with spatial-aware feature and rank consistency. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 10052–10061 (2023)
33. Wang, X., Wang, W., Cao, Y., Shen, C., Huang, T.: Images speak in images: A generalist painter for in-context visual learning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 6830–6839 (2023)
34. Wei, Z., Zhang, J., Shen, X., Lin, Z., Mech, R., Hoi, M., Samaras, D.: Good view hunting: Learning photo composition from dense view pairs. In: Proceedings of



- the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 5437–5446 (2018)
35. Yan, J., Lin, S., Bing Kang, S., Tang, X.: Learning the change for automatic image cropping. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 971–978 (2013)
  36. Yang, C., Wang, X., Lu, Y., Liu, H., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D., Chen, X.: Large language models as optimizers. In: The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (2024)
  37. Yang, G.Y., Zhou, W.Y., Cai, Y., Zhang, S.H., Zhang, F.L.: Focusing on your subject: Deep subject-aware image composition recommendation networks. *Computational Visual Media* **9**(1), 87–107 (2023)
  38. Zeng, H., Li, L., Cao, Z., Zhang, L.: Reliable and efficient image cropping: A grid anchor based approach. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 5949–5957 (2019)
  39. Zeng, H., Li, L., Cao, Z., Zhang, L.: Grid anchor based image cropping: A new benchmark and an efficient model. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **44**(3), 1304–1319 (2020)
  40. Zhang, B., Haddow, B., Birch, A.: Prompting large language model for machine translation: A case study (2023)
  41. Zhang, J., Wang, B., Li, L., Nakashima, Y., Nagahara, H.: Instruct me more! random prompting for visual in-context learning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision. pp. 2597–2606 (2024)
  42. Zhang, L., Song, M., Yang, Y., Zhao, Q., Zhao, C., Sebe, N.: Weakly supervised photo cropping. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* **16**(1), 94–107 (2013)
  43. Zhang, M., Zhang, L., Sun, Y., Feng, L., Ma, W.: Auto cropping for digital photographs. In: 2005 IEEE international conference on multimedia and expo. pp. 4–pp. IEEE (2005)
  44. Zhang, Y., Feng, S., Tan, C.: Active example selection for in-context learning. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 9134–9148. Association for Computational Linguistics (2022)
  45. Zhang, Y., Zhou, K., Liu, Z.: What makes good examples for visual in-context learning? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024)
  46. Zhong, L., Li, F.H., Huang, H.Z., Zhang, Y., Lu, S.P., Wang, J.: Aesthetic-guided outward image cropping. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* **40**(6), 1–13 (2021)

## Cropper: Vision-Language Model for Image Cropping through In-Context Learning Supplementary Material

In Section 7, we provide a detailed description of various prompts, including free-form cropping, subject-aware cropping, aspect ratio-aware cropping, and color enhancement. We further explain the details of a straightforward chain-of-thought process using GPT-4V [1] for comparison with the Cropper, as mentioned earlier in the main paper. Section 8 showcases additional cropping examples. Finally, Section 9 discusses the limitations of the Cropper.

### 7 Details of Prompts


Fig 12 and Fig 13 show examples of our prompt used for free-form cropping. As shown in Fig 12, initial prompts consist of in-context learning examples and a query image. Given the query image, visual prompt retrieval selects ten in-context examples where each sample has top-5 crop annotations. In other words, total 50 crops are used for free-form cropping. The vision-language model (VLM) predicts text-based five crops, then we make crops by parsing the text outputs, which are used for iterative crop refinement stage. Fig 13 shows the example prompt for iterative crop refinement. The first row is the crops preprocessed from Fig 12’s text-based output. Note that we put text-based coordinates and images together for refinement process. With the prepanded prompts, this process continuously traverse the optimal crop for higher VILA-R [17] score. Finally, we observe that the crop is converged after refinement.

Fig 14 and Fig 15 show the prompt for subject-aware cropping and aspect ratio-aware cropping, respectively. Different thing from free-form cropping is that subject-aware cropping supports one crop per the image. For aspect ratio-aware crop, as shown in Fig 15, we predict only width of the crop and re-calculate the coordinate based on the given aspect ratio. We added more details about prompts for subject-aware cropping (see Table 6) and aspect ratio aware cropping (see Table 7).

Since these cropping setting starts with one crop, we accumulate to five crop for iterative refinement. We also provide further details of GPT-4V [1]’s chain-of-thoughts process in Fig 16. Even if the GPT-4V is basically good at vision-language reasoning, we observe that their actual crop doesn’t involve anything about their language-based cues.

Fig 17 shows examples of the color enhancement prompt. As described in the paper, we utilize a brute-force approach to create ground-truth trajectories, selecting the one that results in the highest VILA-R score. The trajectory length is set to 8, including various image operations like *+contrast*, *-contrast*, *+brightness*, *-brightness*, *+saturation*, and *-saturation*. These adjustments are performed using the PILImageEnhance, a popular image processing library. For contrast and saturation, "+" increases the value by a factor of 1.05, and "-" decreases it by 0.95. Brightness adjustments are similar, with "+" making the image 1.03

“Localize the aesthetic part of the image. (s,x1,y1,x2,y2) represents the region. x1 and x2 are the left and right most positions, normalized into 0 to 1, where 0 is the left and 1 is the right. y1 and y2 are the top and bottom positions, normalized into 0 to 1 where 0 is the top and 1 is the bottom. s is MOS score. We provide several images here. ”



Query image

Output


**Fig. 12:** Example of initial prompt for free-form cropping. times brighter and "-" reducing brightness by a factor of 0.97, resulting in a darker image. Iterative refinement for color enhancement is optional.

Prompt & Output Instruction	
Initial Prompt	“Localize the aesthetic part of the image. $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ represents the region. $x_1$ and $x_2$ are the left and right most positions, normalized into 0 to 1, where 0 is the left and 1 is the right. $y_1$ and $y_2$ are the top and bottom positions, normalized into 0 to 1 where 0 is the top and 1 is the bottom. We provide several images here. {image 1} $(x_1^1, y_1^1, x_2^1, y_2^1)$ {image 2}, $(x_1^2, y_1^2, x_2^2, y_2^2)$ ... {image 10}, $(x_1^{10}, y_1^{10}, x_2^{10}, y_2^{10})$ {Query image}, $(x_1^1, y_1^1, x_2^1, y_2^1)$
<b>Output</b>	$(\hat{x}_1^1, \hat{y}_1^1, \hat{x}_2^1, \hat{y}_2^1)$
Iterative Crop	Initial Prompt + {Cropped image 1} $(\hat{x}_1^1, \hat{y}_1^1, \hat{x}_2^1, \hat{y}_2^1)$ , Score is {VILA score 1}
Refinement Prompt	{Cropped image 2} $(\hat{x}_1^2, \hat{y}_1^2, \hat{x}_2^2, \hat{y}_2^2)$ , Score is {VILA score 2}
	...
	{Cropped image 5} $(\hat{x}_1^5, \hat{y}_1^5, \hat{x}_2^5, \hat{y}_2^5)$ , Score is {VILA score 5}
	Please propose new region $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ ; Score is high as much as possible.
<b>Output</b>	$(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{y}_2)$

**Table 6:** VLM prompt used for subject-aware cropping. The goal is to achieve accurate coordinates of the crop  $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{y}_2)$ . In the initial prompt, we use ten in-context (ICL) examples for image cropping. First, we accumulate five crops because this task supports one crop per one image. Using five crops for our task, the format of image  $i$ ’s crop is defined as  $(x_1^i, y_1^i, x_2^i, y_2^i)$ . Intermediate results of initial prompt are coordinates of five crops. Subsequently, the crop is iteratively refined by accumulating the context into prompts, using refinement prompt.

Prompt & Output Instruction	
Initial Prompt	“Find visually appealing crop. Each region is represented by $(x, y, w)$ . $x$ is the left most position. $y$ is the top position. $w$ is the width {image 1} $(x^1, y^1, w^1)$ {image 2}, $(x^2, y^2, w^2)$ ... {image 10}, $(x^{10}, y^{10}, w^{10})$ {Query image}, $(x^1, y^1, w^1)$
<b>Output</b>	$(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{w}_1)$
Iterative Crop	Initial Prompt + {Cropped image 1} $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{w}_1)$ , Score is {VILA score 1}
Refinement Prompt	{Cropped image 2} $(\hat{x}_2, \hat{y}_2, \hat{w}_2)$ , Score is {VILA score 2}
	...
	{Cropped image 5} $(\hat{x}_5, \hat{y}_5, \hat{w}_5)$ , Score is {VILA score 5}
	Please propose new region $(x, y, w)$ ; Score is high as much as possible.
<b>Output</b>	$(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{w})$

**Table 7:** VLM prompt used for aspect ratio aware cropping. The goal is to achieve coordinates of the crop  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{w})$ . In the initial prompt, we use ten in-context (ICL) examples for image cropping. We also accumulate five crops because this task supports one crop per one image. Using five crops for our task, the format of image  $i$ ’s crop is defined as  $(x^i, y^i, w^i)$ . Intermediate results of initial prompt are coordinates of five crops. Subsequently, the crop is iteratively refined by accumulating the context into prompts, using refinement prompt. Likewise, {ViLAscore} is measured with the aesthetic scorer.



**Fig. 13:** Visualization of iterative crop refinement for free-form cropping. Yellow bounding box (left column) represents the ground truth and the blue bounding boxes (from the second to the last column) illustrate predictions through iterative refinement. Notably, with each iteration, the VILA [17] score increases, indicating improved aesthetics.

## 8 More Results

We added more uncurated free-form cropping examples in Fig. 18.

## 9 Limitation


Similar to other in-context learning techniques, the effectiveness of Cropper relies on the quality of the prompt retrieval database. Future studies should aim to enhance model performance using unsupervised data. Additionally, like other in-context learning methods, the VLM lacks precise context comprehension and may misinterpret task schemas. As the context length increases, the ability to process and understand long contexts becomes crucial. Further research to enhance the foundational vision-language model will greatly benefit Cropper.

“Localize the aesthetic part of the image. (x1,y1,x2,y2) represents the region. x1 and x2 are the left and right most positions, normalized into 0 to 1, where 0 is the left and 1 is the right. y1 and y2 are the top and bottom positions, normalized into 0 to 1 where 0 is the top and 1 is the bottom. We provide several images here.”




**Fig. 14:** Example of initial prompt for subject-aware cropping.

“Find visually appealing crop. Each region is represented by (x,y,w). x is the left most position. y is the top position. w is the width.”



**Fig. 15:** Example of initial prompt for aspect ratio-aware cropping (16:9).



To find visually pleasing crops of this image, consider applying the rule of thirds, which involves dividing the image into nine equal segments by two equally spaced horizontal lines and two equally spaced vertical lines. Then, you position the important compositional elements along these lines or their intersections. For this image, some crops that might be visually pleasing are:

A wide crop that keeps the boat and the sun's reflection on the water in alignment with the rule of thirds' lines or intersections.

A tighter crop focusing on the boat and the flag, positioning them along one of the vertical lines, which can give the image a sense of direction and movement.

A vertical crop that captures the reflection of the sun in the water, creating a pathway leading to the boat.

You can also look for symmetry, leading lines, or framing elements to create other crops that might be appealing to the eye. Would you like me to create a crop using one of these suggestions?

“Yes.”



I've created a cropped version of the image focusing on the boat and the sun's reflection along the horizontal line of thirds, which should be visually pleasing. You can view and download the cropped image using the link below:



**Fig. 16:** Diagram of chain-of-thoughts process using GPT-4V [1] which is used for visual comparison of subject-aware cropping in the main paper. The process automatically identifies the main object denoted as focal points. Despite their strong reasoning ability regarding aesthetics, the crop output is far from visual appealing by missing the main object, a boat.



“Create a new path for image post-processing by combining adjustments in +contrast,+saturation,+brightness,-contrast,-saturation,-brightness.”




Fig. 17: Example of prompts for color enhancement.

