
SELENOVLM: GROUNDED LUNAR GEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION AND THE LIMITS OF GENERATED CRATER-CHRONOLOGY AGES

A PREPRINT

• Tom Sander, • Kay Wohlfarth, • Christian Wöhler

Image Analysis Group
TU Dortmund University
44227 Dortmund, Germany
`{firstname.lastname}@tu-dortmund.de`

July 29, 2026

Abstract

Geological interpretation, the step from co-registered remote-sensing data to statements about units, processes, and ages, does not scale by hand, and the interpretive layer of the Moon still rests in large part on maps compiled five decades ago. Vision-language models produce interpretive prose on request, but their statements are not dependably tied to the scene, and in a scientific setting an unverifiable interpretation is worse than none. We therefore treat grounding as a property to be measured, not asserted. To this end, we present SelenoVLM, which couples a frozen multimodal masked autoencoder, pretrained self-supervised over five co-registered global lunar mosaics, to a LoRA-adapted 7B language model through a lightweight trainable bridge, and which is trained to write geological interpretations in the register of published mare-basalt chronology studies, grounded by retrieval over the source literature. The architecture is deliberately standard. The supervision targets are not. Distilled interpretive prose is prepended with deterministic, tile-specific facts computed from the rasters, which makes the targets unreproducible without reading the tile. Evaluated on a spatially disjoint test split with closed-book age scoring, the produced text proves causally tile-grounded. Swapping the tile’s visual input alters 52% of the target tokens, the mapped geologic unit is named on 85.8% of held-out tiles, and stated-fact fidelity exceeds instructed open baselines of 24B to 27B parameters by a factor of 2.2 to 5 under an identical protocol. The same measurement discipline then exposes where grounding ends. Age emission is learned reliably, with ages stated on 73% of mare tiles and a false-age rate of 1.5% on highlands, yet the stated age values regress to the global mare prior under every target design we tested, and no generation model beats a constant-age baseline. A probe battery localizes the failure. The dating signal is present in the frozen visual latent and still present after the resampler bottleneck, whereas the generation channel extracts none of it. The failure sits in the language extraction pathway, not in the representation. In the deployed open-book mode, in contrast, the retriever supplies the published dated record and the model integrates it faithfully. The stated age matches the injected record on 91.6% of tiles, rewriting the record moves the stated age with slope 0.711, and deployed age accuracy is bounded by retrieval quality rather than by the model. We conclude that target design governs what a grounded planetary vision-language model states and where it remains silent, whereas numeric crater-chronology ages should be estimated by decoupled heads reading the same representations, or supplied through retrieval where published records exist, rather than generated as text.




Figure 1: The interpretation workflow this work targets. (A) In established practice a geologist studies the co-registered observations and writes the geological interpretation, so coverage is limited by expert time. (B) In this work a vision-language model drafts the interpretation from the same observations. Each stated fact is checked against the underlying rasters, and the expert verifies rather than transcribes.

Keywords multimodal learning · vision-language models · lunar geology · crater chronology · grounded generation

1 Introduction

Geological maps represent not the appearance of a planetary surface, but its formative history. These maps document the ages of geological units, their stratigraphic relationships, and the processes responsible for their formation. For the Moon, the prevailing interpretive framework remains largely based on Apollo-era photogeology, produced manually. The current authoritative resource, the Unified Geologic Map of the Moon [Fortezzo et al., 2020], integrates quadrangle maps compiled approximately fifty years ago, while crater-count chronologies that provide absolute age constraints [Neukum et al., 2001, Hiesinger et al., 2011] are available only where experts have conducted measurements. Advances in global imaging, altimetry, and spectroscopy have surpassed the capabilities of this interpretive layer, and manual interpretation does not scale to them.

To date, machine learning has automated the perceptual aspects of planetary geological analysis. Crater catalogs are extracted from imagery and topography [Silburt et al., 2019], terrain and unit boundaries are segmented [Kuang et al., 2022], and brief captions are generated for planetary scenes [Qiu et al., 2020]. However, these outputs provide labels rather than substantive interpretation. In contrast, large vision-language models can generate fluent interpretive prose, but their statements are not consistently grounded in the specific visual data, which is unacceptable in scientific contexts. Grounding must therefore be empirically measured rather than assumed, requiring causal validation (whether the text depends on the specific tile), factual accuracy (whether stated quantities correspond to the raster data), and clear delineation of which content is derived from visual input versus prior knowledge.

To address these challenges, we develop SelenoVLM, a standard architecture trained on a deliberately unconventional supervision signal. We pretrain a multimodal masked autoencoder self-supervised on co-registered global lunar mosaics, comprising imagery, elevation, geologic maps, spectral ratios, and positional text. We freeze this encoder and couple it to a LoRA-adapted [Hu et al., 2022] 7B language model through a Perceiver resampler [Jaegle et al., 2021] and gated cross-attention [Alayrac et al., 2022]. The model is trained to write geological interpretations in the style of Hiesinger’s mare-basalt studies [Hiesinger et al., 2011], grounded through retrieval over his published results, the unit legend descriptions, the book "New views of the moon 2" [Neal et al., 2023], and the IAU Gazetteer of Planetary Nomenclature¹ [IAU/USGS, 2026]. The critical design choice concerns the training targets. Distilled prose is preceded by deterministic, tile-specific numeric facts computed from the rasters (Sec. 4.5), so that no target can be reproduced without reading the tile. Prompts and targets carry no coordinates, which closes the coordinate shortcut. The evaluation protocol enforces the same discipline through a spatially disjoint block split, closed-book age scoring with withheld location ages, quantization-matched fact tolerances, and a constant-prior baseline for every age comparison.

The results show that target design alone suffices to make the model verifiably grounded to specific tiles, and that the same measurement discipline delineates precisely where this grounding ends. When the visual input tile is replaced with another, 52% of the generated target tokens change. The correct geologic unit is identified on 85.8% of held-out tiles, and the fidelity of stated facts surpasses that of instructed open

¹<https://planetarynames.wr.usgs.gov>

vision-language baselines of 24B to 27B parameters by a factor of 2.2 to 5 under an identical protocol. The model reports ages for 73% of mare tiles, remains almost silent on highlands (false-age rate 1.5%), and employs the appropriate epoch terminology. However, the model does not extract age values from the visual data. Under every target design tested, the generated numeric ages regress toward the global mare prior, and no generative model outperforms a constant-age baseline, although a leave-unit-out probe recovers a dating signal from the frozen visual latent. The limitation resides in the language extraction process rather than in the visual representation. In the deployed open-book mode, in contrast, the model integrates retrieved published ages faithfully and causally, so the missing values are supplied by retrieval wherever a correct dated record covers the tile (Sec. 7.7).

This dissociation between grounded behaviour and grounded values constitutes the central finding of this study. It defines the capabilities and limitations of supervised target design for scientific vision-language systems, specifically enabling verifiable descriptive content, calibrated output behaviour, and disciplined silence, but not accurate numeric estimation through free-text generation. These conclusions are supported by causal evidence rather than anecdotal observations. The following sections review related work (Sec. 2), describe the data and the two-stage system (Secs. 3 and 4), specify the evaluation protocol (Sec. 5), characterize the vision tower independently (Sec. 6), evaluate SelenoVLM within this measurement framework (Sec. 7), and discuss the broader implications and limitations of the approach (Sec. 8).

2 Related Works

Lunar geology has long relied on painstaking manual mapping and crater counting, culminating in the interpretive framework we use today. The most widely accepted global product (the USGS Unified Geologic Map of the Moon [Fortezzo et al., 2020]) integrates Apollo-era 1:5,000,000 quadrangle maps. Their stratigraphic logic, established through nearside photogeologic mapping [Wilhelms and McCauley, 1971] and formalized in the time-stratigraphic systems of lunar history [Stöffler and Ryder, 2001], underpins our current understanding. Absolute ages for mare units rest on crater size-frequency distribution (CSFD) measurements calibrated against radiometrically dated Apollo and Luna samples [Neukum, 1984, Neukum et al., 2001, Tanaka and Hartmann, 2012], a program that Hiesinger and colleagues have extended across the nearside maria over more than two decades [Hiesinger et al., 2000, 2003, 2010, 2011, 2023]. These chronologies are the gold standard we validate against, but they are hand-made, spatially uneven, and in places decades old. They encode interpretation as static map units and tables rather than as a queryable, continuously updatable layer, and producing them does not scale to the global, high-resolution coverage that modern instruments now provide.

Machine learning has begun to automate the perceptual steps of planetary geology. Convolutional networks detect and measure impact craters directly from imagery and topography. The DeepMoon model, for instance, recovers crater catalogs from lunar digital elevation data and transfers to Mercury [Silburt et al., 2019], an approach since scaled to global multimodal crater catalogs [La Grassa et al., 2025] and to a global boulder map from LRO NAC imagery [Aussel et al., 2025], while semantic-segmentation approaches delineate terrain and geologic units for rover navigation and mapping [Kuang et al., 2022]. More recently, an open-vocabulary detector built on a vision-language backbone has been fine-tuned to localize craters in high-resolution orbital imagery for landing-site assessment [Bauer et al., 2026]. Captioning systems such as SCOTI even attach short textual labels to Martian terrain to prioritize downlink [Qiu et al., 2020]. Each of these produces a perceptual product and stops there, whether a crater count, a label raster, or a brief caption. None of these systems reasons from the surface to its geoscientific interpretation, that is, to the inferred ages, the stratigraphy, and the formation history in which the actual science resides.

Recent advances in self-supervised masked modeling have shaped the learning of visual representations for planetary data. Masked autoencoders reconstruct missing image patches to learn transferable features [He et al., 2022], extended to multi-modal data by MultiMAE [Bachmann et al., 2022] and generalized by the 4M framework for any-to-any prediction across modalities [Mizrahi et al., 2023, Bachmann et al., 2024], resting on discrete tokenization such as VQ-VAE [Van Den Oord et al., 2017] and finite-scalar quantization [Mentzer et al., 2024]. Prior work has applied this multimodal paradigm to lunar data, reconstructing imagery, topography, and albedo [Sander et al., 2026]. The focus of these methods remains perceptual reconstruction rather than language-based geological interpretation.

A parallel effort has produced remote-sensing foundation models for Earth observation. SatMAE and ScaleMAE adapt masked autoencoding to the temporal, multispectral, and multiscale structure of satellite imagery [Cong et al., 2022, Reed et al., 2023], and large pretrained backbones such as Prithvi and Clay, together with multimodal variants [Nedungadi et al., 2024, Jakubik et al., 2025], serve as general feature extractors

for downstream tasks [Szwarcman et al., 2024, Philanthropic]. These models are optimized for perceptual tasks on terrestrial sensors, producing embeddings or label maps rather than natural-language geological interpretation, and none targets a planetary body or its published geological record.

On the vision-language side, Frozen demonstrated the alignment of vision encoders with frozen language models for few-shot multimodal tasks [Tsimpoukelli et al., 2021], Flamingo introduced gated cross-attention and Perceiver resampling to handle variable numbers of visual tokens [Alayrac et al., 2022, Jaegle et al., 2021], BLIP-2 and LLaVA established query-based bridging and visual instruction tuning [Li et al., 2023, Liu et al., 2023], and parameter-efficient adapters such as LoRA facilitate the language-model adaptation [Hu et al., 2022]. However, these methods usually rely on general web image-text data and lack mechanisms to ensure that the generated language is grounded in authoritative scientific sources.

A major challenge identified in the generative interpretation literature is the "faithfulness gap," referring to the risk that generated outputs may not be traceable to authoritative sources. Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) has been proposed as a solution, conditioning language models on retrieved documents to enable attribution of generated content to specific external corpora [Lewis et al., 2020]. This approach tackles the persistent problem of hallucination in generative models [Maynez et al., 2020] and builds on methods that measure the attribution of statements to identifiable sources [Rashkin et al., 2023]. However, existing studies in this area have focused almost exclusively on general-domain text and open-domain question answering, with limited or no application to the task of grounding geological interpretation in the primary planetary science literature.

Several recent systems relevant to geological interpretation are remote-sensing vision-language models. For example, RemoteCLIP, GeoChat, RSGPT, and EarthGPT integrate visual encoders with language models to enable applications such as image captioning, visual question answering, and grounded dialogue over aerial and satellite imagery [Liu et al., 2024, Kuckreja et al., 2024, Hu et al., 2025, Zhang et al., 2024]. Extensions of these systems have introduced retrieval mechanisms and agentic reasoning, supporting geological applications such as lithology recognition and mineral exploration [Chen et al., 2025, Yu et al., 2025]. However, these models predominantly target terrestrial data and typically produce general scene descriptions. Even those oriented towards geology focus on surface material recognition, rather than reconstructing units' ages, stratigraphy, or formation histories, and none provide outputs grounded in a published, citable geological literature. Closest to our setting, LLaVA-LE adapts a LLaVA backbone to lunar imagery using model-written captions conditioned on gravity and slope rasters [Inal et al., 2026]. Its evaluation relies on language-model judges that score responses against caption-derived references without access to the image. Grounding is therefore asserted by the supervision and the protocol rather than measured. Neither the causal dependence of the text on the tile nor the faithfulness of stated quantities to the rasters is tested, and crater-chronology ages are not addressed. The task also differs from ours. LLaVA-LE answers concise questions about single-band panchromatic patches, whereas we target paragraph-length geological interpretation over co-registered multimodal tiles, designed so that the stated content can be verified against the input data. Since the model weights from Inal et al. [2026] are not released, a comparison under a shared evaluation protocol is not possible.

To date, no existing system produces natural-language geological interpretation that is grounded in the published scientific record and whose grounding is itself measured. The present work contributes such a measurement protocol, together with the delimitation it yields. Target design makes descriptive and stratigraphic content verifiably tile-grounded, whereas numeric crater-chronology ages are not recovered through generation, although the visual representation contains the dating signal.

3 Data and Preprocessing

This section outlines the datasets, the preprocessing pipeline, and the encoding and splitting strategies used to preserve data integrity during both training and evaluation. The preprocessing enforces spatial consistency across modalities, so that every tile carries co-registered evidence from all rasters. Figure 2 provides an overview of the input modalities, while Table 1 summarizes all raster and text modalities used.

3.1 Data sources

All modalities are derived from globally co-registered Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter (LRO) [Robinson et al., 2010, Humm et al., 2015] products and ancillary datasets. These datasets are resampled to a unified equirectangular grid at 100 m/pixel to maintain consistent spatial resolution and enable pixel-level fusion. The dataset includes a panchromatic image (WAC) [Wagner et al., 2015], elevation data (GLD100) [Scholten et al., 2012], a Clementine UVVIS color-ratio composite (Clementine) [Eliason et al., 1999, Hare et al., 2008],




Figure 2: Overview of the input modalities. All raster products are co-registered at 100 m/pixel. The text modalities are derived from per-tile coordinates and from weakly supervised captions.

Modality	Type	Source / derivation
WAC	Image (1-ch)	LROC Wide-Angle Camera global mosaic, 100 m, June 2013 [Speyerer et al., 2011, Wagner et al., 2015]
Elevation (GLD100)	Image (1-ch)	LRO/LOLA-derived digital elevation model (eight equatorial PDS tiles, stitched) [Scholten et al., 2012]
Clementine	Image (3-ch)	Clementine UVVIS colour-ratio composite, warped to ULCN 2005 [Eliason et al., 1999, Hare et al., 2008]
Geomap	Segmentation (50)	Unified lunar geological map with categorical legend [Fortezzo et al., 2020]
POS	Text	Per-tile geographic coordinates
Primary Units	Text	Caption section
Dominant Processes	Text	Caption section
Stratigraphy	Text	Caption section
Interpretation	Text	Caption section

Table 1: Modalities used in this work. All raster products are co-registered at 100 m/pixel. The text modalities are derived from per-tile coordinates and from weakly supervised captions (Section 3.3).

segmentation data (geomap) [Fortezzo et al., 2020], and five text modalities, as summarized in Table 1. Although the framework can be extended to incorporate additional co-registered rasters, such as the Moon Mineralogy Mapper (M³) hyperspectral cube [Green et al., 2011], only the modalities listed in Table 1 are utilized in this study.

3.2 Tiling and Data Splitting

Following alignment, the global mosaics are partitioned into square tiles with side length $S = 512$ pixels. Tiles are extracted using a sliding window (stride $\tau = 128$ pixels), producing spatially overlapping samples and thereby increasing the dataset size. Each tile spans approximately 51.2 km east-west at the equator and 67.4 km north-south, since the mosaic grid is anisotropic (303.2 and 230.3 pixels per degree of longitude and latitude, respectively). While such overlap improves the model’s ability to detect spatial variation, it calls for careful management to prevent information leakage. To reduce this, a spatially disjoint block split is implemented instead of randomized partitioning [Roberts et al., 2017]. This approach removes adjacency between tiles in different partitions, thereby preventing inflated performance estimates.

When elevation data are included, all modalities are cropped to the valid range of $[-79^\circ, 79^\circ]$ latitude. Otherwise, the full $[-90^\circ, 90^\circ]$ extent is retained. Pixel-to-geographic coordinate mappings are formed using a fixed pixel-per-degree scaling, supporting precise georeferencing of each tile for subsequent lunar surface localization.

The global grid is subdivided into macro-blocks, each deterministically assigned to one partition, and only tiles fully contained within a single partition are retained, which ensures zero pixel overlap between partitions. Applied within the captioned region used in this study, the split diminishes spatial autocorrelation and yields 169,784 partitioned tiles, of which 132,462 (78.0%) form the training, 21,714 (12.8%) the validation, and

15,608 (9.2%) the test partition. The block size, the hash-based assignment, and the boundary handling are given in Appendix A.1.

In addition to its raster form, the geological map is converted from its RGB legend into per-pixel unit labels spanning 50 units, including background (Appendix A.1). The legend provides abbreviations and descriptions for each unit, which later form part of the retrieval corpus (see Section 4).

3.3 Text modalities

Each tile is annotated with its central latitude and longitude, calculated using the pixel-to-coordinate transformation and formatted as a degrees-minutes-seconds string (`long=...`, `lat=...`). This annotation serves as the POS text modality.

In the absence of large-scale expert annotation, textual supervision is provided through machine-generated pseudo-labels. A vision-capable language model (Gemma-3) [Gemma Team et al., 2025] generates structured descriptions for each captioned tile, divided into the four sections Primary Units (PU), Dominant Processes (DP), Stratigraphy (Relative Timing) (strat), and Interpretation Justification (IJ). Section labels are standardized, and each section is extracted as an independent text modality, permitting supervision via four distinct text targets. As these weak, synthetic labels are prone to noise and occasional hallucination, retrieval-grounded distillation is applied (see Section 4). Tiles lacking captions inherit the caption from the spatially nearest annotated tile, determined by pixel-coordinate Euclidean distance. We note that this inheritance affects only training-time text. At evaluation, every stated fact is scored against the held-out tile’s own rasters and every age against the withheld dated record (Section 5.3), so no annotation from another tile enters the metrics.

4 Methodology

In the following, we give an overview of the approach, describe the modality tokenization, and present Stage A, the multimodal masked pre-training of the vision foundation, and Stage B, the grounded interpretation model (SelenoVLM). Section 4.5 then specifies the construction of the supervision targets, which carries the main methodological weight of this work.

4.1 Overview

The methodology consists of a two-stage process, as depicted in Figure 3. The initial stage (Section 4.3) uses a multimodal masked autoencoder (MAE) based on the 4M architecture [Mizrahi et al., 2023] for self-supervised vision representation learning. Each co-registered lunar modality is tokenized independently, and a unified encoder-decoder transformer is trained to reconstruct masked tokens from the visible tokens of the other modalities. In the subsequent stage (Section 4.4), the pre-trained and frozen MAE encoder serves as a vision tower and is integrated with a large language model via a lightweight, trainable bridge, forming a vision-language model (SelenoVLM) that generates natural-language geological interpretations grounded in retrieved domain literature. We note that only the second stage uses the weakly supervised textual targets described in Section 3.3. The MAE is trained once and then applied read-only during the second stage.

4.2 Modality tokenization

All modalities are mapped to discrete token sequences so that a single transformer can operate on a homogeneous stream. Each raster modality (WAC, elevation, Clementine, and the geologic map) is tokenized by its own pre-trained and subsequently frozen tokenizer, a Vision Transformer encoder [Sharir et al., 2021] whose 16×16 grid of patch embeddings is discretized by finite scalar quantization (FSQ) [Mentzer et al., 2024], with a conditional diffusion decoder [Ho et al., 2020] reconstructing the raster from the quantized codes.

The coordinate prompt (POS) and the four weakly supervised caption fields (Section 3.3) are tokenized with modality-specific WordPiece vocabularies [Schuster and Nakajima 2012], [Wu et al. 2016], POS at the character level so that arbitrary coordinates are representable digit-by-digit, and the caption fields at the word level with the section header encoded as a fixed prefix. The codebook constructions, the vocabulary sizes, and tokenized examples are given in Appendix A.2.




Figure 3: Overview of the proposed two-stage methodology. **(A) Multimodal-masked pre-training.** Co-registered remote-sensing modalities, comprising WAC imagery, DEM elevation, the Clementine colour-ratio composite (CLEM), the legacy geological map (GEO), and geographic position (POS), are discretized by frozen tokenizers (FSQ for the raster modalities, WordPiece for position) and concatenated into a single token stream. A unified masking step then hides a random subset of tokens, with per-modality budgets drawn from a Dirichlet distribution (crossed cells denote masked tokens), and a Transformer encoder-decoder is trained to reconstruct the held-out tokens under a per-modality cross-entropy loss, yielding a self-supervised vision foundation model. **(B) Grounded interpretation (SelenoVLM).** Input tiles are embedded by the frozen pre-trained encoder, compressed by a Perceiver resampler to a fixed set of visual tokens, and injected into a frozen Qwen-2.5-7B language model through trainable gated cross-attention and LoRA adapters. A retrieval module (Hiesinger Retriever) supplies cited context from the published literature, grounding the generated interpretation. The model is supervised to produce free-text geological paragraphs from distilled prose targets (training only, Sec. 4.5). The lower block shows one decoder layer in detail, frozen self-attention followed by trainable gated cross-attention. Throughout, marks frozen components and marks trainable ones.

4.3 Stage A: Multimodal masked pre-training

At each training step, all tokenized modalities are concatenated into a single input stream, which is split into encoder (visible) and decoder (target) sets through a unified masking strategy [Bachmann et al., 2022]. Per-modality token budgets are sampled from a mixture of Dirichlet distributions under fixed total encoder and decoder budgets (Table 10). Raster modalities use random masking following the MAE approach [He et al., 2022], while text modalities employ span masking guided by a cosine keep-probability schedule, with sentinel tokens marking masked regions. Moreover, with a fixed probability, one raster modality is entirely omitted from the encoder and used as a full decoder target. This modality dropout introduces cross-modal reconstruction explicitly into the training distribution. Without this mechanism, the model would rarely encounter fully withheld modalities at inference, as Dirichlet sampling almost never yields such cases.

The architecture is a standard transformer encoder-decoder with per-modality embedding tables, positional encodings, and output heads over a shared embedding space. The encoder processes the visible tokens, and the decoder attends to the target slots through cross-attention with the encoder output, predicting raster targets block-parallel and text targets under a causal mask. Width, depth, and head counts are listed in Table 10.

The training objective is the average per-token cross-entropy loss between the predicted and ground-truth tokens, computed separately for each modality. For inference, raster targets are generated by MaskGIT-style iterative parallel decoding [Chang et al., 2022], while text targets are produced by greedy autoregressive sampling.

4.4 Stage B: Grounded interpretation (SelenoVLM)

In the second stage, language generation capabilities are integrated with the frozen vision foundation through a compact, trainable bridge, following the approach established by Flamingo [Alayrac et al., 2022].

For each tile, all modalities are provided to the pre-trained MAE encoder as complete (unmasked) inputs, producing a latent sequence and a corresponding key-padding mask. The MAE parameters remain frozen and are used in a read-only manner. The weakly supervised structured captions are not used directly as targets in this stage.

To bridge the vision and language components, a Perceiver resampler [Jaegle et al., 2021] compresses the variable-length encoder output into a fixed set of $K = 64$ learned query tokens, which are projected to the hidden width of the language model, with padded positions excluded through the key-padding mask. These visual tokens are injected into a pre-trained Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct decoder [Yang et al., 2024] via gated cross-attention blocks placed before each transformer layer, whose tanh gates are initialized to zero so that the base language model’s behaviour is replicated until they are trained. The language model is further adapted with low-rank adapters (LoRA [Hu et al., 2022]) applied to the attention and feed-forward projections, while the base model weights remain unchanged. Consequently, only the resampler, the gated cross-attention modules, the LoRA adapters, and the auxiliary heads described below are updated during training.

To ensure the produced text incorporates retrieved factual information rather than merely reproducing synthetic bullet-point captions, the supervised targets are pre-distilled offline. For each captioned tile, a language model (Gemma-3-27B) rewrites the four structured caption fields and retrieved domain context into an integrated natural-language paragraph, which is stored as a per-tile sidecar and retrieved at training time by position (Section 4.5). Domain context is supplied by a retriever operating over a corpus of Hiesinger geological results [Hiesinger et al., 2000, 2010, 2011, 2023], the book "New views of the moon 2" [Neal et al., 2023], the geological-map unit descriptions, and the named features of the IAU gazetteer [IAU/USGS, 2026]. During both training and inference, the retriever parses tile coordinates and returns a concise, referenced context block with the nearest dated unit within an 8° geographic gate, the relevant map-unit description, and the most similar literature excerpts, which is then incorporated into the prompt. As the distilled targets already integrate the retrieved facts, the retrieval process provides a substantive gradient signal during training. The corpus composition and indexing are detailed in Appendix A.4.

Model training uses a standard language modeling cross-entropy loss, computed solely on the answer tokens, with the system prompt and retrieved context excluded from the loss. The deterministic fact and age tokens of Section 4.5 are upweighted sixfold in this loss. Two auxiliary objectives act on the mean-pooled resampler output during training only. A unit head (weight 1.0) classifies the 50 geologic-map units, which grounds the resampler categorically without teacher forcing, and a vision-consistency contrastive loss (weight 0.5, margin 1.0) requires the answer to score better under its own tile’s visual tokens than under those of another tile. Later variants additionally train a diagnostic age regression head on the same pooled vector, whose behaviour is analysed in Section 7.6. Detailed optimization settings are provided in Appendix A.

4.5 Target construction

The supervision targets, not the architecture, carry the grounding claim of this paper, so we state their construction in full. Each target consists of a deterministic opener with tile-specific numeric facts, followed on mare tiles by one age sentence, and then the distilled interpretive paragraph of Section 4.4. The governing rule is that a target must not be reproducible without reading the tile.

The served design (SelenoVLM_{age}) opens every target with four facts computed from the rasters. Albedo is the tile mean of the normalized WAC reflectance, stated to two decimals. Relief is the spread between the 2nd and the 98th percentile of the tile’s elevation values, which is insensitive to single outlier pixels, rounded to the nearest 100 m. Roughness is the standard deviation of the elevation, rounded to the nearest 25 m. The spectral fact is the tile mean of the Clementine 415/750 ratio, stated to two decimals. Each opener is phrased through one of four rotated sentence scaffolds, so that no single surface string can be memorized, and every scaffold carries an ordinal quintile descriptor (such as "very dark") together with the rounded number. The number is the load-bearing element. With ordinal wording alone, only 35% of intra-mare targets remained

distinct. The rounded numbers at the served granularity raise this fraction to 44%, and coarsening the metre bins to 250 m and 50 m collapses it to 13%, which motivated keeping the fine bins (a second, terrain-adaptive coarsening is falsified in Section 7.3). The scoring tolerances of Section 5.3 are matched to this granularity and enforced identically between the target builder and the scorer.

Age language is gated on the mapped geology. A tile receives an age sentence only if at least half of its geologic-map pixels belong to mare units, the same criterion by which the evaluation partitions tiles into mare and highland. If the nearest dated mare unit lies within 8° great-circle distance, the sentence states that unit’s published crater-count model age in Ga, again through rotated scaffolds. Beyond this gate the sentence names only the epoch. Every mare tile hence carries age language in one of the two forms, and highland tiles carry none, which is the behaviour the emission metrics of Section 7.4 measure.

The crater-chronology variant (SelenoVLM_{chrono}, Section 7.5) extends this design as far as we could push it on the target side. Every target opens additionally with the tile’s crater density from the Robbins database [Robbins, 2019], counted for craters of at least 1 km diameter per 1000 km² and quantized in steps of 1 below a density of 25 and steps of 5 above. This density is the quantity on which crater chronology rests, related to the absolute model age through the lunar chronology function of Neukum et al. [2001] (Appendix A.4). Mare tiles inside a dated mapped polygon state that unit’s published age, determined by a point-in-polygon test on the full mapped geometry. This test replaces the nearest-centroid label, which deviates from the polygon age by 0.19 Ga on average even for tiles inside a polygon. Mare tiles outside every dated polygon state an age fitted from their own measured crater density through an isotonic regression trained on the in-polygon tiles, which calibrates the raw tile densities to the published record (Appendix A.4), so that all age sentences of this design are chronology-consistent with one another.

The assembled targets are stored per tile (174,035 rows for the served design) and retrieved by nearest position within a 3° gate, so a held-out tile is teacher-forced against its own target and never against a neighbour’s. Prompts and targets carry no coordinates at any point. In an early bridge run with raw coordinates in the prompt, the language model learned a coordinate-to-geology shortcut and the cross-attention gates remained near zero, hence location enters only internally through the retriever.

5 Evaluation protocol

Grounding is claimed as a measured property in this paper, so the measurement itself must be specified before any result is reported. In the following, we define the test split, the two evaluation regimes of the vision tower, and the metric groups under which SelenoVLM is scored. All later sections reuse these definitions unchanged.

5.1 Test split and general discipline

All quantitative claims in this paper are computed on the test split of a geographic block split, which is spatially disjoint from the training data. The vision tower is scored on 240 seeded tiles of this split, and the bridge on $n = 500$ tiles. Paired comparisons, that is, the instructed-baseline comparison and the target-design ablation, use an identical seeded subset of $n = 120$ tiles so that per-tile differences are meaningful. Targets and closed-book prompts carry no coordinates at any point. The open-book context of Sec. 7.7 is the one exception, since a retrieved record quotes the location of its published unit.

Where we report uncertainty, we use 95% bootstrap confidence intervals over the evaluation tiles (10,000 resamples). Adjacent tiles within a partition overlap through the sliding window, so the scored tiles are spatially autocorrelated. The 500 scored tiles fall into 34 distinct macro-blocks, and we therefore resample entire macro-blocks (a cluster bootstrap) rather than individual tiles. The cluster intervals are materially wider than their naive per-tile counterparts, and every significance statement in this paper rests on the cluster intervals.

5.2 Vision-tower metrics

The frozen MAE is evaluated in two regimes. In the cross-modal generation regime, the target modality is fully withheld from the encoder and regenerated from all remaining modalities, with MaskGIT-style [Chang et al., 2022] iterative decoding for raster and segmentation targets and greedy autoregressive decoding for text. In the masked-reconstruction regime, training-style Dirichlet span masking is applied and token metrics are computed on the masked target positions only. Fidelity is measured in task space, with PSNR and SSIM for rasters [Wang et al., 2004], pixel accuracy and mIoU for the geologic map, BLEU-4 [Papineni et al., 2002] and ROUGE-L [Lin, 2004, Ganesan, 2018] for the caption sections, and parse rate together with great-circle

error for position. Teacher-forced top-1 accuracy and perplexity are additionally reported as token-level calibration, with the uniform floor of each vocabulary as the chance reference.

5.3 SelenoVLM metrics

Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the set of held-out tiles. For a tile $t \in \mathcal{T}$, let v_t be its visual tokens, y_t the free-running generation, and $y_t^* = (y_{t,1}^*, \dots, y_{t,L_t}^*)$ the teacher-forced target sequence. The bridge is scored in five metric groups, mirroring the blocks of Table 3.

The first group measures causal grounding through interventions on the visual input, in the spirit of decision-flip tests [Serrano and Smith, 2019] and modality-ablation analyses for multimodal models [Gat et al., 2021, Frank et al., 2021]. Writing $p_\theta(\cdot | y_{t,<i}^*, v)$ for the next-token distribution under visual input v , the tile-swap flip rate is the fraction of target positions whose argmax changes when the tile’s visual tokens are replaced by those of a different tile $t' \neq t$,

$$f_{\text{swap}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{1}{L_t} \sum_{i=1}^{L_t} \mathbf{1} \left[\arg \max_w p_\theta(w | y_{t,<i}^*, v_{t'}) \neq \arg \max_w p_\theta(w | y_{t,<i}^*, v_t) \right], \quad (1)$$

and the vision-removal flip rate f_{zero} is defined analogously with $v_{t'}$ replaced by zeroed visual latents. The relation between the two is diagnostic. A model that uses vision only in an on/off manner shows a large f_{zero} together with $f_{\text{swap}} \approx 0$, whereas a tile-grounded model must flip under both interventions. At the generation level, we report two metrics. The first is the mean token-set Jaccard distance [Jaccard, 1901, Levandowsky and Winter, 1971], defined as $1 - |W_t \cap W_t^0| / |W_t \cup W_t^0|$, which measures the difference between the word sets of paired generations with and without vision. The second is the unit naming, which is the fraction of tiles where y_t contains a content word from the mapped dominant unit’s legend description.

Grounding alone does not guarantee that the stated content is correct, so the second group scores it against the rasters. Every target opens with deterministic facts computed from the tile (Sec. 4.5). For each fact k (albedo, relief, roughness, 415/750 ratio), let $x_{t,k}$ be the raster-measured value, $q_k(x_{t,k})$ its quantization to the target granularity, and $\hat{x}_{t,k}$ the value parsed back out of y_t (absent facts are recorded as unstated). A stated fact counts as correct if

$$|\hat{x}_{t,k} - q_k(x_{t,k})| \leq \Delta_k, \quad (2)$$

where Δ_k is a fixed tolerance matched to the target granularity, that is, $\Delta = 0.03$ for albedo, 100 m for relief, 25 m for roughness, and 0.05 for the ratio, enforced identically between the target builder and the scorer. Stated-fact fidelity is the mean per-fact accuracy over the stated facts, and per-quantity accuracy and MAE are reported alongside the aggregate.

For ages, we separate the decision to state an age from the stated value. The stated age $\hat{a}_t = \text{median}\{a : "a \text{ Ga}" \in y_t\}$ is the median of all Ga-qualified numbers in the generation, which is insensitive to an isolated anomalous value, and it remains undefined if no age is mentioned. A tile counts as mare if at least half of its geologic-map pixels belong to mare units (Sec. 4.5), and as highland otherwise. Mare coverage is the fraction of mare tiles with $\hat{a}_t$ defined, and the highland false-positive rate is the same fraction over highland tiles, where no basalt age is defined and silence is the correct behaviour. For epoch scoring, an epoch map $E(a)$ assigns each age to the lunar epoch whose conventional model-age bounds [Stöffler and Ryder, 2001] contain it. A generation’s epoch is the named epoch word if one is present, otherwise $E(\hat{a}_t)$, and epoch accuracy is exact agreement with $E(a_t)$ for the reference age a_t . The adjacent relaxation accepts a distance of one epoch, since the epoch boundaries are themselves approximate.

The value metric $\hat{a}_t$ is evaluated independently. Unless a comparison is explicitly declared open book, all age evaluations are closed-book, that is, the dated reference record that indicates the tile’s location is omitted from the retrieved context, so any stated age must be inferred rather than copied. For tiles that state an age, we report the mean absolute error (MAE) $\frac{1}{n} \sum_t |\hat{a}_t - a_t|$ and the Spearman rank correlation. Where the scatter is analysed (Table 7), we additionally report the slope of the least-squares regression of the stated on the reference ages, which is one under perfect value extraction and zero for a constant predictor, and the bias, the signed mean error $\frac{1}{n} \sum_t (\hat{a}_t - a_t)$. The same definitions apply to the probe predictions of Sec. 7.6, with $\hat{a}_t$ taken as the probe output. Every age comparison keeps a constant-prior baseline visible, the constant predictor $\tilde{a} = \text{median}\{a_t\}$ scored on the identical tiles, which states the global mare prior everywhere. A model without visual age extraction matches this baseline, so claimed recovery skill must beat it rather than merely look small in absolute terms. We note that the constant-prior MAE differs numerically across tables, since it is recomputed on each analysis’s own held-out set, and it is always the fair within-table reference. Two ground-truth conventions appear in this paper. Centroid ages assign a tile the published age of the nearest

Table 2: Held-out evaluation of the stage-2 multimodal MAE on the spatially disjoint test split ($n = 240$ seeded tiles), before any language coupling. In the cross-modal regime, the target modality is fully withheld from the encoder and regenerated from the remaining modalities (MaskGIT for rasters, greedy autoregression for text). Fidelity is reported in task space because FSQ codes are degenerate (exact token agreement is near zero while decoded rasters remain faithful). Top-1 and perplexity are teacher-forced token calibration. Chance ppl is the uniform floor of each vocabulary. The reconstruction column uses training-style random masking. A high position error is the desired outcome. A single tile is not geolocatable, hence downstream grounding cannot be coordinate memorization.

Modality	Cross-modal generation	top-1 $\uparrow$	ppl $\downarrow$	chance ppl	recon top-1 $\uparrow$
WAC	PSNR 19.8 dB / SSIM 0.53	0.01	3091.1	6561	0.01
Elevation	PSNR 7.2 dB / SSIM 0.35	0.01	2392.5	6561	0.02
Clementine	PSNR 15.0 dB / SSIM 0.46	0.02	1129.7	15360	0.04
Geomap	pixel acc. 0.30 / mIoU 0.09	0.12	222.9	2916	0.67
Position	parse 0.96 / GC err. 2672 km	0.87	1.4	65	0.82
Units	BLEU-4 0.08 / ROUGE-L 0.15	0.93	1.2	295	0.80
Processes	BLEU-4 0.17 / ROUGE-L 0.29	0.90	1.4	841	0.80
Stratigraphy	BLEU-4 0.02 / ROUGE-L 0.11	0.79	2.1	3111	0.68
Interpretation	BLEU-4 0.04 / ROUGE-L 0.14	0.69	2.8	4176	0.63

dated unit within the 8° retrieval gate ($n = 500$), and polygon-accurate ages come from point-in-polygon tests on the full mapped geometry ($n = 93$). The two are never mixed within a comparison.

Sec. 7.7 additionally evaluates the deployed open-book mode, in which the retriever supplies its full context including the nearest dated record within the 8° gate. The injected centroid record is identical to the centroid ground truth, so agreement with it is circular by construction. We therefore report it as transfer fidelity, the mean absolute difference between the stated and the injected age together with the fraction of exact transfers (within 0.05 Ga), and never as age recovery. Non-circular open-book accuracy is scored against polygon ground truth only, where the injected record can disagree with the point-in-polygon age, and every open-book age comparison keeps two references visible, the constant prior and a retrieval oracle that scores the injected record itself against the polygon ground truth. Two evaluation-time interventions, a ± 0.5 Ga rewrite of the injected age and a swap to a different tile’s full context, together with a geo-suppressed control that removes only the dated record, make the integration claim causal rather than correlational. Their specification accompanies the results in Sec. 7.7.

The last group tracks degeneration in free-running generation. Distinct-1 [Li et al., 2016] is the mean ratio of unique to total tokens per generation, averaged over tiles rather than normalized over a whole corpus of generations as in the original definition, and the consecutive-repeat rate is the mean fraction of adjacent token pairs that are identical. We treat these statistics as a first-class selection axis, since offline repeat rates above a few percent turned into user-facing output collapse at later checkpoints.

We note that perplexity (ppl), token accuracy, and ROUGE against the distilled targets are fit diagnostics on circular supervision. They guide training but support no grounding claim, and no such claim in this paper rests on them.

6 Vision-Tower Results

Before making any claims regarding language-side performance, we first analyze the frozen vision tower independently, under the cross-modal generation and masked-reconstruction regimes of Sec. 5.2, summarized in Table 2 and Fig. 4. On the raster modalities, exact token agreement is near zero while the decoded rasters remain perceptually faithful, since many FSQ code assignments decode to perceptually equivalent rasters. We therefore assess raster fidelity in task space throughout.

Cross-modal raster prediction works where the physics allows it. The withheld WAC mosaic and the Clementine 415/750 composite are regenerated from the remaining modalities at the fidelities of Table 2, so the spectral basalt evidence on which the mare-age analysis relies is recoverable from appearance. Absolute elevation is not, since appearance constrains relief but not altitude, which we regard as a physical limit of the modality combination rather than a defect of the tower. Structure, in contrast, is largely predictable from co-registered context, while tile-specific wording is not. The caption sections gain 5.5 to 7.3 nats/token over




Figure 4: Per-modality predictability in one comparable unit, computed as the uniform-vocabulary NLL floor minus the measured token NLL (nats per token), with the target modality fully withheld (cross-modal) or partially masked as in training (reconstruction). Structured modalities (captions, geologic map) are largely recoverable from the co-registered context. Raster token identity is not, although decoded rasters remain perceptually faithful (Table 2).

the uniform floor in the cross-modal regime (Fig. 4), yet free-running BLEU-4 stays at or below 0.17 with no exact matches, and the shortfall is not repetition ($\text{distinct-1} \geq 0.96$). The tower reproduces the section format and the dominant regional content but not the tile-specific wording. The same circularity reappears at stage 3 and motivates the grounded openers in the targets (Sec. 7.3).

Finally, tiles are not geolocatable, which is the precondition for the grounding claims of Sec. 7. Asked to produce coordinates from imagery alone, the tower emits well-formed position strings (parse rate 0.96) whose mean great-circle error is 2672 km, within 2% of the random-pair expectation on the $\pm 79^\circ$ sphere (2729 km). A single 51×67 km tile therefore does not determine where it is, hence the tile-specific grounding measured in Sec. 7.1 cannot be coordinate memorization through the vision path.

7 SelenoVLM Results

All results in this section follow the protocol of Sec. 5, computed on the spatially disjoint test split with the metric groups of Sec. 5.3, and all age metrics are closed-book, with the declared exception of the open-book evaluation in Sec. 7.7. The vision tower they rest on is characterized in Sec. 6. In the following, we refer to the served bridge, whose targets attach an age sentence to every mare tile, as SelenoVLM_{age}, and to the variant retrained on the crater-chronology targets of Sec. 4.5 as SelenoVLM_{chrono}. Centroid ground truth is used in Table 3 and Fig. 8a, polygon-accurate ground truth in Table 7 and Fig. 8b.

The section follows the argument of the paper. We first establish that the generated prose is causally tile-grounded and that this grounding is a property of the target design (Secs. 7.1–7.3). We then show that age emission is a learnable target-side behaviour (Sec. 7.4), whereas age values regress to the global mare prior under every target design we tested (Sec. 7.5). We then localize the failure. The dating signal is present in the frozen visual representation but is lost on the way into text (Sec. 7.6). Finally, we show that the deployed open-book mode supplies through retrieval the values that vision does not (Sec. 7.7).

7.1 Causal vision grounding and stated-fact fidelity

Table 3 summarizes the held-out evaluation of SelenoVLM_{age} on $n = 500$ tiles, with 95% cluster-bootstrap intervals (Sec. 5.1) for the headline rates. The tile-swap flip rate (Sec. 5.3) reaches 0.52, against a vision-removal flip rate of 0.631. The proximity of the two rates is the important observation, since the on/off signature of Sec. 5.3, a large zero flip with a near-zero tile-swap flip, was exactly the failure mode of our

Table 3: Held-out evaluation of SelenoVLM_{age} on the spatially disjoint test split ($n = 500$ tiles). All age metrics are closed-book, i.e. the location’s dated reference is withheld from the prompt. Stated-fact tolerances are matched to the target quantization (± 0.03 albedo, ± 100 m relief, ± 25 m roughness, ± 0.05 ratio). Brackets give the 95% cluster-bootstrap confidence interval over the 34 macro-blocks of the test split (Sec. 5.1), shown again as a strip on a $[0, 1]$ axis with the dot at the point estimate. Rows without an interval are point estimates, and the age-value difference, which lies off this axis, is reported numerically only. The age-value block is computed on the 172 tiles with a stated age and a defined reference, and its nominal skill is analysed in Sec. 7.5 and Table 6.

	Metric	Value	95% CI
Vision grounding	tile-swap flip rate (shuffle) $\uparrow$	0.520	[0.481, 0.562]
	vision-removal flip rate (zero) $\uparrow$	0.631	[0.522, 0.740]
	names mapped geologic unit $\uparrow$	0.858	
	generation change, vision ablated $\uparrow$	0.824	
Stated-fact fidelity	overall	0.458	[0.400, 0.511]
	mare / highland	0.527 / 0.399	
	albedo acc. / MAE	0.516 / 0.043	
	415/750 ratio acc. / MAE	0.369 / 0.091	
Age emission	mare coverage $\uparrow$ ($n = 230$)	0.730	[0.597, 0.837]
	mare age MAE (Ga) $\downarrow$	0.426	
	highland false-positive rate $\downarrow$ ($n = 270$)	0.015	[0.000, 0.034]
	epoch accuracy / adjacent $\uparrow$	0.659 / 1.000	
Age-value skill	model MAE vs. constant-age baseline (Ga)	0.425 vs. 0.430	
	difference model – constant (Ga)	−0.005	[−0.022, +0.014]
	Spearman ρ (stated vs. reference)	0.295	
Degeneration	consecutive-repeat rate $\downarrow$	0.0039	
	distinct-1 $\uparrow$	0.780	

early bridges trained on near-identical mare prose targets. The served model, in contrast, produces text that depends on which tile it sees, not merely on whether it sees one.

The stated content is verifiable against the rasters. The model names the mapped geologic unit on 85.8% of tiles. Stated-fact fidelity (Sec. 5.3) is 0.458 overall, with a clear terrain split (0.527 on mare, 0.399 on highland tiles). The per-quantity view shows where the model reads well. Mean albedo is stated within ± 0.03 on 51.6% of tiles (MAE 0.043), the Clementine 415/750 ratio within ± 0.05 on 36.9% (MAE 0.091), whereas relief and roughness are harder (50% and 44.6%), with the errors concentrated on high-relief highland terrain. Generation quality remains stable at the served checkpoint (consecutive-repeat rate 0.004, distinct-1 0.78), the selection axis of Sec. 5.3.

Fig. 11 (Appendix B) illustrates this measured behaviour on a single held-out tile. The model receives the four co-registered rasters, no coordinates and no retrieval context, and answers a free-form age question. All four opener facts it states fall within one scoring tolerance of the raster-measured values, the dominant mapped unit is named, and the interpretation argues from superposition relations between the mapped units rather than from a template. We note that the stated age matches the published unit age on this tile. The example was selected for that match, and Sec. 7.5 shows that stated age values in general follow the mare prior. The answer also illustrates the residual risk. It names a distant satellite feature and appeals to crater statistics the model cannot have computed, exactly the unverifiable content that the faithfulness protocol is designed to expose, and the appendix caption flags both statements. A paired closed-book against open-book comparison on a second tile follows in Sec. 7.7 (Fig. 10).

7.2 Comparison with instructed open VLMs

Table 4 and Fig. 5 compare SelenoVLM_{age} against three instructed open (V)LMs of 24B to 27B parameters (gemma3:27b [Gemma Team et al., 2025], mistral-small3.2 [Liu et al., 2026], qwen3.5:27b [Qwen Team, 2026]) on an identical seeded subset of $n = 120$ held-out tiles, under the identical parser and scoring protocol. The baselines receive the same four co-registered rasters rendered as images, together with an explicit task instruction, and a prose-fallback parser ensures they are not penalized on output format. On this subset, SelenoVLM_{age} reaches a stated-fact fidelity of 0.494 against 0.187, 0.222, and 0.096, a margin of $2.2\times$ to

Table 4: Comparison against instructed open (V)LMs on identical held-out tiles, protocol, and scoring ($n = 120$). Baselines receive the four co-registered rasters rendered as images plus an explicit task instruction, and all age metrics are closed-book. Bold marks the best value per column. *Near-zero coverage, so the corresponding age cells are not comparable. [†]On the full centroid-GT set (Table 3) the served model nominally edges the constant baseline by 0.005 Ga, but the bootstrapped difference straddles zero and the leave-one-region-out control (Table 6) attributes the remainder to memorized regional structure, hence we score it as not beating the prior.

Model	Facts $\uparrow$	Albedo $\uparrow$	415/750 $\uparrow$	Unit naming $\uparrow$	Mare age cov. $\uparrow$	Highland FP $\downarrow$	Epoch acc. $\uparrow$	Beats const.?
SelenoVLM _{age} (served)	0.494	0.567	0.433	0.883	0.734	0.018	0.714	no [†]
gemma3:27b	0.187	0.320	0.065	0.733	0.750	0.643	0.632	no
mistral-small3.2	0.222	0.425	0.133	0.733	0.031*	0.054	0.267	no
qwen3.5:27b	0.096	0.077	0.081	0.783	0.062*	0.018	0.562	no




Figure 5: Instructed open (V)LM baselines vs. SelenoVLM_{age} on identical tiles, protocol, and scoring. The baselines are fluent and image-reactive but read quantities poorly, and none combines mare age coverage with highland silence. Arrows on the category labels mark whether a higher ($\uparrow$) or lower ($\downarrow$) score is better, the highland false-positive rate being the only category where lower is better.

5 $\times$, and unit naming reaches 0.883 against at most 0.783. A bootstrap over the identical 120 tiles places the lower 95% confidence bound of SelenoVLM_{age}’s stated-fact fidelity at 0.440, above the point estimate of every baseline, and since the baselines are larger models reading the same rasters, the margin cannot be explained by model capacity. We note, however, that this comparison confounds three factors. The baselines are not trained on lunar data, they read the rasters as rendered 8-bit images, which in particular removes the absolute elevation scale, and they were never given raster-derived targets. The table therefore establishes that instructed open VLMs do not produce tile-grounded interpretation under this protocol without domain supervision. The attribution of the grounding to the target design rests on the single-variable falsifications of Sec. 7.3.

The baselines fail in different ways. gemma3:27b emits mare ages readily but also states them on 64.3% of highland tiles, where no basalt age is defined, against 1.8% for SelenoVLM_{age} on the same subset. mistral-small3.2 and qwen3.5:27b avoid false highland ages but barely emit ages at all (mare coverage 3.1% and 6.2%), so their numeric age cells rest on a handful of tiles and are not comparable. No model, including ours, beats its constant-age prior on this subset. We return to this point in Sec. 7.5.

7.3 Grounding is a property of the targets, and it decays

Two observations show that the grounding of Sec. 7.1 is produced by the target design rather than by the architecture. The first is the training dynamics (Fig. 6). Causal grounding (tile-swap flip) rises over training,




Figure 6: Training dynamics of the bridge. Causal vision grounding (tile-swap flip) trends upward over training, while adherence to target content (stated facts, closed-book age coverage) peaks early and decays. The served checkpoint is selected at the knee of this trade-off, never by validation loss, which measures fit to distilled targets rather than grounding. Late checkpoints additionally degenerate into repetition (not shown).

Table 5: Terrain-adaptive metre-fact bins vs. the served fixed fine bins, retrained and evaluated on the identical $n = 120$ seeded held-out tiles. Adaptive bins make highland quantities learnable (highland fact fidelity $0.375 \rightarrow 0.398$) and lift mare fidelity, unit naming, and age coverage, but causal grounding regresses (paired tile-swap flip $\Delta = -0.093 \pm 0.024$, $t = -3.90$), since coarser targets are satisfiable with less tile-specific vision. The fixed-bin model remains the served checkpoint.

Targets	Facts $\uparrow$	Facts (mare)	Facts (highl.)	Unit naming $\uparrow$	Mare age cov. $\uparrow$	Tile-swap flip $\uparrow$	Consec. rep. $\downarrow$	Distinct-1 $\uparrow$
Fixed fine bins (served)	0.494	0.598	0.375	0.883	0.734	0.539	0.004	0.776
Terrain-adaptive bins	0.523	0.633	0.398	0.900	0.750	0.445	0.008	0.767
Paired Δ (adaptive – fixed)	facts: -0.015 ± 0.028 ($t = -0.52$)					tile-swap: -0.093 ± 0.024 ($t = -3.90$)		

apart from local fluctuations. Adherence to the target content (stated facts, age statements), in contrast, peaks within the first epoch and then decays. The served checkpoint is a mid-training snapshot at the knee of this trade-off, found by dense snapshotting. Validation loss selects a different and strictly worse checkpoint in every run, since it measures fit to distilled targets rather than grounding. We observed the same pattern in seven consecutive training runs, and a third epoch degraded the model in three independent attempts.

The second is the granularity of the injected facts, which is load-bearing (Table 5, Fig. 7). Retraining with terrain-adaptive metre bins, which coarsen the relief and roughness targets on high-relief tiles, makes highland quantities more learnable and lifts every content metric, including highland fact fidelity (0.375 to 0.398) and unit naming. Causal grounding, however, regresses. The paired tile-swap flip drops by 0.093 ± 0.024 ($t = -3.90$, $n = 120$). Coarser targets are satisfiable with less tile-specific vision, so target learnability trades directly against unreproducibility without vision. Because the serving decision is gated on causal grounding, the fixed fine bins were kept.

7.4 Age emission is a learnable target-side behaviour

The age-emission block of Table 3 shows that when and where to state an age is learned reliably from the targets. SelenoVLM_{age} states an age on 73% of mare tiles ($n = 230$) while remaining almost silent on highlands, with a false-age rate of 1.5% ($n = 270$). When an epoch is stated, it is the correct one in 65.9% of cases and an adjacent one in the remainder (epoch-adjacent 100%). No baseline combines this coverage with highland silence (Sec. 7.2).

Two falsifications delimit what controls this behaviour. First, silence is itself learned. Under an earlier target design that left a quarter of mare tiles without an age sentence, emission was volatile across neighbouring checkpoints. Attaching age language to every mare tile (the SelenoVLM_{age} design) stabilized it. Second, elicitation cannot substitute for target design. Adding an explicit prompt-side instruction to state a numeric




Figure 7: Terrain-adaptive bins vs. the served fixed fine bins on the identical seeded held-out tiles (Table 5). Adaptive bins win every content metric, highland fact fidelity most of all, but lose causal grounding (paired tile-swap $\Delta = -0.093$, $t = -3.90$), the axis on which the serving decision is gated.

Table 6: Leave-one-region-out age recovery (eastern Oceanus Procellarum, closed-book, training-format prompts without retrieval text). The excised model never saw the zone’s published ages in its corpus or targets, yet scores essentially the same as the fully trained model, and both default to ~ 3.45 Ga on genuinely younger basalts. The stated values track the global mare prior, not the imagery.

Model	Zone age coverage	Zone age MAE (Ga)	Epoch adjacent
Trained with zone ages	0.800	0.844	1.000
Zone ages excised (LOO)	0.725	0.807	1.000

age left coverage unchanged. Emission is thus governed by target statistics, not by instructions at inference time.

7.5 Numeric age values regress to the global mare prior

The stated age values are the central negative result of this paper. On centroid ground truth, the served model nominally edges out the constant baseline (MAE 0.425 vs. 0.43 Ga) with a Spearman rank correlation of 0.295 (Table 3, Fig. 8a). The difference of -0.005 Ga lies well inside its 95% cluster-bootstrap interval of $[-0.022, +0.014]$ Ga, so the nominal edge is already indistinguishable from zero before any control. The leave-one-region-out control then removes the appearance of skill entirely (Table 6). We retrained the bridge with all published ages of eastern Oceanus Procellarum excised from both the retrieval corpus and the targets. On that zone, the excised model scores essentially the same as the fully trained one (age MAE 0.807 vs. 0.844 Ga at comparable coverage), and both default to approximately 3.45 Ga on the zone’s genuinely younger basalts. The nominal centroid-GT skill is therefore a memorized regional age field, not an age recovered from the imagery.

SelenoVLM_{chrono} is the strongest target-side design we could construct against this failure (Sec. 4.5). Every target opens with the tile’s Robbins crater density, unit ages are polygon-accurate, off-polygon mare tiles receive isotonic density-fitted ages, and the grounded fact and age tokens carry the same sixfold loss upweighting as the served design. The behavioural metrics improved, with age coverage rising from 0.645 to 0.731 on the polygon-GT set alongside gains in unit naming and tile-swap flip. The values, however, got worse (Table 7, Fig. 8b). Against polygon-accurate unit ages, SelenoVLM_{chrono} reaches an MAE of 0.473 Ga against a constant-prior 0.407 Ga, with $\rho = -0.210$ and a regression slope of -0.054 , whereas SelenoVLM_{age} shows a positive rank correlation (0.387) with near-zero slope (0.044) and a strong old bias (0.327 Ga), the signature of a smooth memorized age field. SelenoVLM_{chrono} states a crater density on nearly every tile, but




Figure 8: Stated age against reference or injected age on the held-out test split. (a) Closed book against centroid ground truth. Points cluster at the global mare prior, and the apparent residual skill (Table 3) is explained as memorized regional structure by the leave-one-region-out control (Table 6). (b) Closed book against polygon-accurate unit ages. The stated values concentrate at the modal mare age, including for SelenoVLM_{chrono}, whose targets state tile-specific chronology-consistent ages, while the same latent supports a positive-slope probe (Table 8). (c) Open book, the stated age against the injected dated record on the polygon set (Sec. 7.7). The stated values track the record along the identity, also where the record disagrees with the polygon ground truth (brighter points), so the residual error is inherited from retrieval. (d) Rewriting the injected record by ± 0.5 Ga moves the stated age with slope 0.711, so the transfer is causal rather than a coincidence with the memorized regional prior of panel (a). The panels use different ground-truth conventions and tile sets and are not directly comparable to one another.

Table 7: Closed-book numeric age against polygon-accurate unit ages (point-in-polygon on the full mapped geometry, $n = 93$ dated held-out tiles, identical seeded set for both models). Neither generation channel beats the constant prior on MAE. The SelenoVLM_{age} targets teach a smooth regional age field (positive rank correlation, strong old bias), while the SelenoVLM_{chrono} targets remove that crutch without transferring the counting signal. The frozen-latent probe that diagnoses this failure is reported in Table 8 on its own evaluation set.

	Coverage $\uparrow$	MAE (Ga) $\downarrow$	Spearman ρ	Slope	Bias (Ga)
SelenoVLM _{age} (served)	0.645	0.413	0.387	0.044	0.327
SelenoVLM _{chrono}	0.731	0.473	-0.210	-0.054	0.171
Constant prior (3.5 Ga)	–	0.407	0	0	–

Table 8: Where the numeric dating signal is lost. The identical leave-unit-out probe battery (20,956 mare tiles from 290 dated units, identical folds) is applied at successive taps of one frozen forward pass. No bridge training and no language-model forward is involved. Row 1 probes the encoder latent, row 2 the mean-pooled resampler output that the in-loop age head reads, row 3 the same output without pooling. Each row reports the better of ridge and MLP by held-out MAE and carries a row-shuffle control that collapses toward the constant. Every probe faces the constant prior of this set (0.449 Ga). The bottleneck passes the dating signal. This localizes the failure and claims no numeric age recovery by any generation model.

Probe input	MAE (Ga) $\downarrow$	Spearman ρ	Slope	Shuffled ρ
MAE encoder latent (768-d), condition A	0.429	0.342	0.143	-0.110
→ resampler, mean-pooled (3584-d), condition B	0.428	0.306	0.126	-0.121
→ resampler, all 64 tokens, condition B2	0.427	0.312	0.125	-0.050
Constant prior (per fold)	0.449	0	0	–

its stated densities are uncorrelated with the measured ones, and its stated ages are not predicted by its own stated densities. Neither generation channel beats the constant prior on MAE. With emission, quantization, upweighting, and chronology-consistent supervision exhausted, we conclude that target-side levers do not produce numeric age recovery in the generation channel.

7.6 The dating signal is present in the latent but lost in extraction

The failure of Sec. 7.5 is not caused by missing visual information. Ridge and MLP probes trained on the frozen MAE latent, cross-validated leave-unit-out so that no dated unit contributes to both fit and evaluation, recover age with an MAE of 0.429 Ga against the constant prior of 0.449 Ga on the same set (20,956 mare tiles from 290 dated units), with $\rho = 0.342$ and slope 0.143 for the ridge, the better of the two families by held-out MAE (row 1 of Table 8, probe protocol in Appendix A.5). Probes for log crater density perform better still (rank correlation 0.569 per tile, 0.783 aggregated to units), and shuffle controls collapse to the constant prior, ruling out label leakage. The attainable ceiling at this tile scale is itself modest. Feeding the true Robbins crater counts, in place of vision, into the same probe improves the error only moderately (MAE 0.361 Ga, $\rho = 0.47$), which we attribute to small-number crater statistics on 51×67 km tiles, unit-level ground truth, and a prior-peaked age distribution. The latent recovers just under a quarter of the margin that true counts attain over the constant (0.228), so most of this modest ceiling remains out of reach. We further note that a randomly initialised encoder over the same trained tokenizers supports a nearly identical probe ($\rho = 0.341$). The signal the probe reads is hence carried by the tokenized input representation rather than by the pretraining. For the diagnosis this suffices, since the argument only requires the signal to be present at the tower output. The same latent, read through the generation channel, yields slope -0.054 . We refer to this contrast as the probe-generation gap. The failure is one of extraction in the language pathway, not of representation.

To localize the loss, we trained a supervised age head on the mean-pooled resampler output jointly with the bridge (Fig. 9). The head never beats the constant-prior baseline on held-out tiles at any training step, and at the final polygon-GT evaluation it also loses to the constant while shuffling its visual input degrades its error substantially. The head therefore reads vision, but what it learns is a regional-appearance proxy that does not transfer across the geographic block split. The unit-naming head on the same pooled vector works at the level of the generation channel’s unit naming, so the resampler preserves categorical identity.




Figure 9: Held-out age MAE of the in-loop supervised age head, a regression head trained jointly on the mean-pooled resampler output (mare-gated Huber loss), evaluated per training snapshot ($n = 40$). The constant-prior baseline is recomputed on this evaluation’s own set of $n = 40$ dated snapshot tile sets (Sec. 5.3) and is therefore lower than the constants of Tables 3 and 7, which live on different tile sets. The head never beats this baseline, and the shuffled-vision control tracks it closely. Together with the frozen-resampler probe (Table 8), the localization is that the representation the head reads provably carries the signal, and the joint training fails to extract it (Sec. 7.6).

To separate the resampler bottleneck from the joint training, we probed the frozen resampler output of the served bridge directly, with identical folds and controls (rows 2 and 3 of Table 8). The probe recovers the signal at the level of the encoder-latent probe (MAE 0.428 Ga, $\rho = 0.306$, slope 0.126), and probing all 64 unpooled tokens shows that mean pooling discards nothing either. The bottleneck therefore passes the signal, for crater density as well ($\rho = 0.495$ after the resampler). What remains is the joint optimization itself. Trained inside the cross-entropy loop, the head settles on the regional proxy described above, although the vector it reads provably carries the signal.

7.7 Open book, the stated values follow the retrieved record

The preceding sections withhold the dated reference in order to isolate the vision pathway. The deployed configuration runs with retrieval on, and in the following we evaluate this open-book mode on the identical held-out tiles. We note that the served bridge was trained without any retrieval text in its prompt, so the open-book context is a distribution shift at inference time, and any use of the injected record is in-context behaviour of the underlying language model rather than a copying pattern rewarded during training. Table 9 (block A) shows that the behavioural profile of Sec. 7.1 carries over with small shifts in stated-fact fidelity, unit naming, and mare age coverage, and generation remains clean (consecutive-repeat rate 0.012). Highland silence survives as well. The 8° retrieval gate is geometric, so a highland tile near a dated mare polygon does receive a mare age in its context, yet the highland false-age rate rises only from 1.5% to 1.8% ($n = 270$). The mare gate is therefore a visual behaviour, not a text reflex. Causal grounding is also preserved with the context present, with a tile-swap flip of 0.529 against 0.52 closed book and a vision-removal flip of 0.731 against 0.631. Retrieval text does not close the vision path.

What changes is the stated value. On mare tiles with an injected record and a stated age ($n = 167$), the stated age reproduces the retrieved one with a mean absolute difference of 0.097 Ga [0.033, 0.198] and matches it within 0.05 Ga on 91.6% of tiles. Since the injected centroid record is at the same time the centroid ground truth of Table 3, this agreement is circular by construction, and we report it strictly as transfer fidelity, never as age recovery.

Whether faithful transfer helps depends on whether the record is right, and the polygon-GT set is where this question is not circular. Block B of Table 9 and Fig. 8c give the decomposition. Overall, open book neither beats nor loses to the constant prior (MAE 0.416 against 0.414 Ga, paired difference [-0.25, 0.307]). The reason is retrieval, not the model. The injected centroid record deviates from the polygon age by more than 0.3 Ga on 20 of the 93 tiles. Where the record is correct ($n = 73$), the stated age is nearly exact (MAE 0.087 Ga).

Table 9: Open-book (deployed, retrieval-on) evaluation of the served model. Block A (centroid set): behaviour is unchanged from closed book while the stated age transfers the injected record. Agreement with the injected record is circular and is reported only as transfer fidelity. Block B (polygon-accurate GT, non-circular): open book does not beat the constant prior overall because centroid retrieval is imperfect, and conditioning on record correctness decomposes this into near-exact accuracy where retrieval is right and record-tracking where it is wrong, so deployed accuracy is bounded by the retrieval oracle rather than by the model. The perturbation slope shows that the transfer is causal.

<i>Block A, centroid set ($n = 500$): behaviour and transfer fidelity</i>		
Metric	Closed book	Open book
Stated-fact fidelity (overall) $\uparrow$	0.458	0.435
Names mapped unit $\uparrow$	0.858	0.806
Mare age coverage $\uparrow$	0.73	0.726
Highland false-positive rate $\downarrow$	0.015	0.018
Consecutive-repeat rate $\downarrow$	0.004	0.012
Distinct-1 $\uparrow$	0.78	0.772
Transfer fidelity (stated vs. injected record)	exact 0.916, MAE 0.097 Ga ($n = 167$)	
<i>Block B, polygon set ($n = 93$): non-circular numeric age accuracy</i>		
Condition	Coverage	MAE (Ga) $\downarrow$
SelenoVLM _{age} closed book	0.645	0.413
SelenoVLM _{age} open book	0.634	0.416
where retrieval correct ($n = 73$)	0.603	0.087
where retrieval wrong ($n = 20$)	0.750	1.38
Retrieval oracle (record vs. polygon GT)	1.000	0.195
Constant prior (3.5 Ga)	–	0.414
Perturbation slope (stated on injected, ± 0.5 Ga)	0.711 ($r = 0.808$)	


Where it is wrong, the model transfers the wrong value just as faithfully (MAE 1.38 Ga). The retrieval oracle, the injected record itself scored against the polygon ground truth, reaches an MAE of 0.195 Ga with $\rho = 0.706$ and is the ceiling of this mode. The deployed error is therefore inherited from centroid-level retrieval, and a polygon-accurate retriever would move the deployed system toward the oracle without touching the model.

Two interventions establish that the transfer is causal rather than a coincidence with the memorized regional field of Sec. 7.5. Rewriting the injected age by ± 0.5 Ga moves the stated age with slope 0.711 ($r = 0.808$, $n = 258$ stated generations, cluster CI [0.588, 0.794], Fig. 8d). The interval excludes zero, and the slope falls short of one because a minority of tiles hold the prior regardless and because the rewrite clamps at the plausible mare range. Swapping in a different tile’s full context moves the stated age to the foreign record with slope 0.84, while highland silence again survives the foreign mare context (false-age rate 0.024). A geo-suppressed control, the open-book context with only the dated record removed, leaves mare age coverage essentially unchanged (74.8% with the record against 76.5% without). The record therefore supplies the numeric value, whereas the decision to state an age remains the target-taught, visually gated behaviour of Sec. 7.4.

Fig. 10 shows the resulting deployed behaviour on a young Oceanus Procellarum tile whose record is correct (polygon and record age 2.1 Ga). Closed book, the model states a prior-shaped 3.1 Ga and misplaces the scene in Mare Frigoris. Open book, with identical raster-derived opener facts, it states the published 2.1 Ga and the correct region. The tile was selected from the candidate scan for exactly this correction. Together with Secs. 7.5 and 7.6, the dissociation is complete. The generation channel cannot regress the age value from vision, but it transfers the value faithfully and causally from retrieved text, hence the deployed system states correct published ages wherever a correct record covers the tile.

8 Discussion

The results support one claim and its precise negation, and both matter. On the positive side, tile-grounded geological prose is achievable with a frozen, self-supervised vision tower and a standard bridge, provided



Prompt (both modes) Provide the geological interpretation for this lunar tile.

Retrieved context (open book only, abridged) Named lunar feature "Oceanus Procellarum" (Oceanus, ~2592 km across) [IAU Gazetteer]. "Crater-count model age for unit P43 [...]": 2.1 Ga" [Hiesinger et al., mare-basalt model ages], retrieved 2.6° away. Two literature excerpts on crater size-frequency dating [...].

A (closed book) The scene is very dark (albedo 0.16) and smooth — local relief ~1000 m, roughness ~225 m — while the Clementine UV/VIS ratio (~0.52) reads as a near-neutral ratio color. Regional crater statistics date the adjacent mapped basalts to roughly 3.1 Ga, within the Eratosthenian. The Imbrium Fra Mauro Formation Unit serves as the foundational layer here, representing the oldest discernible epoch in this portion of Mare Frigoris before being buried by subsequent volcanic activity. [...]

age 3.1 Ga / polygon 2.1 Ga ×

region "Mare Frigoris" ×

albedo 0.16 / 0.19 ✓

415/750 0.52 / 0.55 ✓

relief 1000 / 333 m ×

roughness 225 / 88 m ×

A (open book) The scene is very dark (albedo 0.16) and smooth — local relief ~1000 m, roughness ~225 m — while the Clementine UV/VIS ratio (~0.53) reads as a near-neutral ratio color. Regional crater statistics date the adjacent mapped basalts to roughly 2.1 Ga, within the Eratosthenian. The Imbrium Fra Mauro Formation Unit serves as the foundational layer here, representing the oldest discernible epoch in this portion of Oceanus Procellarum before being buried by subsequent volcanic activity. [...]

age 2.1 Ga / polygon 2.1 Ga ✓

region "Oceanus Procellarum" ✓

albedo 0.16 / 0.19 ✓

415/750 0.53 / 0.55 ✓

relief 1000 / 333 m ×

roughness 225 / 88 m ×

injected record 2.1 Ga at 2.6° (the only age in either prompt)

Figure 10: Closed book against open book on a held-out Oceanus Procellarum tile (long=35°38'9.33"W, lat=15°5'3.92"N, shown for the reader, not the model). Both answers are generated under the trained coordinate-free interpretation instruction, and the open-book prompt additionally carries the retrieved context, whose dated record (2.1 Ga for unit P43, here consistent with the polygon ground truth) is the only age information available to either mode. The raster-derived opener facts are identical on both sides, with the same two hits and the same two misses against the measured values, so the context changes only the retrieved content, not the visual reading. The tile was selected from the candidate scan for this correction, and the answers are abridged at the marked ellipses. Table 9 quantifies the transfer over all tiles.

the supervision targets are constructed so that they cannot be reproduced without reading the tile. The causal ablations of Sec. 7.1 and the falsifications of Sec. 7.3 locate this capability in the target design rather than in the architecture or in model scale. Near-identical prose targets produced a model that ignored the tile, deterministic raster-derived openers produced one that reads it, and coarsening those openers traded grounding away again. On the negative side, the same targets that control where and how the model speaks about age do not make its stated age values track the surface. We consider the target-side avenue exhausted, since emission gating, quantization granularity, token upweighting, and chronology-consistent supervision with per-tile crater densities were each tested and the value metrics did not improve (Sec. 7.5).

The dissociation between behaviour and values has a plausible mechanism. Token-level cross-entropy on distilled prose rewards reproducing the distributional properties of the targets. Emission behaviour (when a sentence appears, which vocabulary it uses) is such a property, and it was learned wherever the targets expressed it consistently. The numeric value inside an age sentence, in contrast, must be regressed from a continuous visual statistic, and for values concentrated near the modal mare age the loss incurred by always stating the prior is small. The leave-one-region-out control shows what the model does instead. The model reproduces a memorized regional age field that survives the excision of the region’s published ages. We note that this account is consistent with our evidence but was not tested in isolation. Disentangling it from optimization effects would require targeted synthetic-target experiments.

The probe battery constrains where the information is lost. The frozen MAE latent supports leave-unit-out age recovery and correlates with log crater density (rank correlation 0.569 per tile, 0.783 aggregated to units), so the dating signal enters the pipeline. The in-loop age head on the mean-pooled resampler output loses to the constant prior while the unit-naming head on the same vector works, so categorical identity survives the resampler. The probe on the frozen resampler output separates the remaining explanations. It recovers the signal at the level of the encoder probe, and probing the unpooled tokens excludes the pooling (Table 8). The 64-token bottleneck is hence not where the signal is lost. What remains is the joint training, under which the head settled on a regional-appearance proxy that anti-transfers across the geographic block split, and the language-side extraction it feeds.

Two ceilings qualify how much numeric dating one should expect at this scale at all. Tile-level crater statistics on 51×67 km windows are small-number statistics against unit-level ground truth with a prior-peaked age distribution, and even the true Robbins counts [Robbins, 2019], fed into the same probe in place of vision, yield only modest skill (Sec. 7.6). The frozen latent recovers just under a quarter of that ceiling, and unit-level aggregation improves every probe we ran (age MAE 0.354 Ga, $\rho = 0.489$). The practical implication is that numeric chronology should be estimated at the mapped-unit scale, by aggregating evidence over many tiles, rather than emitted tile-by-tile inside generated prose. A decoupled dating head trained outside the language-modelling objective, reading a representation that the probes show to suffice, aggregated over a unit and reported alongside the generated interpretation, is the design our evidence indicates. A vision tower with explicit sensitivity to small-crater statistics remains complementary, although it is bounded by the same tile-scale ceiling.

The open-book evaluation of Sec. 7.7 adds the deployment-side complement to this diagnosis. The same generation channel that cannot regress the age value from vision transfers it faithfully and causally once the retrieval context contains the published record, although the served bridge never saw retrieval text during training. In deployment, the numeric values are therefore already supplied by the retrieval corpus wherever a correct record covers the tile, and the measured chain from record to stated sentence, with the perturbation slope as the causal check, is the same faithfulness discipline the paper argues for, applied to the retrieved content instead of the rasters. The immediate lever is retrieval accuracy. Replacing the nearest-centroid lookup by the point-in-polygon assignment would remove the wrong-record stratum that dominates the deployed error, and the decoupled dating head remains the path to ages where no published record exists. The division of labour the paper proposes is thus already partially realized in the served system. Generation carries the grounded description, and the numeric age arrives as a cited, retrieved fact rather than as a visually estimated one.

Beyond the system itself, the evaluation methodology of Sec. 5 is a contribution we expect to transfer. Checkpoint selection must optimize the trade-off between target adherence and causal grounding explicitly, since validation loss measures fit to circular targets and selects the wrong checkpoint (Sec. 7.3). The tile-swap ablation rather than vision-zeroing alone exposes tile-unspecific models, and degeneration statistics belong on the selection axis. None of these observations is specific to lunar data. They apply to any vision-language system trained on distilled targets over visually homogeneous scenes.

Several limitations bound the claims. The leave-one-region-out control was run for the mare-age target generation, not re-run for the crater-chronology variant, so we make no leakage-free claim for the latter. The polygon-accurate age evaluation rests on 93 dated held-out tiles, the centroid-based evaluation is larger but noisier, and the two ground truths are never mixed. The scored tiles are spatially autocorrelated through the sliding window, hence all confidence intervals resample whole macro-blocks (Sec. 5.1). The distilled targets originate from weakly supervised captions written by a single teacher model (Gemma-3, whose instructed 27B variant also appears as a baseline in Sec. 7.2), which is why fit diagnostics carry no evidential weight anywhere in the paper, and the stylistic register of the generated interpretations inherits from one author’s published corpus. The open-book results claim retrieval integration, never visual age recovery, and the deployed mode earns its value through the decomposition of Sec. 7.7, not through an aggregate win over the constant prior. Free-form question answering under an injected context compounds two distribution shifts for the served bridge and can degenerate, hence the open-book results use the trained interpretation instruction, and the corresponding demonstration on the leave-one-region-out model was inconclusive, since that late checkpoint degenerates under the open-book shift, so the causal evidence for integration rests on the served checkpoint. Finally, all results concern one body, one tower, and one bridge. Systematic expert assessment of the generated interpretations remains to be done.

9 Conclusion

We presented SelenoVLM, a study of grounded vision-language interpretation for planetary geology built from a frozen multimodal masked autoencoder over five co-registered lunar mosaics and a LoRA-adapted 7B language model. The vision tower was characterized before any language claim. It predicts withheld rasters across modalities where the physics allows it, and a single tile is not geolocatable from its imagery, which rules the coordinate shortcut out of the vision path. On this foundation, supervision targets prepended with deterministic raster-derived facts produced a model whose prose is causally tile-grounded, whose stated quantities are verifiable against the rasters at margins of 2.2 to 5 over instructed baselines of 24B to 27B parameters, and whose age statements appear where they should and remain absent where no age is defined.

The same measurement discipline delimits the result. The numeric values inside those age statements regress to the global mare prior under every target design we tested, no generation model beats a constant-age baseline, and the nominal skill that remains is memorized regional structure rather than recovery from the imagery. The probe battery shows that the dating signal is present in the frozen visual latent, that it survives the resampler bottleneck unchanged, and that the physical ceiling at tile scale is itself modest. The loss occurs in the extraction into text, not in the representations. Grounded behaviour can be taught through targets. Grounded numbers, on this evidence, cannot. They can, however, be carried into the prose by retrieval. Open book, the stated ages follow the injected published record faithfully and causally, so the deployed system is bounded by retrieval quality rather than by the model.

For the goal of scaling geological interpretation, the division of labour follows directly. Free-text generation, disciplined by target design and audited by causal ablation, closed-book scoring, and constant-prior baselines, is ready to carry the descriptive and stratigraphic content of an interpretive layer at the resolution of the data. Numeric chronology should not be generated but estimated, by decoupled heads reading the same frozen representations and aggregating over mapped units, and then cited by the language model like any other retrieved fact. The open-book evaluation verifies the citing half of this division on the published record already, since injected ages are transferred into the interpretation nearly without loss and demonstrably from the record. Establishing that division quantitatively, rather than assuming either half, is what this paper contributes.

References

- Corey Matthew Fortezzo, Paul D Spudis, SL Harrel, et al. Unified geologic map of the moon. 2020.
- Gerhard Neukum, Boris A Ivanov, and William K Hartmann. Cratering records in the inner solar system in relation to the lunar reference system. *Space Science Reviews*, 96(1):55–86, 2001.
- H Hiesinger, JW Head, U Wolf, R Jaumann, and G Neukum. Ages and stratigraphy of lunar mare basalts: A synthesis. 2011.
- Ari Silburt, Mohamad Ali-Dib, Chenchong Zhu, Alan Jackson, Diana Valencia, Yevgeni Kissin, Daniel Tamayo, and Kristen Menou. Lunar crater identification via deep learning. *Icarus*, 317:27–38, 2019.

- Boyu Kuang, Chengzhen Gu, Zeeshan A Rana, Yifan Zhao, Shuang Sun, and Somtochukwu Godfrey Nnabuife. Semantic terrain segmentation in the navigation vision of planetary rovers—a systematic literature review. *Sensors*, 22(21):8393, 2022.
- Dicong Qiu, Brandon Rothrock, Tanvir Islam, Annie K Didier, Vivian Z Sun, Chris A Mattmann, and Masahiro Ono. Scoti: Science captioning of terrain images for data prioritization and local image search. *Planetary and Space Science*, 188:104943, 2020.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Liang Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *Iclr*, 1(2):3, 2022.
- Andrew Jaegle, Felix Gimeno, Andy Brock, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Joao Carreira. Perceiver: General perception with iterative attention. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4651–4664. PMLR, 2021.
- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022.
- Clive R Neal, Lisa Gaddis, Brad L Jolliff, Samuel J Lawrence, Stephen J Mackwell, Charles K Shearer, and Sarah N Valencia. *New views of the moon 2*. Mineralogical Society of America, 2023.
- IAU/USGS. Gazetteer of planetary nomenclature. <https://planetarynames.wr.usgs.gov>, 2026. IAU Working Group for Planetary System Nomenclature (WGPSN) and USGS Astrogeology Science Center. Accessed: July 2026.
- Don E Wilhelms and John F McCauley. Geologic map of the near side of the moon. Technical report, US Geological Survey, 1971.
- Dieter Stöfler and Graham Ryder. Stratigraphy and isotope ages of lunar geologic units: Chronological standard for the inner solar system. *Space Science Reviews*, 96(1):9–54, 2001.
- G Neukum. Meteorite bombardment and dating of planetary surfaces. Technical report, 1984.
- KL Tanaka and WK Hartmann. The planetary time scale. *The geologic time scale*, pages 275–298, 2012.
- Harald Hiesinger, Ralf Jaumann, Gerhard Neukum, and James W Head III. Ages of mare basalts on the lunar nearside. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 105(E12):29239–29275, 2000.
- H Hiesinger, JW Head III, U Wolf, R Jaumann, and G Neukum. Ages and stratigraphy of mare basalts in oceanus procellarum, mare nubium, mare cognitum, and mare insularum. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 108(E7), 2003.
- H Hiesinger, JW Head III, U Wolf, R Jaumann, and G Neukum. Ages and stratigraphy of lunar mare basalts in mare frigoris and other nearside maria based on crater size-frequency distribution measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 115(E3), 2010.
- Harald Hiesinger, Carolyn H Van der Bogert, G Michael, N Schmedemann, W Iqbal, Stuart J Robbins, B Ivanov, J-P Williams, M Zanetti, J Plescia, et al. The lunar cratering chronology. *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry*, 89(1):401–451, 2023.
- R. La Grassa, Cristina Re, Elena Martellato, Adriano Tullo, Silvia Bertoli, Gabriele Cremonese, Natalia A. Vergara Sassarini, Maddalena Faletti, Valentina Galluzzi, and Lorenza Giacomini. From the moon to mercury: Release of global crater catalogs using multimodal deep learning for crater detection and morphometric analysis. *Remote Sensing*, 17(19):3287, 2025.
- B Aussel, O Rüscher, B Gundlach, VT Bickel, S Kruk, and E Sefton-Nash. Global lunar boulder map from lro nar optical images using deep learning: implications for regolith and protolith. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 130(7):e2025JE008981, 2025.
- Patrick Bauer, Marius Schwinning, Florian Renk, Andreas Weinmann, and Hichem Snoussi. Vision-language model for accurate crater detection, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.07795>.
- Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollar, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15979–15988. IEEE, June 2022. doi:10.1109/cvpr52688.2022.01553. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/cvpr52688.2022.01553>.
- Roman Bachmann, David Mizrahi, Andrei Atanov, and Amir Zamir. *MultiMAE: Multi-modal Multi-task Masked Autoencoders*, chapter 20, pages 348–367. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2022. ISBN 9783031198366. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-19836-6_20. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19836-6_20.

- David Mizrahi, Roman Bachmann, Oguzhan Kar, Teresa Yeo, Mingfei Gao, Afshin Dehghan, and Amir Zamir. 4m: Massively multimodal masked modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:58363–58408, 2023.
- Roman Bachmann, Oğuzhan Fatih Kar, David Mizrahi, Ali Garjani, Mingfei Gao, David Griffiths, Jiaming Hu, Afshin Dehghan, and Amir Zamir. 4m-21: An any-to-any vision model for tens of tasks and modalities, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09406>.
- Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al. Neural discrete representation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Fabian Mentzer, David Minnen, Eirikur Agustsson, and Michael Tschannen. Finite scalar quantization: VQ-VAE made simple. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- Tom Sander, Moritz Tenthoff, Kay Wohlfarth, and Christian Wöhler. The moon’s many faces: A single unified transformer for multimodal lunar reconstruction. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 236:363–379, 2026.
- Yezhen Cong, Samar Khanna, Chenlin Meng, Patrick Liu, Erik Rozi, Yutong He, Marshall Burke, David B. Lobell, and Stefano Ermon. Satmae: Pre-training transformers for temporal and multi-spectral satellite imagery, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.08051>.
- Colorado J Reed, Ritwik Gupta, Shufan Li, Sarah Brockman, Christopher Funk, Brian Clipp, Kurt Keutzer, Salvatore Candido, Matt Uyttendaele, and Trevor Darrell. Scale-MAE: A scale-aware masked autoencoder for multiscale geospatial representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 4088–4099, 2023.
- Vishal Nedungadi, Ankit Kariryaa, Stefan Oehmcke, Serge Belongie, Christian Igel, and Nico Lang. Mmearth: Exploring multi-modal pretext tasks for geospatial representation learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 164–182. Springer, 2024.
- Johannes Jakubik, Felix Yang, Benedikt Blumenstiel, Erik Scheurer, Rocco Sedona, Stefano Maurogiovanni, Jente Bosmans, Nikolaos Dionelis, Valerio Marsocci, Niklas Kopp, Rahul Ramachandran, Paolo Fraccaro, Thomas Brunschweiler, Gabriele Cavallaro, Juan Bernabe-Moreno, and Nicolas Longép  . Terramind: Large-scale generative multimodality for earth observation, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.11171>.
- Daniela Szwarcman, Sujit Roy, Paolo Fraccaro, Porsteinn El   G  slason, Benedikt Blumenstiel, Rinki Ghosal, Pedro Henrique de Oliveira, Joao Lucas de Sousa Almeida, Rocco Sedona, Yanghui Kang, Srija Chakraborty, Sizhe Wang, Carlos Gomes, Ankur Kumar, Myscon Truong, Denys Godwin, Hyunho Lee, Chia-Yu Hsu, Rohit Lal, Ata Akbari Asanjan, Besart Mujeci, Disha Shidham, Trevor Keenan, Paulo Arevalo, Wenwen Li, Hamed Alemohammad, Pontus Olofsson, Christopher Hain, Robert Kennedy, Bianca Zadrozny, David Bell, Gabriele Cavallaro, Campbell Watson, Manil Maskey, Rahul Ramachandran, and Juan Bernabe Moreno. Prithvi-eo-2.0: A versatile multi-temporal foundation model for earth observation applications, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.02732>.
- Philanthropic. Ai for earth. URL <https://madewithclay.org/>.
- Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jacob L Menick, Serkan Cabi, SM Eslami, Oriol Vinyals, and Felix Hill. Multimodal few-shot learning with frozen language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 200–212, 2021.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:34892–34916, 2023.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich K  ttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rockt  schel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1906–1919, 2020.
- Hannah Rashkin, Vitaly Nikolaev, Matthew Lamm, Lora Aroyo, Michael Collins, Dipanjan Das, Slav Petrov, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Iulia Turc, and David Reitter. Measuring attribution in natural language generation models. *Computational Linguistics*, 49(4):777–840, 2023.

- Fan Liu, Delong Chen, Zhangqingyun Guan, Xiaocong Zhou, Jiale Zhu, Qiaolin Ye, Liyong Fu, and Jun Zhou. Remoteclip: A vision language foundation model for remote sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 62:1–16, 2024.
- Kartik Kuckreja, Muhammad Sohail Danish, Muzammal Naseer, Abhijit Das, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Geochat: Grounded large vision-language model for remote sensing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 27831–27840, 2024.
- Yuan Hu, Jianlong Yuan, Congcong Wen, Xiaonan Lu, Yu Liu, and Xiang Li. Rsgpt: A remote sensing vision language model and benchmark. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 224:272–286, 2025.
- Wei Zhang, Miaoxin Cai, Tong Zhang, Yin Zhuang, and Xuerui Mao. Earthgpt: A universal multimodal large language model for multisensor image comprehension in remote sensing domain. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 62:1–20, 2024.
- Xiaodao Chen, Yupeng Liu, Wei Han, Xiongwei Zheng, Sheng Wang, Jun Wang, and Lizhe Wang. A vision-language foundation model-based multi-modal retrieval-augmented generation framework for remote sensing lithological recognition. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 225:328–340, 2025.
- Beibei Yu, Tao Shen, and Ling Chen. Sta-cot: Structured target-centric agentic chain-of-thought for consistent multi-image geological reasoning. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*, pages 25426–25444, 2025.
- Gokce Inal, Pouyan Navard, and Alper Yilmaz. Llava-le: Large language-and-vision assistant for lunar exploration, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.24696>.
- M. S. Robinson, S. M. Brylow, M. Tschimmel, D. Humm, S. J. Lawrence, P. C. Thomas, B. W. Denevi, E. Bowman-Cisneros, J. Zerr, M. A. Ravine, M. A. Caplinger, F. T. Ghaemi, J. A. Schaffner, M. C. Malin, P. Mahanti, A. Bartels, J. Anderson, T. N. Tran, E. M. Eliason, A. S. McEwen, E. Turtle, B. L. Jolliff, and H. Hiesinger. Lunar reconnaissance orbiter camera (lroc) instrument overview. *Space Science Reviews*, 150(1-4):81–124, January 2010. ISSN 1572-9672. doi:[10.1007/s11214-010-9634-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-010-9634-2). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11214-010-9634-2>.
- D. C. Humm, M. Tschimmel, S. M. Brylow, P. Mahanti, T. N. Tran, S. E. Braden, S. Wiseman, J. Danton, E. M. Eliason, and M. S. Robinson. Flight calibration of the lroc narrow angle camera. *Space Science Reviews*, 200(1-4):431–473, September 2015. ISSN 1572-9672. doi:[10.1007/s11214-015-0201-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-015-0201-8). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11214-015-0201-8>.
- RV Wagner, EJ Speyerer, MS Robinson, LROC team, et al. New mosaicked data products from the lroc team. In *46th annual lunar and planetary science conference*, number 1832, page 1473, 2015.
- Frank Scholten, J Oberst, K-D Matz, Thomas Roatsch, Marita Wählisch, EJ Speyerer, and MS Robinson. Gld100: The near-global lunar 100 m raster dtm from lroc wac stereo image data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 117(E12), 2012.
- E. Eliason, C. Isbell, E. Lee, T. Becker, L. Gaddis, A. McEwen, and M. Robinson. Mission to the Moon: The Clementine UVVIS global lunar mosaic. PDS Volumes USA_NASA_PDS_CL_4001 through 4078, produced by the U.S. Geological Survey and distributed on CD media by the Planetary Data System, 1999.
- T. M. Hare, B. A. Archinal, T. L. Becker, E. M. Lee, L. R. Gaddis, B. L. Redding, and M. R. Rosiek. Clementine mosaics warped to ULCN 2005 network. In *39th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference*, Houston, TX, 2008. Lunar and Planetary Institute. URL <https://www.lpi.usra.edu/meetings/lpsc2008/pdf/2337.pdf>.
- R. O. Green, C. Pieters, P. Mouroulis, M. Eastwood, J. Boardman, T. Glavich, P. Isaacson, M. Annadurai, S. Besse, D. Barr, B. Buratti, D. Cate, A. Chatterjee, R. Clark, L. Cheek, J. Combe, D. Dhingra, V. Essandoh, S. Geier, J. N. Goswami, R. Green, V. Haemmerle, J. Head, L. Hovland, S. Hyman, R. Klima, T. Koch, G. Kramer, A. S. K. Kumar, K. Lee, S. Lundeen, E. Malaret, T. McCord, S. McLaughlin, J. Mustard, J. Nettles, N. Petro, K. Plourde, C. Racho, J. Rodriguez, C. Runyon, G. Sellar, C. Smith, H. Sobel, M. Staid, J. Sunshine, L. Taylor, K. Thaisen, S. Tompkins, H. Tseng, G. Vane, P. Varanasi, M. White, and D. Wilson. The moon mineralogy mapper (m3) imaging spectrometer for lunar science: Instrument description, calibration, on-orbit measurements, science data calibration and on-orbit validation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 116(E10), 2011. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JE003797>. URL <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2011JE003797>.

- EJ Speyerer, MS Robinson, BW Denevi, LROC Science Team, et al. Lunar reconnaissance orbiter camera global morphological map of the moon. In *42nd annual lunar and planetary science conference*, number 1608, page 2387, 2011.
- David R. Roberts, Volker Bahn, Simone Ciuti, Mark S. Boyce, Jane Elith, Gurutzeta Guillera-Arroita, Severin Hauenstein, José J. Lahoz-Monfort, Boris Schröder, Wilfried Thuiller, David I. Warton, Brendan A. Wintle, Florian Hartig, and Carsten F. Dormann. Cross-validation strategies for data with temporal, spatial, hierarchical, or phylogenetic structure. *Ecography*, 40(8):913–929, 2017. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02881>. URL <https://nsojournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ecog.02881>.
- Gemma Team, Aishwarya Kamath, et al. Gemma 3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>.
- Gilad Sharir, Asaf Noy, and Lihi Zelnik-Manor. An image is worth 16x16 words, what is a video worth?, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.13915>.
- Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- Mike Schuster and Kaisuke Nakajima. Japanese and korean voice search. In *2012 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5149–5152. IEEE, 2012.
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, et al. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144*, 2016.
- Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Lu Jiang, Ce Liu, and William T Freeman. Maskgit: Masked generative image transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11315–11325, 2022.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen2.5 technical report, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.15115>.
- Stuart J Robbins. A new global database of lunar impact craters > 1–2 km: 1. crater locations and sizes, comparisons with published databases, and global analysis. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 124(4):871–892, 2019.
- Zhou Wang, A.C. Bovik, H.R. Sheikh, and E.P. Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004. doi:[10.1109/TIP.2003.819861](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2003.819861).
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002.
- Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- Kavita Ganesan. Rouge 2.0: Updated and improved measures for evaluation of summarization tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01937*, 2018.
- Sofia Serrano and Noah A. Smith. Is attention interpretable?, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.03731>.
- Itai Gat, Idan Schwartz, and Alexander Schwing. Perceptual score: What data modalities does your model perceive?, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14375>.
- Stella Frank, Emanuele Bugliarello, and Desmond Elliott. Vision-and-language or vision-for-language? on cross-modal influence in multimodal transformers. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9847–9857, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:[10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.775](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.775). URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.775/>.
- Paul Jaccard. Étude comparative de la distribution florale dans une portion des Alpes et du Jura. *Bull Soc Vaudoise Sci Nat*, 37:547–579, 1901.

- Michael Levandowsky and David Winter. Distance between sets. *Nature*, 234(5323):34–35, November 1971. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:[10.1038/234034a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/234034a0). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/234034a0>.
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. A diversity-promoting objective function for neural conversation models. In Kevin Knight, Ani Nenkova, and Owen Rambow, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 110–119, San Diego, California, June 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:[10.18653/v1/N16-1014](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N16-1014). URL <https://aclanthology.org/N16-1014/>.
- Alexander H. Liu, Kartik Khandelwal, Sandeep Subramanian, Victor Jouault, Abhinav Rastogi, Adrien Sadé, Alan Jeffares, Albert Jiang, Alexandre Cahill, Alexandre Gavaudan, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Amélie Héliou, Amos You, Andy Ehrenberg, Andy Lo, Anton Eliseev, Antonia Calvi, Avinash Sooriyarachchi, Baptiste Bout, Baptiste Rozière, Baudouin De Monicault, Clémence Lanfranchi, Corentin Barreau, Cyprien Courtot, Daniele Grattarola, Darius Dabert, Diego de las Casas, Elliot Chane-Sane, Faruk Ahmed, Gabrielle Berrada, Gaëtan Ecrepont, Gauthier Guinet, Georgii Novikov, Guillaume Kunsch, Guillaume Lample, Guillaume Martin, Gunshi Gupta, Jan Ludziejewski, Jason Rute, Joachim Studnia, Jonas Amar, Joséphine Delas, Josselin Somerville Roberts, Karmesh Yadav, Khyathi Chandu, Kush Jain, Laurence Aitchison, Laurent Fainsin, Léonard Blier, Lingxiao Zhao, Louis Martin, Lucile Saulnier, Luyu Gao, Maarten Buyt, Margaret Jennings, Marie Pellat, Mark Prins, Mathieu Poirée, Mathilde Guillaumin, Matthieu Dinot, Matthieu Futrel, Maxime Darrin, Maximilian Augustin, Mia Chiquier, Michel Schimpf, Nathan Grinsztajn, Neha Gupta, Nikhil Raghuraman, Olivier Bousquet, Olivier Duchenne, Patricia Wang, Patrick von Platen, Paul Jacob, Paul Wambergue, Paula Kurylowicz, Pavankumar Reddy Muddireddy, Philomène Chagniot, Pierre Stock, Pravesh Agrawal, Quentin Torroba, Romain Sauvestre, Roman Soletskyi, Rupert Menneer, Sagar Vaze, Samuel Barry, Sanchit Gandhi, Siddhant Waghjale, Siddharth Gandhi, Soham Ghosh, Srijan Mishra, Sumukh Aithal, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Théo Cachet, Theo Simon Sorg, Thibaut Lavril, Thiziri Nait Saada, Thomas Chabal, Thomas Foubert, Thomas Robert, Thomas Wang, Tim Lawson, Tom Bewley, Tom Bewley, Tom Edwards, Umar Jamil, Umberto Tomasini, Valeriia Nemychnikova, Van Phung, Vincent Maladière, Virgile Richard, Wassim Bouaziz, Wen-Ding Li, William Marshall, Xinghui Li, Xinyu Yang, Yassine El Ouahidi, Yihan Wang, Yunhao Tang, and Zaccharie Ramzi. Ministral 3, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.08584>.
- Qwen Team. Qwen3.5-omni technical report, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.15804>.
- Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*, pages 234–241. Springer, 2015.
- Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 586–595, 2018.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.
- Sean Welleck, Ilia Kulikov, Stephen Roller, Emily Dinan, Kyunghyun Cho, and Jason Weston. Neural text generation with unlikelihood training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04319*, 2019.
- Noam Shazeer. Glu variants improve transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05202*, 2020.
- Jianlv Chen, Shitao Xiao, Peitian Zhang, Kun Luo, Defu Lian, and Zheng Liu. Bge m3-embedding: Multilingual, multi-functionality, multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03216*, 4(5), 2024.
- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *IEEE transactions on big data*, 7(3):535–547, 2019.

A Implementation details

A.1 Data preprocessing details

For the spatially disjoint block split, the global grid is subdivided into macro-blocks of 4096 pixel per side, and each block is deterministically assigned to a partition using a coordinate-based hash to guarantee reproducibility. Only tiles fully contained within a single partition are retained, while those that cross partition boundaries are discarded, ensuring zero pixel overlap between partitions.

The geological map is supplied as an RGB raster with a categorical legend. Each pixel is mapped to the nearest legend color in RGB space and assigned the corresponding geological unit. This procedure produces a one-hot-encoded label volume spanning 50 units (including background).

A.2 Tokenizer details

Each raster tokenizer uses a Vision Transformer encoder with patch size 16, so a 256×256 single- or multi-channel tile corresponds to 256 tokens. FSQ constrains and rounds each latent dimension to a fixed number of levels. The codebook is therefore the Cartesian product of the per-dimension level counts, which obviates the need for a learned codebook or an auxiliary commitment loss. The resulting code indices constitute the token vocabulary ($3^8 = 6561$ codes for WAC and elevation, $8 \cdot 8 \cdot 8 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 = 15,360$ for the Clementine composite, $4 \cdot 3^6 = 2916$ for the geological map). The associated decoder is a conditional diffusion model [Ho et al., 2020]. A U-Net [Ronneberger et al., 2015] is optimized to denoise the target raster conditioned on the quantized codes, employing a noise-prediction objective that combines ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 losses with an LPIPS perceptual loss [Zhang et al., 2018].

For the text modalities, every sequence is wrapped in `[SOS]`/`[EOS]` markers, padded with `[PAD]` or truncated to a fixed per-modality length (64 tokens for POS, 128 for stratigraphy), with out-of-vocabulary items mapped to `[UNK]`. A reserved range of sentinel tokens (ids at or above a per-modality offset) marks the masked spans consumed by Stage A. In the character-level POS tokenization, each digit and symbol (`=`, `°`, `'`, `"`, `.`, `,`, `°`, `'`, `"`, `.`, `,`, and a literal space) is its own token while contiguous letters are grouped:

`[SOS]` `long` `=` `1` `3` `6` `°` `5` `6` `'` `3` `8` `.` `5` `7` `"` `W` `,` `lat` `=` `1` `1` `°` `2` `9` `'` `1` `0` `.` `3` `4` `"` `N` `[EOS]`

In the word-level caption tokenization, a fixed keyword prefix encoding the section header is prepended, and the body is whitespace-split with punctuation detached as separate tokens. A stratigraphy field beginning `The Plains Unit overlies the Basin Lineated Unit, indicating...` yields:

`[SOS]` `**Stratigraphy` `(Relative` `Timing):**` `The` `Plains` `Unit` `overlies` `the` `Basin` `Lineated` `Unit` `,` `indicating` `...` `[EOS]`

A.3 Training configuration

All training uses bf16 mixed precision and the AdamW optimizer [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017] with cosine-annealed learning rates (minimum learning rate set to 5% of the peak) and gradient clipping at 1.0. Tiles are extracted at 512 px with a stride of 128 px and resized to the tokenizer input resolution. Hyperparameters for the two stages are listed in Tables 10 and 11.

The Clementine stream was added to the trained eight-modality MAE via freeze-warmup head-add. During the first 2,000 steps only the Clementine embeddings and output head are trained, after which all parameters are unfrozen. To decrease text-only repetition, optional penalties such as unlikelihood loss [Welleck et al., 2019] and logit-space penalties (which discourage repeated outputs at inference) are implemented, although these are not used in the present configuration.

A.4 Retrieval corpus and crater-chronology target details

The retrieval corpus of Section 4.4 comprises 13,007 records, namely the geological-map unit descriptions, 291 dated mare units with their mapped polygon geometries, partitioned passages from the source literature, and 9,085 named features from the IAU gazetteer [IAU/USGS, 2026], all embedded [Chen et al., 2024] and indexed for cosine similarity search [Johnson et al., 2019]. A deterministic prose template constructed from the four caption fields serves as a fallback where no distilled target exists, and if no corpus is available, the retriever returns an empty context, allowing training to continue without retrieval augmentation.

The published model ages stated by the crater-chronology targets of Section 4.5 derive from the lunar chronology function of Neukum et al. [2001],

$$N(1) = 5.44 \times 10^{-14} [\exp(6.93 T) - 1] + 8.38 \times 10^{-4} T, \quad (3)$$

which relates the cumulative density $N(1)$ of craters with diameters of at least 1 km, per km^2 of counting area, to the absolute model age T in Ga, calibrated against radiometrically dated Apollo and Luna samples. The

Hyperparameter	Value
Modalities	WAC, elevation, Clementine, geomap, POS, and 4 caption fields (9 total)
Transformer width D	768
Encoder / decoder depth	12 / 12
Attention heads	12
Feed-forward	SwiGLU [Shazeer, 2020], no bias
Drop-path rate	0.1
Embedding init. std.	0.15
Encoder / target token budget	640 / 512
Modality-dropout prob.	0.6
Optimizer	AdamW, $\beta = (0.9, 0.99)$, weight decay 0.05
Peak learning rate	1×10^{-5}
LR schedule	cosine ($T_{\max} = 2 \times \text{run length}$)
Batch size	34
Epochs	180
Precision / devices	bf16-mixed / 2 GPUs (DDP)

Table 10: Stage A (multimodal masked pre-training) configuration.

Hyperparameter	Value
Language model	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct (frozen base)
Resampler latents K	64
Resampler depth / heads	2 / 8
Gated cross-attention	every layer, 8 heads, tanh gate init. 0
LoRA rank / α / dropout	16 / 32 / 0.05
LoRA target modules	q, k, v, o, gate, up, down projections
Optimizer	AdamW, $\beta = (0.9, 0.95)$, weight decay 0
Peak learning rate	1×10^{-4}
LR schedule	cosine
Batch size / grad. accum.	4 / 4 (effective 16)
Max sequence length	1024
Epochs	5
Memory	gradient checkpointing, bf16-mixed, 1 GPU

Table 11: Stage B (SelenoVLM) configuration.

stated tile density differs from $N(1)$ only in the areal normalization. We deliberately do not invert Eq. (3) on the tile densities. The published measurement protocol counts craters on geologically homogeneous areas and excludes secondary craters [Hiesinger et al., 2011], whereas the tile densities are raw catalog counts on fixed 51×67 km windows, so a direct inversion would assign the off-polygon tiles ages systematically inconsistent with the published ages stated on the in-polygon tiles. The isotonic fit of Section 4.5 preserves the monotone increase of crater density with age that Eq. (3) implies, while calibrating the raw densities to the published record.

A.5 Probe battery

The probe battery of Sec. 7.6 quantifies how much of the dating signal each stage of the pipeline retains. It is evaluated on its own set of 20,956 mare tiles from 290 dated units, where each tile carries the published age of its mapped unit as reference. On this set, the protection against memorized regional structure is provided by the cross-validation scheme rather than by the geographic block split. Writing $u(t)$ for the dated unit of tile t and z_t for the frozen MAE encoder latent of the tile, mean-pooled over the encoder token sequence to a fixed-length feature vector, each probe is a regression fitted and evaluated leave-unit-out,

$$\hat{a}_t = g_{-u(t)}(z_t), \quad (4)$$

where g_{-u} denotes the regressor fitted on the tiles of all dated units except u . Every prediction is therefore out-of-unit, and no dated unit contributes to both fitting and evaluation. The probe family comprises ridge regressors and small multilayer perceptrons. The ridge regularisation is selected within each training fold over

a four-value grid ($\lambda \in \{10, 10^2, 10^3, 10^4\}$) on a held-out portion of the fold and refit with the winning value, with features standardised on training-fold statistics. The held-out portion holds out whole training groups (dated units for the age probe, spatial blocks for the density probe), so the selection of λ is itself group-aware. The perceptron runs in one fixed configuration without any search. MAE, Spearman rank correlation, and regression slope, as defined in Sec. 5.3, are computed over the pooled out-of-unit predictions.


Two probe targets are used. The age probe regresses the unit’s published model age and reaches an MAE of 0.429 Ga against the constant prior of 0.449 Ga recomputed on the identical set, with $\rho = 0.342$ and slope 0.143 for the ridge, the better of the two families by held-out MAE (Table 8). The density probe regresses the logarithm of the tile’s Robbins crater density and reaches a rank correlation of 0.569 per tile and 0.783 after unit-level aggregation. Aggregation, that is, averaging the out-of-unit predictions over all tiles of a unit before scoring, improves every probe, and the aggregated age probe reaches an MAE of 0.354 Ga with $\rho = 0.489$. Two controls guard the battery. The constant prior is recomputed on each probe’s own evaluation set, and a shuffle control refits Eq. (4) after permuting the pairing between latents and reference ages, which collapses the probes to the constant prior and rules out leakage through the fitting protocol. The ceiling estimate of Sec. 7.6 replaces z_t with the tile’s true Robbins crater density under the identical leave-unit-out scheme, yielding an MAE of 0.361 Ga and $\rho = 0.47$.

The frozen-resampler probe of Table 8 applies the identical battery, with byte-identical folds and the same controls, to two further taps of the same frozen forward pass of the served bridge, recorded by checkpoint hash. Condition B replaces z_t with the mean-pooled resampler output (dimension 3584), the exact vector the in-loop age head reads. Condition B2 probes the unpooled 64 resampler tokens under three views, the per-token statistics, a fixed-seed random projection of the flattened tokens, and a learned single-query attention pooling whose uniform special case reproduces mean pooling. The preservation criterion was fixed relative to condition A before any condition-B number existed. A family counts as preserved if its best model by held-out MAE beats the per-fold constant and reaches at least 0.7 times the rank correlation and 0.5 times the slope of condition A, with the shuffle control collapsed. Both conditions pass. No bridge parameter is updated at any point.

The in-loop age head of Fig. 9 is not part of this battery. It is a LayerNorm followed by a small multilayer perceptron on the mean-pooled resampler output, trained jointly with the bridge at loss weight 0.5 under a Huber loss, gated to tiles with a mare fraction of at least one half and a dated reference within 8° (Sec. 4.4). Its per-snapshot evaluation uses $n = 40$ dated snapshot tiles with the constant prior recomputed on that set.

B Closed-book chat example

Fig. 11 shows the free-form question mode on a single held-out tile, discussed in Sec. 7.1. It complements the instruction-format closed-book against open-book comparison of Fig. 10, which is the deployed configuration the quantitative evaluation scores. The tile was selected as a best-case age match, and the caption flags the two ungrounded statements in the answer.



Q How old is the surface here and why?

A The scene is very dark (albedo 0.13) and very smooth — local relief ~ 200 m, roughness ~ 50 m — while the Clementine UV/VIS ratio (~ 0.49) reads as a near-neutral ratio color. Regional crater statistics date the adjacent mapped basalts to roughly 3.6 Ga, within the Imbrian. The Basin Massif Unit (Nbm) forms the foundational structural element here, representing ancient crustal uplift associated with large-scale basin formation events. I see this older terrain being progressively buried by successive stages of volcanic activity, specifically where the Mare Unit (Em) overlies these massifs before being further mantled by the Upper Mare Unit (Im2). This clear superposition allows me to reconstruct a sequence of basaltic flooding following the initial impact-related deformation. Near the small satellite feature Schroter U, the stratigraphic relationship becomes even more evident as the younger mare flows clearly drape over the pre-existing topography of the Nbm. While I am confident in this relative chronology based on the visible layering, my understanding remains qualitative regarding the exact duration between these specific volcanic pulses without a distance-specific age anchor for this particular location.

Reference (withheld from the prompt). Chips read stated / measured:

mapped unit Im2 ✓ named unit age 3.5 Ga / stated 3.6 Ga ✓ nearest dated ref. 3.5 Ga at 0.8°
 albedo 0.13 / 0.12 ✓ relief 200 / 145 m ✓ roughness 50 / 40 m ✓ 415/750 0.49 / 0.44 ✓

Figure 11: Closed-book chat on a held-out tile (long= $22^\circ 58' 20.68''$ W, lat= $55^\circ 39' 24.92''$ N, shown for the reader, not the model). SelenoVLM_{age} reads the four co-registered rasters, no coordinates and no retrieval context. The chips compare stated against raster-measured values and verify the four opener facts, the named unit, and the stated age, and nothing else. Two statements in the answer are not grounded. The place name "**Schroter U**" cannot come from the inputs, since the feature lies roughly 53° of latitude away, and the phrase "**regional crater statistics**" asserts a measurement the model does not perform. Both are learned prose patterns of the target distribution. The WAC panel is rendered at natural reflectance, so the dark mare surface appears dark, consistent with the stated albedo, while the elevation and Clementine panels are contrast-stretched for legibility. The tile was selected as a best-case age match. Table 7 quantifies that stated age values in general track the mare prior rather than the tile.