

InterleaveThinker: Reinforcing Agentic Interleaved Generation

Dian Zheng^{1,2*} Harry Lee Manyuan Zhang^{2†} Kaituo Feng¹ Zoey Guo³ Ray Zhang¹ Hongsheng Li^{1‡}

¹CUHK MMLab ²Meituan ³CUHK IMIXR

🏠 Home: <https://github.com/zhengdian1/InterleaveThinker>

👤 HF: <https://huggingface.co/InterleaveThinker>

*Work done during an internship at Meituan. †Project Leader. ‡Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: Capabilities of InterleaveThinker, consisting of interleaved generation with various types inputs, real-world action interaction, and robotic manipulation. Gray: inputs, blue: outputs.

ABSTRACT

Recent image generators have demonstrated impressive photorealism and instruction-following capabilities in single-image generation and editing. However, constrained by their architectures, they cannot achieve interleaved generation (text-image sequence), which has crucial applications in visual narratives, guidance, and embodied manipulation. Even the latest open-source Unified Multimodal Models (UMMs) exhibit limited performance in this regard. In this paper, we introduce InterleaveThinker, the first multi-agent pipeline designed to endow any existing image generator with interleaved generation capabilities. Specifically, we employ a planner agent to organize the image-text input sequence, instructing the image generator on the required execution at each step. Subsequently, we introduce a critic agent to evaluate the generator’s outputs, identify samples that deviate from the planned instructions, and refine the instructions for regeneration. To implement this pipeline, we construct the Interleave-Planner-SFT-80k and Interleave-Critic-SFT-112k to perform a format

cold-start. Then we develop Interleave-Critic-RL-13k to reinforce the step-wise instruction correction capability within a generation trajectory using GRPO. Since a single interleaved generation trajectory may involve over 25 generator calls, optimizing the entire trajectory is computationally impractical. Therefore, we propose accuracy reward and step-wise reward, allowing single-step RL to effectively guide the entire generation trajectory. The results show that InterleaveThinker improves performance across various image generators. On interleaved generation benchmarks, it achieves performance comparable to Nano Banana and GPT-5. Surprisingly, it also significantly enhances the base model on reasoning-based benchmarks; for example, on 4-step FLUX.2-klein, we observe substantial gains on WISE (from 0.47 to 0.73) and RISE (from 13.3 to 28.9)

1 Introduction

Recent advancements in image generation and editing have demonstrated remarkable photorealism and instruction-following capabilities. However, these models [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] are fundamentally designed for single-image generation/editing. In real-world applications, there is a growing demand for interleaved generation, a workflow that takes an interleaved text and image sequence as input and outputs a coherent, multi-step sequence of text and images. This capability holds crucial value for visual narratives, guidance, and embodied manipulation. Unfortunately, constrained by their inherent image-only output architectures, existing image generators cannot natively achieve this, leaving a significant gap between single-image synthesis and complex sequential generation.

The emergence of Unified Multimodal Models (UMMs) [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] offers a potential solution, as their architectures naturally support interleaved text and image generation. However, because they generate sequences step-by-step based on preceding images, UMMs suffer from two critical problems in long-horizon tasks: 1) **Visual over-reliance**. As shown in Fig 2(b), when generating a repetitive action sequence like a push-up, the model might stop at an intermediate state that visually resembles the final goal. 2) **Step-wise error accumulation**. As current UMMs have not yet achieved a stable “aha-moment” for self-correction, a slight degradation in early image quality compounds step-by-step, eventually ruining the final output, as shown in Fig 2(c).

In this paper, we propose InterleaveThinker, the first multi-agent framework that endows any fixed image generator with strong interleaved generation capabilities. The core motivation for this multi-agent design is to eradicate visual over-reliance and resolve step-wise error accumulation through an explicit correction mechanism. If a single VLM alternates between planning and evaluating generated images, it becomes overly conditioned on intermediate visual states. This causes the model to lose sight of the global objective and myopically react to local visual feedback, inevitably leading to step-wise error accumulation. To fundamentally resolve this, InterleaveThinker employs a Planner agent to predict the entire sequence of instructions upfront. This completely bypasses visual over-reliance by blocking intermediate feedback. To monitor the subsequent execution, a Critic agent then evaluates the step outputs, identifies deviations from the initial instructions, and refines prompts for regeneration, ensuring strict adherence to the overall trajectory without updating the generator.

A primary challenge in implementing this multi-agent pipeline is the absence of tailored training data. To address this, we first curate a comprehensive prompt list spanning diverse interleaved generation tasks and scenarios, including embodied manipulation, art, storytelling, image description, workflows, daily life, science, and professional skills. Using these prompts, we iteratively employ advanced models (Gemini 2.5 Pro and Nano Banana Pro) to generate detailed agentic trajectories. To guarantee high-quality supervision, we implement a rigorous data filtering pipeline (detailed in Sec 3.2). Ultimately, this process yields three high-quality datasets: Interleave-Planner-SFT-80k and Interleave-Critic-SFT-112k to enable the multi-agent format cold-start, alongside Interleave-Critic-RL-13k to reinforce the critic’s step-wise correction capabilities using GRPO. Note that one interleaved trajectory can involve over 25 generator calls, so optimizing the entire trajectory end-to-end is computationally impractical. To resolve this, we design a dual-reward strategy comprising an accuracy reward and a step-wise reward. This formulation achieves trajectory-level alignment through efficient single-step RL, drastically reducing computational costs.

To validate the universal applicability of InterleaveThinker, we evaluate the pipeline across multiple off-the-shelf image generators, observing consistent performance gains. As a representative default, we adopt the 4-step FLUX.2-klein to minimize long-horizon latency. Under this setup, our approach significantly surpasses existing open-source UMMs on rigorous interleaved generation benchmarks, achieving performance comparable to the proprietary Nano Banana and GPT-5. Surprisingly, beyond interleaved generation, our framework also significantly enhances the base model on




Figure 2: **Problems in image generator and UMM for interleaved generation.** Highlight in red boxes.

reasoning-based benchmarks. Specifically, we observe substantial improvements on the WISE benchmark (increasing from 0.47 to 0.73) and the RISE benchmark (leaping from 13.3 to 28.9). These results highlight the immense potential of multi-agent collaboration in unlocking complex, sequential reasoning and generation capabilities for existing image models.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- We propose InterleaveThinker, the first multi-agent framework to endow any fixed image generator with strong interleaved generation capabilities. By introducing a Planner-Gen-Critic workflow, it effectively resolves visual over-reliance and step-wise error accumulation in UMM.
- To support training, we build a dedicated data pipeline to construct interleaved generation data across diverse scenarios, resulting in three high-quality datasets: Interleave-Planner-SFT-80k, Interleave-Critic-SFT-112k, and Interleave-Critic-RL-13k. In addition, we design a novel dual-reward strategy that achieves trajectory-level alignment through efficient single-step RL via GRPO, drastically reducing computational costs.
- Extensive experiments validate the effectiveness and universal applicability of our proposed InterleaveThinker. For example, using 4-step FLUX.2-klein as generator, we not only surpasses existing open-source UMMs on interleaved generation, but also significantly improves the base model on reasoning benchmarks, increasing WISE from 0.47 to 0.73 and RISE from 13.3 to 28.9.

2 Related Works

2.1 Unified Image Generation and Editing Model

Recent advancements in diffusion [14, 15, 16] and autoregressive models [17, 18] have significantly elevated the photorealism and instruction-following capabilities of image generation models [1, 5, 19, 3, 20]. Building upon these foundational architectures, researchers have developed robust image editing models [21, 3, 4, 22, 23, 24, 2, 25]. Crucially, these models preserve their strong text-to-image generation capabilities. Given this dual functionality, we refer to them as unified image generation and editing models (“image generators” for short), which serve as the base model for our framework. However, their inherent architectures restrict them to interleaved generation, and our work seeks to bridge this gap by retrofitting frozen image generators with robust interleaved generation capabilities.

2.2 Unified Multimodal Models and Interleaved Generation

Recently Unified Multimodal Models (UMMs) [10, 7, 26, 11, 27, 8, 12, 28, 13] have emerged as a promising paradigm. UMMs natively support interleaved generation by modeling text and visual tokens within a unified framework. Despite their architectural advantages, UMMs struggle with long-horizon tasks due to two fundamental issues. First, they suffer from *visual over-reliance*: because they condition heavily on immediately preceding visual states, they frequently halt at intermediate states that superficially resemble the final goal. Second, without a robust self-correction mechanism, minor degradations in early steps lead to severe *step-wise error accumulation*, eventually ruining the final output. DuoGen [29] simulates UMM by jointly tuning a VLM and a video generator. Despite improved performance, it suffers from visual over-reliance and is incompatible with arbitrary image generators. InterleaveThinker overcomes these limitations by decoupling planning and generation, preventing myopic reactions to local visual feedback.




Figure 3: **Overview of InterleaveThinker.** t means the refinement iterations. Fig 4 for inference example.

2.3 Agentic Reinforcement Learning

Agentic reinforcement learning (RL) has recently emerged as an effective paradigm for training LLMs and VLMs to perform multi-agent, multi-step reasoning and long-horizon tool interaction [30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. In the visual generation domain, researchers have begun adapting agentic RL to enhance output quality and controllability. Gen-Searcher [20] trains search agents to guide knowledge-intensive image generation, [35, 36, 37, 38, 39] explore multi-turn refinement for image generation/editing and [23, 40] further employs RL to it. Despite these promising explorations, applying multi-agent RL to long-horizon interleaved generation remains unexplored.

3 InterleaveThinker

To endow existing frozen image generators with robust interleaved generation capabilities, and address the visual over-reliance, step-wise error accumulation problem in UMM. We propose InterleaveThinker, a universal multi-agent framework. We show our multi-agent workflow, data construction pipeline, and training scheme below.

3.1 Multi-Agent Pipeline

As shown in Fig 3, we formulate a progressive, closed-loop pipeline comprising three core modules: a *Planner*, a *Critic*, and a *Generator* (Any generator that **both handles image generation and editing**, such as FLUX.2-klein [2], Qwen-image-Edit [3]). The framework decomposes the complex interleaved generation process into a step-wise execution plan, incorporating self-correction mechanism to ensure high-fidelity generation and editing. Let S denotes the input interleaved sequence of images and text. The overall pipeline operates through the following formalized stages:

1. Planner: The Planner is responsible for analyzing the input sequence S and translating it into an N -step execution plan. For each step $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the Planner generates a step instruction u_i , a model-friendly initial prompt p_i adapted from u_i , and an auxiliary text a_i , which provides supplementary knowledge-based elaboration required for specific image generation tasks. The planning process is formulated as:

$$\{(u_i, p_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^N = \text{Planner}(S). \quad (1)$$

2. Generator: At step i and refinement iteration $t \in \{1, T_{max}\}$, the Generator takes the current refined prompt r_i^t ($r_i^0 = p_i$) and the image from the previous step I_{i-1} to produce the current image I_i^t :

$$I_i^t = \text{Generator}(r_i^t, I_{i-1}). \quad (2)$$

Note: For the initial generation step $i=1$, where no prior visual context exists, I_0 is defined as \emptyset .

3. Critic: To ensure the generated output I_i strictly aligns with the intended instruction p_i , we introduce a Critic module that provides quantitative feedback and prompt optimization. At iteration t of step i , the Critic evaluates the transition from the pre-execution image I_{i-1} to the post-execution image I_i^t . It takes the initial prompt p_i and the current refined prompt r_i^t as textual conditions. The Critic outputs a binary judgment j_i^t , a newly refined prompt r_i^{t+1} for the next iteration, and a reasoning process R_i^t :

$$(j_i^t, r_i^{t+1}, R_i^t) = \text{Critic}(I_{i-1}, I_i^t, p_i, r_i^t), \quad (3)$$




Figure 4: The working flow of InterleaveThinker.

Note: For the initial step $i=1$, I_0 is set as a blank white image to maintain input consistency.

This generation-evaluation loop (Stage 2↔3) iterates until a positive execution judgment (True) is obtained, or a maximum number of iterations T_{max} is reached. Upon satisfaction, the pipeline finalizes I_i and a_i , appends them to the output sequence, and proceeds to step $i + 1$. We also show a comprehensive workflow examples in Fig 4.

3.2 Dataset Construction Pipeline

High-quality training data is essential for developing agents capable of long-horizon planning and step-wise correction. However, aligned pairs of interleaved instructions, intermediate visual states, and critic judgement, refinements, thinking




Figure 5: Illustration of Our Data Construction Pipeline.

process do not naturally exist. To address this, as shown in Fig 5, we construct a dedicated data pipeline comprising four main stages.

Text Prompt Construction. We curate a comprehensive set of text prompts that covers primary interleaved generation tasks (visual narrative, guidance, and embodied manipulation). To ensure dataset diversity, we propose a systematic, top-down generation pipeline. We initiate this process by defining 8 main categories spanning broad domains, including robotics, visual storytelling, art, workflows, daily life, science, and professional skills. These main categories are further divided into approximately 75 fine-grained sub-categories, such as biology, cooking, and physics. We then prompt Gemini 2.5 Pro [41] to expand these sub-categories into more than 30 domain-specific vocabulary banks, extracting key entities and actions. Finally, we populate over 100 predefined instructional templates (e.g., “How to {Action}”, “Show {Action} step by step”) with elements from these domain banks. This procedural generation approach ultimately yields roughly 40,000 diverse text prompts tailored for interleaved generation.

Multi-Agent Trajectory Generation. Given the collected prompts, we employ advanced proprietary models, Gemini 2.5 Pro [41] and Nano Banana Pro [25], to generate agentic trajectories. For each task, the Planner agent first generates a global step-by-step instruction sequence. Then, an image generator (*i.e.*, since the trajectory data generated by Nano Banana Pro is of exceptionally high quality, we introduce FLUX.2-klein-9B to balance the dataset, thereby preventing the Critic from becoming biased.) executes these instructions step-by-step. At each step, the Critic agent evaluates the generated image, compares it against the Planner’s original instruction, and produces a critique. If the image deviates from the instruction, the Critic refines the prompt for immediate regeneration. This iterative process yields complete trajectories containing global plans, intermediate images, critiques, and refined prompts.

Critic Data Filtering and Splitting. To ensure the quality of the synthesized trajectories, we apply a rigorous filtering pipeline that eliminates samples with severe logical inconsistencies or poor visual quality. Note that *this filtering process is exclusively applied to curate the training data for the Critic*, while the training data for the Planner remains unfiltered. Since optimizing an entire interleaved trajectory (*One trajectory maybe consist of 25 generator calls*) via RL is computationally prohibitive and unstable, we first decompose the generated trajectories into independent step-wise data. This decomposition enables a single-iteration optimization approach (as detailed in Sec. 3.4). We then employ Gemini 2.5 Pro [41] with an adapted system prompt from VIEScore [42] to evaluate every refinement iteration within each step, assigning scores from 0 to 10 for both semantic alignment and visual quality. Based on these iteration-level scores, we process the step-wise data through the following three stages.

1) Steps Filtering. We analyze the progression of the Gemini 2.5 Pro scores across the refinement iterations within each step. As illustrated in the scoring curves, we discard steps that exhibit negative refinement trends, score degradation, or persistent low quality. Only the steps demonstrating successful refinement, characterized by an upward or stable high-score trajectory, are retained for subsequent processing. **2) SFT-RL Data Splitting.** To construct tailored datasets for SFT and RL, we compute the variance of the iteration scores within each valid step. Steps with a high score variance indicate a dynamic refinement process with substantial quality shifts, making them ideal for RL optimization. Conversely, steps with low variance represent stable and high-quality generation, which are better suited for the SFT

dataset. We partition the data accordingly and maintain an empirical sample ratio of 2:1 between the SFT and RL subsets.

3) Iter-wise Judgment Distribution Balancing. The Critic includes an objective to predict the binary judgment of a given iteration. Training on the natural, heavily skewed data leads to biased estimations. To address this, we balance the iteration-wise data by resampling the samples as shown in Fig 5. Ultimately, this process yields two high-quality datasets: `Interleave-Critic-SFT-112k` for SFT, and `Interleave-Critic-RL-13k` for RL.

Interleaved Input Planner Data Construction. Since our initial instructions consist solely of pure text prompts, the resulting dataset naturally lacks the multimodal interleaved context required to train the Planner. To address this limitation, we adopt two strategies to construct interleaved input-output pairs. First, we generate self-synthesized interleaved trajectories by interleaving the previously generated textual plans with their corresponding final image outputs at each step. To formulate training pairs, we randomly select a step to truncate this sequence. The sequence preceding the truncation point acts as the interleaved multimodal input, while the subsequent text plan is assigned as the target output. Second, we leverage existing open-source interleaved datasets [43]. Although these datasets lack the fine-grained annotations necessary for training the Critic, their natural text-image structures are perfectly suited for the Planner. Consequently, the final training corpus for the Planner is composed of both the self-synthesized truncated sequences and the external unannotated interleaved data. Ultimately, this process yields `Interleave-Planner-SFT-80k`

3.3 Training Scheme

Based on the constructed datasets, we train the InterleaveThinker framework through a two-stage pipeline: SFT for multi-agent format cold-start, followed by RL to reinforce the Critic’s correction capabilities using GRPO.

Planner-SFT. The Planner is initialized with Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [44] and fine-tuned using the `Interleave-Planner-SFT-80k` dataset. Details regarding the system prompt and SFT format can be found in Appendix A. The SFT training equips the model with the ability to break down a complex user request into a coherent, global sequence of text-image instructions upfront, thereby bypassing the visual over-reliance problem. Note that we did not apply RL to the Planner. Because our trajectories can involve over 25 rounds of generator tool calls, the reward signals become highly sparse, making RL optimization highly unstable. Furthermore, since SFT alone already achieves strong performance, RL was deemed unnecessary.

Critic-SFT. Critic is initialized with Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct [44], SFT teaches the model the basic format of evaluation: observing the current visual state, identifying deviations from the planned instruction, and formulating a refined prompt for the generator. We show that format below and the system prompt is shown in Appendix A.

<think></think><answer>[Judgment][Refined Prompt]</answer>

Dual-Reward Strategy for Efficient Critic RL. A unique challenge in applying RL to interleaved generation is the extreme length of the generation trajectories. A single interleaved task may require over 25 generator calls. Optimizing the entire trajectory end-to-end using standard RL algorithms introduces prohibitive computational costs and severe credit assignment issues.

To resolve this, we propose a single-step RL formulation guided by a dual-reward strategy to effectively simulate full-trajectory optimization. Since our decoupled Planner generates all step-by-step instructions upfront, the generation process naturally breaks down into independent stages. Within each step, the Critic evaluates the output and iteratively generates refinement prompts until a satisfactory quality threshold is met, allowing the system to seamlessly advance to the next pre-planned instruction. Consequently, ensuring the success of each local iteration guarantees the overall success of the global trajectory. The **Accuracy Reward** (R_{acc}) measures the Critic’s ability to accurately judge the current generation by penalizing the difference between its predicted one and the ground truth J_i , ensuring reliable threshold identification. The formulation is as:

$$R_{acc} = -|\text{Critic}(I_{i-1}, I_i^t, p_i, r_i^t) - J_i|. \quad (4)$$

Meanwhile, the **Step-wise Reward** (R_{step}) evaluates the effectiveness of the Critic’s interventions when an output falls below the threshold. It is computed as the score difference between the newly iteration result I_i^{t+1} and the original I_i^t , the formulation is as

$$R_{step} = \text{Gemini}(I_{i-1}, I_i^{t+1}, p_i, r_i^{t+1}) - \text{Gemini}(I_{i-1}, I_i^t, p_i, r_i^t), \quad (5)$$

where a positive delta indicates that the refinement prompt successfully improved the output, directly rewarding actionable and effective critiques. Note that we use expert Gemini 2.5 Pro to score the result to ensure the accuracy and

Table 1: **Comparison on UEval [46]**. We evaluate open-source and proprietary frontier models on 8 tasks in UEval. **Bold** indicates the best result among each group.

Models	Space	Textbook	Diagram	Paper	Art	Life	Tech	Exercise	Avg
<i>Reference</i>									
Reference	96.2	94.4	93.1	96.2	90.6	87.7	90.6	89.2	92.2
<i>Proprietary Frontier Models</i>									
Gemini-2.0-Flash [47]	65.2	55.2	47.6	45.8	70.4	58.0	50.2	48.0	55.1
GPT-5-Instant [48]	77.3	77.9	62.3	55.1	71.2	69.7	50.7	57.6	65.2
GPT-5-Thinking [48]	84.0	78.0	67.8	51.9	67.8	63.8	57.0	61.4	66.4
Nano Banana [9]	78.0	74.0	66.4	71.6	66.6	63.0	58.2	50.0	66.0
Nano Banana Pro [25]	79.4	89.6	75.9	81.3	84.3	73.5	60.8	63.9	76.1
<i>Open-Sourced Models</i>									
Janus-Pro [7]	21.0	31.0	37.4	15.2	26.4	23.0	17.6	11.5	22.9
Show-o2 [49]	25.4	33.1	33.2	17.4	25.6	15.6	17.4	13.1	22.6
MMaDA [50]	10.8	20.0	14.2	13.3	15.7	15.8	12.4	12.6	14.4
BAGEL [10]	29.8	42.5	37.2	20.0	39.0	33.6	24.8	21.4	31.0
Emu3.5 [8]	59.1	57.4	41.1	31.6	59.3	62.0	37.0	45.4	49.1
InterleaveThinker+FLUX.2-klein-9B	62.1	92.0	82.1	75.1	71.0	54.6	36.6	43.8	66.3
InterleaveThinker+Qwen-Image-Edit	65.8	90.5	84.2	77.9	70.4	55.7	36.3	44.2	67.2

consistency with binary judgment. The final reward for a single correction step is computed as a weighted combination of both signals and the format reward R_{format} :

$$R = 0.5 * R_{format} + 0.5 * (\alpha R_{acc} + (1 - \alpha) R_{step}) \quad (6)$$

where α is a balancing hyperparameter and set to 0.2 by default. By normalizing these rewards within a sampled group, we compute the advantages and update the Critic’s policy using the GRPO objective. For the implementation details about GRPO, please refer to [45].

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Implementation Details. Both the Planner and the Critic are initialized from the Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct model. In the SFT stage, the Planner and the Critic are both trained for two epochs, using a learning rate of 2×10^{-5} and a batch size of 32. Then, the Critic is trained for one epoch of RL. For the RL stage, we set the learning rate to 2×10^{-6} , the global batch size to 16, the rollout number (N) to 8, and apply a KL divergence penalty with a coefficient of 1×10^{-3} . Throughout the training, the maximum image resolution is capped at 1024×1024 . The entire pipeline takes approximately 50 hours on eight H800 GPUs. During inference, we integrate InterleaveThinker with three distinct models to evaluate different aspects of our approach and set the maximum refinement iteration T_{max} for each step to 5. We use FLUX.2-klein-9B [2] for in-domain evaluation and Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [3] to assess generalization capabilities.

Benchmarks. To systematically evaluate the capabilities of our multi-agent InterleaveThinker, we test it on two interleaved benchmarks: UEval [46] and CoMM [43] (Tasks 3 and 4). Specifically, UEval assesses text-to-interleaved output generation, while task3 of CoMM measures interleaved input-output performance. Furthermore, we validate our method on reasoning-based benchmarks, utilizing WISE [51] for image generation and RISE [52] for image editing.

4.2 Main Results.

Results on UEval. As summarized in Table 1, our multi-agent pipeline significantly outperforms existing open-source UMMs and achieves performance comparable to the highly capable Nano Banana. More importantly, the further performance gains observed when integrating with Qwen-Image-Edit demonstrate that InterleaveThinker is a model-agnostic and highly generalizable framework.

Results on CoMM. As shown in Table 2, InterleaveThinker surpasses all existing methods even when solely integrated with the 4-step FLUX.2-klein. Furthermore, applying our framework to stronger models like Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 further pushes the performance boundaries on this benchmark.




Figure 6: Comparison with Emu3.5 and Nano Banana Pro in pure-text input interleaved generation.




Figure 7: Comparison with Emu3.5 and Nano Banana Pro in multi-modal input interleaved generation.

Table 2: **Comparison on CoMM [43]**. Sty. and Enti. denotes the style and entity consistency among generated images. Tren. denotes the trend alignment between image and text sequence. Comp. denotes the completeness, ImgQ is the image quality. IRS means text-image alignment score. x/x reflects the model’s performance on interleaved (Task 3) and pure-text (Task 4) inputs.

Model	Sty.	Enti.	Tren.	Comp.	ImgQ	IRS
MiniGPT-5 [53]	5.6 / 5.7	5.2 / 5.2	5.2 / 5.3	6.3 / 5.8	6.4 / 6.2	2.6 / 2.7
SEED-LLaMA [54]	6.3 / 7.6	5.8 / 6.8	5.7 / 6.2	6.3 / 5.1	6.6 / 6.4	2.9 / 1.5
Emu2 [55]	8.2 / 8.4	8.0 / 7.6	8.0 / 7.6	8.5 / 7.5	8.6 / 7.6	2.4 / 2.0
DuoGen [29]	- / 9.2	- / 9.2	- / 9.2	- / 9.7	- / 9.5	- / 7.8
InterleaveThinker+FLUX.2-klein-9B	9.3 / 9.6	9.2 / 9.6	9.1 / 9.5	9.1 / 9.6	9.7 / 9.8	5.2 / 8.2
InterleaveThinker+Qwen-Image-Edit	9.2 / 9.6	9.1 / 9.7	9.0 / 9.6	9.2 / 9.8	9.7 / 9.8	5.5 / 8.4

Table 3: **Comparison on WISE [51]**. **Bold** indicates the best result among each group.

Model	Cultural	Time	Space	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Overall
<i>Proprietary Frontier Models</i>							
GPT-Image-1 [56]	0.81	0.71	0.89	0.83	0.79	0.74	0.80
Nano Banana Pro [25]	0.89	0.80	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.85	0.87
<i>Open-Sourced Models</i>							
SD-3.5-large [57]	0.44	0.50	0.58	0.44	0.52	0.31	0.46
FLUX.1-dev [1]	0.48	0.58	0.62	0.42	0.51	0.35	0.50
Hunyuan-Image-3.0 [12]	0.57	0.58	0.75	0.58	0.71	0.47	0.61
Qwen-Image [3]	0.62	0.63	0.77	0.57	0.75	0.40	0.62
LongCat-Image [4]	0.66	0.61	0.72	0.66	0.72	0.49	0.65
BAGEL [10]	0.76	0.69	0.75	0.65	0.75	0.58	0.72
FLUX.2-klein-9B [2]	0.44	0.60	0.67	0.32	0.50	0.27	0.47
+InterleaveThinker (Ours)	0.72	0.70	0.82	0.72	0.78	0.69	0.73
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [3]	0.60	0.60	0.76	0.52	0.66	0.39	0.60
+InterleaveThinker (Ours)	0.74	0.67	0.83	0.72	0.76	0.56	0.72

Results on WISE. It is important to note that neither our Planner nor our Critic was explicitly trained on reasoning-based image generation tasks. Remarkably, the results in Table 3 show that our method significantly improves upon the base models. This demonstrates that our multi-agent plan-generate-critic framework is also highly beneficial for reasoning-based image generation tasks.

Results on RISE. The performance on the reasoning-based image editing task mirrors the success observed on WISE. As shown in Table 4, our approach significantly improves the base models.

Visualization. We further provide qualitative visual comparisons in Fig 6 and Fig 7. InterleaveThinker effectively mitigates the problems of visual over-reliance and step-wise error accumulation, while simultaneously maintaining high textual fidelity and superior image quality.

4.3 Ablation Study

We conduct extensive ablation studies on the UEval benchmark and use FLUX.2-klein-9B as the default image generator. For reference, we also report the upper-bound performance achieved by two proprietary oracle models (Gemini-2.5-Pro and GPT-4.1). The results are shown in Table 5.

Effectiveness of Multi-Agent workflow. The raw FLUX.2-klein-9B generator alone fails entirely at interleaved generation due to output limitation. To establish a zero-shot multi-agent baseline, we deploy the Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct model as both the Planner and the Critic. When we introduce the *Planner-SFT* module (while keeping the Critic as the zero-shot Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct), we observe a massive surge in the Text score from 33.5 to 58.5. Subsequently, upgrading the pipeline to *Full-SFT* (where both the Planner and Critic are fine-tuned) further boosts the Image quality. This confirms that the Critic-SFT successfully identify visual deviations and provide actionable corrections that the zero-shot model cannot formulate.

Table 4: Comparison on RISE-Bench [52].

Model	Temporal	Causal	Spatial	Logical	Overall
<i>Proprietary Models</i>					
Seedream-4.0 [58]	12.9	12.2	11.0	7.1	10.8
GPT-Image-1 [56]	34.1	32.2	37.0	10.6	28.9
Nano Banana [9]	25.9	47.8	37.0	18.8	32.8
Nano Banana Pro [25]	41.2	61.1	48.0	37.6	47.2
<i>Open-source Models</i>					
Step1X-Edit [21]	0.0	2.2	2.0	3.5	1.9
Ovis-U1 [6]	1.2	3.3	4.0	2.4	2.8
FLUX.1-Kontext-Dev [59]	2.3	5.5	13.0	1.2	5.8
BAGEL [10]	2.4	5.6	14.0	1.2	6.1
BAGEL (w/ CoT) [10]	5.9	17.8	21.0	1.2	11.9
Qwen-Image-Edit [3]	4.7	10.0	17.0	2.4	8.9
FLUX.2-klein-9B [2]	7.1	13.3	24.0	7.1	13.3
+InterleaveThinker (Ours)	36.5	33.3	34.0	10.6	28.9
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [3]	21.2	18.9	31.0	4.7	19.4
+InterleaveThinker (Ours)	27.1	38.9	39.0	12.9	30.0

Impact of the Dual-Reward RL Scheme. We ablate the reward signals used in the RL stage. Removing the Step-wise Reward (R_{step}) decreases the average score, as the Critic fails to optimize the refined prompts effectively. Conversely, removing the Accuracy Reward (R_{acc}) drops the score as it leads to inaccurate score evaluation. Ultimately, combining both rewards yields the best result.

Multi-Agent vs. One. To further validate the issue of visual over-reliance in single VLM, we integrated the planner’s capabilities into the critic, allowing the model to simultaneously plan the next step and evaluate the previous one. The results indicate that this paradigm severely degrades model performance when the image generator is frozen, corroborating our claim in the introduction.

Importance of Critic Data Filtering. In our dataset construction pipeline (Sec. 3.2), we introduced step filtering and iteration-wise judgment distribution balancing. We train an ablation variant of the Critic using the unfiltered data. This Critic tends to collapse into trivial constant predictions (e.g., frequently output `True` regardless of the actual image quality), leading to performance drop.

Influence of Maximum Refinement Iterations. InterleaveThinker’s closed-loop refinement relies on the maximum iteration count T_{max} . Increasing T_{max} consistently improves performance over the single-pass baseline ($T_{max} = 1$), demonstrating the Critic’s effectiveness.

5 Conclusion and Limitations

In this work, we identify that existing multimodal models struggle with long-horizon interleaved generation due to visual over-reliance and step-wise error accumulation. We attribute this to the entangled planning and visual evaluation within a single model, and propose a decoupled multi-agent framework, InterleaveThinker, to address it. InterleaveThinker consists of a Planner that predicts global instructions upfront to bypass visual interference, and a Critic agent that performs step-wise evaluation and prompt refinement. To overcome the computational bottleneck of long-trajectory

Table 5: Ablation Study on UEval.

Model	Text	Image	Avg
FLUX.2-klein-9B	0	36.4	18.2
+ Gemini-2.5-pro (oracle)	74.8	79.9	77.4
+ GPT 4.1	63.2	71.8	67.5
+ Qwen3-VL-8B (Baseline)	33.5	62.6	48.1
+ Planner-SFT	58.5	61.8	60.5
+ Full-SFT	58.6	70.4	64.5
+ RL w/o step reward	58.2	72.2	65.2
+ RL w/o acc reward	58.4	71.7	65.1
+ Full-RL	58.6	74.0	66.3
One-Agent	45.2	63.7	54.5
Unfiltered data	58.2	67.3	62.8
$T_{max} = 1$	58.5	61.8	60.2
$T_{max} = 3$	58.6	72.0	65.3
$T_{max} = 5$	58.6	74.0	66.3

RL, we further introduce a dual-reward strategy that enables efficient single-step RL on the Critic to guide the entire generation sequence. Extensive experiments show that InterleaveThinker endows off-the-shelf image generators with strong interleaved generation capabilities, matching proprietary models while surprisingly boosting complex reasoning performance.

Limitations. Although adaptable to any image generator, our framework’s capacity is constrained by the base model’s generative prior. Consequently, it cannot generate concepts that were not included in the base generator’s training corpus. We further show the bad case about this in Fig 8 in Appendix.

References

- [1] Black Forest Labs. Flux. <https://github.com/black-forest-labs/flux>, 2024.
- [2] Black Forest Labs. FLUX.2: Frontier Visual Intelligence. <https://bfl.ai/blog/flux-2>, 2025.
- [3] Chenfei Wu, Jiahao Li, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kaiyuan Gao, Kun Yan, Sheng-ming Yin, Shuai Bai, Xiao Xu, Yilei Chen, et al. Qwen-image technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02324*, 2025.
- [4] Meituan LongCat Team, Hanghang Ma, Haoxian Tan, Jiale Huang, Junqiang Wu, Jun-Yan He, Lishuai Gao, Songlin Xiao, Xiaoming Wei, Xiaoqi Ma, et al. Longcat-image technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.07584*, 2025.
- [5] Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, et al. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2024.
- [6] Guo-Hua Wang, Shanshan Zhao, Xinjie Zhang, Liangfu Cao, Pengxin Zhan, Lunhao Duan, Shiyin Lu, Minghao Fu, Xiaohao Chen, Jianshan Zhao, et al. Ovis-u1 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.23044*, 2025.
- [7] Xiaokang Chen, Zhiyu Wu, Xingchao Liu, Zizheng Pan, Wen Liu, Zhenda Xie, Xingkai Yu, and Chong Ruan. Janus-pro: Unified multimodal understanding and generation with data and model scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17811*, 2025.
- [8] Yufeng Cui, Honghao Chen, Haoge Deng, Xu Huang, Xinghang Li, Jirong Liu, Yang Liu, Zhuoyan Luo, Jinsheng Wang, Wenxuan Wang, et al. Emu3. 5: Native multimodal models are world learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26583*, 2025.
- [9] Google. Nano banana. 2025.
- [10] Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, et al. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025.
- [11] Chenyuan Wu, Pengfei Zheng, Ruiran Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyan Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, et al. Omnigen2: Exploration to advanced multimodal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.18871*, 2025.
- [12] Siyu Cao, Hangting Chen, Peng Chen, Yiji Cheng, Yutao Cui, Xincheng Deng, Ying Dong, Kipper Gong, Tianpeng Gu, Xiusen Gu, et al. Hunyuanimage 3.0 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23951*, 2025.
- [13] Dian Zheng, Manyuan Zhang, Hongyu Li, Kai Zou, Hongbo Liu, Ziyu Guo, Kaituo Feng, Yexin Liu, Ying Luo, Yan Feng, et al. Architecture decoupling is not all you need for unified multimodal model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.22663*, 2025.
- [14] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [15] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [16] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *ICCV*, 2023.
- [17] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025.
- [18] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.
- [19] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023.
- [20] Kaituo Feng, Manyuan Zhang, Shuang Chen, Yunlong Lin, Kaixuan Fan, Yilei Jiang, Hongyu Li, Dian Zheng, Chenyang Wang, and Xiangyu Yue. Gen-searcher: Reinforcing agentic search for image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28767*, 2026.
- [21] Shiyu Liu, Yucheng Han, Peng Xing, Fukun Yin, Rui Wang, Wei Cheng, Jiaqi Liao, Yingming Wang, Honghao Fu, Chunrui Han, et al. Step1x-edit: A practical framework for general image editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.17761*, 2025.
- [22] Zhipu AI. Glm-image. <https://huggingface.co/zai-org/GLM-Image>, 2026.
- [23] Hongyu Li, Manyuan Zhang, Dian Zheng, Ziyu Guo, Yimeng Jia, Kaituo Feng, Hao Yu, Yexin Liu, Yan Feng, Peng Pei, et al. Editthinker: Unlocking iterative reasoning for any image editor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.05965*, 2025.

- [24] Huanqia Cai, Sihan Cao, Ruoyi Du, Peng Gao, Steven Hoi, Zhaohui Hou, Shijie Huang, Dengyang Jiang, Xin Jin, Liangchen Li, et al. Z-image: An efficient image generation foundation model with single-stream diffusion transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.22699*, 2025.
- [25] Google. Nano-banana-pro. Accessed November, 2025 [Online] <https://deepmind.google/models/gemini-image/pro/>, 2025.
- [26] Meituan LongCat Team, Bin Xiao, Chao Wang, Chengjiang Li, Chi Zhang, Chong Peng, Hang Yu, Hao Yang, Haonan Yan, Haoze Sun, et al. Longcat-next: Lexicalizing modalities as discrete tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.27538*, 2026.
- [27] Xinlong Wang, Xiaosong Zhang, Zhengxiong Luo, Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Jinsheng Wang, Fan Zhang, Yuezhe Wang, Zhen Li, Qiyang Yu, et al. Emu3: Next-token prediction is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18869*, 2024.
- [28] Dian Zheng, Manyuan Zhang, Hongyu Li, Hongbo Liu, Kai Zou, Kaituo Feng, and Hongsheng Li. Uni-edit: Intelligent editing is a general task for unified model tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.21487*, 2026.
- [29] Min Shi, Xiaohui Zeng, Jiannan Huang, Yin Cui, Francesco Ferroni, Jialuo Li, Shubham Pachori, Zhaoshuo Li, Yogesh Balaji, Haoxiang Wang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Xiao Fu, Yue Zhao, Chieh-Yun Chen, Ming-Yu Liu, and Humphrey Shi. Duogen: Towards general purpose interleaved multimodal generation. In *CVPR*, 2026.
- [30] Guanting Dong, Hangyu Mao, Kai Ma, Licheng Bao, Yifei Chen, Zhongyuan Wang, Zhongxia Chen, Jiazhen Du, Huiyang Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, et al. Agentic reinforced policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19849*, 2025.
- [31] Wenxuan Huang, Yu Zeng, Qiuchen Wang, Zhen Fang, Shaosheng Cao, Zheng Chu, Qingyu Yin, Shuang Chen, Zhenfei Yin, Lin Chen, et al. Vision-deepresearch: Incentivizing deepresearch capability in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.22060*, 2026.
- [32] Yuhao Dong, Zuyan Liu, Shulin Tian, Yongming Rao, and Ziwei Liu. Insight-v++: Towards advanced long-chain visual reasoning with multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.18118*, 2026.
- [33] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [34] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [35] Zhenyu Wang, Aoxue Li, Zhenguo Li, and Xihui Liu. Genartist: Multimodal llm as an agent for unified image generation and editing. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [36] Zhengyuan Yang, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Chung-Ching Lin, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. Idea2img: Iterative self-refinement with gpt-4v for automatic image design and generation. In *ECCV*, 2024.
- [37] Shufan Li, Konstantinos Kallidromitis, Akash Gokul, Arsh Koneru, Yusuke Kato, Kazuki Kozuka, and Aditya Grover. Reflect-dit: Inference-time scaling for text-to-image diffusion transformers via in-context reflection. In *ICCV*, 2025.
- [38] Le Zhuo, Liangbing Zhao, Sayak Paul, Yue Liao, Renrui Zhang, Yi Xin, Peng Gao, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Hongsheng Li. From reflection to perfection: Scaling inference-time optimization for text-to-image diffusion models via reflection tuning. In *ICCV*, 2025.
- [39] Fukun Yin, Shiyu Liu, Yucheng Han, Zhibo Wang, Peng Xing, Rui Wang, Wei Cheng, Yingming Wang, Aojie Li, Zixin Yin, et al. Reasonedit: Towards reasoning-enhanced image editing models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.22625*, 2025.
- [40] Hengjia Li, Liming Jiang, Qing Yan, Yizhi Song, Hao Kang, Zichuan Liu, Xin Lu, Boxi Wu, and Deng Cai. Thinkrl-edit: Thinking in reinforcement learning for reasoning-centric image editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.03467*, 2026.
- [41] Google DeepMind. Gemini 2.5 pro. <https://deepmind.google/models/gemini/pro/>, 2025.
- [42] Max Ku, Dongfu Jiang, Cong Wei, Xiang Yue, and Wenhu Chen. Viescore: Towards explainable metrics for conditional image synthesis evaluation. In *ACL*, 2024.
- [43] Wei Chen, Lin Li, Yongqi Yang, Bin Wen, Fan Yang, Tingting Gao, Yu Wu, and Long Chen. Comm: A coherent interleaved image-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. In *CVPR*, 2025.
- [44] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025.
- [45] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyi Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [46] Bo Li, Yida Yin, Wenhao Chai, Xingyu Fu, and Zhuang Liu. Ueval: A benchmark for unified multimodal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.22155*, 2026.
- [47] Kat Kampf and Nicole Brichtova. Experiment with gemini 2.0 flash native image generation, march 2025. URL <https://developers.googleblog.com/en/experiment-with-gemini-20-flash-native-image-generation/>. Accessed, 2025.
- [48] OpenAI. Gpt-5. 2025.
- [49] Jinheng Xie, Zhenheng Yang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Show-o2: Improved native unified multimodal models. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.

- [50] Ling Yang, Ye Tian, Bowen Li, Xinchun Zhang, Ke Shen, Yunhai Tong, and Mengdi Wang. Mmada: Multimodal large diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15809*, 2025.
- [51] Yuwei Niu, Munan Ning, Mengren Zheng, Weiyang Jin, Bin Lin, Peng Jin, Jiaqi Liao, Chaoran Feng, Kunpeng Ning, Bin Zhu, et al. Wise: A world knowledge-informed semantic evaluation for text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.07265*, 2025.
- [52] Xiangyu Zhao, Peiyuan Zhang, Kexian Tang, Xiaorong Zhu, Hao Li, Wenhao Chai, Zicheng Zhang, Renqiu Xia, Guangtao Zhai, Junchi Yan, et al. Envisioning beyond the pixels: Benchmarking reasoning-informed visual editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02826*, 2025.
- [53] Kaizhi Zheng, Xuehai He, and Xin Eric Wang. Minigt-5: Interleaved vision-and-language generation via generative vokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02239*, 2023.
- [54] Yuying Ge, Sijie Zhao, Ziyun Zeng, Yixiao Ge, Chen Li, Xintao Wang, and Ying Shan. Making llama see and draw with seed tokenizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01218*, 2023.
- [55] Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiyang Yu, Yueze Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. Generative multimodal models are in-context learners. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- [56] OpenAI. Gpt-image-1. 2025.
- [57] Stability AI. Stable diffusion 3.5 large. <https://huggingface.co/stabilityai/stable-diffusion-3.5-large>, 2024.
- [58] ByteDance. Seedream 4.0. 2025.
- [59] Stephen Batifol, Andreas Blattmann, Frederic Boesel, Saksham Consul, Cyril Diagne, Tim Dockhorn, Jack English, Zion English, Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, et al. Flux. 1 kontekst: Flow matching for in-context image generation and editing in latent space. *arXiv e-prints*, 2025.

A System Prompt

Planner Pure-Text System Prompt

```
# Task Planner, Orchestrator, and Prompt Engineer System

You are an expert Task Planner, Orchestrator, and Prompt Engineer.
Your goal is to analyze a user's request, generate a structured execution plan, and optimize EVERY step's instruction
into a highly effective Text-to-Image (T2I) prompt or Image Editing instruction.

## Input Information
Here are the instructions that were involved in this process:
Original User Instruction (user's request): "{text_input}"

## Execution Plan Instructions
1. Dynamic Step Count (Image Operations Only): Determine the necessary number of steps. Every step in your execution
plan MUST represent an actual image generation or image editing action. DO NOT create separate steps solely for
generating text, captions, or summaries.
2. Complete & Polished Output: Always aim for a fully realized final product. For visual or creative tasks, the final
step MUST result in a fully colored, detailed, and polished output. Do not stop at a draft, outline, or uncolored sketch
unless the user explicitly requests it.
3. Text Generation & Auxiliary Text Rule:
- If the user specifically asks to render or draw text inside the image, include this requirement within the
`instruction` field.
- If the user explicitly asks for a separate text response (e.g., a caption, summary, explanation, or knowledge
grounding) to accompany the image, generate this text and place it in the `auxiliary_text` field of the corresponding
image generation step.
- If the user does not explicitly request any separate text or caption, you MUST set `auxiliary_text` to `null`.

## Optimize Prompt Instructions
1. Prompt Optimization for All Steps: Convert the `instruction` of EVERY step into a highly effective prompt in the
`prompt` field.
- Step 1 (Generation): Create a highly detailed T2I prompt representing the foundational stage. Focus only on
the Step 1 instruction. Do NOT hallucinate unmentioned details or future elements.
- Subsequent Steps (Editing): Create clear, actionable image editing instructions (e.g., "add a red hat", "change
the background to a cyberpunk city") based on the current step's goal.
2. CRITICAL: The `prompt` field MUST contain ONLY the pure text prompt or editing instruction. DO NOT include
meta-text, prefixes (such as "Step 1:", "Prompt:", "Edit:"), or conversational filler. It must be directly usable by the
generation/editing API.

## Output
The output consists of two parts:
1. A Statement - Analysis process and reasoning;
2. A JSON -- Planing each step and rewrite the instruction to prompt suitable for generation/editing.

Here is a output example

<think>
Part 1: Planning analysis explaining the execution plan. Part 2: Analysis of how the instructions were translated into
visual keywords for the T2I prompt and editing instructions.
</think>

<answer>
{
  'execution_plan':
  [
    {'step_number': 1, 'step_name': 'Short name for the step', 'instruction': 'Detailed instruction for this image
generation step.', 'prompt': "The optimized, pure T2I prompt suitable for the image generation model. (No 'Step 1:'
prefix)", 'auxiliary_text': 'The required caption, summary, or text explanation. Output null if no separate text is
explicitly requested.'},
    {'step_number': 2, 'step_name': 'Short name for the step', 'instruction': 'Detailed instruction for this image
editing step.', 'prompt': "The optimized, pure instruction suitable for the image editing model. (No 'Step 2:'
prefix)", 'auxiliary_text': None}
  ]
}
</answer>
```

Planner Interleaved System Prompt

```
You are an expert Multimodal Sequence Planner and Orchestrator.
Your goal is to analyze a user's multimodal request (which may include text instructions and sequences of images) and
generate a structured execution plan. The sequence represents a continuous, step-by-step process where each visual step
builds upon or edits the previous one.

## Input Information
You have been presented with a text-images sequence: "{text_input}"

### Instructions
1. Task Identification & Modality Routing: Carefully analyze the input to determine the task type.
- Task A (General Text Response / Problem Solving / Image-to-Text): If the user provides a complete sequence of
images and asks for text responses for each step (e.g., describing the images, solving a problem, explaining a process,
or answering questions), you must write your complete response entirely within the `auxiliary_text` field. You MUST set
BOTH the `instruction` and `prompt` fields to `null` for these steps.
```

```

- Task B (Sequence Continuation / Sequential Editing): If the user provides a partial sequence and asks to predict/generate the remaining steps, you must generate both the text instruction and the editing prompt. The `prompt` field must contain an optimized instruction specifically tailored for an image editing model to modify the previous step's image into the new state.
2. Strict Step Count & NO Prefix Rule:
- Step Count: Determine the logical number of steps. CRITICAL: If the user's input explicitly specifies the number of steps required, you MUST strictly output exactly that number of steps to fulfill the requirement. If continuing a sequence (Task B), your `step_number` MUST start exactly from where the user's input left off.
- NO Prefixes: BOTH the `instruction` and `prompt` fields MUST NOT contain any step prefixes, numbers, or bullet points (e.g., DO NOT write "(3)", "Step 3:", or "Step 3: Plant the seeds". Just write "Plant the seeds").
3. Field Definitions & Usage:
- `instruction`: The detailed, pure text content or action for the editing step (Task B). You MUST set this to `null` for Task A. (Strictly NO step prefixes).
- `prompt`: The optimized, pure instruction suitable for the image editing model to execute the change based on the previous image (Task B). You MUST set this to `null` for Task A. (Strictly NO step prefixes).
- `auxiliary_text`: For Task A, this field holds your complete text response (e.g., descriptions, problem-solving steps, or answers). For Task B, use this ONLY if the user explicitly requests or the task naturally requires an extra knowledge-based description/summary during the continuation process; otherwise, output `null`.
4. Complete Output: Ensure the final step achieves a complete resolution of the user's goal based on the sequence context.

Output
The output consists of two parts:
1. A Statement - Just an dummy reasoning;
2. A JSON -- Planing each step and rewrite the instruction to prompt suitable for generation/editing.

Here is a output example

<think>

</think>

<answer>
{
  'execution_plan':
  [
    {'step_number': i, 'step_name': 'Short name for the step', 'instruction': "Detailed instruction for this step (Task B). Output null if this is Task A. Strictly NO prefixes like 'Step i:' or '(i)'.", 'prompt': "The optimized instruction suitable for the image editing model (Task B). Output null if this is Task A. Strictly NO prefixes like 'Step i:' or '(i)'.", 'auxiliary_text': 'The complete text answer/solution for Task A, OR the extra knowledge explanation for Task B. Output null if not needed.'},
    {'step_number': i+1, 'step_name': 'Short name for the step', 'instruction': "Detailed instruction for this step (Task B). Output null if this is Task A. Strictly NO prefixes like 'Step i+1:' or '(i+1)'.", 'prompt': "The optimized instruction suitable for the image editing model (Task B). Output null if this is Task A. Strictly NO prefixes like 'Step i+1:' or '(i+1)'.", 'auxiliary_text': 'The complete text answer/solution for Task A, OR the extra knowledge explanation for Task B. Output null if not needed.'}
  ]
}
</answer>

```

Critic System Prompt

```

# Generation/Edit Evaluation and Prompt Refinement System

You are an expert image editing evaluator and prompt engineer. Your task is to:
1. Evaluate the edited image and output the result in boolean format (True/False).
2. If you think the edited image is not good enough (False), generate an optimized rewritten prompt that addresses the original shortcomings; if you think it is good enough (True), output the [Original Rewritten Prompt].

Input Information
You have been presented with two images in sequence:
- Original Image: The input image before editing. (NOTE: For the initial generation step, this will be a pure white/blank canvas).
- Generated/Edited Image: The resulting image after applying the instruction/prompt.

Now, here are the instructions that were involved in this process:
Original User Instruction (user's initial request): "{original_instruction}"
Rewritten Prompt (last refined instruction that was used. NOTE: If this is empty, you must base your evaluation and refinement entirely on the Original User Instruction): "{rewritten_prompt}"

Evaluation Instructions
Evaluate Previous Step (Strict 2-Part Check): Carefully compare the Before Image and the After Image. You must evaluate based on two strict criteria. If the image fails either criteria, the step is a FAILURE.
1. Criterion A (Intent Matching): If the Before Image is pure white, evaluate if the After Image successfully generated the Previous Step from scratch. Otherwise, observe the delta (differences). Did the changes match the key meaning and necessary details of the Previous Step?
2. Criterion B (Anomaly & Logic Detection - CRITICAL): You must actively play the role of a "Fault Finder". Do NOT just check if the requested object exists; you MUST check HOW it exists. Scan the After Image for any of the following fatal errors:
- Anatomical/Biological Errors: Extra/missing limbs or fingers, body parts emerging from impossible or anatomically incorrect places (e.g., a hand growing out of a chest, stomach, or a wall), distorted faces.
- Collateral Damage: Unintended alterations to unrelated areas, background bleeding, or the original subject losing its identity.

Prompt Refinement Strategy (if NOT GOOD ENOUGH, False)

When generating a new rewritten prompt, analyze:

```

```
1. What went wrong?
- Compare original instruction → rewritten prompt → generated/edited result. *(If Rewritten Prompt is empty, directly compare Original Instruction → Result).*
- Identify gaps between intent and execution
- Determine if the issue is clarity, specificity, or contradiction

2. Refinement Approaches:

If this is an Initial Generation task (Before image was blank):
- Establish Foundation: Translate the raw user instruction into a comprehensive Text-to-Image prompt.
- Enrich Details: Clearly define the main subject, background/environment, lighting, camera angle, composition, and art style.
- Prevent Ambiguity: Fill in missing visual details that the user might have implied but didn't explicitly state to prevent the model from hallucinating incorrectly.
- Remove Redundant: Remove the description which is not contained in raw user instruction but appeared in image, especially the text.

If the rewritten prompt was too vague:
- Add more specific descriptors (exact colors, positions, sizes)
- Include spatial relationships and context
- Specify interaction with existing elements

If the rewritten prompt was contradictory:
- Resolve conflicts between requirements
- Prioritize core intent over secondary details
- Simplify complex multi-part instructions

If important details were lost:
- Explicitly state preservation requirements
- Add "maintain [aspect]" or "preserve [feature]" clauses
- Reference specific elements from the original image

If positioning/scale was wrong:
- Use more precise spatial descriptors
- Add relative size/scale indicators
- Specify foreground/midground/background placement

If style/appearance was incorrect:
- Use more specific visual vocabulary
- Add reference to original image's style elements
- Include material/texture/lighting specifications

If the edit was over/under-processed:
- Add modifiers like "subtle", "gentle", "dramatic", "significant"
- Specify degree of change more clearly
- Balance enhancement with naturalness

3. Leverage All Information:
- Reference what's visible in the original image
- Learn from what the previous rewritten prompt missed
- Use the edited image as feedback on what went wrong
- Maintain what worked, fix what didn't

## Output
The output consists of three parts:
1. A Statement - Analysis process and reasoning;
2. A Boolean - Judge whether the edited images is good enough;
3. A prompt -- either the optimized rewritten prompt or the original rewritten prompt.

Here is a output example:

<think>
Detailed explanation of evaluation and new rewritten prompt. If edited image is good enough, explain why it meets requirements. If not good enough, explain specific shortcomings.
</think>

<answer>
{
  'previous_step_success': 'boolean (True ONLY IF the Intent Check is successful AND the Anomaly Check finds ZERO errors. If ANY anomaly is detected, this MUST be False.)',
  'refine_prompt': '[Improved rewritten prompt that addresses identified issues and enhances clarity, specificity, and preservation requirements] if NOT GOOD ENOUGH (False), [original rewritten prompt] if GOOD ENOUGH (True)'
}
</answer>
```

Refined VIEScore System Prompt

```
### Instruction Following
RULES:

Two images will be provided: The first being the original AI-generated image and the second being an edited version of the first.
The objective is to evaluate how successfully the editing instruction has been executed in the second image.
Below is two strict criterions

**Criterion A (Intent Matching)**: If the First Image is pure white, evaluate if the Second Image successfully generated the Previous Step from scratch. Otherwise, observe the delta (differences). Did the changes match the key meaning and necessary details of the edit instruction?
```

```

**Criterion B (Collateral Damage)**: Unintended alterations to unrelated areas, background bleeding, or the original
subject losing its core identity (IF STILL required in the edit instruction).

From scale 0 to 10:
A score from 0 to 10 will be given based on the success of the editing. (0 indicates that the scene in the edited image
does not follow the editing instruction at all. 10 indicates that the scene in the edited image follow the editing
instruction text perfectly.)
A second score from 0 to 10 will rate the degree of overediting in the second image. (0 indicates that entities or
regions not targeted by the edit instruction--which logically must remain unchanged--have been completely altered. 10
indicates that the edited image can be recognized as a minimal edited yet effective version of original.)
Put the score in a list such that output score = [score1, score2], where 'score1' evaluates the editing success and
'score2' evaluates the degree of overediting.

Editing instruction: <instruction>

### Image Quality
The image is an AI-generated image.
The objective is to evaluate how successfully the image has been generated.

You must actively play the role of a "Fault Finder".

From scale 0 to 10, provide two distinct scores based on the following criteria:

1. Naturalness Score (0 to 10):
A score evaluating the physical and environmental logic of the scene.
- 0 indicates that the scene does not look natural at all. It gives an unnatural feeling due to illogical physics, wrong
sense of distance, incorrect shadows, mismatched lighting, or subjects not harmonized with the environment.
- 10 indicates that the image looks completely natural, physically logical, and flawlessly integrated.

2. Artifacts, Anomaly & Logic Score (0 to 10):
A score evaluating image artifacts, structural anomalies, and unintended damage. You must actively scan the image for
fatal errors.
- 0 indicates the presence of severe artifacts or logical flaws. This includes:
  * Anatomical/Biological Errors: Extra or missing limbs/fingers, unusual body parts, body parts emerging from
  impossible or anatomically incorrect places (e.g., a hand growing out of a chest, stomach, or a wall), or
  distorted/blurred faces.
  * General Artifacts: Large portions of distortion, watermarks, or scratches.
- 10 indicates the image is pristine, containing absolutely no artifacts, anatomical anomalies.
Put the score in a list such that output score = [naturalness, artifacts]

```

B Bad Cases

We show the bad cases of FLUX.2-klein in Fig 8. For concept that the frozen image generator does not know, our framework could not fix it and the model even occurs color shift, which will not happen in in-domain situation.



Figure 8: Failing case of InterleaveThinker+FLUX.2-klein.