



MPIE-Bench: Benchmarking Anatomically Plausible Multi-Person Interaction Editing

Jiajia Lin^{1,*}, Mingxuan Du^{1,*}, Tuowen Zhou¹, Benfeng Xu^{1,2,‡}, Hongtao Xie^{1,†}

¹University of Science and Technology of China, ²Metastone Technology, Beijing, China

*Equal contribution, [§]Work done during the internship at Metastone., [‡]Project leader, [†]Corresponding author

Text-to-image and personalized editing models now synthesize high-fidelity single-subject images with ease. Yet placing multiple named people into shared contact actions such as embrace, carry, or grapple still exposes major failures: fused limbs, invented extremities, and interpenetrating bodies. Existing evaluations largely overlook these anatomical and geometric issues, and VLM-as-a-judge checklists often saturate on Interaction while the errors remain obvious to humans. We introduce MPIE-Bench, a 2,500-sample benchmark of video-mined editing triplets spanning 405 scenes, 14 interaction categories, and four contact densities (C0–C3). We also propose MPIE-Eval, whose two new axes score contact-time geometry from a frozen public multi-person mesh reconstruction. Anatomy asks whether every human-like mass is explained by a complete set of reconstructed bodies, and Interaction asks whether the penetration and surface distance between those bodies match the contact the instruction asked for. Across ten editors, mesh Anatomy tops out at 0.65 and mesh Interaction at 0.72 on two different models, so no single editor is strong on both, while VLM checklists rate the same images above 0.95. A five-rater study confirms that both axes track human judgement more closely than a zero-shot VLM judge, and the rankings hold under ablation of every weight and threshold.

Code: <https://github.com/AnnLin0628/mpie-bench>



1 Introduction

Text-to-image models now compose a coherent scene from a short instruction, follow directions about layout and style, and carry a named person’s appearance from a few reference photographs into a new image. Demand is moving toward scenes where several people interact: two friends embracing, a parent carrying a child, two athletes grappling. Even the strongest models break down here, and not in the way current benchmarks look for. The people stay recognizable and so does the requested action; what fails is the body. Limbs fuse where two people touch, extra hands and feet appear along the contact seam, and one body occupies the volume of another (Figure 3).

Current evaluation cannot see this. Benchmarks for multi-person and personalized generation ask how many people appear, whether their identities match the references, whether the requested action is present, and how pleasing the result looks (Borse et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2026; Peng et al., 2026), and an image whose bodies are anatomically impossible satisfies all four. The suites that do ask about interaction often delegate that judgement to a vision-language model (Peng et al., 2026), which in our experiments rates the strongest closed-source models between 0.98 and 0.99 on interaction quality for images whose fused limbs are obvious to a human reader. Whether the requested edit happened and whether the bodies survived it are different questions, and only the first is being asked. Table 1 summarizes the gap.

We close it with **MPIE-Bench**, a benchmark for multi-person interaction editing, and **MPIE-Eval**, a protocol that derives contact-time body coherence from 3D human mesh reconstruction rather than from a language model’s opinion. Data comes first, since images of people in dense physical contact are rare in personalization corpora. We therefore mine video, where frames in which the people stand apart crop into per-person identity references and a later frame in dense contact serves as a held-out target from the same real interaction. A contact-density curve locates those valleys and peaks, a vision-language model writes the edit instruction backwards from the pair, and human review leaves 2,500 triplets over 405 scenes, 14 interaction categories

and four contact densities, as the MPIE-Bench section details.

Scoring them is where our main contribution lies. MPIE-Eval reconstructs the people in a generated image with a frozen, publicly available multi-person mesh recovery model and reads two axes off those meshes. **Anatomy** asks whether every human-like mass is explained by a complete set of reconstructed bodies, which is precisely what a fused or invented limb is not. **Interaction** asks whether penetration and surface distance between those bodies match the contact the instruction asked for. The two join the conventional Count, Identity, Instruction and Quality axes and are never blended into a single number; because the frontend and every threshold are fixed in advance, any ranking can be recomputed from released dumps (Figure 1).

Across ten closed- and open-source editors, mesh Anatomy tops out at 0.65 and mesh Interaction at 0.72 on two different models, so *no single editor is strong on both*, while a checklist judge rates the same images above 0.95. Five-rater human gold confirms that the mesh axes track people more closely than that judge on hard contact items, and the ranking survives ablation of every weight and threshold.

Contributions.

1. **MPIE-Bench**: a licensing-aware mining pipeline and frozen public test set whose references and target come from the same real interaction, stratified by interaction category and contact density.
2. **MPIE-Eval**: Anatomy and Interaction axes that score contact-time limb completeness and body inter-penetration from a frozen public mesh frontend, with every band and weight fixed before scoring.
3. A complete human-consistency study establishing that the protocol is accurate and robust, against five-rater human gold, against a zero-shot VLM judge, and under ablation of every weight, gate and threshold.

2 Related Work

Multi-person generation and editing. Personalized generation began with adapters and spatial conditions binding one identity into a scene. Group-level editing followed, and the field consolidated around multi-reference in-context editors that take several references and an instruction in a single pass—the interface we evaluate (Borse et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2026; Gu and Yang, 2026; Peng et al., 2026; Jiang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2026b; Wu et al., 2026b; Wang et al., 2025b; Chen et al., 2026a). Identity preservation and instruction following improve quickly along this line; close-contact geometry does not.

Benchmark	Count	ID	Anat	Inter	Instr	Qual	VLM
MultiHuman-Testbench	✓	✓	×	△	✓	✓	✓
MIBE	✓	✓	×	△	×	×	✓
CPT	×	×	×	△	✓	×	✓
GroupDiff	△	×	×	×	△	△	×
InsHuman	△	✓	×	×	△	△	✓
BodyMetric	×	×	△	×	×	✓	×
MPIE-Bench (ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×

Table 1 Axis coverage of recent multi-person benchmarks (✓ scored, △ partial, × absent). △ under Inter means semantic or binding-level interaction only, never contact geometry; △ under Anat means single-person anatomy.

Benchmarks for generation and editing. Evaluation followed one step behind: human-aligned protocols for subject-driven generation, large instruction-editing datasets, and the first suites for generating several recognizable humans (Ye et al., 2025; Jiang et al., 2026; Brooks et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2025; Huang et al., 2024; Luo et al., 2026; Nguyen et al., 2026; Borse et al., 2025). Interaction itself entered through stress tests that use physical contact to break identity binding, diagnostics for attribute ownership, and concurrent preference-based interaction binding (Peng et al., 2026; Chen et al., 2026a; Nguyen et al., 2026). In every case the interaction question is semantic or relational, never whether the bodies realizing that relation remain anatomically possible.

Judging bodies, and judging the judges. A parallel line asks whether a generated body is possible at all,

from annotated synthetic anatomical defects to learned realism metrics that feed a single-image 3D body representation into a predictor (Fang et al., 2024a; Li et al., 2026a; Andreou et al., 2024; Käs et al., 2026). Purpose-built detectors then found that general vision-language models sit near chance at localizing missing or redundant body parts. All of this work, the reconstruction-assisted metric included, is scoped to a single isolated person. As Table 1 shows, multi-person suites still omit joint anatomical completeness and interaction geometry, and VLM scores on contact axes often stay near ceiling. MPIE targets this gap with contact-rich editing triplets and mesh-based Anat/Inter (Figure 1).

Interaction-aware geometry and HMR. Multi-person HMR (Baradel et al., 2024; Brégier et al., 2025; Zheng et al., 2026), contact-field representations (Lee et al., 2024), hand reconstruction (Pavlakos et al., 2024), and related contact/distance machinery (Wang et al., 2025a; Fang et al., 2024b; Saha et al., 2025) make geometry-side scoring feasible. For the public v1 protocol we freeze a single RGB Multi-HMR frontend so editor rankings are reproducible; stronger contact-aware reconstructors can be swapped in later as alternate leaderboard tracks.

3 MPIE-Bench




Figure 1 MPIE-Bench / MPIE-Eval overview. (A) data construction; (B) six-axis eval with mesh Anat/Inter.

Figure 1(A) sketches construction; Figure 1(B) and MPIE-Eval below define scoring.

Sources. We collect multi-person interaction videos from three open sources: permissively licensed Pexels stock footage, Harmony4D (Khrodkar et al., 2024), and CHI3D (Fieraru et al., 2020). Stock supplies identity and scene diversity; studio sources add hard contact with persistent actor labels. We filter for resolution and multi-person presence, categorize by interaction type, and exclude restricted-tier corpora from the redistributable split. A related CHI3D interaction resource (Fieraru et al., 2025) is used only to calibrate mesh soft bands on held-out GT reconstructions in MPIE-Eval below; it contributes neither MPIE-Bench test scenes nor any Table 3 generator output.

Input-output selection. Contact-sparse frames yield clean per-person references; contact-dense frames yield interaction targets. For each video we compute a contact-density curve $\phi(t)$ from person-box IoU, pose proximity, optical flow, and occlusion cues, with refine mix 0.35/0.30/0.20/0.15 after within-video percentile norm. Local maxima of smoothed ϕ with height $\geq P_{60}$ and ≥ 2 s gap yield peak targets; a disjoint high-separation pool yields valley references. When multi-person 3D poses are available, peaks/valleys use nearest-joint distance instead. References follow a cross-video > cross-shot > cross-camera > same-shot priority to mitigate

copy-paste leakage (Chen et al., 2026b). This valley→peak construction is the operational definition of an editing sample: references are easy-to-crop people, and the target is a harder interaction frame from the same scene narrative, not a random collage.

Prompt reverse writing. Given valley references $\{R_k\}$ and the peak target, a VLM reverse-captions an edit instruction that names roles, the shared action, and contact intent, without revealing target pixels at test time. Contact intent is later mapped to {required, forbidden, unspecified} for Interaction mixing (Section 4.4); the prompt text itself remains the only instruction shown to editors.

Human review and distribution. Automatic mining yields $\sim 20,000$ candidates. Adult reviewers remove unsafe or off-task clips, check that each reverse-captioned prompt names the visible interaction, then de-duplicate and cap per scene to freeze 2,500 targets across 405 scenes. Coverage is a 14×4 grid: fourteen everyday-to-combat interaction categories crossed with four contact-density levels, from no contact through hand-level and torso/point-line contact up to high contact (Figure 2); about 61% of samples sit in the two denser bins. Stock footage supplies most targets ($\approx 2,135$); studio CHI3D/Harmony4D add hard-contact coverage, with about 3.2 references per sample on average. Most prompts expect two people (2,093 samples); 399 samples (16%) expect three or more, up to nine. Splits are scene-level, and reference embeddings freeze at finalize. Valley→peak may change camera or background within a scene; we score this as reference-conditioned interaction editing under that gap, not as pixel-local inpainting.




Figure 2 Public test-set distribution ($N=2,500$). Inner ring: contact density from none (C0) to high contact (C3); outer ring: 14 interaction categories.

4 MPIE-Eval

MPIE-Eval reports six axes separately and never blends them into one scalar. Count, Identity, Instruction, and Quality ask whether the edit request was met; **Anatomy** and **Interaction** ask whether bodies stay coherent at contact. Figure 1(B) sketches the pipeline: reconstruct people once, then score Anatomy from unexplained mass and Interaction from pairwise contact geometry, while the four task axes stay on their own tracks.

4.1 Why mesh scores for contact geometry

VLM checklists often report success on contact while fused limbs and interpenetration remain obvious (Figure 3). A 2D rubric can confirm that two people are hugging, yet miss whether a limb is invented or one mesh volume occupies another. We therefore score Anatomy and Interaction from a frozen 3D human reconstruction frontend (Baradel et al., 2024): one public stack for all editors, released dumps for audit, and transparent geometric proxies rather than another preference head. The resulting scores are ranking observables, not physical volumes; soft bands and mix weights below are public and were locked before scoring the ten editors.

4.2 Reconstruction frontend

Every generation I is reconstructed with the same Multi-HMR checkpoint. We keep the top- k detections by score with $k=n_{\text{exp}}$, the expected person count from frozen sample metadata; we do not match identities at this stage. On 399/2,500 samples (16%) we have $n_{\text{exp}} \geq 3$; Interaction still aggregates by the worst kept pair under the same k rule. If reconstruction fails or returns zero meshes, Anatomy and Interaction are set to 0 so unscorable geometry cannot inflate rankings; if fewer people are detected than expected, Interaction is halved. All Anat/Inter terms below operate on this fixed set of kept meshes.

4.3 Anatomy

Anatomy asks whether every human-like region in the image is explained by a complete set of people. We group failures into four readable families and score each from 1 (clean) to 0 (severe):

- **Extra / fused limbs:** mass glued onto a person that should not be there.
- **Floating parts:** detached leftover blobs that belong to no body.
- **Body structure:** broken scale, part ownership, or self-collision on the meshes.
- **Residual mass:** leftover human-like foreground not covered above.

To detect the first two families we compare a classical human-like foreground mask (luma/saturation vs. the border; no learned segmenter) with a raster of the kept meshes inside a padded person ROI. Their mismatch is the leftover fraction

$$\ell = \frac{|M_{\text{fg}} \cap R \setminus M_{\text{ex}}|}{|M_{\text{fg}} \cap R|},$$

and we also count detached leftover blobs n_b . When leftover is high but no blob floats free ($\ell \geq 0.62$, $n_b=0$), we treat it as an attached false limb rather than clothing clutter; otherwise attach terms are down-weighted so loose clothing does not dominate.

Each diagnostic maps through the same soft ramp $s(x; a, b) = \text{clip}((b-x)/(b-a), 0, 1)$ (good below a , fail above b). Within a family we keep the worst sub-score, then mix the four family scores with public weights

$$S_{\text{anat}}^{\text{mesh}} = 0.40 s_{\text{attach}} + 0.20 s_{\text{orphan}} + 0.25 s_{\text{struct}} + 0.15 s_{\text{resid}}.$$

Exact sub-diagnostics and bands (leftover, in-hull enclosure, over-detect, blob count, Multi-HMR scale/ownership/part terms) are frozen in Table 2 and the released scorer; the narrative above is the full scoring logic a reader needs to follow Table 3.

4.4 Interaction

Interaction asks: does reconstructed contact geometry match the prompt’s contact intent? For every kept mesh pair we measure a convex-hull penetration proxy and a surface gap,

$$V_p = r_{\text{in}} \cdot \min(\text{Vol}_{\text{hull}}(A), \text{Vol}_{\text{hull}}(B)),$$

$$d_s = \min_{u \in A, v \in B} \|u - v\|_2,$$

where r_{in} is the symmetrized in-hull vertex fraction, used as a ranking proxy rather than an SDF volume. The same soft map yields penetration and proximity scores; s_{qual} comes from ownership/over-detect, and forbidden contact uses a clearance score:

$$s_{\text{pen}} = \min(s(V_p; 0.05, 0.15), s(r_{\text{in}}; 0.20, 0.50)),$$

$$s_{\text{prox}} = s(d_s; 0.05, 0.40),$$

$$s_{\text{clear}} = 1 - \max(s_{\text{prox}}, 1 - s_{\text{pen}}, 1 - s_{\text{qual}}).$$

We aggregate by the worst pair, then mix by prompt intent mapped to required, forbidden, or unspecified contact:

$$S_{\text{inter}}^{\text{mesh}} = \begin{cases} 0.45 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.35 s_{\text{prox}} + 0.20 s_{\text{qual}} & \text{req.,} \\ 0.55 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.45 s_{\text{clear}} & \text{forb.,} \\ 0.85 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.15 s_{\text{qual}} & \text{unspec.} \end{cases}$$

Whole-body proximity does not yet enforce contact locus; Section 5.3 reports a small hand-hand / gaming check that leaves Inter top-2 unchanged.

4.5 Protocol freeze and calibration

Table 2 lists the public freeze used for Table 3. Soft Interaction bands are fit on held-out CHI3D-related GT reconstructions (Fieraru et al., 2025) with no MPIE-Bench test scenes and no generator outputs from the leaderboard: volume/distance cutoffs target GT percentiles so typical contact lies in the soft-ok band and rare extremes approach fail. We release the recipe and dumps, not restricted calibration pixels. Two resolution tracks share the same algebra: Track A at vendor-native resolution and Track B after letterbox→1024² (Tables 3/6).

4.6 Task axes

We also report four established axes so rankings stay comparable and Anatomy/Interaction cannot be gamed alone. Two VLM paths are kept separate: a shared geometry checklist (vlm_judge) and a per-sample Instruction QA bank.

Count. Binary person-count correctness from the shared vlm_judge checklist, using the same call family as the V-Anat/V-Inter baseline in Experiments, not the Instruction bank.

Identity. Occlusion-aware face matching to frozen reference embeddings with one-to-one assignment and a yaw gate (Borse et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2026); GT-visible faces that disappear score zero.

Instruction. A separate pipeline from vlm_judge: for each of the 2,500 samples we freeze a small atomic QA set offline from the edit text alone covering role, asymmetry, and prop. At eval time a VLM only answers on the generation; it cannot invent questions.

Quality. Standard human-preference aesthetic score (Wu et al., 2023), reported raw and never mixed into Anatomy/Interaction.

5 Experiments

R#	GT	GPT-Image-2	Gemini-3	FireRed	FLUX.1	OmniGen2	UNO	ACE
								
Anat	0.88	0.83	0.87	0.85	0.79	0.80	0.86	0.83
Inter	0.88	0.82	0.89	0.81	0.78	0.82	0.85	0.87
								
Anat	0.79	0.71	0.81	0.73	0.43	0.56	0.55	0.40
Inter	0.72	0.55	0.73	0.54	0.33	0.78	0.77	0.24
								
Anat	0.84	0.83	0.85	0.51	0.48	0.30	0.56	0.53
Inter	0.89	0.83	0.89	0.63	0.63	0.38	0.41	0.40
								
Anat	0.76	0.60	0.79	0.60	0.60	0.47	0.33	0.24
Inter	0.77	0.44	0.80	0.41	0.33	0.13	0.22	0.08
								
Anat	0.85	0.89	0.86	0.38	0.42	0.48	0.48	0.39
Inter	0.86	0.55	0.80	0.35	0.40	0.29	0.37	0.31

Figure 3 Multi-person editing failures. Columns: references, GT, and editor outputs. Red: contact cues in prompts; boxes: limb fusion, missing parts, contact errors.

Models and settings. Ten editors share one multi-reference + instruction interface (7 open, 3 closed: GPT-Image-2 (OpenAI, 2026), Gemini 3 Pro Image (Google DeepMind, 2026), Seedream 5 Pro (ByteDance, 2026);

Quantity	Frozen public value
Anat mix	0.40/0.20/0.25/0.15 (attach/orphan/struct/resid)
Attached gate	$\ell \geq 0.62$, $n_b=0$; else attach soft-down $1-0.15(1-s)$
Anat family mins	attach: ℓ /fuse/over/extreme; orphan: blob/ofrac; struct: scale/own/part
Anat bands	$s(\ell; 0.50, 0.75)$, $s(r_{in}; 0.15, 0.45)$; blobs (0, 3), ofrac (0.02, 0.15)
Inter (req.)	$0.45 s_{pen} + 0.35 s_{prox} + 0.20 s_{qual}$
Inter bands	$V_p: (0.05, 0.15)$; $r_{in}: (0.20, 0.50)$; $d_s: (0.05, 0.40)$
Tracks	Multi-HMR; A=native, B=letterbox 1024 ²

Table 2 Public protocol freeze (pre-scoring). Sub-diagnostics live here; Track A/B in Tables 3/6.

Model	Anat	Inter	Count	ID	Instr	Qual
GPT-Image-2 OpenAI (2026)	0.58	0.61	0.74	0.58	0.93	0.29
Gemini-3-Pro-Image Google DeepMind (2026)	0.65	0.68	0.71	0.50	0.93	0.27
Seedream-5-Pro ByteDance (2026)	0.62	0.72	0.72	0.49	0.93	0.29
FLUX.1-Kontext Labs et al. (2025)	0.57	0.57	0.69	0.21	0.71	0.30
DreamO Mou et al. (2025)	0.56	0.57	0.69	0.20	0.72	0.30
OmniGen2 Wu et al. (2026a)	0.55	0.53	0.69	0.17	0.77	0.29
UNO Wu et al. (2025)	0.57	0.53	0.68	0.05	0.65	0.28
ACE++ Mao et al. (2025)	0.54	0.45	0.49	0.02	0.54	0.29
BAGEL Deng et al. (2025)	0.62	0.59	0.68	0.15	0.75	0.26
FireRed-Image-Edit FireRedTeam (2025)	0.63	0.60	0.72	0.17	0.86	0.29

Table 3 **Track A** (public): full-set six-axis results at vendor-native resolution ($N=2,500$). Shaded: mesh Anat/Inter. Bold: column best (Qual excluded). Gaps ≈ 0.01 read as ties under scene-clustered uncertainty.

vendor defaults 2026-07; 1 gen/sample, open seed 0). Figure 3 and Table 3 summarize failures and scores. Two official mesh tracks share Table 2’s Multi-HMR algebra: Track A at deployment resolution with vendor-native closed APIs and Table 4 for open models; Track B letterbox $\rightarrow$ 1024² on the full set (Table 6). No model sees the held-out target. Instr uses the frozen QA bank; Count and V-Anat/V-Inter use `vlm_judge`. Unless noted, means are over the full $N=2,500$ scene-split test set; ≈ 0.01 axis gaps read as ties under scene-clustered uncertainty (Section 5.3).

5.1 Main results

On Table 3 and Figure 3, closed V-Inter sits at 0.98–0.99 while mesh M-Inter spans 0.45–0.72 (Table 5). Identity shows the steepest closed/open gap ($S_{id} \approx 0.49$ –0.58 vs. 0.02–0.21). Instruction leadership is closed-dominated, whereas Anat/Inter leaders diverge: Gemini Anat 0.65, Seedream Inter 0.72. Among open editors, FireRed is competitive on Anat but mid-pack on Inter. For Track B, Table 6 re-scores the full set after letterbox $\rightarrow$ 1024²; absolute scores rise, and open Anat rank Spearman vs. Track A stays 0.89 with all-ten 0.83 and Anat top-3 unchanged. Track A is the deployment leaderboard; Track B is the fair-resolution view.

5.2 Contact-density stress

Figure 4 plots Anat/Inter by density (bin sizes $n=513/449/942/596$). Anatomy softens from C2 $\rightarrow$ C3 for Gemini, Seedream, and FireRed, while several open systems stay nearly flat (e.g., DreamO 0.54 $\rightarrow$ 0.56). Means often rise from C0 to C1 because C0 mixes non-contact and unspecified-intent samples, so we treat C0 as a control bin. For high-contact comparisons we prefer absolute Inter under C3 (≈ 0.51 –0.69).

Protocol stability. Offline Anat recompositions (equal weights; 0.30/0.30/0.20/0.20; attached $\ell \in \{0.50, 0.62, 0.75\}$) keep ten-model rank Spearman ≥ 0.98 vs. the public mix; attached gates likewise. ROI pad 0.22 $\max(H, W)$ affects only Anat leftover/ROI terms (Inter pad-invariant); a FireRed pad sweep $\{0.15, 0.22, 0.30\}$ on $N=150$ moves Anat by +0.020/0/−0.006. Track A recomposes frozen Multi-HMR dumps; Track B is the official resolution-matched view. On $N=150$, a two-frontend mean (Multi-HMR + alternate HMR) yields Anat/Inter rank Spearman $\approx 0.92/0.68$ vs. Multi-HMR and keeps the same Anat top-3.

Model	Backend	Steps	Guid.	Res.
FLUX.1-Kontext	FLUX.1	28	2.5	1024 ²
DreamO	FLUX.1	12	4.5	1024 ²
OmniGen2	OmniGen2	50	5.0/2.0 [†]	1024 ²
UNO	FLUX.1+LoRA	25	4.0	704 ²
ACE++	FLUX-Fill+LoRA	28	50 [‡]	768 ²
BAGEL	BAGEL-7B-MoT	50	4.0	1024 ²
FireRed-Image-Edit	FireRed-1.1	40	4.0 [§]	1024 ²

Table 4 Open-source inference settings (1 gen/sample; seed 0). [†]text/image guidance; [‡]ACE `guide_scale`; [§]FireRed `true_cfg_scale`.

Model	V-Anat	V-Inter	M-Anat	M-Inter
GPT-Image-2	0.95	0.98	0.58	0.61
Gemini-3-Pro-Image	0.95	0.99	0.65	0.68
Seedream-5-Pro	0.96	0.98	0.62	0.72
FLUX.1-Kontext	0.64	0.95	0.57	0.57
DreamO	0.71	0.96	0.56	0.57
OmniGen2	0.75	0.96	0.55	0.53
UNO	0.71	0.93	0.57	0.53
ACE++	0.56	0.88	0.54	0.45
BAGEL	0.71	0.94	0.62	0.59
FireRed-Image-Edit	0.89	0.97	0.63	0.60

Table 5 Checklist VLM (V-) vs. mesh (M-) Anat/Inter on the full set (Track A).

Model	Anat _B	Inter _B
GPT-Image-2	0.681	0.754
Gemini-3-Pro-Image	0.712	0.791
Seedream-5-Pro	0.680	0.803
FLUX.1-Kontext	0.682	0.736
DreamO	0.663	0.730
OmniGen2	0.678	0.750
UNO	0.691	0.732
ACE++	0.649	0.710
BAGEL	0.696	0.768
FireRed-Image-Edit	0.736	0.788

Table 6 Track B letterbox→1024² Anat/Inter ($N=2,500$). Not a drop-in for Table 3; vs. Track A Anat $\rho=0.89$ (open) / 0.83 (all).

5.3 Metric validation of Anat/Inter

Our metric contribution is Anatomy and Interaction; Count, Identity, Instruction, and Quality follow standard practice. Prior multi-person suites that address contact typically use a VLM or semantic probe (Table 1). We validate mesh Anat/Inter by controlled corruptions and by human agreement against that VLM-style baseline.

Sanity checks. The hull penetration term is a ranking proxy rather than a physical volume. Controlled mesh corruptions on 200 GT reconstructions lower Interaction under every damage in Table 7. A CPU synthetic two-person suite (same Inter algebra; no HMR) passes 6/6 required direction checks. Keyword contact-intent parsing matches human intent on 145/170 (85.3%) consistency-pool units; replacing keyword intent with human labels changes full-set Inter means by $<10^{-3}$ and leaves the ten-model ranking unchanged.

Human agreement vs. VLM-style contact scoring. On a shared Anat/Inter checklist we compare human gold (H), a frozen mesh→checklist mapping (M), and a VLM judge without fine-tuning on our labels (V). V approximates the contact scoring used by prior multi-person benchmarks; we do not re-evaluate Count/ID/Instruction here. M fits a small per-item ridge on Multi-HMR fields (e.g., I1 from s_{pen} ; Ic from s_{prox} and d_s) and chooses Spearman-max cuts on a held-out label split; cuts freeze before scoring the reported pool and are never applied to Table 3’s continuous Anat/Inter. We use $N=170$ hard units (C2–C3); gold is the mean of five adult ratings (mean $\alpha=0.53$). Table 8 reports per-item Spearman ρ : M beats V on 9/10 items (all but person-count I0),




Figure 4 Mesh Anat (top) and Inter (bottom) by contact density C0–C3 (full set; $n=513/449/942/596$). Point estimates only.

Condition	ΔInter	Direction	n
Force penetration	−0.15	↓ vs. baseline	200
Separate far (required)	−0.04	↓ vs. baseline	200
Drop person	−0.35	↓ vs. baseline	200
Duplicate person	−0.14	↓ vs. baseline	200

Table 7 Mesh corruptions on GT reconstructions ($n=200$): Inter drops under every damage.

with Steiger significance on I3/Ir. Absolute agreement remains moderate, so we treat the study as a ranking check on hard contact items rather than a per-image oracle. Editor-level preference anchors in the same pool track mesh Anat/Inter ($\rho \approx 0.87/0.80$).

Visible error tags and locus. On a hard open-source contact pool ($N=220$), geometric failures are dense (55% have ≥ 1 tag); among anatomy-positive units 63% are *fine-only* (hands 27%), so topology checklists under-cover MPIE’s regime. Contact tags move Interaction directionally on that pool. Public Interaction still uses whole-body proximity: locus-critical prompts (handshake / hand-hold / high-five / arm-around) have pooled Inter ≈ 0.59 vs. ≈ 0.56 elsewhere, while a hand–hand distance swap on a fixed $N=150$ subset lowers Inter by only ≈ 0.005 – 0.011 overall (≈ 0.02 – 0.04 on IDs that enter the hand branch). A proximity-gaming proxy (high $s_{\text{pen}}/s_{\text{prox}}$ but VLM contact-points=no) fires on $\approx 1.3\%$ of required-ok units and leaves Inter top-2 unchanged; part-conditioned locus remains future work.

Uncertainty and sampling. Scene-clustered bootstrap gives Seedream–Gemini Inter $\Delta = +0.042$ with CI $[0.019, 0.064]$ ($B=2000$). Gaps of ≈ 0.01 in Table 3 read as ties. Primary tables use one generation per sample; regenerating a fixed 150-sample subset for three open editors at seeds $\{0, 1, 2\}$ yields seed-level Anat/Inter stds of the three means in $O(10^{-2})$, well below closed/open and density gaps. Anat rank Spearman stays ≥ 0.98 under weight/gate ablations. Per-sample Multi-HMR dumps ship for offline audit; recon failures score Anat/Inter=0 so unscorable geometry cannot inflate the public means.

Ethical Statement

Data licensing. Harmony4D pixels ship under MIT. Public Pexels stock follows the Pexels License for IDs, URLs/timestamps, scripts, and derived crops for research, with no re-host as a stock library. Academically licensed sources such as CHI3D ship as IDs/timestamps/boxes/scripts under original terms; the CHI3D interaction resource (Fieraru et al., 2025) calibrates thresholds only, with the recipe released and not the pixels. Restricted-tier corpora never enter the public suite.

Item	$\rho(H, M)$	CI	$\rho(H, V)$	CI
I0	0.41	[0.28, 0.53]	0.77	[0.70, 0.82]
I1	0.39	[0.25, 0.51]	0.30	[0.16, 0.43]
Ic	0.54	[0.42, 0.64]	0.53	[0.41, 0.63]
I3 [†]	0.43	[0.30, 0.55]	0.09	[-0.06, 0.24]
Ir [†]	0.46	[0.33, 0.57]	0.17	[0.02, 0.31]
A1	0.34	[0.20, 0.47]	0.20	[0.05, 0.34]
A2	0.24	[0.09, 0.38]	0.18	[0.03, 0.32]
A3	0.38	[0.24, 0.50]	0.21	[0.06, 0.35]
A4	0.38	[0.24, 0.50]	0.33	[0.19, 0.46]
A5	0.26	[0.11, 0.39]	0.19	[0.04, 0.33]

Table 8 Per-item checklist Spearman vs. human gold ($N=170$; Fisher z 95% CIs). Bold: larger of M/V; [†]Steiger $p<0.05$ for $M>V$. I0 is person-count (VLM-native).

Safety and intended use. Keyframes pass automated minor detection and flagged frames are dropped; non-sexualization constraints apply to identity-conditioned generation; combat/restrain prompts are sports- or self-defense-style. Checklist labels used adult raters only. Sources are appearance-only public/academic likenesses; we scope out placing identifiable real individuals into synthetic scenes without consent. Metrics, including ID, are for research diagnosis, not rewards for non-consensual likenesses; downstream users must obey source licenses and any local consent rules.

6 Conclusion

We set out to make contact-time body coherence measurable for multi-person interaction editing. MPIE-Bench contributes a licensing-aware, scene-split test set of 2,500 video-mined triplets over 405 scenes, stratified by 14 interaction categories and C0–C3 contact density, with held-out targets so editors cannot copy pixels. MPIE-Eval contributes a six-axis protocol that keeps Count/ID/Instruction/Quality for task success while scoring Anatomy/Interaction from a frozen, dump-auditable Multi-HMR frontend under dual public tracks: Track A at vendor-native resolution and Track B after letterbox→1024².

Across ten editors, the mesh axes do work the checklists do not: closed V-Inter saturates near ceiling while M-Inter retains dynamic range; identity remains the steepest closed/open gap; Anat and Inter leaders need not coincide; and density, corruption, human-checklist, and ablation checks support model-level ranking under the frozen frontend rather than a single blended score.

We release the redistributable subset, evaluation code, per-sample Multi-HMR dumps, and the calibration recipe so the community can audit rankings and add alternate-frontend tracks without redefining the editing task.

Acknowledgments

We thank collaborators who helped with data review and annotation tooling. This preprint presents the frozen evaluation protocol, full-set tables, and appendix analyses in a single-column format without a page cap.

References

- Nefeli Andreou, Varsha Vivek, Ying Wang, Alex Vorobiov, Tiffany Deng, Raja Bala, Larry Davis, and Betty Mohler Tesch. Bodymetric: Evaluating the realism of human bodies in text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04086*, 2024.
- Fabien Baradel, Matthieu Armando, Salma Galaaoui, Romain Brégier, Philippe Weinzaepfel, Grégory Rogez, and Thomas Lucas. Multi-hmr: Multi-person whole-body human mesh recovery in a single shot. In *ECCV*, 2024.
- Shubhankar Borse, Seokeon Choi, Sunghyun Park, Jeongho Kim, Shreya Kadambi, Risheek Garrepalli, Sungrack Yun,

- Munawar Hayat, and Fatih Porikli. Multihuman-testbench: Benchmarking image generation for multiple humans. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.
- Romain Br  gier, Fabien Baradel, Thomas Lucas, Salma Galaaoui, Matthieu Armando, Philippe Weinzaepfel, and Gr  gory Rogez. CondiMen: Conditional multi-person mesh recovery. In *CVPR Workshops*, 2025.
- Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A. Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- ByteDance. Seedream image generation. <https://www.volcengine.com>, 2026. Seedream 5 Pro API; accessed 2026-07.
- Zhihan Chen, Yuhuan Zhao, Yijie Zhu, Xinyu Yao, Mengcong Ren, Suwen Wang, Qiuyang Yin, Yuchen Sun, Qin Wang, and Lu Xin. MIBE: Multi-subject interaction benchmark and evaluator for personalized image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.01383*, 2026a.
- Zhuowei Chen, Bingchuan Li, Tianxiang Ma, Lijie Liu, Mingcong Liu, Yunsheng Jiang, Gen Li, Xinghui Li, Liyang Chen, Siyu Zhou, Qian He, and Xinglong Wu. Phantom-data: Towards a general subject-consistent video generation dataset. In *ICLR*, 2026b.
- Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, Guang Shi, and Haoqi Fan. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025.
- Guian Fang, Wenbiao Yan, Yuanfan Guo, Jianhua Han, Zutao Jiang, Hang Xu, Shengcai Liao, and Xiaodan Liang. Humanrefiner: Benchmarking abnormal human generation and refining with coarse-to-fine pose-reversible guidance. In *ECCV*, 2024a.
- Peng Fang, Wei Wang, Ruofeng Tong, Hailong Li, and Min Tang. gDist: Efficient distance computation between 3D meshes on GPU. In *SIGGRAPH Asia Conference Papers*, 2024b.
- Mihai Fieraru, Mihai Zanfir, Elisabeta Oneata, Alin-Ionut Popa, Vlad Olaru, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Three-dimensional reconstruction of human interactions. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- Mihai Fieraru, Mihai Zanfir, Elisabeta Oneata, Alin-Ionut Popa, Vlad Olaru, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Reconstructing three-dimensional models of interacting humans. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2025.
- FireRedTeam. Firered-image-edit-1.1. <https://huggingface.co/FireRedTeam/FireRed-Image-Edit-1.1>, 2025. accessed 2026-07.
- Google DeepMind. Gemini image generation. <https://deepmind.google>, 2026. Gemini 3 Pro Image API; accessed 2026-07.
- Dian Gu and Zhengyi Yang. Triopose: Native triple-stream diffusion transformers for pose-guided text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.07053*, 2026.
- Mingzhen Huang, Jialing Cai, Shan Jia, Vishnu Suresh Lokhande, and Siwei Lyu. ParallelEdits: Efficient multi-aspect text-driven image editing with attention grouping. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Yuming Jiang, Nanxuan Zhao, Qing Liu, Krishna Kumar Singh, Shuai Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Groupdiff: Diffusion-based group portrait editing. In *ECCV*, 2024.
- Zhangqi Jiang, Zheng Sun, Xianfang Zeng, Yufeng Yang, Xuanyang Zhang, Yongliang Wu, Wei Cheng, Gang Yu, Xu Yang, and Bihan Wen. Geditbench v2: A human-aligned benchmark for general image editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28547*, 2026.
- Stephanie K  s, Erik Sch  nherr, and Bastian Leibe. We still see broken limbs: Towards anatomical realism in GenAI via human preference learning. In *WACV Workshops*, pages 1038–1047, 2026.
- Rawal Khirodkar, Jyun-Ting Song, Jinkun Cao, Zhengyi Luo, and Kris Kitani. Harmony4d: A video dataset for in-the-wild close human interactions. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Black Forest Labs, Stephen Batifol, Andreas Blattmann, Frederic Boesel, Saksham Consul, Cyril Diagne, Tim Dockhorn, Jack English, Zion English, Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Kyle Lacey, Yam Levi, Cheng Li, Dominik Lorenz, Jonas M  ller, Dustin Podell, Robin Rombach, Harry Saini, Axel Sauer, and Luke Smith. Flux.1 kontext: Flow matching for in-context image generation and editing in latent space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.15742*, 2025.
- Hansol Lee, Tackgeun You, Hansoo Park, Woohyeon Shim, Sanghyeon Kim, and Hwasup Lim. ContactField: Implicit field representation for multi-person interaction geometry. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.

- Bao Li, Yuliang Xiu, and Zhen Liu. Towards anatomically plausible human image generation via synthetic localized preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.25759*, 2026a.
- Jie Li, Shulian Zhang, Yangyang Gao, Wenbo Li, Yulun Zhang, Yong Guo, and Jian Chen. Inshuman: Towards natural and identity-preserving human insertion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.07402*, 2026b.
- Jie Liu, Gongye Liu, Jiajun Liang, Yangguang Li, Jiaheng Liu, Xintao Wang, Pengfei Wan, Di Zhang, and Wanli Ouyang. Flow-grpo: Training flow matching models via online rl. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.
- Siqi Luo, Huayu Zheng, Jianghan Shen, Yi Xin, Luxin Xu, Jiyao Liu, Xinyu Zhang, Hang Zhou, Pengyu Xie, Xiaohui Li, Shuo Cao, Yuandong Pu, Junjun He, Bin Fu, Yihao Liu, Yu Qiao, Guangtao Zhai, Yuewen Cao, and Xiaohong Liu. MICE-Bench: A challenging and comprehensive benchmark for multi-reference image creation and editing. In *ICML*, 2026.
- Chaojie Mao, Jingfeng Zhang, Yulin Pan, Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhen Han, Yu Liu, and Jingren Zhou. Ace++: Instruction-based image creation and editing via context-aware content filling. In *ICCV Workshops*, 2025.
- Chong Mou, Yanze Wu, Wenxu Wu, Zinan Guo, Pengze Zhang, Yufeng Cheng, Yiming Luo, Fei Ding, Shiwen Zhang, Xinghui Li, Mengtian Li, Mingcong Liu, Yunsheng Jiang, Shaojin Wu, Songtao Zhao, Jian Zhang, Qian He, and Xinglong Wu. Dreamo: A unified framework for image customization. In *SIGGRAPH Asia*, 2025.
- Long-Bao Nguyen, Quang-Khai Tran, Tam V. Nguyen, Minh-Triet Tran, and Trung-Nghia Le. CogCanvas: A benchmark for evaluating multi-subject reference-based image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.15867*, 2026.
- OpenAI. Gpt image generation. <https://openai.com>, 2026. GPT-Image-2 API; accessed 2026-07.
- Georgios Pavlakos, Dandan Shan, Ilija Radosavovic, Angjoo Kanazawa, David Fouhey, and Jitendra Malik. HaMeR: Reconstructing hands in 3D with transformers. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- Wenxuan Peng, Bharath Hariharan, and Hadar Averbuch-Elor. Composing people together: Iterative pose-image generation for multi-person interaction scenes. In *SIGGRAPH*, 2026.
- Yuang Peng, Yuxin Cui, Haomiao Tang, Zekun Qi, Runpei Dong, Jing Bai, Chunrui Han, Zheng Ge, Xiangyu Zhang, and Shu-Tao Xia. Dreambench++: A human-aligned benchmark for personalized image generation. In *ICLR*, 2025.
- Oindrila Saha, Vojtech Krs, Radomir Mech, Subhransu Maji, Kevin James Blackburn-Matzen, and Matheus Gadelha. SIGMA-Gen: Structure and identity guided multi-subject assembly for image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.06469*, 2025.
- Bram Wallace, Meihua Dang, Rafael Rafailov, Linqi Zhou, Aaron Lou, Senthil Purushwalkam, Stefano Ermon, Caiming Xiong, Shafiq Joty, and Nikhil Naik. Diffusion model alignment using direct preference optimization. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- Kaiwen Wang, Kaili Zheng, Yiming Shi, Chenyi Guo, and Ji Wu. Towards metric-aware multi-person mesh recovery by jointly optimizing human crowd in camera space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.13282*, 2025a.
- Shulei Wang, Longhui Wei, Xin He, Jianbo Ouyang, Hui Lu, Zhou Zhao, and Qi Tian. Psr: Scaling multi-subject personalized image generation with pairwise subject-consistency rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.01236*, 2025b.
- Chenyuan Wu, Jiahao Wang, Pengfei Zheng, Ruiran Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyan Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, Ziyi Xia, Ze Liu, Chaofan Li, Haoge Deng, Kun Luo, Bo Zhang, Jiajun Zhang, Dong Liu, Defu Lian, Xinlong Wang, Zhongyuan Wang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. Omnigen2: Towards instruction-aligned multimodal generation. In *CVPR*, 2026a.
- Chuoqiao Wu, Jin Song, and Yiyun Fei. Skeleguide: Explicit skeleton reasoning for context-aware human-in-place image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.01579*, 2026b.
- Shaojin Wu, Mengqi Huang, Wenxu Wu, Yufeng Cheng, Fei Ding, and Qian He. Less-to-more generalization: Unlocking more controllability by in-context generation. In *ICCV*, 2025.
- Xiaoshi Wu, Yiming Hao, Keqiang Sun, Yixiong Chen, Feng Zhu, Rui Zhao, and Hongsheng Li. Human preference score v2: A solid benchmark for evaluating human preferences of text-to-image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09341*, 2023.
- Hengyuan Xu, Wei Cheng, Peng Xing, Yixiao Fang, Shuhan Wu, Rui Wang, Xianfang Zeng, Daxin Jiang, Gang Yu, Xingjun Ma, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Withanyone: Toward controllable and id consistent image generation. In *ICLR*, 2026.

Yang Ye, Xianyi He, Zongjian Li, Bin Lin, Shenghai Yuan, Zhiyuan Yan, Bohan Hou, and Li Yuan. Imgedit: A unified image editing dataset and benchmark. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.

Kaili Zheng, Kaiwen Wang, Xun Zhu, Chenyi Guo, and Ji Wu. InterMesh: Explicit interaction-aware end-to-end multi-person human mesh recovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.04554*, 2026.

Appendix

A Extended protocol notes

Instr v2 design. We separate question generation from answering. Offline, a text-only stage extracts atomic claims from the edit instruction and freezes a per-sample QA bank with buckets **role/asymm/prop** (main) and optional **scene** (diagnostic only), forbidding interaction-occurrence, count, face-identity, and anatomy questions. At evaluation time the VLM answers the frozen questions from the generated image alone and cannot rewrite them. An earlier image-conditioned self-authored **instr_qa** protocol saturated on closed-source models and is deprecated.

Mesh Interaction intent. Contact intent is read from the edit prompt text (not the dataset category label), yielding required / forbidden / unspecified. Penalties combine interpenetration volume, enclosure fraction, proximity, and contact-quality terms, with soft ramps calibrated on GT frames. The metric flags unreasonable geometry; higher Inter than GT can occur when a generation under-penetrates relative to real contact.

Release artifacts. We release: (i) the redistributable test subset and scene-level split; (ii) frozen reference face embeddings; (iii) evaluation scripts for the six-axis protocol including 3D mesh Anatomy/Interaction; (iv) the human checklist template and agreement scripts; (v) the metric calibration recipe for GT percentile thresholds.

B Toward anatomy-aware training (future work)

The main paper is evaluation-only. For completeness we sketch a training recipe we are exploring on top of MPIE-Bench signals; none of these results are required to use the benchmark.

Base model. Fine-tune FLUX.1 Kontext (Labs et al., 2025) with a rank-512 LoRA rather than full-parameter updates, because (a) narrow-task data at $\sim 10^4$ scale risks catastrophic forgetting under full fine-tuning of a large DiT, and (b) Kontext is guidance-distilled; full updates can disturb the distillation structure. Kontext already exposes a native reference-conditioning pathway, so we do not add an identity encoder unless post-hoc ID/ M_{CP} diagnostics indicate copy-paste cheating.

Auxiliary skeleton stream. A lightweight auxiliary LoRA + projection head predicts a 2D multi-person skeleton visualization during training (discarded at inference), encouraging the shared backbone to keep one complete skeleton per person under occlusion – targeting limb-fusion and limb-attribution failures.

Contact-density curriculum. Training samples are scheduled along C0–C3: early C0–C1, mid C2, late C3, so the model stabilizes body completeness before deep mutual occlusion. This is a dataloader-level change with zero architectural cost.

What we defer. Corrupted positive/negative pairs from metric calibration are reserved for future preference optimization / RL stages (e.g., Diffusion-DPO (Wallace et al., 2024), Flow-GRPO (Liu et al., 2025)) rather than standard supervised losses that would simply reproduce corruptions.

C VLM-as-judge saturation diagnostic

An all-checklist visual judge yields Anatomy/Interaction means near 0.98–0.99 for strong closed-source editors while fused limbs and pathological interpenetration remain visible. Parametric joint/bone priors similarly saturate (≈ 0.99) because hallucinated extremities often lie outside the fitted topology. Primary tables therefore report mesh-anchored Anatomy and prompt-conditioned Interaction in 3D mesh space; checklist Anat/Inter remain diagnostics only and are released with the evaluation code rather than used for ranking.

D Coverage rules

An axis is reported when it meets the coverage rule in the release scripts (minimum fraction of scored generations per model and axis). All eight systems in the main tables meet that rule for every reported axis.

E End-to-end pipeline (Algorithm 1)

This supplement freezes the numeric constants, sensitivity checks, and human-consistency details used by the mining and mesh Anat/Inter pipeline described in the main paper.

F Dataset distribution

The main paper includes the public test-set sunburst (density $\times$ category). Source-stratified counts and per-class breakdowns ship with the release tables.

Algorithm 1 MPIE-Bench pipeline (data construction + Anat/Inter scoring)

Input: video corpus $\mathcal{V}$; editor f ; frozen pack $\mathcal{D}$

Output: per-sample six-axis scores (Anat/Inter detailed below)

```
1: // A. Mine reference-instruction-target triplets
2: for video  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  do
3:   Coarse  $\phi_{\text{coarse}}$  then refine  $\phi$  (IoU/Prox/Flow/Occ); peaks via smoothed  $\phi$  ( $P_{60}, \geq 2s$ )
4:    $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \text{TopPeaks}(\phi)$ ;  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow$  high-separation / low-overlap pool (disjoint from  $\mathcal{T}$ )
5:   Pick peak target crop; valley identity crops (tiered anti-copy-paste); emit prompt  $p$ ,  $n_{\text{exp}}$ , C0–C3
6: end for
7: Human-review scenes; freeze public split  $\mathcal{D}$  ( $N=2,500$ ) and reference embeddings
8: // B. Generate
9: for sample  $(I_{\text{refs}}, p) \in \mathcal{D}$  do
10:   $I \leftarrow f(I_{\text{refs}}, p)$  {identical refs/prompt across editors}
11:  Score Count / ID / Instr / Qual with checklist, ArcFace, HPSv2
12:  // C. Mesh Anat / Inter
13:  Reconstruct meshes on  $I$  (frozen Multi-HMR); keep top- $n_{\text{exp}}$  detections
14:  Build leftover / enclosure / ownership proxies
15:  Form  $s_{\text{attach}}, s_{\text{orphan}}, s_{\text{struct}}, s_{\text{resid}}$  ( $s=1-P$ )
16:   $S_{\text{anat}} \leftarrow \sum w s$  with weights 0.40/0.20/0.25/0.15
17:  Measure  $V_p, r_{\text{in}}, d_s \rightarrow s_{\text{pen}}, s_{\text{prox}}, s_{\text{qual}}$ 
18:  intent  $\leftarrow \text{ParseContactIntent}(p)$ 
19:  if required then  $S_{\text{inter}} \leftarrow 0.45 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.35 s_{\text{prox}} + 0.20 s_{\text{qual}}$ 
20:  else if forbidden then  $S_{\text{inter}} \leftarrow 0.55 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.45 s_{\text{clear}}$ 
21:  else  $S_{\text{inter}} \leftarrow 0.85 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.15 s_{\text{qual}}$ 
22:  if  $n_{\text{humans}} < n_{\text{exp}}$  then  $S_{\text{inter}} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} S_{\text{inter}}$ 
23: end for
```

G Frozen metric constants

Public rankings freeze Multi-HMR backend `multiHMR_896_L`. Table 9 lists the constants used by the public Anat/Inter scorers and the mining defaults stated in the main paper.

Group	Symbol / name	Value / definition
Mining (coarse)	ϕ_{coarse}	$0.7 \text{IoU}_{\text{pair}} + 0.3 E_{\text{mot}}$
Mining (refine)	$(w_{\text{IoU}}, w_{\text{Prox}}, w_{\text{Flow}}, w_{\text{Occ}})$	$(0.35, 0.30, 0.20, 0.15)$ after within-video percentile norm
Peak detect	smooth / height / gap	3-frame box; $\geq P_{60}(\phi)$; ≥ 2 s separation
Valley refs	—	high-separation / low-overlap pool; disjoint from peaks
Face gate	det / yaw	≥ 0.62 ; $ \text{yaw} \leq 38^\circ$
Foreground M_{fg}	classical mask	$ L - b > 0.10$ or $(S > S_{70} \wedge \text{person-side of mid-luma})$; no learned segmenter
Explained / ROI	M_{ex}, R	thick skeleton/torso of kept bodies; joint-box pad $0.22 \max(H, W)$, floor 24 px
Leftover / blobs	ℓ, n_b	$\ell = M_{\text{fg}} \cap R \setminus M_{\text{ex}} / M_{\text{fg}} \cap R $; n_b detached leftover blobs ($\text{frac} \geq 0.025$)
s_ℓ / s_{fuse}	leftover / in-hull	$s(\ell; 0.50, 0.75)$; $s(r_{\text{in}}; 0.15, 0.45)$
Attached signature	gate on s_ℓ, s_{fuse}	if $\ell \geq 0.62$ and $n_b = 0$: use as-is; else $s \leftarrow 1 - 0.15(1 - s)$
$s_{\text{over}}^{\text{gated}}$ / s_{extreme}	over-detect	gated soft band on $n_{\text{raw}}/n_{\text{exp}}$ when attach evidence; milder ungated floor if $n_{\text{raw}} \gg n_{\text{exp}}$
s_{blob} / s_{ofrac}	orphan	blob count $(0, 3)$; orphan-frac $(0.02, 0.15)$
$s_{\text{scale}}, s_{\text{own}}^{\text{amp}}, s_{\text{part}}$	structure	Multi-HMR scale / ownership amp 2.0 / part self-collision
s_{resid}	residual	foreground explain-residual
Anat mix	S_{anat}	$0.40/0.20/0.25/0.15$ on $s_{\text{attach}}, s_{\text{orphan}}, s_{\text{struct}}, s_{\text{resid}}$
s_{pen}	V_p , pair r_{in}	$\min(s(V_p; 0.05, 0.15), s(r_{\text{in}}; 0.20, 0.50))$
s_{prox}	gap d_s	$s(d_s; 0.05, 0.40)$
s_{qual} / s_{clear}	quality / clearance	ownership+over-detect; $s_{\text{clear}} = 1 - \max(s_{\text{prox}}, 1 - s_{\text{pen}}, 1 - s_{\text{qual}})$
Inter mix	intent cases	req. $0.45/0.35/0.20$; forb. $0.55/0.45$; unspec. $0.85/0.15$
Missing person	Inter	$\times \frac{1}{2}$ if $n_{\text{humans}} < n_{\text{exp}}$
V_p	hull proxy	$r_{\text{in}} \cdot \min(\text{Vol}_{\text{hull}} A, \text{Vol}_{\text{hull}} B)$; not SDF

Table 9 Frozen constants for mining gates and mesh Anat/Inter (complete soft-score sheet).

H Anatomy and Interaction formulas

The main paper states leftover ℓ , the Anatomy soft-score structure, the Inter pair proxies V_p/d_s , and the public weighted mixes; here we expand operational sub-terms, aggregation, and the hull-proxy rationale. Reconstruct with frozen Multi-HMR; keep top- k with $k = n_{\text{exp}}$. On generation I , let M_{fg} be a classical human-like foreground, M_{ex} thick skeleton/torso coverage of kept bodies, and R the joint-box union padded by $0.22 \max(H, W)$ (floor 24 px). Leftover fraction and detached-blob count are

$$\ell = \frac{|M_{\text{fg}} \cap R \setminus M_{\text{ex}}|}{|M_{\text{fg}} \cap R|}, \quad n_b = \#\{\text{detached leftover blobs, frac} \geq 0.025\}.$$

Additional constants appear in Table 9. Anatomy soft scores (same algebra as the main paper; $s=1-P$ is only an implementation alias):

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\text{attach}} &= \min(s_\ell, s_{\text{fuse}}, \\ &\quad s_{\text{over}}^{\text{gated}}, s_{\text{extreme}}), \\ s_{\text{orphan}} &= \min(s_{\text{blob}}, s_{\text{ofrac}}), \\ s_{\text{struct}} &= \min(s_{\text{scale}}, s_{\text{own}}^{\text{amp}}, s_{\text{part}}), \end{aligned}$$

where s_ℓ/s_{fuse} band ℓ and r_{in} ; $s_{\text{over}}^{\text{gated}}$ bands $n_{\text{raw}}/n_{\text{exp}}$ when attach evidence is present; s_{extreme} is an ungated mild floor for extreme over-detect; $s_{\text{blob}}/s_{\text{ofrac}}$ score detached leftovers; $s_{\text{scale}}, s_{\text{own}}^{\text{amp}} = 1 - \min(1, (1 - s_{\text{own}}) \cdot 2)$, and s_{part} come from Multi-HMR scale / ownership / part-mesh scores; s_{resid} is foreground explain-residual.

Leftover/fuse enter the min as-is only under the attached signature ($\ell \geq 0.62$, $n_b = 0$); otherwise replace s by $1 - 0.15(1 - s)$ (equivalent to scaling the old penalty by 0.15). Then

$$S_{\text{anat}}^{\text{mesh}} = 0.40 s_{\text{attach}} + 0.20 s_{\text{orphan}} \\ + 0.25 s_{\text{struct}} + 0.15 s_{\text{resid}}.$$

For Interaction, each kept mesh pair yields

$$V_p = r_{\text{in}} \cdot \min(\text{Vol}_{\text{hull}}(A), \text{Vol}_{\text{hull}}(B)), \\ d_s = \min_{u \in A, v \in B} \|u - v\|_2,$$

s_{pen} from the stricter of volume and r_{in} bands, s_{prox} from d_s , s_{qual} from ownership/over-detect, and

$$S_{\text{inter}}^{\text{mesh}} = \begin{cases} 0.45 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.35 s_{\text{prox}} + 0.20 s_{\text{qual}} & \text{req.}, \\ 0.55 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.45 s_{\text{clear}} & \text{forb.}, \\ 0.85 s_{\text{pen}} + 0.15 s_{\text{qual}} & \text{unspec.} \end{cases}$$

halved if $n_{\text{humans}} < n_{\text{exp}}$. Across ≥ 2 kept bodies, pair diagnostics aggregate by worst contact geometry before the mix above: max over pairs of penetration/enclosure proxies and min over pairs of surface distance (one severely intersecting pair dominates the unit score).

Exception handling. Expected count n_{exp} comes from the frozen sample metadata. Multi-HMR detections are sorted by detector score; we keep the top- k with $k = n_{\text{exp}}$ (no identity-aware matching in the public protocol). If reconstruction fails or yields zero usable meshes, Anat and Inter for that unit are 0. If $0 < n_{\text{det}} < n_{\text{exp}}$, Interaction is halved (missing-person penalty) and Anatomy applies the under-detection path in the Anat composer. Surplus detections beyond k are ignored for pairing. Intent for the Interaction mix is keyword-parsed from the edit instruction (human overrides on the consistency pool do not change full-set rankings; main text).

Why hull-normalized V_p . Exact mesh-mesh penetration via SDF or signed volumes is accurate but slow and brittle under Multi-HMR topology noise. We use

$$V_p = r_{\text{in}} \cdot \min(\text{Vol}_{\text{hull}}(A), \text{Vol}_{\text{hull}}(B)) :$$

r_{in} captures relative enclosure while the hull factor removes absolute mesh units. Outstretched limbs inflate convex hulls and can overstate fusion; we therefore treat V_p as a *ranking* observable under a frozen reconstructor, not a metric contact volume, and calibrate soft cutoffs on held-out GT frames in the same units. The CPU synthetic suite in Section M includes a hull-inflation stress case (outstretched arms) that lowers the effective fusion signal relative to a part-aware volume oracle, confirming the known bias direction without changing editor rankings under the frozen frontend.

I Mesh→checklist mapping (M)

For each checklist item q , hand-select a small feature vector $\mathbf{x}_q$ of related Multi-HMR fields (e.g., I1: s_{pen} and penetration ratios; A1: leftover/ P_{extra} / s_{own} ; Ic: s_{prox} , d_s). On a held-out calibration split of human labels y_q , z -score features to $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_q$ and fit a ridge regressor

$$\hat{y}_q = \mathbf{w}_q^\top \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_q + b_q, \\ (\mathbf{w}_q, b_q) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w}, b} \sum_i (y_q^{(i)} - \mathbf{w}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_q^{(i)} - b)^2 \\ + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2.$$

Discretize $\hat{y}_q$ with cuts that maximize Spearman correlation with y_q on the calibration split. Binary items use a (possibly polarity-inverted) threshold τ_q ; ternary items use ordered cuts $\tau_q^{(1)} < \tau_q^{(2)}$:

$$c_q(\hat{y}) = \begin{cases} 1[\hat{y} \geq \tau_q] & \text{binary,} \\ 0 & \hat{y} < \tau_q^{(1)}, \\ 1 & \tau_q^{(1)} \leq \hat{y} < \tau_q^{(2)}, \\ 2 & \text{else (ternary).} \end{cases}$$

Weights, biases, and cuts freeze before evaluating the $N=170$ consistency pool; Interaction items apply the same intent-conditioned dependency rules as humans.

J Two VLM paths: checklist vs. Instruction QA

MPIE-Eval uses two *disjoint* VLM protocols. Conflating them is a common reading error, so we state the split once:

	Shared checklist (<code>vlm_judge</code>)	Per-sample Instruction QA
Main-table use	Count; also V-Anat / V-Inter as a saturation baseline vs. mesh	Instr only
Questionnaire	One fixed field set for all samples (count, anatomy tags, semantic / contact / penetration, ...)	One frozen atomic bank per sample (2,500 banks)
Authoring	Protocol fields are written once; judge fills them on the generation (+ refs)	Questions authored from <i>text only</i> ; answering sees the generation
Not used for	Main-table Instr	Count / V-Anat / V-Inter

Sections K–L detail each path. Main-table Instr never reads checklist Instruction-like fields from `vlm_judge`.

K Checklist VLM protocol (`vlm_judge`)

The main-paper Count column and the V-Anat / V-Inter baseline columns use a frozen shared checklist `vlm_judge` with a frontier vision-language judge. This is *not* the main-table Instruction score (Section L). Per sample the judge sees the generation plus ordered reference crops $R_1, \dots, R_n$ (no GT target at test time) and structured metadata (instruction, expected person count, interaction type, contact density). Outputs are binary/ordinal checklist items, not Likert scores:

- **Count:** whether the visible person count matches n_{exp} (feeds the main-table Count axis).
- **Anatomy (V-Anat):** closed-set error tags (e.g., extra/missing limb, merged body, limb ownership, bad hand, floating part); score 1 if empty, else $1 - \min(1, 0.25 n_{\text{err}})$.
- **Interaction (V-Inter):** three cuts—semantic action presence, contact-point fit, and no pathological penetration—each yes=1/partial=0.5/no=0, then averaged. Real deep contact is not scored as penetration.

Visible contract (fields + example). Public Count / V-Anat / V-Inter read only the fixed fields below (same schema for every sample). Closed Anat vocabulary: `extra_limb`, `missing_limb`, `merged_body`, `limb_ownership_error`, `bad_hand`, `impossible_joint`, `floating_part`, `face_melt`. A real judge return used for the V-Anat/V-Inter baseline (excerpt; identity fields omitted here because the public ID axis uses ArcFace, not this checklist):

```
{
  "count_detected": 2,
  "count_expected": 2,
  "count_pass": true,
```

```

"anat_errors": [
  {"type": "bad_hand",
   "where": "high-five contact region fingers appear fused/overcrowded"}
],
"anat_pass": false,
"inter": {
  "semantic": "yes",
  "contact_points": "yes",
  "no_pathological_penetration": "partial"
}
}

```

Prompt skeleton (abridged): Image 1 = generation; Images 2... = ordered references; text carries instruction, n_{person} , interaction type, contact density, and contact-point hints; “return only one JSON object”; deep legitimate contact is not pathological penetration. Full prompt text and schema checks ship with the release scripts. Any Instruction-like free-form fields that an older joint call might have emitted are *ignored* for the public leaderboard (main-table Instr uses Section L). Closed-source V-Inter stays near ceiling (0.98–0.99) while M-Inter spans 0.45–0.72; closed-source V-Anat is high but not saturated (0.95–0.96) against M-Anat 0.54–0.65.

L Instruction QA protocol

Main-table Instruction is a two-stage text-then-answer bank (TIFA-style), separate from `vlm_judge`.

Stage A (offline; text only). For each of the 2,500 edit prompts we freeze a small atomic question set with gold answers implied by the text (role binding to reference slots, asymmetric duties, prompt-mandated props/attributes). Question authoring never sees the generation or reference pixels, so the bank cannot drift with the editor under test. Contact-geometry, person-count, face-ID, and anatomy items are forbidden here (they belong to Inter / Count / ID / Anat). Scene-wallpaper questions are excluded from the main Instr aggregate.

Stage B (eval; answer only). A VLM answers each frozen item on the generation with {yes/partial/no and cannot rewrite questions. The public Instr mean aggregates role / asymmetry / prop subtypes with fixed weights (asymm 0.50, role 0.35, prop 0.15). Banks and answering scripts ship with the release.

Example bank (one sample). Table 10 shows three main-table items from the frozen bank of sample `hug__-69628680878d__T2`. Questions were authored from the edit text alone; Stage B only answers them on the generation. They are not `vlm_judge` checklist fields.

Subtype	Question	Gold
asymm	Is R2 resting his cheek against R1’s cheek during the close embrace, rather than R1 resting hers against R2’s?	yes
role_duty	Is R1 in tight affectionate body contact with R2 while R2’s cheek is pressed or rested against hers?	yes
prop_object	Does R1 hold a yellow plaid gift box?	yes

Table 10 Instruction QA example (one frozen bank; main-table subtypes only).

This separation is intentional: the shared checklist is the right instrument for Count and for showing VLM saturation on contact geometry (V-Anat/V-Inter), while Instr needs a reproducible, text-authored bank that does not invent questions from the image under test.

M Metric anchors: GT reference and controlled corruption

GT reference. A full held-out GT pack under the public Anat/Inter scorer is pending in the release; we therefore treat GT as a qualitative upper-anchor check rather than a hard numeric row in the main-paper results table.

Controlled mesh corruption. The main paper summarizes direction checks on 200 Multi-HMR reconstructions of GT targets: force penetration, separate far under required intent, drop person, and duplicate person all lower Inter under the public algebra. Absolute Δ values are protocol-dependent; we report monotonicity rather than a single frozen delta recipe. A CPU synthetic two-person mesh suite (same Inter algebra; no HMR) additionally passes 6/6 required direction checks (penetration, separation, drop-person, forbidden-near, bone/self-collision).

N Scene-clustered uncertainty for Anat/Inter

Full-set Anat/Inter *point estimates* are those in main-paper Table 3 (frozen also as `results/tab_main.json` in the code/data supplement). Means nest in 405 scenes. A paired scene-level bootstrap of Seedream–Gemini Inter on shared scenes ($B=2000$; resample scenes with replacement) yields $\Delta=+0.042$ with 95% CI $[0.019, 0.064]$ (excludes zero): Seedream’s Inter lead is significant under this clustering. Gaps of ≈ 0.01 in Table 3 should be read as ties under the same clustering. We do *not* reprint a per-model CI table here: older bootstrap dumps on incomplete per-model coverage produced means that disagree with Table 3, so those intervals are not authoritative for the public freeze.

O Sensitivity analyses

Offline recomposition of stored Multi-HMR intermediates (no reconstructor re-run) defines the public Anat/Inter scores. Table 12 reports ten-model Anatomy rank Spearman under weight, attached-signature, and attached-threshold (ℓ) variants relative to the public mix (0.40/0.20/0.25/0.15); all variants keep $\rho \geq 0.98$, and FireRed / Gemini / Seedream remain the Anat top-3 except under equal weights (BAGEL enters top-3). The AC-style 0.30/0.30/0.20/0.20 mix keeps $\rho=0.988$ with the same top-3; varying $\ell \in \{0.50, 0.62, 0.75\}$ keeps $\rho=1.000$. ROI padding ($0.22 \max(H, W)$) enters only Anat leftover/ROI terms—Interaction is pad-invariant by construction. Re-rasterizing leftover terms from stored Multi-HMR geometry on FireRed ($N=150$) at pad fractions $\{0.15, 0.22, 0.30\}$ leaves Inter unchanged and moves Anat by $+0.020 / 0 / -0.006$ vs. the default 0.22 setting (Table 11), so the public pad sits in a mild, one-sided neighborhood. Inter top-2 (Seedream/Gemini under the current ten-editor table) remains stable under moderate cutoff and intent-mix perturbations. Full numeric ablation dumps ship with the release scripts.

Pad frac. of $\max(H, W)$	Anat	Inter	Δ Anat vs 0.22
0.15	0.695	0.733	+0.020
0.22 (public)	0.676	0.733	0
0.30	0.670	0.733	−0.006

Table 11 ROI pad sensitivity on FireRed ($N=150$ subset; public Anat/Inter recipe). Inter is pad-invariant; Anat moves mildly.

P Per-category Anat/Inter

Table 13 pools mesh Anat/Inter over ten editors by interaction category (studio source tags CHI3D/Harmony4D excluded). Lowest Anatomy means appear on handshake / hug / high-five; lowest Interaction on face-to-face talk / high-five / hug. Talk Inter is partly depressed by non-contact and unspecified-intent prompts; hug/high-five remain hard contact cases where editors still fail geometry.

Locus-critical slice. We mark handshake / hand-hold / high-five / arm-around as *locus-critical*: prompts name a part-specific contact that whole-body s_{prox} cannot verify. These four categories cover 491/2,500

Variant	Rank Spearman vs. base	Anat top-3
base (0.40/0.20/0.25/0.15)	1.000	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
equal weights (0.25 ⁴)	0.976	FireRed, Gemini, BAGEL
0.30/0.30/0.20/0.20	0.988	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
attach-heavy	1.000	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
drop s_{struct} (renorm)	1.000	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
attached-signature off	0.988	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
attached-signature stricter	1.000	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
attached $\ell \geq 0.50$	1.000	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream
attached $\ell \geq 0.75$	1.000	FireRed, Gemini, Seedream

Table 12 Offline Anat weight / attached-signature / ℓ -threshold ablations on the full set (ten editors; anat_v4_exp recompose).

samples ($\approx 19.6\%$). Pooling Table 13 rows gives Inter ≈ 0.59 on the locus-critical slice vs. ≈ 0.56 on the remainder—comparable or slightly higher—so the public Interaction axis does not down-rank part-specific prompts by itself. As a stricter probe on a fixed $N=150$ subset, we replace whole-body d_s by the minimum 3D wrist/hand distance between the two kept humans on locus-critical IDs only (same Inter algebra otherwise). Mean Inter drops by ≈ 0.005 – 0.011 over all scored IDs and by ≈ 0.02 – 0.04 on the IDs that enter the hand–hand branch (≈ 27 – $43/150$ per editor with geometry dumps), confirming that body proximity is mildly more lenient than a part-specific hand distance; we keep whole-body s_{prox} in the public recipe and treat hand–hand as a Supplementary sensitivity. The gaming proxy in Section Q ($\approx 1.3\%$) remains the diagnostic for high-proximity / wrong-region residuals.

$n_{\text{exp}} \geq 3$. Expected person count is ≥ 3 on 399/2,500 samples (16%; max 9). Scoring keeps $k=n_{\text{exp}}$ and aggregates Interaction by worst kept pair; under-detection (kept $< n_{\text{exp}}$) on this slice is rare in frozen dumps ($\approx 1\%$) and triggers the public halve rule.

Category	n	Anat	Inter
face-to-face talk	1004	0.58	0.43
handshake	994	0.54	0.57
hand-hold	1480	0.62	0.72
high-five	1031	0.56	0.48
arm-around	1268	0.58	0.54
hug	1982	0.56	0.48
piggyback	1389	0.58	0.49
carry/lift	1670	0.58	0.56
dance	2073	0.58	0.59
dance-lift	1276	0.63	0.69
combat	1829	0.58	0.63
grapple	1376	0.61	0.60
other	2642	0.62	0.53

Table 13 Pooled mesh Anat/Inter by interaction category (ten editors; offline anat_v4_exp + inter_v3.1).

Q Interaction gaming proxy

Continuous Interaction does not enforce the semantically required contact region. As a diagnostic, we flag required-intent, recon-successful units with high mesh s_{pen} and s_{prox} (≥ 0.85) whose frozen VLM judge marks `contact_points` = no. This proxy fires on $\approx 1.3\%$ of required-ok units (higher on several open editors, ≈ 2 – 2.5% ; $\approx 0.5\%$ on closed APIs). Removing these units does not change Inter top-2. A dedicated region-condition term beyond s_{qual} remains future work; the proxy is asymmetric (VLM-saturated contact tags) and underestimates a residual locus failure mode left for future work.

R Detection-confidence proxy

Public Anat/Inter do not downweight unstable reconstructions. Splitting full-set successes by mean kept-body Multi-HMR detection score at 0.45 yields lower means in the low-det bin (Anat/Inter $\approx 0.55/0.46$) than the high-det bin ($\approx 0.65/0.76$), with comparable Anat stds. We report this only as a ranking diagnostic: detection score is not a calibrated mesh uncertainty, and identity-aware person selection is not yet applied.

S Multi-seed generation variance

Primary tables report a single generation per sample. To quantify sampling noise, we regenerate a fixed 150-sample subset for three open-source editors (FLUX.1 Kontext dev, ACE++, OmniGen2) at seeds $\{0, 1, 2\}$ and keep only samples with valid judgments under *all* seeds ($n=150$ per model). Seed-level Anat/Inter stds of the three seed means remain small ($O(10^{-2})$), well below the closed/open and density gaps in the main tables; per-image noise is larger, as expected for stochastic editors. Absolute seed-level means shift with the Anat/Inter protocol and are therefore omitted here.

T Letterbox / normalize probe

The main paper defines two official mesh tracks: Track A (vendor-native public six-axis table) and Track B (letterbox $\rightarrow 1024^2$ on the full 2,500-sample set; Table 14). Absolute Anat/Inter rise for all ten editors (Anat $\Delta \approx +0.06$ – 0.14), while open-editor Anat rank Spearman vs. Track A stays 0.89 (all-ten 0.83) and the Anat top-3 is unchanged. Track A remains the deployment-facing public leaderboard; Track B is the fair-resolution view.

Model	Anat native / lb (Δ)	Inter native / lb (Δ)
GPT-Image-2	0.566/0.681 (+0.114)	0.660/0.754 (+0.094)
Gemini-3-Pro-Image	0.630/0.712 (+0.082)	0.693/0.791 (+0.098)
Seedream-5-Pro	0.599/0.680 (+0.081)	0.660/0.803 (+0.143)
FireRed-Image-Edit	0.677/0.736 (+0.060)	0.712/0.788 (+0.076)
BAGEL	0.600/0.696 (+0.097)	0.661/0.768 (+0.108)
UNO	0.582/0.691 (+0.109)	0.655/0.732 (+0.077)
FLUX.1-Kontext	0.538/0.682 (+0.144)	0.634/0.736 (+0.102)
DreamO	0.539/0.663 (+0.124)	0.626/0.730 (+0.104)
OmniGen2	0.542/0.678 (+0.136)	0.640/0.750 (+0.109)
ACE++	0.535/0.649 (+0.114)	0.629/0.710 (+0.082)
Rank Spearman (Anat)	closed / open / all: 0.50 / 0.89 / 0.83	

Table 14 Track B letterbox $\rightarrow 1024$ on the full 2,500-sample set (same Anat/Inter algebra as Track A). FireRed Track A public cells stay 0.63/0.60.

U Alternate mesh frontend (HMR2)

Public rankings freeze Multi-HMR. For audit we also score the same $N=150$ IDs with a detect+single-person HMR2 frontend under the *public* Anat/Inter recipe (Table 15). A single alternate frontend is *not* interchangeable with Multi-HMR on editor order; the useful companion is a two-frontend *mean* of editor means, which agrees with Multi-HMR at rank Spearman ≈ 0.92 (Anat) / 0.68 (Inter) and keeps the same Anat top-3 on that slice (Table 16). These subset means are *not* Table 3—the full-set public leaders remain Gemini (Anat) / Seedream (Inter). We therefore keep Multi-HMR as the primary leaderboard and release the mean-ensemble numbers as an optional multi-frontend view.

Model	n	ρ Anat	ρ Inter
ACE++	150	0.215	0.110
BAGEL	150	-0.142	0.064
DreamO	150	-0.100	-0.126
FireRed-Image-Edit	150	-0.290	-0.150
FLUX.1-Kontext	150	-0.062	0.084
Gemini-3-Pro-Image	150	-0.167	-0.145
GPT-Image-2	150	-0.067	0.064
OmniGen2	150	-0.071	-0.090
Seedream-5-Pro	150	-0.184	0.034
UNO	150	-0.216	-0.051
Ten-model rank Spearman	—	0.103	0.248

Table 15 HMR2 vs. Multi-HMR under the public Anat/Inter recipe ($N=150$). Per-row values are sample-wise Spearman; last row is Spearman of the ten editor means.

Aggregation vs. Multi-HMR	ρ Anat	ρ Inter
HMR2 alone	0.10	0.25
Mean ensemble (MHMR+HMR2)	0.92	0.68
Worst-case min ensemble	0.10	0.25

Table 16 Ten-model rank Spearman vs. Multi-HMR editor means ($N=150$). Mean ensemble is the companion track; min matches single-frontend HMR2 and is not used publicly.

V Contact-intent parsing

On the human-consistency pool ($N=170$), keyword/system intent matches human intent on 145/170 (85.3%). Confusion is dominated by unspecified $\leftrightarrow$ required; required $\leftrightarrow$ forbidden disagreements are rare (2 units). Replacing keyword intent with human intent on the disagreeing units and recomputing $S_{\text{inter}}^{\text{mesh}}$ changes full-set per-model Inter means by $<10^{-3}$ and leaves the ten-model Inter ranking unchanged (Spearman 1.00).

W Human-consistency statistics

Annotators and gold. Five adult annotators independently score every unit in the $N=170$ consistency pool on the shared checklist (I0, I1, Ic, I3, Ir, A1–A5), following written guidelines that forbid collecting personal information beyond anonymous rater IDs. Main-paper gold is the mean over raters on each item (skipping undecidable marks). Per-annotator exports ship with the release.

Inter-annotator reliability (Krippendorff’s α). Table 17 reports per-item Krippendorff’s α over the five raters (interval metric on the per-item scores). The unweighted mean across the ten items is $\alpha=0.53$. Core contact items are highest (I1 0.68, Ic 0.65); mid-range items sit near 0.50–0.60; near-ceiling / high-prevalence items (I0, A4) show lower α even when raw percent-agreement is high, which is expected under class imbalance. We therefore treat human gold as a moderately reliable ranking signal rather than a near-perfect oracle, and interpret H–M / H–V correlations in that light.

Steiger tests. On the same pool we compare dependent Spearman correlations $\rho(H, M)$ vs. $\rho(H, V)$ using Steiger’s test with the empirical $\rho(M, V)$. Significant differences ($p<0.05$): $M>V$ on I3 and Ir; $V>M$ on I0. Other M edges are directional but not significant at 0.05 (A3: $p\approx 0.09$).

Model-level preference anchors. Averaging $Q_{\text{anat}}/Q_{\text{inter}}$ and mesh Anat/Inter per editor in the consistency pool yields Spearman $\rho(Q_{\text{anat}}, S_{\text{anat}})\approx 0.87$ and $\rho(Q_{\text{inter}}, S_{\text{inter}})\approx 0.80$ across editors (small n of editors; unit-level correlations remain weaker).

Fisher z 95% intervals for main-paper checklist Spearman ρ with $N=170$:

Item	Krippendorff's α	Note
I0	0.35	Near-ceiling; high %agree, lower α
I1	0.68	Core contact (penetration)
Ic	0.65	Core contact (fit)
I3	0.58	Mid-high
Ir	0.55	Mid-high
A1	0.60	Mid-high
A2	0.50	Harder; near 0.5
A3	0.55	Mid
A4	0.32	Near-ceiling; same class as I0
A5	0.52	Harder but >0.5
Mean	0.53	Unweighted over 10 items

Table 17 Five-rater Krippendorff's α on the $N=170$ consistency pool.

Item	$\rho(H, M)$	CI	$\rho(H, V)$	CI
I0	0.41	[0.28, 0.53]	0.77	[0.70, 0.82]
I1	0.39	[0.25, 0.51]	0.30	[0.16, 0.43]
Ic	0.54	[0.42, 0.64]	0.53	[0.41, 0.63]
I3	0.43	[0.30, 0.55]	0.09	[-0.06, 0.24]
Ir	0.46	[0.33, 0.57]	0.17	[0.02, 0.31]
A1	0.34	[0.20, 0.47]	0.20	[0.05, 0.34]
A2	0.24	[0.09, 0.38]	0.18	[0.03, 0.32]
A3	0.38	[0.24, 0.50]	0.21	[0.06, 0.35]
A4	0.38	[0.24, 0.50]	0.33	[0.19, 0.46]
A5	0.26	[0.11, 0.39]	0.19	[0.04, 0.33]




Figure 5 Radar view of the per-item $\rho(H, M)$ vs. $\rho(H, V)$ table above (main paper Table 8).

X Face-Visible Rate and ID conditioning

Mean Face-Visible Rate from `arcface_v1` (full scored set):

Model	FVR
GPT-Image-2	0.91
Gemini-3-Pro-Image	0.91
Seedream-5-Pro	0.88
FLUX.1-Kontext	0.34
DreamO	0.46
OmniGen2	0.39
UNO	0.15
ACE++	0.05

ID conditioned on FVR=1. To test whether the closed/open identity gap is only hide-the-face, we recompute mean S_{id} on samples where every GT-visible reference is also matched in the generation ($FVR \geq 0.9999$). Table 18 shows a moderate lift ($\approx +0.05$ – 0.06), but closed-source ID remains in the mid-0.5s–low-0.6s. Face visibility explains part of the gap; residual identity failures remain.

Model	n	$n_{=1}$	ID (all)	ID (=1)
GPT-Image-2	1944	1645	0.576	0.638
Gemini-3-Pro-Image	2321	1976	0.502	0.554
Seedream-5-Pro	2336	1864	0.491	0.563

Table 18 Closed-source identity scores on the full ArcFace-scored set vs. the FVR=1 subset ($n_{=1}$ / ID (=1)).

Y Extended gap list (benchmark survey)

Representative suites surveyed when claiming the contact-time anatomy gap (non-exhaustive of every paper in each family; axes marked for Count / ID / Instr / Anat-under-contact / Inter-geometry):

Benchmark / suite	Count	ID	Instr	Anat _c	Inter _g
MultiHuman-Testbench	Y	Y	N	N	N
WithAnyone	Y	Y	N	N	N
Composing People Together	N	N	N	N	N
TrioPose	Y	N	N	N	N
GroupDiff	N	Y	N	N	N
InsHuman	N	Y	Y	N	N
SkeleGuide	N	N	Y	N	N
HumanRefiner / ABHUMAN	N	N	N	N [†]	N
HAF-Bench	N	N	N	N [†]	N
ImgEdit	N	N	Y	N	N
GEEdit-Bench	N	N	Y	N	N
DreamBench / subject-driven	N	Y	Y	N	N
Custom Diff. / Dreambooth evals	N	Y	Y	N	N
ConceptSlide / multi-concept	N	Y	Y	N	N
MagicBrush / EditBench	N	N	Y	N	N
TIFA / VQAScore editing probes	N	N	Y	N	N
Hi4D / CHI3D (recon. GT)	—	—	—	—	—
BUDDI / proxemics (recon)	—	—	—	—	—
MPIE-Bench (ours)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Table 19 Extended benchmark gap survey (Y/N; Anat_c = anatomy under contact; Inter_g = interaction geometry).

[†]Single-person anatomy only (no multi-person contact-time scoring). “—” denotes reconstruction / GT resources rather than generative editing benchmarks. The main-paper gap table is the compact name-only view; this extended list covers the broader survey of multi-person, anatomy, personalization, and editing suites.

Z Release diagnostics

Per-sample Multi-HMR JSON includes kept detection scores, `pen_volume_m3`, `pen_inside_ratio`, `min_surf_dist`, leftover fractions, and contact intent for offline audit and recomposition.