

Abstract

General Generation

Visual Reasoning

Visual Understanding

Models

Tasks

Legend

- GPT-4o
- Gemini-1.5
- Gemini-1.5 Pro
- Gemini-1.5 Flash
- Gemini-1.5 Flash-Lite
- Gemini-1.5 Flash-Mini

* Overall best score is highlighted in bold.

NEO-unify Blog: <https://huggingface.co/blog/sensenova/neo-unify> (March 5, 2026)



Figure 1 Showcases of SenseNova-U1.5 in infographics and human generation.



Figure 2 Showcases of SenseNova-U1.5 in image editing and multi-reference generation.

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Related Works	5
2.1	Native Multimodal Unified Models	5
2.2	Reinforcement Learning for Diffusion Models	6
2.3	On-Policy Distillation for Unified Models	6
3	Methodology	6
3.1	Model architecture	6
3.2	Training Procedure	9
3.3	Reward Modeling	12
4	Data Construction	13
4.1	Image Generation Data	13
4.2	Image Editing Data	13
4.3	Interleaved Data	14
4.4	RL Training Data	14
5	Experiments	15
5.1	General Understanding	15
5.2	Image Generation	16
5.3	Image Editing	22
5.4	Interleaved Generation	25
6	Conclusion	26
7	Contributors	26

1 Introduction

In recent years, visual generation is rapidly evolving beyond conventional image synthesis into a general medium for visual creation, spanning multilingual typography, information-dense design, high-resolution rendering, multi-reference composition, and fine-grained object-background editing, and interleaved generation. However, this broader scope exposes a fundamental architectural divide: most systems perceive images through pretrained vision encoders (VEs) [97, 107, 119, 152] but generate them through variational autoencoders (VAEs) [55, 57, 106, 145]. Consequently, understanding and generation operate in distinct representational spaces: one optimized for semantic abstraction, the other for pixel-level fidelity. Although effective, this separation limits how seamlessly perception, reasoning, and generation can be coordinated within a unified visual framework across diverse forms of visual creation.

Native unified modelling takes a different route by learning directly from pixels and words. SenseNova-U1 [29] established the feasibility of this paradigm through the encoder-free and VAE-free NEO-unify [101] architecture, bringing perception, reasoning, and pixel-space generation into a single end-to-end model. Its deliberately lightweight visual interface, however, reconstructs each visual token as an independent RGB patch. Although efficient, this factorization prevents information exchange across neighbouring patches during the final stage of image formation, making seams, texture discontinuities, and geometric inconsistencies increasingly pronounced at high resolutions.

Here we present **SenseNova-U1.5**, an 8B-MoT native unified multimodal model for visual understanding, reasoning, and generation. At its core is a first major architectural shift: from *independent patch prediction* to *spatially joint reconstruction*. Rather than mapping each visual token to pixels in isolation, we project tokens onto a two-dimensional feature field and progressively reconstruct the image through spatial convolutions and Pixel Shuffle upsampling. This allows neighbouring regions to exchange information before pixels are finalized, so colour, texture, and geometry can be resolved jointly rather than patch by patch. The resulting design preserves the efficiency of compact visual sequences while substantially improving spatial coherence and enabling native generation at resolutions of up to 4K.

The second major advance is a shift from *joint reward optimization* to a *specialize-then-unify strategy*. Visual creation spans fundamentally different capabilities, from aesthetic synthesis and bilingual text rendering to infographic design and image editing, each with distinct reward signals, rollout dynamics, and optimization challenges. Jointly optimizing them within a single policy can entangle competing objectives and dilute task-specific gains. We therefore first specialize and then unify: dedicated reinforcement-learning (RL) experts are optimized for distinct capabilities with tailored data, rewards, sampling strategies, and regularization, and their complementary strengths are subsequently consolidated through multi-expert on-policy distillation. By distilling along the student model’s own generation trajectories, this process transfers expert capabilities into a single unified policy while preserving their complementary strengths.

Across extensive evaluations, SenseNova-U1.5 further demonstrates that a single native visual representation can serve as a shared substrate for understanding, reasoning, generation, and editing, eliminating both parallel visual pathways and repeated conversion between encoder features and VAE latents. Despite compressing each 32×32 -pixel region into a single visual token, this compact representation supports efficient inference while delivering strong performance across image fidelity, bilingual typography, complex composition, multi-reference editing, interleaved generation, instruction following, visual preservation, and fine-grained control. More strikingly, SenseNova-U1.5 generalizes to long, compositional, and highly structured visual instructions despite limited reliance on fixed generation templates during training. This suggests that structural knowledge and planning capabilities acquired through multimodal understanding and reasoning can transfer naturally to visual creation. Together, these results show that native unification is more than an architectural simplification: a compact shared visual representation can efficiently support both seeing and creating, while enabling capabilities learned through one form of visual intelligence to reinforce another.

2 Related Works

2.1 Native Multimodal Unified Models

Native vision-language models (VLMs), including Fuyu-8B [3], EVE [25, 27], Mono-InternVL [83, 84], NEO [26, 28], Gemma4-12B [113], and Inkling [117], directly process visual inputs without external encoders and have progressively narrowed the performance gap with leading modular VLMs [44, 95, 104, 126]. A parallel trend is emerging in visual generation, where recent works directly model pixels [18, 19, 65, 148], demonstrating that high-fidelity synthesis need not rely on heavily compressed latent spaces [55, 120]. Building on these advances, native unified multimodal models

increasingly seek to combine understanding and generation within a single framework. Among them, discrete native models [21, 60, 68, 71, 111, 115, 127] unify multimodal learning through token-level autoregression, while continuous native approaches [10, 29, 80, 101] pursue end-to-end modeling without explicit tokenizers or latent bottlenecks. Building on NEO-unify [101], our SenseNova-U series further scales this direction toward a fully native foundation where understanding, reasoning, and generation emerge from a shared visual substrate.

2.2 Reinforcement Learning for Diffusion Models

In language modeling, reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) established a general post-training paradigm where learned rewards guide policy optimization, with PPO stabilizing updates against a reference policy [93, 98]. Notably, GRPO and DAPO improve efficiency and scalability by removing explicit value models and introducing group-relative advantages and enhanced online optimization strategies [102, 147]. Online RL has also been extended to visual generation, with ReFL, DDPO, and DPOK optimizing diffusion models via preference rewards or policy gradients [5, 35, 140], while AlignProp and D3PO improve efficiency and reduce reliance on explicit reward models [94, 144]. More recently, Flow-GRPO and DanceGRPO extend group-relative optimization to diffusion and flow-matching models, improving preference alignment, compositional accuracy, text rendering, and visual quality [74, 142].

For flow-matching models, online RL requires stochastic exploration beyond deterministic ordinary differential equation (ODE) inference. Flow-GRPO [73] enables such exploration through stochastic differential equation (SDE)-based rollouts, while coefficients-preserving sampling (CPS) [121] and Precise [163] improve finite-step sampling by better preserving the underlying flow dynamics and balancing exploration with distributional fidelity. Beyond sampling, GRPO-Guard [124] mitigates reward over-optimization through regulated clipping and noise-aware gradient reweighting. Existing visual RL further relies on capability-specific rewards, including preference models for perceptual quality and text-image alignment [76, 86, 133, 140], as well as specialized rewards for typography and editing [47, 52]. Motivated by these advances, we adopt task-dependent RL post-training that combines CPS or Precise sampling with interleaved or task-specific rewards to address the distinct optimization requirements of generation and editing.

2.3 On-Policy Distillation for Unified Models

Recently, on-policy distillation (OPD) [1, 81] mitigates the distribution mismatch of conventional knowledge distillation by training the student on its own generated trajectories while receiving dense supervision from a teacher. Building on this paradigm, MOPD [85] extends OPD to multi-teacher capability integration, where independently optimized domain experts supervise the student’s on-policy rollouts, enabling diverse reasoning capabilities to be consolidated into a single model. Beyond language modeling, OPD has been explored for multimodal understanding and reasoning [6, 149], where teachers supervise student-generated multimodal trajectories. Its application has also recently expanded to visual generation. Specifically, Flow-OPD, DiffusionOPD, and DanceOPD distill task-specialized generators along student-generated denoising trajectories through teacher-consistency signals, transition matching, and velocity-field regression, respectively [36, 64, 162]. Besides, DiffusionOPSD instead removes the external teacher and constructs bounded self-distillation targets from differentiable reward gradients [161]. Our setting is complementary: rather than forcing all tasks into a shared distillation recipe, we retain four task-specialized external experts and hard-route their supervision into a single native pixel-space model. This design preserves the task-dependent conditioning, guidance, and resolution policies of each expert, while consolidating their specialized capabilities into a unified model.

3 Methodology

3.1 Model architecture

Near-Lossless Visual Interface. SenseNova-U1.5 retains the lightweight native visual interface introduced in NEO [26], directly transforming raw images or noise-corrupted visual inputs into compact token sequences without relying on an external visual encoder or VAE. Specifically, two convolutional projections with GELU activations downsample the input by factors of 16 and 2, respectively, yielding one visual token for each 32×32 image region. Two-dimensional sinusoidal positional embeddings preserve spatial coordinates, while special `<img>` and `</img>` tokens delimit individual visual blocks. Text is tokenized with the original language tokenizer, after which visual and textual representations are projected into a shared hidden space and jointly processed by the unified backbone. This design preserves near-lossless visual information while keeping the sequence length tractable for large-scale multimodal modeling.




Figure 3 Overview of SenseNova-U1.5. Compared with SenseNova-U1, U1.5 further refines the near-lossless visual interface on both encoding and decoding: resolution-aware noise conditioning is extended to the 4096×4096 range, while the original patch-wise MLP head is replaced by a lightweight spatial decoder with Pixel Shuffle and 3×3 convolutions. These improvements preserve compact 32×32 visual tokenization while enhancing spatial continuity, high-resolution fidelity, and downstream robustness.

Configuration	Patch Size	Pre-Buffer	# Layers	# Heads (Q/KV)	Head Size (T/H/W)	Hidden Size	# Parameters (Und/Gen)
SenseNova-U1.5	32×32	✓	42	32 / 8	64 / 32 / 32	4,096	8.2B / 8.2B

Table 1 Configurations of SenseNova-U1.5. It features a high spatial compression ratio, Pre-Buffer design, native RoPE for unified spatiotemporal encoding, and a Mixture-of-Transformers architecture for joint multimodal understanding and generation.

For generation, the effective noise magnitude varies with image resolution, making resolution an important conditioning signal for the denoising process. SenseNova-U1.5 therefore explicitly incorporates a resolution-dependent noise-scale embedding. Compared with SenseNova-U1, whose normalization range is calibrated up to 2048×2048 , we extend the reference resolution to 4096×4096 to better support native high-resolution synthesis in Figure 3. Let $\sigma_R(H, W)$ denote the noise scale associated with resolution (H, W) . We normalize it as $\bar{\sigma}_R = \sigma_R(H, W) / \sigma_{\max}$, where $\sigma_{\max}$ corresponds to the 4096×4096 reference resolution, and encode it using a dedicated sinusoidal MLP, $\text{NSEmb}(\cdot)$. The resulting embedding is combined with the diffusion timestep representation: $\mathbf{s}_t = \boldsymbol{\tau}_t + \text{NSEmb}(\bar{\sigma}_R)$, providing the denoiser with explicit awareness of both diffusion time and resolution-dependent noise statistics. This conditioning helps the model adapt more consistently to variations across diverse image resolutions and aspect ratios.

Compact patchification greatly reduces image-modeling cost, but independently decoding each 32×32 token with an MLP imposes an undesirable patch-wise factorization on the output. This is particularly problematic at high resolutions, where local image continuity makes independent patch prediction prone to seams, grid artifacts, and texture discontinuities. SenseNova-U1.5 therefore replaces the original MLP head with a lightweight spatially coupled decoder. Given backbone hidden states $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times hw \times d}$, we first restore their two-dimensional topology, $\mathbf{H}_{2D} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times d \times h \times w}$, and progressively reconstruct the full-resolution RGB image through Pixel Shuffle stages with upsampling factors of 2, 2, and 8 in Figure 3. Between successive upsampling stages, 3×3 convolutions enable information exchange across neighboring token regions, allowing pixels near patch boundaries to be determined jointly rather than independently. The decoder complements compact token-space modeling by restoring local spatial interactions before pixel synthesis, enabling global semantics, composition, and fine-grained structure to be jointly optimized within the same end-to-end framework. Trained together with the backbone under the flow-matching objective, this lightweight design improves cross-patch consistency and local continuity with only modest additional computation, substantially reducing boundary artifacts while enhancing the stability of high-resolution generation and downstream adaptation.

Native Mixture-of-Transformers. SenseNova-U1.5 retains the native Mixture-of-Transformers (MoT) design [29], integrating understanding and generation within a single Transformer backbone rather than completely separating them into two independent networks. Clean image-text context and noise-conditioned visual states are interleaved within a unified sequence, allowing semantic representations, visual evidence, and generative dynamics to interact directly through shared self-attention. This design lets generation draw continuously on representations formed during multimodal understanding, without introducing auxiliary fusion modules or cross-space feature conversion.

The attention pattern is structured to reconcile causal language modeling with bidirectional visual interaction. Text tokens attend only to preceding context, while tokens within each clean image block attend bidirectionally to capture spatial dependencies. Noise-conditioned generation tokens likewise interact bidirectionally within their image block and attend to all preceding clean multimodal context. The reverse path is explicitly masked, preventing clean representations from accessing stochastic generation states. This asymmetric information flow exposes generation to rich semantic and visual context while preserving the integrity of representations used for understanding and reasoning.

Crucially, architectural unification does not imply parameter sharing everywhere. Understanding and generation retain separate attention projections, normalization layers, and feedforward modules, dynamically routed by token type at each Transformer layer. Shared attention therefore serves as the interface for cross-stream communication, while stream-specific parameters preserve the distinct computation required by perception and synthesis. This combination of dense interaction and parameter specialization allows the two capabilities to benefit from a common representational space without forcing their different optimization objectives into the same computational pathway.

Unified Training Objectives. SenseNova-U1.5 is trained with a unified objective that jointly couples autoregressive language modeling, native pixel-space flow learning, and perceptual supervision. For multimodal understanding, we optimize the conditional likelihood of the target text sequence as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{AR}} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log p_{\theta}(x_n | x_{<n}, \mathbf{c}), \quad (1)$$

where x_n is the n -th target token and $\mathbf{c}$ denotes the preceding multimodal context.

For visual generation, SenseNova-U1.5 follows the $\mathbf{x}$ -prediction [65] and learns pixel-space flow matching directly in RGB space. To accommodate varying image resolutions, we construct the training trajectory with resolution-adaptive noise, sampling $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$ and $t \in [0, 1]$ to form

$$\mathbf{z}_t = t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\sigma_R(H, W)\epsilon, \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma_R(H, W)$ adjusts the noise magnitude according to the target resolution. After that, the model attempts to predict the clean endpoint $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\theta}$, which induces the velocity estimate:

$$\mathbf{v}_{\theta} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\theta} - \mathbf{z}_t}{1-t}, \quad \mathbf{v}^* = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_t}{1-t}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, we supervise this trajectory with the pixel-space flow-matching loss as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Flow}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{\theta} - \mathbf{v}^*\|_2^2 \right]. \quad (4)$$

Beyond pixel-space trajectory supervision, SenseNova-U1.5 further introduces a perceptual objective to improve structural consistency and local visual coherence:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Perc}} = \text{LPIPS}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\theta}, \mathbf{x}), \quad (5)$$

where LPIPS [154] provides feature-space supervision complementary to the RGB-space flow objective. The entire training process is jointly optimized under a unified objective:

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_{\text{AR}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{AR}} + \lambda_{\text{Flow}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{Flow}} + \lambda_{\text{Perc}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{Perc}}. \quad (6)$$

This brings three complementary signals into a single native model: autoregressive supervision establishes semantic understanding and multimodal reasoning, flow matching learns the continuous transformation from noise to images directly in pixel space, and perceptual supervision further regularizes the generated endpoint toward coherent global structure, faithful local textures, and visually plausible appearance. Together, they couple high-level semantics with low-level visual formation, enabling understanding and generation to be learned within a unified representation.

Training Stage	Stage 1: Generation Pre-Training			Stage 2: Unified Mid-Training	Stage 3: Unified SFT
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III		
Optimization					
Training steps	180K	100K	185K	80K	10.5K
Peak learning rate	2×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	2×10^{-5}	2×10^{-5}
Min learning rate	2×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	2×10^{-5}	2×10^{-5}	0
LR scheduler	Constant	Constant	Cosine decay	Constant	Cosine decay
Sequence length	8,196	20,480	20,480	32,768	32,768
Optimizer	AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95, \epsilon = 10^{-8}$)				
Module settings					
Understanding branch	❄	❄	❄	🔥	🔥
Generation branch	🔥	🔥	🔥	🔥	🔥
$\lambda_{AR} : \lambda_{Flow} : \lambda_{Perc}$	0 : 1 : 0	0 : 1 : 0	0.1 : 1 : 0.1	0.1 : 1 : 0.1	0.1 : 1 : 0.1
Generation resolution	256^2 – 1024^2	512^2 – 4096^2	512^2 – 4096^2	512^2 – 4096^2	512^2 – 4096^2
Data sampling ratio					
Understanding data	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.30
Text-to-image data	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.40	0.40
Image-editing data	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.20	0.30
Interleaved data	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.10

Table 2 Training recipe of SenseNova-U1.5. ❄ denotes frozen modules; 🔥 denotes trainable modules.

3.2 Training Procedure

SenseNova-U1.5 progressively builds native multimodal capabilities, beginning with generation pre-training, unified mid-training, and unified supervised fine-tuning (Stages 1–3), as summarized in Table 2. These stages are followed by capability-specific learning (Stage 4) and multi-expert on-policy distillation (Stage 5).

Stage 1: Generation Pre-Training. Building on a pre-trained understanding branch, we randomly initialize the generation branch and train it via pixel-space flow matching, conditioned on representations from the frozen understanding branch. SenseNova-U1.5 increases the compute budget and introduces a dedicated native 4K training phase. Training begins with text-to-image data at resolutions ranging from 256×256 to 1024×1024 . During this phase, we train for 180K steps with a constant learning rate of 2×10^{-4} and a sequence length of 8,196. We then extend to higher-resolution text-to-image data ranging from 512×512 to 4096×4096 , thereby strengthening the model’s native 4K generation capability. This phase runs for 100K steps with a constant learning rate of 1×10^{-4} and an increased sequence length of 20,480. In the final phase, we introduce image-editing and interleaved-generation tasks and train for an additional 185K steps, broadening the model’s generative capabilities across diverse downstream scenarios. The training mixture comprises 60% text-to-image, 30% image-editing, and 10% interleaved image-text data. We apply a cosine learning-rate schedule that decays from 1×10^{-4} to 2×10^{-5} , while maintaining the sequence length at 20,480. Beginning in this phase, we augment the flow-matching objective with an LPIPS-based perceptual loss [154] weighted by 0.1 to improve the generation of fine-grained visual details and local visual coherence. Notably, we maintain this combined generation objective throughout the subsequent unified mid-training and supervised fine-tuning stages.

Stage 2: Unified Mid-Training. We jointly optimize two branches, where shared attention facilitates cross-branch information exchange while preserving task-specific representations. To balance general multimodal competence with diverse generative capabilities, we construct a mixed corpus consisting of 30% text-only and multimodal-understanding data, 40% text-to-image data, 20% image-editing data, and 10% interleaved image-text data. This mixture exposes the model to complementary forms of perception, synthesis, editing, and multimodal interaction within a unified training stage. We train the model for 80K steps with a maximum sequence length of 32,768 tokens and a constant learning rate of 2×10^{-5} . The understanding and generation losses are weighted by 0.1 and 1.0, respectively. This weighting helps preserve the pretrained understanding capability while assigning greater optimization emphasis to the more challenging generative objectives, leading to stable joint training and more effective capability integration.

Stage 3: Unified Supervised Fine-Tuning. We further fine-tune the model on a curated collection of high-quality instruction-following data, following a task composition similar to Stage 2. This stage further strengthens instruction adherence and consolidates the capabilities acquired during earlier training into a unified model. Training proceeds for 10.5K steps with a cosine learning-rate schedule, decaying from 2×10^{-5} to 0, while retaining the same loss coefficients as in Stage 2 to preserve the balance between understanding and generation objectives.




Figure 4 Post-training process of SenseNova-U1.5, including multi-expert reinforcement learning and on-policy distillation.

Stage 4: Multi-Expert Reinforcement Learning. In Figure 4, we train four experts for aesthetics, text rendering, infographic generation, and image editing, each with task-specific data, rewards, sampling, and regularization.

(1) Aesthetic Expert. Optimizing visual preference alone can improve global appearance at the expense of text legibility. We therefore train the aesthetic expert by interleaving aesthetic-preference and typography data across epochs. Samples from each partition are routed to task-specific rewards: HPSv3++ [76] evaluates perceptual quality and prompt-image alignment, while a bilingual OCR reward based on PaddleOCR [32] measures text fidelity. This routing avoids mixing rewards with different scales and semantics, while preserving typographic accuracy during preference optimization.

For each prompt, we generate 16 candidates using a 30-step trajectory with guidance scale 4.0 and timestep shift 3. We adopt coefficients-preserving sampling (CPS) with $\eta = 0.7$ [121] to introduce stochastic exploration while reducing finite-step artifacts from conventional SDE sampling. At each update, we uniformly sample a contiguous five-step window from the first ten trajectory steps, focusing optimization on early denoising stages that largely determine global content and composition. Training uses dynamic resolutions and aspect ratios, a constant learning rate of 2×10^{-5} , and a reference-policy KL coefficient of 0.01. To reduce this reward-induced drift, we freeze the final generation Transformer block, the flow-matching output head, and its output-normalization layer during the RL process.

(2) OCR Expert. The OCR expert specializes the model for accurate bilingual text rendering. For each prompt, we extract the intended in-image text as the target and apply PaddleOCR [32] to recognize the generated content. We then compute a normalized multiset intersection-over-union score between the recognized and target text, matching English at the word level and Chinese at the character level. Compared with exact matching, this graded reward better captures partially correct generations while remaining sensitive to omissions, duplications, and rendering errors.

We generate 16 candidates per prompt using a 30-step trajectory with guidance scale 4.0 and timestep shift 3, and sample a contiguous five-step optimization window from the first ten steps. Rollouts use Precise sampling with $\eta = 1.5$ [163], while GRPO-Guard [124] stabilizes optimization under sparse high OCR rewards. Training uses dynamic resolutions and aspect ratios, a constant learning rate of 2×10^{-5} , and a reference-policy KL coefficient of 0.02. We also freeze the final generation Transformer block, flow-matching output head, and output-normalization layer during RL.

(3) Editing Expert. Effective image editing requires balancing three objectives: instruction adherence, preservation of unedited content, and the visual quality of edited regions [123, 131]. Under-editing can leave instructions only partially fulfilled, while over-editing may alter content that should remain unchanged. The editing expert must therefore learn what to modify, what to preserve, and how to integrate the requested changes naturally into the source image.

The editing expert is trained with a constant learning rate of learning rate of 4×10^{-5} , KL coefficient of 0.01, rollout size of 24, and noise scale of 0.7, with an exponential moving average (EMA). We avoid SDE-based trajectory sampling, as excessive stochastic perturbations can introduce residual noise and visual artifacts. Under this setup, we further introduce two editing-specific strategies for targeted reward supervision and more effective optimization.

(i) *Multi-dimensional reward.* We utilize a VLM-based reward framework that evaluates editing quality along five dimensions: instruction fulfillment, edit execution, overall visual quality, text-editing quality when applicable, and preservation of unedited regions. These complementary signals provide targeted supervision for distinct failure modes while jointly balancing edit accuracy, visual fidelity, and content preservation.

(ii) *Progressive training.* We adopt a progressive sliding-window strategy, shifting optimization from early stages that establish semantics to later stages that refine textures. This coarse-to-fine progression first secures the intended structural change and then improves local fidelity and visual integration with the surrounding content.

Infographic Expert. Infographic generation requires accurate text rendering, coherent dense layouts, clear information hierarchies, and strong overall visual quality. The infographic expert first undergoes a complete training process from infographic-oriented mid-training to task-specific RL, aiming to achieve more substantial improvements in small-text rendering and related capabilities. During mid-training, we introduce high-quality real and synthetic data and rebalance both the infographic subcategories and the mixture of infographic and other categories of data. This further improves small-text rendering, complex layout handling, information organization, and overall visual design quality.

Here, we further refine the infographic expert in three stages. The first improves text rendering using the same training data and text-fidelity reward as the OCR expert. The second applies direct preference optimization (DPO) [61] to curated preference pairs to enhance overall visual quality, using a constant learning rate of 5×10^{-6} , a DPO loss coefficient of $\beta = 10$, and one timestep sampled from steps 1–20 at each update. The final stage alternates text-rendering and aesthetic data, routing them separately to the text-fidelity reward and HPSv3++ [76], rather than merging the two scores.

The first and final stages use group relative policy optimization (GRPO), generating 16 candidates per prompt over a 30-step trajectory with coefficients-preserving sampling (CPS) [121]. Classifier-free guidance is used only during rollout collection for reward evaluation, while the policy objective is computed from conditional predictions alone. Both stages use a constant learning rate of 2×10^{-5} and a reference-policy KL coefficient of 0.01.

Stage 5: Multi-Expert On-Policy Distillation. In Figure 4, we apply on-policy velocity-field distillation to consolidate four specialized experts for aesthetic quality, text rendering, infographic generation, and image editing into a single unified model. Each training sample is hard-routed to the frozen expert corresponding to its capability. Given a text-only or text-image condition $\mathbf{c}$ from capability m , the student first generates its own trajectory $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\theta,t}\}_{t=0}^1$. The student and routed expert are then evaluated at the same student-generated state, timestep, and condition:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{OPD}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{v}_{\theta}(\text{sg}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\theta,t}), t, \mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{v}_m(\text{sg}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\theta,t}), t, \mathbf{c}) \right\|_2^2 \right].$$

Here, sg denotes stop-gradient, preventing gradients from propagating through the full sampling trajectory. Each epoch uses a single capability partition and its paired frozen expert, rotating in a fixed order.

Both text-to-image generation and image editing use fixed 30-step deterministic ODE denoising steps, with one queried timestep per trajectory. To learn both high-noise states that establish global structure and low-noise states that determine local details, we progressively shift the query distribution over training. At the n -th epoch, the continuous query location and its discrete 0-based index are determined by $t_e \sim \text{Beta}(2 + 3n/N, 5 - 3n/N)$, where N is the total number of epochs. The distribution therefore moves smoothly from $\text{Beta}(2, 5)$, which emphasizes the early high-noise portion of the trajectory, to $\text{Beta}(5, 2)$, which emphasizes late low-noise states and hence fine details and text fidelity. To align training and inference, we directly optimize the velocity under classifier-free guidance (CFG). We use scale $s = 4$ for the aesthetic, OCR, and infographic experts, with global-norm clipping, and scale $s = 1$ for the editing expert.

For text-to-image generation, we first choose a target area from $\mathcal{A} = \{1024^2, 1536^2, 2048^2, 3072^2, 4096^2\}$, and a target aspect ratio from $\{1:1, 16:9, 9:16, 4:3, 3:4, 3:2, 2:3, 1:2, 2:1\}$. The final width and height are computed by preserving the area and rounded to the nearest multiple of 32. For image editing, the generation resolution follows that of the source image, with only rounding to the nearest multiple of 32 pixels.

The student is trained for 800 optimizer steps with a global batch size of 128 and gradient accumulation of 1, using 25,600 samples per domain. We use AdamW with learning rate 2×10^{-5} , $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, weight decay 10^{-4} , maximum gradient norm 1, and BF16 mixed precision. The understanding branch, the final three generation layers, and the generation output head are frozen. The entire training process adopts a 30-step trajectory, but terminates immediately after the sampled query transition to avoid computing the unused trajectory suffix.

3.3 Reward Modeling

Aesthetic Reward. Aesthetic quality is difficult to capture with hand-crafted objectives, as it jointly reflects composition, visual fidelity, semantic consistency, stylistic coherence, and broader human preference. We therefore adopt HPSv3++ [76] as the preference reward $R_{\text{HPSv3++}}$. Its capability- and iteration-aware training makes it particularly suitable for RL post-training, where the model distribution continuously shifts as generation quality improves. This provides more robust and adaptive preference supervision than scorers trained on a fixed generation distribution, helping the model pursue perceptual improvements without overfitting to a narrow reward landscape.

OCR Reward. Preference rewards alone are insufficient for typography, where visually plausible images may still contain missing, duplicated, or malformed text. We therefore introduce an explicit OCR reward. Target transcriptions are extracted from text spans specified in the prompt, while generated images are recognized using PaddleOCR [32]. After normalizing case, punctuation, and whitespace, English text is tokenized into words and Chinese text into characters. Let g_t and o_t denote the multiplicities of token t in the target and OCR transcription, respectively. We define:

$$R_{\text{ocr}} = \frac{\sum_t \min(g_t, o_t)}{\sum_t \max(g_t, o_t)}. \quad (7)$$

This multiset IoU rewards correct token occurrences while symmetrically penalizing omissions, hallucinations, and errors in repeated text. It is also robust to unreliable OCR reading order in dense or multi-region layouts. During post-training, aesthetic and OCR prompts use their respective rewards and are interleaved at the epoch level, avoiding the need to combine heterogeneous reward scales within each sample.

Infographic Reward. Note that we do not introduce an additional infographic-specific reward model. Instead, the infographic expert reuses the OCR and aesthetic rewards above through stage-conditioned and task-conditioned routing. Here, the first training stage is optimized exclusively with the OCR reward for warmup:

$$R_{\text{info}}^{\text{warmup}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\theta, \mathbf{c}) = R_{\text{ocr}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\theta, \mathbf{c}), \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\theta$ is a generated image and $\mathbf{c}$ is its corresponding text prompt. In the final training stage, let $m \in \{\text{ocr}, \text{aesthetic}\}$ identify the prompt partition. The reward is assigned as follows:

$$R_{\text{info}}^{\text{final}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\theta, \mathbf{c}, m) = \begin{cases} R_{\text{ocr}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\theta, \mathbf{c}), & m = \text{ocr}, \\ R_{\text{HPSv3++}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\theta, \mathbf{c}), & m = \text{aesthetic}. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The OCR and HPSv3++ scores are therefore not summed or normalized against one another. This routing preserves their distinct scales and semantics while providing complementary supervision for textual fidelity and perceptual quality.

Editing Reward. Reinforcement learning for image editing requires reward signals that assess not only whether the requested change is successfully completed, but also whether the result is visually convincing and unrelated source content is preserved. A single holistic score can obscure these distinct failure modes, allowing strength in one aspect to compensate for critical errors in another. We therefore employ a set of dimension-specific rewards. (i) *Instruction fulfillment* measures the semantic correctness of the edited result and the completeness of the requested changes. (ii) *Edit execution quality* evaluates the visual quality of the target region and how naturally it integrates with the surrounding context. (iii) *Overall visual quality* captures global technical quality and coherence with the intended style. When visible text modification is required, (iv) *text-editing quality* further assesses textual correctness and rendering quality. (v) *Unedited-region preservation* compares the source and edited images and penalizes unintended semantic, structural, or visual changes outside the target region. For criteria with multiple sub-dimensions, we retain the minimum sub-dimension score to expose the weakest aspect. After normalization, the applicable scores are aggregated as

$$R_{\text{edit}} = \min(\{R_{\text{inst}}, R_{\text{exec}}, R_{\text{visual}}, R_{\text{pres}}\} \cup \{R_{\text{text}} \mid \text{text edit is applicable}\}). \quad (10)$$

The text-editing criterion is omitted for instructions that do not involve text modification, while the edit-execution score is set to zero when no requested change is visibly realized. This bottleneck-style aggregation emphasizes the weakest aspect of each edit and prevents strong performance in one dimension from masking critical failures in another. As a result, the reward remains sensitive to incomplete edits, unintended modifications, and local quality defects, providing more balanced and reliable supervision for image-editing RL during the training process.




Figure 5 Training corpus of SenseNova-U1.5. From left to right, the charts show the hierarchical composition of the *Image Generation*, *Image Editing*, *Interleaved*, and *RL Training* datasets. The inner ring denotes major data categories and their proportions, while the outer ring further decomposes them into fine-grained subclasses. Together, these distributions highlight the broad coverage of natural and synthetic imagery, diverse editing scenarios, interleaved image-text and video content, and post-training data.

4 Data Construction

In Figure 5, SenseNova-U1.5 substantially expands the training corpus of SenseNova-U1 [29], with an emphasis on data diversity, visual quality, high-resolution generation, complex instruction following, and fine-grained image editing. Beyond increasing data scale, we systematically improve data curation through quality-aware filtering, distribution rebalancing, stronger image-text alignment, and targeted synthesis for underrepresented capabilities.

4.1 Image Generation Data

The image-generation corpus combines large-scale real-world image-text pairs, carefully curated public and proprietary sources, and high-quality synthetic data. Compared with SenseNova-U1, we introduce approximately 59M additional text-image pairs collected from 78 sources, substantially broadening the training distribution across general scenes, human-centric content, objects and materials, text-rich imagery, infographics, and other specialized visual domains. Importantly, high-resolution samples constitute a substantial fraction of the overall training mixture, with approximately 88.2% of the effective training volume exceeding 1024^2 resolution and 64.4% exceeding 2048^2 . This exposes the model to rich visual statistics at multiple spatial scales, providing supervision not only for globally coherent scene composition and layout, but also for fine-grained local structures, textures, materials, and other high-frequency visual details.

To improve instruction alignment, captions are constructed at multiple levels of granularity, ranging from long detailed descriptions to concise captions and lightweight semantic tags. We further strengthen bilingual Chinese-English coverage, particularly for text-rich images, and explicitly verify the consistency between the language and text specified in the prompt and that rendered in the image. To complement real-world data, we collect web-scale data and also introduce targeted synthesis for rare concepts, complex layouts, and text-intensive designs. Both synthetic and real samples are processed through a shared filtering pipeline that jointly evaluates perceptual quality, prompt fidelity, text correctness, layout quality, and visual diversity, ensuring a high-quality and well-balanced training distribution.

4.2 Image Editing Data

Our image-editing corpus contains approximately 38M examples and is designed to cover four complementary settings: general image editing, infographic editing, reference-conditioned editing, and spatially controlled editing. Together, these settings span a broad range of editing scenarios, including localized attribute modification, object insertion and removal, scene-level transformation, pose and action editing, restoration and enhancement, text and layout manipulation, reference-guided customization, and region-controlled operations. To improve robustness beyond fixed instruction patterns, we diversify both the underlying visual content and the formulation, granularity, and complexity of editing instructions. For challenging multi-target or multi-constraint edits, we further incorporate structured prompt-enhancement and chain-of-thought examples that explicitly characterize the editing intent, target regions, desired attributes, spatial or semantic constraints, and content that should remain unchanged. This structured supervision reduces instruction ambiguity and provides stronger guidance for precise, faithful, and preservation-aware editing.

The corpus comprises $\sim 43\%$ general editing, $\sim 42\%$ spatially controlled infographic editing examples, together with a substantial $\sim 15\%$ reference-conditioned subset that supports both single- and multi-reference editing. Infographic data combines programmatically rendered source–target pairs with model-generated examples, enabling precise manipulation of text, visual elements, layout structures, and overall styles. Reference-conditioned data emphasizes subject and identity preservation, attribute transfer, compositional integration, and controlled transformations across viewpoint, pose, geometry, and illumination, with each example containing up to ten reference images. Spatially controlled data further introduces explicit region-level guidance through bounding boxes and visual markers, supporting more precise and interactive manipulation. Across all editing settings, data curation jointly evaluates instruction fulfillment, target quality, reference or identity fidelity when applicable, and preservation of content outside the intended edit region.

4.3 Interleaved Data

The majority of the corpus is drawn from lifestyle-oriented trajectories ($\sim 44\%$), including procedural tutorials, everyday scenarios, and picture-book narratives. These examples provide rich supervision for maintaining long-range semantic coherence, visual consistency, and cross-modal dependencies across alternating text and image segments. Infographic data contributes another $\sim 29\%$, emphasizing structured composition, dense textual content, and coordinated generation of linguistic and visual elements. Video-derived sequences account for approximately $\sim 19\%$, introducing temporal evolution, state transitions, and cross-frame dependencies. The remaining $\sim 8\%$ consists of reasoning-intensive examples augmented with explicit intermediate reasoning for complex multi-step understanding and generation.

Rather than treating these sources as isolated task collections, we convert them into a unified trajectory format in which textual and visual states are progressively interleaved [21, 139]. This unified formulation exposes the model to a broad spectrum of multimodal dependencies, ranging from local image–text grounding to long-range semantic progression, temporal continuity, and reasoning-conditioned generation across multiple steps. It is worth noting that all trajectories are constructed through a shared pipeline that combines source preprocessing, domain-specific transformation or synthesis, and trajectory-level validation. The resulting corpus is jointly filtered for linguistic validity, visual quality, cross-modal consistency, and the coherence and correctness of the complete multimodal progression.

4.4 RL Training Data

Aesthetic, OCR, and Infographic Samples. For aesthetic samples, we construct approximately 280K prompts by combining HPSv3++ [76], Pick-a-Pic [56], bilingual prompts expanded with Cosmos3PE [89], and internally generated prompts covering diverse subjects, styles, compositions, and spatial configurations. Multiple images are generated for each prompt and scored with HPSv3++; prompt groups with weak reward variation are removed to retain examples that provide more discriminative relative supervision. The OCR corpus contains approximately 60K bilingual text-rendering prompts with balanced Chinese and English coverage. It includes approximately 20K short-text prompts collected from Flow-GRPO [74], which are further rewritten and expanded into approximately 40K longer prompts with denser text and more complex rendering requirements; the specified text is extracted as the reference transcription for online OCR reward computation. For infographic samples, the first GRPO stage reuses the OCR corpus, while the later GRPO stage jointly iterates OCR and aesthetic prompts according to their task-specific rewards. We further introduce approximately 120K filtered preference pairs derived from the Linear-DPO corpus [61] for DPO, with additional balancing over portrait/non-portrait content and Chinese/English prompts to improve overall visual-preference alignment.

Image Editing Samples. The editing expert is trained on approximately 120K examples, with local and global editing accounting for roughly 80% and 20% of the corpus, respectively. Local editing covers infographic and document manipulation, scene- and object-level edits, human action and pose adjustment, portrait retouching, text replacement, image restoration and enhancement, and bounding-box- or mask-conditioned editing, while global editing focuses on coherent image-level transformations. Chinese, English, and mixed-language instructions are included, with instruction lengths balanced across predefined ranges and training resolutions spanning from 512×512 to 2048×2048 . Data curation follows three stages. We first remove corrupted, duplicated, low-resolution, or visually degraded samples and retain a diverse set of common aspect ratios. We then verify that the entities, text, spatial regions, and visual attributes specified by each instruction are grounded in the source image and that the target image faithfully realizes the requested modification. Finally, both source and edited images are evaluated for aesthetics, technical quality, and structural and textural richness, with conservative pairwise aggregation exposing deficiencies in either image. The retained samples are then rebalanced across task categories and resolution levels to form a diverse and challenging distribution.

Benchmark	SenseNova-U1.5 8B-Think	SenseNova-U1 8B-Think	Qwen3VL 8B-Think	Qwen3.5 9B	Gemma4 12B
<i>STEM & Reasoning</i>					
MMMU [150]	73.86	74.78	74.10	78.40	64.67*
MMMU-Pro [151]	66.47	67.69	60.40	70.10	69.10
MathVista _{mini} [82]	85.85	84.20	81.40	85.70	74.70*
MathVision [125]	73.55	75.82	62.70	78.90	79.70
<i>General VQA</i>					
MMBench-EN [77]	90.47	90.25	87.50	90.10	83.85*
MMStar [17]	77.53	78.27	75.30	79.70	70.13*
<i>OCR</i>					
InfoVQA [87]	82.51	82.46	86.00	90.76	88.40
OCRBench-v2 [37]	59.07	61.30	61.55	66.54	67.46*
AI2D [48]	92.03	91.74	84.90	90.20	84.00*
OCRBench [78]	82.46	82.10	81.90	89.20	76.90*
<i>Hallucination</i>					
HallusionBench [46]	68.53	67.75	65.40	69.30	66.43*
<i>Visual Reasoning</i>					
BabyVision [16]	25.52	25.00	17.78	25.80	22.43*
TiR [62]	28.68	28.15	22.30	31.90	27.32*
<i>Knowledge</i>					
MMLU-Pro [128]	86.67	81.44	77.30	82.50	77.20
MMLU-Redux [40]	86.33	87.61	88.80	91.10	88.33*
C-Eval [51]	90.41	84.40	83.88	88.20	84.23*
SuperGPQA [31]	49.55	49.67	51.20	58.20	48.43*
<i>Instruction Following</i>					
IFEval [159]	93.35	91.13	83.20	91.50	97.20
IFBench [155]	69.00	67.01	29.93	64.50	74.00

Table 3 Quantitative evaluation results on multimodal and language understanding benchmarks. Note that * denotes results reproduced using VLMEvalKit [33]. SenseNova-U1, SenseNova-U1.5, and Qwen3-VL are all initialized from Qwen3 LLM weights [143]. Besides, Gemma4-12B [113] represents a recent state-of-the-art encoder-free model for visual understanding.

5 Experiments

5.1 General Understanding

Multimodal Understanding. In Table 3, SenseNova-U1.5 shows consistently strong performance across diverse multimodal benchmarks, covering STEM reasoning, general VQA, OCR, hallucination, and visual reasoning. Compared with SenseNova-U1 [29], U1.5 preserves or improves performance on most benchmarks while substantially extending its image-generation and editing capabilities, indicating that stronger generative modeling does not come at the expense of visual understanding. In particular, U1.5 achieves competitive results on MMMU, MathVista, MMBench, MMStar, AI2D, OCRBench, HallusionBench, BabyVision, and TiR, and remains comparable to or better than strong modular baselines such as Qwen3-VL [2] on many tasks. Notably, despite adopting an encoder-free architecture, U1.5 also compares favorably with the recent encoder-free Gemma4-12B [113] across various visual understanding evaluations, highlighting the effectiveness of native multimodal unification for general-purpose perception and reasoning.

Language Understanding. Beyond multimodal capability, SenseNova-U1.5 retains strong language understanding and instruction-following performance after unified multimodal training. It achieves particularly strong results on MMLU-Pro and C-Eval, reaching 86.67 and 90.41, respectively, while remaining competitive on MMLU-Redux and SuperGPQA. More importantly, U1.5 substantially improves instruction-following performance over SenseNova-U1, achieving 93.35 on IFEval and 69.00 on IFBench. This suggests that visual generation and editing capabilities introduced in U1.5 do not significantly dilute its underlying language competence. Instead, the model maintains a strong text reasoning foundation while supporting a substantially broader multimodal capability space within a single unified model.

Model	# Params	Quality	Aesthetics	Alignment	Real-world Fidelity	Creative Generation	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>							
GPT-Image-2 [92]	–	59.09	68.48	65.78	59.40	75.34	65.23
GPT-Image-1.5 [91]	–	55.78	62.87	61.39	55.86	67.06	60.42
Nano-Banana-2.0 [43]	–	54.86	62.63	61.11	54.66	64.49	59.59
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	–	55.30	61.38	60.30	55.91	64.54	59.33
Seedream 5.0 [99]	–	54.01	59.96	58.63	53.86	63.64	57.80
Seedream 4.5 [7]	–	54.05	60.11	57.44	51.55	59.82	56.95
Qwen-Image2-Pro [156]	–	55.16	60.36	57.86	53.06	63.59	57.90
<i>Open-source Models</i>							
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ PE)	8B	54.74	63.72	61.79	53.40	67.89	60.22
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	53.22	58.22	54.77	43.90	51.09	53.53
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	51.27	55.19	54.64	48.67	51.87	52.82
Qwen-Image-2512 [129]	20B	51.84	54.40	51.44	47.80	47.75	51.32
Boogu-Image 0.1 Base [14]	10B	50.38	53.90	52.62	46.54	47.52	51.00
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	47.30	50.30	50.58	43.13	46.15	48.28

Table 4 Quantitative evaluation results on Qwen-Image-Bench-EN. Results are reported on the English subset. # Params denotes the number of parameters in the generation component; A in this column denotes activated parameters during inference.

Model	# Params	Quality	Aesthetics	Alignment	Real-world Fidelity	Creative Generation	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>							
GPT-Image-2 [92]	–	58.65	67.53	65.85	57.38	75.23	64.69
Nano-Banana-2.0 [43]	–	54.77	61.08	62.40	54.28	67.05	59.82
GPT-Image-1.5 [91]	–	55.14	60.88	61.72	53.95	66.35	59.65
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	–	55.67	60.26	61.25	54.07	66.23	59.45
Seedream 5.0 [99]	–	52.55	58.40	58.90	51.92	65.29	57.22
Seedream 4.5 [7]	–	54.41	58.72	57.31	51.69	60.64	56.78
Qwen-Image2-Pro [156]	–	54.39	58.67	59.28	51.83	64.94	57.84
<i>Open-source Models</i>							
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ PE)	8B	54.42	62.21	62.61	52.39	68.56	60.13
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	52.92	56.92	54.87	44.86	52.10	53.38
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	51.37	54.33	54.66	47.13	51.31	52.43
Qwen-Image-2512 [129]	20B	51.76	54.74	52.72	47.00	50.19	52.06
Boogu-Image 0.1 Base [14]	10B	50.41	53.14	52.91	45.42	48.62	50.96
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	48.44	52.25	50.72	43.16	47.30	49.23
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	45.79	47.07	47.78	42.53	43.88	45.99

Table 5 Quantitative evaluation results on Qwen-Image-Bench-ZH. Results are reported on the Chinese subset. # Params denotes the number of parameters in the generation component; A in this column denotes activated parameters during inference.

5.2 Image Generation

General Generation. We evaluate general text-to-image generation on Qwen-Image-Bench [63], GenEval [42], GenEval2 [54], DPG-Bench [49], and OneIG-Bench [12], covering visual quality, prompt alignment, compositional generation, dense instruction following, text rendering, style, and diversity.

Qwen-Image-Bench. In Tables 4 and 5, SenseNova-U1.5 delivers strong overall performance on both the English and Chinese subsets of Open-Image-Bench. With prompt enhancement, it achieves scores of 60.22 and 60.13, respectively, reaching the best overall performance among the evaluated open-source models. Even without prompt enhancement, SenseNova-U1.5 consistently improves over SenseNova-U1 and remains competitive with larger open-source baselines, demonstrating strong bilingual generation quality and narrowing the gap with leading closed-source systems.

Model	# Params	Single Object	Two Object	Counting	Colors	Position	Attribute Binding	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>								
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	0.99	0.98	0.85	0.93	0.85	0.77	0.89
GPT-Image-1 [90]	-	0.99	0.92	0.85	0.92	0.75	0.61	0.84
Seedream 4.0 [100]	-	0.99	0.92	0.72	0.91	0.76	0.74	0.84
Nano-Banana-2.0 [43]	-	1.00	0.96	0.71	0.84	0.86	0.65	0.83
<i>Open-source Models</i>								
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	1.00	0.97	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.81	0.92
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	1.00	0.96	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.76	0.91
HiDream-O1-Image [10]	8B	1.00	0.99	0.79	0.89	0.93	0.78	0.90
Tuna [79]	7B	1.00	0.97	0.81	0.91	0.88	0.83	0.90
OneCAT [60]	9BA3B	1.00	0.96	0.84	0.94	0.84	0.80	0.90
NEO-unify [101]	8B	1.00	0.96	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.77	0.90
Mogao [69]	7B	1.00	0.97	0.83	0.93	0.84	0.80	0.89
ERNIE-Image [72]	8B	1.00	0.96	0.78	0.93	0.86	0.79	0.89
Lumina-DiMOO [138]	8B	1.00	0.94	0.85	0.89	0.85	0.76	0.88
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.99	0.92	0.89	0.88	0.76	0.77	0.87
NEO-unify [101]	2B	0.99	0.92	0.89	0.86	0.77	0.76	0.87
Tuna-2 [80]	7B	0.99	0.96	0.80	0.91	0.84	0.76	0.87
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	1.00	0.98	0.53	0.93	0.78	0.84	0.85
Boogu-Image 0.1 Base [14]	10B	0.99	0.95	0.80	0.84	0.85	0.68	0.85
LongCat-Next [115]	68BA3B	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.84

Table 6 Quantitative evaluation results on GenEval. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # *Params*.

Model	# Params	Attribute	Counting	Object	Position	Verb	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>							
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	0.98	0.89	0.98	0.90	0.70	0.81
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	0.97	0.85	0.98	0.91	0.54	0.76
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	0.95	0.81	0.98	0.88	0.55	0.68
Gemini-3-Pro-Image [22]	-	0.97	0.74	0.96	0.84	0.47	0.59
Qwen-Image-2.0 [156]	-	0.93	0.70	0.98	0.66	0.47	0.48
<i>Open-source Models</i>							
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ PE)	8B	0.99	0.83	0.98	0.90	0.55	0.71
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.89	0.77	0.98	0.77	0.41	0.55
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	0.85	0.71	0.98	0.78	0.38	0.43
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	-	-	-	-	-	0.42
Z-Image [8]	6B	-	-	-	-	-	0.31

Table 7 Quantitative evaluation results on GenEval2. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # *Params*.

GenEval. In Table 6, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves the best overall performance among open-source models on GenEval, reaching 0.92 and surpassing both SenseNova-U1 and larger baselines such as Qwen-Image. The improvements are particularly clear in counting, position, and attribute binding, while performance on single- and two-object generation remains consistently strong. These results indicate that U1.5 not only preserves basic object-level generation quality, but also improves compositional consistency and the ability to satisfy multiple visual constraints within a single prompt.

GenEval2. In Table 7, SenseNova-U1.5 further shows stronger compositional reasoning and instruction following under complex constraints. With prompt enhancement, it substantially outperforms all evaluated open-source baselines, while further narrowing the gap to leading closed-source systems. The improvements are particularly notable in attribute, counting, and verb-related generation, indicating better modeling of object properties, quantities, and interactions. Notably, SenseNova-U1.5 is more capable of faithfully translating structured, relation-intensive prompts into coherent visual compositions, especially when multiple constraints need to be satisfied simultaneously.

Model	# Params	Alignment	Text	Reasoning	Style	Diversity	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>							
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	0.889	0.962	0.333	0.483	0.247	0.583
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	0.888	0.976	0.336	0.420	0.193	0.563
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	0.899	0.886	0.341	0.431	0.207	0.553
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	0.903	0.741	0.352	0.443	0.139	0.516
<i>Open-source Models</i>							
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	0.902	0.994	0.345	0.427	0.151	0.564
ERNIE-Image [72]	8B	0.891	0.967	0.295	0.447	0.169	0.554
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.883	0.988	0.329	0.402	0.159	0.552
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	0.882	0.969	0.330	0.396	0.166	0.549
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.882	0.891	0.306	0.418	0.197	0.539
HiDream-I1-Full [9]	17B	0.829	0.707	0.317	0.347	0.186	0.477
SD3.5 Large [34]	8B	0.809	0.629	0.294	0.353	0.225	0.462
FLUX.1 [Dev] [57]	12B	0.786	0.523	0.253	0.368	0.238	0.434
BAGEL [24]	7B	0.769	0.244	0.173	0.367	0.251	0.361
BLIP3-o [15]	1.4B	0.711	0.013	0.223	0.361	0.229	0.307

Table 8 Quantitative evaluation results on OneIG-EN. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # *Params*.

Model	# Params	Alignment	Text	Reasoning	Style	Diversity	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>							
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	0.856	0.968	0.313	0.470	0.239	0.569
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	0.836	0.950	0.320	0.413	0.196	0.543
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	0.855	0.887	0.302	0.421	0.202	0.533
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	0.861	0.868	0.321	0.432	0.146	0.526
<i>Open-source Models</i>							
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.825	0.963	0.267	0.405	0.279	0.548
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.831	0.985	0.307	0.392	0.165	0.536
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	0.826	0.977	0.303	0.392	0.176	0.535
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	0.853	0.941	0.300	0.386	0.166	0.529
ERNIE-Image [72]	8B	0.842	0.898	0.266	0.421	0.177	0.521
BAGEL [24]	7B	0.672	0.365	0.186	0.357	0.268	0.370
HiDream-I1-Full [9]	17B	0.620	0.205	0.256	0.304	0.300	0.337
BLIP3-o [15]	1.4B	0.608	0.092	0.213	0.369	0.233	0.303

Table 9 Quantitative evaluation results on OneIG-ZH. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # *Params*.

OneIG-Bench. In Table 8 and 9, SenseNova-U1.5 exhibits a notably balanced generation profile across English and Chinese evaluations. Note that its strongest advantage lies in bilingual text-centric generation. Besides, the model maintains competitive alignment, reasoning, and style scores despite its relatively compact 8B scale. This balanced performance is particularly important for practical generation scenarios, where accurate typography, semantic consistency, and visual quality must be satisfied simultaneously rather than optimized in isolation.

DPG-Bench. In Table 10, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves an overall score of 88.11, placing it among the top-performing open-source models. It delivers consistently strong results across entity, attribute, relation, and other fine-grained dimensions, reflecting solid semantic grounding and compositional fidelity. Compared with SenseNova-U1, U1.5 improves the overall score while maintaining a balanced performance profile across different prompt components, indicating more reliable generation under complex and structured instructions.

Model	# Params	Global	Entity	Attribute	Relation	Other	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>							
Seedream 4.5 [7]	-	89.24	94.30	92.14	92.23	93.83	88.63
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	84.67	92.76	89.49	95.42	84.34	87.32
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	85.00	92.85	90.09	95.02	86.80	87.02
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	84.19	92.47	89.58	94.74	81.12	86.59
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	84.66	92.06	89.82	94.46	83.74	86.00
<i>Open-source Models</i>							
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	91.32	91.56	92.02	94.31	92.73	88.32
Z-Image [8]	6B	93.39	91.22	93.16	92.22	91.52	88.14
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	86.54	93.61	91.52	93.33	92.13	88.11
JoyAI-Image [105]	16B	-	-	-	-	-	88.05
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	88.74	90.90	92.43	92.43	92.50	87.78
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	90.86	92.31	92.37	92.55	91.96	87.48
Boogu-Image-0.1-Base [14]	10B	89.33	90.64	92.22	93.72	93.32	87.13
NEO-unify [101]	8B	91.00	91.53	92.06	94.14	90.43	86.71
Tuna-2 [80]	7B	89.50	91.40	92.07	91.91	88.81	86.54
NEO-unify [101]	2B	89.49	92.87	91.26	92.29	92.13	86.54
BAGEL [24]	7B	88.94	90.37	91.29	90.82	88.67	85.07
LongCat-Next [115]	68BA3B	-	-	-	-	-	84.66
OneCAT [60]	9BA3B	-	-	-	-	-	84.53
Mogao [69]	7B	-	-	-	-	-	84.33

Table 10 Quantitative evaluation results on DPG-Bench. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # Params.

Model	# Params	NED	CLIPScore	Word Accuracy				Average↑
				2 regions	3 regions	4 regions	5 regions	
Closed-source Models								
Seedream 4.5 [7]	-	0.948	0.807	0.878	0.895	0.908	0.901	0.899
GPT-Image-1 [90]	-	0.948	0.798	0.878	0.866	0.873	0.822	0.857
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	0.875	0.737	0.737	0.775	0.786	0.793	0.779
Open-source Models								
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.977	0.819	0.933	0.941	0.955	0.954	0.948
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	0.972	0.825	0.945	0.954	0.944	0.936	0.940
HiDream-O1-Image [10]	8B	0.956	0.808	0.909	0.916	0.922	0.901	0.913
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.912
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	0.945	0.818	0.892	0.878	0.882	0.857	0.875
JoyAI-Image [105]	16B	0.937	0.799	-	-	-	-	0.874
Z-Image [8]	6B	0.937	0.797	0.901	0.872	0.865	0.851	0.867
Boogu-Image-0.1-Base [14]	10B	0.927	0.801	0.852	0.863	0.866	0.863	0.863
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.912	0.802	0.837	0.836	0.831	0.816	0.829

Table 11 Quantitative evaluation results on CVTG-2K. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # Params.

Text-centric Generation. We further examine text rendering under more demanding text-centric settings using CVTG-2K [30] and LongText-Bench [41], focusing on multi-region layouts and long-form bilingual text generation.

CVTG-2K. In Table 11, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves the best overall performance among all evaluated models, reaching an average score of 0.948. Impressively, it demonstrates particularly strong gains in dense text rendering, with word accuracy remaining above 0.95 even in the more challenging four- and five-region settings. Compared with SenseNova-U1, U1.5 further improves NED and high-region word accuracy, while maintaining a comparable CLIPScore, indicating stronger text fidelity and robustness as the amount of rendered text increases.

Model	# Params	LongText-Bench-EN $\uparrow$	LongText-Bench-ZH $\uparrow$
<i>Closed-source Models</i>			
Seedream 4.5 [7]	-	0.989	0.987
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	0.982	0.971
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	0.976	0.949
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	0.964	0.983
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	0.941	0.946
<i>Open-source Models</i>			
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.988	0.989
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	0.979	0.962
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	0.976	0.928
JoyAI-Image [105]	16B	0.963	0.963
Boogu-Image-0.1-Base [14]	10B	0.952	0.969
ERNIE-Image [72]	8B	0.968	0.959
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.943	0.946
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	0.923	0.913
Z-Image [8]	6B	0.935	0.936
LongCat-Next [115]	68BA3B	0.932	0.891
X-Omni [41]	12B	0.900	0.814
InternVL-U [118]	1.7B	0.738	0.860
NEO-unify [101]	2B	0.748	0.495

Table 12 Quantitative evaluation results on LongText-Bench. A in # Params denotes activated parameters during inference.

Model	# Params	Question Type										Overall	
		 Comp.	 Enc.	 Order	 Marks	 Anno.	 Axes	 Leg.	 Chart	 H Title	 Deco.	Q-ACC↑	I-ACC
Closed-source Models													
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	0.84	0.86	0.90	0.87	0.93	0.93	0.96	0.92	0.98	0.94	0.90	0.49
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	0.89	0.61	0.93	0.87	0.94	0.98	0.95	0.93	0.99	0.95	0.88	0.38
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	0.65	0.43	0.77	0.77	0.84	0.84	0.87	0.85	0.80	0.88	0.74	0.13
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	0.64	0.47	0.71	0.73	0.77	0.85	0.83	0.83	0.86	0.88	0.73	0.17
Open-source Models													
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ PE)	8B	0.65	0.47	0.76	0.77	0.82	0.82	0.89	0.84	0.87	0.92	0.76	0.17
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.41	0.33	0.58	0.56	0.66	0.67	0.83	0.72	0.83	0.88	0.62	0.08
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	0.27	0.23	0.49	0.45	0.54	0.61	0.70	0.65	0.74	0.82	0.51	0.04
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.10	0.13	0.19	0.29	0.43	0.37	0.51	0.48	0.56	0.78	0.36	0.01
Z-Image-Turbo [8]	6B	0.10	0.16	0.16	0.25	0.38	0.31	0.58	0.42	0.61	0.73	0.35	0.00
HiDream-I1 [9]	17B	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.07	0.14	0.10	0.26	0.19	0.20	0.11	0.00
FLUX.1-dev [57]	12B	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.01	0.24	0.09	0.39	0.10	0.00

Table 13 Quantitative evaluation results on IGenBench. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # Params.

LongText-Bench. In Table 12, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves leading open-source performance on both English and Chinese tracks, with particularly strong gains over SenseNova-U1 in Chinese. Its accuracy remains robust as text length and layout complexity increase, demonstrating improved stability in dense, structured, and bilingual text rendering.

Complex Infographic Generation. We further evaluate SenseNova-U1.5 on complex infographic and commercial content generation using IGenBench [110] and BizGenEval [66]. They require the model to jointly satisfy textual content, layout organization, chart semantics, visual attributes, and domain knowledge.

IGenBench. As shown in Table 13, SenseNova-U1.5 already achieves the strongest open-source performance without prompt enhancement, and improves further with PE. These gains indicate more reliable infographic generation and stronger structured visual planning, although a gap to the strongest proprietary systems remains.

Model	# Params	Layout	Attribute	Text	Knowledge	Average↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>						
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	88.5 / 95.3	81.9 / 91.0	83.9 / 92.6	74.2 / 90.9	82.1 / 92.5
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	72.2 / 91.2	65.6 / 92.2	86.4 / 95.0	82.6 / 96.2	76.7 / 93.7
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	79.3 / 89.5	74.0 / 87.6	72.0 / 88.3	76.8 / 90.5	75.5 / 89.0
Nano-Banana-2.0 [43]	-	68.4 / 91.0	57.4 / 91.6	83.4 / 94.6	64.6 / 93.0	68.5 / 92.5
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	-	75.5 / 87.6	74.1 / 87.3	63.2 / 81.1	49.8 / 75.3	65.7 / 82.8
<i>Open-source Models</i>						
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ PE)	8B	82.5 / 92.3	66.5 / 86.9	67.4 / 86.5	72.0 / 87.9	72.2 / 88.4
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	78.1 / 91.2	55.9 / 80.0	66.6 / 86.1	4.8 / 23.4	51.4 / 70.2
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	61.6 / 81.6	47.5 / 72.8	46.3 / 74.6	3.5 / 17.9	39.7 / 61.7
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	30.4 / 63.4	14.2 / 52.6	7.0 / 33.6	1.2 / 11.0	13.2 / 40.2
HunyuanImage-3.0 [11]	80BA13B	27.8 / 65.0	13.8 / 53.6	10.2 / 39.6	0.0 / 2.0	13.0 / 40.1
Z-Image [8]	6B	26.8 / 69.2	2.6 / 47.6	2.8 / 45.0	0.6 / 13.2	8.2 / 43.8
Qwen-Image-2512 [129]	20B	22.2 / 70.6	1.2 / 47.8	1.8 / 39.2	0.0 / 6.4	6.3 / 41.0
FLUX.2-dev [58]	32B	17.2 / 67.8	1.2 / 49.2	1.0 / 43.0	0.0 / 8.2	4.9 / 42.0
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	10.4 / 51.2	0.2 / 22.2	0.6 / 17.6	0.0 / 4.4	2.8 / 23.8

Table 14 Quantitative evaluation results on BizGenEval. Each cell reports hard / easy testset scores.

Model	# Params	Cultural	Time	Space	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>								
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	0.89	0.80	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.85	0.87
GPT-Image-1 [90]	-	0.81	0.71	0.89	0.83	0.79	0.74	0.80
Seedream 4.0 [100]	-	0.78	0.73	0.85	0.79	0.84	0.67	0.78
<i>Open-source Models</i>								
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ CoT)	8B	0.82	0.73	0.86	0.80	0.86	0.76	0.81
SenseNova-U1-SFT (w/ CoT) [29]	8B	0.78	0.73	0.82	0.80	0.85	0.77	0.78
NEO-unify (w/ CoT) [101]	8B	0.73	0.67	0.79	0.70	0.75	0.66	0.72
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	0.66	0.68	0.82	0.69	0.80	0.66	0.70
BAGEL (w/ CoT) [24]	7B	0.76	0.69	0.75	0.65	0.75	0.58	0.70
SenseNova-U1-SFT [29]	8B	0.65	0.66	0.82	0.68	0.81	0.66	0.69
Qwen-Image [129]	20B	0.63	0.62	0.76	0.60	0.72	0.39	0.63
BLIP3-o [15]	1.4B	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.62
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.58
LongCat-Next [115]	68BA3B	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.57
UniWorld-V1 [70]	12B	0.53	0.55	0.73	0.45	0.59	0.41	0.55
BAGEL [24]	7B	0.44	0.52	0.65	0.42	0.62	0.41	0.49
NEO-unify [101]	8B	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.47

Table 15 Quantitative evaluation results on WISE [88]. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # Params.

BizGenEval. As shown in Table 14, SenseNova-U1.5 substantially improves over SenseNova-U1 on both easy and hard splits, with prompt enhancement further achieving leading open-source performance. The gains are especially clear in knowledge-intensive cases, while remaining consistent across layout, attribute, and text-related dimensions.

Reasoning-centric Generation. We further evaluate knowledge- and reasoning-intensive generation capabilities using WISE [88], covering cultural knowledge, time, space, biology, physics, and chemistry.

WISE. As shown in Table 15, SenseNova-U1.5 is already competitive without chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning, while enabling CoT yields a substantial improvement and establishes leading open-source performance. The gains are particularly evident in knowledge-intensive domains such as cultural knowledge, biology, and chemistry, highlighting the benefit of explicit reasoning for grounding visual generation in world knowledge.

Model	# Params	Add	Adjust	Extract	Replace	Remove	Background	Style	Hybrid	Action	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>											
UniWorld-V2 [67]	-	4.29	4.44	4.32	4.69	4.72	4.41	4.91	3.83	4.83	4.49
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	4.44	4.62	3.42	4.60	4.63	4.32	4.97	3.64	4.69	4.37
Seedream 4.5 [7]	-	4.57	4.65	2.97	4.66	4.46	4.37	4.92	3.71	4.56	4.32
Seedream 4.0 [100]	-	4.33	4.38	3.89	4.65	4.57	4.35	4.22	3.71	4.61	4.30
GPT-Image-1 [90]	-	4.61	4.33	2.90	4.35	3.66	4.57	4.93	3.96	4.89	4.20
<i>Open-source Models</i>											
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	4.64	4.66	4.20	4.84	4.54	4.59	4.91	4.36	4.61	4.59
FireRed-Image-Edit [116]	20B	4.55	4.66	4.34	4.75	4.58	4.45	4.97	4.07	4.71	4.56
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [129]	20B	4.54	4.57	4.13	4.70	4.46	4.36	4.89	4.16	4.81	4.51
Boogu-Image-0.1-Edit [14]	10B	4.71	4.50	3.69	4.65	4.75	4.44	4.94	4.04	4.90	4.51
LongCat-Image-Edit [114]	6B	4.44	4.53	3.83	4.80	4.60	4.33	4.92	3.75	4.82	4.45
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	4.61	4.32	3.96	4.84	4.58	4.35	4.79	3.69	4.57	4.41
FLUX.2 [Dev] [58]	32B	4.50	4.18	3.83	4.65	4.65	4.31	4.88	3.46	4.70	4.35
Z-Image-Edit [8]	6B	4.40	4.14	4.30	4.57	4.13	4.14	4.85	3.63	4.50	4.30
Qwen-Image-Edit [129]	20B	4.38	4.16	3.43	4.66	4.14	4.38	4.81	3.82	4.69	4.27
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	3.83	4.15	3.12	4.32	3.26	4.18	4.85	3.03	4.41	3.90
OmniGen2 [130]	4B	3.57	3.06	1.77	3.74	3.20	3.57	4.81	2.52	4.68	3.44

Table 16 Quantitative evaluation results on ImgEdit. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # *Params*.

Model	# Params	GEdit-Bench-EN			GEdit-Bench-CN		
		G_SC	G_PQ	G_O ↑	G_SC	G_PQ	G_O ↑
Closed-source Models							
GPT-Image-2 [92]	-	9.42	8.31	8.73	9.43	8.31	8.76
Seedream 5.0 Pro [99]	-	9.02	8.45	8.53	9.07	8.37	8.53
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	7.86	8.33	7.54	7.51	8.31	7.25
Seedream 4.0 [100]	-	8.24	8.08	7.68	8.19	8.14	7.71
Qwen-Image-2.0 [156]	-	9.02	8.02	8.37	8.99	8.04	8.35
Qwen-Image-3.0 [96]	-	8.68	8.37	8.40	8.84	8.34	8.49
Open-source Models							
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	9.15	7.79	8.26	9.06	7.79	8.24
FireRed-Image-Edit [116]	20B	8.36	8.25	7.94	8.28	8.22	7.88
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [129]	20B	8.00	7.86	7.56	7.82	7.79	7.52
LongCat-Image-Edit [114]	6B	8.18	8.00	7.64	8.08	7.99	7.60
Emu3.5 [21]	32B	8.11	7.70	7.59	-	-	-
Z-Image-Edit [8]	6B	8.11	7.72	7.57	8.03	7.80	7.54
Qwen-Image-Edit [2509] [129]	20B	8.15	7.86	7.54	8.05	7.88	7.49
SenseNova-U1 [29]	8B	8.27	7.49	7.47	8.61	7.36	7.70
FLUX.2 [Dev] [58]	32B	7.84	8.06	7.41	7.69	8.04	7.28
LLaDA-Image [13]	6B	8.04	7.18	7.33	7.71	7.59	7.29
BAGEL [24]	7B	7.36	6.83	6.52	7.34	6.85	6.50

Table 17 Quantitative evaluation results on GEdit-Bench. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as # *Params*.

5.3 Image Editing

General Editing. We evaluate general editing capability on ImgEdit [146], GEdit-Bench [75], WeEdit [153], and OmniRef-Bench [50], covering diverse edit types, semantic consistency, text-centric and reference-based editing.

ImgEdit. As shown in Table 16, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves leading overall performance across a broad range of edit types, with substantial gains over SenseNova-U1. The improvements are consistent across categories, indicating stronger edit execution while maintaining source-image preservation and visual quality.

Model	Add			Replace			Delete			Rearrange			Translate			Style			Combined			Reasoning			Overall			Avg.↑
	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	IA	TC	BP	
Closed-source Models																												
Gemini-3-Pro-Image [22]	9.38	9.66	9.43	9.06	8.80	8.05	8.33	8.56	8.04	8.05	8.49	8.26	8.08	9.07	9.55	9.76	9.51	9.50	9.31	9.72	9.45	4.91	9.47	9.42	8.58	9.10	8.85	8.84
GPT-Image-1.5 [91]	8.02	9.32	6.80	7.16	7.58	5.55	6.43	6.59	3.82	5.44	6.91	5.35	4.09	6.97	7.71	9.30	9.44	8.31	8.12	9.12	6.34	3.37	7.02	7.93	6.52	7.78	6.15	6.82
Seedream 4.5 [7]	6.86	8.21	6.40	7.23	7.93	5.91	6.60	7.37	4.70	5.29	7.08	5.36	4.97	6.93	7.15	8.76	9.08	8.37	7.33	8.62	7.66	2.17	5.69	7.67	6.29	7.66	6.38	6.78
Gemini-2.5-Flash-Image [23]	5.88	8.06	7.58	3.35	6.05	7.50	6.01	8.17	6.05	1.77	6.86	7.11	1.75	6.06	8.83	7.95	9.54	9.58	4.08	7.57	8.83	1.70	4.82	8.76	3.92	7.14	7.80	6.29
Open-source Models																												
SenseNova-U1.5	8.40	8.54	8.52	8.83	8.56	8.22	8.20	8.75	7.38	5.71	7.18	7.67	2.19	4.16	8.11	8.60	8.58	7.91	8.58	8.52	8.68	1.84	4.17	7.94	6.81	7.50	8.08	7.46
FireRed-Image-Edit [109]	5.44	7.54	7.67	4.58	6.30	6.26	6.80	8.81	5.97	1.76	4.78	5.52	1.39	2.67	8.44	9.30	9.23	9.78	4.19	7.23	7.48	1.25	5.45	8.90	4.15	6.33	7.14	5.87
HY-image-3-instruct [11]	6.04	7.55	7.68	3.91	5.42	5.79	6.32	7.85	4.69	1.73	4.26	6.59	1.45	3.52	8.67	9.43	9.35	9.52	4.73	6.62	7.43	1.12	4.67	8.65	4.16	5.99	7.03	5.73
Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [129]	4.96	7.05	6.55	3.44	5.17	5.90	4.97	7.84	5.07	1.35	4.90	5.91	1.26	2.72	8.77	8.97	9.15	9.11	3.90	6.48	7.24	1.22	5.17	8.51	3.49	5.84	6.80	5.38
FLUX.2-dev [58]	5.40	7.59	4.92	3.59	6.09	4.95	3.07	8.14	5.27	1.44	5.73	5.84	1.24	3.59	8.78	8.04	8.88	8.31	4.60	7.31	5.52	1.26	6.33	9.55	3.37	6.53	6.19	5.36
LongCat-Image-Edit [114]	5.23	6.10	6.80	3.03	4.51	5.16	4.65	7.18	5.84	1.33	4.91	5.92	1.29	4.42	8.29	8.40	8.95	9.27	3.89	5.47	6.87	1.17	5.05	8.38	3.39	5.59	6.71	5.23
Step1X-Edit-v1.2 [75]	2.73	3.98	7.38	2.44	3.22	6.75	5.68	7.01	6.45	1.26	3.46	4.76	1.34	2.84	7.64	7.78	8.54	8.67	2.12	3.79	7.89	1.09	5.81	9.37	2.78	4.36	7.03	4.72
Emu3.5 [21]	4.89	6.60	3.72	3.26	4.60	2.81	4.76	5.20	2.29	1.46	3.94	3.36	1.27	2.73	5.93	8.27	8.66	8.41	3.96	5.98	4.13	1.23	3.34	6.32	3.42	4.96	4.07	4.15
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [129]	4.80	5.94	3.73	3.36	3.73	3.77	3.89	4.46	3.94	1.42	2.67	3.95	1.28	1.60	6.97	8.50	8.88	8.48	3.27	4.21	4.23	1.09	1.97	6.04	3.18	3.93	4.63	3.91
BAGEL [24]	2.32	3.03	5.99	1.48	2.41	4.30	3.03	6.46	2.92	1.07	3.53	5.66	1.03	4.88	7.68	7.36	7.76	8.98	1.44	2.33	5.83	1.02	4.42	8.89	1.97	4.01	5.75	3.91
OmniGen2 [130]	1.72	3.11	3.86	1.26	3.30	3.61	1.53	3.54	2.52	1.07	3.34	3.32	1.00	3.35	3.85	3.67	5.29	4.21	1.21	3.41	3.92	1.01	4.15	6.24	1.40	3.48	3.68	2.85

Table 18 Quantitative evaluation results on the WeEdit benchmark. Note that IA, TC, and BP denote Instruction Adherence, Text Clarity, and Background Preservation, respectively. Avg. is the arithmetic mean of the three Overall scores.

Model	Objective Metrics							MLLM Evaluation						
	Subject	Style	Background	Lighting	Pose	Avg.↑		Subject	Background	Style	Lighting	Aesthetics	Instruction	Avg.↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>														
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	0.64	0.46	0.89	0.77	0.72	0.70		8.50	8.61	8.37	8.75	8.37	8.39	8.50
Seedream 4.5 [7]	0.65	0.34	0.89	0.74	0.74	0.67		8.77	8.92	6.27	8.78	8.08	7.97	8.13
<i>Open-source Models</i>														
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ PE)	0.63	0.47	0.88	0.70	0.70	0.68		8.45	8.37	7.89	8.31	7.98	7.90	8.15
FLUX.2 [klein] [58]	0.63	0.21	0.87	0.69	0.74	0.63		8.25	6.32	2.18	7.69	7.95	6.53	6.49
DreamOmni2 [135]	0.57	0.28	0.85	0.71	0.67	0.62		6.75	3.43	3.45	6.07	6.65	4.71	5.18
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [129]	0.55	0.15	0.84	0.71	0.71	0.59		6.50	4.35	1.61	6.81	6.09	4.46	4.97
BAGEL [24]	0.58	0.15	0.85	0.67	0.69	0.59		6.21	3.66	1.13	6.31	5.98	4.54	4.64
OmniGen2 [130]	0.59	0.11	0.85	0.65	0.65	0.57		4.47	2.31	0.37	4.68	6.73	4.16	3.79

Table 19 Quantitative evaluation results on OmniRef-Bench. We adopt both objective and MLLM-based evaluation protocols.

GEdit-Bench. In Table 17, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves the strongest overall performance. The gains are particularly evident in semantic consistency, indicating that the model can more reliably identify the intended edit, modify the correct visual content, and preserve the semantic context of the original image. At the same time, U1.5 maintains competitive perceptual quality, suggesting that improved instruction execution does not come at the cost of visual realism or local coherence. This reflects a better balance between edit correctness, preservation, and overall image quality.

WeEdit. As shown in Table 18, SenseNova-U1.5 substantially outperforms other open-source models and remains competitive with leading proprietary systems. Its strong instruction adherence, text clarity, and background preservation demonstrate robust text-centric editing, where requested textual changes must be accurately executed while unrelated visual content remains intact. The results further suggest improved coordination between semantic editing and visual reconstruction. Translation-related and reasoning-intensive edits, however, remain relatively challenging, indicating room for further improvement in tasks requiring deeper linguistic and contextual understanding.

OmniRef-Bench. In Table 19, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves leading open-source performance on OmniRef-Bench under both objective and MLLM-based evaluation protocols. The gains are particularly pronounced in style consistency and background preservation, indicating that the model can more effectively exploit reference information while minimizing unintended modifications to the target image. Besides, strong subject and pose consistency show that identity, appearance, and structural cues are reliably preserved across diverse editing conditions. These results suggest that U1.5 not only improves reference fidelity, but also achieves a better balance among reference utilization, transformation accuracy, and preservation of the original scene, which is critical for robust multi-reference and customization-oriented editing.

Model	# Params	Temporal	Causal	Spatial	Logical	Overall↑	IR	AC	VP
<i>Closed-source Models</i>									
GPT-Image-1.5 [91]	-	54.1	60.0	62.0	21.2	50.0	69.7	92.5	94.9
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	-	41.2	61.1	48.0	37.6	47.2	77.0	85.5	94.4
Nano-Banana [23]	-	25.9	47.8	37.0	18.8	32.8	61.2	86.0	91.3
GPT-Image-1 [90]	-	34.1	32.2	37.0	10.6	28.9	62.8	80.2	94.9
Seedream 4.0 [100]	-	12.9	12.2	11.0	7.1	10.8	58.9	67.4	91.2
<i>Open-source Models</i>									
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ CoT)	8B	38.8	52.2	42.0	20.0	38.6	64.7	86.8	94.8
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	34.1	37.8	49.0	10.6	33.6	59.7	85.3	95.2
SenseNova-U1-8B-MoT-SFT (w/ CoT) [29]	8B	31.8	33.3	27.0	15.3	26.9	60.8	86.6	88.2
SenseNova-U1-8B-MoT-SFT [29]	8B	22.4	33.3	27.0	11.8	23.9	58.2	84.1	82.4
Qwen-Image-Edit-2511 [129]	20B	21.2	18.9	31.0	4.7	19.4	49.9	71.0	91.5
BAGEL (w/ CoT) [24]	7B	5.9	17.8	21.0	1.2	11.9	45.9	73.8	80.1
Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [129]	20B	4.7	10.0	17.0	2.4	8.9	37.2	66.4	86.9
BAGEL [24]	7B	2.4	5.6	14.0	1.2	6.1	36.5	53.5	73.0
FLUX.1-Kontext-Dev [59]	12B	2.3	5.5	13.0	1.2	5.8	26.0	71.6	85.2
Lumina-DiMOO [138]	8B	2.4	1.1	4.0	1.2	2.2	34.0	50.7	72.3
Step1X-Edit [75]	12B	0.0	2.2	2.0	3.5	1.9	25.1	41.5	73.5
OmniGen [136]	3.8B	1.2	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.8	22.0	32.6	55.3
Emu2 [108]	37B	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	22.6	38.2	78.3

Table 20 Quantitative evaluation results on RISEBench. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as *# Params*. Note that CoT denotes chain-of-thought prompting before outputting the resulting image.

Model	# Params	Complete	Quality	Richness	Correct	Human Align.	IT Coherency	Multi-step	Overall↑
<i>Closed-source Models</i>									
Nano-Banana [23]	-	9.34	8.58	8.00	9.17	8.88	9.27	8.70	8.85
Wan-Weaver [139]	-	9.41	8.32	8.03	8.90	8.69	8.78	8.56	8.67
GPT-4o [53]+DALL-E3 [4]	-	8.66	8.01	7.42	7.98	8.77	8.15	8.38	8.20
Gemini [112]+Flux [57]	-	7.58	7.26	6.48	7.03	7.98	6.98	7.33	7.23
<i>Open-source Models</i>									
SenseNova-U1.5 (w/ CoT)	8B	9.13	9.21	8.51	9.19	9.45	9.58	9.21	9.18
SenseNova-U1-SFT (w/ CoT) [29]	8B	9.14	9.03	8.43	9.08	9.35	9.40	9.09	9.07
SEED-X [39]	17B	5.65	6.07	4.92	5.77	7.03	5.72	5.72	5.84
Emu3 [127]	8B	5.90	5.96	5.52	5.43	6.47	5.66	5.37	5.76
Anole [20]	7B	6.27	6.02	5.28	5.06	6.91	4.90	5.81	5.75
SEED-LLaMA [38]	14B	5.59	5.50	4.61	4.59	6.50	4.43	5.13	5.19
VILA-U [134]	7B	5.60	5.14	4.68	4.78	5.69	4.74	4.79	5.06
Show-o [137]	1.3B	4.37	4.79	3.83	3.76	5.78	4.04	4.33	4.41
MiniGPT-5 [158]	0.86B	3.91	4.50	3.61	3.63	5.51	3.56	4.10	4.12
NExT-GPT [132]	1.3B	3.89	4.25	3.35	3.61	5.35	3.32	3.85	3.95

Table 21 Quantitative evaluation results on OpenING. The parameters of the generation component are denoted as *# Params*.

Reasoning-centric Editing. Beyond direct instruction following, we further evaluate edits that require the model to infer temporal, causal, spatial, or logical consequences before modifying the image, using RISEBench [157].

RISEBench. As shown in Table 20, SenseNova-U1.5 already outperforms the evaluated open-source baselines without CoT, while explicit reasoning provides a further substantial improvement. The gains are most pronounced for causal, logical, and temporal edits, indicating that CoT is particularly effective when the required transformation must first be inferred rather than directly localized. In contrast, spatial editing benefits less consistently, suggesting that explicit reasoning is most valuable for implicit multi-step transformations rather than directly grounded edits.

Model	Overall↑	In-Domain by Category						Out-of-Domain by Category					
		Avg.	Abst.	Know.	Perc.	Spat.	Trans.	Avg.	Abst.	Know.	Perc.	Spat.	Trans.
Closed-source Models (Image Generation)													
Seedream-5.0-Pro [99]	55.7	48.5	67.3	34.9	67.9	44.1	30.7	62.9	68.9	56.5	74.4	55.9	22.3
Qwen-Image-2.0 [156]	31.3	24.8	35.0	22.0	30.0	18.7	18.6	37.8	46.3	29.2	44.0	38.4	8.8
Open-source Models (Image Generation)													
FLUX.2-dev [58]	15.7	10.8	11.4	12.2	9.6	11.0	9.3	20.6	26.8	20.5	20.7	24.1	8.5
Qwen-Image-Edit [129]	13.4	10.8	12.0	9.2	13.4	12.0	7.9	15.9	23.9	7.8	15.8	18.2	9.1
BAGEL [24]	8.9	6.6	5.0	9.5	8.9	5.0	3.8	11.1	27.2	3.9	8.2	2.8	13.3
Closed-source Models (Interleaved Generation)													
Nano-Banana-Pro [22]	56.4	48.0	67.4	47.3	68.2	31.3	24.6	64.8	75.1	61.9	73.9	58.5	24.3
GPT-Image-2 [92]	50.7	42.8	59.3	35.6	57.1	22.7	42.4	58.7	54.0	51.3	71.2	48.0	33.5
Open-source Models (Interleaved Generation)													
SenseNova-U1.5	68.2	67.6	78.4	75.2	70.5	60.8	48.7	68.9	69.8	59.9	71.6	67.8	65.0
VBVR-SenseNova-U1 [141]	40.8	46.9	46.3	35.1	49.7	42.5	67.4	34.7	39.5	39.3	30.9	48.0	26.3
ThinkMorph [45]	15.4	11.3	13.0	9.2	13.4	16.2	4.4	19.5	23.8	20.6	18.3	25.3	11.4

Table 22 Quantitative evaluation results on VBVR-Pro-Bench. We evaluate two model settings: image generation and interleaved generation. We report both in-domain (ID) and out-of-domain (OOD) scores as percentages, together with category-wise performance.

Model	# Params	Uni-MMMU-GaU					RealUnify-GEU				
		Jigsaw-T	Maze-T	Sliding-T	Geometry-T	Avg↑	MR	MT	AF	CN	Avg↑
SenseNova-U1.5	8B	86.0	17.3	0.0	15.0	29.6	38.0	84.0	51.0	52.0	56.3
SenseNova-U1-SFT [29]	8B	87.3	28.6	0.0	24.2	35.0	36.0	63.0	51.0	40.0	47.5
BAGEL [24]	7B	48.0	0.0	1.2	32.8	20.5	38.0	25.0	52.0	28.0	35.8
OmniGen2 [130]	4B	48.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	13.4	42.0	24.0	38.0	19.0	30.8
Ovis-U1 [122]	1.2B	53.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	14.1	38.0	25.0	31.0	24.0	29.5

Table 23 Quantitative evaluation results on Uni-MMMU-GaU and RealUnify-GEU. For Uni-MMMU-GaU, we report text accuracy (T) for all tasks and sample-level accuracy for the multi-step Maze and Sliding Puzzle tasks. For RealUnify-GEU, MR, MT, AF, and CN denote mental reconstruction, mental tracking, attentional focusing, and cognitive navigation, respectively.

5.4 Interleaved Generation

Interleaved Generation. We evaluate this capability on OpenING [160] and VBVR-Pro-Bench [141] that integrate understanding, reasoning, and generation for open-ended interleaved generation and generation-mediated visual reasoning.

OpenING. In Table 21, SenseNova-U1.5 with CoT achieves leading overall performance on OpenING, improving over SenseNova-U1 and outperforming the compared proprietary pipelines. Strong results in image-text coherency, human alignment, and multi-step consistency demonstrate reliable open-ended interleaved generation.

VBVR-Pro-Bench. In Table 22, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves new state-of-the-art results across cognitive faculties, showing its ability to reason directly through interleaved text-image generation. It also generalizes strongly to out-of-domain tasks, outperforming leading proprietary models such as Nano-Banana-Pro [22] and GPT-Image-2 [92].

Unified Reasoning. Uni-MMMU [164] evaluates generation-aided understanding (GaU), while RealUnify [103] evaluates generation-enhanced understanding (GEU) across reconstruction, tracking, focusing, and navigation.

Uni-MMMU-GaU and RealUnify-GEU. In Table 23, SenseNova-U1.5 achieves leading performance on RealUnify-GEU with a considerable improvement over SenseNova-U1-SFT, while remaining competitive with the previous SenseNova model on Uni-MMMU-GaU. These findings show that generation in SenseNova-U1.5 is not only an output modality, but can also function as an intermediate representation that supports multimodal reasoning and understanding.

6 Conclusion

We present SenseNova-U1.5 as a further step toward native multimodal systems in which visual understanding and generation are learned within a common computational substrate rather than connected through separate perceptual and generative pipelines. Our extensive results demonstrate that this direction can scale beyond basic image synthesis: a compact native representation can simultaneously sustain strong understanding while impressively supporting high-fidelity generation, editing, interleaved generation, and reasoning-intensive visual tasks.

More broadly, SenseNova-U1.5 suggests that the central opportunity of multimodal unification is not architectural simplification, but capability interaction. Reasoning can improve how visual content is created and transformed, while generation can itself become part of the model’s internal process for solving visual problems. This blurs the conventional boundary between perception and creation, and points toward a class of foundation models in which seeing, reasoning, and generating are no longer trained as loosely coupled functions, but emerge as different expressions of a shared visual intelligence. We view this as an important step toward multimodal models that do not merely combine modalities, but develop a unified mechanism for interpreting, imagining, and acting upon visual worlds.

7 Contributors

The list is organized by contribution role, with individuals listed alphabetically by their first name within each category.

Project Sponsor and Advisor:

Dahua Lin

Senior Project Lead:

Lei Yang, Lewei Lu, Quan Wang, Ruihao Gong, Wenxiu Sun, Ziwei Liu

Project Lead:

Haiwen Diao, Jiahao Wang

Core Contributor:

Chenjing Ding, Hanming Deng, Jiangnan Chen, Ruixi Zhang, Ruohui Wang, Wenwen Tong, Xiangyu Fan, Yubo Wang, Yue Zhu, Yuwei Niu, Zhengqi Bai, Zhiqian Lin, Zhitao Yang, Zhongang Cai

Contributor:

Bo Yang, Chen Feng, Chengguang Lv, Guangjia Liu, Guanlin Wang, Hanyu Zhang, Haojia Yu, Hongcan Xiao, Hongli Wang, Huan Wu, Huaping Zhong, Jian Fang, Jianan Fan, Jiaqi Li, Jiefan Lu, Jing Zuo, Jingcheng Ni, Junxiang Xu, Linjun Dai, Mutian Xu, Peishen Yan, Penghao Wu, Ruijie Mao, Ruisi Wang, Shihao Bai, Shuang Yang, Shuya Yang, Shuyan Zheng, Silei Wu, Siying Li, Tao Chu, Tianbo Zhong, Tongxi Zhou, Weichao Luo, Weichen Fan, Wenhao Jia, Wenjie Gao, Xiangli Kong, Yan Li, Yang Yong, Zimo Wen, Zixuan Qian

Acknowledgement:

We would like to thank Boyu Guan, Chen Wei, Chenyang Gu, Fanzhou Wang, Haoge Deng, Houyuan Chen, Huchuan Lu, Jiayu Li, Kaizhe Yang, Lianqiang Shi, Oscar Qian, Qingping Sun, Wanqi Yin, Wenjie Ye, Xiaotong Li, Xuehai Bai, Yijia Fan, Yue Huang, Yukun Wei, Yves Wang, and Zongpu Zhang for their valuable support for this project, including data preparation, model evaluation, infrastructure support, architecture analysis, and helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Rishabh Agarwal, Nino Vieillard, Yongchao Zhou, Piotr Stanczyk, Sabela Ramos Garea, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Bachem. On-policy distillation of language models: Learning from self-generated mistakes. In International Conference on Learning Representations, volume 2024, pages 21246–21263, 2024.
- [2] 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.
- [3] Rohan Bavishi, Erich Elsen, Curtis Hawthorne, Maxwell Nye, Augustus Odena, Arushi Somani, and Sağnak Taşlılar. Introducing our multimodal models, 2023. URL <https://www.adept.ai/blog/fuyu-8b>.
- [4] James Betker, Gabriel Goh, Li Jing, Tim Brooks, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Long Ouyang, Juntang Zhuang, Joyce Lee, Yufei Guo, Wesam Manassra, Prafulla Dhariwal, Casey Chu, Yunxin Jiao, and Aditya Ramesh. Improving image generation with better captions, 2023. URL <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/dall-e-3.pdf>.
- [5] Kevin Black, Michael Janner, Yilun Du, Ilya Kostrikov, and Sergey Levine. Training diffusion models with reinforcement learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13301, 2023.
- [6] Walid Bousselham, Hilde Kuehne, and Cordelia Schmid. Vold: Reasoning transfer from llms to vision-language models via on-policy distillation. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 26209–26218, 2026.
- [7] ByteDance. Seedream 4.5, 2025. URL https://seed.bytedance.com/en/seedream4_5.
- [8] Huanqia Cai, Sihan Cao, Ruoyi Du, Peng Gao, Steven Hoi, Shijie Huang, Zhaohui Hou, 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.
- [9] Qi Cai, Jingwen Chen, Yang Chen, Yehao Li, Fuchen Long, Yingwei Pan, Zhaofan Qiu, Yiheng Zhang, Fengbin Gao, Peihan Xu, et al. Hidream-1l: An open-source high-efficient image generative foundation model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22705, 2025.
- [10] Qi Cai, Jingwen Chen, Chengmin Gao, Zijian Gong, Yehao Li, Yingwei Pan, Yi Peng, Zhaofan Qiu, Kai Yu, Yiheng Zhang, et al. Hidream-o1-image: A natively unified image generative foundation model with pixel-level unified transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.11061, 2026.
- [11] Siyu Cao, Hangting Chen, Peng Chen, Yiji Cheng, Yutao Cui, Xinchu Deng, Ying Dong, Kipper Gong, Tianpeng Gu, Xiusen Gu, et al. Hunyuanimage 3.0 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23951, 2025.
- [12] Jingjing Chang, Yixiao Fang, Peng Xing, Shuhan Wu, Wei Cheng, Rui Wang, Xianfang Zeng, Gang Yu, and Hai-Bao Chen. Oneig-bench: Omni-dimensional nuanced evaluation for image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07977, 2025.
- [13] Chuyan Chen, Haoxing Chen, Kun Chen, Zhenglin Cheng, Long Cui, Ruishan Fang, Zhangxuan Gu, Zhicheng Huang, Zhenzhong Lan, Yuanting Lei, et al. Llada-image: Building strong image generators with fully open training recipes. arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.03796, 2026.
- [14] Guoxuan Chen, Chufeng Xiao, Haoran Yang, Siyue Xie, Binxiao Huang, Ming Zhang, Cheuk Him Chau, Xinyu Fu, Yingzhao Lian, Tom SY Li, et al. Boogu-image-0.1: Boosting open-source unified multimodal understanding and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.13125, 2026.
- [15] Jiuhai Chen, Zhiyang Xu, Xichen Pan, Yushi Hu, Can Qin, Tom Goldstein, Lifu Huang, Tianyi Zhou, Saining Xie, Silvio Savarese, Le Xue, Caiming Xiong, and Ran Xu. Blip3-o: A family of fully open unified multimodal models-architecture, training and dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09568, 2025.
- [16] Liang Chen, Weichu Xie, Yiyan Liang, Hongfeng He, Hans Zhao, Zhibo Yang, Zhiqi Huang, Haoning Wu, Haoyu Lu, Yiping Bao, et al. Babyvision: Visual reasoning beyond language. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.06521, 2026.
- [17] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, et al. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models? Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 37:27056–27087, 2024.
- [18] Shoufa Chen, Chongjian Ge, Shilong Zhang, Peize Sun, and Ping Luo. Pixelflow: Pixel-space generative models with flow. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07963, 2025.
- [19] Zhennan Chen, Junwei Zhu, Xu Chen, Jiangning Zhang, Xiaobin Hu, Hanzhen Zhao, Chengjie Wang, Jian Yang, and Ying Tai. Dip: Taming diffusion models in pixel space. arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18822, 2025.

- [20] Ethan Chern, Jiadi Su, Yan Ma, and Pengfei Liu. Anole: An open, autoregressive, native large multimodal models for interleaved image-text generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06135](#), 2024.
- [21] 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.
- [22] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3 pro image model card, Nov 2025. URL <https://storage.googleapis.com/deepmind-media/Model-Cards/Gemini-3-Pro-Image-Model-Card.pdf>.
- [23] Google DeepMind. Gemini 2.5 flash & gemini 2.5 flash image model card, 2025. URL <https://storage.googleapis.com/deepmind-media/Model-Cards/Gemini-2-5-Flash-Model-Card.pdf>.
- [24] 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.
- [25] Haiwen Diao, Yufeng Cui, Xiaotong Li, Yueze Wang, Huchuan Lu, and Xinlong Wang. Unveiling encoder-free vision-language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:52545–52567, 2024.
- [26] Haiwen Diao, Mingxuan Li, Silei Wu, Linjun Dai, Xiaohua Wang, Hanming Deng, Lewei Lu, Dahua Lin, and Ziwei Liu. From pixels to words—towards native vision-language primitives at scale. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.14979](#), 2025.
- [27] Haiwen Diao, Xiaotong Li, Yufeng Cui, Yueze Wang, Haoge Deng, Ting Pan, Wenxuan Wang, Huchuan Lu, and Xinlong Wang. Evex2: Improved baselines for encoder-free vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 21014–21025, 2025.
- [28] Haiwen Diao, Jiahao Wang, Penghao Wu, Yuhao Dong, Yuwei Niu, Yue Zhu, Zhongang Cai, Weichen Fan, Linjun Dai, Silei Wu, Xuanyu Zheng, Mingxuan Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Hanming Deng, Huchuan Lu, Quan Wang, Lei Yang, Lewei Lu, Dahua Lin, and Ziwei Liu. From pixels to words—towards native one-vision models at scale. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.28820](#), 2026.
- [29] Haiwen Diao, Penghao Wu, Hanming Deng, Jiahao Wang, Shihao Bai, Silei Wu, Weichen Fan, Wenjie Ye, Wenwen Tong, Xiangyu Fan, Yan Li, Yubo Wang, Zhijie Cao, Zhiqian Lin, Zhitao Yang, Zhongang Cai, Yuwei Niu, Yue Zhu, Bo Liu, Chengguang Lv, Haojia Yu, Haozhe Xie, Hongli Wang, Jianan Fan, Jiaqi Li, Jiefan Lu, Jingcheng Ni, Junxiang Xu, Kaihuan Liang, Lianqiang Shi, Linjun Dai, Linyan Wang, Oscar Qian, Peng Gao, Pengfei Liu, Qingping Sun, Rui Shen, Ruisi Wang, Shengnan Ma, Shuang Yang, Siyi Xie, Siying Li, Tianbo Zhong, Xiangli Kong, Xuanke Shi, Yang Gao, Yongqiang Yao, Yves Wang, Zhengqi Bai, Zhengyu Lin, Zixin Yin, Wenxiu Sun, Ruihao Gong, Quan Wang, Lewei Lu, Lei Yang, Ziwei Liu, and Dahua Lin. Sensenova-u1: Unifying multimodal understanding and generation with neo-unify architecture, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.12500>.
- [30] Nikai Du, Zhennan Chen, Shan Gao, Zhizhou Chen, Xi Chen, Zhengkai Jiang, Jian Yang, and Ying Tai. Textcrafter: Accurately rendering multiple texts in complex visual scenes. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23461](#), 2025.
- [31] Xinrun Du, Yifan Yao, Kaijing Ma, Bingli Wang, Tianyu Zheng, King Zhu, Minghao Liu, Yiming Liang, Xiaolong Jin, Zhenlin Wei, et al. Supergpqa: Scaling llm evaluation across 285 graduate disciplines. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14739](#), 2025.
- [32] Yuning Du, Chenxia Li, Ruoyu Guo, Xiaoting Yin, Weiwei Liu, Jun Zhou, Yifan Bai, Zilin Yu, Yehua Yang, Qingqing Dang, and Haoshuang Wang. PP-OCR: A practical ultra lightweight ocr system. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09941](#), 2020.
- [33] Haodong Duan, Junming Yang, Yuxuan Qiao, Xinyu Fang, Lin Chen, Yuan Liu, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, et al. Vlmevalkit: An open-source toolkit for evaluating large multi-modality models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 11198–11201, 2024.
- [34] 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 *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [35] Ying Fan, Olivia Watkins, Yuqing Du, Hao Liu, Moonkyung Ryu, Craig Boutilier, Pieter Abbeel, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Kangwook Lee, and Kimin Lee. DPOR: Reinforcement learning for fine-tuning text-to-image diffusion models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16381](#), 2023.
- [36] Zhen Fang, Wenxuan Huang, Yu Zeng, Yiming Zhao, Shuang Chen, Kaituo Feng, Yunlong Lin, Lin Chen, Zehui Chen, Shaosheng Cao, et al. Flow-opd: On-policy distillation for flow matching models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.08063](#), 2026.

- [37] Ling Fu, Zhebin Kuang, Jiajun Song, Mingxin Huang, Biao Yang, Yuzhe Li, Linghao Zhu, Qidi Luo, Xinyu Wang, Hao Lu, et al. Ocrbench v2: An improved benchmark for evaluating large multimodal models on visual text localization and reasoning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00321, 2024.
- [38] 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.
- [39] Yuying Ge, Sijie Zhao, Jinguo Zhu, Yixiao Ge, Kun Yi, Lin Song, Chen Li, Xiaohan Ding, and Ying Shan. Seed-x: Multimodal models with unified multi-granularity comprehension and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14396, 2024.
- [40] Aryo Pradipta Gema, Joshua Ong Jun Leang, Giwon Hong, Alessio Devoto, Alberto Carlo Maria Mancino, Rohit Saxena, Xuanli He, Yu Zhao, Xiaotang Du, Mohammad Reza Ghasemi Madani, et al. Are we done with mmlu? In Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 5069–5096, 2025.
- [41] Zigang Geng, Yibing Wang, Yeyao Ma, Chen Li, Yongming Rao, Shuyang Gu, Zhao Zhong, Qinglin Lu, Han Hu, Xiaosong Zhang, et al. X-omni: Reinforcement learning makes discrete autoregressive image generative models great again. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.22058, 2025.
- [42] Dhruva Ghosh, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Geneval: An object-focused framework for evaluating text-to-image alignment. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36:52132–52152, 2023.
- [43] Google. Nano banana 2: Combining pro capabilities with lightning-fast speed, 2026. URL <https://blog.google/innovation-and-ai/technology/ai/nano-banana-2/>.
- [44] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3 Pro Model Card, November 2025. URL <https://storage.googleapis.com/deepmind-media/Model-Cards/Gemini-3-Pro-Model-Card.pdf>.
- [45] Jiawei Gu, Yunzhuo Hao, Huichen Will Wang, Linjie Li, Michael Qizhe Shieh, Yejin Choi, Ranjay Krishna, and Yu Cheng. Thinkmorph: Emergent properties in multimodal interleaved chain-of-thought reasoning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.27492, 2025.
- [46] Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, et al. Hallusionbench: an advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination and visual illusion in large vision-language models. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 14375–14385, 2024.
- [47] Hanzhong Guo, Jie Wu, Jie Liu, Yu Gao, Zilyu Ye, Linxiao Yuan, Xionghui Wang, Yizhou Yu, and Weilin Huang. Leveraging verifier-based reinforcement learning in image editing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.27505, 2026.
- [48] Tuomo Hiippala, Malihe Alikhani, Jonas Haverinen, Timo Kalliokoski, Evanfiya Logacheva, Serafina Orekhova, Aino Tuomainen, Matthew Stone, and John A Bateman. Ai2d-rst. Language Resources and Evaluation, 55(3):661–688, 2021.
- [49] Xiwei Hu, Rui Wang, Yixiao Fang, Bin Fu, Pei Cheng, and Gang Yu. Ella: Equip diffusion models with llm for enhanced semantic alignment. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05135, 2024.
- [50] Wenwang Huang, Yusen Fu, Junjie Wang, Mengfei Huang, Yulin Li, Gan Liu, Jing Cai, Yancheng He, and Zhuotao Tian. Scaling multi-reference image generation with dynamic reward optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.26947, 2026.
- [51] Yuzhen Huang, Yuzhuo Bai, Zhihao Zhu, Junlei Zhang, Jinghan Zhang, Tangjun Su, Junteng Liu, Chuancheng Lv, Yikai Zhang, Yao Fu, et al. C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36:62991–63010, 2023.
- [52] Ziwei Huang, Ying Shu, Hao Fang, Quanyu Long, Wenya Wang, Qiushi Guo, Tiezheng Ge, and Leilei Gan. From competition to synergy: Unlocking reinforcement learning for subject-driven image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18263, 2025.
- [53] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276, 2024.
- [54] Amita Kamath, Kai-Wei Chang, Ranjay Krishna, Luke Zettlemoyer, Yushi Hu, and Marjan Ghazvininejad. Geneval 2: Addressing benchmark drift in text-to-image evaluation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.16853, 2025.
- [55] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114, 2013.
- [56] Yuval Kirstain, Adam Polyak, Uriel Singer, Shahbuland Matiana, Joe Penna, and Omer Levy. Pick-a-pic: An open dataset of user preferences for text-to-image generation. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 36, 2023.

- [57] Black Forest Labs. Flux, 2024. URL <https://github.com/black-forest-labs/flux>.
- [58] Black Forest Labs. FLUX.2: Frontier Visual Intelligence, 2025. URL <https://bfl.ai/blog/flux-2>.
- [59] Black Forest Labs, Stephen Batifol, Andreas Blattmann, Frederic Boesel, Saksham Consul, Cyril Diagne, Tim Dockhorn, Jack English, Zion English, Patrick Esser, et al. Flux. 1 kontext: Flow matching for in-context image generation and editing in latent space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.15742*, 2025.
- [60] Han Li, Xinyu Peng, Yaoming Wang, Zelin Peng, Xin Chen, Rongxiang Weng, Jingang Wang, Xunliang Cai, Wenrui Dai, and Hongkai Xiong. Onecat: Decoder-only auto-regressive model for unified understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.03498*, 2025.
- [61] Kesong Li, Yixuan Xu, Kuo kun Tseng, Weiyl Lu, Kan Liu, and Tao Lan. Linear-dpo: Linear direct preference optimization for diffusion and flow-matching generative models, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.21123>.
- [62] Ming Li, Jike Zhong, Shitian Zhao, Haoquan Zhang, Shaoheng Lin, Yuxiang Lai, Chen Wei, Konstantinos Psounis, and Kaipeng Zhang. Tir-bench: A comprehensive benchmark for agentic thinking-with-images reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.01833*, 2025.
- [63] Niantong Li, Guangzheng Hu, Weixu Qiao, Ying Ba, Qichen Hong, Shijun Shen, Jinlin Wang, Fan Zhou, Jianye Kang, Xin Shang, et al. Qwen-image-bench: From generation to creation in text-to-image evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.28091*, 2026.
- [64] Quanhao Li, Junqiu Yu, Kaixun Jiang, Yujie Wei, Zhen Xing, Pandeng Li, Ruihang Chu, Shiwei Zhang, Yu Liu, and Zuxuan Wu. Diffusionopd: A unified perspective of on-policy distillation in diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.15055*, 2026.
- [65] Tianhong Li and Kaiming He. Back to basics: Let denoising generative models denoise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.13720*, 2025.
- [66] Yan Li, Zezi Zeng, Ziwei Zhou, Xin Gao, Muzhao Tian, Yifan Yang, Mingxi Cheng, Qi Dai, Yuqing Yang, Lili Qiu, et al. Bizgeneval: A systematic benchmark for commercial visual content generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.25732*, 2026.
- [67] Zongjian Li, Zheyuan Liu, Qihui Zhang, Bin Lin, Feize Wu, Shenghai Yuan, Zhiyuan Yan, Yang Ye, Wangbo Yu, Yuwei Niu, et al. Uniworld-v2: Reinforce image editing with diffusion negative-aware finetuning and mllm implicit feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.16888*, 2025.
- [68] Weixin Liang, Lili Yu, Liang Luo, Srinivasan Iyer, Ning Dong, Chunting Zhou, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, et al. Mixture-of-transformers: A sparse and scalable architecture for multi-modal foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04996*, 2024.
- [69] Chao Liao, Liyang Liu, Xun Wang, Zhengxiong Luo, Xinyu Zhang, Wenliang Zhao, Jie Wu, Liang Li, Zhi Tian, and Weilin Huang. Mogao: An omni foundation model for interleaved multi-modal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05472*, 2025.
- [70] Bin Lin, Zongjian Li, Xinhua Cheng, Yuwei Niu, Yang Ye, Xianyi He, Shenghai Yuan, Wangbo Yu, Shaocong Wang, Yunyang Ge, et al. Uniworld: High-resolution semantic encoders for unified visual understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03147*, 2025.
- [71] Xi Victoria Lin, Akshat Shrivastava, Liang Luo, Srinivasan Iyer, Mike Lewis, Gargi Ghosh, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Armen Aghajanyan. Moma: Efficient early-fusion pre-training with mixture of modality-aware experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21770*, 2024.
- [72] Jiaxiang Liu, Zhida Feng, Pengyu Zou, Zhenyu Qian, Tianrui Zhu, Jun Xia, Yuehu Dong, Yanzheng Lin, Honglin Xiong, Anqi Chen, et al. Ernie-image technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.25347*, 2026.
- [73] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05470*, 2025.
- [74] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05470*, 2025.
- [75] 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.
- [76] Yijun Liu, Jie Huang, Zeyue Xue, Yuming Li, Ruizhe He, Haoran Li, Shijia Ge, and Siming Fu. HPSv3++: Scaling reward models across the full spectrum of diffusion model capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.14657*, 2026.

- [77] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision, pages 216–233. Springer, 2024.
- [78] Yuliang Liu, Zhang Li, Mingxin Huang, Biao Yang, Wenwen Yu, Chunyuan Li, Xu-Cheng Yin, Cheng-Lin Liu, Lianwen Jin, and Xiang Bai. Ocrbench: on the hidden mystery of ocr in large multimodal models. Science China Information Sciences, 67 (12):220102, 2024.
- [79] Zhiheng Liu, Weiming Ren, Haozhe Liu, Zijian Zhou, Shoufa Chen, Haonan Qiu, Xiaoke Huang, Zhaochong An, Fanny Yang, Aditya Patel, et al. Tuna: Taming unified visual representations for native unified multimodal models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02014, 2025.
- [80] Zhiheng Liu, Weiming Ren, Xiaoke Huang, Shoufa Chen, Tianhong Li, Mengzhao Chen, Yatai Ji, Sen He, Jonas Schult, Tao Xiang, Wenhui Chen, Ping Luo, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Yuren Cong. Tuna-2: Pixel embeddings beat vision encoders for unified understanding and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.24763, 2026.
- [81] Kevin Lu and Thinking Machines Lab. On-policy distillation. Thinking Machines Lab: Connectionism, 2025. doi: 10.64434/tml.20251026. <https://thinkingmachines.ai/blog/on-policy-distillation>.
- [82] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02255, 2023.
- [83] Gen Luo, Wenhan Dou, Wenhao Li, Zhaokai Wang, Xue Yang, Changyao Tian, Hao Li, Weiyun Wang, Wenhui Wang, Xizhou Zhu, et al. Mono-intervl-1.5: Towards cheaper and faster monolithic multimodal large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.12566, 2025.
- [84] Gen Luo, Xue Yang, Wenhan Dou, Zhaokai Wang, Jiawen Liu, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Xizhou Zhu. Mono-intervl: Pushing the boundaries of monolithic multimodal large language models with endogenous visual pre-training. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 24960–24971, 2025.
- [85] Wenhan Ma, Jianyu Wei, Liang Zhao, Hailin Zhang, Bangjun Xiao, Lei Li, Qibin Yang, Bofei Gao, Yudong Wang, Rang Li, et al. Mopd: Multi-teacher on-policy distillation for capability integration in llm post-training. arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.30406, 2026.
- [86] Yuhang Ma, Xiaoshi Wu, Keqiang Sun, and Hongsheng Li. HPSv3: Towards wide-spectrum human preference score. arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03789, 2025.
- [87] Minesh Mathew, Viraj Bagal, Rubèn Tito, Dimosthenis Karatzas, Ernest Valveny, and CV Jawahar. Infographicvqa. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision, pages 1697–1706, 2022.
- [88] 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.
- [89] NVIDIA. Cosmos 3: Omnimodal world models for physical ai. arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.02800, 2026. URL <https://research.nvidia.com/labs/cosmos-lab/cosmos3/technical-report.pdf>.
- [90] OpenAI. Gpt-image-1, 2025. URL <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/image-generation>.
- [91] OpenAI. Gpt-image-1.5, 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/new-chatgpt-images-is-here/>.
- [92] OpenAI. Introducing chatgpt images 2.0, 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-chatgpt-images-2-0/>.
- [93] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2022.
- [94] Mihir Prabhudesai, Anirudh Goyal, Deepak Pathak, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Aligning text-to-image diffusion models with reward backpropagation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03739, 2023.
- [95] Qwen Team. Qwen3.5: Towards native multimodal agents, February 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.5>.
- [96] Qwen Team. Qwen-image-3.0: Rich content, authentic details, deep knowledge, July 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen-image-3.0>.

- [97] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In International conference on machine learning, pages 8748–8763, 2021.
- [98] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347, 2017.
- [99] Bytedance Seed. Seedream 5.0 lite. https://seed.bytedance.com/en/seedream5_0_lite, 2026.
- [100] Team Seedream, Yunpeng Chen, Yu Gao, Lixue Gong, Meng Guo, Qiushan Guo, Zhiyao Guo, Xiaoxia Hou, Weilin Huang, Yixuan Huang, et al. Seedream 4.0: Toward next-generation multimodal image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.20427, 2025.
- [101] SenseNova. Neo-unify: Building native multimodal unified models end to end, 2026. URL <https://huggingface.co/blog/sensenova/neo-unify>.
- [102] Zhihong Shao, Pei Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Jun Song, Xiao Zhang, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300, 2024.
- [103] Yang Shi, Yuhao Dong, Yue Ding, Yuran Wang, Xuanyu Zhu, Sheng Zhou, Wenting Liu, Haochen Tian, Rundong Wang, Huanqian Wang, et al. Realunify: Do unified models truly benefit from unification? a comprehensive benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.24897, 2025.
- [104] Aaditya Singh, Adam Fry, Adam Perelman, Adam Tart, Adi Ganesh, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aidan McLaughlin, Aiden Low, AJ Ostrow, Akhila Ananthram, et al. Openai gpt-5 system card. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.03267, 2025.
- [105] JD Open Source. Joyai-image: Awakening spatial intelligence in unified multimodal understanding and generation, 2026. URL <https://github.com/jd-opensource/JoyAI-Image>.
- [106] Stability AI. Introducing stable diffusion 3.5, 2024. URL <https://stability.ai/news/introducing-stable-diffusion-3-5>.
- [107] Quan Sun, Yuxin Fang, Ledell Wu, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. Eva-clip: Improved training techniques for clip at scale. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15389, 2023.
- [108] Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiying Yu, Yueze Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. Generative multimodal models are in-context learners. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 14398–14409, 2024.
- [109] Super Intelligence Team, Changhao Qiao, Chao Hui, Chen Li, Cunzheng Wang, Dejie Song, Jiale Zhang, Jing Li, Qiang Xiang, Runqi Wang, Shuang Sun, Wei Zhu, Xu Tang, Yao Hu, Yibo Chen, Yuhao Huang, Yuxuan Duan, Zhiyi Chen, and Ziyuan Guo. Firered-image-edit-1.0 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.13344, 2026.
- [110] Yinghao Tang, Xueding Liu, Boyuan Zhang, Tingfeng Lan, Yupeng Xie, Jiale Lao, Yiyao Wang, Haoxuan Li, Tingting Gao, Bo Pan, et al. Igenbench: Benchmarking the reliability of text-to-infographic generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.04498, 2026.
- [111] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2405.09818. URL <https://github.com/facebookresearch/chameleon>.
- [112] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805, 2023.
- [113] Gemma Team, Sherif El Abd, Vaibhav Aggarwal, Robin Algayres, Alek Andreev, Olivier Bachem, Ian Ballantyne, Cormac Brick, Victor Cărbune, Michelle Casbon, et al. Gemma 4 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.02770, 2026.
- [114] 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.
- [115] 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.
- [116] Super Intelligence Team. Firered-image-edit-1.0 technical report. 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.13344>.
- [117] Thinking Machines Lab. Inkling: Our open-weights model. <https://thinkingmachines.ai/news/introducing-inkling/>, July 2026. Accessed: 2026-09-06.

- [118] Changyao Tian, Danni Yang, Guanzhou Chen, Erfei Cui, Zhaokai Wang, Yuchen Duan, Penghao Yin, Sitao Chen, Ganlin Yang, Mingxin Liu, et al. Internvl-u: Democratizing unified multimodal models for understanding, reasoning, generation and editing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.09877, 2026.
- [119] Michael Tschanen, Alexey Gritsenko, Xiao Wang, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Nikhil Parthasarathy, Talfan Evans, Lucas Beyer, Ye Xia, Basil Mustafa, et al. Siglip 2: Multilingual vision-language encoders with improved semantic understanding. Localization, and Dense Features, 6, 2025.
- [120] Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al. Neural discrete representation learning. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30, 2017.
- [121] Feng Wang and Zihao Yu. Coefficients-preserving sampling for reinforcement learning with flow matching. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.05952, 2025.
- [122] 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.
- [123] Haozhe Wang, Cong Wei, Weiming Ren, Jiaming Liu, Fangzhen Lin, and Wenhu Chen. Rationalrewards: Reasoning rewards scale visual generation both training and test time, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.11626>.
- [124] Jing Wang, Jiajun Liang, Jie Liu, Henglin Liu, Gongye Liu, Jun Zheng, Wanyuan Pang, Ao Ma, Zhenyu Xie, Xintao Wang, Meng Wang, Pengfei Wan, and Xiaodan Liang. GRPO-Guard: Mitigating implicit over-optimization in flow matching via regulated clipping. arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.22319, 2025.
- [125] Ke Wang, Junting Pan, Weikang Shi, Zimu Lu, Houxing Ren, Aojun Zhou, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. Measuring multimodal mathematical reasoning with math-vision dataset. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 37: 95095–95169, 2024.
- [126] Weiyun Wang, Zhangwei Gao, Lixin Gu, Hengjun Pu, Long Cui, Xingguang Wei, Zhaoyang Liu, Linglin Jing, Shenglong Ye, Jie Shao, et al. Internvl3. 5: Advancing open-source multimodal models in versatility, reasoning, and efficiency. arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18265, 2025.
- [127] Xinlong Wang, Xiaosong Zhang, Zhengxiong Luo, Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Jinsheng Wang, Fan Zhang, Yueze Wang, Zhen Li, Qiyang Yu, et al. Emu3: Next-token prediction is all you need. arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18869, 2024.
- [128] Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, et al. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 37:95266–95290, 2024.
- [129] 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.
- [130] Chenyuan Wu, Pengfei Zheng, Ruirao Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyang Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, et al. Omnigen2: Exploration to advanced multimodal generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.18871, 2025.
- [131] Keming Wu, Sicong Jiang, Max Ku, Ping Nie, Minghao Liu, and Wenhu Chen. Editreward: A human-aligned reward model for instruction-guided image editing, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.26346>.
- [132] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. NExT-GPT: Any-to-Any Multimodal LLM. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2024.
- [133] Xiaoshi Wu, Keqiang Sun, Feng Zhu, Rui Zhao, and Hongsheng Li. Human preference score: Better aligning text-to-image models with human preference. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2023.
- [134] Yecheng Wu, Zhuoyang Zhang, Junyu Chen, Haotian Tang, Dacheng Li, Yunhao Fang, Ligeng Zhu, Enze Xie, Hongxu Yin, Li Yi, et al. Vila-u: a unified foundation model integrating visual understanding and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04429, 2024.
- [135] Bin Xia, Bohao Peng, Yuechen Zhang, Junjie Huang, Jiyang Liu, Jingyao Li, Haoru Tan, Sitong Wu, Chengyao Wang, Yitong Wang, et al. Dreamomni2: Multimodal instruction-based editing and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.06679, 2025.
- [136] Shitao Xiao, Yueze Wang, Junjie Zhou, Huaying Yuan, Xingrun Xing, Ruirao Yan, Shutong Wang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. Omnigen: Unified image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11340, 2024.
- [137] Jinheng Xie, Weijia Mao, Zechen Bai, David Junhao Zhang, Weihao Wang, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Yuchao Gu, Zhijie Chen, Zhenheng Yang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Show-o: One single transformer to unify multimodal understanding and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12528, 2024.

- [138] Yi Xin, Qi Qin, Siqi Luo, Kaiwen Zhu, Juncheng Yan, Yan Tai, Jiayi Lei, Yuewen Cao, Keqi Wang, Yibin Wang, et al. Lumina-dimoo: An omni diffusion large language model for multi-modal generation and understanding. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.06308](#), 2025.
- [139] Jinbo Xing, Zeyinzi Jiang, Yuxiang Tuo, Chaojie Mao, Xiaotang Gai, Xi Chen, Jingfeng Zhang, Yulin Pan, Zhen Han, Jie Xiao, et al. Wan-weaver: Interleaved multi-modal generation via decoupled training. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.25706](#), 2026.
- [140] Jiazheng Xu, Xiao Liu, Yuchen Wu, Yuxuan Tong, Qinkai Li, Ming Ding, Jie Tang, and Yuxiao Dong. Imagereward: Learning and evaluating human preferences for text-to-image generation. [Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems](#), 2023.
- [141] Junxiang Xu, Ruisi Wang, Fanyi Pu, Maijunxian Wang, Ran Ji, Tongxi Zhou, Chenyang Gu, Jing Zuo, Hongcan Xiao, Yimeng Geng, Wanqi Yin, Wei Chen, Oscar Qian, Zhengan Yan, Ziqi Huang, Haiwen Diao, Liang Pan, Bo Li, Xiangyu Fan, Dezhi Luo, Fengyuan Yu, Zehong Zhao, Qingying Gao, Tinghui Zhu, Yilan Zhang, Jingqi Tong, Pinyuan Feng, Zhengze Jiang, Letian Wang, Ziyu Guo, Renrui Zhang, Jieneng Chen, Sonia Joseph, Constantin Venhoff, Saman Motamed, Mengyue Yang, Chandra Sripada, Alan Yuille, Philip Torr, Lvmin Zhang, Vikash Kumar, Daniel Khashabi, Nikolaus Kriegeskorte, Raphaël Millière, Vincent C. Müller, Anyi Rao, Quan Wang, Ziwei Liu, Dahua Lin, Lei Yang, Hokin Deng, and Zhongang Cai. Vbvr-pro: A scalable and verifiable suite for native visual reasoning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.26105](#), 2026.
- [142] Zeyue Xue, Jie Wu, Yu Gao, Fangyuan Kong, Lingting Zhu, Mengzhao Chen, Zhiheng Liu, Wei Liu, Qiushan Guo, Weilin Huang, and Ping Luo. DanceGRPO: Unleashing grpo on visual generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07818](#), 2025.
- [143] 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.
- [144] Kai Yang, Jian Tao, Jiafei Lyu, Chunjiang Ge, Jiabin Chen, Qimai Li, Weihang Shen, Xiaolong Zhu, and Xiu Li. Using human feedback to fine-tune diffusion models without any reward model. In [Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition](#), 2024.
- [145] Jingfeng Yao, Bin Yang, and Xinggang Wang. Reconstruction vs. generation: Taming optimization dilemma in latent diffusion models. In [Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference](#), pages 15703–15712, 2025.
- [146] 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. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.20275](#), 2025.
- [147] Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, et al. Dapo: An open-source llm reinforcement learning system at scale. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.14476](#), 2025.
- [148] Yongsheng Yu, Wei Xiong, Weili Nie, Yichen Sheng, Shiqiu Liu, and Jiebo Luo. Pixeldit: Pixel diffusion transformers for image generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.20645](#), 2025.
- [149] Qianhao Yuan, Jie Lou, Xing Yu, Hongyu Lin, Le Sun, Xianpei Han, and Yaojie Lu. Vision-opd: Learning to see fine details for multimodal llms via on-policy self-distillation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18740](#), 2026.
- [150] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In [Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition](#), pages 9556–9567, 2024.
- [151] Xiang Yue, Tianyu Zheng, Yuansheng Ni, Yubo Wang, Kai Zhang, Shengbang Tong, Yuxuan Sun, Botao Yu, Ge Zhang, Huan Sun, et al. Mmmu-pro: A more robust multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark. In [Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics \(Volume 1: Long Papers\)](#), pages 15134–15186, 2025.
- [152] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In [Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision](#), pages 11975–11986, 2023.
- [153] Hui Zhang, Juntao Liu, Zongkai Liu, Liqiang Niu, Fandong Meng, Zuxuan Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Weedit: A dataset, benchmark and glyph-guided framework for text-centric image editing. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.11593](#), 2026.
- [154] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A. Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.03924>.
- [155] Tao Zhang, Yuyang Hong, Yang Xia, Kun Ding, Zeyu Zhang, Ying Wang, Shiming Xiang, and Chunhong Pan. If-bench: Benchmarking and enhancing mllms for infrared images with generative visual prompting. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.09663](#), 2025.
- [156] Bing Zhao, Chenfei Wu, Deqing Li, Hao Meng, Jiahao Li, Jie Zhang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kaiyuan Gao, Kuan Cao, Kun Yan, Liang Peng, Lihan Jiang, Niantong Li, Ningyuan Tang, Shengming Yin, Tianhe Wu, Xiao Xu, Xiaoyue Chen, Xihua

- Wang, Yan Shu, Yanran Zhang, Yi Wang, Yilei Chen, Ying Ba, Yixian Xu, Yujia Wu, Yuxiang Chen, Zecheng Tang, Zekai Zhang, Zhendong Wang, Zihao Liu, Zikai Zhou, An Yang, Chen Cheng, Chenxu Lv, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Hantian Xiong, Hongzhu Shi, Hu Wei, Huihong Zhao, Ivy Liu, Jianwei Zhang, Jiawei Zhang, Kai Chen, Kang He, Levon Xue, Lin Qu, Linhan Tang, Luwen Feng, Minggang Wu, Minmin Sun, Na Ni, Rui Men, Shuai Bai, Sishou Zheng, Tao Lan, Tianqi Zhang, Tingkun Wen, Wei Wang, Weixu Qiao, Weiyi Lu, Wenmeng Zhou, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaoxiao Xu, Xinlei Fang, Xionghui Chen, Yanan Wang, Yang Fan, Yichang Zhang, Yixuan Xu, Yu Wu, Zhiyuan Ma, and Zhizhi Cai. Qwen-image-2.0 technical report, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.10730>.
- [157] 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.
- [158] Kaizhi Zheng, Xuehai He, and Xin Eric Wang. MiniGPT-5: Interleaved vision-and-language generation via generative tokens. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02239](#), 2023.
- [159] Jeffrey Zhou, Tianjian Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Siddhartha Brahma, Sujoy Basu, Yi Luan, Denny Zhou, and Le Hou. Instruction-following evaluation for large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07911](#), 2023.
- [160] Pengfei Zhou, Xiaopeng Peng, Jiajun Song, Chuanhao Li, Zhaopan Xu, Yue Yang, Ziyao Guo, Hao Zhang, Yuqi Lin, Yefei He, et al. Opening: A comprehensive benchmark for judging open-ended interleaved image-text generation. In [Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference](#), pages 56–66, 2025.
- [161] Wei Zhou, Xiongwei Zhu, Lingdong Kong, Bo Chen, Lei Zhang, Yongyuan Liang, Xiaoxia Hou, Ye Tian, Xian Sun, Yingshuo Wang, Linfeng Li, Shengqiong Wu, Leigang Qu, Feng Li, Wei Liu, Julian McAuley, and Tat-Seng Chua. On-policy self-distillation in diffusion models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.24646](#), 2026.
- [162] Wei Zhou, Xiongwei Zhu, Zelin Xu, Bo Dong, Lixue Gong, Yongyuan Liang, Meng Chu, Leigang Qu, Lingdong Kong, Wei Liu, et al. Danceopd: On-policy generative field distillation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.27377](#), 2026.
- [163] Jade Zou, Tao Huang, Weijie Kong, Junzhe Li, Yue Wu, Qi Tian, Jiangfeng Xiong, Jianwei Zhang, Liefeng Bo, and Zhao Zhong. Precise: Sde-consistent stochastic sampling for rl post-training of flow-matching models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.23522](#), 2026.
- [164] Kai Zou, Ziqi Huang, Yuhao Dong, Shulin Tian, Dian Zheng, Hongbo Liu, Jingwen He, Bin Liu, Yu Qiao, and Ziwei Liu. Uni-mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal unified benchmark. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.13759](#), 2025.