arXiv:2611.01860v1 [cs.CV] 1 Nov 2026

Advances in Agentic Computer Graphics

Hengyu Liu[1,*] Jihyeon Je[2,*] Ruiqi Wang[3,*] Mingxuan Wu[1] Haven Feng[4] Qixing Huang[1] Georgios Pavlakos[1]
Hao Zhang[3] Jiajun Wu[2] Maneesh Agrawala[2] Leonidas Guibas[2] R. Kenny Jones[2] Shangzhe Wu[5] Guandao Yang[1]

[1]University of Texas at Austin [2]Stanford University [3]Simon Fraser University [4]University of California, Berkeley [5]University of Cambridge
*Equal contribution.




Figure 1: ***Agentic Systems for Computer Graphics*** *use language models to operate graphics tools and refine their outputs through feedback. From left to right: drawing sketches through sequential strokes [VSZ*25] and refining SVG illustrations from rendered feedback [WYZ*26]; editing 3D scenes from language instructions [SWJ*26] and modifying geometry and appearance to match target images [GHJ*25]; generating articulated 3D assets [ZLL*26b] and inferring executable scene programs from videos [SKK*26].*

Abstract

Computer graphics is built on code. Large language model (LLM) agents can now generate graphics code and iteratively refine it through various feedback. This capability opens the door to a potentially new paradigm of computer graphics, with graphics algorithms increasingly built around agentic systems to automate progressively complex tasks. Over the past years, research on agentic graphics has expanded rapidly across a diverse range of tasks. This rapid growth makes it increasingly difficult for manual literature reviews to keep pace with new developments. At the same time, similar ideas are often described using different terminology across these tasks, further complicating efforts to develop a systematic understanding of the field. In this report, we address these challenges through two contributions. First, we introduce a unified taxonomy for characterizing agentic systems across diverse computer graphics tasks. Second, we develop an agentic literature system that can assist human researchers in analyzing existing and newly published papers at scale. Building on these contributions, we analyze emerging research trends and discuss open challenges in coordinating agents and tools across graphics tasks, designing interfaces and representations for human–agent collaboration, sustaining long-horizon planning and refinement, and reliably evaluating interactive graphics systems.

1. Introduction

In computer graphics, code defines executable procedures for creating and manipulating visual content [Coo84; MWH*06]. Recent advances in large language models (LLMs), particularly their capabilities in code generation, reasoning, and tool use [CTJ*21; YZY*23], open up new opportunities for automating complex graphics workflows. By interacting with graphics environments, LLM agents can execute operations, inspect the results, and use feedback to guide subsequent actions [HYG24; HIJ*24; LCD*25]. We refer to systems that leverage these capabilities to perform computer graphics tasks as **agentic graphics systems**. Agentic graphics systems have demonstrated strong capabilities across diverse graphics tasks, including 3D asset creation and iterative


editing [LCD*25], articulated object animation [ZDH*26], and dynamic scene construction with rigid-body and fluid simulations [LWC*26]. For example, instead of manually specifying and adjusting shader programs [Coo84], users can guide an agent's material edits with a short language instruction and an optional reference image [HYG24]. The rapid growth of agentic graphics research (Fig. 2a), and the strong capabilities demonstrated by current agentic graphics systems motivate our survey.

The demonstrated capabilities of these systems have attracted growing research interest across graphics applications. This expanding body of work poses challenges of both scale and terminology. First, the literature is large and growing at a seemingly exponential rate: our collected corpus includes more than 300 papers published through September 2026 (Fig. 2a). This scale and pace of growth make it increasingly difficult to organize existing studies and synthesize the field's methods and findings. Second, studies across applications such as CAD, animation, and simulation describe functionally similar components using different terminology. Fig. 2b illustrates this variation in the names of feedback (top; Sec. 3.3.2) and planning (bottom; Sec. 3.3.1) modules. These differences can obscure shared design choices and complicate comparisons across works. These challenges make it difficult to assess the field's overall progress and identify broader research trends across graphics applications.

To support a coherent understanding of this rapidly growing field, we address these challenges through a unified taxonomy and an agentic literature survey system built on it. First, we introduce a taxonomy that characterizes agentic graphics systems along four dimensions: *specification*, *base model*, *harness*, and *graphics interface and tooling* (Fig. 3). Within each dimension, we define the key design choices and provide a common vocabulary for describing system components and their roles. This allows similarities and differences in system design to be examined across applications, even when individual works use different terminology. Second, we develop an agentic literature survey system that searches for relevant papers, reads their content, and annotates their designs using this taxonomy (Sec. 4). The system records taxonomy labels, design insights, and limitations alongside supporting source evidence, producing structured reports that support comparison across papers and analysis of broader research trends. By retaining these records across runs, it allows new papers to be incorporated and existing annotations to be revisited as further evidence becomes available. The taxonomy and the resulting literature analysis enable us to synthesize shared design patterns across applications (Secs. 6, 7, and 8), trace emerging research trends, and identify open challenges in agentic graphics (Sec. 9). We conclude by summarizing the survey's main findings (Sec. 10).

2. Background and Scope

In this report, we study agentic systems that use large language models (LLMs) to perform computer graphics tasks. Here, we use the term LLM broadly, including models with visual capabilities or additional reasoning training. Such **agentic graphics systems** must satisfy three criteria: (1) an LLM makes at least some action decisions; (2) the system executes operations in a graphics environment to create or modify graphics content; and (3) feedback on intermediate graphics results or the execution of those operations is used to select or revise subsequent actions during the task.



(a) Rapid Growth of the agentic graphics literature (b) Inconsistent naming for functionally similar modules

Figure 2: ***Motivation for organizing the agentic graphics literature.*** *(a) Rapid growth of our collected paper corpus. (b) Different names used across papers for feedback modules (top; Sec. 3.3.2) and planning modules (bottom; Sec. 3.3.1), motivating a unified taxonomy for comparing system designs.*

This definition is purposefully inclusive: we impose no restrictions on the graphics representation, software platform, training strategy, or level of automation. These actions can draw on a broad range of tools, including image generators, renderers, simulators, and geometric solvers. We allow for diverse feedback sources, which may come from learned models, structured analysis, or a human working with the system. We cover systems that generate, reconstruct, and edit graphics artifacts, across 2D media, as well as static and dynamic 3D content, including operations on materials, cameras, and lighting.

At the same time, we use the above definition to set clear bounds on the scope of our report. The system must contain a learned model capable of using tools and receiving feedback, which excludes many methods that train networks from scratch to directly solve graphics tasks. It also excludes single-pass LLM generation without subsequent feedback, and additionally methods that use feedback only for model training or final evaluation. Moreover, not all multi-step LLM pipelines are agentic, as the feedback stemming from the graphics environment must influence what actions the model takes. That said, an agentic workflow may still have predefined stages, provided the model is influenced by results of the previous stage.

Comparison with Prior and Concurrent Surveys. Prior graphics surveys examine procedural modeling [STBB14], learned shape and scene structure [CRW*20], neural representations and rendering [XTS*22; TTM*22; KBM*20], and neurosymbolic modeling [RGJ*23]. These surveys establish the representations and construction methods that agentic graphics systems can use. Surveys of language model agents address general architectures [XCG*23; WMF*24], multimodal tool use [XCZ*24; YZH*25], software development and GUI interaction [LWC*24; DJQ*25; ZHQ*24; NCW*25], and runtime harnesses [MWC*26; LXZ*26a; TPC*26].

Recent surveys organize agentic visual creation by the scope of controller decisions [HTY*26], autonomy levels and functional components [XWX*26], or the agent's role in generation, editing, composition, and programming [MHQ*26]. Across artifact do-

mains, related work examines the interaction between representations, construction policies, and runtime verification [WHX*26]. Domain-specific surveys also review applications of language models to CAD [ZLA*26].

Our survey organizes agentic graphics systems through a shared design space covering specification, base model, harness, graphics interface and tooling (Sec. 3). We examine how these choices interact across graphics tasks, with particular attention to how representations and available operations determine what agents can construct, inspect, and revise. The application sections (Sec. 6, 7, 8) use this design space to analyze how systems address the visual, geometric, and physical requirements of different graphics tasks.

2.1. Background

Traditional Graphics Workflows. Graphics content is commonly authored through sequences of modeling, material, lighting, animation, and simulation operations, exposed through interactive interfaces or scripts. Procedural rules, shading programs, and numerical solvers automate geometry construction, appearance specification, and physical evolution [MWH*06; STBB14; Coo84; Sta99; ZPW*26].These workflows can also incorporate learned methods for shape and scene generation [CRW*20] and the inference of graphics programs from observations [RGJ*23]. Artists and engineers combine these capabilities, inspect rendered views or the underlying graphics state, and revise content, parameters, or programs to meet their goals. These workflows provide the representations, operations, and inspection mechanisms on which agentic graphics systems build.

Learning to Generate Graphics Programs. Graphics programs can also be generated by specialized networks trained from scratch. Shape2Prog learns to infer programs from input shapes, using a learned approximation of program execution to train the generator [TLS*19]. ShapeAssembly similarly learns hierarchical programs that construct shapes by connecting parts [JBX*20]. In both cases, the program describes how the shape is built, making its structure available for inspection and editing. These representations can support agentic workflows, but the generators themselves fall outside our scope because they do not use a general-purpose LLM to decide which graphics operations to perform.

Non-Agentic Uses of LLMs. LLMs can translate prompts and references into descriptions that specify graphics content. LayoutGPT [FZF*23] provides layouts for image and scene synthesis, while LLaMA-Mesh [WLW*24] generates mesh geometry as text. This approach also supports program generation: StarVector [RPA*25] produces SVG code, and UniCAD [CJS*26] generates executable CAD programs. In these settings, each candidate is generated in a single pass, without iterative refinement based on execution feedback. Agentic systems use this feedback to guide subsequent construction or revision.

Language Model Agents. Language model agents use an LLM to select actions based on task instructions and observations from an external environment [XCG*23]. A surrounding software harness executes these actions through tools and returns their results to the model, connecting language-based decisions with external computation and interaction [SDD*23; YZY*23]. By retaining observations and feedback in context or memory, agents can revise plans, correct errors, and improve subsequent attempts without necessarily updating model weights [YZY*23; SCB*23]. These capabilities provide the basis for delegating parts of graphics authoring and revision to a model while preserving access to existing graphics tools.

3. Design Space of Agentic Graphics Systems

Building on the definition and scope established in Sec. 2, we introduce a unified taxonomy that organizes the shared structure of agentic graphics systems (Fig. 3). This taxonomy defines a design space with four dimensions: specification, base model, harness, and graphics interface and tooling. The *specification* (Sec. 3.1) describes the task, available inputs, and expected outputs. Given these requirements, the *base model*(Sec. 3.2) makes decisions about how to proceed, while the *harness*(Sec. 3.3) coordinates planning, execution, feedback, and memory. The *graphics interface and tooling*(Sec. 3.4) provides the operations, resources, and representations needed to carry out the proposed actions.

Within each dimension, we identify key design choices and denote each option with an icon. A single system may combine several options for the same choice, such as using both rendered images and execution diagnostics as feedback. We reuse these icons in the application tables (Secs. 6–8), providing a consistent notation for comparing methods across graphics tasks and connecting those comparisons to the definitions introduced here.

3.1. Specification

Specification supplies the system with requirements and reference content that guide planning and generation. It is characterized by the target task, input form, and expected output.

Task. Task specifies what activity the system should perform:

- *2D Graphics* creates or edits vector graphics, diagrams, data visualizations, posters, banners, presentations, and animations.
- *Static 3D Graphics* generates and manipulates 3D assets, such as parametric CAD constructs [LNC*26], Blender objects [LCD*25], material and texture modeling, and scene composition [PCZ*26].
- *Dynamic 3D Graphics* specifies temporal changes in visual content, including object motion [ZWZT26; LWC*26], procedural particle effects [ZYW*26; ZWZT26], and camera motion [XWW*25]. It also involves constructing environments and behaviors governed by physical dynamics, including real-to-sim reconstruction [RWP*26; LXL*24], generation of simulation environments [XLL*26; PCZ*26], physical interactions [ZLL*26a; LWC*26], and articulated assets [ZLL*26b],

Input Form. Input form describes the information and existing content supplied by the user:

- *Language* expresses intent and constraints [ZLL*26b].
- An *image* provides a visual reference [YGW*26; KLC*26].
- *Video* provides observations across views or time [RWP*26].




Figure 3: *Design Space of Agentic Graphics Systems. We taxonomize our design space into four dimensions: specification, base model, harness, graphics interface and tooling. We detail subclassification within each system following the taxonomy.*

- An existing *3D representation* supplies content for modification, such as Blender scenes with procedural geometry, material graphs, and lighting configurations [HYG24], or monolithic 3D Gaussian Splatting scenes that can be decomposed into individually editable objects [HGC*26].
- A *document* provides source content for graphics authoring, such as paper excerpts used to construct explanatory animations [JCS*26].

Output. Output specifies what content the system should return:

- A *program* expresses construction operations as executable code, such as Python code for articulated part assembly [ZLL*26b], Blender scene-construction scripts [HIJ*24; LCD*25], or JavaScript game logic [JHX*26].
- A *structured specification* encodes components and relationships for a graphics backend, such as JSON particle-system configurations [ZYW*26], CAD construction graphs with parameter dependencies [LNC*26], or URDF joints [ZLL*26b; LXL*24].
- A *graphics artifact* retains editable content, such as scenes with individually manipulable objects [HGC*26].
- *Rendered media* encode the visual result as images or videos, such as explanatory animations [JCS*26] or rendered dynamic scenes [LWC*26].

3.2. Base Model

As the system's decision-making component, the base model reasons over user requirements and context supplied by the harness. It returns plans, code, or tool calls to the harness, which coordinates execution through graphics tools. Base models are characterized by model type and model training.

Model Type. Model type describes which models make decisions and what evidence they can interpret:

- A *large language model* (LLM) processes textual instructions, code, and tool reports, with implementations based on Qwen2.5-Coder [DCZ*24] or gpt-oss-120b [XLL*26].
- A *vision–language model* (VLM) additionally interprets images, as in GPT-4V-based scene editing [HYG24] or Qwen3-VL-based visual refinement [YGW*26].
- *Hybrid* systems combine distinct backbones across roles, such as language-based planning paired with vision–language scene analysis [XLL*26], or Claude-based code generation paired with Gemini-based visual critique [LCD*25]. Separate roles do not necessarily use distinct models.

Model Training. Model training describes how the base model is used or adapted:

- *Off-the-shelf* models are used without task-specific parameter updates [ZLL*26b; YGW*26].
- *Supervised fine-tuning* adapts a pretrained model using task-specific input–output pairs, with training examples drawn from graphics programs [DCZ*24; GDN*26] or interaction trajectories [HAW*26].
- *Reinforcement-learning post-training* optimizes the model's policy to maximize task rewards. Rewards include geometric fidelity [HAW*26], sketch-token accuracy [YHHP26], and spatial validity [NYW*26].

3.3. Harness

The harness connects the base model to the graphics interface and tooling. It routes model decisions to graphics tools for execution and returns observations, assessments, and relevant memory to the model, allowing subsequent actions to respond to execution results. Here, we identify three sub-axes in the design space: planning and acting, feedback mechanisms, and memory.

3.3.1. Plan & Act

Planning and acting organize the construction and revision of graphics artifacts. The base model uses task requirements and retained context to propose actions, which the harness schedules and

executes through the graphics interface. The harness returns execution feedback to the model for revision. This process is characterized by planning, workflow, and update strategy.

Planning. Planning describes whether a task plan is explicitly represented and how much of that plan is fixed in advance. We distinguish three levels, from more to less fixed:

- *Hard-Coded* prescribes the task steps and their order, leaving the model to carry out assigned steps [RWP*26; GHJ*25].
- *Hybrid* combines predefined stages with model decisions about how to complete them, as in Articraft [ZLL*26b].
- *Non Hard-Coded* lets the agent determine task steps and their order during execution, as in SAGE [XLL*26].

Workflow. Workflow describes how these steps are connected and scheduled, and specifies execution order and the flow of intermediate results:

- A *sequential* workflow executes actions in order, passing each result to the next action [ZLL*26b; YGW*26].
- A *parallel* workflow executes independent subtasks concurrently, such as configuring separate particle emitters [ZYW*26] or furnishing different rooms [PCZ*26].
- A *graph-structured* workflow represents operations as nodes connected by dependencies or alternative branches. Structures include hierarchical task trees, such as room–furniture–object hierarchies that place supporting furniture before dependent objects [PCZ*26], and branching search trees, such as competing scene edits expanded and pruned over successive iterations [GHJ*25; HYG24].

Update Strategy. Update strategy specifies how feedback changes the current plan or graphics artifact:

- *Regeneration* replaces a candidate in full, such as an animation script [JCS*26] or a procedural modeling script [GSY*26].
- A *local patch* modifies selected components, such as particle-emitter parameters [ZYW*26] or object placements [XZY*26].
- *Rollback* restores an earlier state, such as reverting unsuccessful patch segments [ZYW*26] or restoring scene checkpoints after a score decrease [PCZ*26].
- *Replanning* revises intended steps, such as updating a stage's tactical plan [LWC*26] or changing refinement priorities and tool choices [YJZH25].
- *Candidate selection* chooses among proposed updates, such as tournaments over edit scripts [GHJ*25] or pairwise tree search [HYG24].

3.3.2. Feedback Mechanism

The feedback mechanism links execution results to subsequent decisions. A verifier assesses observations from the graphics environment against task requirements. The harness combines this assessment with the underlying observations into a feedback signal, using it to control execution and guide the base model's next action. The mechanism is characterized by the verifier and the feedback signal.

Verifier. The verifier evaluates the graphics result using available evidence and returns an assessment to the harness:

- *Self-verification* has an agent assess its own output, for example by comparing rendered and target views [YGW*26] or inspecting simulated deformation during material tuning [ZLL*26a].
- A *critic* employs a separate agent, which may use the same underlying model as the acting agent, to assess outputs it did not create, such as indoor layouts [PCZ*26] or particle-effect appearance [ZYW*26].
- *Programmatic* verification tests explicit constraints, such as geometric conditions or joint-extent checks [ZLL*26b].
- *Environment*-based verification tests behavior through execution, such as object stability under gravity [XLL*26] or actor motion after simulation baking [LWC*26].
- *Human* verification incorporates user judgments during refinement, such as critiques of generated assets [LCD*25] or feedback on intermediate game content [EPB24].

Feedback Signal. feedback signals are sourced either from assessment or environmental observation.

Assessment expresses a verifier's judgment of a result:

- A *binary verdict* indicates success or failure, for instance in geometric connectivity checks [ZLL*26b]
- A *score* quantifies an artifacts quality, such as visual alignment [ZYW*26] or scene plausibility [PCZ*26]
- A *ranking* orders a set of alternatives through pairwise comparisons [GHJ*25; HYG24]
- A *diagnosis* identifies defects, such as violated spatial constraints [XZY*26] or visual mismatches [YGW*26].

Environmental observations report graphics state and execution behavior through tool outputs. These include:

- *Visual* observations, such as multi-view renders [YGW*26] or motion-frame sequences [LWC*26]
- *Structural scene state*, such as joint axes [ZLL*26b], or object poses and support relationships [PCZ*26]
- *Runtime* observations, such as compilation errors [ZYW*26] or physics-cache and bake states [LWC*26].

3.3.3. Memory

Memory stores information for reuse during task execution or across tasks. In an agentic graphics system, it connects the base model with task inputs, execution records from graphics tools, and assessments from the feedback mechanism. The harness stores selected information in memory and retrieves relevant records into the model's context to inform subsequent decisions. Memory is characterized by retention time and access scope.

Time. The temporal dimension describes how long information remains available for model decisions:

- *Working memory* is the context assembled for the current model call, such as task and tool instructions [ZLL*26b; XLL*26], or renders and plans [YGW*26; LWC*26].

- *Short-term memory* retains context across calls within a run, such as revision histories [ZLL*26b; LCD*25] or render histories [YGW*26; PCZ*26].
- *Long-term memory* stores knowledge for reuse across tasks without changing model weights, such as reusable skills [XZY*26; HIJ*24] or experience records [JCS*26; LNC*26].

Reach. Reach specifies the scope within which stored information can be retrieved for model decisions:

- *Local memory* is accessible only within an individual execution context, such as separate designer and critic histories [PCZ*26], or stage-specific sessions [LWC*26; PCZ*26].
- *Global memory* makes a common store of information accessible across execution contexts, such as shared conversation histories [LCD*25], requirement-status records [XZY*26], or scene representations reused across stages [XZY*26; YLG*26].

Combining both scopes preserves specialized context while supporting coordination.

3.4. Graphics Interface & Tooling

An agent interacts with graphics software through instructions that create, inspect, or modify graphics content. The available operations depend on the software environment, the content representation, and the tools and resources provided to the agent. We examine these choices along five dimensions: action type, graphics environment, representation, tools, and resources.

3.4.1. Action Type

Action type describes the form in which an agent specifies an operation for execution. We distinguish four types: code/script, structured specification, tool/function call, and GUI action. These types differ in how much of an operation the agent must specify and how much is handled by the execution environment.

Code/Scripts. The agent generates or modifies executable programs that construct or edit graphics content. Programs combine graphics API calls with variables, loops, and functions, giving the agent control over operation order, repetition, and parameter dependencies. Applications include procedural modeling and scene layout [SHD*25; HIJ*24], material and lighting editing [HYG24], parametric CAD modeling [BLF26], and articulated object construction [ZLL*26b; LXL*24]. Generated code may contain syntax or API errors, and successful execution does not guarantee that the resulting content satisfies the task requirements.

Structured Specification. The agent describes graphics content or edits using a predefined schema, which an interpreter, solver, or converter translates into graphics operations. Examples include particle-system specifications [ZYW*26], indoor scene layout [BRYC25; ÇHS*24; WCR*26], and template-defined slide components [FWZ26]. The execution layer handles construction, while the agent controls the entities, relationships, and parameters exposed by the schema. Edits through this interface are therefore limited to those the schema can express.

Tool/Function Call. The agent selects a predefined operation and supplies its arguments. Calls support scene construction and editing [XLL*26; YJZH25; PCZ*26], geometry inspection and rendering [SGK*26], and spatial evaluation, including circulation and clearance checks [WCR*26]. The agent determines which operations to invoke and in what order, while each tool implements the requested operation. This reduces the implementation detail the agent must generate, but limits direct control to the operations and parameters exposed by the interface.

GUI Action. The agent operates graphics software through mouse and keyboard input, including clicks, drags, shortcuts, and text entry. Applications include building and mechanical modeling [DDNB25; DLM*26], and image and video editing [TZX*24; WXN*26]. GUI actions provide access to existing interactive workflows, but require the agent to locate interface elements and track application state. The effect of an action can depend on the current selection, active editing mode, or open dialog.

A system may combine several action types. We classify actions by the graphics instruction rather than the mechanism used to submit it: a script passed to an execution tool remains a code action, and mouse or keyboard commands remain GUI actions when encoded as function calls.

3.4.2. Graphics Software

The graphics environment provides the runtime and interfaces through which an agent constructs, edits, and inspects graphics content. We distinguish agent-native environments, agent-adapted environments, and direct use of general-purpose software according to how support for agent interaction is provided. This distinction concerns the environment configuration used by each system. Source availability, API coverage, and documentation access are considered separately, since they can vary within each category.

Agent-native. The authoring interface, state representation, and execution feedback are designed together for agent use. Examples include dedicated SDKs for defining geometry, parts, and joints [ZLL*26b], domain-specific languages with relational operators for composing geometry [WWH*26], and scene-authoring runtimes that combine local operations with explicit state and constraint verification [XZY*26]. Construction and validation operate on shared task entities, such as named parts or scene objects, allowing the agent to relate execution feedback to the target content.

Agent-adapted. An existing graphics environment is extended with a dedicated interface for agent operations and state inspection. The added layer translates requests into application-specific operations and returns structured state or diagnostic feedback. Examples include scene and simulation inspection in Blender [YGW*26; LWC*26], and geometry queries and edit-history management in CAD environments [SGK*26]. The underlying software supplies the graphics capabilities, while the adapter determines how those capabilities and their results are exposed to the agent.

General-purpose. The agent uses existing scripting APIs, procedural libraries, file formats, or GUI workflows without a dedicated authoring abstraction for agents. Examples include graph-

ics editing through Blender's Python interface [GHJ*25], mathematical animation through Manim [JCS*26], and CAD or building modeling through application GUIs [DLM*26; DDNB25]. The agent must follow the software's conventions for addressing content, specifying operations, and interpreting state. A generic script executor or GUI-control wrapper does not by itself make the environment agent-adapted.

Source availability, API coverage, and documentation access are separate properties across all three categories. Access to source code supports inspection and modification of the implementation, while documented APIs may also be available in closed-source software. Human editing and agent control may coexist within the same environment.

3.4.3. Tools

Tools provide callable capabilities for acting on or inspecting graphics content. We distinguish graphics operations, perception models, and validators according to the functions they provide within a graphics workflow. This dimension describes the capabilities available to the agent, while action type describes how operations are expressed and graphics software specifies the environment in which they execute.

Graphics Operations. Graphics operations create or modify 3D graphics state through authoring functions. These include constructing geometry, changing object transforms and materials, and defining part relationships or motion controls. VIGA [YGW*26] uses Blender operations to construct geometry and revise scene layout, while Articraft [ZLL*26b] provides dedicated operations for composing part geometry and specifying joints. The available operations determine the granularity of editing: an agent may adjust individual parameters, modify an existing object, or construct an assembly through a sequence of calls. Their execution updates the graphics state that subsequent observations and checks inspect.

Perception Models. Perception models provide learned capabilities for analyzing visual inputs or generating graphics content. As observation tools, they extract semantic and geometric information from images, videos, or rendered views. For example, SimFoundry [RWP*26] combines segmentation and depth models to recover object masks and spatial structure, and uses a VLM to identify movable parts. Models can also supply assets for subsequent authoring: SAM 3D [SCC*25] predicts object geometry, texture, and layout from an image. Observation outputs inform planning and editing, while generated assets become inputs to graphics operations that place or modify them within the scene.

Validators. Validators assess graphics content against specified requirements and may compute states satisfying geometric or physical constraints. *Solver validators* explore alternative states through optimization or simulation, potentially returning a revised configuration. SceneThesis [LLL*26], for example, adjusts object poses under collision and support constraints, while physics simulators can test stability by evolving a scene under gravity. *Static validators* inspect the supplied state directly, checking properties such as intersections, unsupported objects, or mesh watertightness. For presentation graphics, PosterMELD [HDL*26] applies checks to layout bounds, overlap, and text size. These checks identify violations that subsequent edits can address without prescribing how the content should be revised.

These categories can overlap within a single tool. In this way, a VLM may extract information from rendered views or assess whether a visual requirement is satisfied, while a constraint solver may both diagnose violations and modify scene state.

3.4.4. Resources

Resources comprise reusable graphics content and reference knowledge available during authoring. They may be incorporated into the output or consulted to guide construction and repair. We distinguish three categories: assets, examples and experience, and documentation and rules.

Assets. Assets provide reusable geometry, materials, and other graphics components. Examples include object meshes from BlenderKit and Poly Haven [ZLL*26a], scene objects from Objaverse and 3D-FUTURE [YJZH25], and articulated models from ArtVIP and surface materials from ambientCG [PCZ*26]. Asset reuse reduces construction effort, while the available part structure, joint definitions, and physical properties affect subsequent editing and simulation.

Examples & Trajectories. Examples and trajectories provide construction patterns and diagnostic knowledge that can guide new tasks. These include articulated-modeling code examples [ZLL*26b], CAD construction graphs and reusable subgraphs [LNC*26], diagnostic cases linking visual symptoms to particle-system errors [ZYW*26], and success rationales and failure lessons from animation generation [JCS*26]. Such resources may be curated in advance or accumulated from completed tasks, then supplied as context or retrieved during construction and repair.

Documentation & Rules. Documentation and rules describe supported operations, parameter meanings, and requirements for valid use. Examples include Blender API references [LCD*25], CadQuery documentation and modeling guidelines [AAMJ26], and version-specific Blender schemas and manuals [LWC*26]. These references guide operation selection and argument specification. Their usefulness depends on coverage of the required operations and consistency with the target software version.

These categories describe resource content, while access and maintenance are separate design choices. Resources may be supplied in advance or retrieved on demand, and may remain fixed or be updated as the system accumulates experience.

3.4.5. Representation

Representation describes how graphics content is encoded for editing, simulation, and observation. It determines which entities and properties can be addressed by operations or exposed through feedback. We distinguish six overlapping forms according to the information they retain.

Code. Code describes graphics content through operations, parameters, and dependencies. Examples include Python programs




Figure 4: ***Overview of our agentic literature survey system.*** *The agent searches for candidate papers and organizes them into a reading queue, then examines text and figures to assess scope and assign taxonomy labels (Sec. 3). Curation tools check report structure and save annotations with supporting evidence, design insights, and limitations. These records provide context for subsequent discovery and reading.*

defining articulated parts [ZLL*26b], CAD construction graphs recording modeling operations [LNC*26], and domain-specific programs expressing component relationships [WWH*26]. Retaining these descriptions supports coordinated changes through parameter edits and re-execution.

Geometry. Geometry encodes explicit shape and topology. Examples include CAD boundary representations with addressable faces and edges [SGK*26], and object meshes accompanied by collision geometry and articulated structure [PCZ*26]. These representations support geometric operations and spatial queries. Their topology and component boundaries determine the granularity of editing and verification.

Dynamic State. Dynamic state comprises variables updated during simulation, such as object poses, velocities, particle attributes, and deformation. Examples include cloth and fluid simulation states [LWC*26], and coupled rigid-body and deformable-body states [ZLL*26a]. Simulators advance these variables under specified dynamics. State queries and temporal observations support assessment of motion and interaction beyond the initial configuration.

Scene Structure and Layouts. Scene structure and layout encode object identities, transforms, hierarchies, and spatial relationships. Examples include room and furniture specifications [WCR*26], and object layouts with support and orientation relations [YJZH25]. This structure supports object placement and relational checks, while detailed shape is retained in the associated geometry. Explicit relationships also provide references for edits involving multiple objects.

Pixels. Pixels encode sampled appearance as images or video frames. They provide visual observations for inverse graphics [YGW*26] and comparisons between candidate scenes [GHJ*25]. These observations support appearance assessment but do not directly expose topology, occluded geometry, or simulation variables. Viewpoint and temporal sampling therefore affect which errors can be observed.

Learned State. Latent representations encode visual identity or appearance through features, such as entity embeddings associated with scene programs [ZLZ*25]. State representations instead describe renderable appearance in 3D, as in Gaussian reconstructions of scene backgrounds [RWP*26]. Gaussian primitives have explicit spatial and appearance parameters, but do not inherently provide semantic object boundaries or collision surfaces. Physical interaction may therefore require object segmentation and additional mesh geometry [HGC*26].

A workflow may retain several representations at once, such as a construction program, an explicit scene, and rendered observations. The representation used for editing and the representation exposed through feedback should therefore be identified separately.

4. Agentic Literature Survey System

Given the rapid growth of research in agentic graphics and the lack of a unified taxonomy, identifying and organizing relevant literature and keeping pace with emerging trends have become increasingly challenging. To address this, we provide an agentic literature survey system, that can automatically find new papers, classify them using the taxonomy (Sec. 3), and curate a report. More precisely, the system proceeds through stages of (1) paper discovery, (2) evidence-based annotation, and (3) knowledge curation (Fig. 4). Each run is instantiated with the taxonomy, collection of candidate papers, and previous records, together with a date cutoff and reading budget. Our harness also provides the base mode with the dedicated research tools, following SWE-agent [YJW*24], along with instructions and resources as a portable skill usable with compatible agent harnesses. We plan to release the system publicly.

Table 1: *Example outputs of our agentic literature survey system.*

Output module	SubDGuide [JFA*26]	PLAYGROUND [LHP*26]
Scope	Core, mesh-to-SubD reconstruction	Core, 2D layout generation
Input	Modeling, 3D Representation, Graphics Artifact	2D Graphics Authoring, Language, Image, Graphics Artifact
Base model	VLM, Off-the-Shelf	VLM, Supervised Fine-Tuning (retriever, planner, generator), Off-the-Shelf (verifier)
Harness	Hybrid, Sequential (feedback loop), Local Patch, Rollback, Candidate Selection, Self-verification, Programmatic, Binary, Score, Diagnosis, Visual, Structural Scene State, Short-Term Memory, Local Memory	Hybrid, Sequential (feedback loop), Regeneration, Candidate Selection, Replanning, Critic, Ranking, Binary, Diagnosis, Visual, Structural Scene State, Short-Term Memory, Global Memory, Local Memory
Graphics interface	Structured Specification, Tool/Function Call, Agent-Adapted, Graphics Operations, Perception Models, Validators, External reference resources not reported, Geometry, Pixels	Structured Specification, Agent-Adapted, Authoring, Observation, Examples & Trajectories, Documentation & Rules, Scene Structure and Layouts, Pixels
Design insight	Separating semantic decisions from geometric execution allows proposed repairs to be checked before replacing the current result.	Conditioning each planning step on the current render adapts grouping and placement to the evolving canvas.
Limitation analysis	Repairs depend on the initial cage and supported topology operations; missing components and arbitrary edge flow cannot generally be recovered.	Previously accepted groups remain fixed, restricting recovery from early layout errors.
Evidence	Secs. 3.1–3.5, 4.1, 5; Tables 6–7; Appendices C–D	Secs. 4.1–4.6, 5.1; Algorithm 1; Appendices C.1, C.4

4.1. System Design

Paper discovery. To automatically identify new and relevant papers, our agent first scans publication listings and searches the web using customized queries [NHB*21]. The query can be iteratively refined based on retrieval results, following the framework in ReAct [YZY*23]. Throughout this process, the system maintains a list of candidate papers by identifying and merging related works, removing duplicates, and verifying publication versions against official sources. The agent then reviews the abstracts of selected candidate papers, prioritizing full-text reading based on the date cutoff and available budget, while deferring uncertain or unread candidates to subsequent runs.

Evidence-based annotation. Once a paper is selected, the agent reads its text and inspects relevant figures and tables using dedicated tools [YJW*24]. Following PaperQA2 [SCL*24], the agent gathers supporting evidence before classifying the work. Based on this evidence, it identifies how the main agent interacts with graphics content, determines whether the paper falls within the scope of the survey, and assigns taxonomy labels. The agent classifies each paper according to our unified taxonomy, ensuring consistent categorization across works despite minor differences in terminology. The generated annotation retains source references, distinguishes reported facts from the agent's interpretations, and separates training, inference, and evaluation procedures. The agent also flags cases with insufficient supporting evidence.

Knowledge curation. To enable reuse and refinement in subsequent runs, the system maintains a curated record of paper versions, annotations, and supporting evidence, independent of the agent's temporary working context [SYNG24]. Before saving each annotation, the system verifies that all required fields are present and that the assigned labels adhere to the taxonomy. We note that while these checks identify missing or inconsistent entries, they do not verify the correctness of the classifications. When a work is flagged for insufficient supporting evidence, the agent can revisit the paper within the allocated budget. Each paper is saved independently to preserve progress in case of interruptions, allowing subsequent runs to resume from unresolved candidates and revisit existing annotations when new versions or evidence become available.

4.2. Agentic Survey Findings

4.2.1. Search Results

We ran the system using GPT-6 Astra with medium reasoning effort to automatically compile a corpus of 350 papers published between 2024 and September 2026, followed by manual verification of relevance. For each retained paper, the system records taxonomy labels, design insights, limitations, and source locations, supporting comparison and verification of the analysis. As an illustrative example, we walk through the analysis of SubDGuide [JFA*26] and PLAYGROUND [LHP*26] in Table 1 to demonstrate how the system output facilitates comparison. For PLAYGROUND, the analysis distinguishes fine-tuned retrieval, planning, and generation modules from an off-the-shelf verifier. It also highlights how each system's limitations relate to its editing capabilities: SubDGuide verifies local repairs but remains constrained by its initial control mesh, whereas PLAYGROUND revises the current group of elements while keeping previously accepted groups fixed. Comparing these update strategies helps explain why certain errors remain difficult to correct.




Figure 5: ***Design patterns in the annotated corpus.*** *Analysis in (a) observation types, (b) update strategies, (c) resources. (a.1–a.3) Task distributions by observation category; (b.1) Temporal trends in update strategy and (b.2) Update strategy by task; (c.1) Temporal trends in resources and (c.2) Resource counts by task. Task percentages use all assignments within each observation category; temporal percentages use records annotated for each field and period.*

4.2.2. Search Analysis

Our agentic literature survey system enables us to systematically analyze a large body of existing works using our proposed taxonomy, providing new insights into common patterns and emerging trends across the literature (Fig. 5). Our analysis reveals several notable patterns, four of which we discuss below.

(1) Feedback observations: Visual feedback is the most widely used observation type, appearing in 77.0% of the 304 works that use observation as feedback (Fig. 5a). This is expected given the rapid development of VLMs, which enable agents to interpret outputs and provide feedback without task-specific visual evaluators. 58.2% combine multiple observation categories, suggesting that a single observation type may be often insufficient. For instance, geometric measurements and simulations provide additional information about structural and physical validity that may not be apparent from visual feedback alone [BLF26; CZS*26]. The choice of feedback also varies across tasks: scene generation accounts for the largest share of assignments involving visual and structural observations (Fig. 5a.1, a.3), whereas CAD generation accounts for the largest share involving runtime observations(Fig. 5a.2). This difference may reflect the greater emphasis on geometric precision and executable correctness in CAD workflows.

(2) Update strategies: Different tasks utilize different approaches to revising generated outputs. CAD generation more frequently relies on full regeneration, whereas scene generation more frequently uses local patch updates (Fig. 5b.2). One possible explanation is that scene representations often allow individual objects and their properties to be modified independently, while CAD operations can involve dependencies between modeling steps, making local modifications more challenging. Beyond choosing how to update an artifact, some systems also evaluates whether a revision should be retained. For example, SceneSmith [PCZ*26], restores previous checkpoints when critic scores decline, allowing unsuccessful updates to be reversed.

(3) Supporting resources: The type of assets systems utilize also differ across tasks (Fig. 5c.2). Scene generation most frequently uses asset libraries which supplies reusable scene components [PCZ*26], while CAD generation relies on documentation and rules, which helps agents select assets are the most frequently recorded resource category for scene generation, while documentation and rules are the most frequent for CAD generation, which helps agents select appropriate modeling operations [AAMJ26]. This distinction reflects the different requirements of these tasks: scene generation often involves selecting and arranging existing assets, whereas CAD generation requires precise use of modeling tools and operations.

(4) Trend analysis: Our agentic literature survey system also enables us to examine how system designs evolve over time, revealing several notable trends. Local revision becomes increasingly common, with local patching rising from 50.0% to 83.0% across the analyzed period (Fig. 5b.1). Additionally, documentation and rules become more prevalent as supporting resources, reaching 85.3% of records in the latest period (Fig. 5c.1). This may reflect the growing use of specialized graphics tools and APIs, where explicit documentation helps agents perform complex operations reliably. Together, these trends suggest a shift toward systems that integrate richer feedback, make targeted revisions, and rely more heavily on explicit task knowledge.

5. Datasets and Benchmarks for Agentic Graphics

As agentic systems become increasingly capable of interacting with graphics environments, evaluating their ability to reliably per-




Figure 6: ***Existing benchmarks and datasets for evaluating static and dynamic artifacts.*** *We show examples of datasets for CAD [MKC*25], Blender objects [GSY*26], and scene generation [LLL*25] for static, and articulated objects [ZLL*26b], dynamic scenes [TSM*26], and motion graphics [MA25] generation for dynamic outputs.*

form graphics tasks is becoming increasingly important. General-purpose vision-language and spatial understanding benchmarks provide an important foundation for this evaluation, measuring capabilities such as object recognition, spatial relationships, visual reasoning, and scene understanding [AMKK22; CCN20; STG*20; MAZ*24]. Building on these general-purpose evaluation on spatial perception, recent work on agentic graphics has introduced benchmarks that evaluate models as interactive systems for more complex graphics tasks: agents must interpret a graphics goal, reason about the current scene or state, use graphics-specific tools or programs, and produce a correct and usable artifact.

Spatial understanding in agents. A fundamental capability underlying agentic graphics is the ability to understand and reason about space. Existing benchmarks probe this capability through identifying spatial relationships, estimating distances and directions, or reasoning about the relative positions of objects [CXK*24; MYdM*25]. Recent work extends these evaluations through limited-view inference, multi-view integration, 3D grounding, and geometric reasoning [HZC*23; XWW*24; ZWZ*25], testing whether multimodal models can form a coherent understanding of 3D structure from visual observations. Other approaches incorporate explicit 3D representations or geometric supervision to strengthen this capability [WKZ*25; JLW*26; FZL*26; AMKK22; CCN20]. Some assess semantic understanding and multi-step action planning in exploratory 3D environments [STG*20; MAZ*24]. These evaluations primarily measure spatial and metric reasoning, providing a foundation for assessing whether agents possess the 3D understanding required to subsequently interact with and manipulate graphics environments.

Evaluation of graphics artifacts. Building on these general-purpose evaluation on spatial perception, recent work on agentic graphics has introduced benchmarks that evaluate models as interactive systems for more complex graphics tasks: agents must interpret a graphics goal, reason about the current scene or state, use graphics-specific tools or programs, and produce a correct and usable artifact. Many existing benchmarks focus on evaluating the correctness and quality of the resulting graphics artifacts on various aspects, such as material [CSL*23], artistic quality [HYS*24; LLLK22], or semantic understanding [QLF*25; YXP*24]. CAD-Assistant [MKC*25] evaluates CAD generation given various input types. 3DCodeBench [GSY*26], VoxelCodeBench [ZB26], and BrickBench [KXJ*26] evaluate agents that translate textual and visual specifications into executable Blender programs, voxel representations, and lego assemblies respectively. MoVer [MA25] does so in the motion graphics domain through first-order spatio-temporal logic predicates to verify generations. IR3D-Bench [LLL*25] evaluates image-to-3D scene reconstruction on various aspects of spatial perception, including localization, visual appearance, and semantics. These benchmarks assess whether the requested graphics task was successfully executed, while also enabling evaluation of properties such as geometric validity and artistic preference.

At the same time, benchmarks also evaluate artifacts at multiple levels, moving beyond simple, one-shot operations and towards complex workflows that require multiple sequential edits, iterative refinement, and reasoning. BlenderGym [GHJ*25] evaluates agents that transform an existing Blender scene toward a specified target through operations including object placement, lighting, material, and geometry editing, with verification at each stage of the edit. Op-CAD [BGX26] evaluates construction through long sequences of CAD operations. VIGA [YGW*26] evaluates an iterative code-render-inspect process in which agents generate graphics programs, inspect rendered results, and revise their outputs. BVB [TSM*26] and 4DCodeBench [SKK*26] extends this setting to video-to-3D, evaluating both perceptual similarity and preservation of underlying spatio-temporal information.

Evaluation of agentic interaction and coordination. As agentic graphics systems become more complex, benchmarks are expand-

ing beyond evaluation of the final artifact to assess agents' ability to directly interact with the environment and coordinate across a sequence of actions. ALE [SHZ*26] and OSWorld [XZC*24] evaluate computer-use agents on various long-horizon tasks that require the agent to execute GUI interactions and software tools. 3DHarnessBench [LGPO26] and SceneActBench [ZZY*26] evaluate reconstruction under various interactive settings, including single- and multi-view inputs, arbitrary viewpoint access, and full 3D interaction. CADWorld [DLM*26] extends this to CAD workflows by evaluating computer-use agents on mechanical CAD workflows. Collectively, these benchmarks enable evaluation at both the outcome and process levels: in addition to assessing whether an agent achieves the desired final result, they provide an interaction trajectory that can be analyzed to evaluate how the agent plans, coordinates, and executes a sequence of actions within the environment.

6. Application: 2D Graphics

2D graphics editing supports the creation, modification, and refinement of visual artifacts, ranging from vector illustrations and sketches to scientific figures, data visualizations, and presentation layouts. These artifacts differ in their underlying representations, structural constraints, and intended uses. Unlike raster image generation, which primarily targets the final appearance, many graphics editing systems operate on structured representations, such as SVG, executable visualization code, or editable design elements, allowing agents to reason about individual components and perform localized modifications. We organize agentic 2D graphics editing into five application categories: *SVG and vector graphics*, *visual design and editing*, *scientific figures and diagrams*, *data visualization and plot generation*, and *document and presentation graphics*. Tab. 2 summarizes representative systems from each category.

For *SVG and vector graphics*, many works focus on constructing editable visual artifacts from language, images, or other visual references. Unlike pixel-based representations, vector graphics encode shapes, paths, and visual attributes explicitly, enabling localized editing and scalable rendering. For static SVG generation, many works utilize VLM-based rendering feedback into iterative generation [PKH*26; WYZ*26; LWH*26]. Beyond static graphics, Decomate [PMS*25] and LogoMotion [LKW*25] organize visual elements into semantic groups and animate them through code synthesis. Others extend this workflow to visual templates [YFZ*26] or shader-based motion graphics [YS25]. Together, these methods highlight the importance of grounding structured visual representations in rendered evidence, while preserving component-level editability throughout the generation process.

Visual design and editing supports the creation and modification of graphics through interactive tools, sequential drawing actions, and structured layout representations. These tasks vary in the level of abstraction at which agents operate, from direct manipulation of existing graphics to the construction of new compositions from high-level requirements. PSDesigner [STH*26] addresses graphic design through a human-like creative workflow built around Photoshop tool use, while [YLJ*26] explores editable visual design through web-based representations. Beyond direct graphic editing, SketchAgent [VSZ*25] generates sketches through sequential language-driven actions, allowing the user to collaboratively generate a sketch with the agent. AgenticDesigner [YLX*26] and WorldCraft [SFY*26] extends text-driven construction to layout and scene generation. Together, these approaches span tool-mediated editing, sequential drawing, and spatial composition, highlighting the need to translate high-level design intent into localized operations while preserving the coherence and editability of the resulting artifact.




Figure 7: *SketchAgent [VSZ*25] provides a collaborative system between the user and the agent to generate a sequence of sketch strokes given a text prompt. The generated sketch can be additionally edited or animated.*




Figure 8: *PaperBanana [ZMS*26] generates paper-ready academic illustrations by orchestrating specialized agents, each for: retrieving references, planning the content based on text, stylizing aesthetics, rendering and generating executable code for visualization, and finally refining the content through self feedback.*

Scientific figure and diagram generation aims to translate scientific descriptions, concepts, or visual references into graphics that communicate technical information while preserving domain-specific conventions and relationships among components. For academic illustration, PaperBanana [ZMS*26] addresses the generation of methodology diagrams and scientific plots through orchestrating specialized agents. Many others invesigate agentic or automated workflows for producing and refining editable scientific illustrations, reflecting a growing interest in making scientific figures not only easier to generate and refine, but also more editable and adaptable to iterative design needs [ZLW*26; LXZ*26b; ZSW*26; SLXL26; HZG*26]. A related line of work focuses on constructing diagrams from textual descriptions: text-to-diagram generation and editing [WTC*25], compositional diagram generation [ZLL25], text-guided geometric construction where spatial and

Method	Base Model		Harness				Graphics Interface & Tooling				
	Type	*Training*	*Update*	*Verifier*	*Assessment*	*Observation*	*Action*	*Software*	*Tools*	*Resources*	*Representation*
Decomate [PMS*25]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration	Human	–	Visual	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations	–	Code/Script, Layouts
LogoMotion [LKW*25]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Critic, Programmatic	Diagnosis	Visual, Structural state	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations, Validators	–	Code/Script, Layouts
PSDesigner [STH*26]	VLM	SFT, RL	Local Patch	Self	–	Visual, Structural state	Tool/Function Call	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations	Assets	Layouts
SketchAgent [VSZ*25]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	–	–	Visual, Structural state	Structured Specification	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Assets, Documentation & Rules	Layouts
PaperBanana [ZMS*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration	Critic	Diagnosis	Visual	–	General-Purpose	Perception Models	Examples & Trajectories, Documentation & Rules	Pixels
DeTikZify [BPE24]	VLM	SFT	Candidate Selection	Programmatic	Score	Runtime	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations, Perception Models, Validators	–	Code/Script
MatPlotAgent [YZW*24]	Hybrid	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration	Critic, Programmatic	Diagnosis	Runtime	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations	–	Code/Script
PlotGen [GMRD25]	Hybrid	Off-the-Shelf	–	Critic, Programmatic	Diagnosis	Runtime	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations	–	Code/Script
PosterAgent [PLJ*25]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Critic	Binary, Score	Visual	Structured Specification	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Assets, Examples & Trajectories	Layouts
SeaSlides [FWZ26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Critic, Programmatic	Binary, Score	Runtime	Structured Specification	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Assets, Documentation & Rules	Layouts
SLIDEFORGE [ZWX*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Critic	Binary, Score	Visual, Structural state	Structured Specification	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Assets	Layouts

Table 2: *Representative 2D graphics systems discussed in Sec. 6, characterized using the design space in Sec. 3.*




Figure 9: *LL3M [LCD*25] generates editable Blender programs using retrieved API documentation, then uses visual feedback to guide iterative code revisions and verify whether they resolve the identified issues. In this example, an initially missing hydrant cap is added but remains detached, prompting a further revision to lower it into place before a final visual check confirms its attachment.*

geometric relationships constrain the resulting figure [ZWY*26]. Others focus on reconstructing existing visual content into editable representations. DeTikZify [BPE24] targets the translation of existing scientific figures and sketches into executable TikZ programs, while ViCo [DZL*26] and ChartCoder [ZLS*25] addresses chart-to-code generation, translating chart images into code. These tasks impose different requirements: illustration generation must organize scientific content into a coherent visual narrative, diagram construction must realize specified relationships and constraints, and graphic replication must recover the visual structure of a reference. Across these settings, a central challenge is to combine semantic understanding with reliable graphical construction, while supporting targeted revisions that preserve the correctness and coherence of the resulting figure.

Data visualization aims to translate data and visualization requests into charts and plots, typically through executable code. Unlike scientific illustration generation, which primarily communicates scientific concepts through diagrams and illustrations, data visualization transforms structured data into charts whose visual encodings must accurately reflect the underlying values and relationships. Existing work addresses this problem from complementary directions. Query-driven systems such as MatPlotAgent [YZW*24] and PlotGen [GMRD25] focus on the generation process itself, using query interpretation, candidate code execution, and feedback to identify and correct errors. A complementary line of work improves the code-generation models themselves: [NNZ*25; NCC*25] develop specialized visualization code-generation approaches, with the latter extending support across multiple programming languages. These approaches address distinct bottlenecks: interpreting ambiguous visualization requests, generating reliable executable code, and aligning rendered outputs with visual requirements. Together, they highlight the importance of evaluating visualization systems not only by whether the generated code executes, but also by whether it faithfully represents the data and satisfies the intended visual design.

Document and presentation design involves arranging text and visual elements into coherent artifacts while satisfying constraints on layout, information hierarchy, and stylistic consistency. Unlike isolated figure generation, these tasks require coordinating multiple elements within a page or slide and, for presentations, maintaining coherence across a slide deck. For posters and banners, Paper2Poster [PLJ*25] and PosterForest [CPSS26] explore automated poster creation from scientific content, with PosterMELD [HDL*26] emphasizing controllable design diversity and editable, print-ready outputs. BannerAgency [WST25] extends this problem to advertising banners, where content and visual composition must fit a more constrained format. Presentation-generation methods address the additional challenge of organizing content across slides: [GWZ*25; ZMY*26; ZGK*25; XXC*25; LZX*25] explore automated or agentic approaches to slide creation, with different emphases on visual generation, environment-grounded reflection, evaluation, and multimodal collaboration. Other methods




Figure 10: Left: *BlenderAlchemy [HYG24] uses visual feedback to revise material programs, adjusting shader parameters and graph structure to match text instructions.* Right: *ShapeCraft [ZJLD25] uses the object's component structure to guide texture generation, aligning surface appearance with the text description.*




Figure 11: *ViSculpt [PPZ*26] decomposes language requests into localized edits on existing meshes using a compact set of sculpting primitives in Blender's GUI. View selection and target masks constrain where these actions operate, while before-and-after visual feedback guides refinement of localization and brush parameters. Successful operations are stored in a reference library for reuse.*

make slide generation more controllable and adaptable after initial creation. MemSlides [JXZY26] uses hierarchical memory to support personalization and iterative revision, SeaSlides [FWZ26] introduces a semantic abstraction layer for slide generation, and SLIDEFORGE [ZWX*26] treats slides as structured artifacts to facilitate controlled editing. Together, these methods address complementary aspects of document design: organizing content within a fixed canvas, coordinating visual structure across multiple slides, and enabling revisions without rebuilding the entire artifact. This makes both global consistency and local editability central challenges in automated document and presentation design.

7. Application: Modeling Static 3D Assets

7.1. Object Modeling

Object modeling creates and modifies the geometry and surface appearance of 3D assets, often through editable programs or direct mesh operations. We discuss three related tasks: *geometry construction*, *texture and material modeling*, and *asset editing*, with engineering-oriented CAD tasks covered in Sec. 7.2. These tasks overlap: an edit may change either geometry or appearance. Tab. 3 compares representative methods within our design space.

For *geometry construction*, a central challenge is translating descriptions into geometry that reflects the intended part structure and spatial relations. LL3M [LCD*25] addresses this through an iterative Blender programming workflow (Fig. 9). Its planner divides the request into modeling subtasks, which a coder implements using retrieved API documentation. After execution, multi-view critique guides code edits, and a verifier checks whether they resolve the reported defects. L3GO [YCL*25] also constructs objects incrementally, but guides part placement through bounding-box observations and connectivity checks rather than visual critique. aDSL [WWH*26] retains iterative program refinement while expressing part hierarchies and spatial relations through dedicated modeling operators. Procedura [LYH*26] similarly makes assembly relations explicit, determining placement from connections between named parts. Idea23D [CLY*25] also uses visual feedback, but revises generation prompts and selects new candidates instead of editing an existing program. Workflow design also involves allocating computation between exploring alternative constructions and refining existing candidates [CLY*25; ZJLD25]. A useful direction is to let the harness adapt this allocation as construction progresses, deciding when to try another candidate and when to continue refining the current one.

Texture and material modeling creates surface appearance through texture maps or editable material programs. MultiMat [BBK26] approaches this by constructing a procedural material graph one node at a time. Each addition is executed, and its visual output informs the generation of subsequent nodes. Once the graph is complete, an optional differentiable optimization stage refines its numerical parameters to better match the reference image. BlenderAlchemy [HYG24] also uses visual results to guide material programming, but revises an existing program through parameter and structural edits rather than constructing a graph incrementally (Fig. 10). ShapeCraft [ZJLD25] shares the use of optimization for appearance refinement, but optimizes surface textures using both the global prompt and descriptions of individual components. AGILE [SYL*26] likewise operates on texture maps in its object-generation stage, but delegates corrections to an image-editing model guided by VLM critique of discrepancies with validated synthesized views. Its refinement preserves the existing UV layout. These comparisons suggest connecting material-program editing with explicit surface correspondence: program controls determine how appearance changes, while component descriptions and UV mappings identify where those changes belong [BBK26; ZJLD25; SYL*26]. Exposing both to the harness could support material revisions that remain consistent with the intended appearance of each part.

Asset editing aims to make requested changes while preserving the rest of an existing asset. BlenderAlchemy [HYG24] exposes selected aspects of a Blender scene as editable programs over a fixed base state. A VLM proposes alternative edits, and pairwise comparisons of their renderings select the program to refine next. The current best result remains among the candidates, allowing unsuccessful revisions to be discarded. ViSculpt [PPZ*26] shares this reliance on visual feedback, but modifies existing meshes through brush actions in Blender's GUI rather than program edits (Fig. 11). View selection and target masks constrain where these actions operate, while before-and-after screenshots guide corrections to localization and brush parameters. Preservation can also be supported by constraints tailored to the asset: SmartAvatar [HLX*25] guides avatar customization with identity con-

Method	App.	Base Model		Harness				Graphics Interface & Tooling				
		Type	*Training*	*Update*	*Verifier*	*Assessment*	*Observation*	*Action*	*Software*	*Tools*	*Resources*	*Representation*
aDSL [WWH*26]	Object	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self, Human	Binary	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
LL3M [LCD*25]	Object	Hybrid model	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self, Human	Binary	Runtime	Code/Script, Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
L3GO [YCL*25]	Object	LLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Replanning	Self, Programmatic	Binary	Structural state	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
Idea23D [CLY*25]	Object	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration, Candidate Selection	Self	Binary, Ranking, Diagnosis	Visual	Tool/Function Call	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Examples / trajectories	Geometry
ShapeCraft [ZJLD25]	Object	Hybrid model	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Regeneration, Candidate Selection	Self, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
AGILE [SYL*26]	Object	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Candidate Selection	Self	Binary, Ranking, Diagnosis	Visual	Structured spec.	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	–	Visual
BlenderAlchemy [HYG24]	Object	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Regeneration, Candidate Selection	Self, Critic, Environment	Binary, Ranking, Diagnosis	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
ViSculpt [PPZ*26]	Object	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self	Binary, Score	Visual	GUI Action	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Examples / trajectories, Documentation / rules, Assets	Geometry
CADCodeVerify [ATZ*25]	CAD	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration	Self, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations	Examples / trajectories	Code/Script
Seek-CAD [LLS*26]	CAD	Hybrid model	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration, Local Patch	Self, Programmatic, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Examples / trajectories, Documentation / rules	Code/Script
CADSmith [BLF26]	CAD	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration, Local Patch, Replanning	Self, Programmatic, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime, Visual	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Examples / trajectories, Documentation / rules	Code/Script
CIT-CAD [DSXL26]	CAD	LLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Rollback	Programmatic	Binary, Score	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
CADReasoner [KKV*26]	CAD	VLM	SFT	Regeneration, Candidate Selection	Programmatic, Environment	Binary, Score, Ranking	Runtime, Visual	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	–	Code/Script
Vision2CAD [CZC*26]	CAD	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Replanning, Rollback	Programmatic, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime, Visual	Structured spec.	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Examples / trajectories	Geometry
ReCAD [CHL*25]	CAD	VLM	SFT, RL / preference tuning	Local Patch	Self	Diagnosis	Visual	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations	–	Code/Script
AgenticCADedit [SGK*26]	CAD	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Rollback	Self, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime, Visual	Code/Script, Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Documentation / rules	Geometry
SceneCraft [HIJ*24]	Scene	Hybrid model	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Replanning	Self, Programmatic	Score	Visual	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Assets	Code/Script
PhyScensis [WYG*26]	Scene	LLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self, Programmatic, Environment	Binary, Score	Runtime	Structured spec.	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Assets	Scene structure / layouts
SceneSmith [PCZ*26]	Scene	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Rollback	Self, Programmatic	Binary, Score	Visual	Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models, Validators	Assets	Scene structure / layouts
VIGA [YGW*26]	Scene	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Regeneration, Candidate Selection	Self, Critic, Programmatic, Environment	Score	Runtime, Visual	Code/Script, Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Assets	Code/Script
Function2Scene [WCR*26]	Scene	LLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self, Critic, Programmatic, Human	Binary	Visual	Structured spec., Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models, Validators	Examples / trajectories, Assets	Scene structure / layouts
LEGO-Anything [LSD*26]	Scene	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Rollback	Self, Programmatic	Binary	Runtime, Visual	Code/Script, Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models, Validators	Documentation / rules	Code/Script
LiteReality-Agent [HLC*26]	Scene	–	–	Local Patch	Self, Programmatic	Binary	Visual	Code/Script, Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models, Validators	Assets	Code/Script
FirePlace [HBT*25]	Scene	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Candidate Selection	Self, Programmatic	Binary, Ranking	Visual	Structured spec.	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Documentation / rules	Scene structure / layouts
VULCAN [KLZ*25]	Scene	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Regeneration, Candidate Selection	Self, Programmatic	Binary, Score	Visual	Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Documentation / rules	Scene structure / layouts
MUSE [XZY*26]	Scene	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Replanning	Self, Programmatic	Binary	Visual	Tool/Function Call	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Validators	Assets	Scene structure / layouts

LLM · VLM · Hybrid model · Off-the-Shelf · SFT · RL / preference tuning · Regeneration · Local Patch · Replanning · Rollback · Candidate Selection · Self · Critic · Programmatic · Environment · Human · Binary · Score · Ranking · Diagnosis · Visual · Structural state · Runtime · Code/Script · Structured spec. · Tool/Function Call · GUI Action · Agent-Native · Agent-Adapted · General-Purpose · Graphics Operations · Perception Models · Validators · Assets · Examples / trajectories · Documentation / rules · Geometry · Scene structure / layouts · Pixels / texture maps

Table 3: *A summary of the methods of 3D asset modeling discussed in Sec. 7, characterized using the design space in Sec. 3.*

straints, while Nova3D [NBHB26] exposes named parts that allow source edits to target individual components. The comparison highlights the role of the editing interface in connecting a user's request to the controls that modify the intended part of an asset [HYG24; PPZ*26; NBHB26].

7.2. CAD Modeling

Computer-aided design (CAD) supports the creation and modification of engineering designs through geometric models [ZMST15]. Parametric CAD represents dimensions and relationships among features explicitly, making geometric validity and conformance to design specifications central to the task. We organize agentic CAD methods into three tasks: *specification-driven generation* from design requirements, *reference-based reconstruction* from images or scanned geometry, and *model editing* of an existing design. Tab. 3 compares representative methods within our design space.

For *specification-driven generation*, CADCodeVerify [ATZ*25] targets mismatches between requested and generated shapes by converting the design description into requirement-specific questions that a VLM answers from rendered views. Its critic returns yes/no/unclear verdicts and supporting diagnoses, turning unresolved requirements into feedback for code regeneration. To address geometric errors that visual critique may miss, CADSmith [BLF26] supplements rendered views with kernel-derived measurements, including bounding-box dimensions, volume, and face/edge counts. These measurements inform the judge's assessment, while a deterministic check rejects invalid solids regardless of that assessment. CIT-CAD [DSXL26] makes construction intent explicit as constraints checked against the generated program, accepting repairs only when they preserve satisfied constraints and reduce remaining violations. Verification can be organized around both design requirements and construction stages (Fig. 12). CADCodeVerify formulates requirement-specific visual questions [ATZ*25], while Seek-CAD examines intermediate shapes alongside the corresponding design reasoning [LLS*26]. Their comparison suggests coupling construction planning with




Figure 12: Top: *CADCodeVerify [ATZ*25] converts design requirements into visual questions and uses the answers to guide code refinement, addressing discrepancies between requested and generated shapes.* Bottom: *Seek-CAD [LLS*26] compares intermediate shapes with the corresponding design reasoning to guide code refinement, exposing geometry that may be obscured in final views.*




Figure 13: *CAD-Assistant [MKC*25] uses a VLM planner to execute text- and sketch-guided CAD operations in FreeCAD. Rendered views and structured geometry summaries enable the planner to adjust subsequent edits as the design evolves.*




Figure 14: *SceneSmith [PCZ*26] builds scenes hierarchically, from architectural layouts to furniture and supported objects (top). Room- and surface-specific prompts guide local placements while retaining the overall scene requirements; designer (D), critic (C), and orchestrator (O) interactions refine each stage. Bottom: generated scenes for different text prompts.*

verification, so that each requirement can be assessed in a state that exposes the relevant geometry.

For *reference-based reconstruction*, CADReasoner [KKV*26] reconstructs CAD programs from target surface geometry, including simulated scans, using a fine-tuned model to interpret multiview overlays and point-cloud offsets encoding the location and magnitude of geometric discrepancies. Each revision is executed and compared with the target, allowing the harness to retain the best reconstruction or rank multiple candidates by geometric scores. For image-based reconstruction, Vision2CAD [CZC*26] addresses unreliable feature placement by exposing tagged faces and edges with a geometry table, so that structured operations can explicitly reference existing entities. Its backend converts view coordinates into sketch coordinates and reverts candidate constraints that overconstrain the sketch, while a VLM checks modeling previews against the target image before accepting an operation. Their observation and assessment choices in Tab. 3 reflect the evidence available from the reference: target geometry supports direct discrepancy measurement and score-based selection, whereas a single image leaves depth and hidden structure ambiguous even when the constructed CAD model passes geometric checks.

For *model editing*, CAD-Assistant [MKC*25] uses execution feedback to handle the unpredictable geometric effects of CAD commands (Fig. 13). Its recognizer tools pair rendered views with serialized geometric parameters, grounding the VLM planner's subsequent Python actions in the current FreeCAD model. ReCAD [CHL*25] addresses the difficulty of tracing geometric discrepancies to code by training a feedback model to align components in reference images with program blocks. Its central contribution to *verifier* and *assessment* design is a learned critic that identifies erroneous blocks and error types, enabling a separate editor to make targeted corrections such as changing a translation or rotation. AgenticCADedit [SGK*26] addresses uncertain edit targets through geometry queries and visual inspection of selected faces and edges before applying incremental edits. Its persistent execution environment preserves progress, restores the previous state after execution failures, and provides undo for completed edits that produce unintended results. The training, observation, and action choices in Tab. 3 illustrate two routes to identifying edit targets: learning image–code correspondence and exposing geometric entities for inspection. The former maps a discrepancy to a program block; the latter lets an agent query and visually confirm an entity before editing it, without task-specific model training.

7.3. Scene Modeling

Scene modeling supports the creation and modification of 3D environments through the arrangement of objects and architectural elements [HIJ*24; PCZ*26]. Scene layouts represent object positions, orientations, and relationships, making spatial coherence and conformance to scene requirements central to the task. We organize agentic scene modeling into three tasks: *generation* from user requirements, *reconstruction* from images or geometric observations [KLC*26], and *editing* of an existing scene [XZY*26]. Tab. 3 compares representative methods within our design space.




Figure 15: *VIGA [YGW*26] reconstructs scenes through a code–render–inspect loop. By separating read-only viewpoint inspection from scene edits, it gathers visual evidence to localize spatial discrepancies and guide targeted program revisions.*




Figure 16: *FirePlace [HBT*25] grounds placement instructions in constraints between visually selected 3D surfaces. A solver generates geometrically feasible placements, followed by VLM-based selection that assesses whether the resulting arrangements are plausible in context.*

For *generation*, SceneCraft [HIJ*24] decomposes text descriptions into sub-scenes and builds their relational scene graphs. It translates these relationships into constraint functions and uses numerical optimization to determine placements. A VLM reviewer inspects rendered views to guide revisions to the graph or constraint implementations. An outer loop consolidates function revisions across scenes into a reusable spatial skill library. PhyScensis [WYG*26] similarly realizes proposed relations through a solver, but incorporates physics to handle support and stacking; solver feedback guides predicate revisions. SceneSmith [PCZ*26] also refines scenes iteratively, but organizes construction by rooms and supporting surfaces (Fig. 14). A designer edits the scene through structured tools. Its critic assesses rendered views and queried state, while an orchestrator requests revisions or restores checkpoints. Session memory supports successive corrections within each stage and is reset between stages. Beyond the scene-level updates in Tab. 3, SceneCraft's library learning and SimWorld Studio's evolving tools and skills [HIJ*24; KYL*26] suggest coupling feedback with long-term procedural memory. An open design question is how to verify that retained corrections remain useful across different scenes.

For *reconstruction*, VIGA [YGW*26] reconstructs an editable scene from a reference image through a code–render–inspect loop (Fig. 15). Its tools separate read-only viewpoint changes and scene queries from persistent modifications, allowing the agent to inspect a suspected error before editing. Comparisons between rendered and reference views guide targeted revisions to geometry, layout, and appearance. A sliding-window memory retains recent plans, code changes, and renders to support successive corrections. LEGO-Anything [LSD*26] follows a similar reconstruction loop, with safeguards against edits that undo earlier progress. Its LEGO-Plugin uses layout cues from the reference image to guide scene initialization and check subsequent edits. Changes that fail these checks are revised or rolled back, helping preserve earlier progress. LiteReality-Agent [HLC*26] similarly revises a scene program, but grounds refinement in RGB-D scans, enabling calibrated image comparisons and metric measurements. Collision and support checks additionally assess the scene's geometric consistency. Feedback and observation tools should be designed together to support specific corrections. Object-level image comparisons and geometric measurements help identify errors in size or placement [LSD*26; HLC*26], turning a general visual mismatch into a concrete target for program revision.

For *editing*, FirePlace [HBT*25] translates placement instructions into geometric constraints between object surfaces. It uses color-coded renderings to select the objects and surfaces involved in each constraint. A solver generates feasible poses, and a VLM selects placements that suit the scene and instruction (Fig. 16). This separates the interpretation of spatial intent from the computation of precise poses. VULCAN [KLZ*25] similarly combines constraint solving with visual assessment, but considers dependencies between successive moves. It plans from visual history and backtracks when earlier placements block further progress. MUSE [XZY*26] also combines visual and geometric checks, while recording satisfied requirements in memory and protecting associated objects from incompatible edits. Whereas VULCAN reconsiders earlier placements when progress stalls, MUSE restricts later operations to preserve requirements already met. The verification and update choices in Tab. 3 suggest coupling placement checks with scene history and requirement tracking. This could guide which earlier placements to revisit when progress stalls and which satisfied requirements subsequent edits must preserve.

8. Application: Modeling Dynamic Assets

Dynamic 3D asset modeling produces editable descriptions of how objects and scenes move, deform, and interact [ZLL*26b; HPG*26; CQX*26]. We distinguish three overlapping tasks: *articulation* defines permissible part motions, *animation* specifies temporal behavior, and *simulation* computes responses from physical models and interactions. Across generation, reconstruction, and editing, these tasks require feedback that connects the intended behavior to the structures and controls responsible for producing it. Static scene construction is covered in Sec. 7.3, while Tab. 4 compares the dynamic modeling systems within our design space.

For *articulation*, a shared strategy is to construct parts and joints through executable programs; the main distinction is the evidence used to accept or revise the resulting mechanism. Articraft [ZLL*26b] provides an SDK for defining part geometry, joint axes, and motion limits, together with a harness that exe-

Method	Base Model		Harness				Graphics Interface & Tooling				
	Type	*Training*	*Update*	*Verifier*	*Assessment*	*Observation*	*Action*	*Software*	*Tools*	*Resources*	*Representation*
Articraft [ZLL*26b]	LLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Programmatic	Binary	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Examples / trajectories	Code/Script
Artisan [CZS*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self, Programmatic	Binary	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations	Examples / trajectories	Code/Script
Articulate-Anything [LXL*24]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration	Critic	Visual	Visual	Code/Script	Agent-Native	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Assets, Examples / trajectories	Code/Script
Cutscene Agent [HPG*26]	Hybrid model	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Self, Critic	Binary	Runtime	Tool/Function Call	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations	Assets	Dynamic state
ArtiMo [ZDH*26]	Hybrid model	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Critic	Binary	Visual	Tool/Function Call	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations	Assets	Dynamic state
StateFlow [YLD*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Candidate Selection	Self	Diagnosis	Visual	Structured Specification	–	Graphics Operations	–	Geometry, Layouts, Dynamic state
ParticleGen [ZYW*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Rollback, Candidate Selection	Critic	Diagnosis	Visual	Structured Specification	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Assets	Dynamic state
SimWorlds [LWC*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch, Replanning	Critic, Programmatic	Binary	Runtime	Code/Script	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Documentation / rules	Geometry, Dynamic state
DiagGen [CQX*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Regeneration	Critic, Programmatic	Binary	Runtime	Structured Specification, Code/Script	Agent-Adapted	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Documentation / rules	Geometry, Dynamic state
CoDimRecon [XWL*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	Local Patch	Critic, Programmatic	Binary	Runtime	–	–	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Examples / trajectories	Geometry, Dynamic state
4DCodeBench [SKK*26]	VLM	Off-the-Shelf	–	Critic, Programmatic	Binary	Runtime	Code/Script	General-Purpose	Graphics Operations, Perception Models	Documentation / rules	Code/Script

LLM · VLM · Hybrid model · Off-the-Shelf · SFT · Regeneration · Local Patch · Replanning
Rollback · Candidate Selection · Self · Critic · Programmatic · Environment · Human · Binary
Score · Ranking · Diagnosis · Visual · Structural state · Runtime · Code/Script · Tool/Function Call
Structured Specification · GUI Action · Agent-Native · Agent-Adapted · General-Purpose · Graphics Operations · Perception Models
Validators · Assets · Examples / trajectories · Documentation / rules · Geometry · Layouts · Dynamic state

Table 4: *A summary of the methods of dynamic 3D asset modeling discussed in Sec. 8, characterized using the design space in Sec. 3.*




Figure 17: Top: *Articraft [ZLL*26b] builds articulated assets through a predefined SDK that couples part geometry with joint axes and motion limits, using geometric tests to guide code repair.* Bottom: *Artisan [CZS*26] augments this construction with part materials and masses, using MuJoCo collision and stability feedback to guide repairs and independent review to check that they preserve the intended motion.*



Figure 18: *ArtiMo [ZDH*26] connects visual diagnosis to constrained motion editing. It plans causally ordered joint trajectories under URDF constraints, augments rendered keyframes with motion cues, and translates critic feedback into bounded parameter updates through a deterministic actor.*

cutes the program and returns structured validation feedback. Programmatic checks and agent-authored geometric tests make assembly requirements explicit and guide code repair. Articulate-Anything [LXL*24] similarly exposes part placement and joint specification through a Python API, but uses visual references to evaluate the constructed articulation. In its video-conditioned configuration, a critic compares rendered motion with the reference and inspects the program to diagnose joint errors. The comparison therefore concerns how intent is grounded: through explicit construction tests or through agreement with a demonstrated motion. Artisan [CZS*26] extends Articraft with physical attributes and MuJoCo collision and stability feedback, adding evidence about behavior under contact and gravity (Fig. 17). Its independent reviewer checks repairs against the intended function, for example flagging a reduced door-opening range used to avoid collisions. This additional check matters because passing a physical test can otherwise come at the expense of a required motion; structural validity, reference fidelity, and functional usability are complementary criteria.

For *animation*, systems differ in how temporal intent is represented and how an observed discrepancy is mapped to an editable control. Cutscene Agent [HPG*26] organizes character animation, speech, facial expression, and camera motion as coordinated Unreal Engine sequence tracks, using rendered frames to refine staging and camera composition. StateFlow [YLD*26] also maintains an editable world, but organizes changes around persistent object states containing geometry, pose, and semantic attributes. Its rendered feedback guides camera-trajectory repair, while state transitions preserve object identities across successive edits. Some events use discrete target-state asset substitution, illustrating that persistent identity does not by itself establish continuous physical dynamics. At the level of joint motion and visual effects, ArtiMo [ZDH*26]




Figure 19: *DiagGen [CQX*26] uses simulated interaction to diagnose upstream construction errors. After generating deformable geometry and material properties from an image, it probes the asset through grasp-and-release episodes, routes repair to the responsible generation stage, and reruns that stage and its downstream dependencies before retesting.*

and ParticleGen [ZYW*26] both translate visual diagnoses into parameter updates, but constrain those updates differently. ArtiMo plans causally ordered joint trajectories under URDF constraints and augments keyframes with motion cues so that a critic can detect incorrect direction, magnitude, or unintended motion (Fig. 18). A deterministic actor then applies bounded changes to the motion parameters. ParticleGen instead diagnoses discrepancies in coupled emitter configurations through rendered sequences and procedural diagnostic resources, producing localized patches with selective rollback to retain effective changes. Its feedback targets artistic alignment of the evolving effect, which differs from validating the underlying physics. Across these approaches, effective refinement requires both an observation that exposes the relevant temporal error and controls that allow it to be corrected without unnecessarily changing the rest of the sequence.

For *simulation*, an incorrect response can originate in geometry, physical properties, numerical settings, or the imposed interaction, making failure diagnosis central to revision. DiagGen [CQX*26] illustrates an interaction-based approach: it generates a deformable asset from an image, selects informative regions, and probes their deformation and recovery through grasp-and-release episodes (Fig. 19). The observed behavior guides a repair to segmentation, material inference, or mesh processing; the selected stage and all downstream stages are rerun before the asset is tested again. CoDimRecon [XWL*26] likewise uses diagnostic interactions, but supports rod, shell, and solid representations for deformable curves, surfaces, and volumes. Its repair procedure distinguishes problems in motion, geometry, and numerics before revising the material model. Thus, both methods use behavior to guide asset revision, while differing in the representations they support and how a diagnosis determines the scope of repair. SimWorlds [LWC*26] provides a complementary approach at scene level: deterministic checks and runtime-state inspection test assembly relations and motion phases alongside visual review, guiding staged construction and recovery. These checks inspect how the mechanism is configured, while interaction tests expose how an asset responds when exercised. The comparison highlights why an implausible rollout should not automatically trigger material changes: its cause may lie in the geometry, the numerical setup, or the interaction itself. Behavioral tests assess the chosen model under selected conditions; CoDimRecon's material settings, in particular, are not calibrated from real-world measurements.

Across these tasks, matching visible motion must be distinguished from recovering the physical mechanism that produces it. 4DCodeBench [SKK*26] makes this distinction explicit by benchmarking reconstruction from video as executable graphics programs, allowing agents to choose prescribed motion or physical simulation. During reconstruction, agents can inspect rendered outputs and use format checks to revise their programs; the benchmark separately assesses appearance, geometry, and dynamics. Its results show that strong static reconstruction does not ensure accurate temporal behavior, while even a close trajectory match leaves the underlying mechanism underconstrained. The authors therefore identify changed initial conditions, external forces, and longer-horizon prediction as future tests of whether reconstructed dynamics generalize beyond the reference sequence.

9. Open Problems

In this report, we review the emerging landscape of agentic graphics workflows, formally defining their scope and examining the capabilities that enable agents to create and edit visual content. We develop a taxonomy of existing systems and organize recent advances across a range of domains, including computer graphics, computer vision, CAD, 2D graphics, and human-computer interaction. This taxonomy reveals common patterns and shared capabilities across different approaches, while also shedding light on gaps and underexplored areas that warrant further investigation. Building on this analysis, we discuss key open problems and opportunities for advancing the field of agentic graphics.

Multi-agent collaboration and cross-task generalization Graphics agents are evolving from task-specific systems with predefined workflows toward more general frameworks capable of handling complex tasks across modalities and applications. As we move to more complex tasks that require effective collaboration, this will require agents to dynamically decompose objectives, coordinate specialized expertise, and integrate intermediate results into a coherent artifact. Beyond coordinating agents within a single workflow, an important challenge is enabling collaboration across various tools and domains, where representations and assumptions may not be directly compatible. Future work should investigate how agents can share knowledge, transfer skills across tasks, and adapt their collaboration strategies to unfamiliar requirements, rather than relying on manually designed pipelines for each application.

Action spaces and tool orchestration. Visual generation agents increasingly operate through heterogeneous interfaces, including code generation, GUI interactions, API calls, and domain-specific programs. These action spaces offer complementary capabilities: code enables precise, reproducible modifications, while GUI interactions provide access to functionality that may not be exposed programmatically. As agentic systems expand to more diverse applications, a key challenge is determining which actions and tools are appropriate for a given task, when to switch between them, and how to combine them within a single workflow. Although recent works

have begun to move beyond fixed tool-use strategies toward adaptive orchestration, selecting and coordinating actions across heterogeneous interfaces while balancing execution reliability, editability, and cost remains an open challenge. An interesting research directions could be to study what is the optimal kind of action and tools for an given application and agentic graphic system.

Agent-oriented interfaces and representations. Many existing graphics tools and domain-specific languages (DSLs) were designed primarily for human use, and may not provide the most effective abstractions for agents to reason about and manipulate visual content. A promising direction is to develop agent-oriented languages and interfaces that facilitate more effective agent execution and inter-agent communication. For instance, an effective abstractions could enable agents to express, exchange, and compose actions and intermediate representations with minimal ambiguity. For example, AIDL [JZH*25] introduces a hierarchical, solver-aided language for CAD that aligns with the strengths of language models by representing high-level structure explicitly and offloading geometric constraints to a solver. Beyond manually designing such languages, future agents could learn to identify, compose, or even develop task-specific languages and neural primitives that serve as reusable building blocks for visual actions and interactions. However, representations optimized for agent reasoning and execution may not align with what is intuitive or interpretable to human designers. Bridging this gap will require interfaces that translate between machine-oriented representations and human-understandable concepts, preserving the efficiency and flexibility of agent-native operations while enabling users to inspect, understand, and edit the resulting artifacts.

Long-horizon planning, memory, and efficiency. Visual design is inherently iterative. Human designers typically develop an initial concept and progressively refine it by evaluating intermediate results and revisiting earlier decisions. Such iterative workflows rely on retaining and reusing intermediate results, design decisions, tools, and assets across multiple iterations. Enabling agents to follow a similar process becomes increasingly important as generation tasks grow more complex and involve interdependent decisions, multiple rounds of generations, and accumulated design constraints. Agents must maintain project state across iterations, track design decisions and dependencies, and preserve intermediate outputs for subsequent refinement. Beyond retaining context, they should learn from failed attempts, reuse successful strategies, and develop new procedures as requirements change. Without such capabilities, early mistakes can propagate through later stages, making corrections increasingly costly. Moving forward, the community should explore how to build agentic systems that continuously learn from their own outputs and performance, enabling them to adapt, refine their strategies while balancing design quality with computational costs.

Transparency and Interpretability. Agentic workflows can be difficult to understand when intermediate decisions and operations remain hidden behind a final output. Exposing plans, assumptions, intermediate artifacts, and edit histories would allow users to inspect how a result was produced and identify the source of errors. Making these processes understandable without overwhelming users with low-level execution details is an important yet unsolved problem. Effective transparency should support both retrospective inspection and intervention during generation, enabling users to understand not only what changed but also why.

Human interaction and intent alignment. User requests are often incomplete, ambiguous, or expressed in subjective terms such as “make it cleaner" or “move the stars lower". Without a shared conceptual grounding between users and agents, such instructions are difficult to interpret, evaluate, and follow precisely, as users and agents may have different understandings of the intended outcome. Following user instructions requires agents to determine when to infer reasonable defaults, when to expose their assumptions, and when to ask for necessary clarification questions. This is particularly important in graphics, where instructions are often underspecified and multiple visually or structurally distinct outputs may satisfy the same request, making it difficult to distinguish intended design choices from incorrect assumptions. An important direction is to develop interaction strategies that combine proactive clarification, explicit assumption management, and fine-grained human feedback, allowing users to steer the generation process without specifying every implementation detail. An emerging direction in this space studies systems where people and LLMs first work together to build a user-centric common vocabulary of reusable operations that improve alignment on future tasks [JGMR26; JWA26]

Reliable evaluation and validation Assessing generated visual artifacts remains challenging because visual quality involves multiple dimensions, including semantic correctness, spatial relationships, aesthetic quality, and domain-specific validity. While VLMs are often used as critics, these models are known to overlook subtle errors, not align well with human perception, or be insensitive to violations of physical and geometric constraints [KHC23; CXK*24]. Beyond assessing individual artifacts, evaluating agentic graphics systems introduces additional challenges. First, the stochastic nature of agentic workflows can lead to substantial variation across runs, making it difficult to draw reliable conclusions from a limited number of evaluations. Second, many systems rely on proprietary foundation models, making it challenging to disentangle improvements arising from agentic system design from those attributable to the underlying models. Additionally, evaluation at scale remains difficult, as assessing the quality of graphics artifacts often requires specialized expertise and time-consuming human inspection. These challenges call for not only stronger benchmarks but also evaluation protocols that enable reliable and scalable assessment of both artifact and agentic behavior.

Creativity and attribution As visual agents take on increasingly substantial roles in ideation, composition, and refinement, their place within creative workflows becomes less clear. Rather than treating generation as a binary distinction between human- and machine-produced work, future research should examine how creative decisions are distributed between users and agents, how human direction shapes the resulting artifact, and how generated contributions should be attributed. This raises broader questions about authorship, provenance, and accountability, particularly when outputs incorporate user-provided materials, retrieved references, or assets generated across multiple tools. Supporting trans-

parent provenance and meaningful human control will be important for integrating agentic systems into professional and academic design practice.

10. Conclusion

In this survey, we treat agentic graphics as a class of systems in which a base model performs graphics operations through agentic harness in a graphics interface (Sec. 2). The literature that meets this definition is growing quickly and across communities that do not share a vocabulary (Fig. 2). Our survey addresses such challenges by constructing a unified taxonomy that categorizes various works according to four dimensions: user input, base model, harness, and graphics interface and tooling (Sec. 3). To automate this process, we also provide an agentic system that can conduct a literature search to discover candidate works, annotate it with the taxonomy, and retain records adaptively (Sec. 4). We also evaluate benchmarks (Sec. 5) and agentic graphics systems spanning various dimensions and tasks: 2D graphics, static 3D assets, and dynamic 3D assets (Secs. 6, 7, and 8). Finally, we discuss potential directions for the field and open problems (Sec. 9).

Our survey reveals several key insights into the current landscape of agentic graphics systems. Across different tasks, we observe recurring design patterns, particularly in how systems approach planning, verification, and iterative refinement. Most existing systems rely on off-the-shelf base models, with relatively limited exploration of supervised or reinforcement post-training tailored to graphics tasks. In contrast, harness designs exhibit considerably greater diversity, reflecting different strategies for orchestrating agentic workflows and incorporating feedback. We also find that code and structured specifications remain the dominant forms of interaction with graphics environments, while tool calls and GUI actions are adopted depending on the available interfaces. Finally, evaluation practices are gradually expanding beyond final artifact quality to consider multi-step editing, interaction trajectories, and the effectiveness of agentic workflows.

Given the rapid growth of agentic graphics research, establishing a unified taxonomy is increasingly important for organizing and comparing systems developed across different communities, particularly as new tools, interfaces, and agentic mechanisms continue to emerge. We envision our taxonomy as an adaptive framework whose high-level structure can accommodate future developments, while individual design dimensions and categories can be expanded and refined as new approaches emerge. We hope this survey provides a common vocabulary and foundation for understanding existing approaches, identifying emerging trends, and guiding the development of more capable, reliable, and generalizable agentic graphics systems.

Acknowledgments

Guandao Yang is supported in part by the Advanced Micro Devices (AMD) Fellowship in Computer Engineering. Hao Zhang is funded in part by an NSERC Discover Grant RGPIN-2026-07641. Georgios Pavlakos and Mingxuan Wu were supported by NSF grants 2504906 and 2544200. Mingxuan Wu and Qixing Huang were supported by NSF grants IIS-2515626, IIS-2504906, and IIS-2413161.

References

[AAMJ26] ATAEI, MOHAMMADMEHDI, ASKARI, FARZANEH, MALEKSHAN, KAMAL RAHIMI, and JAYARAMAN, PRADEEP KUMAR. "Zero-to-CAD: Agentic Synthesis of Interpretable CAD Programs at Million-Scale Without Real Data". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.24479* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2604.24479 7, 10.

[AMKK22] AZUMA, DAICHI, MIYANISHI, TAIKI, KURITA, SHUHEI, and KAWANABE, MOTOAKI. "ScanQA: 3D Question Answering for Spatial Scene Understanding". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2022, 19129–19139 11.

[ATZ*25] ALRASHEDY, KAMEL, TAMBWEKAR, PRADYUMNA, ZAIDI, ZULFIQAR, et al. "Generating CAD Code with Vision-Language Models for 3D Designs". *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2025. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.05340 15, 16.

[BBK26] BELOUADI, JONAS, BOUBEKEUR, TAMY, and KAISER, ADRIEN. "MultiMat: Multimodal Program Synthesis for Procedural Materials using Large Multimodal Models". *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2026. arXiv: 2509.22151. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.22151 14.

[BGX26] BAI, YIXUE, GU, YUFEI, and XIE, ZEKE. "Op-CAD: Benchmarking and Investigating Operation-oriented CAD Generation". *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Machine Learning*. Vol. 306. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2026, 5245–5264. URL: https://proceedings.mlr.press/v306/bai26a.html 11.

[BLF26] BARKLEY, JESSE, LOGHMANI, RUMI, and FARIMANI, AMIR BARATI. "Cadsmith: Multi-agent cad generation with programmatic geometric validation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.26512* (2026) 6, 10, 15.

[BPE24] BELOUADI, JONAS, PONZETTO, SIMONE PAOLO, and EGER, STEFFEN. "DeTikZify: Synthesizing Graphics Programs for Scientific Figures and Sketches with TikZ". *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2024. URL: https://openreview.net/forum?id=bcVLFQCOjc 13.

[BRYC25] BIAN, ZIXUAN, REN, RUOHAN, YANG, YUE, and CALLISON-BURCH, CHRIS. "Holodeck 2.0: Vision-language-guided 3d world generation with editing". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05899* (2025) 6.

[CCN20] CHEN, DAVE ZHENYU, CHANG, ANGEL X., and NIESSNER, MATTHIAS. "ScanRefer: 3D Object Localization in RGB-D Scans using Natural Language". *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*. 2020. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.08830 11.

[CHL*25] CHEN, JIALI, HEI, XUSEN, LIU, HONGFEI, et al. "CADReview: Automatically Reviewing CAD Programs with Error Detection and Correction". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22304* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2505.22304 15, 16.

[ÇHS*24] ÇELEN, ATA, HAN, GUO, SCHINDLER, KONRAD, et al. "I-design: Personalized llm interior designer". *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2024, 217–234 6.

[CJS*26] CHEN, JINGYUAN, JIN, SHENG, SUN, HAOPENG, et al. "UniCAD: A Unified Benchmark and Universal Model for Multi-Modal Multi-Task CAD". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.05058* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.05058 3.

[CLY*25] CHEN, JUNHAO, LI, XIANG, YE, XIAOJUN, et al. "Idea23D: Collaborative LMM Agents Enable 3D Model Generation from Interleaved Multimodal Inputs". *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. 2025, 4149–4166. arXiv: 2404.04363. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2025.coling-main.280/ 14, 15.

[Coo84] COOK, ROBERT L. "Shade Trees". *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques (SIGGRAPH '84)*. 1984, 223–231 1–3.

[CPSS26] CHOI, JIHO, PARK, SEOJEONG, SONG, SEONGJONG, and SHIM, HYUNJUNG. "PosterForest: Hierarchical Multi-Agent Collaboration for Scientific Poster Generation". *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Ed. by LIAKATA, MARIA, MOREIRA, VIVIANE P., ZHANG, JIAJUN, and JURGENS, DAVID. San Diego, California, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2026, 379–401. ISBN: 979-8-89176-390-6. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2026.acl-long.15. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2026.acl-long.15/ 13.

[CQX*26] CHEN, GUANXIONG, QU, YIDUO, XIA, QIANJUN, et al. "DiagGen: Agentic Generation of Deformable Assets with Sim-based Diagnostics for Robotic Simulation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.23103* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2609.23103. arXiv: 2609.23103 [cs.RO]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.23103 17–19.

[CRW*20] CHAUDHURI, SIDDHARTHA, RITCHIE, DANIEL, WU, JIAJUN, et al. "Learning Generative Models of 3D Structures". *Computer Graphics Forum (Eurographics STAR)* 39.2 (2020), 643–666. DOI: 10.1111/cgf.14020. URL: https://doi.org/10.1111/cgf.14020 2, 3.

[CSL*23] CHEN, DAVE ZHENYU, SIDDIQUI, YAWAR, LEE, HSIN-YING, et al. "Text2Tex: Text-driven Texture Synthesis via Diffusion Models". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2023, 18558–18568 11.

[CTJ*21] CHEN, MARK, TWOREK, JERRY, JUN, HEEWOO, et al. "Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021). eprint: 2107.03374 1.

[CXK*24] CHEN, BOYUAN, XU, ZHUO, KIRMANI, SEAN, et al. "SpatialVLM: Endowing Vision-Language Models with Spatial Reasoning Capabilities". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2024, 14455–14465 11, 20.

[CZC*26] CHENG, XI, ZHAI, CHENXI, CHENG, HANG, et al. "Vision2CAD: A Visual Agent Harness for Explicit Geometry Referencing and Localization in Parametric CAD Modeling". *arXiv preprint* (2026). arXiv: 2609.22688 15, 16.

[CZS*26] CAI, XUDONG, ZHU, RUIJIE, SHANG, HAOLIANG, et al. *Towards Physically Grounded Articulated 3D Assets: A Multi-Agent Pipeline and Benchmark*. 2026. arXiv: 2610.13947. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.13947 10, 18.

[DCZ*24] DU, YUHAO, CHEN, SHUNIAN, ZAN, WENBO, et al. "BlenderLLM: Training Large Language Models for Computer-Aided Design with Self-improvement". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14203* (2024). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2412.14203 4.

[DDNB25] DENG, ZIHAN, DU, CHANGYU, NOUSIAS, STAVROS, and BORRMANN, ANDRÉ. "BIMgent: Towards Autonomous Building Modeling via Computer-Use Agents". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07217* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2506.07217 6, 7.

[DJQ*25] DONG, YIHONG, JIANG, XUE, QIAN, JIARU, et al. "A Survey on Code Generation with LLM-based Agents". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.00083* (2025). eprint: 2508.00083. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.00083 2.

[DLM*26] DONG, ZIHAN, LIU, YUANZHE, MA, ZHIYUAN, et al. "CADWorld: Computer-Use Benchmark for Long-Horizon Computer-Aided Design". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.16251* (2026) 6, 7, 12.

[DSXL26] DU, YALI, SUN, HUI, XI, SAN-ZHUO, and LI, MING. "CIT-CAD: Constraint Intent Tree-based CAD Code Generation and Verification". *arXiv preprint* (2026). arXiv: 2609.07434 15.

[DZL*26] DUAN, JIAXIN, ZHAO, DIAN JIAO SHUAI, LENG, JIABING, et al. *ViCo: Visual-oriented Coding with Self-Reflection for Chart Replication*. 2026. arXiv: 2609.16014 [cs.CL]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.16014 13.

[EPB24] EARLE, SAM, PARAJULI, SAMYAK, and BANBURSKI-FAHEY, ANDRZEJ. "DreamGarden: A Designer Assistant for Growing Games from a Single Prompt". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01791* (2024). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2410.01791 5.

[FWZ26] FANG, SHENGJUN, WU, CHENYANG, and ZHANG, ZONGZHANG. "SeaSlides: Semantic Abstraction Layer for Agentic Slide Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.03298* (2026) 6, 13, 14.

[FZF*23] FENG, WEIXI, ZHU, WANRONG, FU, TSU-JUI, et al. "LayoutGPT: Compositional Visual Planning and Generation with Large Language Models". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 36. 2023. eprint: 2305.15393 3.

[FZL*26] FAN, ZHIWEN, ZHANG, JIAN, LI, RENJIE, et al. "VLM-3R: Vision-Language Models Augmented with Instruction-Aligned 3D Reconstruction". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2026, 31054–31065 11.

[GDN*26] GIANNONE, GIORGIO, DORIS, ANNA CLARE, NOBARI, AMIN HEYRANI, et al. "GIFT: Bootstrapping Image-to-CAD Program Synthesis via Geometric Feedback". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.27448* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2603.27448 4.

[GHJ*25] GU, YUNQI, HUANG, IAN, JE, JIHYEON, et al. "BlenderGym: Benchmarking Foundational Model Systems for Graphics Editing". *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2025, 18574–18583. DOI: 10.1109/CVPR52734.2025.01731 1, 5, 7, 8, 11.

[GMRD25] GOSWAMI, KANIKA, MATHUR, PUNEET, ROSSI, RYAN, and DERNONCOURT, FRANCK. "PlotGen: Multi-Agent LLM-based Scientific Data Visualization via Multimodal Retrieval Feedback". *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*. WWW '25. Sydney NSW, Australia: Association for Computing Machinery, 2025, 1672–1676. ISBN: 9798400713316. DOI: 10.1145/3701716.3716888. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/3701716.3716888 13.

[GSY*26] GAO, YIPENG, SHU, LEI, YE, GENZHI, et al. "3DCodeBench: Benchmarking Agentic Procedural 3D Modeling Via Code". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.01057* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.01057 5, 11.

[GWZ*25] GE, JIAXIN, WANG, ZORA ZHIRUO, ZHOU, XUHUI, et al. "AutoPresent: Designing Structured Visuals from Scratch". *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2025, 2902–2911. DOI: 10.1109/CVPR52734.2025.00276 13.

[HAW*26] HU, TAO, AI, JIAXIN, WEN, LICHENG, et al. "IterCAD: An Iterative Multimodal Agent for Visually-Grounded CAD Generation and Editing". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.13368* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.13368 4.

[HBT*25] HUANG, IAN, BAO, YANAN, TRUONG, KAREN, et al. "FirePlace: Geometric Refinements of LLM Common Sense Reasoning for 3D Object Placement". *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2025, 13466–13476. DOI: 10.1109/CVPR52734.2025.01257 15, 17.

[HDL*26] HU, HAOJIE, DANG, CHENHAO, LIU, YAOJIA, et al. "PosterMELD: Multi-Agent Paper-to-Poster Generation for Controllable Design Diversity with Editable Print-Ready Outputs". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.02218* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.02218 7, 13.

[HGC*26] HU, JICHEN, GUO, JIAWEI, CEN, JIAZHONG, et al. "WorldAct: Activating Monolithic 3D Worlds into Interactive-Ready Object-Centric Scenes". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.15843* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2605.15843 4, 8.

[HIJ*24] HU, ZINIU, ISCEN, AHMET, JAIN, AASHI, et al. "SceneCraft: An LLM Agent for Synthesizing 3D Scenes as Blender Code". *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 2024, 19252–19282 1, 4, 6, 15–17.

[HLC*26] HUANG, ZHENING, LI, YUEYAN, CHIU, JOHNATHAN, et al. "LiteReality-Agent: An Agentic System for Interactable 3D Indoor Scene Reconstruction". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.01863* (2026) 15, 17.

[HLX*25] HUANG-MENDERS, ALEXANDER, LIU, XINHANG, XU, ANDY, et al. "SmartAvatar: Text- and Image-Guided Human Avatar Generation with VLM AI Agents". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.04606* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2506.04606 14.

[HPG*26] He, Lanshan, Pang, Haozhou, Gan, Qi, et al. "Cutscene Agent: An LLM Agent Framework for Automated 3D Cutscene Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.25318* (2026) 17, 18.

[HTY*26] Huang, Yinming, Tu, Shuyuan, Yan, Xi, et al. "Agentic Visual Generation: From Generative Models to Agentic Control". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.06758* (2026). eprint: 2609.06758. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.06758 2.

[HYG24] Huang, Ian, Yang, Guandao, and Guibas, Leonidas J. "BlenderAlchemy: Editing 3D Graphics with Vision-Language Models". *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024*. 2024, 297–314. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-73024-5_18 1, 2, 4–6, 14, 15.

[HYS*24] Huang, Yipo, Yuan, Quan, Sheng, Xiangfei, et al. "AesBench: An Expert Benchmark for Multimodal Large Language Models on Image Aesthetics Perception". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08276* (2024). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.08276 11.

[HZC*23] Hong, Yining, Zhen, Haoyu, Chen, Peihao, et al. "3D-LLM: Injecting the 3D World into Large Language Models". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2023. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.12981 11.

[HZG*26] Huang, Siyuan, Zhou, Yifan, Gao, Yutong, et al. *SciFig: Towards Automating Editable Figure Generation for Scientific Papers*. 2026. arXiv: 2601.04390 [cs.AI]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.04390 12.

[JBX*20] Jones, R. Kenny, Barton, Theresa, Xu, Xianghao, et al. "ShapeAssembly: Learning to Generate Programs for 3D Shape Structure Synthesis". *ACM Transactions on Graphics (SIGGRAPH Asia)* 39.6 (2020), 234:1–234:20. eprint: 2009.08026 3.

[JCS*26] Jiang, Wenjia, Cai, Zongyuan, Shao, Yuanhang, et al. "ManimAgent: Self-Evolving Multimodal Agents for Visual Education". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.30296* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.30296 4–7.

[JFA*26] Jiang, Mengnan, Franke, Christian, Adesso, Michele Franco, et al. "SubDGuide: A Modeler-Inspired Agentic Workflow for Mesh-to-SubD Reconstruction". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.11721* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2610.11721. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.11721 9.

[JGMR26] Jones, R. Kenny, Guerrero, Paul, Mitra, Niloy, and Ritchie, Daniel. "ShapeLib: Designing a library of programmatic 3D shape abstractions with Large Language Models". *ACM Trans. Graph.* 46.2 (Oct. 2026). ISSN: 0730-0301. DOI: 10.1145/3840293. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/3840293 20.

[JHX*26] Jiang, Yilei, Hu, Jinyuan, Xiao, Qianyin, et al. "OpenGame: Open Agentic Coding for Games". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.18394* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2604.18394 4.

[JLW*26] Jiang, Haoyi, Liu, Liu, Wang, Xinjie, et al. "Spa3R: Predictive Spatial Field Modeling for 3D Visual Reasoning". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.21186* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.21186 11.

[JWA26] Jones, R. Kenny, Wu, Jiajun, and Agrawala, Maneesh. *Co-DSL: Human-LLM Co-design of Reusable Spatial Concepts for Layout Generation*. 2026. arXiv: 2610.15290 [cs.GR]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.15290 20.

[JXZY26] Jin, Ye, Xu, Yangyang, Zhu, Jun, and Yang, Yibo. *MemSlides: A Hierarchical Memory Driven Agent Framework for Personalized Slide Generation with Multi-turn Local Revision*. 2026. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.17162. arXiv: 2606.17162 [cs.CL]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.17162 14.

[JZH*25] Jones, B. T., Zhang, Z., Hähnlein, F., et al. "A Solver-Aided Hierarchical Language for LLM-Driven CAD Design". *Computer Graphics Forum* 44.7 (2025), e70250. DOI: 10.1111/cgf.70250. eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/cgf.70250. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/cgf.70250 20.

[KBM*20] Kato, Hiroharu, Beker, Deniz, Morariu, Mihai, et al. "Differentiable Rendering: A Survey". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12057* (2020). eprint: 2006.12057. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.12057 2.

[KHC23] Kamath, Amita, Hessel, Jack, and Chang, Kai-Wei. "What's "up" with vision-language models? Investigating their struggle with spatial reasoning". *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Ed. by Bouamor, Houda, Pino, Juan, and Bali, Kalika. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2023, 9161–9175. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.568. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.568/ 20.

[KKV*26] Kabisov, Soslan, Kirichuk, Vsevolod, Volkov, Andrey, et al. "CADReasoner: Iterative Program Editing for CAD Reverse Engineering". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.29847* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2603.29847 15, 16.

[KLC*26] Kim, Jeonghwan, Lan, Yushi, Chen, Yongwei, et al. "SceneConductor: 3D Scene Generation from a Single Image with Multi-Agent Orchestration". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.08402* (2026) 3, 16.

[KLZ*25] Kuang, Zhengfei, Lin, Rui, Zhao, Long, et al. "VULCAN: Tool-Augmented Multi Agents for Iterative 3D Object Arrangement". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.22351* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2512.22351 15, 17.

[KXJ*26] Kulits, Peter, Xu, Yiqing, Jones, R. Kenny, et al. *BrickBench: Evaluating Agentic Brick Design*. 2026. arXiv: 2610.12452 [cs.AI]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.12452 11.

[KYL*26] Kang, Haoqiang, Ye, Xiaokang, Liu, Yuhan, et al. "SimWorld Studio: Automatic Environment Generation with Evolving Coding Agent for Embodied Agent Learning". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.09423* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2605.09423 17.

[LCD*25] Lu, Sining, Chen, Guan, Dinh, Nam Anh, et al. "LL3M: Large Language 3D Modelers". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.08228* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2508.08228 1–7, 13–15.

[LGPO26] Liu, Ling, Gong, Bingchen, Parakkat, Amal Dev, and Ovsjanikov, Maks. "3DHarnessBench: Probing Agentic 3D-to-Code Capabilities of Frontier Vision-Language Models". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.06535* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.06535 12.

[LHP*26] Lee, Jaeho, Heo, Junhwan, Park, Junghyun, et al. "PLAYGROUND: Progressive Layout Generation with Render-Grounded Planning". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.18865* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2610.18865. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.18865 9.

[LKW*25] Liu, Vivian, Kazi, Rubaiat Habib, Wei, Li-Yi, et al. "LogoMotion: Visually-Grounded Code Synthesis for Creating and Editing Animation". *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '25. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2025. ISBN: 9798400713941. DOI: 10.1145/3706598.3714155. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3714155 12, 13.

[LLL*25] Liu, Parker, Li, Chenxin, Li, Zhengxin, et al. "IR3D-Bench: Evaluating Vision-Language Model Scene Understanding as Agentic Inverse Rendering". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.23329* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2506.23329 11.

[LLL*26] Ling, Lu, Lin, Chen-Hsuan, Lin, Tsung-Yi, et al. "Scenethesis: A Language and Vision Agentic Framework for 3D Scene Generation". *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2026 7.

[LLLK22] Liao, Peiyuan, Li, Xiuyu, Liu, Xihui, and Keutzer, Kurt. "The ArtBench Dataset: Benchmarking Generative Models with Artworks". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11404* (2022). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11404 11.

[LLS*26] LI, XUEYANG, LI, JIAHAO, SONG, YU, et al. "Seek-CAD: A Self-refined Generative Modeling for 3D Parametric CAD Using Local Inference via DeepSeek". *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2026. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.17702 15, 16.

[LNC*26] LIU, YU, NI, JINGZHE, CHEN, YIMING, et al. "CADIR: A Cross-Backend Editable Intermediate Representation for Agentic CAD Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.00891* (2026) 3, 4, 6–8.

[LSD*26] LI, XIRUI, SHI, PENG, DONG, MINGWEN, et al. "LEGO-Anything: Coding Agents for 3D Scene Reconstruction". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.36380* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.36380 15, 17.

[LWC*24] LIU, JUNWEI, WANG, KAIXIN, CHEN, YIXUAN, et al. "Large Language Model-Based Agents for Software Engineering: A Survey". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02977* (2024). eprint: 2409.02977 2.

[LWC*26] LIU, CHUNJIANG, WANG, XIAOYUAN, CHEN, HAOYU, et al. "SimWorlds: A Multi-Agent System for Dynamic 3D Scene Creation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.01766* (2026) 2–8, 18, 19.

[LWH*26] LIANG, GUOTAO, WANG, ZHANGCHENG, HU, JUNCHENG, et al. "Render-in-the-Loop: Vector Graphics Generation via Visual Self-Feedback". *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 2026 12.

[LXL*24] LE, LONG, XIE, JASON, LIANG, WILLIAM, et al. "Articulate-Anything: Automatic Modeling of Articulated Objects via a Vision-Language Foundation Model". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13882* (2024). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2410.13882 3, 4, 6, 18.

[LXZ*26a] LI, JUNJIE, XIAO, XI, ZHANG, YUNBEI, et al. *Agent Harness Engineering: A Survey*. 2026. URL: https://openreview.net/pdf?id=eONq7FdiHa 2.

[LXZ*26b] LIN, ZHEN, XIE, QIUJIE, ZHU, MINJUN, et al. "AutoFigure-Edit: Generating Editable Scientific Illustrations via Reference-Guided Styling". *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*. Ed. by DURRETT, GREG and JIAN, PING. San Diego, California, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2026, 57–67. ISBN: 979-8-89176-392-0. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2026.acl-demo.6. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2026.acl-demo.6/ 12.

[LYH*26] LIN, YOUTIAN, YANG, YIKANG, HU, ZHANPENG, et al. "Agentic 3D Modeling with Procedural Control". *arXiv preprint* (2026). arXiv: 2608.26238. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.26238 14.

[LZX*25] LIANG, XIN, ZHANG, XIANG, XU, YIWEI, et al. "SlideGen: Collaborative Multimodal Agents for Scientific Slide Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04529* (2025) 13.

[MA25] MA, JIAJU and AGRAWALA, MANEESH. "MoVer: Motion Verification for Motion Graphics Animations". *ACM Trans. Graph.* 44.4 (July 2025). ISSN: 0730-0301. DOI: 10.1145/3731209. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/3731209 11.

[MAZ*24] MAJUMDAR, ARJUN, AJAY, ANURAG, ZHANG, XIAOHAN, et al. "OpenEQA: Embodied Question Answering in the Era of Foundation Models". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2024, 16488–16498 11.

[MHQ*26] MEI, HEFEI, HE, HANGZHOU, QIU, HAIYI, et al. "Beyond Visual Generation: Frontiers, Challenges, and Future Directions in Agentic Visual Creation". *Preprints.org* (2026). Preprint, version 1. URL: https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202609.0682/v1 (visited on 10/06/2026) 2.

[MKC*25] MALLIS, DIMITRIOS, KARADENIZ, AHMET SERDAR, CAVADA, SEBASTIAN, et al. "CAD-Assistant: Tool-Augmented VLLMs as Generic CAD Task Solvers". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. Oct. 2025, 7284–7294. arXiv: 2412.13810. URL: https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/ICCV2025/html/Mallis_CAD-Assistant_Tool-Augmented_VLLMs_as_Generic_CAD_Task_Solvers_ICCV_2025_paper.html 11, 16.

[MWC*26] MENG, QIANYU, WANG, YANAN, CHEN, LIYI, et al. "Agent Harness for Large Language Model Agents: A Survey". *Preprints.org* (2026). Preprint, version 3. URL: https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202604.0428/v3 (visited on 10/06/2026) 2.

[MWH*06] MÜLLER, PASCAL, WONKA, PETER, HAEGLER, SIMON, et al. "Procedural Modeling of Buildings". *ACM Transactions on Graphics (SIGGRAPH)* 25.3 (2006), 614–623 1, 3.

[MYdM*25] MA, WUFEI, YE, LUOXIN, de MELO, CELSO M, et al. "SpatialLLM: A Compound 3D-Informed Design towards Spatially-Intelligent Large Multimodal Models". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2025, 17249–17260 11.

[NBHB26] NOOR, NIMRA, BILAL, MUHAMMAD, HUSSAIN, ABDULLAH, and BAIG, HASSAN. "Nova3D: Code-Native Generation of Programmable 3D Assets". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.22738* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2607.22738 15.

[NCC*25] NI, YUANSHENG, CAI, SONGCHENG, CHEN, XIANGCHAO, et al. "VisCoder2: Building Multi-Language Visualization Coding Agents". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.23642* (2025) 13.

[NCW*25] NGUYEN, DANG, CHEN, JIAN, WANG, YU, et al. "GUI Agents: A Survey". *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL Findings)*. 2025. eprint: 2412.13501 2.

[NHB*21] NAKANO, REIICHIRO, HILTON, JACOB, BALAJI, SUCHIR, et al. "WebGPT: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332* (2021). eprint: 2112.09332. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.09332 9.

[NNZ*25] NI, YUANSHENG, NIE, PING, ZOU, KAI, et al. "VisCoder: Fine-Tuning LLMs for Executable Python Visualization Code Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03930* (2025) 13.

[NYW*26] NING, YANSONG, YE, JINGWEN, WU, ZHONGKAI, et al. "VibeWorlding: Can Multimodal Agents Construct 3D Open Worlds End-to-End?": *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.15265* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.15265 4.

[PCZ*26] PFAFF, NICHOLAS, COHN, THOMAS, ZAKHAROV, SERGEY, et al. "SceneSmith: Agentic Generation of Simulation-Ready Indoor Scenes". *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. Spotlight. 2026 3, 5–8, 10, 15–17.

[PKH*26] PARK, SEHWAN, KIM, TAEHOON, HAN, GEONHEE, et al. *Compositional SVG Generation via VLM-Driven Hierarchical Semantic Parsing*. 2026. arXiv: 2609.14657 [cs.CV]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.14657 12.

[PLJ*25] PANG, WEI, LIN, KEVIN QINGHONG, JIAN, XIANGRU, et al. *Paper2Poster: Towards Multimodal Poster Automation from Scientific Papers*. 2025. arXiv: 2505.21497 [cs.CV]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.21497 13.

[PMS*25] PARK, JIHYEON, MYUNG, JIYOON, SHIN, SEONE, et al. *Decomate: Leveraging Generative Models for Co-Creative SVG Animation*. 2025. arXiv: 2511.06297 [cs.HC]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.06297 12, 13.

[PPZ*26] PANG, BO, PAN, JIAQI, ZHANG, XIAOCHENG, et al. "ViSculpt: Visual-Centric Agentic Geometry Editing". *arXiv preprint* (2026). arXiv: 2608.24169. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.24169 14, 15.

[QLF*25] QIU, ZEJU, LIU, WEIYANG, FENG, HAIWEN, et al. "Can Large Language Models Understand Symbolic Graphics Programs?": *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2025. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.08313 11.

[RGJ*23] RITCHIE, DANIEL, GUERRERO, PAUL, JONES, R. KENNY, et al. "Neurosymbolic Models for Computer Graphics". *Computer Graphics Forum (Eurographics STAR)* 42.2 (2023), 545–568. eprint: 2304.10320 2, 3.

[RPA*25] RODRIGUEZ, JUAN A., PURI, ABHAY, AGARWAL, SHUBHAM, et al. "StarVector: Generating Scalable Vector Graphics Code from Images and Text". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2025, 16175–16186. eprint: 2312.11556 3.

[RWP*26] RANAWAKA, NADUN, WONG, JOSIAH, PAI, WEI-LIN, et al. "SimFoundry: Modular and Automated Scene Generation for Policy Learning and Evaluation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.28276* (2026) 3, 5, 7, 8.

[SCB*23] SHINN, NOAH, CASSANO, FEDERICO, BERMAN, EDWARD, et al. "Reflexion: Language Agents with Verbal Reinforcement Learning". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* (2023). eprint: 2303.11366 3.

[SCC*25] SAM 3D TEAM, CHEN, XINGYU, CHU, FU-JEN, et al. "SAM 3D: 3Dfy Anything in Images". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.16624* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2511.16624. arXiv: 2511.16624 [cs.CV]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.16624 7.

[SCL*24] SKARLINSKI, MICHAEL D., COX, SAM, LAURENT, JON M., et al. "Language Agents Achieve Superhuman Synthesis of Scientific Knowledge". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13740* (2024). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2409.13740. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.13740 9.

[SDD*23] SCHICK, TIMO, DWIVEDI-YU, JANE, DESSÌ, ROBERTO, et al. "Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* (2023). eprint: 2302.04761 3.

[SFY*26] SUN, JIANWEN, FENG, YUKANG, YING, KAINING, et al. *World Craft: Agentic Framework to Create Visualizable Worlds via Text*. 2026. arXiv: 2601.09150 [cs.HC]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.09150 12.

[SGK*26] SINHA, SAPTARSHI NEIL, GOSCHKE, MIKA SILVAN, KÜHN, PAUL JULIUS, et al. "AgenticCADedit: A Stateful, Tool-Mediated Agentic Approach to Multimodal 3D CAD Editing". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.29621* (2026) 6, 8, 15, 16.

[SHD*25] SUN, CHUNYI, HAN, JUNLIN, DENG, WEIJIAN, et al. "3d-gpt: Procedural 3d modeling with large language models". *2025 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*. IEEE. 2025, 1253–1263 6.

[SHZ*26] SUN, YIYOU, HAN, XINYANG, ZHANG, WEICHEN, et al. "Agents' Last Exam". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.05405* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.05405 12.

[SKK*26] SHEN, RUIHONG, KOVAČIČ, ŽIGA, KULITS, PETER, et al. "4DCodeBench: Benchmarking Agents on Inverse Graphics of Dynamic Scenes". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.03715* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.03715 1, 11, 18, 19.

[SLXL26] SHAO, CHENYANG, LIU, JIAHE, XU, FENGLI, and LI, YONG. *LiveFigure: Generating Editable Scientific Illustration with VLM Agents*. 2026. arXiv: 2605.23527 [cs.CE]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.23527 12.

[Sta99] STAM, JOS. "Stable Fluids". *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques (SIGGRAPH '99)*. 1999, 121–128 3.

[STBB14] SMELIK, RUBEN M., TUTENEL, TIM, BIDARRA, RAFAEL, and BENES, BEDRICH. "A Survey on Procedural Modelling for Virtual Worlds". *Computer Graphics Forum* 33.6 (2014), 31–50. DOI: 10.1111/cgf.12276 2, 3.

[STG*20] SHRIDHAR, MOHIT, THOMASON, JESSE, GORDON, DANIEL, et al. "ALFRED: A Benchmark for Interpreting Grounded Instructions for Everyday Tasks". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2020 11.

[STH*26] SHUAI, XINCHENG, TANG, SONG, HUANG, YUTONG, et al. "PSDesigner: Automated Graphic Design with a Human-Like Creative Workflow". *CVPR*. 2026 12, 13.

[SWJ*26] SUN, FAN-YUN, WU, SHENGGUANG, JACOBSEN, CHRISTIAN, et al. "3d-GENERALIST: Vision-language-action models for crafting 3d worlds". *2026 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*. IEEE. 2026, 1873–1883 1.

[SYL*26] SHI, JIN-CHUAN, YE, BINHONG, LIU, TAO, et al. "AGILE: Hand-Object Interaction Reconstruction from Video via Agentic Generation". *ACM SIGGRAPH 2026 Conference Papers*. 2026. DOI: 10.1145/3799902.3811134. arXiv: 2602.04672. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.04672 14, 15.

[SYNG24] SUMERS, THEODORE R., YAO, SHUNYU, NARASIMHAN, KARTHIK, and GRIFFITHS, THOMAS L. "Cognitive Architectures for Language Agents". *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2024). URL: https://openreview.net/forum?id=1i6ZCvflQJ 9.

[TLS*19] TIAN, YONGLONG, LUO, ANDREW, SUN, XINGYUAN, et al. "Learning to Infer and Execute 3D Shape Programs". *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2019. eprint: 1901.02875 3.

[TPC*26] TANG, XINYU, PENG, HAN, CHEN, GUOXIN, et al. "Agent Systems with Harness Engineering: A Systematic Survey". *Frontiers of Computer Science* (2026). Accepted manuscript, published online September 16, 2026. DOI: 10.1007/s11704-026-61123-6 2.

[TSM*26] TANG, YOLO Y., SHIMADA, DAIKI, MENG, JIAYUE, et al. "BVB: Benchmarking Agentic Video Understanding via Programmatic Reconstruction in Blender". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.15478* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.15478 11.

[TTM*22] TEWARI, AYUSH, THIES, JUSTUS, MILDENHALL, BEN, et al. "Advances in neural rendering". *Computer Graphics Forum*. Vol. 41. 2. Wiley Online Library. 2022, 703–735 2.

[TZX*24] TAN, WEIHAO, ZHANG, WENTAO, XU, XINRUN, et al. "Cradle: Empowering foundation agents towards general computer control". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03186* (2024) 6.

[VSZ*25] VINKER, YAEL, SHAHAM, TAMAR ROTT, ZHENG, KRISTINE, et al. "SketchAgent: Language-Driven Sequential Sketch Generation". *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*. June 2025, 23355–23368 1, 12, 13.

[WCR*26] WANG, RUIQI, CHEN, QIMIN, RITCHIE, DANIEL, et al. "Function2Scene: 3D Indoor Scene Layout from Functional Specifications". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.30819* 3 (2026) 6, 8, 15.

[WHX*26] WANG, TIANFU, HAO, ZHEZHENG, XIA, XILIN, et al. "Agentic Artifact Creation: Systems, Evaluation, Principles, and Opportunities". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.28122* (2026). eprint: 2608.28122. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.28122 3.

[WKZ*25] WANG, YUXIN, KE, LEI, ZHANG, BOQIANG, et al. "N3D-VLM: Native 3D Grounding Enables Accurate Spatial Reasoning in Vision-Language Models". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.16561* (2025). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.16561 11.

[WLW*24] WANG, ZHENGYI, LORRAINE, JONATHAN, WANG, YIKAI, et al. "LLaMA-Mesh: Unifying 3D Mesh Generation with Language Models". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09595* (2024). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2411.09595 3.

[WMF*24] WANG, LEI, MA, CHEN, FENG, XUEYANG, et al. "A Survey on Large Language Model Based Autonomous Agents". *Frontiers of Computer Science* 18.6, 186345 (2024). DOI: 10.1007/s11704-024-40231-1 2.

[WST25] WANG, HENG, SHIMOSE, YOTARO, and TAKAMATSU, SHINGO. "BannerAgency: Advertising Banner Design with Multimodal LLM Agents". *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Ed. by CHRISTODOULOPOULOS, CHRISTOS, CHAKRABORTY, TANMOY, ROSE, CAROLYN, and PENG, VIOLET. Suzhou, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2025, 4304–4329. ISBN: 979-8-89176-332-6. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.214. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2025.emnlp-main.214/ 13.

[WTC*25] WEI, JINGXUAN, TAN, CHENG, CHEN, QI, et al. "From Words to Structured Visuals: A Benchmark and Framework for Text-to-Diagram Generation and Editing". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2025 12.

[WWH*26] WANG, RUI-HUAN, WEI, SI-TONG, HE, JIA-QI, et al. "aDSL: Agentic 3D Creation via Joint Agent-Program Design". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.17975* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.17975 6, 8, 14, 15.

[WXN*26] WANG, WENKAI, XIONG, TAO, NI, JINGCHEN, et al. "DeskCraft: Benchmarking Desktop Agents on Professional Workflows and Human-in-the-Loop Collaboration". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.03103* (2026) 6.

[WYG*26] WANG, YIAN, YANG, HAN, GUO, MINGHAO, et al. "PhyScensis: Physics-Augmented LLM Agents for Complex Physical Scene Arrangement". *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2026 15, 17.

[WYZ*26] WANG, FEIYU, YANG, JIAYUAN, ZHAO, ZHIYUAN, et al. "IntroSVG: Learning from Rendering Feedback for Text-to-SVG Generation via an Introspective Generator-Critic Framework". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. June 2026, 615–625 1, 12.

[XCG*23] XI, ZHIHENG, CHEN, WENXIANG, GUO, XIN, et al. "The Rise and Potential of Large Language Model Based Agents: A Survey". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864* (2023). eprint: 2309.07864 2, 3.

[XCZ*24] XIE, JUNLIN, CHEN, ZHIHONG, ZHANG, RUIFEI, et al. "Large Multimodal Agents: A Survey". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15116* (2024). eprint: 2402.15116. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.15116 2.

[XLL*26] XIA, HONGCHI, LI, XUAN, LI, ZHAOSHUO, et al. "SAGE: Scalable Agentic 3D Scene Generation for Embodied AI". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.10116* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2602.10116 3–6.

[XTS*22] XIE, YIHENG, TAKIKAWA, TOWAKI, SAITO, SHUNSUKE, et al. "Neural Fields in Visual Computing and Beyond". *Computer Graphics Forum* 41.2 (2022), 641–676 2.

[XWL*26] XIE, SHUZHAO, WANG, LELIN, LIN, GUYING, et al. "CoDimRecon: Agentic Reconstruction of Sim-Ready 3D Scenes with Deformable Curves, Surfaces, and Volumes". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.36024* (2026) 18, 19.

[XWW*24] XU, RUNSEN, WANG, XIAOLONG, WANG, TAI, et al. "PointLLM: Empowering Large Language Models to Understand Point Clouds". *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024*. 2024. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.16911 11.

[XWW*25] XU, ZHENRAN, WANG, LONGYUE, WANG, JIFANG, et al. "FilmAgent: A Multi-Agent Framework for End-to-End Film Automation in Virtual 3D Spaces". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12909* (2025). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2501.12909 3.

[XWX*26] XING, ZIHAN, WANG, JIN, XIA, RONG, et al. "Agentic Visual Generation: A Survey". *Preprints.org* (2026). Preprint, version 1. URL: https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202609.0173/v1 (visited on 10/06/2026) 2.

[XXC*25] XU, XIAOJIE, XU, XINLI, CHEN, SIRUI, et al. "PreGenie: An Agentic Framework for High-quality Visual Presentation Generation". *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*. Ed. by CHRISTODOULOPOULOS, CHRISTOS, CHAKRABORTY, TANMOY, ROSE, CAROLYN, and PENG, VIOLET. Suzhou, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2025, 3045–3063. ISBN: 979-8-89176-335-7. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2025.findings-emnlp.165. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2025.findings-emnlp.165/ 13.

[XZC*24] XIE, TIANBAO, ZHANG, DANYANG, CHEN, JIXUAN, et al. "OSWorld: Benchmarking Multimodal Agents for Open-Ended Tasks in Real Computer Environments". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 2024. eprint: 2404.07972 12.

[XZY*26] XU, RUIJIE, ZHU, XINNAN, YING, JIAYU, et al. "MUSE: Agentic 3D Scene Authoring via Memory-Grounded Incremental Requirement Satisfaction". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.14168* (2026) 5, 6, 15–17.

[YCL*25] YAMADA, YUTARO, CHANDU, KHYATHI, LIN, BILL YUCHEN, et al. "L3GO: Language Agents with Chain-of-3D-Thoughts for Generating Unconventional Objects". *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (System Demonstrations)*. 2025, 456–469. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-demo.37. arXiv: 2402.09052. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-demo.37/ 14, 15.

[YFZ*26] YU, HONGJIE, FAN, ZHIYUAN, ZHANG, YUZHE, et al. *TemplateCraft: Agentic Visual Template Generation*. 2026. arXiv: 2609.31451 [cs.MM]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.31451 12.

[YGW*26] YIN, SHAOFENG, GE, JIAXIN, WANG, ZORA ZHIRUO, et al. "Vision-as-Inverse-Graphics Agent via Interleaved Multimodal Reasoning". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.11109* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2601.11109 3–8, 11, 15, 17.

[YHHP26] YAN, SHUHAO, HE, CHANGHAO, HU, PENG, and PENG, XI. "RA-CAD: Learning Post-Execution Critique for State-Aware Text-to-CAD Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.05714* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.05714 4.

[YJW*24] YANG, JOHN, JIMÉNEZ, CARLOS E., WETTIG, ALEXANDER, et al. "SWE-agent: Agent-Computer Interfaces Enable Automated Software Engineering". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 2024. eprint: 2405.15793 8, 9.

[YJZH25] YANG, YANDAN, JIA, BAOXIONG, ZHANG, SHUJIE, and HUANG, SIYUAN. "SceneWeaver: All-in-One 3D Scene Synthesis with an Extensible and Self-Reflective Agent". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 2025 5–8.

[YLD*26] YIN, YUYANG, LI, ZIXIANG, DENG, LONGXUAN, et al. "StateFlow: Building, Evolving, and Accessing 3D World States for Previsualization". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.12314* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.12314 18.

[YLG*26] YANG, YIXUAN, LUO, ZHEN, GAN, WANSHUI, et al. "Code-as-Room: Generating 3D Rooms from Top-Down View Images via Agentic Code Synthesis". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18451* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2605.18451 6.

[YLJ*26] YE, JUNYAN, LIU, WEI, JIANG, DONGZHI, et al. *Editable Visual Design*. 2026. arXiv: 2609.04034 [cs.CV]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.04034 12.

[YLX*26] YANG, ZHIJING, LIN, HAOCHENG, XU, ZHIHUA, et al. "Agentic Designer: Progressive Multi-Agent Collaboration for Structure-Aware Interior Layout Generation". *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 48.11 (2026), 14266–14280. DOI: 10.1109/TPAMI.2026.3711762 12.

[YS25] YUKSEL, KAMER ALI and SAWAF, HASSAN. *AI Co-Artist: A LLM-Powered Framework for Interactive GLSL Shader Animation Evolution*. 2025. arXiv: 2512.08951 [cs.NE]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.08951 12.

[YXP*24] YUAN, HAOCHENG, XU, JING, PAN, HAO, et al. "CADTalk: An Algorithm and Benchmark for Semantic Commenting of CAD Programs". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2024, 3753–3762 11.

[YZH*25] YAO, HUANJIN, ZHANG, RUIFEI, HUANG, JIAXING, et al. "A Survey on Agentic Multimodal Large Language Models". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10991* (2025). eprint: 2510.10991. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.10991 2.

[YZW*24] YANG, ZHIYU, ZHOU, ZIHAN, WANG, SHUO, et al. "MatPlotAgent: Method and Evaluation for LLM-Based Agentic Scientific Data Visualization". *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Ed. by KU, LUN-WEI, MARTINS, ANDRE, and SRIKUMAR, VIVEK. Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, 11789–11804. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.701. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.701/ 13.

[YZY*23] YAO, SHUNYU, ZHAO, JEFFREY, YU, DIAN, et al. "ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models". *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2023. eprint: 2210.03629 1, 3, 9.

[ZB26] ZHENG, YAN and BORDES, FLORIAN. "VoxelCodeBench: Benchmarking 3D World Modeling Through Code Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.02580* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.02580 11.

[ZDH*26] ZOU, CHUNYU, DAI, PENG, HUANG, YI-HUA, et al. "ArtiMo: Agent-Driven Articulated Mesh Animation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.20699* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.20699. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.20699 2, 18.

[ZGK*25] ZHENG, HAO, GUAN, XINYAN, KONG, HAO, et al. "PPTAgent: Generating and Evaluating Presentations Beyond Text-to-Slides". *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Ed. by CHRISTODOULOPOULOS, CHRISTOS, CHAKRABORTY, TANMOY, ROSE, CAROLYN, and PENG, VIOLET. Suzhou, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2025, 14402–14418. ISBN: 979-8-89176-332-6. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.728. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2025.emnlp-main.728/ 13.

[ZHQ*24] ZHANG, CHAOYUN, HE, SHILIN, QIAN, JIAXU, et al. "Large Language Model-Brained GUI Agents: A Survey". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18279* (2024). eprint: 2411.18279 2.

[ZJLD25] ZHANG, SHUYUAN, JIANG, CHENHAN, LI, ZUOOU, and DENG, JIANKANG. "ShapeCraft: LLM Agents for Structured, Textured and Interactive 3D Modeling". *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2025. arXiv: 2510.17603. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.17603 14, 15.

[ZLA*26] ZHANG, LICHENG, LE, BACH, AKHTAR, NAVEED, et al. "Large Language Models for Computer-Aided Design: A Survey". *ACM Computing Surveys* 58.9, 225 (2026). DOI: 10.1145/3787499 3.

[ZLL*26a] ZHANG, HONGXIN, LIN, CHUNRU, LI, JUNYAN, et al. "GS-Agent: Creating 4D Physical Worlds With Generative Simulation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.21522* (2026) 3, 5, 7, 8.

[ZLL*26b] ZHOU, MATT, LI, RUINING, LYU, XIAOYANG, et al. "Articraft: An Agentic System for Scalable Articulated 3D Asset Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.15187* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2605.15187 1, 3–8, 11, 17, 18.

[ZLL25] ZHANG, HANTAO, LIU, JINGYANG, and LI, ED. *See it. Say it. Sorted: Agentic System for Compositional Diagram Generation*. 2025. arXiv: 2508.15222 [cs.AI]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.15222 12.

[ZLS*25] ZHAO, XUANLE, LUO, XIANZHEN, SHI, QI, et al. "Chartcoder: Advancing multimodal large language model for chart-to-code generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06598* (2025) 13.

[ZLW*26] ZHU, MINJUN, LIN, ZHEN, WENG, YIXUAN, et al. "AutoFigure: Generating and Refining Publication-Ready Scientific Illustrations". *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2026. URL: https://openreview.net/forum?id=5N3z9JQJKq 12.

[ZLZ*25] ZHANG, YUNZHI, LI, ZIZHANG, ZHOU, MATT, et al. "The Scene Language: Representing Scenes with Programs, Words, and Embeddings". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2025, 24625–24634. URL: https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2025/html/Zhang_The_Scene_Language_Representing_Scenes_with_Programs_Words_and_Embeddings_CVPR_2025_paper.html 8.

[ZMS*26] ZHU, DAWEI, MENG, RUI, SONG, YALE, et al. *PaperBanana: Automating Academic Illustration for AI Scientists*. 2026. arXiv: 2601.23265 [cs.CL]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.23265 12, 13.

[ZMST15] ZIMMERS Jr., EMORY W., MARANGOS, CHARALAMBOS A., SUNDARARAJAN, SEKAR, and TECHNICAL STAFF. "Computer-Aided Design". *Mechanical Engineers' Handbook*. Ed. by KUTZ, MYER. John Wiley & Sons, 2015. DOI: 10.1002/9781118985960.meh201 15.

[ZMY*26] ZHENG, HAO, MO, GUOZHAO, YAN, XINRU, et al. "DeepPresenter: Environment-Grounded Reflection for Agentic Presentation Generation". *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*. Ed. by LIAKATA, MARIA, MOREIRA, VIVIANE P., ZHANG, JIAJUN, and JURGENS, DAVID. San Diego, California, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2026, 31545–31558. ISBN: 979-8-89176-395-1. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.1578. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-acl.1578/ 13.

[ZPW*26] ZHAO, MINGRUI, PERLA, SAI RAJ KISHORE, WANG, KAI, et al. "Functionalization via Structure Completion and Motion Rectification". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18010* (2026) 3.

[ZSW*26] ZHAO, HAOZHE, SI, SHUZHENG, WANG, ZHENHAILONG, et al. *Crafter: A Multi-Agent Harness for Editable Scientific Figure Generation from Diverse Inputs*. 2026. arXiv: 2605.30611 [cs.CV]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.30611 12.

[ZWX*26] ZHENG, HAOZHEN, WANG, FULIN, XIONG, TIANHU, et al. *SLIDEFORGE: An LLM Agent for Controllable Editing of Slides as Structured Artifacts*. 2026. arXiv: 2609.03109 [cs.CV]. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.03109 13, 14.

[ZWY*26] ZHANG, TING, WANG, JUNXIAO, YU, HENG, et al. "MagicGeo: Training-free text-guided geometric diagram generation". *Graphical Models* 145 (2026), 101331. ISSN: 1524-0703. DOI: 10.1016/j.gmod.2026.101331. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1524070326000123 13.

[ZWZ*25] ZHU, CHENMING, WANG, TAI, ZHANG, WENWEI, et al. "LLaVA-3D: A Simple yet Effective Pathway to Empowering LMMs with 3D Capabilities". *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2025, 4295–4305 11.

[ZWZT26] ZHANG, YI, WANG, YUNSHUANG, ZHANG, ZEYU, and TANG, HAO. "Code2Worlds: Empowering Coding LLMs for 4D World Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.11757* (2026). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2602.11757 3.

[ZYW*26] ZHUGE, JUNHAO, YANG, JUNYI, WANG, YUQING, et al. "ParticleGen: A Multi-Agent System for Particle Effects Generation". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.00629* (2026) 3–7, 18, 19.

[ZZY*26] ZHAO, YIFEI, ZHOU, XIANGXIN, YANG, WENHAO, et al. "SceneActBench: Can Agents Act on the 3D Scenes They See?": *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.22393* (2026). URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.22393 12.