

PSR: Scaling Multi-Subject Personalized Image Generation with Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards

Shulei Wang^{1,2,*} Longhui Wei^{2,†} Xin He² Jianbo Ouyang² Hui Lu²
 Zhou Zhao¹ Qi Tian²
¹ Zhejiang University ² Huawei Inc.
 shuleiawang@zju.edu.cn

Abstract

Personalized generation models for a single subject have demonstrated remarkable effectiveness, highlighting their significant potential. However, when extended to multiple subjects, existing models often exhibit degraded performance, particularly in maintaining subject consistency and adhering to textual prompts. We attribute these limitations to the absence of high-quality multi-subject datasets and refined post-training strategies. To address these challenges, we propose a scalable multi-subject data generation pipeline that leverages powerful single-subject generation models to construct diverse and high-quality multi-subject training data. Through this dataset, we first enable single-subject personalization models to acquire knowledge of synthesizing multi-image and multi-subject scenarios. Furthermore, to enhance both subject consistency and text controllability, we design a set of Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards and general-purpose rewards, which are incorporated into a refined reinforcement learning stage. To comprehensively evaluate multi-subject personalization, we introduce a new benchmark that assesses model performance using seven subsets across three dimensions. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach in advancing multi-subject personalized image generation. Github Link: <https://github.com/wang-shulei/PSR>.

1. Introduction

Personalized image generation aims to produce images that remain faithful to the given subjects while following textual instructions, and has significant applications in film production, personalized marketing, and beyond. Single-subject personalization models, such as FLUX.1 Kontext [15] and

Qwen-Image-Edit [38], have already demonstrated impressive capabilities. Meanwhile, several recent efforts, including UNO [40] and OmniGen [39, 41], have begun to explore the domain of multi-subject generation, enabling models to accept multiple reference images and roughly maintain the overall subject consistency. However, these multi-subject personalization approaches still suffer from several limitations: **(a) Poor subject consistency**: the subjects in the generated images may not be similar to the given reference subjects, or even omit certain subjects entirely. **(b) Limited adherence to text prompts**: given the prompt “the dog wears a chef’s hat and the cat wears a scarf”, existing methods may fail to capture specific attributes, such as a chef’s hat, or incorrectly assign them. For instance, the generated image may depict the dog wearing a scarf and the cat wearing a chef’s hat, failing to follow the semantics specified in the prompt.

We attribute these shortcomings to two factors: the lack of high-quality multi-subject personalization datasets and the absence of refined post-training strategies. For multi-subject personalization datasets, existing methods such as OmniGen [41] introduce X2I-subject-driven, where most of the high-quality data focuses on human faces, while subject datasets for general scenarios are constructed from GRIT [24] and exhibit relatively low consistency. UNO [40], on the other hand, generates subject pairs using a Text-to-Image (T2I) model, which inherently introduces discrepancies in consistency.

To address this, we leverage single-subject personalization models such as FLUX.1 Kontext [15] to introduce a scalable multi-subject data generation pipeline. Specifically, we first employ T2I models [33, 38] to synthesize images containing multi-subject scenes. Then, a detection model [19] is applied to extract single-object instances, which are further used to generate input images through a single subject personalization model [15], thereby constructing multi-subject synthetic image pairs. This pipeline yields a large-scale dataset of 350K multi-subject images. With these data in place, we first conduct supervised fine-

[†]Corresponding author. *Work was done during internship at Huawei Inc.




Figure 1. Quantitative comparison of recent methods on PSRBench across three evaluation dimensions: subject consistency, aesthetic preference, and semantic alignment. Our method consistently outperforms all baselines across all seven subsets.

tuning(SFT) on a single-subject personalization model and introduce a scalable frame-wise positional encoding that equips the model with multi-subject personalization knowledge. This encoding scheme generalizes effectively to varying numbers of input reference images. Moreover, existing methods are limited to the SFT stage, where the optimization objective is defined at the global image level, making it difficult to ensure subject consistency. To address this limitation, we propose the Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards (PSR), which is combined with other generation rewards to improve subject consistency and text compliance.

Additionally, existing benchmarks for multi-subject personalized generation are neither fine-grained nor comprehensive, which hinders accurate evaluation of model performance. For instance, DreamBench [28] simply relies on DINO [22] similarity between the generated image and the reference subject at the global level, while XVerseBench [2] evaluates generated images via detection and segmentation but does not segment the reference subject images, nor does it consider scenarios with more subjects. Therefore, to comprehensively evaluate multi-subject personalization, we propose PSRBench, a new benchmark comprising seven subsets, each assessing models from three dimensions: subject consistency, aesthetic preference, and semantic alignment.

Based on PSRBench, we evaluate our model against existing state-of-the-art approaches. As detailed in Figure 1 and Sec. 5.3, extensive experiments demonstrate that our method achieves SOTA performance across multiple subsets, with both quantitative and qualitative results validating its effectiveness.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a scalable multi-subject personalization data generation pipeline that leverages existing single-subject models to synthesize data with arbitrary numbers of subjects. Using this pipeline, together with predefined data-

cleaning strategies, we construct approximately 350K high-quality samples for multi-subject personalized generation.

- We extend the scalable frame-wise positional encoding and introduce Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards, which together, through a two-stage training paradigm, substantially enhance the model’s ability to maintain subject consistency and to faithfully adhere to textual instructions.
- We present PSRBench, a fine-grained and comprehensive benchmark with seven subsets, evaluating multi-subject personalization across three dimensions: subject consistency, aesthetic preference, and semantic alignment.

2. Related Works

2.1. Multi-subject Driven Generation

Personalized generation refers to the task of synthesizing images of a target subject in novel scenes, given reference images containing that subject. Existing approaches to this task can be broadly categorized into two paradigms: test time fine-tuning and zero-shot methods. Early approaches [14, 28, 37] such as DreamBooth [28] and Textual Inversion [7] adapt a model by fine-tuning selected parameters on 3–5 reference images of the subject, enabling the model to capture the desired concept. However, this paradigm requires training a separate model for each concept, incurring substantial computational and storage costs.

More recently, research has shifted toward zero-shot methods [9, 11, 16, 21, 31, 32, 34, 46], which aim to perform personalization for arbitrary subjects without the need for model fine-tuning. While such single-subject personalization methods demonstrate promising results, their performance remains limited when multiple subjects are involved. To address the challenges of multi-subject personalization, UNO [40] leverages T2I models to construct data and per-




Figure 2. Overview of the dataset construction pipeline. The process consists of two stages: (1) multi-subject paired image generation, where LLM-guided prompts are used to generate paired subject-aware images via T2I and personalized models, and (2) multi-subject paired instruction generation, which edits image attributes or actions and produces corresponding textual instructions. The final dataset contains diverse paired samples with consistent multi-subject semantics.

form co-evolution, first training on single-subject data before extending to multiple subjects. XVerse [2] achieves subject control by transforming reference images into shifts for text-stream modulation. OmniGen2 [39] constructs high-quality identity-preserving data from video sources. Despite these advances, existing approaches [35, 40] still struggle to ensure consistency across multiple subjects and are difficult to scale effectively to larger sets of reference images.

2.2. Reinforcement Learning for Generation

Reinforcement learning (RL) [8, 23, 29] has emerged as an effective paradigm for alignment and has demonstrated strong potential in visual generation [3–6, 13, 17, 18, 25, 26, 36, 42–44]. Previous approaches [3, 25] optimized generative models for alignment by backpropagating through the reward signal. More recently, policy-based reinforcement learning methods [18, 44] have been introduced, which directly compute policy gradients to optimize the policy. These approaches have demonstrated notable improvements in enhancing semantic alignment, aesthetic preference, and other aspects of pre-trained generative models. For autoregressive T2I models, T2I-R1 [13] integrates semantic-level and token-level chain-of-thought reasoning and employs diverse rewards to enhance text alignment during generation. In the case of flow matching based models, approaches such as Flow-GRPO [18] and DanceGRPO [44] leverage different forms of reward to fine-tune T2I models via RL, thereby significantly improving their capabilities in semantic fidelity, text rendering, and human preference alignment.

However, applying reinforcement learning to multi-subject personalized generation remains an open challenge.

3. Datasets and Benchmark

The core of our dataset construction pipeline lies in leveraging the powerful capabilities of large language models, Text-to-Image generation models, and single-subject personalization models in a synergistic manner, enabling the creation of datasets that can scale to an arbitrary number of personalized subjects. Specifically, as shown in Figure 2, our dataset construction pipeline consists of two stages: multi-subject paired image generation and multi-subject paired instruction generation.

3.1. Scalable Multi-subject Driven Datasets

Stage 1: multi-subject paired image generation. Existing approaches for synthesizing personalized generation data often rely solely on T2I models combined with strict subject-consistency filtering strategies, such as UNO [40] and Subjects200K [31], where a T2I model generates a diptych containing the same subject depicted across two different scenes. However, due to the inherent instability of T2I models in producing such data, these methods often yield datasets of limited consistency and quality.

In contrast, recent advances in single-subject personalization models [15, 38] have demonstrated strong capabilities: given a single subject, these models can reliably generate its appearance across novel scenes while maintaining high consistency. Motivated by the capability of these mod-

els, we propose a highly scalable multi-subject paired image generation pipeline that harnesses the strengths of these powerful models. Specifically, as shown in Figure 2, for constructing data with n subjects, we first sample an n -element category set $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ from the full category pool of Objects365 [30]. We then prompt a large language model (LLM) [45] to generate a text-to-image instruction T^{t2i} , where each category’s appearance is explicitly specified to increase data diversity. In addition, we prompt the LLM [45] to produce subject-driven instructions T^{sub} for each category, which will be used for generating single subject personalization images. Using a state-of-the-art T2I models [33, 38], we employ T^{t2i} to synthesize multi-subject images I_{out} . Then we leverage GroundingDINO [19], a grounding-based object detection model, to detect and crop instances by category in I_{out} , resulting in single-subject images I_{crop} . Finally, given I_{crop} and T^{sub} , we generate new reference images I_{ref} for each subject using the single-image personalization models [15], which serve as the input references of our multi-subject generation dataset. This stage enables the construction of diverse and high-quality image pairs.

Stage 2: multi-subject paired instruction generation.

In Stage 1, to guide the T2I model [33, 38] toward producing higher-quality and more distinctive images, the prompts include explicit descriptions of the subjects’ appearances. However, directly reusing these descriptions for multi-subject personalization may cause the model to exploit textual leakage: focusing only on the appearance information revealed in the text rather than attending to the reference images themselves. Furthermore, to enhance the diversity of our dataset, we hope to ensure that these multi-subject paired instructions cover a broader range of tasks, such as instructions focused on describing spatial relationships or those capable of detailing the attributes of each subject.

To address these challenges, we first predefine seven types of multi-subject personalized tasks, including attribute personalization, background personalization, action personalization, positional personalization, complex-scene personalization, three-subject personalization, and four-subject personalization. More details about these tasks are provided in the Supplementary Material. For each task, we apply recaptioning strategies, as shown in Figure 2. For example, in the background personalization task, we prompt MLLM [1] to focus on describing the background of I_{out} while explicitly using pronouns to refer to specific subjects, thus avoiding the leakage of subject appearance information within the instructions. Specifically, for tasks involving attributes or actions, the subject images generated in Stage 1 may not exhibit sufficiently prominent attributes. Therefore, we introduce an additional ‘re-editing’ step to modify the original I_{out} . Concretely, we first use an LLM [45] to generate task-specific editing instructions.

These instructions, together with I_{out} , are then fed into an editing model to produce I_{out}^* . Similarly, we use I_{out}^* to prompt MLLM [1] to generate the corresponding instructions. This stage yields a large set of high-quality, diverse, and personalized instruction data, which substantially enriches the dataset and supports more effective downstream training.

3.2. PSRBench

Existing benchmarks for evaluating multi-subject personalization exhibit significant limitations in both evaluation tasks and metrics. For example, DreamBench [28] only includes combinations of two subjects with overly simplistic scene descriptions, and evaluates the semantic consistency of images using CLIP [27], which can not accurately capture the true semantic alignment. Moreover, current evaluation protocols are often coarse-grained. For instance, UNO [40] computes the DINO score [22] between each subject in a generated two-subject image and its corresponding reference image, but such a method cannot provide a fine-grained assessment of subject consistency. OmniContext [39] leverages GPT-4.1 for evaluation, yet it still fails to reliably measure consistency. XVerse [2] proposes a segmentation-based approach, where each subject in the generated image is segmented and then compared to the corresponding input reference using DINO scores [22]. However, this method assumes that reference images contain isolated subjects on plain white backgrounds—an idealized setting that does not generalize well to real-world scenarios, where reference images typically include subjects within simple or even complex backgrounds.

To this end, we propose PSRBench, a comprehensive and multi-dimensional benchmark for multi-subject personalization. Specifically, our benchmark consists of seven subsets: Attribute, Background, Action, Position, Complex, Three, and Four, each representing a distinct sub-task. Each subset is evaluated along three complementary dimensions: subject consistency, semantic alignment, and aesthetic preference. For subject consistency, we adopt a grounding-based [19] approach: both input and output images are first processed with an object grounding model [19] to detect and crop the subjects, after which DINO scores [22] are computed on corresponding subject pairs. This design enables precise and fine-grained evaluation of subject consistency. For semantic alignment, we first employ an MLLM [1] to evaluate image-text alignment according to the specific task requirements. To more precisely assess positional alignment, a grounding-based evaluation is additionally performed on the Position subset, wherein the centers of the subjects are localized and their relative spatial relations are compared against the prompt. For aesthetic preference, we rely on HPSv3 [20] for evaluation.




Figure 3. Left: Scalable frame-wise positional encoding. Middle: Pairwise subject-consistency rewards. Right: GRPO training pipeline combining PSR with multiple rewards.

4. Methods

4.1. Preliminary

Flow Matching Flow Matching model is trained by minimizing the objective:

$$\min_v \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[|(z_1 - z_0) - v(z_t, t)|^2 \right] dt \quad (1)$$

During the sampling process, the model starts from random noise, and the ODE is solved using a simple Euler solver:

$$z_{t_{i-1}} = z_{t_i} + v(z_{t_i}, t) \Delta t \quad (2)$$

GRPO for flow matching Flow-GRPO [18] transforms the ODE-based sampling into an SDE form to incorporate the stochasticity required by GRPO. Through Euler-Maruyama discretization, the resulting policy update is as follows:

$$x_{t+\Delta t} = x_t + \left(v_\theta(x_t, t) + \frac{\sigma_t^2}{2t} (x_t + (1-t)v_\theta(x_t, t)) \right) \Delta t + \sigma_t \sqrt{\Delta t} \epsilon, \quad \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \quad (3)$$

Flow-GRPO [18] set $\sigma_t = a\sqrt{\frac{t}{1-t}}$, a is a scalar hyperparameter that controls the noise level.

4.2. Scalable Frame-wise Positional Encoding

In the SFT stage, our goal is to endow a single-image personalization model with the knowledge required to handle multi-image, multi-subject scenarios. To achieve this, we leverage a frame-wise positional offset together with a multi-image joint training strategy. Similar to prior work [15, 31, 40], we also employ a VAE encoder to encode input images, and then concatenate the resulting latents with the noise latent. In the case of multi-image inputs, this

token-level concatenation remains a natural choice; however, it requires a specific positional indexing scheme to distinguish tokens from different input images. Some previous approaches [40] introduced offsets along the h and w dimensions. For example, UNO [40] suggested that the spatial index of the i^{th} image should start from the terminal position of the $(i-1)^{th}$ image. While such indexing allows better utilization of pretrained model capacity, it suffers from two key limitations. First, by enforcing offsets along the h and w dimensions, the model implicitly inherits a strong prior that the second image is naturally positioned to the right or below the first image, which complicates fine-grained control through textual prompts. Second, when scaling to more images, e.g., three or four inputs, such large spatial offsets in h and w become increasingly misaligned with the pretrained distribution, ultimately degrading the model’s generalization ability.

Therefore, as shown in Figure 3, we extend the positional encoding scheme proposed in FLUX.1 Kontext [15] by employing only a virtual temporal offset to indicate the index of each input image. Concretely, for the latent tokens of the i^{th} input image, the positional offset is defined as

$$PO_i = (i, h, w), \quad (4)$$

where h, w denote the latent’s spatial dimensions. During training, we adopt a multi-image joint training strategy that incorporates datasets with varying numbers of input images. We argue that jointly training across different reference counts allows the model to exploit their complementary benefits, leading to improved generalization and robustness in multi-subject personalization.

4.3. Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards

Despite the benefits of the first-stage SFT, two key challenges remain in multi-subject personalization. On the one hand, while SFT enables the model to process multiple reference images, its optimization operates only at the global

Table 1. Quantitative comparison of subject consistency on PSRBench. “Ours-SFT” denotes the model trained with only the first-stage supervised fine-tuning. “Ours (PSR)” represents the models further trained using the proposed reinforcement strategy.

Model	Attribute	Background	Action	Position	Complex	Three	Four	Overall
FLUX.1 Kontext [15]	0.510	0.534	0.535	0.560	0.543	0.425	0.373	0.497
UNO [40]	0.532	0.568	0.573	0.584	0.540	0.460	0.402	0.523
OmniGen2 [39]	0.602	0.559	0.628	0.678	0.610	0.527	0.508	0.587
XVerse [2]	0.599	0.624	0.694	0.595	0.619	0.541	0.435	0.587
Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38]	0.593	0.539	0.634	0.653	0.546	0.552	0.361	0.554
Ours-SFT	0.551	0.573	0.631	0.582	0.587	0.519	0.472	0.559
Ours (PSR)	0.626	0.721	0.741	0.727	0.713	0.615	0.571	0.673

image level and therefore lacks fine-grained supervision for individual subjects. Personalized generation inherently requires subject-level alignment, which is difficult to achieve through standard SFT loss. RL [18, 44], in contrast, provides a mechanism to directly optimize localized objectives via subject-aware rewards. Moreover, in multi-subject personalization scenarios [35, 40], the reference images often contain background elements, making it essential for the model to robustly extract and preserve subject identity under realistic inputs.

To this end, we introduce a novel Pairwise Subject-Consistency Reward (PSR), as illustrated in Figure 3, and employ an online RL stage to post-train the model initialized from the first-stage. The key idea behind PSR is subject decoupling: we disentangle each subject from the global image, and then encourage pairwise similarity between the disentangled subjects and their references to guide training. Formally, let a pretrained model θ take multiple input images, each containing multiple subjects, and produce an output I_{out} . We apply subject decoupling to the output to obtain subject-specific crops: $I_{dec}^i = g(I_{out}, c_i)$, where g denotes an open-vocabulary object detector and c_i represents the category of the i^{th} subject. The decoupled image I_{dec}^i contains only the subject-specific region. Since input references in real-world scenarios also contain background, we perform the same decoupling operation on input references: $I_{gt}^i = g(I_{ref}^i, c_i)$. We then define the subject consistency reward as the average similarity between each pair of corresponding subject crops:

$$R_{PSR} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(I_{dec}^i, I_{gt}^i) \quad (5)$$

where N denotes the number of input images, and f measures visual similarity using the DINO features [22].

To further mitigate the risk of copy-paste artifacts and prevent reward hacking, we further incorporate aesthetic preference and semantic alignment rewards. The overall reward is defined as follows:

$$R = w_1 * R_{PSR} + w_2 * R_s + w_3 * R_h \quad (6)$$

where w_1, w_2, w_3 denote the weights of different reward terms, and R_s is the semantic reward computed by Qwen2.5-VL [1]:

$$R_s = MLLM(instruction, I_{out}), \quad (7)$$

R_h is aesthetic preference reward from a human preference scoring model HPSv3 [20]:

$$R_h = HPS(instruction, I_{out}), \quad (8)$$

5. Experiments

5.1. Implementation Details

We build our multi-subject personalization model on top of FLUX.1 Kontext [15] and train the model using LoRA [10]. In the first stage, we set the learning rate to 1e-4. Our dataset provides 2–4 reference images. During training, we sample 2, 3, and 4 references with probabilities of 0.9, 0.05, and 0.05, respectively, enabling joint training across different reference counts. In the second stage, we use a smaller learning rate of 1e-5. Specifically, we adopt a joint reinforcement training strategy with multiple rewards. The reward for subject consistency is provided by our proposed PSR. For textual faithfulness, we leverage Qwen2.5-VL-32B-Instruct [1] to evaluate image-text alignment, while aesthetic preference is modeled using HPSv3 [20]. Since this stage requires evaluating human preferences, sampling and training are both conducted over the original 28 diffusion timesteps. All square images are resized to a resolution of 512×512. For non-square images, the shortest side is proportionally resized to 512 pixels while maintaining the original aspect ratio.

We use the model trained with only the first-stage, referred to as Ours-SFT, as the baseline. We also compare our proposed PSR with state-of-the-art multi-subject personalization models, including UNO [40], OmniGen2 [39], XVerse [2], and FLUX.1 Kontext [15]. Since FLUX.1 Kontext [15] only supports single-image inputs, for fair evaluation we concatenate multiple input images along the width dimension before feeding them into the model. We

Table 2. Quantitative comparison of aesthetic preference on PSRBench.

Model	Attribute	Background	Action	Position	Complex	Three	Four	Overall
FLUX.1 Kontext [15]	0.811	0.968	0.776	0.828	0.967	0.886	0.857	0.870
UNO [40]	0.876	1.060	0.960	1.060	0.979	1.100	1.030	1.009
OmniGen2 [39]	0.908	1.100	0.911	1.070	0.983	1.070	1.100	1.020
XVerse [2]	0.882	0.936	0.754	0.970	0.864	0.938	0.909	0.893
Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38]	0.883	0.890	0.877	0.961	0.898	0.981	0.533	0.860
Ours-SFT	0.644	0.819	0.634	0.779	0.771	0.952	0.961	0.794
Ours (PSR)	1.040	1.150	0.881	1.200	1.050	1.260	1.290	1.124

Table 3. Quantitative comparison of semantic alignment on PSRBench.

Model	Attribute	Background	Action	Position	Complex	Three	Four	Overall
FLUX.1 Kontext [15]	0.710	0.810	0.600	0.058	0.644	0.656	0.605	0.583
UNO [40]	0.701	0.864	0.662	0.250	0.740	0.746	0.704	0.667
OmniGen2 [39]	0.833	0.908	0.895	0.389	0.768	0.784	0.727	0.758
XVerse [2]	0.758	0.839	0.648	0.259	0.689	0.779	0.709	0.669
Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38]	0.918	0.945	0.826	0.439	0.713	0.894	0.592	0.761
Ours-SFT	0.822	0.916	0.709	0.310	0.640	0.828	0.762	0.712
Ours (PSR)	0.908	0.926	0.739	0.468	0.692	0.884	0.866	0.783

also compared with the latest Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38], which supports multi-image input.

5.2. Comparisons with Recent Methods

PSRBench employs three distinct metrics to evaluate subject consistency, semantic alignment, and human preference. The detailed calculation for these metrics can be found in the Supplemental Material. Table 1 presents a detailed comparison of subject consistency across seven subsets of PSRBench. Our method achieves the best performance not only in terms of the overall score (0.673), but also consistently outperforms all baselines across every individual subset. In particular, the improvements are especially pronounced in more challenging scenarios involving complex prompts and interactions among more subjects. For example, on the Three and Four subsets, our model reaches 0.615 and 0.571, respectively, substantially surpassing the previous best results of 0.552 and 0.508. These gains indicate that our model is more robust in handling consistency entanglement when multiple images are provided as input, which is a common failure mode of existing methods.

Table 2 and Table 3 report the aesthetic preference score and semantic alignment score, respectively. PSR also achieves the overall best performance on these two metrics, indicating that our method not only preserves consistency in multi-subject scenarios but also exhibits strong text controllability, enabling the generation of high-quality images. Notably, compared with baseline model FLUX.1 Kontext [15], “Ours-SFT” exhibits a drop in aesthetic scores. We attribute this decline to the mismatch in training resolution: the original FLUX.1 Kontext [15] is trained at 1024 resolution,

whereas our SFT stage is primarily conducted at 512 resolution. This downscaling disrupts the generative priors of the original model and consequently degrades the visual quality, leading to lower aesthetic preferences. However, our PSR-based reinforcement learning effectively mitigates this issue and restores the overall perceptual quality. Furthermore, benefiting from our multi-reward joint optimization, our method achieves notably superior performance on the Position and Four subsets in the semantic alignment evaluation. These subsets are particularly challenging for existing models, yet our approach demonstrates clear advantages under these difficult settings.

5.3. Qualitative Analysis

Figure 4 presents qualitative analyses on PSRBench. In comparison with other baselines, our approach demonstrates superior performance in both subject preservation and text adherence. In the case of two-image inputs, our method is able to faithfully retain the original appearance of the subjects while simultaneously complying with semantic instructions, thereby validating the effectiveness of both our data and methodology. For example, our approach successfully preserves the distinctive visual characteristics of the “remote” and “butterfly”, while also adhering to the textual description that specifies “sunlit windowsill”. In contrast, other methods often fail to maintain high consistency across multiple subjects, with XVerse [2] even suffering from complete subject omission. Furthermore, our method demonstrates powerful text alignment capabilities while maintaining strong subject consistency: when the prompt contains positional, action, or attribute-




Figure 4. Qualitative analysis results of PSR with recent state-of-the-art models.

binding constraints, our method can still generate coherent images. While other models such as OmniGen2 [39] and Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38] also exhibit robust overall performance in text adherence, they notably suffer from diminished subject consistency.

5.4. Ablation Study

We further conduct ablation studies on our proposed scalable frame-wise positional encoding to validate its effectiveness. Specifically, we hypothesize that existing encoding schemes introduce inherent spatial positional priors, which in turn restrict the model’s capacity to understand and represent semantics that deviate from this intrinsic prior. To verify this, we randomly sample 50K training samples and train each variant with a different positional encoding for one epoch. We then evaluate their semantic alignment scores on 2-subject, 3-subject, and 4-subject settings, as well as the Position subset. As shown in Table 4, our method consistently achieves the best semantic alignment across multi-subject personalization tasks. Notably, on the Position subset, our approach demonstrates a significant lead, outperforming the second-best method by 0.39.

Table 4. Comparison of different offset strategies for the positional index. The notation “w/ h-w” indicates that the positional indexing is offset in both the height and width dimensions. Conversely, “w/ w” denotes an offset applied solely along the width dimension, and “w/ h” signifies an offset applied solely along the height dimension. We compare the semantic scores across different subsets. Our positional encoding strategy (“w/ ours”) achieves overall superior performance, with particularly notable improvements on the Position subset.

Method	2 subjects	3 subjects	4 subjects	Position
w/ h-w	0.929	0.831	0.808	0.469
w/ w	0.915	0.824	0.777	0.459
w/ h	0.925	0.840	0.805	0.437
w/ ours	0.922	0.870	0.821	0.508

We attribute this to the fact that alternative encoding methods impose fixed spatial layouts, making it harder for the model to modify subject positions according to the textual prompt. In contrast, our frame-wise positional encoding operates solely along the frame dimension, effectively avoiding such pre-imposed spatial biases.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we addressed the challenges of multi-subject personalized image generation, where existing models struggle to maintain subject consistency and adhere to textual instructions. To overcome these limitations, we proposed a scalable multi-subject data generation pipeline and introduced Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards within a multi-reward reinforcement learning framework. Furthermore, we designed PSRBench, a comprehensive benchmark that evaluates subject consistency, aesthetic preference, and semantic alignment across diverse and challenging scenarios. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our method not only achieves state-of-the-art performance in multi-subject consistency but also exhibits strong scalability and text controllability, enabling the generation of high-quality and semantically faithful images. We believe this work provides a solid foundation for future research on controllable and scalable multi-subject personalized generation.

PSR: Scaling Multi-Subject Personalized Image Generation with Pairwise Subject-Consistency Rewards

Supplementary Material

Table 5. Quantitative Comparison on DreamBench

Method	CLIP-T	CLIP-I	DINO
UNO [40]	0.319	0.713	0.492
OmniGen2 [39]	0.329	0.720	0.506
XVerse [2]	0.327	0.715	0.479
Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38]	0.337	0.716	0.494
Ours (PSR)	0.335	0.717	0.529

7. More Implementation Details

We adopt LoRA [10] in both training stages, using a rank of 512 in the first stage and 64 in the second stage. During the GRPO training phase, we set the group size to 6, which yields stable convergence in practice. Since the aesthetic preference reward cannot be naturally normalized to the $[0, 1]$ range and is often larger than the other rewards in our experiments, we adjust the weighting scheme to stabilize multi-reward training. Specifically, we assign weights $w_1 = 0.4$, $w_2 = 0.4$ and $w_3 = 0.2$ to the respective reward components.

8. Experimental Results on DreamBench

To further validate the effectiveness of our approach, we also conduct evaluations on DreamBench [28, 40]. Specifically, we randomly sample 100 test cases from the DreamBench [28, 40] multi-ip subset and compare our method against recent state-of-the-art approaches, including UNO [40], OmniGen2 [39], XVerse [2], and Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38]. The evaluation follows the official testing protocol provided by UNO [40]. As shown in Table 5, our method achieves state-of-the-art performance on the DINO metric, surpassing the second-best method on DINO by a margin of 0.23. In addition, our model attains competitive results with Qwen-Image-Edit-2509 [38] on the CLIP-T metric. These findings collectively demonstrate the superiority of our approach. Although our method outperforms existing approaches on these metrics, it is important to acknowledge that there are still limitations in this evaluation method. For example, CLIP’s semantic evaluation is not always accurate, and the global DINO score for assessing subject consistency is susceptible to interference from background information. We will discuss these issues in further sections.

In addition, Figure 6 presents the qualitative results of our model on the DreamBench [28]. Consistent with the observations on PSRBench, our method demonstrates supe-

rior subject consistency compared to other approaches. For instance, in the fourth row, existing methods fail to preserve the appearance of the robot toy in the generated images. In contrast, our method performs exceptionally well in maintaining both the dog’s and the robot’s appearances. Furthermore, as shown in the fifth row, when the input image features a candle that is not similar to a conventional candle, existing methods either disregard this ‘non-standard’ candle or generate one that is completely dissimilar to the original. Our method, on the other hand, handles such challenging cases effectively.

9. More Information about Datasets and PSR-Bench

In the construction of the dataset, we use Qwen3-32B [45] to generate instructions for T2I and single subject personalization, with the prompt template for Qwen3-32B shown in Figure 7. We utilize the Text-to-Image model FLUX.1-schnell [33] to generate I_{out} . During the construction process, since Qwen-Image [38] performs better when generating images containing four subjects, we use Qwen-Image [38] for generating data involving four subjects.

Our benchmark consists of seven subsets, as illustrated in Figure 5, with each subset containing 50 evaluation samples. Our input images are generated by Qwen-Image [38] and are manually filtered to select images with distinctive subject appearances, ensuring the high quality of the benchmark. The basic information for each subset is as follows:

- **Action:** Each input image in this subset features a different animal, with the prompt explicitly requiring each animal to perform a distinct action, such as “sit”, “run”, and so on.
- **Attribute:** This subset also consists of animal images, with the prompt specifying that each animal must possess a unique attribute, such as “wearing a hat”, “wearing a crown”, etc. This is considered a more challenging subset.
- **Background:** The input images in this subset can include both objects and animals, with the prompt requiring the images to feature a specific background.
- **Position:** The inputs in this subset are arbitrary, with the prompt instructing that the subjects be placed in fixed orientations within the image, such as “on the right”, “on the left”, etc.

- **Complex:** The prompts in this subset are more intricate, potentially including detailed backgrounds, specific animal actions, or subjects placed in precise locations within the image.
- **Three:** This subset consists of three input subjects, which must be placed within a specific background.
- **Four:** This subset contains four input subjects, each requiring a specific background.

For evaluation, we consider three complementary dimensions. First, for subject consistency, we detect and crop the corresponding subjects in both the input references and the generated images, compute pairwise similarities, and average the results. Because subject consistency is defined as an averaged similarity score, its value naturally falls within the range of 0 to 1. For semantic alignment, we employ Qwen2.5-VL-32B-Instruct [1] to assess whether the generated image semantically aligns with the given prompt. The MLLM outputs a score between 0 and 10, where 10 indicates perfect alignment and 0 indicates complete misalignment. We then normalize this score to the range of 0–1. For each specific subset, the corresponding prompt template used for evaluation by the MLLM is shown in Figure 8. For aesthetic preference, we evaluate image quality using HPSv3 [20], an uncertainty-aware ranking model that provides a non-normalized aesthetic score. To make it compatible with other reward components during training, we normalize the score by dividing it by 10.

10. Data Cleaning

To obtain high-quality paired data, we further design a stringent data-filtering pipeline. Specifically, we filter samples based on both subject consistency and semantic alignment. Similar to our evaluation protocol, we compute a paired DINO [22] score to assess the consistency between the input subjects and the generated outputs, and we employ Qwen2.5-VL [1] to evaluate semantic alignment with the prompt. After this filtering stage, we obtain a curated dataset of approximately 350K high-quality multi-subject personalization samples.

11. Metric Comparison

In this section, we compare several metrics used to evaluate subject consistency in previous works.

UNO [40] and MIP-Adapter [12] assess subject consistency by directly comparing the DINO [22] score of the input image with that of the output image. However, the output image often involves other subjects and background information, which can significantly affect the evaluation of subject consistency. As shown in Figure 9, the results of the

traditional Global DINO Score evaluation are presented. It is evident that the bag in ‘Output Image 1’ is more similar to the bag in the ‘Ref Image’. However, the Global DINO Score assigns a higher score to ‘Output Image 2’. This is because the background of the reference image and ‘Output Image 2’ are more similar, thus distorting the subject consistency evaluation. In contrast, our method first grounds the subject and then performs cropping, effectively eliminating the irrelevant background information that could interfere with the evaluation. As demonstrated in Figure 9, our evaluation metric accurately identifies which image is more similar to the input subject, highlighting the precision of our approach.

Some existing methods use multimodal large language models to evaluate subject consistency. Therefore, we also compare our method with MLLM-based evaluations. We utilize the powerful multimodal large language model GPT-5 and employ the evaluation prompt proposed in OmniContext [39]. As shown in Figure 10, even the most advanced GPT-5 model fails to be highly sensitive to changes in the subject’s appearance during subject consistency evaluation, often producing hallucinations.




Figure 5. Overview of PSRBench, with a case from each subset shown on the left and the three evaluation dimensions for each subset displayed on the right.
































































Input Prompt	Input Image		XVerse	UNO	OmniGen2	Qwen-Image-Edit-2509	Ours
a dog wearing a yellow shirt, next to it is a dog							
a cat wearing a yellow shirt, next to it is a dog							
a cartoon and a toy with a blue house in the background							
a dog and a toy on top of a wooden floor							
a candle and a clock in the snow							
a candle and a clock in the jungle							
a dog wearing a red hat, next to it is a toy							
a cat and a dog on the beach							
a cat and a dog on top of a wooden floor							

Figure 6. Qualitative Analysis on DreamBench



"Role:

Please be very creative and generate 10 brief subject prompts for text-to-image generation.

Follow these rules:

1. You will be given two subjects, you need to create an asset(brief subject prompt) based on the two subjects. 2. These descriptions can refer only to appearance description. 3. These descriptions includes simple scene descriptions. 4. Do not repeat each asset, you need to use your imagination and common sense of life to create. 5. No more than 24 words.

Example

[asset category1]: Cat

[asset category2]: Dog

[asset1]: A silver-gray Russian Blue cat and a black and brown dog in the desert oasis, where the water and grass are lush and abundant

[asset2]: A gray, dense-furred British Shorthair cat and a golden Golden Retriever in a vintage clothing store

[asset3]: A pure white cat and a yellow and white striped dog in front of the city's night view

...

(Up to [asset10])

[asset category1]: {}

[asset category2]: {} "

LLM instruction
template for task 1



"Role:\

Please be very creative and generate 10 brief subject prompts for text-to-image generation. \

Follow these rules:\

1. Given a brief subject prompt of an asset, you need to generate 10 detailed Scene Description for the asset. \

2. Each Scene Description should be a detailed description, which describes the background area you imagine for an identical extracted asset, under different environments/camera views/lighting conditions, etc (please be very very creative here). \

3. Each Scene Description should be one line and be as short and precise as possible, do not exceed 77 tokens, Be very creative! \

Example1\

[asset]: dog \

[Scene1]: The dog now on the beach, as the sun sets in the west, the golden afterglow spills over the sandy beach. \

[Scene2]: The dog is now in front of the city's night view, surrounded by towering buildings and a bustling flow of traffic. \

[Scene3]: The dog is now in the desert oasis, where the water and grass are lush and abundant. \

... \

(Up to [Scene10]) \

Example2 \

[asset]: Refrigerator \

[Scene1]: The refrigerator is in a jungle, with vines creeping it and exotic birds perched nearby. \

[Scene2]: The refrigerator is in a floating house on a lake, with reflections of trees and sky shimmering on the water. \

[Scene3]: The refrigerator is deep underwater, with colorful fish swimming around and corals growing on its surface. \

... \

(Up to [Scene10]) \

[asset]: {} "

LLM instruction
template for task 2

Figure 7. Instruction template used for providing to Qwen3 to construct the dataset.

Action

Your role is to evaluate whether the action of the objects in the image match the given action descriptions.

Role1: The score range is 0-10, where 10 indicates a perfect match between the action in the image and the action description, with higher scores indicating a better match, and 0 indicating no match at all.

Rule2: You only need to focus on the degree of matching between the action in the image and the action description.

Rule3: The criteria for judging action should be relatively stringent.

Rule4: Please first provide a detailed analysis of the evaluation process, including the criteria for judging action alignment, then give a final Score from 0 to 10. The output text must follow the format [Thought]: ... [Score]: ...

[action description]: {}

[Thought]:

[Score]:

Attribute

Your role is to evaluate whether the object attribute binding and attribute description in the image are consistent.

Role1: The score range is 0-10, where 10 indicates that all attributes of each object are completely consistent with the attribute description.

A lower score indicates low consistency.

Rule2: You only need to focus on the degree of matching between the attributes of subjects of image and the attribute description.

Rule3: The criteria for judging attributes should be relatively stringent.

Rule4: Please first provide a detailed analysis of the evaluation process, including the criteria for judging attribute alignment, then give a final Score from 0 to 10. The output text must follow the format [Thought]: ... [Score]: ...

[attribute description]: {}

[Thought]:

[Score]:

Background

Your role is to evaluate whether the background in the image and background description are consistent.

Role1: The score range is 0-10, where 10 indicates a perfect match between the background in the image and the background description, with higher scores indicating a better match, and 0 indicating no match at all.

Rule2: You only need to focus on the degree of matching between the background in the image and the background description.

Rule3: The criteria for judging attributes should be relatively stringent.

Rule4: Please first provide a detailed analysis of the evaluation process, including the criteria for judging background alignment, then give a final Score from 0 to 10. The output text must follow the format [Thought]: ... [Score]: ...

[background description]: {}

[Thought]:

[Score]:

Complex/Three/Four

Your role is to evaluate whether the content in the image match the description in the prompt.

Role1: The score range is 0-10, where 10 indicates that the content in the image is completely consistent with the description, and lower scores indicate low consistency.

Rule2: You need to evaluate the alignment of all content in the image and the prompt.

Rule3: The criteria for judging alignment should be relatively stringent.

Rule4: Please first provide a detailed analysis of the evaluation process, including the criteria for judging alignment, then give a final Score from 0 to 10. The output text must follow the format [Thought]: ... [Score]: ...

[description]: {}

[Thought]:

[Score]:

Figure 8. Instruction template used for providing to Qwen2.5-VL to evaluate the semantic alignment scores of different subsets.







Ref Image	Output Image 1	Output Image 2		
				
Grounding&Crop DINO Score	0.80	0.77	↓	✓
Global DINO Score	0.55	0.59	↑	✗
				
Grounding&Crop DINO Score	0.82	0.79	↓	✓
Global DINO Score	0.78	0.80	↑	✗

Figure 9. Comparison of different metrics.











Ref Images	Output Image 1	Output Image 2
		
Grounding&Crop DINO Score	0.76	0.71 ↓ 
GPT5 Score	0.5	0.5 → 
		
Grounding&Crop DINO Score	0.81	0.55 ↓ 
GPT5 Score	0.5	0.5 → 

Figure 10. Comparison of different metrics.

References

- [1] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 4, 6, 2
- [2] Bowen Chen, Mengyi Zhao, Haomiao Sun, Li Chen, Xu Wang, Kang Du, and Xinglong Wu. Xverse: Consistent multi-subject control of identity and semantic attributes via dit modulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21416*, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 1
- [3] Kevin Clark, Paul Vicol, Kevin Swersky, and David J Fleet. Directly fine-tuning diffusion models on differentiable rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17400*, 2023. 3
- [4] Chengqi Duan, Rongyao Fang, Yuqing Wang, Kun Wang, Linjiang Huang, Xingyu Zeng, Hongsheng Li, and Xihui Liu. Got-r1: Unleashing reasoning capability of mllm for visual generation with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17022*, 2025.
- [5] Ying Fan and Kangwook Lee. Optimizing ddpm sampling with shortcut fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13362*, 2023.
- [6] Ying Fan, Olivia Watkins, Yuqing Du, Hao Liu, Moonkyung Ryu, Craig Boutilier, Pieter Abbeel, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Kangwook Lee, and Kimin Lee. Dpok: Reinforcement learning for fine-tuning text-to-image diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79858–79885, 2023. 3
- [7] Rinon Gal, Yuval Alaluf, Yuval Atzmon, Or Patashnik, Amit H Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01618*, 2022. 2
- [8] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025. 3
- [9] Zinan Guo, Yanze Wu, Chen Zhuowei, Peng Zhang, Qian He, et al. Pulid: Pure and lightning id customization via contrastive alignment. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37:36777–36804, 2024. 2
- [10] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3, 2022. 6, 1
- [11] Mengqi Huang, Zhendong Mao, Mingcong Liu, Qian He, and Yongdong Zhang. Realcustom: Narrowing real text word for real-time open-domain text-to-image customization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7476–7485, 2024. 2
- [12] Qihan Huang, Siming Fu, Jinlong Liu, Hao Jiang, Yipeng Yu, and Jie Song. Resolving multi-condition confusion for finetuning-free personalized image generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3707–3714, 2025. 2
- [13] Dongzhi Jiang, Ziyu Guo, Renrui Zhang, Zhuofan Zong, Hao Li, Le Zhuo, Shilin Yan, Pheng-Ann Heng, and Hongsheng Li. T2i-r1: Reinforcing image generation with collaborative semantic-level and token-level cot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00703*, 2025. 3
- [14] Nupur Kumari, Bingliang Zhang, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Multi-concept customization of text-to-image diffusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1931–1941, 2023. 2
- [15] Black Forest Labs, Stephen Batifol, Andreas Blattmann, Frederic Boesel, Saksham Consul, Cyril Diagne, Tim Dockhorn, Jack English, Zion English, Patrick Esser, et al. Flux. 1 kontext: Flow matching for in-context image generation and editing in latent space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.15742*, 2025. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- [16] Zhen Li, Mingdeng Cao, Xintao Wang, Zhongang Qi, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Ying Shan. Photomaker: Customizing realistic human photos via stacked id embedding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8640–8650, 2024. 2
- [17] Youwei Liang, Junfeng He, Gang Li, Peizhao Li, Arseniy Klimovskiy, Nicholas Carolan, Jiao Sun, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Sarah Young, Feng Yang, et al. Rich human feedback for text-to-image generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19401–19411, 2024. 3
- [18] Jie Liu, Gongye Liu, Jiajun Liang, Yangguang Li, Jiaheng Liu, Xintao Wang, Pengfei Wan, Di Zhang, and Wanli Ouyang. Flow-grpo: Training flow matching models via online rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05470*, 2025. 3, 5, 6
- [19] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Qing Jiang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 38–55. Springer, 2024. 1, 4
- [20] Yuhang Ma, Xiaoshi Wu, Keqiang Sun, and Hongsheng Li. Hpsv3: Towards wide-spectrum human preference score. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03789*, 2025. 4, 6, 2
- [21] Zhendong Mao, Mengqi Huang, Fei Ding, Mingcong Liu, Qian He, and Yongdong Zhang. Realcustom++: Representing images as real-word for real-time customization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09744*, 2024. 2
- [22] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 2, 4, 6
- [23] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022. 3
- [24] Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. Kosmos-2: Ground-

- ing multimodal large language models to the world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14824*, 2023. 1
- [25] Mihir Prabhudesai, Anirudh Goyal, Deepak Pathak, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Aligning text-to-image diffusion models with reward backpropagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03739*, 2023. 3
- [26] Mihir Prabhudesai, Russell Mendonca, Zheyang Qin, Katerina Fragkiadaki, and Deepak Pathak. Video diffusion alignment via reward gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08737*, 2024. 3
- [27] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PmLR, 2021. 4
- [28] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 22500–22510, 2023. 2, 4, 1
- [29] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017. 3
- [30] Shuai Shao, Zeming Li, Tianyuan Zhang, Chao Peng, Gang Yu, Xiangyu Zhang, Jing Li, and Jian Sun. Objects365: A large-scale, high-quality dataset for object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 8430–8439, 2019. 4
- [31] Zhenxiong Tan, Songhua Liu, Xingyi Yang, Qiaochu Xue, and Xinchao Wang. Ominicontrol: Minimal and universal control for diffusion transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15098*, 2024. 2, 3, 5
- [32] Jiale Tao, Yanbing Zhang, Qixun Wang, Yiji Cheng, Haofan Wang, Xu Bai, Zhengguang Zhou, Ruihuang Li, Linqing Wang, Chunyu Wang, et al. Instantcharacter: Personalize any characters with a scalable diffusion transformer framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.12395*, 2025. 2
- [33] XLabs AI team. x-flux, 2025. Accessed: 2025-02-07. 1, 4
- [34] Qixun Wang, Xu Bai, Haofan Wang, Zekui Qin, Anthony Chen, Huaxia Li, Xu Tang, and Yao Hu. Instantid: Zero-shot identity-preserving generation in seconds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07519*, 2024. 2
- [35] Xierui Wang, Siming Fu, Qihan Huang, Wanggui He, and Hao Jiang. Ms-diffusion: Multi-subject zero-shot image personalization with layout guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07209*, 2024. 3, 6
- [36] Yibin Wang, Zhimin Li, Yuhang Zang, Yujie Zhou, Jiazhi Bu, Chunyu Wang, Qinglin Lu, Cheng Jin, and Jiaqi Wang. Pref-grpo: Pairwise preference reward-based grpo for stable text-to-image reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20751*, 2025. 3
- [37] Yuxiang Wei, Yabo Zhang, Zhilong Ji, Jinfeng Bai, Lei Zhang, and Wangmeng Zuo. Elite: Encoding visual concepts into textual embeddings for customized text-to-image generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15943–15953, 2023. 2
- [38] Chenfei Wu, Jiahao Li, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kaiyuan Gao, Kun Yan, Sheng-ming Yin, Shuai Bai, Xiao Xu, Yilei Chen, et al. Qwen-image technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02324*, 2025. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8
- [39] Chenyuan Wu, Pengfei Zheng, Ruirao Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyao Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, et al. Omnigen2: Exploration to advanced multimodal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.18871*, 2025. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 2
- [40] Shaojin Wu, Mengqi Huang, Wenxu Wu, Yufeng Cheng, Fei Ding, and Qian He. Less-to-more generalization: Unlocking more controllability by in-context generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02160*, 2025. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- [41] Shitao Xiao, Yueze Wang, Junjie Zhou, Huaying Yuan, Xingrun Xing, Ruirao Yan, Chaofan Li, Shuting Wang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. Omnigen: Unified image generation. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 13294–13304, 2025. 1
- [42] Jiazhen Xu, Xiao Liu, Yuchen Wu, Yuxuan Tong, Qinkai Li, Ming Ding, Jie Tang, and Yuxiao Dong. Imagereward: Learning and evaluating human preferences for text-to-image generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:15903–15935, 2023. 3
- [43] Jiazhen Xu, Yu Huang, Jiale Cheng, Yuanming Yang, Jiajun Xu, Yuan Wang, Wenbo Duan, Shen Yang, Qunlin Jin, Shurun Li, et al. Visionreward: Fine-grained multi-dimensional human preference learning for image and video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.21059*, 2024.
- [44] Zeyue Xue, Jie Wu, Yu Gao, Fangyuan Kong, Lingting Zhu, Mengzhao Chen, Zhiheng Liu, Wei Liu, Qiushan Guo, Weilin Huang, et al. Dancegrpo: Unleashing grpo on visual generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07818*, 2025. 3, 6
- [45] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025. 4, 1
- [46] Hu Ye, Jun Zhang, Sibao Liu, Xiao Han, and Wei Yang. Ip-adaptor: Text compatible image prompt adapter for text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06721*, 2023. 2