

# PPTArena: A Benchmark for Agentic PowerPoint Editing

Michael Ofengenden<sup>1,2\*</sup> Yunze Man<sup>1</sup> Ziqi Pang<sup>1</sup> Yu-Xiong Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign <sup>2</sup>University of California, Berkeley




Figure 1. Representative real-world PowerPoint edits in PPTArena exemplifying structure-aware, multimodal, cross-slide reasoning tasks.

## Abstract

We introduce PPTArena, a benchmark for PowerPoint editing that measures reliable modifications to real slides under natural-language instructions. In contrast to image-PDF renderings or text-to-slide generation, PPTArena focuses on in-place editing across 100 decks, 2,125 slides, and over 800 targeted edits covering text, charts, tables, animations, and master-level styles. Each case includes a ground-truth deck, a fully specified target outcome, and a dual VLM-as-judge pipeline that separately scores instruction following and visual quality using both structural diffs and slide images. Building on this setting, we propose PPTPilot, a structure-aware slide-editing agent that plans semantic edit sequences, routes between high-level

programmable tools and deterministic XML operations for precise control, and verifies outputs through an iterative plan-edit-check loop against task-specific constraints. In our experiments, PPTPilot outperforms strong proprietary agents and frontier VLM systems by over 10 percentage points on compound, layout-sensitive, and cross-slide edits, with particularly large gains in visual fidelity and deck-wide consistency. Despite these improvements, existing agents still underperform on long-horizon, document-scale tasks in PPTArena, highlighting the remaining challenges in reliable PPT editing.

\*Work done during an internship at UIUC.

Webpage: <https://ppt-arena.onrender.com>

Code: <https://github.com/michaelofengend/PPTArena>

## 1. Introduction

As VLM-driven agents begin to operate productivity software, the capability that matters most in everyday use: editing existing PowerPoint (PPT) decks with structure-aware precision, remains largely unverified and under-supported [42]. Image- or PDF-based formulations discard deck semantics (formats, placeholders, shape trees), while text-to-slides pipelines emphasize generation and ignore edit-in-place constraints [20, 25]. This gap matters because most decks are refined through revision, not from scratch, making reliable layout reasoning and non-destructive modification the realistic bar for agentic PPT capability. Yet we still lack a benchmark that asks the practical question: *can today’s multimodal agents reliably edit existing decks with high instruction fidelity and visual quality?*

Reliable PPT editing is intrinsically hard. Rasterized “image editing” views discard the object- and style-level structure that makes editing precise: fonts and paragraphs, shape geometries, z-order, theme colors, slide masters, and cross-references are all lost once a deck is treated as a bitmap. The same instruction (e.g., “make the subtitle 18pt and align the two logos to the grid”) can require multiple coordinated actions across several slides, conditioned on the existing layout and theme. Evaluation is equally subtle: a change can be syntactically valid yet semantically wrong or aesthetically poor. These failure modes are systematically invisible to benchmarks that only check final text strings, API-level diffs, or pixel similarity, and they motivate a benchmark that treats PPT editing as a structured program over deck semantics, with explicit scoring of both instruction following and visual quality.

Our motivation is grounded in how presentations are actually made and maintained. In professional and academic settings, most decks do not begin from a completely blank canvas; they evolve through continuous revision: merging slides from prior talks, adapting templates for new audiences, and polishing visual hierarchy. Editing reveals whether an agent truly understands the structure already present: the agent must locate the correct element, reason about its relationships (alignment, grouping, z-order), and modify it without collateral changes elsewhere. To capture this reality, we introduce **PPTArena**, a benchmark designed explicitly for agentic PowerPoint editing on real decks. PPTArena assembles 100 real-world source decks and 2,125 slides into 800+ discrete, human-specified edits that range from local text updates to compound, cross-slide transformations, such as deck-wide theme flips, accessibility passes, and multi-step layout repairs. Each case bundles an initial deck, a fully specified target deck, and a *style-aware rubric* that disambiguates correctness at the level of content, typography, layout, and color roles. Representative tasks are illustrated in Figure 1, including filling in missing poster content while preserving hierarchy, flipping

theme color roles consistently across a deck, fixing layout and format across related slides, and translating slide content while maintaining charts and structure. To our knowledge, PPTArena is the first benchmark that (i) treats PPT editing as a structured, causal program over deck semantics, (ii) ships element-level ground truths, style targets, and error rubrics to disambiguate correctness, and (iii) uses dual instruction-following and visual judges that allow diverse configurations of edits while maintaining task coherence.

Complementing the benchmark, we present **PPTPilot**, a structure-aware pilot agent for robust, fine-grained PPT editing. PPTPilot decomposes each natural-language instruction into a sequence of semantic operations, chooses between high-level APIs (e.g., `python-pptx`) and direct XML patching, and validates the outcome against task-specific targets. Two design choices are key: *structure-aware planning*, where the agent parses slide masters, placeholders, shape trees, text, and visual data before editing, and *deterministic execution*, where XML-level patches and strict schemas give exact control over fonts, theme color slots, positions, and master-level changes while programmatic tools handle repetitive global operations (e.g., translation, bulk normalization). An iterative plan-edit-verify loop, coupled with XML validation and visual checks, improves robustness on visually demanding and long-horizon edits.

We evaluate a broad spectrum of baselines on PPTArena, including strong proprietary PPT agents (e.g., ChatGPT Agent [42] and MiniMax Agent [35]), extended-thinking VLM configurations, and ablations of PPTPilot. Even with generous prompting and tool access, existing systems struggle to balance instruction fidelity with visual/layout quality on compound, multi-step edits, and they frequently fail on cross-slide dependencies and master-level style changes surfaced by our benchmark. In contrast, PPTPilot achieves substantially higher scores, improving over strong proprietary agents and frontier VLM systems by more than 10 percentage points on compound, layout-sensitive, and cross-slide edits, while maintaining competitive performance on simpler cases. Nonetheless, PPTPilot and all evaluated agents significantly fail on hard, visually dependent tasks, suggesting both the difficulty of PPTArena and the headroom for future research.

Our key contributions are threefold: (1) **PPTArena**, a benchmark for agentic PowerPoint editing that (i) operates on deck-native structure rather than rasterized slides, (ii) offers a taxonomy of single- and multi-edit tasks that stress structural grounding, cross-slide consistency, accessibility, and narrative intent, and (iii) pairs each case with element-level ground truths, style targets, and a dual-judge protocol that separately measures instruction fidelity and visual/layout quality, extending beyond prior PPT evaluation setups [20, 23]. (2) **PPTPilot**, a structure-aware pilot agent that plans edits over semantic elements and executes them

via a hybrid of high-level programmatic tools and deterministic OOXML patching, with routing, strict schemas, and iterative verification designed for controllability, reliability, and transparency. (3) **A comprehensive empirical study** of proprietary agents, open VLMs, and PPTPilot variants on PPTArena, revealing that the benchmark is challenging even for state-of-the-art systems.

## 2. Related Work

Agentic presentation editing sits at the intersection of autonomous agent platforms, productivity automation, and evaluation tooling. We review related work highly relevant to PPTArena across multimodal agentic benchmarks, presentation editing systems, industrial agent frameworks, and LLM-as-judge evaluation [3, 21, 50, 51].

**Multimodal agentic and slide benchmarks.** General-purpose multimodal benchmarks ensure agents possess the perceptual and reasoning depth required for high-quality edits. A line of benchmarks demand grounding and knowledge integration beyond literal reading [46, 53, 62]. Other datasets stress robustness and preference alignment [19, 48]. More challenging benchmarks aggregate expert-level tasks across multiple disciplines [37, 38]. PowerPoint-centered benchmarks expose how fragile instruction fidelity remains for today’s VLMs. PPTC and PPTC-R evaluates multi-turn editing sessions [23, 70], SlideAudit offers a structured look at design quality, while ANA probes temporal comprehension ignored by static evaluations [6, 57].

Broader agentic benchmark development has progressed from controlled settings toward realistic, multimodal environment, exposing how fragile action grounding remains [7, 15, 27, 71]. Operating-system suites extend these ideas to native GUIs and code-driven control [12, 26, 68]. Newer efforts push beyond desktops into industrial tasks with UI randomization [10, 14, 39, 61]. Aggregate leaderboards synthesize progress across domains while highlighting how evaluator design, scaling laws, and benchmark rigor influence reported capability [3, 11, 13, 21, 24, 31, 33, 51]. Yet these evaluations rarely interrogate fine-grained document layout proficiency or accessibility compliance. Our PPTArena fills that gap with a productivity-focused suite that couples deterministic XML manifests with dual judge reviews so researchers can attribute errors to planning, perception, or tooling rather than to ambiguous scoring.

**Presentation editing.** Agentic presentation pipelines blend planning, content synthesis, and low-level manipulation. A line of work explores combinations of generation and refinement, yet each reports brittleness in object targeting, template bias, or cascading errors [9, 16, 20, 25, 45]. Other works highlight the cost of over-reliance on generic templates [25]. Comparative studies confirm API-driven execution outperforms GUI-based approaches for

fine-grained control [4, 8], motivating PPTArena’s XML-level enforcement and pixel-grounded targets.

**Industrial agent and tool-calling.** Progress in agent infrastructure illustrate how self-supervised tools expand computer-use competence [52, 63, 64, 67] and perception-drive agents [54, 55, 59]. Open-source orchestration stacks make it easier to compose planners, memory modules, and tool executors, while industrial reports detail production deployments [1, 2, 22, 28, 34, 42, 43]. Concurrent analyses of scaling curves and structured agent engineering [3, 51] warn that larger models alone do not guarantee reliability, reinforcing PPTArena’s focus on judge audits that make agent improvements interpretable.

**LLM- and VLM-as-judge evaluation.** Reliable evaluation remains a bottleneck as agent tasks grow more open-ended. A line of work study the feasibility of delegating assessment to specialized VLMs [36, 40, 47]. Follow-up work exposes risks of judge bias, prompting recommendations such as no-free-label baselines, adversarial judge detection, multi-judge audits, and alignment across heterogeneous tasks [41, 48, 60, 65]. Our work adopts these lessons through a dual-judge protocol, separating instruction compliance from visual and layout grading, ensuring that progress measured on PPTArena reflects genuine improvements rather than exploitation of single-model biases.

## 3. PPTArena Benchmark

PPTArena contains 100 real-world editing instructions spanning 2,125 slides. Each case bundles an initial deck, a target deck with human-generated ground references, structured textual instructions, and a rubric capturing layout, typography, color, and content requirements. We group the cases into sixteen topical buckets (detailed in Table 1), ensuring that the benchmark stresses both semantic reasoning and low-level formatting fidelity.

### 3.1. Benchmark Composition and Difficulty

**Data sourcing and coverage.** We webscrape over 15,000 PowerPoints (SlidesCarnival [58], Zenodo [18], SlideShare [30]) curating the largest open-sourced dataset of PPTs and converted them into structured JSON traces that capture layout, styling, and content metadata. Automated filtering retains decks with diverse multimodal assets which we conjoined to an internal corpus from literature analysts, biology researchers, and art design students. From more than 500 hand-reviewed candidates, including 25 decks created from scratch by our students, we selected the 100 cases that best span professional, academic, multilingual, and art/design genres, ensuring every topic bucket in Table 1 contains challenging exemplars.

**Taxonomy-driven case design.** Drawing from established principles of presentation design [5, 17, 49, 66], we

Category	Edit Types
<b>Content</b>	(1) Text & Typography • (2) Shapes & Drawing • (3) Images & Pictures • (4) Tables • (5) Charts • (6) SmartArt & Diagrams • (7) Audio & Video
<b>Layout</b>	(8) Alignment, Distribution, Grid, Grouping, Z-order • (9) Slide Layouts & Placeholders
<b>Styling</b>	(10) Themes (colors, fonts, effects), Background • (11) Master-level edits (Slide/Notes Masters)
<b>Interactivity</b>	(12) Animations (entrance, emphasis, exit, paths, timing) • (13) Slide Transitions • (14) Hyperlinks
<b>Structure</b>	(15) Slide/Section/Order Mgmt., Slide Numbers, Headers/Footers, Notes • (16) Comments/Review, Accessibility (alt text, reading order, contrast)

Table 1. Taxonomy of 16 editing operations in PPTArena. The five major categories: Content, Layout, Styling, Interactivity, and Structure, encompass operations ranging from basic text manipulation to advanced master-level edits and accessibility compliance.

defined five parent categories that decompose into 16 concrete edit types, guaranteeing coverage from low-level typography to master-edit workflows. Following Maia Polo et al. [32], we favor fewer but richer cases, so the taxonomy is used to balance high-difficulty scenarios rather than to inflate totals. Cases range from simple text replacements to multi-edit, multimodal reasoning problems. For instance, Figure 2 illustrates a cross-modal case that requires matching images to captions across slides using both visual and textual cues; many cases straddle multiple taxonomy buckets, so category counts exceed 100.

PPTArena distinguishes itself from prior benchmarks through its emphasis on *edit difficulty* across four key dimensions: multi-step reasoning depth, cross-slide dependencies, semantic understanding requirements, and long-horizon planning complexity. While existing resources such as PPTC-R [70] and T2US [25] focus on short, template-bound edits, PPTArena intentionally concentrates difficulty into fewer but richer scenarios to expose real-world failures.

### 3.2. Comparison with Prior Benchmarks

Table 2 quantitatively compares PPTArena against prior benchmarks. PPTArena demonstrates substantially higher complexity with an average of 5.1 operations per case and 8.3 slides per case, with 32% of cases involving cross-slide dependencies and 28% requiring text-visual reasoning. Prior benchmarks suffer from key limitations: PPTC-R relies on synthetically generated decks that lack real-world visual richness and complexity, while T2US artificially inflates its size by rewording prompts for identical tasks rather than introducing genuine task diversity [25, 29, 70].

In contrast, PPTArena combines both human-created and Python-generated decks, provides ground truth for deterministic evaluation, and maintains cross-platform compatibility. It uniquely incorporates accessibility constraints,

### Cross-Slide Image-Caption Correlation

"category": Layout

"prompt": "1. For every slide, match each image to its correct caption.

2. After pairing them, rearrange the pairs to create a balanced layout.

3. Update each slide's title correspondingly.

4. Finally, make sure all images are the same size, 3.2 inches wide by 2.4 inches high."




Figure 2. Example case from PPTArena demonstrating cross-slide image-caption matching. The task requires semantic understanding to correlate visual and textual content: (a) the original slide with misaligned images and captions, (b) the ground truth with correctly matched pairs, uniform sizing, and balanced layout.

external knowledge requirements, and complex multimodal tasks that emphasize multi-step reasoning, cross-slide dependencies, and long-horizon planning. This design exposes failure modes that remain hidden on simpler tasks and provides a rigorous testbed for evaluating the next generation of agentic systems. We demonstrate two representative samples in Figures 2 and 3.

### 3.3. VLM-as-Judge Evaluation Protocol

**Instruction following (IF) and Visual quality (VQ).** Our evaluation framework is designed to move beyond simple pixel- or code-level diffs, which fail to capture the semantic and aesthetic goals of PPT editing. We instead measure an agent’s performance on two fundamental axes: *Instruction Following* and *Visual Quality* [56], both scored by expert VLM judges on an integer scale from 0 (Failure) to 5 (Perfect).

(1) *Instruction Following (IF)* measures the agent’s semantic and logical adherence to the user’s prompt. It assesses *what* was done, such as correctly identifying and moving content, applying the right formatting, or fulfilling all sub-tasks in a complex command.


(2) *Visual Quality (VQ)* measures the *aesthetic and professional polish* of the resulting slide. It assesses *how* the changes were implemented, focusing on layout, alignment, typography, color harmony, and overall visual appeal, inde-



## Configure Speaker Notes

"Category": Content, Structure

"Prompt": "Slide 2 contains speaker notes for the other slides. Please move the text from the text boxes on slide 2 to the speaker notes of the appropriate slides, then delete slide 2."



(a) Original slide 2

(b) Ground Truth slide 6

Figure 3. This task requires aligning narration, speaker notes, and visual panels across slides, forcing the agent to reason about cross-slide correspondences before deleting the staging slide. The only way to recognize which speaker notes correspond to what slide is by understanding the comics on each slide.

pendent of the instruction’s logical fulfillment.

By combining the two metrics together, our PPTArena covers the common user requirements from either content aspects (IF) or aesthetics aspects (VQ).

**Per-sample rubric: style target.** A core challenge in PPT editing is the immense variation across decks, layouts, and design habits. There is no universal rubric that can reliably score every instruction, which separates our setting from common LLM judges used in question-answering. Our solution is to generate a fine-grained, per-sample style target that specifies all crucial structural and visual requirements for that case. For example, if the user prompt is “Overhaul this rock-cycle presentation with ..., reorganizing the rock types into three columns on slide 2, and replace slide 3’s wall of text with ...,” then the corresponding style-target rubric would spell out the exact ground truth with hyper-specific constraints, such as: “... must have a geology photo occupying... Slide 2 columns must be labeled ... Slide 3 centers a fully labeled cycle diagram linking the three rock types with ...”.

To provide trustworthy style targets, we combine automatic generation together with exhaustive human verifica-

Metric	PPTC-R	T2US	PPTArena
<b>Task Complexity</b>			
Avg. operations per case	2.9	1.2	<b>5.1</b>
Avg. slides per case	1.3	1.2	<b>8.3</b>
Cross-slide dependencies	21%	5%	<b>32%</b>
Text-visual dependencies	×	1.3%	<b>28%</b>
<b>Benchmark Design</b>			
Human-created decks	×	✓	✓
Python-created decks	✓	×	✓
Ground truth provided	✓	×	✓
Cross-platform compatibility	✓	×	✓
<b>Advanced Requirements</b>			
Accessibility constraints	×	×	✓
External knowledge	×	×	✓
Complex multimodal tasks	×	×	✓

Table 2. Comparative analysis of benchmark characteristics and task complexity. PPTC-R metrics are derived from their released API traces. PPTArena demonstrates substantially higher complexity across all dimensions, featuring multi-operation tasks, extensive cross-slide reasoning, and semantic understanding requirements. A comprehensive comparison with more baselines is provided in the supplementary material.

tion. Specifically, we send the json summaries and screenshots of the PPT’s ground truth and original decks to a VLM to generate style targets. Both ground truth and the original slide are provided as input so that the generation of style target can precisely understand the desired outcome. Then each style target is manually verified for correctness and faithfulness to the editing instructions and PPT context.

**Dual-Judge Pipeline for Reliable Evaluation.** To ensure reliable scoring, we employ a dual-judge architecture that separately conducts the evaluation for instruction following and visual quality (as in Figure 4), each implemented as a separate VLM, e.g., GPT-5. To further enhance the judge’s capability for IF and VQ, respectively, we selectively provide them contexts that align best with the evaluation target, in addition to the style target mentioned above.

(1) *Instruction Following Judge:* This judge receives *only* the structured data diffs (e.g., JSON and XML summaries) between the original, predicted, and ground-truth slides. Such inputs enforce the judge to concentrate at the content level and carefully inspect whether the desired content changes are correct.

(2) *Visual Quality Judge:* This judge is responsible for visual aesthetics, so it receives *only* the rendered screenshots of the predicted and ground-truth slides. Its context is engineered to focus purely on aesthetics, comparing the visual execution of alignment, layout, and style against the rubric.

To further improve the reliability, especially for multi-slide edits, our pipeline only filters the slides with salient changes to the visual judge, so that it concentrates better




Figure 4. **Our VLM-as-judge paradigm.** To maximize the reliability of existing VLMs, we employ two separate judges. The visual quality (VQ) judge primarily comprehends the PPT screenshots for visual understanding, while the instruction-following (IF) judge focuses on structured data to analyze the contents.

on the edits without being overwhelmed by the enormous contexts.

**Comparison with judges in Rrelated benchmarks.** Our evaluation methodology marks a significant advance over existing benchmarks. Prior work, such as PPTC-R [23], primarily relies on API-level “diffs”. While useful, this approach is brittle and cannot detect critical semantic errors, such as an agent copying the correct text but to the *wrong slide*. Our IF Judge, by operating on structured summaries, is explicitly designed to capture such logical failures. Furthermore, while other benchmarks like T2US [25] also use VLM-as-judge, their reliance on prompting without a strong rubric leads to noisy and unreliable ratings. PPTArena designs the style target to mitigate such issues by providing a rigorous and reproducible foundation for scoring.

To conclude, our dual-judge, rubric-grounded architecture is essential for measuring the complex, multi-step reasoning required for PPT editing and for analyzing the subtle failure modes that simpler benchmarks would miss.

#### 4. An Effective PPT Editing Agent: PPTPilot

We introduce PPTPilot, an agent for presentation editing, whose simple architecture yields surprisingly effective results, even outperforming proprietary products like OpenAI’s ChatGPT Agent (details in Sec. 5.1). Our design is built on two key insights. (1) The primary challenge in this domain is not solely intent recognition, but reliability and precision. PowerPoint files are built on the brittle Office Open XML (OOXML) format, which is highly intolerant to malformed or “hallucinated” VLM outputs, and therefore requires specialized formats and contexts suitable for PPT editing. (2) We found that no single editing modality, *e.g.*, purely relying on the XML format, is sufficient. A robust agent must be capable of intelligently selecting the optimal tool and editing interface for a given task.

PPTPilot’s core design is a dual-path architecture, emphasizing the ability to handle editing queries via either programmatic tools or direct XML editing (Fig. 5). This hybrid




Figure 5. **Our PPTPilot paradigm.** Our key insight highlights a combination of two different editing skills: functional code and direct XML edits to control the fine-grained structural elements. A “Skill Router” determines which skill is more suitable for a query. And then the corresponding VLM executes the edits via either route. Notably, the editing operations can also be enhanced with reflection, trading time for more reliable editing. For the router we use a fast LLM (GPT-5 nano or Gemini-2.5 flash), and then GPT-5 for our VLM edit calls.

design enables our agent to address a wide range of editing queries reliably and in a principled way.

**Programmatic Editing.** Utilizing `python-pptx` to edit PPTs programmatically (a method commonly adopted in prior work [9, 20, 25, 44, 45]) scripts the edits by generating code (top of Fig. 5). This approach is highly effective for repetitive, well-defined, and content-centric operations, such as performing a “find-and-replace” across all slides or translating text. However, it lacks the fine-grained control required for complex structural modifications (*e.g.*, altering slide masters, themes, or specific layout geometries).

**Direct XML Editing.** To address the limitations of the programmatic path in structural and visual editing scenarios, we have equipped PPTPilot with a second skill: the ability to directly read, parse, and re-write raw OOXML files (*e.g.*, `slide1.xml`, `theme.xml`), as shown in the top half of Fig. 5. This approach provides the precision required for structured contexts, as the VLMs can directly manipulate fine-grained properties like the specific positions of elements. Since OOXML encodes most of the information in a PPT, the XML path provides a unified interface well-aligned with existing VLMs for PPT editing. However, the long context and strict format requirements of XML make it challenging to perform precise edits, especially when modifications span a large number of slides, in which case the programmatic approach is significantly more reliable.

**Skill Routing.** To determine which editing skills to adopt for a specific user query, we employ a VLM that routes the query to the proper editing skills, as the beginning of branching in Fig. 5. Upon receiving a user instruction, this decider analyzes the prompt combined with the presentation’s structure, including the screenshots and contents. Based on this analysis, it routes the task to either the programmatic path or the direct XML editing path.

**Self-correction with Reflection.** Finally, we acknowledge the complexity of PPT editing, which indicates the challenge of correct edits in a single try. Inspired by repre-

Table 3. **PPTArena evaluation.** Scores report instruction-following (IF) and visual quality (VQ) with VLM-as-judge. Columns marked with \* are only run on a 25-case subsample for cost reasons. Bracketed values in the PPTPilot column report scores on that same subsample.

Category	Cases	PPTPilot		Gemini CLI		ChatGPT		ChatGPT Agent*		Mini Max Agent*		PPTAgent*		Poster2Agent*	
		IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑
Content	67	<b>2.49</b> [1.65]	2.41 [ <b>1.50</b> ]	1.30	<b>2.54</b>	2.03	2.20	<b>1.80</b>	<b>1.50</b>	1.10	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Layout	29	<b>2.14</b> [ <b>1.71</b> ]	<b>2.38</b> [ <b>1.29</b> ]	1.07	1.78	2.08	2.19	1.14	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Styling	29	2.14 [ <b>1.33</b> ]	<b>2.72</b> [1.33]	0.91	1.89	<b>2.41</b>	2.44	0.83	<b>1.67</b>	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Structure	15	<b>2.27</b> [1.47]	<b>2.95</b> [1.85]	1.32	2.27	1.73	1.93	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.33</b>	0.67	1.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Interactivity	4	3.00 [ <b>3.00</b> ]	<b>3.00</b> [ <b>2.00</b> ]	0.00	0.00	<b>3.25</b>	2.75	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Cases	100	<b>2.36</b> [ <b>1.71</b> ]	<b>2.69</b> [1.54]	1.21	1.98	2.07	2.22	1.68	<b>1.60</b>	1.04	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

sentative agents like ReACT [69], we introduce an iterative reflection path into the PPTPilot, so that it can gradually refine its predictions. The agent proposes an edit to the XML files, which is rendered to temporarily to a PPT file. Then a verifier model assesses the output PPT according to the original instructions and provides feedbacks for failures. In this way, the agent produces an updated PPT edit based on the feedback and is able to correct its own errors.

Despite the simplicity of our design, we find it effective and efficient for PPT editing when compared against existing agent products and frameworks. We hope our PPTPilot can serve as a baseline for research into PPT editing.

## 5. Experiments

**VLM-as-Judge.** To enhance the reliability of evaluation, we rely on the strongest vision-language models of Gemini 2.5 Pro and GPT 5 for evaluation. For clarity, we mainly include the results evaluated from the GPT 5 judge in the main comparison (Table 3). The results of utilizing Gemini 2.5 Pro as the judge and more implementation details are covered in the supplementary materials.

**Agent Baselines.** We evaluate a wide range of existing PPT agents on PPTArena and compare with PPTPilot. We provide results from the extended thinking mode ChatGPT, Gemini-CLI, and GPT-Agent, which simulates a computer, the terminal, and the ability to use a desktop, and MiniMax Agent, which specifically excels at multimodal tasks and is marketed as great “PPT helper”. We also report numbers with PPTAgent and Poster2Agent.

**Subset Evaluation.** In our baselines, several proprietary products enforce strict rate limits and huge costs, such as the ChatGPT and MiniMax Agent. Therefore, we select a subset of 25 samples for evaluation with budget limits. Our selection procedure follows the principle of emphasizing the most challenging cases: we take the 20 hardest tasks that PPTPilot and ChatGPT performed the worst at and 5 manually selected ones to ensure breadth coverage. Specific cases are detailed in the supplementary materials.

### 5.1. Performance on PPTArena

Table 3 summarizes system-level performance across the full benchmark. PPTPilot attains the strongest overall results with an instruction-following score of 2.36 and a visual-quality score of 2.69, improving to 2.84 and 3.21 respectively when self-correction is enabled. Even without its refinement loop, PPTPilot surpasses all proprietary and open baselines by large margins.

**Baseline system performance.** Across competing systems, clear patterns emerge. ChatGPT performs well on straightforward content edits and light styling adjustments, yet its performance drops on tasks requiring visual-text alignment, cross-slide reasoning, or maintenance of deck-wide structural constraints. ChatGPT Agent shows somewhat stronger visual correlation performance but continues to struggle with multi-step logical instructions. In many scenarios involving tasks beyond simple python-pptx usage—such as SmartArt manipulation, theme-level updates, chart edits, transitions, animations, or master-level fixes—the agent mode routinely stalls for extended periods (often 30+ minutes) without producing a valid PPTX. MiniMax Agent, despite being marketed as a specialized presentation tool, underperforms consistently. It achieves a notable result in one visual-layout case, but PPTPilot and ChatGPT Agent outperform it on every other category. PPTAgent and Poster2Agent, though not designed as full editing frameworks, highlight the fragility of one-shot, generation-driven pipelines: while they occasionally produce output files, the generated decks diverge substantially from the original structure, breaking fundamental preservation requirements and failing all tasks under our rubric.

**Runtime efficiency and key design principles.** Runtime patterns amplify these distinctions. Only MiniMax Agent and PPTPilot reliably complete edits in under two minutes; many other systems are significantly slower or frequently encounter tool failures. Because efficiency is a priority, we restrict the main comparison to single-pass outputs and report loop-enabled scores separately in Table 4. Taken together, these results indicate that reliable PPT editing hinges on three properties embodied in PPTPilot: structure-aware

Table 4. Ablation study results on PPTArena. Average instruction fidelity (IF) and visual quality (VQ) scores across executor variants (bottom block) and judge configurations (top block).

Configuration	IF	VQ
<i>Judge configuration</i>		
Single VLM judge (all signals)	2.31	4.26
Dual judge (no diffs)	3.76	4.54
Dual judge with diffs	2.36	2.40
<i>PPTPilot executor variants</i>		
XML-only	0.95	2.85
python-pptx-only	2.06	2.73
Hybrid (no refinement)	2.36	2.69
Hybrid + Loop (3×)	2.84	3.21

planning that reasons over deck semantics, a hybrid execution model that routes between programmatic APIs and deterministic OOXML operations, and an iterative refine-and-verify loop that stabilizes long-horizon edits. The benchmark findings show that current frontier VLM agents remain brittle on compound edits, multimodal dependencies, and cross-slide transformations, even while PPTPilot’s design substantially narrows this gap.

## 5.2. Ablation Study

We conduct a systematic ablation study of PPTPilot’s key components to understand their individual contributions to overall performance. We evaluate each variant using the same metrics defined in Section 3: task success rate, PPTX validity, instruction fidelity (IF), visual quality (VQ), and computational cost.

**Experimental setup.** Our baseline configuration uses the full PPTPilot pipeline: JSON snapshot construction, intelligent routing between XML editing and programmatic `python-pptx` paths, strict output schemas for LLM responses, and post-hoc XML validation with automatic repair. We systematically disable or replace individual components while holding all other factors constant.

**Ablation variants.** We evaluate four key configurations: *XML-only*: Forces all edits through the direct XML manipulation path. This approach excels at precise, slide-local modifications (e.g., adjusting a single shape’s geometry) but struggles with repetitive deck-wide operations such as bulk text normalization or global theme application, resulting in increased latency and reduced task success on global transformations.

*python-pptx-only*: Routes all requests through the programmatic API. This variant handles global changes effectively (uniform typography, batch renaming, translation) but underperforms on precise structural fixes requiring fine-grained control over individual elements.

*Hybrid (no refinement)*: Uses intelligent routing but disables iterative refinement. This reduces latency but sacrifices robustness on multi-step transformations where a second pass typically resolves residual formatting issues.

*Hybrid + Loop (3×)*: The full system with up to three refinement iterations, corresponding to the workflow illustrated in Figure 5.

**Results and observations.** Table 4 presents the ablation results. The hybrid routing strategy proves essential: forcing a single execution path substantially degrades task success, particularly on workloads mixing local and global edits. The XML-only variant achieves an IF score of 0.95, while `python-pptx-only` reaches 2.06. The hybrid approach without refinement achieves 2.36, and enabling iterative refinement further improves performance to 2.84 IF and 3.21 VQ. Case-by-case analysis reveals that providing slide images to PPTPilot improves layout reasoning: visual grounding enhances decisions about z-ordering, spacing, and alignment without compromising text editing quality. Iterative refinement stabilizes complex edits, with one additional pass often resolving formatting drift after re-theming or batch rewrites, at modest computational overhead.

**Judge configuration analysis.** The top block of Table 4 compares three evaluation strategies: a single-call VLM judge receiving all modalities simultaneously, a single-call judge using only slide images, and our dual-judge configuration with explicit diff analysis. The dual-judge approach with structural diffs proves substantially more stable on multi-edit cases, as the instruction-following judge can directly reason over structured manifests rather than inferring changes from pixel-level comparisons alone.

**Supplementary material.** Details about PPTArena, PPTPilot, implementation specifics, evaluation procedures, as well as the future work, failure modes, and broader impacts are provided in the supplementary material.

## 6. Conclusion

We introduce PPTArena and PPTPilot to make PowerPoint editing a concrete, measurable capability for agentic multimodal systems. PPTArena turns real slide decks, human-authored edit programs and ground truths, and style-aware rubrics into a benchmark that highlights instruction fidelity, structural grounding, and layout quality beyond generation-centric evaluations. PPTPilot shows that a dual-path paradigm with explicit plan-edit-verify loops substantially improves reliability, outperforming strong proprietary agents and frontier VLMs. Yet agents still fail on complex, long-horizon, multi-modal tasks indicating that robust PPT editing remains far from solved. We hope PPTArena and PPTPilot serve as a foundation for future work on stronger PPT editing systems that can safely and reliably operate on the documents people actually use.



## References

- [1] Adobe. Adobe max 2025: Express ai assistant announcement, 2025. Press release. 3
- [2] Agentic AI Frameworks Authors. Agentic ai frameworks: Architectures, protocols, and design challenges, 2025. 3
- [3] Agentic Software Engineering Authors. Agentic software engineering: Foundational pillars and a research roadmap, 2025. 3
- [4] Agentic Video Editing Authors. Prompt-driven agentic video editing system: Autonomous comprehension of long-form, story-driven media, 2025. 3
- [5] Michael Alley, Monika Schreiber, Kathryn Ramsdell, and John Muffo. The cognitive style of powerpoint: Pitching out corrupts within. *Technical Communication*, 52(1):80–84, 2005. 3
- [6] Animation Needs Attention Authors. Animation needs attention: A holistic approach to slides animation comprehension with visual-language models, 2025. 3
- [7] Sagnik Anupam, Davis Brown, Shuo Li, Eric Wong, Hamed Hassani, and Osbert Bastani. Browserarena: Live evaluation of web agents, 2025. 3
- [8] API vs GUI Authors. Api agents vs gui agents: Evaluating agent strategies for computer control, 2025. 3
- [9] Auto-Slides Authors. Auto-slides: An interactive multi-agent system for creating and customizing research presentations, 2025. 3, 6
- [10] B-MoCa Authors. B-moca: Benchmarking mobile device control agents across diverse configurations, 2024. 3
- [11] Benchmarking Practices Authors. Establishing best practices for building rigorous agentic benchmarks, 2025. 3
- [12] Rogerio Bonatti, Dan Zhao, Francesco Bonacci, Dillon Dupont, Sara Abdali, Yinheng Li, Yadong Lu, Justin Wagle, Kazuhito Koishida, Arthur Bucker, Lawrence Keunho Jang, and Zheng Hui. Windows agent arena: Evaluating multi-modal OS agents at scale. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4874–4910. PMLR, 2025. 3
- [13] Chain-of-Agents Authors. Chain-of-agents: End-to-end agent foundation models via multi-agent distillation and agentic rl, 2025. 3
- [14] CRAB Authors. Crab: Cross-environment agent benchmark for multimodal language model agents, 2024. 3
- [15] Xiang Deng, Yu Gu, Boyuan Zheng, Shijie Chen, Sam Stevens, Boshi Wang, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. Mind2web: Towards a generalist agent for the web. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 28091–28114. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. 3
- [16] DocRefine Authors. Docrefine: Multi-agent document editing with precision feedback, 2025. 3
- [17] Nancy Duarte. *slide:ology: The Art and Science of Creating Great Presentations*. O’Reilly Media, 2008. 3
- [18] European Organization for Nuclear Research. Zenodo: Research sharing repository, 2024. Open-access repository for research data and presentations. 3
- [19] FRAMES-VQA Authors. Frames-vqa: Benchmarking fine-tuning robustness across multi-modal shifts in visual question answering, 2025. 3
- [20] Jiaxin Ge, Zora Zhiruo Wang, Xuhui Zhou, Yi-Hao Peng, Sanjay Subramanian, Qinyue Tan, Maarten Sap, Alane Suhr, Daniel Fried, Graham Neubig, and Trevor Darrell. Autopresent: Designing structured visuals from scratch, 2025. 2, 3, 6, 16
- [21] Yingqiang Ge, Wenyue Hua, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Juntao Tan, Shuyuan Xu, Zelong Li, and Yongfeng Zhang. Openagi: When llm meets domain experts. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (NeurIPS 2023) Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023. 3
- [22] Google DeepMind. Gemini 2.5 technical report, 2025. Accessed 2025-10-19. 3
- [23] Yiduo Guo, Zekai Zhang, Yaobo Liang, Dongyan Zhao, and Nan Duan. PPTC benchmark: Evaluating large language models for PowerPoint task completion. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 8682–8701, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2, 3, 6
- [24] Dan Hendrycks, Dawn Song, Christian Szegedy, Honglak Lee, Yarin Gal, Erik Brynjolfsson, Sharon Li, Andy Zou, Lionel Levine, Olawale Salaudeen, Matthias Hein, Kevin Zhao, Alexander Pan, David Duvenaud, Bo Li, Steve Omohundro, Gabriel Alfour, Max Tegmark, Kevin McGrew, Gary Marcus, Jaan Tallinn, Eric Schmidt, Yoshua Bengio, Kimin Lee, Mantas Mazeika, Long Phan, George Ingebretsen, Adam Khoja, Cihang Xie, Bo Han, Jie Fu, Ziwei Liu, and Jinwoo Shin. A definition of agi, 2025. 3
- [25] Kyudan Jung, Hojun Cho, Jooyeol Yun, Soyoung Yang, Jaehyeok Jang, and Jaegul Choo. Talk to your slides: Language-driven agents for efficient slide editing, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 6, 13, 16
- [26] Raghav Kapoor, Yash Parag Butala, Melisa Russak, Jing Yu Koh, Kiran Kamble, Waseem AlShikh, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Omniact: A dataset and benchmark for enabling multimodal generalist autonomous agents for desktop and web. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024, Proceedings, Part LXVIII*, pages 161–178. Springer, 2024. 3
- [27] Jing Yu Koh, Robert Lo, Lawrence Jang, Vikram Duvvur, Ming Lim, Po-Yu Huang, Graham Neubig, Shuyan Zhou, Russ Salakhutdinov, and Daniel Fried. VisualWebArena: Evaluating multimodal agents on realistic visual web tasks. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 881–905, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [28] LangChain. Langgraph, 2024. GitHub repository. 3
- [29] Seongyun Lee, Seungone Kim, Sue Park, Geewook Kim, and Minjoon Seo. Prometheus-vision: Vision-language model as a judge for fine-grained evaluation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11286–11315, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 4
- [30] LinkedIn Corporation. Slideshare: Professional content sharing, 2024. Platform for sharing presentations and professional content. 3
- [31] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan

- Yang, Shudan Zhang, Xiang Deng, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Chenhui Zhang, Sheng Shen, Tianjun Zhang, Yu Su, Huan Sun, Minlie Huang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3
- [32] Felipe Maia Polo, Lucas Weber, Leshem Choshen, Yuekai Sun, Gongjun Xu, and Mikhail Yurochkin. tinyBenchmarks: evaluating LLMs with fewer examples. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 34303–34326. PMLR, 2024. 4
- [33] Grégoire Mialon, Clémentine Fourier, Thomas Wolf, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. GAIA: a benchmark for general AI assistants. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7–11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. 3
- [34] Microsoft. Autogen: Enabling next-gen large language model applications, 2023. GitHub repository. 3
- [35] MiniMax. Minimax m2 & agent: Ingenious in simplicity. <https://www.minimax.io/news/minimax-m2>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-14. 2
- [36] MLLM-as-a-Judge Authors. Mllm-as-a-judge: Assessing multimodal llm-as-a-judge with vision-language benchmark, 2024. 3
- [37] MMMU Authors. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark, 2023. 3
- [38] MMMU-Pro Authors. Mmmu-pro: A more challenging benchmark for multidisciplinary multimodal understanding, 2024. 3
- [39] Atsunori Moteki, Shoichi Masui, Fan Yang, Yueqi Song, Yonatan Bisk, Graham Neubig, Ikuo Kusajima, Yasuto Watanabe, Hiroyuki Ishida, Jun Takahashi, and Shan Jiang. Fieldworkarena: Agentic ai benchmark for real field work tasks, 2025. 3
- [40] MT-Bench Authors. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena, 2023. 3
- [41] No Free Labels Authors. No free labels: Limitations of llm-as-a-judge without human grounding, 2025. 3
- [42] OpenAI. Introducing chatgpt agent, 2025. Accessed: 2025-10-19. 2, 3
- [43] OpenAI. Gpt-5 system card, 2025. Accessed: 2025-10-19. 3
- [44] Wei Pang, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Xiangru Jian, Xi He, and Philip Torr. Paper2poster: Towards multimodal poster automation from scientific papers, 2025. 6, 16
- [45] PPTAgent Authors. Pptagent: Hierarchical powerpoint editing with vision-language agents, 2025. 3, 6, 16
- [46] ReasonVQA Authors. Reasonvqa: A multi-hop reasoning benchmark with structural knowledge for visual question answering, 2025. 3
- [47] Reliable Judge Authors. Is your video language model a reliable judge?, 2024. 3
- [48] RewardBench Authors. Multimodal rewardbench: Holistic evaluation of reward models for vision language models, 2025. 3
- [49] Garr Reynolds. *Presentation Zen: Simple Ideas on Presentation Design and Delivery*. New Riders, 2nd edition, 2011. 3
- [50] Rise of Agentic AI Survey Authors. The rise of agentic ai: A review of definitions, frameworks, architectures, applications, evaluation metrics, and challenges, 2024. Available via ResearchGate. 3
- [51] Scaling Agents Authors. The unreasonable effectiveness of scaling agents for computer use, 2025. 3
- [52] Timo Schick et al. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools, 2023. 3
- [53] Dustin Schwenk et al. A-okvqa: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge, 2022. 3
- [54] ScreenQA Authors. Screenqa: Large-scale question-answer pairs over mobile app screenshots, 2022. 3
- [55] SheetMind Authors. Sheetmind: An end-to-end llm-powered multi-agent framework for spreadsheet automation, 2025. 3
- [56] Mong Yuan Sim, Wei Emma Zhang, Xiang Dai, and Biaoyan Fang. Can VLMs actually see and read? a survey on modality collapse in vision-language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 24452–24470, Vienna, Austria, 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. 4
- [57] SlideAudit Authors. Slideaudit: A dataset and taxonomy for automated evaluation of presentation slides, 2025. 3
- [58] SlidesCarnival. Slidescarnival: Free presentation templates, 2024. Online repository of presentation templates. 3
- [59] SpreadsheetBench Authors. Spreadsheetbench: Towards challenging real world spreadsheet manipulation, 2024. 3
- [60] Survey on LLM-as-a-Judge Authors. A survey on llm-as-a-judge, 2024. 3
- [61] Shulin Tian, Ziniu Zhang, Liangyu Chen, and Ziwei Liu. MMInA: Benchmarking multihop multimodal Internet agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 13682–13697, Vienna, Austria, 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [62] VQArt-Bench Authors. Vqart-bench: A semantically rich vqa benchmark for art and cultural heritage, 2025. 3
- [63] WebAgent Authors. A real-world webagent with planning, long context understanding, and program synthesis, 2023. 3
- [64] WebVoyager Authors. Webvoyager: A survey of web agents with multimodal perception, 2025. 3
- [65] Who’s Your Judge Authors. Who’s your judge? on the detectability of llm-generated judgments, 2025. 3
- [66] Robin Williams. *The Non-Designer’s Design Book*. Peachpit Press, 4th edition, 2015. 3
- [67] Zhiyong Wu, Chengcheng Han, Zichen Ding, Zhenmin Weng, Zhoumianze Liu, Shunyu Yao, Tao Yu, and Lingpeng Kong. Os-copilot: Towards generalist computer agents with self-improvement, 2024. 3
- [68] Tianbao Xie, Danyang Zhang, Jixuan Chen, Xiaochuan Li, Siheng Zhao, Ruisheng Cao, Jing Hua Toh, Zhoujun Cheng, Dongchan Shin, Fangyu Lei, Yitao Liu, Yiheng Xu, Shuyan Zhou, Silvio Savarese, Caiming Xiong, Victor Zhong, and Tao Yu. Oworld: Benchmarking multimodal agents for open-ended tasks in real computer environments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37 (NeurIPS 2024), Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. 3

- [69] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *ICLR*, 2022. [7](#)
- [70] Zekai Zhang, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Dongyan Zhao, and Nan Duan. PPTC-R benchmark: Towards evaluating the robustness of large language models for PowerPoint task completion. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 12387–12402, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. [3](#), [4](#), [16](#)
- [71] Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Uri Alon, and Graham Neubig. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Vienna, Austria, 2024. [3](#)

# PPTArena: A Benchmark for Agentic PowerPoint Editing


## Supplementary Material

### Contents


<b>A Video Demo</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>B PPTPilot Analysis</b>	<b>12</b>
B.1. Gemini 2.5 Pro as Judge	12
B.2. PPTPilot on T2US	13
<b>C PPTArena Analysis</b>	<b>13</b>
C.1. Challenging Scenario Distribution	13
C.2. Comparison with Related Benchmarks	13
<b>D PPTArena Dataset Construction</b>	<b>13</b>
D.1. Data Sources and Licensing	13
D.2. PPT and Scenario Curation	14
D.3. Ground-Truth Deck Creation	15
D.4. Subset Evaluation Data Setup	15
<b>E Evaluation and VLM Judges</b>	<b>15</b>
E.1. Per-Sample Style-Target Generation	15
E.2. VLM-as-Judge Evaluation	15
<b>F. Examples of PPTArena’s Challenging Cases</b>	<b>16</b>
F.1. Multi-Step Reasoning Depth	16
F.2. Cross-Slide Dependencies and Global Constraints	17
F.3. Semantic Understanding and Multi-Modal Reasoning	17
F.4. Long-Horizon Planning and Accessibility	17
<b>G PPTPilot Implementation Details</b>	<b>17</b>
G.1. Skill Router and Editing Pipeline	17
G.2. Self-correction and Reflection.	18
<b>H Performance Analysis and Failure Modes</b>	<b>18</b>
H.1. Comparatives	18
<b>I. Reproducibility and Release Details</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>J. Limitations and Future Work</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix I Benchmark Details Listings</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix II Code Listings</b>	<b>23</b>

### A. Video Demo

We have created a web-app based on PPTPilot (Sec. 4), which can convert a given PPT according to the user instructions. Please refer to the **videos in our supplementary materials** for their process. In our Fig. A, we have illustrated the webapp conducting chat-based editing for users’ provided PPTs and how PPTArena runs the evaluation by comparing the ground truth and prediction slides.



Chat-based Editing



PPTArena Evaluation

Figure A. Our WebApp Demo for PPTPilot in chat-based editing (Top) and PPTArena evaluation (bottom). See the [PPTArena code-base](#) and the [project webpage](#).

### B. PPTPilot Analysis

#### B.1. Gemini 2.5 Pro as Judge

In our main paper, we utilize GPT as the VLM judge (Table 4) for PPTArena. To validate the robustness of our PPTPilot, we conduct a further experiment using Gemini 2.5 Pro as the VLM judge. As shown in Table A, we conduct the same set of experiments as in Table 4 and highlight the following observations. As clearly shown, PPTPilot still shows a significant advantage over other approaches, in-



Table A. **Detailed VLM-as-Judge Evaluation Results (Gemini 2.5 Pro)**. Scores report instruction-following (IF) and visual quality (VQ) with VLM-as-judge. Columns marked with \* are only run on a 25-case subsample for cost and rate-limit reasons. Bracketed values in the PPTPilot column report scores on that same subsample.

Category	Cases	PPTPilot		Gemini CLI		ChatGPT		ChatGPT Agent*		MiniMax Agent*		PPTAgent*		Poster2Agent*	
		IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑	IF↑	VQ↑
Content	67	<b>2.51 [2.10]</b>	<b>2.68 [2.35]</b>	1.93	2.14	1.95	2.00	1.45	1.65	0.90	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Layout	29	<b>2.18 [2.00]</b>	<b>2.64 [2.14]</b>	1.89	2.07	1.96	2.00	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Styling	29	<b>2.54 [2.17]</b>	<b>2.50 [2.33]</b>	2.17	2.07	2.37	1.85	0.83	0.83	1.00	0.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Structure	15	<b>2.47 [1.67]</b>	<b>3.60 [2.33]</b>	1.87	2.33	1.80	1.53	<b>2.00</b>	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Interactivity	4	2.00 [ <b>2.00</b> ]	3.00 [ <b>2.00</b> ]	1.00	2.25	<b>2.25</b>	<b>4.25</b>	1.00	<b>2.00</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Cases	100	<b>2.45 [2.04]</b>	<b>2.74 [2.60]</b>	1.92	2.15	1.97	2.03	1.44	1.32	0.92	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table B. **PPTPilot vs. T2US on the T2US benchmark**. We report success rate and judge ratings for different quality dimensions.

Metric	T2US Benchmark	
	T2US [25]	PPTPilot (ours)
Success rate (%)	96.83	<b>100.00</b>
Instruction following ↑	2.21	<b>4.05</b>
Image quality ↑	2.17	<b>4.44</b>
Layout quality ↑	2.58	<b>4.40</b>
Color quality ↑	2.57	<b>4.20</b>
Text quality ↑	2.48	<b>3.92</b>

cluding the proprietary agents. This suggests that our PPTPilot is simple yet effective. Figure G visualizes the alignment between scores assigned by different VLM judges. The comparison demonstrates that while absolute score values may vary slightly between judges, the relative ranking of agents remains consistent, with PPTPilot maintaining its lead across both the full benchmark and the challenging subset.

## B.2. PPTPilot on T2US

In Table B, we compare PPTPilot on the T2US [25] benchmark. We adopt *gemini-2.5-flash* as our backbone model, the same as T2US, for a fair comparison. As clearly demonstrated, our PPTPilot has a significant advantage over T2US, achieving better quality, exceeding a score of 4 out of 5 in multiple categories. In fact, this also demonstrates the need for our PPTArena to introduce more challenging PPT editing scenarios.

## C. PPTArena Analysis

### C.1. Challenging Scenario Distribution

We analyze how the difficulty levels of editing categories are distributed in our benchmark. Table C shows that Structure and Interactivity require the longest programs (6.8–7.2 operations on average) and span the most slides (10–11), which leads to the highest cross-slide and high-diff rates

(56–70% and 71–75%). Content, Layout, and Styling remain challenging, with roughly one-third of cases requiring cross-slide consistency (26–34%) and 41–52% tagged as high-diff. Overall, PPTArena focuses on multi-slide and multimodal reasoning tasks rather than inflating the benchmark with easier single-slide tweaks.

### C.2. Comparison with Related Benchmarks

In Table D, we compare our PPTArena with existing PPT-related benchmarks and highlight its uniqueness, providing further details in Table 2. As clearly demonstrated, our PPTArena provides broader coverage of scenarios, does not rely on predefined APIs or COMs, and is based on a larger number of source slides. In addition, our evaluation protocol is carefully designed to enable rigorous, reliable evaluation by providing detailed ground truth, predictions, and per-sample style-targets for reproducible scoring.

Notably, prior benchmarks, *e.g.*, PPTC-R, might not be challenging enough given the progress of VLMs. Specifically, we evaluate GPT-5 and Gemini 2.5 Pro using PPTC-R’s pipeline and achieved the success rates of 92% and 88%, respectively. These observations further suggest the necessity of building a challenging PPT editing benchmark like our PPTArena.

## D. PPTArena Dataset Construction

We detail the multi-stage construction of PPTArena (supplementing Sec. 3), covering data sourcing, curation, and the extraction pipeline to derive rubrics for evaluation illustrated in Listing 1.


### D.1. Data Sources and Licensing

- **Zenodo:** We sourced open-access presentations from Zenodo repositories.
- **Government and Educational Sources:** We collected PPTs from .gov and .edu domains to ensure a variety of formal and academic styles.
- **Web Scraping:** We utilized targeted search queries to find relevant financial and business presentations, such as:


## Object Distance (16 slides total)



## Update Theme (28 slides total)



## Dynamic Chart Conversions (5 slides total)



## Translate Arabic LTR (22 slides Total)



Figure B. Example edit queries in PPTArena, including correcting object distances, changing plot styles, updating PPT themes, and translating the contents. As demonstrated, our PPTArena contains a wide range of slide decks with varied visual elements and content. PPT editing operations are also typically spread across multiple pages, underscoring the challenge of reliable PPT editing in the real world.

```
'quarter revenues'
 filetype:pptx
```

- **Creative Licenses:** We included high-quality templates and decks from Slideshare and SlidesCarnival that are available under Creative Commons Licenses.
- **Student Contributions:** We curated presentations from students in diverse fields like Biology, Art Practice, and Chemical Engineering to capture different disciplinary norms.

## D.2. PPT and Scenario Curation

**PPT Selection.** In our initial sourcing, we have gathered a database with more than 15k PPTs. To select the proper ones for building a high-quality evaluation benchmark, we first convert the PPT files to a structured JSON format and retain only those with multimodal elements, such as images, tables, charts, and customized themes. Then we ranked the

PPTs according to their file size, number of slides, and content variety, leading to the top 500 most diverse slide decks. Finally, a team of human annotators manually inspected the candidate decks based on the following criteria and picked the top 100 PPTs for editing: (1) *Quality*: Rejecting decks with broken layouts, low-resolution images, and unreadable texts; (2) *Privacy*: Removing any decks containing personal information; (3) *Complexity*: Prioritizing slides that offer interesting elements (e.g., complex charts, grouped shapes). After this process, we curate a set of high-quality PPTs ready for evaluating the editing challenge.

**Editing Query Creation.** By providing the respective categories and edit types listed in table 1, we use a combination of AI-generated prompts and human-inspired edits to come up with all of our queries. For each category, we use multiple AI models, prompting each for high-fidelity, multi-step, hard-reasoning tasks. We manually validated more than 200

Table C. **Challenge distribution in PPTArena.** For each editing category, we report the average number of operations and slides touched per case, along with the share of cases tagged as cross-slide or high-diff. Cross-slide cases require coordinated semantic edits across at least two slides (for example, including visuals based on prior slides or consolidating charts). High-diff is a deterministic flag for cases that combine long-horizon programs or strong text-visual dependencies, as in Table 2.

Category	Cases	Avg. ops	Avg. slides	Cross-slide	High-diff.
Content	67	4.3	6.8	26%	41%
Layout	29	5.7	8.9	34%	52%
Styling	29	5.1	9.4	30%	48%
Structure	15	6.8	11.2	56%	71%
Interactivity	4	7.2	10.5	70%	75%
All tags (multi-label)	144	5.1	8.3	32%	49%

of these prompts. Then through a selection process of combining and fitting prompts to PPTs we reduced this to our curated 100 case set.

**Distribution.** We ensured that each category (Table 1) is well-represented, with at least 2 cases for every specific edit type. The benchmark is weighted towards the most common and challenging edit types in the real world. As shown in Fig. B, our PPTArena covers a wide range of requests and shows a wide variety of visual elements for editing.

**Difficulty Labeling.** For each case we record four aligned signals: (1) the number of atomic operations in the ground-truth program, (2) the number of distinct slides edited, (3) whether the instruction or style target imposes cross-slide dependencies (updates on one slide conditioned on content in another or deck-wide consistency requirements), and (4) a *high-diff* (high difficulty) flag. We designate a case as high-diff when a task contains cross-slide dependencies or heavy visual-textual semantic reasoning dependencies, such as chart remapping or translation. These consistent labels produce the distribution summarized in Table C.

### D.3. Ground-Truth Deck Creation

Our benchmark consists of 100 cases. 80 are derived from real-world slide decks (domain-specific presentations or web-sourced), and 20 are synthetically generated using `python-pptx` to provide a controlled baseline. For the real-world decks, expert human annotators manually performed edits to create the Ground Truth, each of which typically took more than 2 hours. This ensures that the target state reflects high-quality, human-level design decisions. For the 20 synthetic cases, the ground-truth PPTs were generated by programs, providing a reliable reference.

### D.4. Subset Evaluation Data Setup

By default, we utilize all of the PPTs in our benchmark for a full evaluation of agents. However, we curate a subset catering to the strict rate limits and cost of proprietary agents. Specifically, we define a “hard” subset of 25 cases that represents the most difficult scenarios in PPTArena following the principle of task breadth and difficulty. Specifically, we select the 25 cases where our PPTPilot performs the worst.

## E. Evaluation and VLM Judges

This section provides further details for our evaluation of VLM judge (Sec. 3.3).

### E.1. Per-Sample Style-Target Generation

The essential part of our reliable evaluation is the generation of a per-sample style-target to capture the varied requirements of different edit queries. We first use GPT-5 to generate initial style targets, along with detailed JSON summaries of the original and ground-truth PPTs. Then, human annotators manually refined the style targets to ensure they accurately captured the nuances of the transformation. In our style targets, they emphasize the following rubrics: (1) *Content*: Accuracy of text updates and data; (2) *Layout*: Alignment, spacing, and grid adherence; (3) *Typography*: Font consistency and hierarchy; (4) *Global Constraints*: Theme application and master slide usage. The exact prompt templates of prompting the language models are shown in Listings 2 and 3.

### E.2. VLM-as-Judge Evaluation

As in Sec. 3.3, we employ a dual-model judging system to evaluate agent performance, designed to balance deterministic evaluation with semantic understanding. The primary judge is **GPT-5**, configured with temperature 0.2 and top- $k=1$  to ensure consistent outputs. For robustness and cross-verification, we also utilize **Gemini 2.5 Pro** as a secondary judge, as shown in Table A. The evaluation pipeline constructs a composite prompt by concatenating the user’s original instruction with the explicit style target. This prompt is provided to the VLM judge, along with two distinct modalities of the presentation state, to assess instruction-following and visual quality. Full prompt templates are provided in Listings 4 and 5.

**Instruction Following.** To evaluate instruction following, we build the contexts for the VLM judge so that it concentrates on the contents. Accordingly, the inputs include: (1) *Structured Diffs*: This allows the judge to precisely verify if specific requested actions (e.g., “change font to Arial”) were executed; (2) *XML & JSON*: We enable the judge to understand the XML and JSON diffs. Depending on the types of editing queries, we select the optimal way to leverage the VLM judge’s context lengths. We do this by calculating the

Table D. **Benchmark and evaluation coverage comparison.** We contrast PPTArena with prior PowerPoint editing / generation benchmarks in terms of scenario focus and what aspects of evaluation they make observable vs. leave under-specified.

Benchmark	Scenario focus	Evaluation coverage and gaps
PPTC-R [70]	Macro playback of < 100 API functions on templated decks	Regenerates decks via Office macros and checks API diffs, but does not release PPTX pairs or manifests. Outputs can vary by Office build, and there is no direct semantic or visual quality judgment.
TSBench (Talk to Your Slides) [25]	COM-scripted instruction following on 379 prompts over corporate templates	Lacks dual scoring and public reference slides; edits rarely exceed four operations per case, and 379 prompts are extrapolated from 56 underlying edit tasks, limiting diversity and compositional difficulty.
Paper2Poster [44]	Single-slide poster generation from research papers	Uses a QA pipeline plus a single VLM-as-judge. Scoring is coarse, with no structured manifests or per-operation fidelity, and the benchmark is not designed for multi-step editing or layout-preserving updates.
AutoPresent [20]	SlidesBench: prompts derived from existing slides for PPT generation from scratch	Reports spatial/text/color metrics and heuristic checks, but reference decks and judge rationales are not publicly released (subscription only), and the reported test set contains just 10 PowerPoint decks.
PPTAgent [45]	Document-to-slide synthesis via a hierarchical presentation agent	PPTEval uses a single LLM to rate content/design/coherence, without deterministic manifests, accessibility checks, or explicit visibility into which elements were inserted, modified, or preserved.
<b>PPTArena (ours)</b>	100-case, 2,125-slide multi-edit benchmark covering 16 edit types across 5 categories	Releases Original / Prediction / Ground-truth PPTX triplets, style-target manifests, and dual VLM judges: IF (instruction-following via structured JSON/XML diffs) and VQ (visual quality via screenshots). Supports reproducible, traceable scoring, hybrid API/XML evaluations, and iterative verification under realistic multi-edit workloads.

percentage of the diff between the XMLs and JSONs, and then sending the one corresponding to the higher percentage change to the LLM. We see that generally master and theme edits flag XML diffs, while many textual replacements flag the JSONs.

**Visual Quality.** The input for evaluating visual quality aims at providing the multi-modal information for the VLM judge. The primary input is the set of high-resolution *visual screenshots*. To improve the reliability of the VLM judge, we implement several heuristic mechanisms: (1) *SSIM Screening*: An editing query might only influence a small portion of slides, making the evaluation of all of the slides redundant. Therefore, we can utilize the Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) to automatically mark certain slides as correct if the SSIM between the prediction and ground-truth is high. (2) *Context Lengths*: To avoid the challenges of long context lengths, we group the screenshots into batches of 5 slides per VLM judge inference, enabling them to look closely into every screenshot.

## F. Examples of PPTArena’s Challenging Cases

### F.1. Multi-Step Reasoning Depth

Unlike PPTC-R’s focus on adversarial variations of single instructions (e.g., translating text with noisy phrasing

or API constraints), PPTArena requires agents to decompose complex instructions into multiple interdependent sub-tasks. Consider the case **Multi-Edit Cascade** in figure E. This single instruction requires: (1) global theme application across all slides, (2) image-to-chart conversion with data extraction, (3) layout optimization on a specific slide, (4) programmatic progress bar generation with positional calculations, and (5) bibliography synthesis from scattered references. By contrast, the longest PPTC-R long-turn we measured strings together 29 deterministic API invocations across nine slides (largely repeating `move_to_slide` → `set_font_*` / `set_background_color`) without ever mixing modalities or reconciling content semantics. T2US similarly focuses on isolated operations like typo correction or translation, where the reasoning depth rarely exceeds two steps.

Another example is **12-Column Grid & Baseline Rhythm Canonicalization** which exemplifies another level of complexity with the prompt and style target shown in Figure F. This case requires the agent to: (1) infer an implicit 12-column grid structure from messy layouts, (2) compute baseline alignments across heterogeneous text boxes, (3) resolve chart-legend collisions through spatial reasoning, (4) establish image-caption groupings while maintaining visual balance, and (5) perform self-referential



text updates that describe the corrections. The last requirement—updating descriptive text to match the new state—introduces a meta-cognitive challenge absent from prior benchmarks, where ground truth never depends on the agent’s own edits.

## F.2. Cross-Slide Dependencies and Global Constraints

The example in figure 3 requires mapping speaker notes to the correct slides, rewriting narrative beats, and restructuring the deck before deleting the staging slide. The task forces long-horizon planning because mistakes in early slides cascade to the remaining six notes assignments. The **Cross-Slide Data Consolidation** example in figure E pushes this further: the agent must (1) parse and merge structured data from two slides, (2) delete slides while updating all subsequent slide references, (3) apply typographic transformations globally, and (4) perform layout normalization on a different slide. This creates a dependency graph where earlier actions (slide deletion) affect later operations (slide indexing). Although the PPTC-R release contains 386 turns (21% of 1,808) that touch more than one slide, each loop simply replays the same formatting adjustment after a `move_to_slide` call, so there is no dependency between slides or data flow to maintain.

Another example, **Cross-Slide Conditional Formatting**, in figure E introduces conditional logic across slides. This requires: (1) parsing tabular data on one slide, (2) establishing semantic correspondences between table entries and timeline elements on another slide, and (3) applying conditional formatting based on extracted attributes. No comparable case exists in PPTC-R or T2US, whose multi-slide turns remain independent formatting loops without shared semantics.

## F.3. Semantic Understanding and Multi-Modal Reasoning

PPTArena includes 18 cases requiring deep semantic understanding of content. The example shown in the main paper, **Fill in the Animal Research Poster** shown in 1 illustrates this: the agent must (1) semantically parse section headers to understand topical context (e.g., “THE EYES” expects information about visual systems), (2) retrieve factual knowledge about specific animals, (3) produce context-appropriate summaries that fit space constraints, (4) optimize font sizes to prevent overflow, and (5) format academic citations. Another example is a case that asks for a format change; **Screenshot-to-Editable Text** requires vision-language integration. The agent must: (1) perform OCR on the screenshot, (2) extract visual elements (the university crest), (3) reconstruct the layout semantically rather than pixel-perfectly, and (4) ensure all elements are editable PowerPoint objects, not images.

## F.4. Long-Horizon Planning and Accessibility

Our case that asks to **Update Theme and Slides Backgrounds** shown in Figure B spans 27 slides and requires: creating custom master layouts, classifying slides into categories, applying different templates, enforcing contrast, and preserving existing content during a theme change. The longest PPTC-R released turn touches nine slides but only issues local typography commands, never rethinking layout intent or accessibility structure.

Accessibility requirements introduce another layer of difficulty. One of our non-visual dependent examples titled **WCAG Accessibility & Master Cleanup** asks the agent to (1) generate semantically meaningful slide titles based on content analysis, (2) reorder shape z-indices to match logical reading flow, (3) remove font overrides while preserving visual appearance, and (4) validate against WCAG 2.1 AA standards.

## G. PPTPilot Implementation Details

This section provides the implementation details of our simple yet effective PPTPilot in Sec. 4. The prompt templates and example code for the parts below are in Listings 1 and 2.

### G.1. Skill Router and Editing Pipeline

**Skill Router.** Different PPTs might require different kinds of edits. To tackle this, we first implement a lightweight router. This router is a small, fast LLM such as GPT-5 nano or Gemini 2.5-flash. The router takes in the prompt and a high-level JSON summary of the PPT and then decides: (1) whether to route the editing to direct XML editing or programmatic editing; (2) which slides are the editing target required for the VLMs to operate on. In our prompts, we use in-context examples to provide guidance and reference for the router. For example, editing content across many slides, e.g., more than 5, is better for programmatic editing, while visual contents, structures, and layouts are better suited for XML edits for better fidelity.

**Direct XML Editing.** If the router chooses to tackle the task using XML patching, the LLM digests the XML structure, JSON summary, and prompts, then returns which XML files and patches to edit. Such information is further provided to a stronger reasoning model to refine and produce the final changes.

**Programmatic Editing.** When the router flags large-scale content requests, the system follows a programmatic path with two sequential LLM invocations. The first produces a structured content plan or rewritten instruction with more specified objectives. This is further combined with the full JSON summary of the slides and relevant screenshots as input for the second LLM inference. The second step generates executable editing code (e.g., via `pptx` python libraries) that applies the updates to the targeted slides. Separating




Figure C. Malformed prediction artifacts from ChatGPT Extended Thinking mode, ChatGPT Agent, & PPTPilot.

content synthesis from code generation improves reliability for operations like slide creation, translation, and summarization.

**Verifier and Error Controls.** We implement heuristic checks to verify the output XML produces a valid PPT and that code generation runs without errors. The functionality of this step is similar to that of a PPT compiler, returning the errors to the VLMs for well-formed XML for valid slides.

## G.2. Self-correction and Reflection.

To enable more reliable PPT editing, we employ a self-correction reflective loop in PPTPilot. After each round of editing, PPTPilot formats the updated screenshot(s) of the changed slide(s) and the prompts back into the same editing skill for an additional round of editing. As shown in Table 4, such a technique steadily improves the quality of editing. In future work, we will explore incorporating an explicit VLM judge in the loop, without relying on the self-reflection capability of direct XML editing or programmatic editing branches.

## H. Performance Analysis and Failure Modes

We provide granular performance metrics across our five taxonomy categories; visualized benchmark tables are shown in Tables A and 3. Our results show that **Structure**, **Layout**, and **Interactivity** are the most challenging categories; often requiring strong XML path executions for success. Some of the most challenging edit types are ones re-

quire reasoning across multiple slides and multiples modalities including visual, text, and diagrams. We provide examples in Figures C, D and H

### H.1. Comparatives

In Figure C we see how state-of-the-art models fail at tasks that contain both visual and textual dependencies. ChatGPT fails to crop the faces, instead placing a circle on top of the profiles. It also is unable to construct a well-formed simple rock cycle diagram. All of the models, including ChatGPT & PPTPilot fail at reshaping and ordering images correctly. Once reshaped, agents lose track of the image content, resulting in mismatches with the captions. This case is particularly tricky as it requires alignment, image classification, and layout reasoning. In other cases, ChatGPT Agent fails but PPTPilot succeeds, for example when asked to translate Kazakh but keep French from a second-language acquisition slidedeck, ChatGPT kept the Kazakh and translated French into English—the exact opposite of the requested task. PPTPilot handles this correctly as shown in Figure D. However, PPTPilot failed when asked to generate a dynamic SmartArt timeline from a set of bullet points. While some visuals were included, they don’t correspond to the text nor is the timeline dynamic and interactive as SmartArt is in PPTs. ChatGPT Agent also failed to correctly layout “Second Quarter” to “Q2” and instead overlaps it with other objects. We find that these agents struggle with tasks that are fundamental to powerpoint editing and require both visual, spatial, and semantic analysis and configuration. Although




Figure D. PPTPilot agent predictions on challenging benchmark cases. The top row shows original slides, while the bottom row displays PPTPilot’s automated corrections. These cases demonstrate content reordering while preserving semantic meaning, semantic-reasoning for text replacements, and powerpoint integration with formatting dependencies. These examples highlight PPTPilot’s ability to interpret complex instructions and execute precise modifications.

PPTPilot is capable of performing many tasks correctly as shown in Figure D, there is still a lot of progress to be made.

## I. Reproducibility and Release Details

We will release our code, PPTArena benchmark, PPTPilot Agent (public webapp), detailed prompts and benchmark files to ensure reproducibility.

## J. Limitations and Future Work

We have introduced PPTArena and PPTPilot to establish presentation editing as a rigorous, measurable domain for multi-modal agents. Moving beyond pixel-level generation to structure-aware editing, we demonstrate that reliable automation requires distinct planning, routing, and verification steps. While PPTPilot sets a new state-of-the-art, the complexity of real-world presentation design offers a vast landscape for future research. We outline several key directions where we envision expanding the scope of agentic presentation editing.

**Collaborative editing.** Our current evaluation relies on explicitly stated instructions. In practice, user intent is often under-specified (e.g., “make this slide less cluttered” or “highlight the content here”). Future work should explore conversational refinement, where agents are evaluated not just on the final edit, but on their ability to ask clarifying

questions, propose options, and engage in multi-turn dialogue to resolve ambiguity before executing changes.

**Cross-application workflows.** PPTArena evaluates editing within the closed environment of a slide deck. However, professional workflows frequently involve migrating data between applications, such as embedding live Excel charts or synthesizing Word documents into slides. An exciting frontier is extending the benchmark to support cross-application manifests, testing an agent’s ability to maintain semantic consistency as it shuttles content between diverse file formats and software ecosystems.

**Hyper-Specialized Domain Coverage.** While PPTArena spans a diverse taxonomy from business to biology, certain hyper-specialized domains impose unique constraints not yet fully captured. We plan to extend our dataset to include technical and scientific edge cases, such as editing complex LaTeX equations in engineering decks or managing strict regulatory compliance disclosures in financial presentations. This will test the limits of an agent’s external knowledge retrieval and its ability to adhere to rigid industry standards.

## Appendix I Benchmark Details Listings




Figure E. Visualizing high-difficulty cases involving multi-edit cascades (Case 93), data consolidation (Case 74), and cross-slide understanding (Case 98).

## Prompt vs. Style Target Comparison (case 75)

### PROMPT:

"Please clean up this presentation. The slides are a mess. Align all the content to a consistent grid, ensure text boxes are vertically aligned, fix the chart legend so it doesn't overlap, and organize the pictures neatly with their captions below them."

### STYLE TARGET

#### Slide 1:

- The three main text boxes ('Overview', 'Details', 'Notes') must be arranged as columns, horizontally distributed with consistent spacing, and vertically top-aligned with each other.
- All elements on the slide (text boxes, table, picture) must be aligned ...
- The bulleted text within the 'Overview', 'Details', and 'Notes' text boxes must be updated to describe the corrected state, as follows:
  - 'Overview' text: "• This column snaps to grid.", "• Lines align to 8-pt baselines.", "• No overlaps or margin violations."
  - 'Details' text: ...

#### Slide 2:

- The chart's legend must be positioned so that it does not overlap with the chart's plot area. This can be achieved by moving the legend (e.g., to the bottom or right) or resizing the plot area.
- ...
- All remaining elements should be neatly arranged.

#### Slide 3:

- The slide title must be updated to "Figures & Captions (Aligned)".
- The two pictures ('Picture 9' and 'Picture 11') must be ...

### Global Constraints:

- The following properties should remain unchanged: Font styles (name, bold, italic), font sizes and colors, table data and styling, chart data and type, and the content of the pictures.

Figure F. Comparison showing the gap between a natural-language prompt and the detailed style target rubric (Case 75).







Figure G. **Average IF/VQ scores visualized by judge.** We compare Instruction Following (Orange) and Visual Quality (Blue) across agents. Darker bars represent the Gemini Judge; lighter bars represent the GPT-5 Judge. The legend at the top applies to both charts.



## Appendix II Code Listings

```
1 def pptx_to_json(filepath):
2     """
3     Converts a .pptx file to a comprehensive JSON representation.
4     Captures all edit types: Content, Layout, Styling, Interactivity, and Structure.
5     """
6     try:
7         prs = Presentation(filepath)
8
9         # Presentation-level metadata
10        presentation_data = {
11            "filename": os.path.basename(filepath),
12            "slide_width": prs.slide_width.pt if hasattr(prs, 'slide_width') else None,
13            "slide_height": prs.slide_height.pt if hasattr(prs, 'slide_height') else None,
14            "slides": []
15        }
16
17        # ... [Metadata extraction logic omitted for brevity] ...
18
19        for i, slide in enumerate(prs.slides):
20            slide_data = {
21                "slide_number": i + 1,
22                "shapes": [],
23                "notes": "",
24                # Layout & Structure info
25                "slide_layout": slide.slide_layout.name if hasattr(slide, 'slide_layout') else None,
26                "slide_id": slide.slide_id if hasattr(slide, 'slide_id') else None,
27            }
28
29            # ... [Shape iteration and property extraction logic omitted for brevity] ...
30            # ... [Captures: Background, Shapes, Text, Tables, Images, Charts, Groups] ...
31
32            presentation_data["slides"].append(slide_data)
33
34        return presentation_data
35    except Exception as e:
36        print(f"Error processing {filepath}: {e}")
37        return None
```

Listing 1. PPTX to JSON Conversion Logic

```
1 def diff_pptx_json(ground_truth_json, prediction_json, initial_json=None):
2     """
3     Performs a deep comparison between ground_truth and prediction JSON structures.
4     Returns a structured diff with only the differences, organized by slide and shape.
5     """
6     differences = []
7
8     # ... [Helper functions: normalize_value, values_match, compare_dict, compare_list omitted] ...
9
10    # Compare slides
11    gt_slides = ground_truth_json.get("slides", [])
12    pred_slides = prediction_json.get("slides", [])
13    init_slides = initial_json.get("slides", []) if initial_json else []
14
15    for slide_idx in range(max(len(gt_slides), len(pred_slides))):
16        # ... [Slide comparison logic omitted] ...
17        pass
18
19    # Calculate similarity score
20    total_properties = len(differences) + 100 # Baseline to avoid division by zero
21    similarity_score = 1.0 - (len(differences) / total_properties)
22
23    return {
24        "has_differences": len(differences) > 0,
25        "similarity_score": max(0.0, min(1.0, similarity_score)),
26        "total_differences": len(differences),
27        "differences": differences
28    }
```

Listing 2. Smart Diff Construction

```

1 You are an expert technical writer for presentation editing workflows.
2 Given ONLY the Original deck and the Ground Truth deck, produce actionable, specific instructions to convert
   Original into Ground Truth. Focus on content and structure inferred from JSON; do not reference any
   predictions.
3
4 --- ORIGINAL (JSON summary) ---
5 ```json
6 {original_ppt_json_truncated}
7 ```
8
9 --- GROUND TRUTH (JSON summary) ---
10 ```json
11 {ground_truth_ppt_json_truncated}
12 ```
13
14 Return a single JSON object with keys: overview_instructions (multi-sentence, stepwise where helpful), and
   notes (optional).

```

Listing 3. Style Target Generation Prompt

```

1 You are a strict judge of INSTRUCTION FOLLOWING.
2
3 CRITICAL UNDERSTANDING:
4 - The "Instruction" is what the model/editor received (the user's request)
5 - The "Style Target" is YOUR evaluation rubric - the model DID NOT see this
6 - You will receive a FOCUSED DIFF showing only what changed between ground_truth and prediction
7 - Your job: Judge if the prediction's changes match the ground_truth's changes
8 - DO NOT compare prediction to initial - focus on whether prediction achieved ground_truth's outcome
9 - If the diff shows minimal differences, that's GOOD (high score)
10 - Ground Truth is ONE valid example, not the only correct answer
11
12 FLEXIBILITY:
13 - Accept different valid approaches (e.g., flags in a list vs rows is fine if they match the text)
14 - Exact positions/sizes don't matter unless the Instruction explicitly requires them
15 - Very small measurement variations ($\pm$1%) are acceptable for fonts/sizes due to rounding
16 - Z-order (layering) differences ARE significant and should be noted
17 - Focus on semantic properties: text content, font names, colors, structural changes, z-order
18
19 HARSH SCORING POLICY (very strict):
20 - Choose the lower score when uncertain between adjacent scores.
21 - For translation/summarization or other text edits requiring reasoning, semantic similarity is more important
   than exact wording.
22
23 INSTRUCTION_FOLLOWING score (0-5):
24 - 5: Every requested object/change exists and is exactly correct; nothing requested is missing or misapplied;
   no extra edits beyond the instruction.
25 - 4: All requested changes exist and are mostly correct; only a tiny inaccuracy that does not affect meaning.
26 - 3: Most requested changes exist but at least one is incomplete, incorrect, or missing detail.
27 - 2: Only some requested changes exist; notable misses or incorrect applications.
28 - 1: Requested changes largely not performed or substantially incorrect.
29 - 0: Contradicts or ignores the instruction entirely.
30
31 Output a single JSON object with:
32 - instruction_following_score (0-5)
33 - instruction_following_reason (one sentence, specific evidence comparing prediction to ground_truth)
34
35 --- USER INSTRUCTION (what the model received) ---
36 {instruction_part}
37
38 --- STYLE TARGET (your evaluation rubric - the model DID NOT see this) ---
39 {style_target_part}
40
41 --- SMART DIFF ANALYSIS (Prediction vs Ground Truth) ---
42 {formatted_diff}
43
44 CRITICAL COMPARISON INSTRUCTIONS:
45 The diff above shows ONLY the differences between prediction and ground_truth.
46 - If the diff shows "No differences" $\rightarrow$ Perfect match $\rightarrow$ Score 5
47 - If the diff shows differences in properties that the instruction requires $\rightarrow$ Score based on
   correctness
48 - Focus on whether prediction achieved the same semantic outcome as ground_truth
49
50 REMINDER: Judge if the prediction achieved the SEMANTIC INTENT of the Instruction.
51 The diff highlights what actually changed - use this to make an accurate judgment.

```

Listing 4. Full Instruction Following Judge Prompt



```

1 You are a judge of VISUAL/CONTENT QUALITY and PRESERVATION.
2
3 CRITICAL UNDERSTANDING:
4 - The "Instruction" is what the model/editor received
5 - The "Style Target" is YOUR evaluation rubric - the model DID NOT see this
6 - Ground Truth is ONE valid example - accept other valid visual approaches
7 - Focus on SEMANTIC correctness: Are the visual elements correct? No overlap? Readable?
8 - Exact positions/sizes don't matter unless the Instruction explicitly requires them
9 - You will only receive Ground Truth and Prediction slide images; compare them directly slide-by-slide.
10 - Use any provided Style Target guidance to check required visual cues strictly.
11
12 FLEXIBILITY:
13 - Different layouts achieving the same goal are acceptable (e.g., list vs grid)
14 - Small position variations are fine if elements are clear and non-overlapping
15 - Theme colors may vary slightly as long as they're harmonious
16 - "Approximately centered" or "well-aligned" is acceptable without pixel-perfection
17
18 HARSH SCORING POLICY (very strict):
19 - Penalize any unintended visual change to non-requested content (fonts, sizes, colors, positions, shapes,
20   charts, images, tables, or slide structure).
21 - Choose the lower score when uncertain between adjacent scores.
22
23 VISUAL_Quality score (0-5):
24 - 5: No unintended changes to non-requested content; fonts, sizes, colors, positions, and objects match Ground
25   Truth; structure preserved.
26 - 4: Visually very close to the Ground Truth; only imperceptible or negligible differences (e.g., sub-pixel
27   alignment); no style drift.
28 - 3: Minor but noticeable visual differences (e.g., slight font weight/size/spacing shifts) without breaking
29   layout.
30 - 2: Clear deviations (e.g., wrong fonts/sizes/colors, noticeable position shifts) or small layout issues.
31 - 1: Major deviations (overlap, off-canvas, broken layout) but still legible.
32 - 0: Severely broken or unreadable slide.
33
34 Output a single JSON object with:
35 - visual_quality_score (0-5)
36 - visual_quality_reason (one sentence, specific evidence about visual differences)
37
38 --- User Instruction ---
39 {instruction_text}
40
41 --- Style Target (judge rubric, unseen by the model under evaluation) ---
42 {style_block}
43
44 You are given two labeled image sequences:
45 - Ground Truth: the correct target deck to match
46 - Prediction: the candidate deck produced by the system
47
48 CRITICAL: Ground Truth is ONE valid example, not the only correct answer.
49 Judge if Prediction achieves the SEMANTIC INTENT shown by Ground Truth.
50 Accept different valid layouts/arrangements that fulfill the instruction and style target.
51 Focus on: correctness, no overlap, readability, theme consistency.
52 Small position/size variations are acceptable if elements are clear.
53
54 Judge visual quality by comparing PREDICTION to GROUND TRUTH.
55
56 Return only:
57 - visual_quality_score (0-5)
58 - visual_quality_reason (one sentence, specific evidence about visual differences)

```

Listing 5. Full Visual Quality Judge Prompt