



DraCo: Draft as CoT for Text-to-Image Preview and Rare Concept Generation

Dongzhi Jiang^{*1}, Renrui Zhang^{*†1✉}, Haodong Li⁴, Zhuofan Zong¹, Ziyu Guo², Jun He³, Claire Guo⁵, Junyan Ye³, Rongyao Fang¹, Weijia Li³, Rui Liu^{1✉}, Hongsheng Li^{1✉}

¹CUHK MMLab ²CUHK IMIXR ³Sun Yat-Sen University ⁴SCUT ⁵CUHK (Shenzhen)

{dzjiang, renruizhang}@link.cuhk.edu.hk

^{*}Equal Contribution [†]Project Leader [✉]Corresponding author

Abstract

Recent unified multimodal large language models (MLLMs) have shown impressive capabilities, incorporating chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning for enhanced text-to-image generation. However, existing approaches remain limited, either treating the model merely as a standalone generator or relying on abstract textual planning. To this end, we propose **Draft-as-CoT (DraCo)**, a novel interleaved reasoning paradigm that fully leverages both textual and visual contents in CoT for better planning and verification. Our method first generates a low-resolution draft image as preview, providing more concrete and structural visual planning and guidance. Then, we employ the model’s inherent understanding capability to verify potential semantic misalignments between the draft and input prompt, and performs refinement through selective corrections with super-resolution. In this way, our approach addresses two fundamental challenges: the coarse-grained nature of textual planning and the difficulty in generating rare attribute combinations. To support training, we curate DraCo-240K, aiming to enhance three atomic capabilities spanning general correction, instance manipulation, and layout reorganization. Supported by DraCo-CFG, a specialized classifier-free guidance (CFG) strategy for interleaved reasoning, DraCo achieves a tremendous increase on GenEval (+8%), Imagine-Bench (+0.91), and GenEval++ (+3%), significantly outperforming direct generation and other generation methods empowered by CoT. The project is at <https://github.com/CaraJ7/DraCo>.

1. Introduction

Recently, unified multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [3, 8, 27, 42, 50, 52, 60, 62–64, 77] have emerged




Figure 1. **Conceptual Comparison of CoT Reasoning for T2I Generation.** (a) Generation without reasoning. (b) Employing exterior reward models to guide generation. (c) Generating Text CoT before producing image. (d) **DraCo**: Producing visual draft for detailed planning and verify it with text reasoning, then correct and refine the draft for final output.

as powerful architectures that integrate both visual understanding and generation capabilities, as exemplified by recent works such as Bagel [8], EMU3 [57], and Janus [60]. By consolidating these two abilities within a single framework, unified MLLMs have demonstrated remarkable performance and exhibit emergent properties that models possessing only one ability fail to acquire. For instance, unified




Figure 2. **Visualization of *DraCo* Output.** For each example, the larger image represents the final output, while the smaller image is the visual draft. The corresponding prompt is located in the corner of each set.

MLLMs can understand interleaved context including both images and texts and subsequently produce images according to the input instruction [61, 66].

Concurrently, advances in chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning [24, 58] have shown remarkable success across various domains, including mathematical problems [1, 18, 32, 72, 73], visual reasoning [4, 22, 34, 70, 71], and multi-agent systems [33, 59]. While several pioneering works have extended CoT to text-to-image (T2I) generation tasks [8, 14, 17, 21, 38, 75] on unified MLLMs, their exploration has not fully exploited the unified architecture of MLLMs. For example, Image-Gen-CoT [17] leverages a reward model to evaluate the quality potential of an image during the early generation stage. This paradigm treats unified MLLM merely as a text-to-image generator, only employing its image generation capabilities. Later, several methods [8, 21] have been proposed to generate textual reasoning for the given prompt prior to image synthesis. However, for generating a dense modality like an image, only planning with text offers too vague and coarse guidance. Besides, only textual understanding ability is leveraged for CoT. This raises a natural question: *Can we design a CoT mechanism with both textual and visual content as better planning and verifier for improved text-to-image generation?*

To answer this question, we propose **Draft-as-CoT**

(***DraCo***), an interleaved CoT reasoning approach that fully leverages the unified framework for the T2I task. Our method first generates a low-resolution draft image as visual planning, then leverages the model’s inherent understanding capability to verify the draft with any semantic misalignments, and ultimately refines and enriches the draft through selective correction and super-resolution. We show the comparison of *DraCo* with previous methods in Fig. 1.

Our method is motivated by two key limitations of textual reasoning for T2I generation. First, text is too abstract to design every aspect of an image in detail, especially on low-level features like appearance and styles. In contrast, planning with a draft image could sufficiently display all the essential visual information during planning. Second, reasoning with a draft image provides an opportunity to preview the image to generate. This addresses a fundamental challenge where current T2I models suffer: difficulty in producing the correct image in one pass. Specifically, due to the natural distribution of real-world data, rare attributes or object combinations are significantly underrepresented in training datasets [5, 46]. For example, when prompted with “a white orange”, models often struggle because they have learned to strongly associate the object “orange” with its typical color attribute rather than treating them as independent concepts. This binding leads to systematic failures in generating unusual yet valid attribute combinations. How-




Figure 3. **Framework of DraCo.** *DraCo* contains three steps for generation: draft sketching, draft verification, and corrective refinement.

ever, by previewing the draft, we do not force the model to directly generate the perfect image. Instead, we make the unified MLLM itself identify and refine its flawed planning for the final output.

To facilitate our proposed *DraCo* reasoning paradigm, the unified MLLM must be capable of identifying mistakes and precisely controlling and operating on drafts to ensure successful corrections. Since no existing dataset provides such capabilities, we carefully curate a training dataset, *DraCo*-240K, targeting three atomic correction capabilities. For each capability, we design a rigorous data synthesizing pipelines that full exploits the synergy between the MLLM [53], advanced editing models [25], and segmentation models [44]. Additionally, how to conduct classifier-free guidance (CFG) [19] for interleaved reasoning remains an open question. We propose *DraCo*-CFG, a specific type of CFG for *DraCo* to explicitly strengthen the two major conditions for final generation: visual semantics from the draft image and correction instructions from verification.

Experimental results show that *DraCo* significantly enhances a strong baseline, Bagel, achieving an 8% improvement on GenEval [13] and surpassing the text-CoT-based method by 4%. We find that *DraCo* consistently demonstrates superior performance on more challenging benchmarks such as ImagineBench and GenEval++ [69]. The visualization output of *DraCo* is shown in Fig. 2.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- **A novel interleaved reasoning paradigm:** We introduce Draft-as-CoT, a new interleaved reasoning mechanism that incorporates detailed visual planning and preview for rare concept and combination generation.
- **A comprehensive training dataset with automated pipeline:** We design and construct *DraCo*-240K to em-

power the model with more precise control and diverse operations to correct the drafts following verifications.

- **A CFG method for interleaved reasoning:** We present a CFG strategy designed specifically for *DraCo*, enabling explicit emphasis on different conditioning signals.

2. Method

We first introduce the structure of our adopted unified MLLM, Bagel, in Section 2.1. Then we elaborate on the design idea and pipeline of *DraCo* in Section 2.2. Finally, we introduce the construction of *DraCo*-240K in Section 2.3.

2.1. Preliminary

Our work is built upon a popular unified MLLM, Bagel, which preserves both visual generation capability, including text-to-image generation and image editing, and visual understanding capability. Bagel is composed of three main components: a ViT vision encoder [54] for understanding, a VAE encoder [23] for generation, and two transformers [55] forming a Mixture-of-Transformer-Experts (MoT). One branch of transformer specifically handles VAE tokens, while another branch processes ViT tokens and text tokens. For visual understanding tasks, an image is first encoded by ViT into a sequence of image tokens, which are then fed into the transformer to autoregressively generate the text tokens. For visual generation tasks, Bagel adopts the Rectified Flow [10, 28, 31] method to produce VAE tokens.

2.2. Draft-as-CoT

We present the pipeline of *DraCo* in Fig. 3. The entire process can be split into three steps: draft sketching, draft verification, and corrective refinement.

Draft Sketching. The goal of the first step in *DraCo* is to form a sketch of the specified semantics in the prompt, including foregrounds like objects with their attributes and relations, and holistic information like backgrounds and image styles. Bagel is typically employed to generate high-resolution images, such as 1024×1024 . While these images exhibit excellent details, such granularity is unnecessary for the visual planning stage. Since models often struggle to directly generate images that align with the prompt, subsequent modifications of the initially generated images are still required. Therefore, we only need the model to first present the basic semantics of the intended final image, with other visual details to be supplemented in a later process. Consequently, we propose using Bagel to generate lower-resolution images in the first step, such as 384×384 . This resolution is sufficiently small to ensure efficient draft generation compared to generating 1024×1024 images, while being large enough to explicitly display all semantic information, particularly smaller objects. Thus, in the first step of *DraCo*, we only input prompt p to generate a low-resolution draft image.

Draft Verification. Leveraging the exceptional visual understanding capabilities inherent in unified MLLMs, we encode the generated draft image through the ViT encoder and re-input it into the unified MLLM. We then instruct the unified MLLM to generate draft verification v : first comprehensively understanding the image content, then comparing it with the prompt, and if misalignments are detected, finally summarizing what edits should be applied to the image. Notably, in the original design of Bagel for understanding interleaved context, such as in editing tasks, it simultaneously inputs both ViT and VAE features. The ViT features facilitate understanding of high-level information, while VAE features maintain low-level details. In contrast, we propose inputting only the ViT features of the draft image without the VAE features. This design choice stems from the fundamental difference between our task and editing tasks. Editing tasks operate at the same resolution, modifying corresponding elements according to editing instructions while preserving all other information unchanged. Under this requirement, the model requires low-level information to maintain image consistency. Conversely, our design focuses solely on the high-level semantics of the draft image. We could ignore details of irrelevant elements and even irrelevant aspects of prompt-related objects. Dropping the VAE feature could eliminate the constraints from the low-level feature and facilitate more substantial changes.

Corrective Refinement with *DraCo*-CFG. Eventually, the unified MLLM is required to generate the final high-resolution, detail-rich image aligned with the prompt. This involves both upscaling the draft with improved details and

correcting any mistakes detected in the verification. However, since multiple conditions exist during final image generation (prompt, draft image, and verification), a notable question arises regarding how to organize classifier-free guidance (CFG) to adequately emphasize different conditions in the multimodal context. We identify two core conditions that should control final image generation: one from the draft image’s visual condition, constraining the final image to maintain relevant semantic consistency with the draft, and another from the prompt and self-reflection, constraining the image to be modified according to the verification and generated following the prompt. Therefore, with unified model m and noise x_t , we design three forms of multimodal context for CFG: the unconditional input $m(\phi, \phi, \phi)$, the draft-only input $m(\phi, vit, \phi)$, and the fully-conditioned input $m(p, vit, v)$. Notably, following our CFG design, we specifically incorporate $m(\phi, vit, \phi)$ during training, where we train the model to output a high-resolution version of the draft image. Concretely, we employ the following CFG formulation during inference:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}(p, vit, v) = & m(\phi, \phi, \phi) \\ & + s_{\text{draft}} \cdot \underbrace{(m(\phi, vit, \phi) - m(\phi, \phi, \phi))}_{\text{draft condition}} \\ & + s_{\text{text}} \cdot \underbrace{(m(p, vit, v) - m(\phi, vit, \phi))}_{\text{prompt and correction condition}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

2.3. *DraCo*-240K

The correction capability is the most critical among all atom capabilities in *DraCo*, integrating super-resolution and advanced editing to generate final images. We first introduce the necessity of constructing the dataset in Section 2.3.1. Then we detail the two stages with generation pipeline for each capability in Section 2.3.2. Finally, we illustrate how to organize the collected data for training in Section 2.3.3.

2.3.1. Necessity of Dataset Construction

Our zero-shot pilot study reveals that Bagel struggles with correction in two key ways: (1) Despite receiving correct verification, the model fails to follow correction instructions. Despite its inherent editing capability, the model still lacks the precise object control and unconventional editing approaches needed for correcting flawed drafts, like image layout adjustment. (2) Rather than adhering to draft semantics, Bagel generates entirely new images. This undermines our core motivation of using drafts to reduce one-shot generation difficulty.

Existing datasets cannot address these challenges. Therefore, we curate a training dataset for *DraCo* with over 240K interleaved reasoning instances. We identify three essential atomic capabilities required for correction and then design data curation pipeline for each one. Throughout data




Figure 4. **Construction Pipeline and Examples of DraCo-240K.** We design specialized data pipelines for each of the three atomic correction capabilities: general correction, instance manipulation, and layout reorganization. We then employ Qwen3-VL [53] to generate prompts and verifications based on the collected image pairs. Finally, we organize the data into two categories for training: corrections needed and corrections not needed.

construction, we ensure semantic correlation between draft and final images, ensuring the model to learn to modify only the erroneous elements and retain correct ones.

2.3.2. Construction Details

As illustrated in Fig. 4, the dataset construction consists of two stages: The first stage collects image pairs where the two images differ in some semantic aspects but maintain overall consistency. These images serve as the draft and final images during training. The second stage generates the textual prompt and verification based on the image pairs. We detail the three pipelines in the first stage below:

- **General Correction.** Existing editing datasets are natural sources for general correction data. We denote the pre-editing image as A-Image and the post-editing image as B-Image. The difference between them exists only in the edited objects, while all other characteristics remain identical, perfectly satisfying our data requirements.

- **Instance Manipulation.** Instance Manipulation refers to finer-grained control over objects in the image, which is crucial for correction. For example, if the prompt speci-

fies generating three dogs but the model generates five, the verification will likely require removing the two dogs on the left. However, we observe that Bagel struggles to edit instances of the same category, often leading to misinterpretations or incorrect modifications. To address this, we design an automated data pipeline for similar scenarios. We first synthesize numerous prompts specifying multiple instances of the same object, then use Bagel to generate multiple images for each prompt. Next, we extract the objects in the prompt to GroundingDINO [30] to obtain their bounding boxes. Then, we randomly select some of them and mask them with black rectangles. We input this masked image to FLUX-Kontext [25], instructing it to inpaint all black masks using the background, thereby obtaining the B-Image. This yields image pairs with multiple identical objects but different quantities. Additionally, we leverage the RefEdit dataset [39]. Due to its relatively poor quality, we use GPT-4o [37] to regenerate the edited images. These image pairs feature multiple identical objects, but one object differs in certain attributes across the images.



Figure 5. **Detailed Visualization of DraCo Output.** We showcase the prompt, verification, draft (smaller image), and final output (larger image). *DraCo* successfully identifies the misalignment within the draft and conducts the correction based on the suggested modification.

• **Layout Reorganization.** As for image layout understanding, we find that Bagel lacks the ability to comprehend spatial relationships in editing instructions, let alone modify them for correction. Therefore, we specifically design a subset for spatial correction. Similarly, we use prompts specifying spatial layouts to have Bagel generate numerous images. We then feed the objects from the prompt into GroundedSAM [44] to obtain segmentation masks for each object. We randomly swap the positions of these segmentation masks and paste them onto a pure black background. Subsequently, if there is no overlap with the original masks, we paste the periphery of the original image onto the black background to make the newly generated image’s background as consistent as possible with the original image. Finally, we use FLUX-Kontext to inpaint the black regions based on the background around the image’s periphery, obtaining B-Image, where the number and appearance of each object remains same but the layout is changed.

In the second stage, we randomly swap A-Image and B-Image in the image pairs and input them to Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B [53]. The first task is to output a caption of B-Image as the prompt for training, ensuring it is misaligned with A-Image. The second task is to generate the verification, namely, if a text-to-image model generates A-Image given the prompt from task one, how should it be modified to become B-Image. The verification needs to first observe the misalignments between the current image and prompt, and if any exist, provides the modification approach.

2.3.3. Training Set

Finally, we organize the image pairs, the prompt, and the verification outputs from Qwen3-VL into two types of data: modification needed (A-Image as draft) and no modification needed (B-Image as draft). During training, we utilize

these two types of data, as well as text-to-image data. The text-to-image data is trained on two resolutions: low resolution, same as the draft, and high resolution, same as the final output. This is to ensure the model produces meaningful draft images and preserves its original generation capability. More details and examples of each capability are shown in the Appendix C.

2.4. Training Loss

We conduct supervised fine-tuning from Bagel. For our curated training dataset, we sequentially input the prompt tokens, the ViT feature of draft images, the verifications, and finally the noisy VAE tokens of the final image. We only calculate Binary Cross Entropy (BCE) loss on the verifications and Mean Squared Error (MSE) on the VAE tokens:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{verification}} = -\frac{1}{|v|} \sum_{i=1}^{|v|} \log(v_i), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{final image}} = \mathbb{E}_{t, x_0, x_1} \left[\|m(t, x_t) - (x_1 - x_0)\|^2 \right]. \quad (3)$$

To support *DraCo*-CFG, we apply two dropout strategies during training, each with a 5% probability: (1) dropping all conditions for unconditional generation, or (2) preserving only the ViT feature, as mentioned in Section 2.2.

3. Experiment

3.1. Experimental Setting

Evaluation. We evaluate our proposed method on GenEval [13], GenEval++, and ImagineBench [69]. GenEval consists of six subcategories focusing on object existence, attributes, counting, and positions. Building

Table 1. **Evaluation results on GenEval.** The best results are in **bold fonts** with the second best underlined.

Method	Single Obj.↑	Two Obj.↑	Counting↑	Colors↑	Position↑	Color Attri.↑	Overall↑
<i>Generation Only</i>							
LlamaGen [35]	0.71	0.34	0.21	0.58	0.07	0.04	0.32
SDXL [40]	0.98	0.74	0.39	0.85	0.15	0.23	0.55
DALL-E 3 [2]	0.96	0.87	0.47	0.83	0.43	0.45	0.67
SD3-Medium [48]	<u>0.99</u>	<u>0.94</u>	<u>0.72</u>	0.89	0.33	0.60	0.74
<i>Unified MLLM</i>							
Show-o [65]	0.95	0.52	0.49	0.82	0.11	0.28	0.53
Janus-Pro-7B [6]	<u>0.99</u>	0.89	0.59	<u>0.90</u>	0.79	<u>0.66</u>	0.80
BLIP3-o 8B [3]	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>0.84</u>
BAGEL [8]	<u>0.99</u>	<u>0.94</u>	0.81	0.88	0.64	0.63	0.78
<i>Unified MLLM w/ CoT</i>							
Show-o+PARM [17]	0.98	0.55	0.54	0.83	0.13	0.29	0.55
T2I-R1 [21]	<u>0.99</u>	0.91	0.53	0.91	<u>0.76</u>	0.65	0.79
BAGEL-Think [8]	<u>0.99</u>	<u>0.94</u>	0.81	0.88	0.64	0.63	0.82
<i>DraCo (Ours)</i>	1.00	0.99	0.81	0.91	0.70	0.76	0.86

upon this benchmark, GenEval++ presents more challenging scenarios with complex combinations and stricter scoring criteria. Additionally, we test on ImagineBench, which specifically targets unusual object-attribute combinations where text-to-image models typically struggle. We generate one image per prompt for evaluation, due to the slow inference speed of Bagel and follow the official scoring method in each benchmark. During our evaluation, s_{draft} and s_{text} are set to 2 to 6, respectively.

Training Details. We empirically observe that Bagel struggles to generate valid 384×384 images. Therefore, we first conduct a text-to-image fine-tuning stage to empower the model with low-resolution image generation capability before training for *DraCo*. Additional details are provided in the Appendix D. Subsequently, we perform full-parameter fine-tuning for 16K steps and retain the EMA weights. The learning rate is set to $2e-5$ with 2K warmup steps. We freeze the ViT encoder and its connector during training to preserve valid visual encoding of high-level information. For each training iteration, the maximum length of concatenated training samples is set to 36K per GPU. We utilize 8 H800 GPUs for training.

3.2. Main Results

We present quantitative results in Tables 1 and 2, with qualitative results shown in Figures 2 and 5. We compare our method against generation-only models (including diffusion-based and autoregressive models), unified

MLLMs, and unified MLLMs with CoT planning.

Our method substantially outperforms other methods with CoT across all three benchmarks. On GenEval, *DraCo* achieves an overall score of 0.86 and attains the highest scores in five out of six subtasks. Notably, *DraCo* excels particularly in the color attribute subtask, which involves objects with different specified colors. This demonstrates that *DraCo* is especially effective at handling complex attribute combinations. As shown in the table, the exterior reward model PARM [17] brings 2% improvement on Show-o [65], from 0.53 to 0.55. However, our method showcases 6% greater improvement based on a more strong baseline starting from 0.78. On ImagineBench, compared to the baseline Bagel without reasoning, *DraCo* achieves a notable improvement of 0.91 points. *DraCo* also surpasses text-only reasoning by 0.18 points, indicating that visual drafting and preview are more effective for generating rare attribute combinations. Furthermore, *DraCo* also demonstrates advantages on the more challenging GenEval++ with overall score of 0.40. Interestingly, Bagel-Think underperforms vanilla Bagel, suggesting potential limitations of text-based planning. In contrast, *DraCo* consistently delivers superior performance across all benchmarks.

3.3. Ablation Study

Effectiveness of *DraCo*-CFG. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed *DraCo*-CFG by comparing it with the original CFG method adopted by Bagel, with details provided in the Appendix B. As shown in Table 3 and Fig. 6,

Table 2. **Evaluation results on Imagine-Bench and GenEval++**. The best results are in **bold fonts** with the second best underlined.

Method	Imagine-Bench					GenEval++							
	Attr. shift↑	Spatiotem.↑	Hybrid.↑	Multi-Obj.↑	Overall↑	Color↑	Count↑	Color/Count↑	Color/Pos↑	Pos/Count↑	Pos/Size↑	Multi-Count↑	Overall↑
Generation Only													
SDv2.1 [45]	4.46	5.06	4.12	3.49	4.30	0.00	0.33	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.08	0.06
SDXL [40]	4.42	6.32	4.93	4.50	4.97	0.05	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06
FLUX.1-dev [25]	5.68	7.13	6.38	5.24	6.06	0.35	0.63	0.15	0.28	0.20	0.38	0.23	0.31
Unified MLLM													
Janus-Pro-7B [6]	5.30	7.28	6.73	6.04	6.22	<u>0.45</u>	0.30	0.13	0.30	0.08	0.35	0.13	0.25
BLIP3-o 4B [3]	5.48	6.79	6.93	6.09	6.23	0.13	0.23	0.10	<u>0.45</u>	0.13	<u>0.55</u>	0.23	0.26
BLIP3-o 8B [3]	5.80	7.08	7.06	6.44	6.51	0.25	0.25	0.13	0.60	0.13	0.58	0.23	0.31
Bagel [8]	5.37	6.93	6.50	6.41	6.20	0.33	<u>0.60</u>	0.25	0.33	<u>0.25</u>	0.48	0.38	<u>0.37</u>
Unified MLLM w/ CoT													
T2I-R1 [21]	5.85	7.70	7.36	6.68	6.78	0.68	0.33	0.20	0.35	0.08	0.25	0.30	0.31
Bagel-Think [8]	<u>6.26</u>	7.13	<u>7.74</u>	6.96	<u>6.93</u>	0.35	0.38	0.35	<u>0.45</u>	0.13	0.48	<u>0.35</u>	0.35
DraCo (Ours)	6.40	<u>7.30</u>	7.99	7.20	7.11	<u>0.45</u>	0.53	<u>0.28</u>	0.40	0.28	0.53	0.38	0.40

Table 3. **Ablation Results of Key Designs in DraCo**.

Draft Resolution	CFG	Draft VAE Input	GenEval Overall ↑
128	<i>DraCo</i> -CFG	✗	0.76
1024	<i>DraCo</i> -CFG	✗	0.75
384	Original	✗	0.83
384	<i>DraCo</i> -CFG	✓	0.84
384	<i>DraCo</i> -CFG	✗	0.86

DraCo-CFG exhibits superior performance both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, *DraCo*-CFG surpasses the original CFG by 3% on the overall score of GenEval. Qualitatively, compared to the blurriness of the original CFG, *DraCo*-CFG demonstrates significantly improved clarity and high quality, as evidenced by the details such as the clock figures.

Is the VAE feature of the draft needed? We investigate the necessity of incorporating VAE features from the draft alongside ViT features during training. Results in Table 3 show that including VAE features yields an overall score of 0.84, which is 2% lower than the model without VAE features. This suggests that low-level features impose constraints on the final correction step. Qualitatively, as shown in Fig. 6, we observe that VAE features may introduce artifacts in the final output due to over-adherence to the draft, including unnatural lighting on the horse, improper intersection between the horse’s legs and the sofa, and disconnected frame at the top of the clock.

Draft Resolution. We examine the impact of draft resolution on final results by testing resolutions of 128×128 and 1024×1024 , as shown in Table 3. At 128×128 resolution, the model cannot adequately express its planning in the excessively small draft. Besides, the resolution is too small for the model to clearly identify the image for the verifica-



Figure 6. **Qualitative Comparison Between Imputing VAE Feature of the Draft, Original CFG and DraCo-CFG**. Zoom in for better visualization.

tion step. These problems result in poor performance with a score of 0.76. Conversely, the excessively large resolution of 1024×1024 substantially increases the token length per training sample, thereby reducing the number of training samples within the same training iterations. This also yields unsatisfactory results, with a score of 0.75.

4. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce *DraCo*, a novel interleaved reasoning paradigm that fully exploits the unified architecture of MLLMs by incorporating both visual and textual chain-of-thought for text-to-image generation. *DraCo* addresses the coarse-grained nature of textual planning and enables generation of rare attribute combinations that models typically struggle with due to training data biases. We also

curate *DraCo*-240K with specialized automated pipelines targeting three atomic correction capabilities, and propose *DraCo*-CFG to explicitly strengthen visual semantics from drafts and correction instructions from verification. Extensive experiments demonstrate *DraCo*'s superiority, achieving +8% on GenEval, +0.91 on ImagineBench, and +3% on GenEval++. Our work offers new direction for enhancing visual generation tasks through interleaved multimodal reasoning in unified MLLMs.

References

- [1] Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Peter Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Mathqa: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13319*, 2019. 2
- [2] James Betker, Gabriel Goh, Li Jing, Tim Brooks, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Long Ouyang, Juntang Zhuang, Joyce Lee, Yufei Guo, Wesam Manassra, Prafulla Dhariwal, Casey Chu, Yunxin Jiao, and Aditya Ramesh. Improving image generation with better captions. 2023. 7
- [3] Jiahai Chen, Le Xue, Manli Shu, Yunhao Zhang, Yu Zhang, Ran Xu, Xin Eric Wang, and Caiming Xiong. Blip3-o: A family of fully open unified multimodal models-architecture, training and dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09568*, 2025. 1, 7, 8
- [4] Liang Chen, Lei Li, Haozhe Zhao, Yifan Song, and Vinci. R1-v: Reinforcing super generalization ability in vision-language models with less than \$3. <https://github.com/Deep-Agent/R1-V>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-02-02. 2
- [5] Muxi Chen, Zhaohua Zhang, Chenchen Zhao, Mingyang Chen, Wenyu Jiang, Tianwen Jiang, Jianhuan Zhuo, Yu Tang, Qiuyong Xiao, Jihong Zhang, et al. Failureatlas: Mapping the failure landscape of t2i models via active exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.21995*, 2025. 2
- [6] Xiaokang Chen, Zhiyu Wu, Xingchao Liu, Zizheng Pan, Wen Liu, Zhenda Xie, Xingkai Yu, and Chong Ruan. Janus-pro: Unified multimodal understanding and generation with data and model scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17811*, 2025. 7, 8, 13
- [7] Xinyan Chen, Renrui Zhang, Dongzhi Jiang, Aojun Zhou, Shilin Yan, Weifeng Lin, and Hongsheng Li. Mint-cot: Enabling interleaved visual tokens in mathematical chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05331*, 2025. 13
- [8] Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, et al. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025. 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 16
- [9] Runpei Dong, Chunrui Han, Yuang Peng, Zekun Qi, Zheng Ge, Jinrong Yang, Liang Zhao, Jianjian Sun, Hongyu Zhou, Haoran Wei, et al. Dreamllm: Synergistic multimodal comprehension and creation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11499*, 2023. 13
- [10] Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, et al. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *Forty-first international conference on machine learning*, 2024. 3
- [11] Rongyao Fang, Chengqi Duan, Kun Wang, Linjiang Huang, Hao Li, Shilin Yan, Hao Tian, Xingyu Zeng, Rui Zhao, Jifeng Dai, et al. Got: Unleashing reasoning capability of multimodal large language model for visual generation and editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10639*, 2025. 13
- [12] Jun Gao, Yongqi Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Wenjie Li. Interleaved-modal chain-of-thought. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 19520–19529, 2025. 13
- [13] Dhruba Ghosh, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Geneval: An object-focused framework for evaluating text-to-image alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:52132–52152, 2023. 3, 6
- [14] Zeqi Gu, Markos Georgopoulos, Xiaoliang Dai, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Chu Wang, Felix Juefei-Xu, Kunpeng Li, Yujun Shi, Zecheng He, Zijian He, et al. Improving chain-of-thought efficiency for autoregressive image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.05593*, 2025. 2, 13
- [15] Ziyu Guo, Ray Zhang, Hao Chen, Jialin Gao, Dongzhi Jiang, Jiaze Wang, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Sciverse: Unveiling the knowledge comprehension and visual reasoning of llms on multi-modal scientific problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10627*, 2025. 13
- [16] Ziyu Guo, Renrui Zhang, Hongyu Li, Manyuan Zhang, Xinyan Chen, Sifan Wang, Yan Feng, Peng Pei, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Thinking-while-generating: Interleaving textual reasoning throughout visual generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.16671*, 2025. 13
- [17] Ziyu Guo, Renrui Zhang, Chengzhuo Tong, Zhizheng Zhao, Peng Gao, Hongsheng Li, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Can we generate images with cot? let's verify and reinforce image generation step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13926*, 2025. 2, 7, 13
- [18] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *NeurIPS*, 2021. 2
- [19] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022. 3
- [20] Dongzhi Jiang, Renrui Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Yanmin Wu, Jiayi Lei, Pengshuo Qiu, Pan Lu, Zehui Chen, Guanglu Song, Peng Gao, et al. Mmsearch: Benchmarking the potential of large models as multi-modal search engines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12959*, 2024. 13
- [21] Dongzhi Jiang, Ziyu Guo, Renrui Zhang, Zhuofan Zong, Hao Li, Le Zhuo, Shilin Yan, Pheng-Ann Heng, and Hongsheng Li. T2i-r1: Reinforcing image generation with collaborative semantic-level and token-level cot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00703*, 2025. 2, 7, 8, 13, 16
- [22] Dongzhi Jiang, Renrui Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Yanwei Li, Yu Qi, Xinyan Chen, Liuhui Wang, Jianhan Jin, Claire Guo, Shen

- Yan, et al. Mme-cot: Benchmarking chain-of-thought in large multimodal models for reasoning quality, robustness, and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09621*, 2025. 2, 13
- [23] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013. 3
- [24] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022. 2
- [25] Black Forest Labs, Stephen Batifol, Andreas Blattmann, Frederic Boesel, Saksham Consul, Cyril Diagne, Tim Dockhorn, Jack English, Zion English, Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Kyle Lacey, Yam Levi, Cheng Li, Dominik Lorenz, Jonas Müller, Dustin Podell, Robin Rombach, Harry Saini, Axel Sauer, and Luke Smith. Flux.1 kontext: Flow matching for in-context image generation and editing in latent space, 2025. 3, 5, 8
- [26] Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07895*, 2024. 13
- [27] Bin Lin, Zongjian Li, Xinhua Cheng, Yuwei Niu, Yang Ye, Xianyi He, Shenghai Yuan, Wangbo Yu, Shaodong Wang, Yunyang Ge, et al. Uniworld: High-resolution semantic encoders for unified visual understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03147*, 2025. 1
- [28] Yaron Lipman, Ricky TQ Chen, Heli Ben-Hamu, Maximilian Nickel, and Matt Le. Flow matching for generative modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02747*, 2022. 3
- [29] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023. 13
- [30] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023. 5, 14
- [31] Xingchao Liu, Chengyue Gong, and Qiang Liu. Flow straight and fast: Learning to generate and transfer data with rectified flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.03003*, 2022. 3
- [32] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chun yue Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating math reasoning in visual contexts with gpt-4v, bard, and other large multimodal models. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.02255, 2023. 2, 13
- [33] Xinji Mai, Haotian Xu, Zhong-Zhi Li, Weinong Wang, Jian Hu, Yingying Zhang, Wenqiang Zhang, et al. Agent rl scaling law: Agent rl with spontaneous code execution for mathematical problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07773*, 2025. 2
- [34] Fanqing Meng, Lingxiao Du, Zongkai Liu, Zhixiang Zhou, Quanfeng Lu, Daocheng Fu, Botian Shi, Wenhai Wang, Junjun He, Kaipeng Zhang, et al. Mm-eureka: Exploring visual aha moment with rule-based large-scale reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.07365*, 2025. 2
- [35] Meta AI. LlamaGen: Autoregressive image generation with llama-based transformers. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/llamagen>, 2024. Code and model released June 2024. 7
- [36] OpenAI. Introducing openai o1, 2024., 2024. 13
- [37] OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, 2024. 5, 14
- [38] Kaihang Pan, Wendong Bu, Yuruo Wu, Yang Wu, Kai Shen, Yunfei Li, Hang Zhao, Juncheng Li, Siliang Tang, and Yuet-ing Zhuang. Focusdiff: Advancing fine-grained text-image alignment for autoregressive visual generation through rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05501*, 2025. 2, 13
- [39] Bimsara Pathiraja, Maitreya Patel, Shivam Singh, Yezhou Yang, and Chitta Baral. Refedit: A benchmark and method for improving instruction-based image editing model on referring expressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03448*, 2025. 5
- [40] Dustin Podell, Tom Marks, Spencer Nølle, et al. SDXL: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023. 7, 8
- [41] Luozheng Qin, Jia Gong, Yuqing Sun, Tianjiao Li, Mengping Yang, Xiaomeng Yang, Chao Qu, Zhiyu Tan, and Hao Li. Uni-cot: Towards unified chain-of-thought reasoning across text and vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05606*, 2025. 13
- [42] Liao Qu, Huichao Zhang, Yiheng Liu, Xu Wang, Yi Jiang, Yiming Gao, Hu Ye, Daniel K Du, Zehuan Yuan, and Xinglong Wu. Tokenflow: Unified image tokenizer for multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03069*, 2024. 1
- [43] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:53728–53741, 2023. 13
- [44] Tianhe Ren, Shilong Liu, Ailing Zeng, Jing Lin, Kunchang Li, He Cao, Jiayu Chen, Xinyu Huang, Yukang Chen, Feng Yan, et al. Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14159*, 2024. 3, 6
- [45] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 8
- [46] Dvir Samuel, Rami Ben-Ari, Simon Raviv, Nir Darshan, and Gal Chechik. Generating images of rare concepts using pre-trained diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4695–4703, 2024. 2
- [47] Weikang Shi, Aldrich Yu, Rongyao Fang, Houxing Ren, Ke Wang, Aojun Zhou, Changyao Tian, Xinyu Fu, Yuxuan Hu, Zimu Lu, et al. Mathcanvas: Intrinsic visual chain-of-thought for multimodal mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.14958*, 2025. 13
- [48] Stability AI. Stable diffusion 3 medium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13753*, 2024. Model released May 2024. 7
- [49] Zhaochen Su, Linjie Li, Mingyang Song, Yunzhuo Hao, Zhengyuan Yang, Jun Zhang, Guanjie Chen, Jiawei Gu, Juntao Li, Xiaoye Qu, et al. Openthinking: Learning to think

- with images via visual tool reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08617*, 2025. 13
- [50] Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiying Yu, Zhengxiong Luo, Yueze Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. Generative multi-modal models are in-context learners. *arXiv: 2312.13286*, 2023. 1, 13
- [51] Quan Sun, Qiying Yu, Yufeng Cui, Fan Zhang, Xiaosong Zhang, Yueze Wang, Hongcheng Gao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. Generative pretraining in multi-modality. *arXiv: 2307.05222*, 2023. 13
- [52] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024. 1
- [53] Qwen Team. Qwen3 technical report, 2025. 3, 5, 6, 14
- [54] Michael Tschannen, Alexey Gritsenko, Xiao Wang, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Nikhil Parthasarathy, Talfan Evans, Lucas Beyer, Ye Xia, Basil Mustafa, et al. Siglip 2: Multilingual vision-language encoders with improved semantic understanding, localization, and dense features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14786*, 2025. 3
- [55] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 3
- [56] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 13
- [57] Xinlong Wang, Xiaosong Zhang, Zhengxiong Luo, Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Jinsheng Wang, Fan Zhang, Yueze Wang, Zhen Li, Qiying Yu, et al. Emu3: Next-token prediction is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18869*, 2024. 1
- [58] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022. 2
- [59] Zhepei Wei, Wenlin Yao, Yao Liu, Weizhi Zhang, Qin Lu, Liang Qiu, Changlong Yu, Puyang Xu, Chao Zhang, Bing Yin, et al. Webagent-r1: Training web agents via end-to-end multi-turn reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16421*, 2025. 2
- [60] Chengyue Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zhiyu Wu, Yiyang Ma, Xingchao Liu, Zizheng Pan, Wen Liu, Zhenda Xie, Xingkai Yu, Chong Ruan, et al. Janus: Decoupling visual encoding for unified multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13848*, 2024. 1, 13
- [61] Chenyuan Wu, Pengfei Zheng, Ruiran Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyan Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, et al. Omnigen2: Exploration to advanced multimodal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.18871*, 2025. 2, 13
- [62] Junfeng Wu, Yi Jiang, Chuofan Ma, Yuliang Liu, Hengshuang Zhao, Zehuan Yuan, Song Bai, and Xiang Bai. Liquid: Language models are scalable multi-modal generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04332*, 2024. 1
- [63] Yecheng Wu, Zhuoyang Zhang, Junyu Chen, Haotian Tang, Dacheng Li, Yunhao Fang, Ligeng Zhu, Enze Xie, Hongxu Yin, Li Yi, et al. Vila-u: a unified foundation model integrating visual understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04429*, 2024. 13
- [64] Shitao Xiao, Yueze Wang, Junjie Zhou, Huaying Yuan, Xingrun Xing, Ruiran Yan, Chaofan Li, Shuting Wang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. Omnigen: Unified image generation. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 13294–13304, 2025. 1, 13
- [65] Jinheng Xie, Weijia Mao, Zechen Bai, David Junhao Zhang, Weihao Wang, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Yuchao Gu, Zhijie Chen, Zhenheng Yang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Show-o: One single transformer to unify multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12528*, 2024. 7
- [66] Yi Xin, Qi Qin, Siqi Luo, Kaiwen Zhu, Juncheng Yan, Yan Tai, Jiayi Lei, Yuewen Cao, Keqi Wang, Yibin Wang, et al. Lumina-dimoo: An omni diffusion large language model for multi-modal generation and understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.06308*, 2025. 2
- [67] Yi Xu, Chengzu Li, Han Zhou, Xingchen Wan, Caiqi Zhang, Anna Korhonen, and Ivan Vulić. Visual planning: Let’s think only with images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.11409*, 2025. 13
- [68] Junyan Ye, Dongzhi Jiang, Jun He, Baichuan Zhou, Zilong Huang, Zhiyuan Yan, Hongsheng Li, Conghui He, and Weijia Li. Blink-twice: You see, but do you observe? a reasoning benchmark on visual perception. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.09361*, 2025. 13
- [69] Junyan Ye, Dongzhi Jiang, Zihao Wang, Leqi Zhu, Zhenghao Hu, Zilong Huang, Jun He, Zhiyuan Yan, Jinghua Yu, Hongsheng Li, et al. Echo-4o: Harnessing the power of gpt-4o synthetic images for improved image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.09987*, 2025. 3, 6
- [70] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoyi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502*, 2023. 2, 13
- [71] Yufei Zhan, Yousong Zhu, Shurong Zheng, Hongyin Zhao, Fan Yang, Ming Tang, and Jinqiao Wang. Vision-r1: Evolving human-free alignment in large vision-language models via vision-guided reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.18013*, 2025. 2
- [72] Renrui Zhang, Dongzhi Jiang, Yichi Zhang, Haokun Lin, Ziyu Guo, Pengshuo Qiu, Aojun Zhou, Pan Lu, Kai-Wei Chang, Peng Gao, et al. Mathverse: Does your multi-modal llm truly see the diagrams in visual math problems? *ECCV 2024*, 2024. 2, 13
- [73] Renrui Zhang, Xinyu Wei, Dongzhi Jiang, Yichi Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Chengzhuo Tong, Jiaming Liu, Aojun Zhou, Bin Wei, Shanghang Zhang, et al. Mavis: Mathematical visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08739*, 2024. 2
- [74] Xincheng Zhang, Xiaoying Zhang, Youbin Wu, Yanbin Cao, Renrui Zhang, Ruihang Chu, Ling Yang, and Yujiu Yang.

- Generative universal verifier as multimodal meta-reasoner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.13804*, 2025. [13](#)
- [75] Yu Zhang, Yunqi Li, Yifan Yang, Rui Wang, Yuqing Yang, Dai Qi, Jianmin Bao, Dongdong Chen, Chong Luo, and Lili Qiu. Reasongen-r1: Cot for autoregressive image generation models through sft and rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24875*, 2025. [2](#), [13](#)
 - [76] Ziwei Zheng, Michael Yang, Jack Hong, Chenxiao Zhao, Guohai Xu, Le Yang, Chao Shen, and Xing Yu. Deep-eyes: Incentivizing” thinking with images” via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14362*, 2025. [13](#)
 - [77] Chunting Zhou, Lili Yu, Arun Babu, Kushal Tirumala, Michihiro Yasunaga, Leonid Shamis, Jacob Kahn, Xuezhe Ma, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. Transfusion: Predict the next token and diffuse images with one multi-modal model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11039*, 2024. [1](#), [13](#)
 - [78] Le Zhuo, Liangbing Zhao, Sayak Paul, Yue Liao, Renrui Zhang, Yi Xin, Peng Gao, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Hongsheng Li. From reflection to perfection: Scaling inference-time optimization for text-to-image diffusion models via reflection tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15329–15339, 2025. [13](#)
 - [79] Zhuofan Zong, Bingqi Ma, Dazhong Shen, Guanglu Song, Hao Shao, Dongzhi Jiang, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. Mova: Adapting mixture of vision experts to multimodal context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13046*, 2024. [13](#)

Appendix Overview

- Section A: Related work.
- Section B: More Details of *DraCo*-CFG.
- Section C: More Dataset Details.
- Section D: More Experiment Details.
- Section E: Limitations and Future Work.
- Section F: Qualitative Examples.

A. Related Work

Unified Multimodal Large Language Models Many prior works have focused on empowering a single model with both understanding and generation capabilities. Although most methods are built upon MLLMs [26, 29, 56, 79], current mainstream approaches have diverged into different streams. One direction employs an external diffusion model for image generation [9, 50, 51, 64]. For example, OmniGen2 [61] uses a diffusion transformer to accept high-level conditions from the MLLM to produce images. Another direction adopts the image generation process into the auto-regressive paradigm [6, 60, 63]. [60] employs CLIP for vision understanding and VQVAE to discretize images for auto-regressive generation. Recently, some works have attempted to merge auto-regressive generation and diffusion into a single framework [8, 77]. Transfusion employs a single transformer model to generate text in an auto-regressive manner and images through iterative denoising. Extending this method further, Bagel employs a mixture of transformer architectures to separately process text tokens and VAE tokens of images.

Reasoning with Images With the introduction of OpenAI’s o1 [36], reasoning with images has been widely explored for image understanding tasks [15, 20, 22, 32, 68, 70, 72]. These methods have attempted to incorporate more information from images into the reasoning process, including the use of external tools [49, 76], the reuse of image tokens from the vision encoder [7, 12], and the generation of auxiliary images [47, 67]. More recently, the field of visual generation has also adopted this paradigm [11, 14, 16, 17, 21, 38, 75]. Image-Gen-CoT [17] evaluates the effectiveness of direct preference optimization [43] for image generation and proposes PARM as a reward model for autoregressive generation in test-time scaling. Later, T2I-R1 [21] proposes generating a semantic-level CoT to analyze the given prompt and design the image. The semantic-level CoT is then fed back into the model to generate the image. Recently, several methods have proposed reflecting on generated images for improved image generation [41, 74, 78]. [78] utilizes a text-to-image diffusion model to generate the image, then a verifier produces reflection and a refined prompt instead of a correction method, and then the generator generates a new image.

This method does not sufficiently connect the first generated image with the subsequently generated one, and therefore does not adequately address the difficulty of generating an image in one pass. Concurrently, [74] and [41] propose editing the first generated image instead of creating an entirely new one. However, there are several key differences between *DraCo* and these methods: (1) These methods follow a post-reflection strategy, rather than the pre-planning strategy adopted by *DraCo*. Therefore, they need to generate the image at the same resolution as the final output and then edit it, incurring much extra cost. (2) Additionally, these methods strictly utilize the image editing setting to edit the first generated image, such as restricting the background to remain exactly the same, thereby limiting the editing content. (3) In our pilot study, we find that the inherent editing capability is insufficient to handle various correction scenarios. Therefore, these methods that rely solely on editing capability cannot sufficiently meet the requirements for correcting errors.

B. More Details of *DraCo*-CFG

B.1. Original CFG of Bagel

Bagel [8] does not directly support *DraCo*, so no CFG can be directly applied to *DraCo*. However, the task that most closely resembles *DraCo* is “thinking before editing.” In this scenario, Bagel takes as input: the image to edit (with both ViT features vit and VAE features vae) and an edit instruction $edit$. Bagel then generates a textual chain-of-thought $think$ to analyze how to perform the editing, followed by generating the edited image. Bagel employs three forms of multimodal context in CFG: $m(\phi, \phi, edit, \phi)$, $m(vit, vae, \phi, \phi)$, and the full condition $m(vit, vae, edit, think)$. The final output is computed through two sequential steps:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}(vit, vae, edit, think)' &= m(vit, vae, edit, think) \\ &+ s_{text} \cdot (m(vit, vae, edit, think) - m(vit, vae, \phi, \phi)), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}(vit, vae, edit, think) &= \hat{m}(vit, vae, edit, think)' \\ &+ s_{img} \cdot (\hat{m}(vit, vae, edit, think)' - m(\phi, \phi, edit, \phi)). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This formulation has two key issues:

1. **Incomplete decoupling of conditions.** The three input conditions, image, edit instruction, and text CoT, are not fully decoupled in the two multimodal contexts used for CFG. Instead, two conditions are always dropped simultaneously. In $m(\phi, \phi, edit, \phi)$, both the image and CoT are absent, while in $m(vit, vae, \phi, \phi)$, both the edit instruction and CoT are absent. This means the CoT is emphasized twice across these two CFG types. Moreover, emphasizing two different conditions simultaneously may produce unexpected results.

2. **Sequential computation couples the scales.** Unlike *DraCo*-CFG, which computes CFG in one round, this approach uses two sequential rounds. This couples the scales s_{text} and s_{img} . Formally, let $M \triangleq m(vit, vae, edit, think)$, $M_{text} \triangleq m(vit, vae, \phi, \phi)$, and $M_{img} \triangleq m(\phi, \phi, edit, \phi)$ denote the latent vectors from the full model, the text-only model, and the image-only model, respectively. By substituting $\hat{m}(vit, vae, edit, think)'$ from Equation 4 into Equation 5, we obtain:

$$\hat{m} = (1 + s_{text})(1 + s_{img})M - s_{text}(1 + s_{img})M_{text} - s_{img}M_{img} \quad (6)$$

As shown, M_{text} is controlled by both s_{text} and s_{img} , meaning the condition from M_{text} may be over-emphasized.

B.2. System Prompt

In *DraCo*-CFG, we adopt different system prompts for $m(\phi, \phi, \phi)$, $m(\phi, vit, \phi)$, and $m(p, vit, v)$ to ensure more emphasis on the specific condition. We omit the details of the system prompt in the full submission for brevity. In practice, we do not adopt system prompt for $m(\phi, \phi, \phi)$. For $m(\phi, vit, \phi)$, we want the model to fully construct the draft image, so the prompt is:

Draft-Only System Prompt

You should generate a larger image with the same content as the input image, with better details and clarity.

For full condition $m(p, vit, v)$, the system prompt is:

Full-Condition System Prompt

You should first generate a scratch image. Then you should analyze whether the scratch image is aligned with the prompt. If not, you should think about how to modify the scratch image to make it aligned with the prompt and then modify the scratch image. The analysis process is enclosed within `<think>` and `</think>` tags, i.e., `<think>` analysis process here modification process here (optional) `</think>` modified image here (optional).

C. More Dataset Details

We provide additional examples of our proposed *DraCo*-240K in Figure 7. As shown, the subset for general correction includes various correction scenarios such as object replacement and background modification. For instance manipulation, the focus is on handling objects of the same

class. The training data includes either adding, removing, or changing attributes for one or multiple instances in the image. Regarding layout reorganization, we include examples that require swapping the positions of objects, or adding or removing an object at a specific position relative to existing objects. To guarantee the accuracy of the generated prompts, we conduct cross-validation for prompts in instance manipulation and layout reorganization. The reason is that prompts in instance manipulation contain numeracy information about objects, and prompts in layout reorganization contain spatial information, which is universally acknowledged that current MLLMs, even powerful ones like Qwen3-VL [53], still struggle to accurately capture. Therefore, we also use GroundingDINO [30] to detect all the objects present in the prompt and record their positions and numbers. We only retain samples where the detection results align with the prompt. Besides, the draft images in the dataset are roughly the same size as the final images. We downsample the draft images to a size of 384×384 during training. For the verification, we deliberately add a conclusion about what needs to be changed so that the model can better follow the correction instruction.

D. More Experiment Details

To facilitate Bagel to generate valid small resolution images as a valid draft, we first conduct a text-to-image fine-tuning stage before training for *DraCo*. We input various forms of prompts to Bagel to generate 1024×1024 images. Then we resize these images to 384×384 to train the model. We also adopt images generated from GPT-4o [37]. During training, half of the images in trained in 384×384 , and half is trained in 1024×1024 to ensure the model’s generation capability of both sizes of images. We finetune the model for 14K steps and adopt the EMA weight. We continue training on this weight for *DraCo*.

E. Limitations and Future Work

While *DraCo* demonstrates significant improvements in text-to-image generation through interleaved reasoning, several limitations remain. The application of this paradigm to other fields has not been extensively studied. Specifically, the low-resolution draft designed in *DraCo* cannot be directly or optimally used in other scenarios, such as videos, 3D assets, or scenes. Clearly, using a low-resolution draft still seems computationally expensive for video generation. The draft for different modalities requires capturing the major difficulty during generation, such as consistency in the video, and then constructing the form of the draft to give a second chance for the most challenging part. These are not clearly studied in this work. Moreover, the role of humans in improving data curation and the training loop is not well studied. Incorporating humans in this process could help




Figure 7. More Examples of *DraCo-240K*.

better align the generation and correction methods.

F. Qualitative Examples

We show more qualitative examples and comparison in Fig. 8. In Fig. 8 (a), we showcase the draft image, final image, and its corresponding prompt. The examples include various correction scenarios, including: position cor-

rection, rare attribute generation, precise object editing, and numeracy correction. We also show more detailed examples including the verification in Fig. 8 (b). During verification, the model first analyzes the inconsistency between the prompt and the image, then proposes a correction method, and also highlights what should not be changed. Ultimately, the model summarizes the correction in its final outcome. In Fig. 8 (c), we compare our method with the CoT-powered





Figure 8. More Qualitative Examples of *DraCo*.

method, T2I-R1 [21], and our baseline model, Bagel [8]. As shown, T2I-R1 tends to generate artifacts, e.g., half of the giraffe and the monkey, or over-saturated images. While Bagel cannot accurately follow the prompt. In contrast, *DraCo* produces satisfying results with both high quality

and precise alignment of the prompt.