

Capturing Classic Authorial Style in Long-Form Story Generation with GRPO Fine-Tuning

Jinlong Liu*

Mohammed Bahja†

Venelin Kovatchev‡

Mark Lee†

Abstract

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) show impressive performance in open-ended story generation, but fine-grained stylistic control remains limited. Existing methods often rely on shallow cues (e.g., names or topics) to simulate authorial style, without robust evaluation. In this work, we present a training framework for style-conditioned story generation using Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) and a custom multi-reward setup. The style reward is derived from a fine-tuned sentence transformer using authorship verification (AV) signals, combined with content and completeness scores to stabilize long-form narrative generation. We conduct experiments using fiction by Mark Twain, a prominent 19th-century American author, with *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* serving as the reference style exemplar. Our 8B model outperforms larger baselines such as GPT-4o and Claude Sonnet 4 in AV-style metrics, achieving a style score of 0.628 and competitive content quality. Results demonstrate the feasibility of agentic stylistic generation with moderate model size and task-specific training. While the output is clearly style-aligned, narrative completeness remains a challenge—indicating future work is needed to better model global coherence and story resolution.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the improvement of language models on story-writing tasks is quite impressive. Current LLMs such as GPT-4o and Claude Sonnet 4 can already produce fluent and coherent outputs for open-ended creative writing. Several new benchmarks have also been proposed to evaluate writing ability more systematically, including WritingBench (Wu et al., 2025), LitBench (Fein et al., 2025), and EQ-Bench (Paech, 2023). These works focus mainly on scoring quality, creativity, and narrative coherence—key challenges for generative models, especially in long-form generation.

At the same time, there are increasing claims that these models can mimic the tone or style of classic au-

thors. However, most of these claims lack concrete evidence or reliable evaluation. In many cases, such style imitation only comes from copying character names or setting elements from the target author’s original works, which leads to a misunderstanding of what authorial style really means. Using superficial references is not equivalent to capturing literary voice or narrative rhythm.

This brings up a key question: how can we enforce a specific writing style without sacrificing the logical consistency and readability of the story? In this paper, we treat this challenge as a variant of the AV problem (Stamatatos, 2009). But instead of classifying who wrote a given text, we use AV-style scoring to guide a model during generation toward stylistically aligned outputs. This creates a direct link between generation and evaluation, and makes it possible to build a more measurable and controllable pipeline for author-style modelling.

To do this, we introduce a new training framework using GRPO (Shao et al., 2024), with a custom reward function system for long-form narrative generation. The main style reward uses a fine-tuned sentence embedding model and is scaled with a sigmoid to give a stable signal during training. Two additional rewards—one for content relevance and one for completeness—are designed specifically to maintain narrative coherence and prevent logical decay over long passages. This makes it possible to train the model to simultaneously adhere to a target style and a coherent plot.

In our experiments, we focus on fiction from Mark Twain, especially *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, as the primary training and evaluation source. We show that the model can reach around 70% style similarity under our AV-style metrics. This indicates that the proposed method can produce vivid, stylistically consistent, and narratively coherent stories that resemble the voice of a classic author.

This paper provides both a practical training pipeline and an experimental study on how to guide LLMs to write with specific classic author styles. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel pipeline for style-conditioned story generation using GRPO, driven by a custom reward model based on AV scores.
- We provide a case study analysing the inherent trade-off between maximizing stylistic similarity and maintaining long-range narrative coherence within an Reinforcement Learning (RL) framework.

*School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom. jx12069@student.bham.ac.uk

†School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom. m.bahja@bham.ac.uk

‡School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom. v.o.kovatchev@bham.ac.uk

- We introduce a new quantitative approach for evaluating stylistic alignment, using the output of our reward model as a dynamic metric during generation.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The **Related Work** section reviews prior research in AV and agentic training methods for LLMs, and provides a summary table of related approaches. The **Methodology** section describes how we build the style reward model and analyze its performance. In **Dataset Preparation**, we explain how the dataset is constructed for GRPO fine-tuning. The **Experiment** section outlines the full training pipeline, hyperparameter setup, and presents comparisons between our fine-tuned model and several strong baselines. The **Conclusion** section discusses final results and future directions for agentic stylistic generation.

2 Related works

Prior research on AV spans a range of strategies, from stylometric features to transformer-based models and prompt-driven approaches. Stamatatos (2009) offer a foundational survey of automated authorship attribution methods, outlining five key stylometric categories: (i) lexical features (e.g., word length, vocabulary richness), (ii) character-level features (e.g., character n-grams), (iii) syntactic structures (e.g., POS tag distributions, parse rules), (iv) semantic indicators (e.g., synonym usage, semantic roles), and (v) domain-specific signals (e.g., structural patterns in emails or genre-linked keywords).

Building on traditional techniques, Bevendorff et al. (2019) extend the "unmasking" method—a previously book-length-dependent AV algorithm—into a generalized form effective on shorter texts, such as articles or essays. Their adaptation preserves high precision, addressing the impracticality of long-text dependency in real-world scenarios.

Recent efforts focus on disentangling style from content. Wang et al. (2023a) show that even when semantic content is obfuscated through masking and paraphrasing, style-based features remain discriminative. In parallel, Nguyen et al. (2023) evaluate transformer architectures on long fanfiction narratives, employing balanced sampling and sliding-window encoding. Their BigBird pipeline achieves a 4.8% equal error rate and a PAN21 score of 0.9596, outperforming Longformer, RoBERTa, and ELECTRA.

Prompt-based AV has emerged as a new frontier. Hung et al. (2023) introduce PromptAV, leveraging step-by-step reasoning with stylometric cues. Their method surpasses standard prompting strategies (e.g., Chain-of-Thought, PS+), reaching up to 66.7% accuracy in few-shot IMDb62 classification. Meanwhile, Sawatphol et al. (2024) emphasize evaluation robustness through Heterogeneity-Informed Topic Sampling (HITS), which

increases topic diversity and yields stable rankings across random seeds, with a Kendall rank correlation of 0.92.

Interpretability has also become an important focus in AV. Ramnath et al. (2025) introduce CAVE, an explanation framework that produces linguistic rationales based on surface-level features such as punctuation, syntactic structure, and stylistic variation. Evaluated across three AV benchmarks (IMDb62, BLOG-AUTH, and FANFICTION), CAVE achieves competitive accuracy while significantly improving human interpretability. In contrast, Michel et al. (2024) investigate AV in the context of literary dialogue, highlighting the difficulty of distinguishing character voice from true authorial style in fictional texts.

For agentic model training, recent work on GRPO has shown encouraging results. This method involves loading the model twice—once as a reference model to measure divergence, and once as the trainable model—to iteratively update the policy based on a custom reward function. GRPO has been successfully applied to models like DeepSeek-R1 without requiring a separate critic network. By estimating reward baselines from grouped sample scores, GRPO significantly reduces the computational overhead compared to traditional methods such as Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Shao et al., 2024).

Unlike earlier approaches that use Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023), which depends on explicitly labelled accept/reject pairs, GRPO allows for greater output diversity. This flexibility is especially critical for open-ended creative tasks like story generation, where multiple stylistic and narrative variations may be acceptable or even desirable.

This work builds on these developments with a focus on writing-style AV. We investigate whether large language models, when fine-tuned with targeted reward signals, can consistently learn and reproduce the stylistic signatures of classic authors in long-form fiction.

3 Methodology

In this section, we introduce a method for efficiently identifying writing style similarity, designed for direct application as a reward function in agentic ghostwriter systems. Traditional style comparison techniques—such as Burrows’ Delta (Burrows, 2002) and the TED Algorithm (Zhang and Shasha, 1989)—operate at the token level and have demonstrated effectiveness in constrained or short-form settings. However, these methods degrade in performance when applied to modern long-form text, where stylistic features are more distributed and less amenable to shallow surface-level comparisons.

To construct a style-based reward model suitable for agentic fine-tuning, we identify three key requirements:

1. **Robust scoring under imperfect style mimicry:**
The reward model must tolerate stylistic approximation rather than penalizing deviations too harshly.

Without this flexibility, agentic training may stagnate due to narrow reward plateaus.

2. **Stability across diverse inputs:** A reliable model must maintain performance across a wide range of generated content, including varying lengths and topics, especially when evaluating out-of-distribution or unseen texts produced during training.
3. **Access to scalable, labelled similarity data:** Effective training requires a dataset that provides controllable and interpretable similarity scores while remaining computationally tractable for iterative fine-tuning. This necessitates a data construction method that both preserves authorial signal and minimizes redundancy.

The remainder of this section outlines our approach for overcoming these limitations through controlled data augmentation, adaptive similarity labelling, and evaluation with pretrained sentence encoders.

3.1 Baseline Analysis of Style Similarity Models

As an initial step, we explore a sentence-transformer-based method that uses pretrained embeddings to compute pairwise similarity between text chunks. Each pair is assigned a label based on its computed similarity score. However, early experiments with fixed threshold rules for labelling yielded inconsistent and often unstable outcomes—particularly during fine-tuning—highlighting the need for a more adaptive, semantically grounded labelling scheme.

To validate the reliability of sentence-transformer embeddings for style similarity detection, we conducted a controlled experiment: authors with at least two books in our dataset were selected, and their texts were segmented into chunks ranging from 500 to 3000 words. Only intra-author chunk pairs were constructed to isolate stylistic consistency and eliminate content-level confounds. The resulting similarity scores were interpreted as a proxy for authorial style similarity.

We evaluated five representative sentence-transformer models for their architectural diversity and optimization for sentence-level semantic tasks. Four models—`all-mpnet-base-v2`, `all-distilroberta-v1`, `all-MiniLM-L6-v2`, and `all-MiniLM-L12-v2`—are from the project (Reimers, 2021), based respectively on MPNet (Song et al., 2020), DistilRoBERTa (Sanh et al., 2019), and MiniLM (Wang et al., 2020). For comparison, we also include StyleDistance (Patel et al., 2025), a domain-specific model fine-tuned for stylistic discrimination tasks.

Each model was assessed across multiple chunk sizes using several statistical criteria (mean Δ , IQR overlap, standard deviation), and performance was benchmarked before and after contrastive fine-tuning. Results show that while pretrained models exhibit varying degrees of

sensitivity to authorial style, their baseline performance is limited—highlighting the need for task-specific adaptation. Fine-tuning consistently improved both discriminative power and distributional separation, confirming the viability of this approach for style-oriented representation learning.

Table 1 presents the experimental results for all five base models. Among them, `all-MiniLM-L6-v2` exhibits the largest gap between same-author and cross-author similarity scores, with a modest average Δ of +0.015 and an IQR overlap of 83.3%. While this is the most promising among the evaluated baselines, the performance gap remains minimal overall. Other models, such as `all-mpnet-base-v2` and `all-distilroberta-v1`, show nearly indistinguishable distributions between same- and cross-author pairs, with Δ values close to zero and IQR overlaps exceeding 94%. Full metrics for each model are detailed in Table 1 in Appendix A.

These results highlight a key limitation of pretrained sentence-transformer models: they struggle to detect stylistic variation when semantic content remains constant. The consistently high IQR overlap—averaging 91.3% across all models—indicates weak authorial discrimination in their default, out-of-the-box state. This reinforces the need for task-specific fine-tuning to capture stylistic features that go beyond surface-level topical or semantic similarity.

3.2 Constructing a Style-Controlled Dataset for Reward Modelling

To address this issue, we introduce a controlled dataset construction method that systematically adjusts writing style while preserving core content. Given a text chunk C from an author’s work—comprising at least ten sentences $s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_{10}$ —we apply a sentence-level masking strategy at a chosen ratio $r_{mask} \in 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.8$. Sentences are selected for masking either based on length. Each masked segment is then regenerated sequentially using a large language model, resulting in a modified chunk C' . The similarity between C and C' can be estimated as approximately $1 - r_{mask}$, based on the assumption that stylistic characteristics are partially preserved during the regeneration process.

To ensure consistency of stylistic context, our dataset is sourced from Project Gutenberg and contains works tagged as Selected texts from the same historical period. Focused on similar themes and subjects, we selected three specific subject labels (based on original metadata): *Fugitive slaves – Fiction*, *Americans–Great Britain–Fiction* and *United States–Social life and customs–19th century–Fiction* distributions shows in Figure 1

This selection reduces genre-driven variation and centres the model’s learning on authorial style. The dataset includes 161 books by 84 authors, mostly American English writers. We split texts into 1500-word chunks to balance computational efficiency and textual coherence. Using Gemma-3-27b-it (Team et al., 2025),

Model	Cross Author \pm SD	Same Author \pm SD	Δ	IQR Overlap
all-mpnet-base-v2	0.477 ± 0.114	0.480 ± 0.117	+0.003	94.3%
all-MiniLM-L6-v2	0.314 ± 0.102	0.329 ± 0.105	+0.015	83.3%
all-MiniLM-L12-v2	0.257 ± 0.093	0.265 ± 0.097	+0.008	86.9%
StyleDistance	0.881 ± 0.070	0.891 ± 0.071	+0.010	97.1%
all-distilroberta-v1	0.586 ± 0.097	0.591 ± 0.101	+0.005	95.0%

Table 1: Baseline model performance averaged across all chunk sizes. Near-zero differences (Δ) between same- and cross-author scores, together with large IQR overlaps ($> 80\%$), reveal limited author-discrimination ability. Sample sizes: $n_{\text{cross}} = 3\,208\text{--}1\,140$, $n_{\text{same}} = 4\,667\text{--}715$.

$\Delta = \text{Same} - \text{Cross}$. IQR Overlap is the percentage intersection of the two 25–75 % percentile ranges.

Model	Cross Author \pm SD	Same Author \pm SD	Δ	IQR Overlap
FT-all-mpnet-base-v2	0.048 ± 0.126	0.628 ± 0.258	+0.580	0.0%
FT-all-MiniLM-L6-v2	0.086 ± 0.171	0.515 ± 0.250	+0.429	0.0%
FT-all-MiniLM-L12-v2	0.081 ± 0.164	0.421 ± 0.239	+0.340	0.0%
FT-StyleDistance	0.172 ± 0.232	0.694 ± 0.226	+0.522	0.0%
FT-all-distilroberta-v1	0.054 ± 0.133	0.682 ± 0.215	+0.628	0.0%

Table 2: Fine-tuned model performance averaged across all chunk sizes. Fine-tuning widens the same-vs-cross gap (Δ) and drives IQR Overlap to 0 %, indicating clear author separation. $\Delta = \text{Same} - \text{Cross}$ (repeated here for stand-alone clarity). FT-all-distilroberta-v1 achieves the largest margin.




Figure 1: Subjects Distributions

each chunk undergoes the masking and refill process described above.

Training and Validation Sets: We construct three pair types: (i) *Positive pairs*, formed by original and refilled chunks from the same author but different books, assigned a score of $s = 1.0 - r_{\text{mask}}$; (ii) *Negative pairs*, formed by refilled chunks from different authors, scored as $s = 0.0$; (iii) *Refilled-refilled pairs*, scored as $s = 1.0 - |r_{\text{mask}_1} - r_{\text{mask}_2}|$, are constructed using content from the same author but from different books. The term $|r_{\text{mask}_1} - r_{\text{mask}_2}|$ reflects the gap between two refilled versions, which can be interpreted as a proxy for stylistic difference, since both are generated from the same author’s original content under varying masking

rates.

Test Set: Two configurations are used: (i) *Same-author pairs* consisting of original chunks from different titles by the same author ($s = 1.0$); (ii) *Cross-author pairs* consisting of original chunks from different authors ($s = 0.0$).

This setup yields 65K training samples and 7K each in validation and test sets. The advantage of this construction is a well-distributed score range and reduced risk of model memorization, as benchmark chunks are excluded from training. A known limitation is the relative scarcity of high-score (positive) training pairs.

3.3 Performance Gains and Model Selection for Agentic Training

Table 2 summarises the performance of the fine-tuned models on the test benchmark, with detailed results available in Appendix A Table 2. A remarkable improvement was observed across the board after applying our fine-tuning technique. Every fine-tuned model achieved perfect distributional separation (0.0% IQR overlap) at all tested chunk sizes. This was accompanied by a dramatic increase in discriminative power; for instance, the average Δ across all fine-tuned models surged to +0.440—more than a 50-fold gain over the baseline average (see Table 2). Per-model box-plots are provided in Appendix A, Figures 1–3.

The most notable transformation occurred in the all-distilroberta-v1 model. Initially the weak-




Figure 2: Similarity-score distributions for 1 500-word chunks. Grey = cross-author, blue = same-author. Smaller outlier markers avoid visual clutter while preserving distribution detail.

est baseline, it showed a minimal similarity gap between same-author and cross-author pairs ($\Delta = +0.005$) and an IQR overlap of 95.0%, indicating almost complete distributional overlap and poor stylistic discrimination. This made it an ideal candidate to test the effectiveness of our fine-tuning procedure.

Post fine-tuning, `all-distilroberta-v1` became the top performer, exhibiting full distributional separation across all tested chunk sizes. Its peak performance was observed at the 1500-word chunk level ($\Delta = +0.681$), but the gains were consistent across the 500–3000 word range. Crucially, the model maintained zero IQR overlap throughout, suggesting that the fine-tuning process instilled a generalizable and robust capability to differentiate authorial style, rather than overfitting to a specific text length.

However, for the subsequent agentic-training phases we proceed with `FT-all-mpnet-base-v2`. Figure 2 (1 500-word chunks) highlights the behavioural gap between the two fine-tuned models. `FT-all-distilroberta-v1` exhibits an almost non-overlapping separation between same and cross-author boxes, signalling a highly conservative reward landscape. While this maximises author discrimination, it also starves early RL iterations of positive feedback—our pilot runs rarely exceeded a reward of 0.2. `FT-all-mpnet-base-v2` retains a healthy margin yet produces a broader spread of cross-author scores, providing the incremental gradients needed for stable exploration and faster policy improvement.

In contrast, `FT-all-mpnet-base-v2` maintains a moderate but consistent separation between distributions. This more permissive structure offers smoother

gradient signals for small policy updates, facilitating more effective learning in low-reward regions. As such, it presents a better fit for reward modelling in early-stage agent fine-tuning.

To further explore the role of architectural capacity, we experimented with training a classifier using a larger model: `LLaMA-3.2-1B` (Meta, 2024). While the model rapidly minimized training loss, results from an obfuscation test revealed that it significantly overfit the training data. Despite its large parameter count and complex architecture, it failed to generalize reliably to unseen examples. This suggests that authorship verification, while nuanced, may become trivial for large autoregressive models unless care is taken to construct challenging and diverse training instances. It also reinforces the value of our contrastive-style fine-tuning strategy, which enables smaller sentence-level models to perform competitively—even outperforming much larger generative models in this context.

4 Dataset Preparation

This section outlines the data construction pipeline for training our story-writing agent using GRPO, a lightweight reinforcement learning method. We prepare two datasets to support this framework: the first is used for supervised fine-tuning (SFT) to initialize a general-purpose story-telling model, and the second is specifically designed for GRPO training to align the generated stories with a target author’s style.

SFT Dataset: Because no widely adopted SFT dataset exists for open-domain story generation, we construct our own starting point using the 300K prompt-story pairs from Fan et al. (2018). While this dataset provides broad narrative diversity, the prompts vary significantly in tone, complexity, and length—making them unsuitable for style-controlled generation during the GRPO stage. To ensure consistency, we curate a new set of 50 prompts designed to first teach the model how to generate base stories in response to generic instructions. In the GRPO stage, we then augment these prompts with style-specific cues, guiding the model to rewrite the same content in a stylistically aligned manner. For example:

"Write a story about a lighthouse keeper during a fierce storm with a focus on high-quality, polished literary prose. Your story should be approximately 1500 words long. Start Your Story:"

Using these prompts, we sample 800 completions per prompt from the `Qwen2.5-32B` (Qwen et al., 2025) model, targeting a story length of around 1500 words with a detailed prompt. To assess the quality of these 40,000 outputs, we follow the rubric-based scoring method introduced by Bai et al. (2024), in which the same LLM is used to judge content quality. This automatic evaluation scores each story on coherence, character depth,

structure, and overall readability. Human evaluation at this scale would be prohibitively expensive and time-consuming, making model-based scoring a practical necessity. The full generation prompt and rubric used for scoring is detailed in Appendix B. The resulting dataset is then used to fine-tune a base model with general storytelling capabilities, serving as the starting point for style-specific adaptation.

GRPO Dataset: To support reward-driven fine-tuning with GRPO, we construct a second dataset that emphasizes both narrative quality and alignment with a target authorial style. Drawing on the findings of Wilmot (2022), who show that training on individual works improves style fidelity, we focus on a single canonical author: **Mark Twain**. We use *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as the reference corpus, splitting it into 1500-word chunks to match the reward model’s input structure. Each chunk is paired with one of the 50 base prompts from the SFT dataset, generating a GRPO dataset of 4,450 prompt-reference pairs.

To promote stylistic control, each prompt is modified to include explicit instructions directing the model to write in Twain’s voice. For example:

"Write a story about a lighthouse keeper during a fierce storm in the style of Mark Twain with first-person narrative voice and vernacular speech, with a focus on high-quality, polished literary prose. Your story should be approximately 1500 words long. Start Your Story:"

This construction strategy encourages the model to retain the narrative planning and content learned during the SFT stage, while transforming surface features—such as diction, syntax, and narrative voice—according to Twain’s stylistic signature. In doing so, the GRPO dataset facilitates training dynamics in which the reward model can guide the generation toward stylistic precision without destabilizing overall story quality.

5 Experiment

In this section, we explore the application of GRPO for training language models on creative writing tasks. GRPO’s group-based reward estimation naturally encourages both stylistic exploration and output diversity, making it well-suited for open-ended narrative generation. And this experiment, the SFT stage is fine-tuned on

Reward Function Setup: We design three complementary reward components:

(i) *Style reward* is calculated using a fine-tuned sentence transformer model to measure the similarity between generated text and reference samples within the same batch. The raw similarity score S_{sim} is first normalized using the average similarity scores of same-author pairs (S_{μ}) and cross-author pairs (C_{μ}), following the

scaling formula in Eq. 1. A scaling factor of 6 is used to shape the sigmoid curve, ensuring a balanced and approximately linear response in the mid-range. This setting was empirically found to provide stable training signals for style scoring. For a detailed comparison of different scaling factors, see Figure 4 in Appendix C. The scaled value x is then passed through a sigmoid function (Eq. 2) and clipped within the range $[0.05, 0.95]$ (Eq. 3) to prevent extreme reward values, which stabilizes the agentic training process.

(ii) *Content reward* evaluates narrative quality, focusing on coherence, character development, and overall human readability. Due to computational constraints, we employ `openchat-3.5-0106`, a 7B model that performs well as an evaluator and produces feedback more aligned with human preferences compared to GPT-4 (Wang et al., 2023b). The model is prompted to return a single integer score (1–4) based on a fixed evaluation rubric, which is then normalized to the $[0.25, 1]$ range. Full evaluation prompts are provided in Appendix B.

(iii) *Completeness reward* evaluates whether the story concludes with a complete sentence and meets the target length of approximately 1500 words. The score is first computed as the percentage of words written relative to the 1500-word target. If the story does not end with a complete sentence, a penalty factor of 0.5 is applied to the score to reflect structural incompleteness.

The final reward is a weighted sum of these components with weights of 0.6 for style, 0.3 for content, and 0.1 for completeness, emphasizing stylistic fidelity while maintaining baseline narrative quality and structural integrity.

$$x = \left(S_{\text{sim}} - \frac{C_{\mu} + S_{\mu}}{2} \right) \cdot \frac{6}{S_{\mu} - C_{\mu}} \quad (1)$$

$$S_{\text{scaled}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} \quad (2)$$

$$S_{\text{final}} = \max(0.05, \min(S_{\text{scaled}}, 0.95)) \quad (3)$$

Experimental Setup: All experiments were conducted on a system with 2× Intel® Xeon® Platinum 8360Y CPUs, 512 GB RAM, and 4× NVIDIA A100 GPUs (80 GB VRAM each). For initial training and parameter exploration, we used a learning rate of 5×10^{-6} with default epsilon values and trained for a single epoch. The DrGRPO loss function (Liu et al., 2025) was used, as it offers advantages for long-form content modelling. Each training batch included at least 16 sampled completions per prompt to promote exploration and stylistic diversity.

Tuning the Beta Parameter for Stability: In the initial experiments, we tested several beta (β) values—specifically 0.05, 0.1, and 0.15—to gain a basic understanding of training behaviour on this task. As shown in Figure 3a and Figure 3b, lower β values yield higher reward signals during training but also introduce instability. Because this is a creative writing task, the KL divergence values appear irregular and noisy, which complicates efforts to




Figure 3: Reward and KL values during training. Plot (a) shows that lower β settings lead to higher reward scores, but this comes at the cost of training stability. Plot (b) illustrates that lower β values result in larger KL divergence spikes, indicating unstable updates. The target behaviour is a smooth and consistent KL increase from 0 to 1, which reflects controlled policy adaptation.

Model	Style \pm SD	Content \pm SD	Completeness \pm SD	Weighted Avg \pm SD
FT-Agentic (8B)	0.628 \pm 0.336	0.750 \pm 0.000	0.744 \pm 0.227	0.676 \pm 0.203
Gemma-3-27B	0.306 \pm 0.171	0.750 \pm 0.000	0.450 \pm 0.005	0.453 \pm 0.102
Qwen 2.5-32B	0.328 \pm 0.218	0.750 \pm 0.000	0.911 \pm 0.013	0.513 \pm 0.131
GPT-4o	0.510 \pm 0.194	0.800 \pm 0.100	0.873 \pm 0.136	0.633 \pm 0.117
Claude 4	0.450 \pm 0.203	0.750 \pm 0.000	0.999 \pm 0.002	0.595 \pm 0.122
Gemini 2.5 Flash	0.357 \pm 0.236	0.750 \pm 0.000	0.992 \pm 0.013	0.538 \pm 0.141

Table 3: Model-level scores (mean \pm SD) for Style, Content, and Completeness. Style is measured using our AV-based reward model. Content scores reflect rubric-based evaluations; most models consistently satisfy level-3 criteria, yielding fixed scores of 0.75 and zero variance. GPT-4o receives slightly higher ratings with minor variation. Completeness scores assess whether the output meets the target length and ends properly—our model shows stronger style alignment but more variance in completeness.

stabilize training. To address this, we adjusted the learning rate and applied gradient normalization to mitigate reward hacking and prevent collapse. We further observed that when β falls below 0.04, the model becomes too aggressive in policy updates, leading to exploitation of the reward model and unstable generation quality.

Based on these findings, we selected $\beta = 0.035$ for the final fine-tuning, combined with a learning rate of 3×10^{-6} and gradient normalization set to 1.0.

Evaluation Against Baseline LLMs: We then evaluated our model against several widely used large language models—Claude Sonnet 4, Gemini 2.5 Flash, OpenAI GPT-4o, Gemma 3-27B, and Qwen 2.5-32B—using our reward-based scoring framework to ensure a consistent comparison. Each model was given the same 10 prompts from our dataset and asked to generate one story per prompt. As shown in Table 3, our fine-tuned model achieved the highest average style reward score of 0.628, outperforming all other LLMs on this metric. It also reached the highest overall score of 0.676, with a reasonable content reward and a lower completeness score of 0.744—comparable to models like Gemma 3, while others such as GPT-4o and Claude

Sonnet 4 achieved values closer to 0.9. While GPT-4o recorded the best content quality score (0.800) and a solid style score (0.510), resulting in a competitive weighted score, our 8B-parameter model demonstrates that GRPO training is highly effective and confirms the feasibility of our approach for agentic stylistic generation, even under limited parameter and resource conditions.

6 Conclusion

This work presents a practical training pipeline for agentic story-writing models that generate long-form narratives in the style of classic authors using GRPO. By combining a sigmoid-scaled style reward with auxiliary signals for content and completeness, we demonstrate that stylistic alignment can be achieved without compromising narrative structure.

Despite the modest model size and limited training data, our method outperforms larger models on AV-style metrics, showing the potential of reward-driven fine-tuning for stylistic control. While generation stability

remains a challenge—particularly for producing complete narratives—the results confirm the feasibility of using GRPO for author-style conditioning in creative writing agents.

Limitations

Our current approach is constrained by computational resources, which limit both the complexity and reliability of the content reward model. In many cases, the content evaluator fails to accurately identify prompt-relevant elements, resulting in weak or unstable signals during generation. This leads to outputs that are occasionally misaligned with the intended structure or lack sufficient narrative quality.

In addition, the GRPO training dataset is restricted to a single literary work—*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*—from one author. This narrow scope limits the model’s ability to generalize across different writing styles and subjects. The current evaluation also lacks human feedback, making it difficult to assess the authenticity of stylistic imitation beyond model-driven metrics.

Future work will expand the dataset to include multiple authors across diverse themes and subject matter. We also plan to integrate a more reliable content reward model and human evaluations to better validate the quality and stylistic fidelity of generated outputs.

Ethics Statement

This work is intended for positive and constructive use, particularly in education, storytelling research, and creative writing support. Our goal is not to "revive" or replicate classic authors in a literal or deceptive sense, but to explore whether modern models can approximate stylistic elements in a controlled, transparent way. While the model is capable of generating polished and stylistically informed narratives, it does not—and cannot—reproduce the depth of thought, cultural context, or lived experience embedded in original works of classic literature. These limitations are especially apparent when compared with the societal insights and historical grounding found in genuine authorial texts.

The training data used in this study is derived entirely from public domain sources and open datasets, ensuring transparency and legal clarity. No copyrighted or private materials were used. The model outputs are meant for experimental and academic exploration, not commercial impersonation.

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful to the manager of the University of Birmingham’s Baskerville HPC system for providing the computational resources that made this research possible.


References

- Yushi Bai, Jiajie Zhang, Xin Lv, Linzhi Zheng, Siqi Zhu, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. Longwriter: Unleashing 10,000+ word generation from long context llms, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.07055>.
- Janek Bevendorff, Benno Stein, Matthias Hagen, and Martin Potthast. Generalizing unmasking for short texts. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 654–659, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1068. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1068/>.
- John Burrows. ‘delta’: a measure of stylistic difference and a guide to likely authorship. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 17(3):267–287, 09 2002. ISSN 0268-1145. doi: 10.1093/lc/17.3.267. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/17.3.267>.
- Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. Hierarchical neural story generation. In Iryna Gurevych and Yusuke Miyao, editors, *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 889–898, Melbourne, Australia, July 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P18-1082. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1082/>.
- Daniel Fein, Sebastian Russo, Violet Xiang, Kabir Jolly, Rafael Rafailov, and Nick Haber. Litbench: A benchmark and dataset for reliable evaluation of creative writing, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.00769>.
- Chia-Yu Hung, Zhiqiang Hu, Yujia Hu, and Roy Lee. Who wrote it and why? prompting large-language models for authorship verification. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 14078–14084, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.937. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.937/>.
- Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Penghui Qi, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. Understanding r1-zero-like training: A critical perspective, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.20783>.
- Meta. meta-llama/llama-3.2-1b-instruct. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-08-01.
- Gaspard Michel, Elena Epure, Romain Hennequin, and Christophe Cerisara. Distinguishing fictional voices:

- a study of authorship verification models for quotation attribution. In Yuri Bizzoni, Stefania Degaetano-Ortlieb, Anna Kazantseva, and Stan Szpakowicz, editors, *Proceedings of the 8th Joint SIGHUM Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, Humanities and Literature (LaTeCH-CLfL 2024)*, pages 160–171, St. Julians, Malta, March 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.latechclfl-1.15/>.
- Trang Nguyen, Charlie Dagli, Kenneth Alperin, Courtland Vandam, and Elliot Singer. Improving long-text authorship verification via model selection and data tuning. In Stefania Degaetano-Ortlieb, Anna Kazantseva, Nils Reiter, and Stan Szpakowicz, editors, *Proceedings of the 7th Joint SIGHUM Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, Humanities and Literature*, pages 28–37, Dubrovnik, Croatia, May 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.latechclfl-1.4. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.latechclfl-1.4/>.
- Samuel J. Paech. Eq-bench: An emotional intelligence benchmark for large language models, 2023.
- Ajay Patel, Jiacheng Zhu, Justin Qiu, Zachary Horvitz, Marianna Apidianaki, Kathleen McKeown, and Chris Callison-Burch. StyleDistance: Stronger content-independent style embeddings with synthetic parallel examples. In Luis Chiruzzo, Alan Ritter, and Lu Wang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8662–8685, Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-189-6. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.436. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-long.436/>.
- Qwen, :, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen2.5 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.15115>.
- 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.
- Sahana Ramnath, Kartik Pandey, Elizabeth Boschee, and Xiang Ren. CAVE: Controllable authorship verification explanations. In Luis Chiruzzo, Alan Ritter, and Lu Wang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8939–8961, Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-189-6. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.451. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-long.451/>.
- Nils Reimers. Train a sentence embedding model with 1 billion training pairs. <https://huggingface.co/blog/1b-sentence-embeddings>, 2021. Accessed: 2025-08-01.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.01108, 2019.
- Jitkapat Sawatphol, Can Udomcharoenchaikit, and Sarana Nutanong. Addressing topic leakage in cross-topic evaluation for authorship verification. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:1363–1377, 2024. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00709. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.tacl-1.75/>.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. MpNet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.09297>.
- Efstathios Stamatatos. A survey of modern authorship attribution methods. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(3): 538–556, 2009. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21001>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.21001>.
- Gemma Team, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Rivière, Louis Rouillard, Thomas Mesnard, Geoffrey Cideron, Jean bastien Grill, Sabela Ramos, Edouard Yvinec, Michelle Casbon, Etienne Pot, Ivo Penchev, Gaël Liu, Francesco Visin, Kathleen Kenealy, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohai Zhai, Anton Tsitsulin, Robert Busa-Fekete, Alex Feng, Noveen Sachdeva, Benjamin Coleman, Yi Gao, Basil Mustafa, Iain Barr, Emilio Parisotto, David Tian, Matan Eyal, Colin Cherry, Jan-Thorsten Peter, Danila Sinopalnikov, Surya Bhupatiraju, Rishabh Agarwal, Mehran Kazemi, Dan Malkin, Ravin Kumar, David Vilar, Idan Brusilovsky, Jiaming Luo, Andreas Steiner, Abe Friesen, Abhanshu Sharma, Abheesh Sharma, Adi Mayrav Gilady, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Alaa Saade, Alex


- Feng, Alexander Kolesnikov, Alexei Bendebury, Alvin Abdagic, Amit Vadi, András György, André Susano Pinto, Anil Das, Ankur Bapna, Antoine Miech, Antoine Yang, Antonia Paterson, Ashish Shenoy, Ayan Chakrabarti, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Bobak Shahriari, Bryce Petrini, Charlie Chen, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, CJ Carey, Cormac Brick, Daniel Deutsch, Danielle Eisenbud, Dee Cattle, Derek Cheng, Dimitris Paparas, Divyashree Shivakumar Sreepathihalli, Doug Reid, Dustin Tran, Dustin Zelle, Eric Noland, Erwin Huiyenga, Eugene Kharitonov, Frederick Liu, Gagik Amirkhanyan, Glenn Cameron, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, Harman Singh, Harsh Mehta, Harshal Tushar Lehri, Hussein Hazimeh, Ian Ballantyne, Idan Szpektor, Ivan Nardini, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Jetha Chan, Joe Stanton, John Wieting, Jonathan Lai, Jordi Orbay, Joseph Fernandez, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Jyotinder Singh, Kat Black, Kathy Yu, Kevin Hui, Kiran Vodrahalli, Klaus Greff, Linhai Qiu, Marcella Valentine, Marina Coelho, Marvin Ritter, Matt Hoffman, Matthew Watson, Mayank Chaturvedi, Michael Moynihan, Min Ma, Nabila Babar, Natasha Noy, Nathan Byrd, Nick Roy, Nikola Momchev, Nilay Chauhan, Noveen Sachdeva, Oskar Bunyan, Pankil Botarda, Paul Caron, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Phil Culliton, Philipp Schmid, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Pingmei Xu, Piotr Stanczyk, Pouya Tafti, Rakesh Shivan, Renjie Wu, Renke Pan, Reza Rokni, Rob Willoughby, Rohith Vallu, Ryan Mullins, Sammy Jerome, Sara Smoot, Sertan Girgin, Shariq Iqbal, Shashir Reddy, Shruti Sheth, Siim Pöder, Sijal Bhatnagar, Sindhu Raghuram Panyam, Sivan Eiger, Susan Zhang, Tianqi Liu, Trevor Yacovone, Tyler Liechty, Uday Kalra, Utku Evci, Vedant Misra, Vincent Roseberry, Vlad Feinberg, Vlad Kolesnikov, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xi Chen, Yinlam Chow, Yu-vein Zhu, Zichuan Wei, Zoltan Egyed, Victor Cotruta, Minh Giang, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Kat Black, Nabila Babar, Jessica Lo, Erica Moreira, Luiz Gustavo Martins, Omar Sanseviero, Lucas Gonzalez, Zach Gleicher, Tris Warkentin, Vahab Mirrokni, Evan Senter, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, Yossi Matias, D. Sculley, Slav Petrov, Noah Fiedel, Noam Shazeer, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Rohan Anil, Dmitry Lepikhin, Sebastian Borgeaud, Olivier Bachem, Armand Joulin, Alek Andreev, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, and Léonard Hussenot. Gemma 3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>.
- Andrew Wang, Cristina Aggazzotti, Rebecca Kotula, Rafael Rivera Soto, Marcus Bishop, and Nicholas Andrews. Can authorship representation learning capture stylistic features? *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:1416–1431, 2023a. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00610. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.tacl-1.80/>.
- Guan Wang, Sijie Cheng, Xianyuan Zhan, Xiangang Li, Sen Song, and Yang Liu. Openchat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11235*, 2023b.
- Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Li Dong, Hangbo Bao, Nan Yang, and Ming Zhou. Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.10957>.
- David Wilmot. *Great Expectations: Unsupervised Inference of Suspense, Surprise and Salience in Storytelling*. Phd thesis, The University of Edinburgh, 2022. URL <https://hdl.handle.net/1842/39175>.
- Yuning Wu, Jiahao Mei, Ming Yan, Chenliang Li, Shaopeng Lai, Yuran Ren, Zijia Wang, Ji Zhang, Mengyue Wu, Qin Jin, and Fei Huang. Writingbench: A comprehensive benchmark for generative writing, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.05244>.
- Kaizhong Zhang and Dennis Shasha. Simple fast algorithms for the editing distance between trees and related problems. *SIAM journal on computing*, 18(6): 1245–1262, 1989.

A Detailed Result




Model: all mpnet base v2 (Pre-trained)

(a) MPNet Pre-trained




Model: all mpnet base v2 (Fine-tuned)

(b) MPNet Fine-tuned



Model: all MiniLM L6 v2 (Pre-trained)


(c) MiniLM-L6 Pre-trained



Model: all MiniLM L6 v2 (Fine-tuned)


(d) MiniLM-L6 Fine-tuned

Figure 4: Similarity score comparison for MPNet and MiniLM-L6 embedding models showing pre-trained vs fine-tuned performance.




Model: all MiniLM L12 v2 (Pre-trained)

(a) MiniLM-L12 Pre-trained




Model: all MiniLM L12 v2 (Fine-tuned)

(b) MiniLM-L12 Fine-tuned



Model: styledistance (Pre-trained)


(c) StyleDistance Pre-trained



Model: styledistance (Fine-tuned)


(d) StyleDistance Fine-tuned

Figure 5: Similarity score comparison for MiniLM-L12 and StyleDistance embedding models showing pre-trained vs fine-tuned performance.



Model: all distilroberta v1 (Pre-trained)

(a) DistilRoBERTa Pre-trained



Model: all distilroberta v1 (Fine-tuned)

(b) DistilRoBERTa Fine-tuned

Figure 6: Similarity score comparison for DistilRoBERTa embedding models showing pre-trained vs fine-tuned performance.

Model	Chunk	Analysis Type	N	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Q25	Q75	95% CI	Effect Size (d)	SNR
all-mpnet-base-v2	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.4748	0.1143	0.4840	0.4067	0.5555	[0.4708, 0.4788]	-0.026	4.15
		Same Author	4,667	0.4778	0.1168	0.4873	0.3994	0.5589	[0.4744, 0.4812]		4.09
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.4791	0.1152	0.4899	0.4089	0.5631	[0.4745, 0.4837]	-0.020	4.16
		Same Author	2,218	0.4814	0.1149	0.4910	0.4080	0.5654	[0.4766, 0.4862]		4.19
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.4796	0.1137	0.4917	0.4025	0.5624	[0.4745, 0.4847]	-0.014	4.22
		Same Author	1,450	0.4812	0.1148	0.4854	0.4008	0.5661	[0.4753, 0.4871]		4.19
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.4789	0.1126	0.4874	0.4065	0.5633	[0.4734, 0.4844]	-0.011	4.25
		Same Author	1,077	0.4802	0.1174	0.4846	0.4056	0.5648	[0.4732, 0.4872]		4.09
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.4740	0.1100	0.4843	0.4024	0.5518	[0.4681, 0.4799]	-0.071	4.31
		Same Author	860	0.4821	0.1195	0.4899	0.4030	0.5697	[0.4741, 0.4901]		4.03
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.4748	0.1112	0.4812	0.4029	0.5552	[0.4683, 0.4813]	0.006	4.27
		Same Author	715	0.4755	0.1207	0.4815	0.3945	0.5633	[0.4666, 0.4844]		3.94
all-MiniLM-L6-v2	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.3136	0.1020	0.3177	0.2466	0.3830	[0.3101, 0.3171]	-1.409	3.07
		Same Author	4,667	0.3284	0.1061	0.3290	0.2562	0.4001	[0.3253, 0.3315]		3.10
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.3148	0.1018	0.3165	0.2449	0.3879	[0.3108, 0.3188]	-1.429	3.09
		Same Author	2,218	0.3294	0.1029	0.3334	0.2594	0.3990	[0.3251, 0.3337]		3.20
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.3156	0.1016	0.3203	0.2469	0.3878	[0.3111, 0.3201]	-1.515	3.11
		Same Author	1,450	0.3316	0.1064	0.3337	0.2594	0.4014	[0.3261, 0.3371]		3.12
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.3132	0.1018	0.3174	0.2448	0.3881	[0.3082, 0.3182]	-1.462	3.08
		Same Author	1,077	0.3284	0.1038	0.3280	0.2642	0.4020	[0.3222, 0.3346]		3.16
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.3156	0.1021	0.3215	0.2459	0.3868	[0.3101, 0.3211]	-1.355	3.09
		Same Author	860	0.3296	0.1048	0.3304	0.2563	0.3989	[0.3226, 0.3366]		3.14
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.3099	0.1042	0.3116	0.2401	0.3832	[0.3038, 0.3160]	-1.307	2.97
		Same Author	715	0.3236	0.1048	0.3239	0.2474	0.3971	[0.3159, 0.3313]		3.09
all-MiniLM-L12-v2	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.2568	0.0945	0.2593	0.1937	0.3194	[0.2535, 0.2601]	-1.082	2.72
		Same Author	4,667	0.2671	0.0959	0.2677	0.2034	0.3333	[0.2643, 0.2699]		2.78
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.2569	0.0932	0.2599	0.1943	0.3234	[0.2532, 0.2606]	-1.152	2.76
		Same Author	2,218	0.2678	0.0959	0.2710	0.2052	0.3302	[0.2638, 0.2718]		2.79
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.2584	0.0931	0.2597	0.1967	0.3238	[0.2542, 0.2626]	-1.005	2.78
		Same Author	1,450	0.2679	0.0981	0.2687	0.2041	0.3358	[0.2628, 0.2730]		2.73
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.2558	0.0930	0.2564	0.1894	0.3210	[0.2512, 0.2604]	-0.551	2.75
		Same Author	1,077	0.2612	0.0980	0.2635	0.1972	0.3250	[0.2553, 0.2671]		2.67
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.2536	0.0953	0.2530	0.1908	0.3203	[0.2485, 0.2587]	-1.248	2.66
		Same Author	860	0.2659	0.0995	0.2685	0.1993	0.3313	[0.2593, 0.2725]		2.67
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.2582	0.0924	0.2588	0.1978	0.3185	[0.2528, 0.2636]	-0.184	2.79
		Same Author	715	0.2600	0.0961	0.2580	0.1914	0.3263	[0.2529, 0.2671]		2.71
StyleDistance	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.8732	0.0740	0.8908	0.8341	0.9291	[0.8706, 0.8758]	-1.228	11.80
		Same Author	4,667	0.8823	0.0745	0.9037	0.8418	0.9382	[0.8801, 0.8845]		11.84
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.8839	0.0677	0.9018	0.8490	0.9346	[0.8812, 0.8866]	-1.217	13.05
		Same Author	2,218	0.8922	0.0719	0.9141	0.8597	0.9433	[0.8892, 0.8952]		12.41
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.8845	0.0698	0.9032	0.8501	0.9362	[0.8814, 0.8876]	-1.270	12.67
		Same Author	1,450	0.8934	0.0696	0.9139	0.8619	0.9440	[0.8898, 0.8970]		12.84
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.8830	0.0681	0.9006	0.8496	0.9343	[0.8796, 0.8864]	-1.640	12.97
		Same Author	1,077	0.8942	0.0710	0.9134	0.8625	0.9450	[0.8899, 0.8985]		12.60
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.8817	0.0715	0.9025	0.8469	0.9335	[0.8778, 0.8856]	-1.355	12.33
		Same Author	860	0.8914	0.0713	0.9132	0.8607	0.9433	[0.8866, 0.8962]		12.50
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.8809	0.0702	0.8998	0.8430	0.9337	[0.8768, 0.8850]	-1.726	12.55
		Same Author	715	0.8928	0.0688	0.9134	0.8623	0.9434	[0.8877, 0.8979]		12.98
all-distilroberta-v1	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.5736	0.1037	0.5868	0.5153	0.6456	[0.5700, 0.5772]	-0.058	5.53
		Same Author	4,667	0.5742	0.1061	0.5841	0.5092	0.6494	[0.5712, 0.5772]		5.41
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.5911	0.0991	0.6055	0.5359	0.6633	[0.5872, 0.5950]	-0.494	5.96
		Same Author	2,218	0.5960	0.0981	0.6058	0.5367	0.6661	[0.5919, 0.6001]		6.08
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.5924	0.0956	0.6032	0.5325	0.6624	[0.5881, 0.5967]	-0.458	6.20
		Same Author	1,450	0.5969	0.0996	0.6038	0.5370	0.6680	[0.5918, 0.6020]		5.99
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.5876	0.0959	0.5952	0.5299	0.6574	[0.5829, 0.5923]	-0.585	6.13
		Same Author	1,077	0.5934	0.0992	0.6003	0.5283	0.6608	[0.5875, 0.5993]		5.98
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.5863	0.0940	0.5991	0.5273	0.6536	[0.5812, 0.5914]	-1.120	6.24
		Same Author	860	0.5970	0.0998	0.6015	0.5321	0.6705	[0.5903, 0.6037]		5.98
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.5852	0.0973	0.5955	0.5232	0.6571	[0.5795, 0.5909]	-0.409	6.01
		Same Author	715	0.5893	0.1024	0.5957	0.5257	0.6631	[0.5818, 0.5968]		5.76

Table 4: Base model performance statistics. Most baseline models show limited ability to distinguish between same-author and cross-author text pairs, with small effect sizes ($|d| < 2.0$). StyleDistance yields the most consistent results, with similarity scores above 0.87 and signal-to-noise ratios above 11.0. MiniLM-based models produce lower overall similarity values but preserve relative patterns across chunk sizes. Effect sizes remain generally consistent from 500w to 3000w chunks, indicating robustness to input length. N = number of comparison pairs; Mean = average similarity score; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; Effect Size (d) = Cohen’s d between cross- and same-author conditions (negative indicates stronger same-author similarity); SNR = Mean/Std Dev.

Model	Chunk	Analysis Type	N	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Q25	Q75	95% CI	Effect Size (d)	SNR
FT-all-mpnet-base-v2	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.0435	0.1125	0.0221	-0.0206	0.0839	[0.0396, 0.0474]	-21.512	0.39
		Same Author	4,667	0.6109	0.2642	0.6891	0.4447	0.8251	[0.6033, 0.6185]		2.31
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.0475	0.1212	0.0235	-0.0200	0.0880	[0.0427, 0.0523]	-21.288	0.39
		Same Author	2,218	0.6108	0.2649	0.6875	0.4444	0.8232	[0.5998, 0.6218]		2.31
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.0475	0.1217	0.0229	-0.0162	0.0771	[0.0421, 0.0529]	-26.830	0.39
		Same Author	1,450	0.7011	0.2319	0.7864	0.6114	0.8662	[0.6891, 0.7131]		3.02
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.0510	0.1292	0.0242	-0.0211	0.0866	[0.0446, 0.0574]	-21.118	0.39
		Same Author	1,077	0.6103	0.2646	0.6849	0.4432	0.8252	[0.5945, 0.6261]		2.31
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.0527	0.1357	0.0229	-0.0214	0.0824	[0.0454, 0.0600]	-20.644	0.39
		Same Author	860	0.6139	0.2635	0.6911	0.4449	0.8280	[0.5962, 0.6316]		2.33
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.0469	0.1264	0.0220	-0.0202	0.0777	[0.0396, 0.0542]	-22.712	0.37
		Same Author	715	0.6218	0.2544	0.6942	0.4608	0.8319	[0.6031, 0.6405]		2.44
	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.0793	0.1619	0.0446	-0.0246	0.1368	[0.0737, 0.0849]	-16.823	0.49
		Same Author	4,667	0.4992	0.2506	0.5270	0.3060	0.7089	[0.4920, 0.5064]		1.99
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.0811	0.1685	0.0440	-0.0245	0.1338	[0.0745, 0.0877]	-15.567	0.48
		Same Author	2,218	0.4945	0.2505	0.5203	0.3022	0.7017	[0.4841, 0.5049]		1.97
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.0710	0.1684	0.0376	-0.0298	0.1163	[0.0635, 0.0785]	-21.375	0.42
		Same Author	1,450	0.5987	0.2380	0.6621	0.4563	0.7859	[0.5864, 0.6110]		2.52
FT-all-MiniLM-L6-v2	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.0958	0.1769	0.0523	-0.0192	0.1591	[0.0871, 0.1045]	-17.958	0.54
		Same Author	1,077	0.4933	0.2526	0.5241	0.2982	0.6979	[0.4782, 0.5084]		1.95
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.1028	0.1825	0.0582	-0.0140	0.1638	[0.0929, 0.1127]	-17.297	0.56
		Same Author	860	0.5008	0.2472	0.5204	0.3113	0.6991	[0.4842, 0.5174]		2.03
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.0868	0.1729	0.0463	-0.0202	0.1374	[0.0767, 0.0969]	-17.974	0.50
		Same Author	715	0.5011	0.2607	0.5265	0.2955	0.7217	[0.4820, 0.5202]		1.92
	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.0798	0.1595	0.0479	-0.0220	0.1410	[0.0743, 0.0853]	-13.458	0.50
		Same Author	4,667	0.4002	0.2388	0.3928	0.2174	0.5869	[0.3933, 0.4071]		1.68
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.0803	0.1603	0.0493	-0.0224	0.1412	[0.0740, 0.0866]	-13.466	0.50
		Same Author	2,218	0.4067	0.2426	0.4073	0.2143	0.5946	[0.3965, 0.4169]		1.68
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.0583	0.1568	0.0298	-0.0315	0.1034	[0.0513, 0.0653]	-18.738	0.37
		Same Author	1,450	0.5233	0.2397	0.5569	0.3547	0.7191	[0.5110, 0.5356]		2.18
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.0874	0.1682	0.0509	-0.0227	0.1526	[0.0791, 0.0957]	-14.508	0.52
		Same Author	1,077	0.3924	0.2334	0.3813	0.2105	0.5734	[0.3784, 0.4064]		1.68
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.0886	0.1674	0.0531	-0.0190	0.1502	[0.0795, 0.0977]	-15.057	0.53
		Same Author	860	0.4034	0.2327	0.3934	0.2191	0.5744	[0.3878, 0.4190]		1.73
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.0945	0.1708	0.0599	-0.0150	0.1586	[0.0845, 0.1045]	-14.541	0.55
		Same Author	715	0.4009	0.2424	0.3833	0.2154	0.5926	[0.3831, 0.4187]		1.65
FT-StyleDistance	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.1785	0.2355	0.1233	-0.0068	0.3297	[0.1703, 0.1867]	-21.126	0.76
		Same Author	4,667	0.6769	0.2330	0.7516	0.5554	0.8537	[0.6702, 0.6836]		2.91
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.1699	0.2299	0.1149	-0.0078	0.3122	[0.1608, 0.1790]	-22.396	0.74
		Same Author	2,218	0.6846	0.2308	0.7620	0.5685	0.8570	[0.6750, 0.6942]		2.97
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.1717	0.2313	0.1129	-0.0082	0.3229	[0.1614, 0.1820]	-24.635	0.74
		Same Author	1,450	0.7400	0.2068	0.8090	0.6612	0.8866	[0.7293, 0.7507]		3.58
	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.1679	0.2317	0.1049	-0.0095	0.3058	[0.1564, 0.1794]	-22.476	0.72
		Same Author	1,077	0.6881	0.2265	0.7614	0.5682	0.8633	[0.6746, 0.7016]		3.04
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.1744	0.2338	0.1137	-0.0025	0.3186	[0.1617, 0.1871]	-21.689	0.75
		Same Author	860	0.6815	0.2351	0.7579	0.5820	0.8577	[0.6658, 0.6972]		2.90
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.1691	0.2363	0.1047	-0.0114	0.3141	[0.1554, 0.1828]	-22.230	0.72
		Same Author	715	0.6949	0.2219	0.7607	0.5991	0.8537	[0.6786, 0.7112]		3.13
	500w	Cross Author	3,208	0.0499	0.1254	0.0257	-0.0195	0.0795	[0.0455, 0.0543]	-28.340	0.40
		Same Author	4,667	0.6641	0.2170	0.7282	0.5542	0.8259	[0.6579, 0.6703]		3.06
	1000w	Cross Author	2,477	0.0504	0.1277	0.0272	-0.0203	0.0827	[0.0454, 0.0554]	-28.751	0.39
		Same Author	2,218	0.6745	0.2155	0.7404	0.5670	0.8357	[0.6655, 0.6835]		3.13
	1500w	Cross Author	1,933	0.0492	0.1261	0.0261	-0.0196	0.0804	[0.0436, 0.0548]	-34.529	0.39
		Same Author	1,450	0.7299	0.1974	0.7920	0.6653	0.8674	[0.7197, 0.7401]		3.70
FT-all-distilroberta-v1	2000w	Cross Author	1,584	0.0547	0.1381	0.0237	-0.0213	0.0859	[0.0479, 0.0615]	-27.832	0.40
		Same Author	1,077	0.6700	0.2209	0.7359	0.5592	0.8371	[0.6568, 0.6832]		3.03
	2500w	Cross Author	1,318	0.0627	0.1440	0.0308	-0.0165	0.0923	[0.0549, 0.0705]	-26.593	0.44
		Same Author	860	0.6720	0.2172	0.7381	0.5705	0.8356	[0.6575, 0.6865]		3.09
	3000w	Cross Author	1,140	0.0577	0.1409	0.0279	-0.0194	0.0834	[0.0495, 0.0659]	-29.757	0.41
		Same Author	715	0.6830	0.2101	0.7421	0.5997	0.8374	[0.6675, 0.6985]		3.25

Table 5: Fine-tuned model evaluation statistics. The models show a marked asymmetry between same-author and cross-author predictions: cross-author similarity scores are consistently low (0.04–0.17) with low signal-to-noise ratios (SNR \sim 0.4–0.8), while same-author pairs yield higher scores (0.40–0.73) and moderate reliability (SNR \sim 1.7–3.7). These results suggest that fine-tuning enables strong rejection of cross-author pairs while preserving reasonable within-author similarity.

B Prompts

Prompt used for SFT Dataset Generation

System Instructions:

You are a master storyteller with decades of experience crafting compelling narratives. Your expertise lies in creating complete, polished stories that captivate readers from first word to last.

CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS:

- * Write ONE complete story of approximately 1500 words
- * Generate the full story immediately - no planning, outlines, or summaries
- * Follow the provided prompt precisely while creating original content

STORY EXCELLENCE STANDARDS:

Structure & Flow:

- Hook readers immediately with compelling action, dialogue, or vivid scene
- NEVER start with exposition, weather descriptions, or "Once upon a time" formulas
- Build narrative tension through escalating conflict and meaningful stakes
- Include at least one significant plot twist, revelation, or turning point
- Create a satisfying resolution that feels earned and complete

Character Development:

- Show character personalities through actions and dialogue, not descriptions
- Give characters clear motivations that drive their decisions
- Create authentic dialogue that sounds natural and advances the plot
- Develop characters who grow or change through story events

Writing Craft:

- Use active voice and varied sentence structures
- Include rich sensory details (sight, sound, smell, touch, taste)
- Create immersive settings that enhance the story's mood
- AVOID cliches, overused expressions, and predictable phrases
- Maintain consistent tone and pacing throughout
- Use precise, evocative language that creates vivid mental images

Technical Requirements:

- Target a word count of approximately 1500 words (natural variation of +/-100 words is acceptable)
- End with "THE END." on its own line
- Use proper paragraph breaks for readability
- Maintain narrative consistency and logical flow

FORBIDDEN ELEMENTS:

- Cliched openings ("It was a dark and stormy night", "Little did they know")
- Info-dumping or excessive backstory
- Passive voice unless specifically needed for effect
- Generic dialogue tags (said sadly, said angrily) - show emotion through words/actions
- Deus ex machina resolutions
- Rushed or unsatisfying endings

User Input:

"Create a complete story of approximately 1500 words based on this prompt:
[STORY_PROMPT]"

Write the story now. Begin immediately with the opening scene - no planning phase."

Prompt used for Evaluation Generated Content(Both in SFT and GRPO)

You are a meticulous story analyst. Your task is to evaluate a story based on the provided rubric and output a single integer score: 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Do not provide any explanation, summary, or thought process. Your entire response must be only the final integer score.

SCORING RUBRIC

Score 4 - Excellent:

- Plot Logic: Flawlessly logical progression; all events feel inevitable and believable within story context.
- Story Structure: Masterfully constructed narrative with seamless scene transitions and

perfect story arc.

- Causality: Every event flows organically from previous actions; tight cause-and-effect.
- Resolution: Brilliant, satisfying conclusion that feels both surprising and inevitable.
- Narrative Integrity: Complete, coherent story without formatting artifacts or meta-commentary.

Score 3 - Good:

- Plot Logic: Generally logical progression with believable events; minor inconsistencies don't seriously impact the story.
- Story Structure: Clear beginning, middle, end with solid connections.
- Causality: Events flow naturally from previous actions; clear cause-and-effect.
- Resolution: Satisfying conclusion that logically follows from story events.
- Narrative Integrity: Well-formed story with minimal extraneous elements.

Score 2 - Below Average:

- Plot Logic: Some logical inconsistencies or minor plot holes that detract from believability.
- Story Structure: Basic structure present but poorly executed; weak connections between scenes.
- Causality: Connections often feel forced or unclear.
- Resolution: Conclusion feels rushed, unearned, or partially contradictory.
- Narrative Integrity: Story coherence compromised by structural issues.

Score 1 - Poor:

- Plot Logic: Illogical events, contradictory details, or nonsensical progression; major plot holes.
- Story Structure: Chaotic or absent narrative structure.
- Causality: Events happen randomly without clear cause-and-effect.
- Resolution: No meaningful conclusion or resolution contradicts earlier story elements.
- Narrative Integrity: Fundamentally broken narrative flow.

CRITICAL EVALUATION RULES:

1. A major failure in Plot Logic or Causality heavily pulls the score down. A story with "Poor" (1) or "Below Average" (2) plot logic cannot receive an overall score of 3 or 4.
2. GAMING DETECTION: Stories containing any of the following automatically receive score 1:
 - Isolated system tokens (e.g., standalone "assistant", "user", "system")
 - Meta-commentary about scoring or evaluation
 - Incomplete narratives that end abruptly without resolution
 - Content clearly designed to manipulate evaluation rather than tell a story
 - Repetitive or nonsensical text patterns
 - Stories that directly reference this rubric or scoring system
 - Use of character names from classic literature (e.g., Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, Elizabeth Bennet, Jay Gatsby, Hamlet, etc.) - maximum penalty applies
3. AUTHENTICITY REQUIREMENT: Score must reflect genuine narrative quality. Stories attempting to game the system through superficial compliance with criteria without substantive storytelling merit cannot score above 1.
4. CONTENT PRIMACY: Evaluate the actual story content. Formatting, length, or stylistic flourishes cannot compensate for fundamental narrative deficiencies.

```
<story>
[Story_text]
</story>
```

Based on the rubric, what is the single integer score for the plot and logical consistency of the story above?"

C Extra Figures




Figure 7: Effect of Scaling Factor k on Sigmoid Mapping. The figure illustrates that setting $k = 6$ provides an ideal scaling range, producing a well-balanced sigmoid curve that maps similarity values effectively for reward computation.