

# Generating Storytelling Images with Rich Chains-of-Reasoning

Xiujie Song<sup>1</sup>, Qi Jia<sup>2</sup>, Shota Watanabe<sup>1</sup>, Xiaoyi Pang<sup>1</sup>,  
Ruijie Chen<sup>3</sup>, Mengyue Wu<sup>1,\*</sup>, Kenny Q. Zhu<sup>4,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>X-LANCE Lab, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

<sup>2</sup>Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, China

<sup>3</sup>East China University of Technology, China

<sup>4</sup>University of Texas at Arlington, USA

{xiujiesong, soawb71, fointpang, mengyuewu}@sjtu.edu.cn,  
jiaqi@pjlab.org.cn, 2023213701@ecut.edu.cn, kenny.zhu@uta.edu

## Abstract

An image can convey a compelling story by presenting rich, logically connected visual clues. These connections form Chains-of-Reasoning (CoRs) within the image, enabling viewers to infer events, causal relationships, and other information, thereby understanding the underlying story. In this paper, we focus on these semantically rich images and define them as Storytelling Images. Such images have diverse applications beyond illustration creation and cognitive screening, leveraging their ability to convey multi-layered information visually and inspire active interpretation. However, due to their complex semantic nature, Storytelling Images are inherently challenging to create, and thus remain relatively scarce. To address this challenge, we introduce the **Storytelling Image Generation** task, which explores how generative AI models can be leveraged to create such images. Specifically, we propose a two-stage pipeline, **StorytellingPainter**, which combines the creative reasoning abilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) with the visual synthesis capabilities of Text-to-Image (T2I) models to generate Storytelling Images. Alongside this pipeline, we develop a dedicated evaluation framework comprising three main evaluators: a Semantic Complexity Evaluator, a KNN-based Diversity Evaluator and a Story-Image Alignment Evaluator. Given the critical role of story generation in the Storytelling Image Generation task and the performance disparity between open-source and proprietary LLMs, we further explore tailored training strategies to reduce this gap, resulting in a series of lightweight yet effective models named **Mini-Storytellers**. Experimental results demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of our approaches. The code is available at <https://github.com/xiujiesong/StorytellingImageGeneration>.

## 1 Introduction

*“A picture is worth a thousand words.”*

Is it possible for a single image to tell a logically coherent and semantically rich story on its own? The answer is yes, and we define this kind of image as *Storytelling Image* in this paper, which typically conveys a story through rich visual clues and the logical connections among them.




Figure 1: Illustrative cases of Storytelling Images with rich CoRs. Each case consists of the original image, a graph formed by the connected CoRs within the image, and a textual description. (a) Cookie Theft, a widely used image in cognitive and linguistic assessments from Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination. (b) Frustration, a magazine cover illustration by Arthur Saron Sarnoff.

\*Corresponding authors.

The Cookie Theft picture (Figure 1 (a)) from Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Goodglass et al., 2001) is a typical Storytelling Image with rich semantics. It tells the story of two children sneaking cookies from the cupboard while their mother is doing the dishes. It is precisely because of the rich semantics of this image that it has been widely used in picture description tasks to evaluate human cognitive and language abilities for more than 50 years. This picture is still widely used, but is now considered outdated and does not adapt well across different cultures (Berube et al., 2019; Steinberg et al., 2022). To address these issues, it is often modified or replaced to better suit different application scenarios (Hussein et al., 2015; Domínguez et al., 2006; Oh et al., 2012; Prasad et al., 2012). In addition to human cognitive assessment, this type of image can also be used to evaluate the cognitive reasoning abilities of Large Vision-Language Models (LVLMs) (Song et al., 2025b). Beyond their evaluative function, these images often appear as illustrations in magazines and books, created by accomplished artists. This indicates that they are both rare and in high demand, and that generating them remains challenging even for experts. Therefore, exploring how to automatically create such images holds substantial scientific and practical value.

Storytelling Images convey compelling narratives through rich visual clues that are meaningfully and logically interconnected. We define a sequence that links these visual clues with their corresponding inferential conclusions as a Chain-of-Reasoning (CoR), which enables the image to convey information across multiple semantic dimensions to the viewers. These semantic dimensions include characters and their relationships, events and their causal connections, as well as the mental states of the characters, etc (Cummings, 2019). In other words, these images are characterized by a high level of semantic density, which is also what makes their creation particularly challenging. For instance, in Figure 1 (b), visual clues such as the “FOOTBALL 2 PM” sign on the billboard, the stadium, the police officer, the man holding tickets in the car, the dashboard clock showing 2:25, and the woman’s facial expression can be logically connected to form a CoR. This CoR enables viewers to infer that the couple is stuck in traffic and will likely miss the football game.

Though Image Generation has already become a well-established and classic problem, there is

currently no work focusing on generating such semantically complex images. The Story Visualization task (Li et al., 2019) focuses on generating a sequence of images to tell a story, but it is still fundamentally different from generating a single Storytelling Image, as the latter requires each image to possess a much higher level of semantic richness. Previous approaches have struggled to generate such images because the task demands not only advanced reasoning but also high-quality image synthesis capabilities, making it particularly challenging. Thus, motivated by the inherent appeal, wide applicability, and extreme scarcity of such images, in this paper, we propose the Storytelling Images Generation task to fill this research gap.

When humans create such images, the process typically involves two stages: story design and image rendering. For example, images like Cookie Theft used for cognitive assessment are typically drawn by an artist based on the specifications provided by professionals (Nicholas and Brookshire, 1993). To simulate this process, we propose a two-stage pipeline, StorytellingPainter, which consists of a Large Language Model (LLM) as Storyteller model and a Text-to-Image (T2I) model as Painter model. To comprehensively evaluate the task and the pipeline, we also propose an evaluation framework consisting of three main evaluators: (1) a Semantic Complexity Evaluator for the semantic complexity of generated stories and images; (2) a KNN-based Diversity Evaluator for image diversity; and (3) a Story-Image Alignment Evaluator for the alignment between stories and the final generated images. Through experiments, we observed a notable performance gap between smaller open-source LLMs and proprietary ones. To enhance the storytelling ability of the open-source models, we also explore different training strategies to train Mini-Storyteller models to generate stories with less computation cost.

To sum up, our contributions are as follows:

- We are the first to formalize the Storytelling Image Generation task, which focuses on generating a single image to tell a semantically rich story with various CoRs.
- We propose StorytellingPainter, a novel pipeline that achieves state-of-the-art performance in generating Storytelling Images. To evaluate different components of the pipeline, we also provide an evaluation system with

three main evaluators. We further conduct comprehensive studies under various configurations.

- We explore different training strategies to enhance the storytelling ability of lightweight open-source LLMs. The resulting Mini-Storyteller models show substantial improvements in story generation quality.

## 2 StorytellingPainter Pipeline

In this section, we first introduce the definition of our proposed Storytelling Image Generation task, the StorytellingPainter pipeline and its specialized evaluators. Then, we introduce the experimental settings and analyze the performance of the pipeline under different configurations.

### 2.1 Task Definition

The goal of the **Storytelling Image Generation** task is to leverage the creative capabilities of generative AI to produce diverse semantically rich Storytelling Images with minimal human effort.

A semantically rich **Storytelling Images** is defined as one that embeds complex **Chains-of-Reasoning (CoRs)** (Song et al., 2025b). These CoRs logically connect the various visual clues or premises within the image to build a narrative.

#### Definition of Chain-of-Reasoning

Let  $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$  be a set of distinct visual clues identified within the image. Let  $K$  be a conclusion, or the inferred proposition, that embodies the story. The CoR is defined by the logical structure where the *conjunction* of these clues implies the conclusion  $K$ :

$$\text{CoR} := (c_1 \wedge c_2 \wedge \dots \wedge c_n) \implies K \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\wedge$  denotes logical conjunction, which means all clues are considered simultaneously, and  $\implies$  denotes logical implication. This structure asserts that the combined presence of all visual clues  $\{c_i\}$  logically supports the inferred conclusion  $K$ .

#### Definition of Storytelling Image Generation Task

Given a collection of  $N$  instructions  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_N\}$ , where the individual instructions  $i_j \in I$  are not necessarily distinct (i.e., it is possible for  $i_j = i_k$  where  $j \neq k$ ), the task is to first create  $N$  stories  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$  and

then generate  $N$  corresponding Storytelling Images,  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_N\}$ .

Each story  $s_i \in S$  should describe a dramatic, single-moment scene that can be depicted in one image, rather than a long story with a time sequence or character dialogue. It should also be semantically distinct from all other stories in the set as much as possible. Each generated image  $y_i \in Y$  is expected to independently and accurately convey the story  $s_i$ .

### 2.2 StorytellingPainter Pipeline

When creators create such images, they normally first envision a story and then bring that imagined scene to life on the canvas with their brush. Inspired by this process, we propose a two-stage StorytellingPainter pipeline, as shown in Figure 2. In the first stage, we leverage the imagination and reasoning abilities of LLMs to generate a story, referring to this component as the Storyteller model. The key difference between this type of story and typical narratives lies in the temporal structure. The stories we generate here are anchored in a single moment in time, meaning each character can perform only one action. In contrast, typical stories unfold over a sequence of events, allowing characters to perform multiple actions in succession. In the second stage, we leverage the image generation capabilities of T2I models to create images that depict the generated stories, referring to this component as the Painter model.

For the Storyteller model, we explore two different prompting modes, as illustrated in Figure 2.

#### 2.2.1 Naive Mode

In Naive Mode, we use a relatively simple prompt for the Storyteller model. The prompt specifies the requirements for imagining a story that can be told from an image and provides the story of the Cookie Theft as an example and some format instructions. The format instructions specify our requirements for the structure of the generated stories. For example, we prefer the stories to be concise rather than lengthy, and they should be imaginative interpretations of a single image rather than traditional narratives with sequences of events or dialogues.

#### 2.2.2 CoR-Guided Mode

The CoRs that constitute a Storytelling Image often involve multiple semantic dimensions. By analyzing the Cookie Theft and other Storytelling Images, we identify seven core dimensions that capture the




Figure 2: Our proposed StorytellingPainter pipeline and dedicated evaluators.

essence of Storytelling Images. We incorporate these CoR dimensions as prior knowledge to guide the Storyteller model in generating more coherent and semantically rich stories. These seven dimensions are listed as follows.

- **[Time]:** the specific time when the story takes place, such as Christmas, Thanksgiving, or 3:00 AM.
- **[Location]:** the specific setting of the story, such as a school, a grocery store, or a baseball field.
- **[Character Role]:** the roles or occupations of the characters, such as a police officer, a teacher, or a firefighter.
- **[Character Relationship]:** the relationships between characters, such as a mother and son, or a romantic couple.
- **[Event]:** the key actions or events that occur in the story. For example, two boys stealing cookies from a cupboard.
- **[Event Causal Relationship]:** the causal relationships between events. For example, a boy is being scolded by his mother because he is doodling on the wall.

- **[Mental State]:** the emotional or psychological states of the characters, such as happiness, anger, or sadness.

Leveraging CogBench’s rich collection of Storytelling Images and descriptions, we propose a Dynamic In-Context Learning (ICL) strategy to enhancing diversity. This strategy randomly samples three descriptions from CogBench as in-context examples for each prompt to the Storyteller model.

## 2.3 Evaluators

Based on the objectives of the task introduced in Section 2.1, we designed a dedicated evaluation framework for the task and pipeline to comprehensively evaluate the pipeline’s effectiveness. Specifically, the framework comprises three evaluators: a Semantic Complexity Evaluator to evaluate the semantic complexity of generated stories and images, a KNN-based Diversity Evaluator to evaluate the diversity of stories and a Story-Image Alignment Evaluator to measure the semantic gap between stories and images.

### 2.3.1 Semantic Complexity Evaluator

The Image Semantic Assessment (ISA) task (Song et al., 2025a) aligns well with the objective of our



task, as it aims to automatically evaluate the storytelling ability of an image by defining a Semantic Complexity Score. Therefore, we adopt an ISA model as a key Evaluator for our pipeline. Specifically, we adopt CoT VLISA (BERT) from the ISA models as the evaluator to automatically calculate the Semantic Complexity Score. CoT VLISA (BERT) will first extract features from the image in text form using GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2023) and then compute the Semantic Score based on the text features with a fine-tuned BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). The extracted text features include the seven dimensions of visual clues mentioned in the CoR-Guided Mode in Section 2.2. Based on the calculated Semantic Score, the effectiveness of different prompting modes, Storyteller models, and Painter models can be observed by fixing the other two variables.

### 2.3.2 KNN-based Diversity Evaluator

Inspired by studies on dataset diversity (Stasaski and Hearst, 2022; Stasaski et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2025b), we adopt Distance-based Semantic Diversity to measure the diversity of our generated stories.

To calculate the Diversity Score, we first address the potential bias introduced by the varying story lengths produced by different models. To ensure a fair comparison focused on core narrative components, we employ a custom-designed summarizer (gpt-4.1-mini), which processes each generated story to extract a relatively standardized, structured representation comprising four CoR elements: [Time], [Location], [Character], and [Event]. The prompt we use is shown in Figure 3.

The extracted information, rather than the full-length story, is then fed into the text embedding model Qwen3-Embedding-0.6B (Qwen et al., 2025) to acquire its embedding  $e$ . The Diversity Score is subsequently defined as the average K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) cosine distance across all embeddings. The formula is as follows:

$$\text{Diversity Score} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \text{KNN}(i)} (1 - \cos(e_i, e_j)) \quad (2)$$

where  $N$  is the number of generated stories,  $K$  is the number of nearest neighbors, and  $e_i, e_j$  are the embeddings of the extracted key elements for story  $i$  and story  $j$ , respectively.  $\cos(e_i, e_j)$  denotes their cosine similarity. We set  $K = 5$  in this paper.

You are an information-extraction assistant. From the provided story, identify and extract only four key dimensions — Time, Location, Characters, and Events — and present them exactly as specified. Return it strictly in the labeled text format shown below, in English, with no additional commentary or explanation.

Rules for Time:

- Include only special dates or holidays (e.g., Christmas, New Year).
- If none are present, omit the Time line entirely.

Rules for Events:

- Include events that pertain not only to characters but also to significant environmental or contextual elements (e.g., weather conditions, signage, background activities).
- Keep each event concise and factual.

Output format:

Time (optional): <holiday name>

Location: <main location>

Characters: <name> (<role>); <name> (<role>);

...

Events:

- <sentence about an event, situation, or notable detail>
- <sentence about an event, situation, or notable detail>

Figure 3: Prompt for the summarizer in KNN-based Diversity Evaluator.

### 2.3.3 Story-Image Alignment Evaluator

Inspired by previous work on Text-Image Alignment evaluation (Lin et al., 2024), we employ a two-stage pipeline to evaluate the alignment between the generated image and its corresponding story.

In the first stage, Key Point Extraction, we utilize an LLM (GPT-4.1) as a structured extractor. This model parses the generated story to extract information across seven predefined dimensions: [Time], [Location], [Character], [Character Relationship], [Event], [Event Causal Relationship], and [Mental State].

In the second stage, Alignment Scoring, we use an LVLM (GPT-4o) as the scorer. This scorer assesses the generated image against the structured key points extracted in the previous stage. The evaluation is multi-faceted: the scorer provides a fine-grained alignment score for each of the seven dimensions individually, as well as a holistic overall score summarizing the total alignment. The prompt is shown in Figure 4.

You are an expert evaluator for text-image alignment. Your task is to determine whether a specific key point from a text description is visually present in the given image.

You will be given:

1. A key point extracted from a text description
2. An image that was generated based on that text description

Evaluation Criteria:

- The key point must be clearly visible or reasonably inferable from the image

Output Format:

Respond with only:

- "YES" — if the key point is visually present in the image
- "NO" — if the key point is not visually present or cannot be reasonably inferred

Figure 4: Prompt for the Alignment Scoring stage in Story-Image Alignment Evaluator.

## 2.4 Experiments

### 2.4.1 Experimental Settings

**Models** We investigate different settings within the StorytellingPainter pipeline. For the Storyteller model, we adopt five representative open-source LLMs with varying parameter sizes: LLaMA-3.2-1B-Instruct, LLaMA-3.2-3B-Instruct, LLaMA-3.1-8B-Instruct (Grattafiori et al., 2024), Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct (Qwen et al., 2025) and two of the state-of-the-art proprietary LLMs GPT-4o and GPT-4.1 (OpenAI, 2023). For the Painter model, we adopt two representative T2I models: DALL-E 3 (Betker et al., 2023) and GPT-image-1 (OpenAI, 2025).

**Evaluation Metrics** Beyond the three aforementioned main evaluators, we further assessed our method based on the following criteria:

- **Human Semantic Complexity Score.** Although the ISA model is able to automatically compute the Semantic Complexity Score with relatively high alignment to human judgments, it still inevitably contains bias. Thus, to evaluate the effectiveness of different methods more accurately, apart from ISA model, we also incorporate human evaluation to assess the semantic complexity of the generated images. Specifically, we adopt the annotation criteria established by Song et al. (2025a) to train our human evaluators and refine the scor-

ing scale from 1 to 5 to include half-point increments for greater granularity. Each image is independently rated by three evaluators, and the final manual Semantic Score is obtained by averaging their scores. To measure the inter-rater reliability, we compute the Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for our annotations. The model we select is two-way mixed-effects model. The ICC of our human evaluation is 0.889, which means there is a high degree of consistency among our evaluators.

- **Number of Visual Clues.** During the feature extraction stage of CoT VLISA (BERT), the seven dimensions of visual clues will be extracted. Thus, we calculate the number of visual clues based on the features as a reference.
- **Number of Words.** Since the generated stories are intended to be short and suitable for image generation, rather than long narratives with temporal progression, we compute the number of words in each story. In other words, in many cases, an excessively long story length may be a signal that the model is failing to follow the given instructions.

**Implementation Details** For each StorytellingPainter configuration, we generate 30 stories along with their corresponding images, and compute the average of their evaluation metrics as the final result. CogBench contains many Storytelling Images created by human illustrators, which we adopt as a reference for human capability. Considering that some CogBench images are included in the training data of the ISA model, we identified 48 overlapping images from the ISA test set to serve as our reference set. For CoR-Guided Mode, we split CogBench in a 3:2 ratio, with the two parts reserved for constructing training data and for testing, respectively.

### 2.4.2 Results

**Comparing the effectiveness of different prompting modes** Table 1 presents the performance across various configurations of the StorytellingPainter pipeline. By comparing the Semantic Score of images generated under two different prompting modes, we can observe that CoR-Guided Mode significantly improves the semantic complexity of generated stories and corresponding images. Specif-

Mode	Model	Success Rate (%)	# Word	# Visual Clue	Diversity	Semantic Score	Human
Naive	Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct + DALL-E 3	100	384.33	7.0	0.382	17.2	–
	Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct + GPT-image-1*	100	384.33	6.1	0.382	18.1	–
	Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct + DALL-E 3	100	339.87	6.2	0.250	11.8	–
	Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct + GPT-image-1*	100	339.87	6.5	0.250	9.95	–
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct + DALL-E 3	100	351.77	6.7	0.337	13.1	–
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct + GPT-image-1*	96.7	351.77	6.38	0.337	13.0	–
	Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct+DALL-E 3	87	311.33	7.50	0.365	16.7	–
	Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct+GPT-image-1*	83	311.33	6.56	0.365	20.2	–
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct+DALL-E 3	100	92.50	7.53	0.272	26.6	–
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct+GPT-image-1*	100	92.50	7.17	0.272	26.2	–
	GPT-4o+DALL-E 3	100	144.07	8.37	0.312	34.1	–
	GPT-4o+GPT-image-1*	100	144.07	7.10	0.312	31.5	–
	GPT-4.1+DALL-E 3	100	111.37	8.37	0.262	39.1	–
	GPT-4.1+GPT-image-1*	100	111.37	8.53	0.262	40.7	–
CoR-Guided	Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct+DALL-E 3	90	459.27	7.33	<b>0.432</b>	28.1	–
	Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct + GPT-image-1*	96.7	459.27	7.17	<b>0.432</b>	36.5	38.6
	Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct + DALL-E 3	100	389.77	7.40	0.350	31.5	–
	Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct + GPT-image-1*	100	389.77	7.80	0.350	36.3	35.6
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct + DALL-E 3	100	359.27	7.37	0.374	25.2	–
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct + GPT-image-1*	100	359.27	7.53	0.374	34.2	32.1
	Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct+DALL-E 3	93	443.20	8.04	<u>0.407</u>	29.1	–
	Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct+GPT-image-1*	100	443.20	8.13	<u>0.407</u>	31.1	29.9
	Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct+GPT-image-1 <sup>†</sup>	100	443.20	7.30	<u>0.407</u>	32.8	34.7
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct+DALL-E 3	100	165.83	7.83	0.381	34.7	–
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct+GPT-image-1*	100	165.83	7.87	0.381	37.2	37.8
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct+GPT-image-1 <sup>†</sup>	100	165.83	8.07	0.381	38.9	44.6
	GPT-4o+DALL-E 3	100	179.10	8.17	0.393	49.3	–
	GPT-4o+GPT-image-1*	100	179.10	<b>9.00</b>	0.393	52.4	<u>57.6</u>
	GPT-4o+GPT-image-1 <sup>†</sup>	100	179.10	8.53	0.393	52.1	<u>57.6</u>
	GPT-4.1+DALL-E 3	100	183.13	8.83	0.367	<u>56.8</u>	–
	GPT-4.1+GPT-image-1*	100	183.13	8.37	0.367	<u>56.7</u>	52.4
	GPT-4.1+GPT-image-1 <sup>†</sup>	100	183.13	<b>8.93</b>	0.367	<b>61.0</b>	<b>62.9</b>
CogBench in ISA test set		–	119.90	8.83	0.425	57.6	66.7
CogBench in ISA test set <sup>†30</sup>		–	135.93	9.13	0.441	59.2	71.8

Table 1: Performance of StorytellingPainter pipeline on the Storytelling Image Generation task. Success Rate refers to the percentage of images successfully generated by the T2I model based on the story. Numbers of Semantic Score are presented in % with a full score of 100%. “\*” denotes that the quality is configured as “medium” and “†” denotes that the quality is configured as “auto”. “† 30” indicates the selection of the top-30 samples with the highest human evaluation scores. The highest scores are shown in bold, and the second-highest scores are underlined.

ically, according to the number of visual clues in Table 1 and Figure 5, we can see that CoR-Guided Mode indeed improves the number of visual clues across multiple dimensions compared to the Naive Mode. In terms of diversity, the CoR-Guided Mode also achieves significantly higher Diversity Scores than the Naive Mode, which can be attributed to our dynamic ICL strategy.

**Investigating the performance of different Storyteller models** According to Table 1, when the prompt mode and Painter model are fixed, the storytelling ability of Storyteller models can be observed.

GPT-4o and GPT-4.1, used as Storyteller models in combination with the Painter model GPT-Image-1, achieve the best performance. By comparing their Semantic Scores with CogBench, we can see that they are capable of generating some qualified Storytelling Images. However, the Semantic Score gap between images generated by GPT-4 and the top 30 human-created images in CogBench indicates that the model’s ability still falls significantly short of top-level human performance.

The performance of smaller open-source models is significantly worse than GPT-4o and GPT-4.1. The number of words of stories generated by Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct, Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct and Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct is obviously larger than other Storyteller models. This is because they fail to understand the instructions and generate long stories with time sequences. Another piece of evidence is the fact that although Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct achieves higher Diversity and Semantic Scores, it’s actually because it plagiarized many of the examples we provided for ICL. Other larger open-source models, while capable of understanding our task instructions and occasionally generating detailed stories, are still not very good at constructing narratives that are both logically coherent and semantically rich. This demonstrates the highly challenging nature of our task.

**Influence of Painter model on the Pipeline** In terms of Painter models, as shown in Table 1, for the same story, images generated by different Painter models yield different Semantic Scores. GPT-Image-1, a more recent T2I model, demon-




Figure 5: Distribution of visual clues across the seven dimensions in images generated by the StorytellingPainter pipeline with different Storyteller models. The Painter model is fixed as GPT-Image-1.

strates better performance than DALL-E 3. When the “quality” hyperparameter of GPT-Image-1 is changed from “medium” to “auto”, a significant improvement in performance can also be observed.

This is attributed to the varying text-alignment capabilities of the Painter models. Higher-quality images generated by better Painter models can more accurately depict events, character emotions, other visual clues and their inter-connections in the image, so that ISA model or human can more easily understand the stories happening in the image. This conclusion can be validated by Figure 6. We can observe that GPT-image-1’s Story-Image Alignment Score is significantly higher than that of DALL-E 3. The performance gap is particularly significant in the four dimensions of [Character], [Character Relationship], [Event], and [Event Causal Rela-

tionship]. More specifically, Figure 7 shows that in (a), GPT-image-1 successfully renders the text “Strawberries: Buy One Get One Free.” within the image, whereas DALL-E 3 fails to do so. In (b), GPT-image-1 also provides a more accurate portrayal of the characters’ emotions, capturing the excitement and nervousness of the children secretly unwrapping gifts, as well as the father’s sense of gratification. Thus, we can see that the Storytelling Image Generation task also places higher demands on the capabilities of T2I models, in order to meet the requirement of telling a semantically rich story using just a single image.

**Case analysis** Figure 8 shows the stories and corresponding images generated by the StorytellingPainter pipeline. According to the cases, we can see that GPT-4o is capable of generating logically coherent and semantically rich stories and subsequently producing corresponding images. For example, the story generated by GPT-4o takes place in a grocery store during a weekend discount day, where a police officer apprehends a thief attempting to steal items. The generated image contains relatively rich visual clues and CoRs. Again, as shown in the comparison between the image generated by GPT-4o and the one in Figure 1 (b), we observe that while these models can produce some qualified Storytelling Images, they still struggle to generate semantically richer images comparable to those created by outstanding human illustrators.

However, for open-source Storyteller models Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct, the stories they generate are noticeably less engaging and coherent in terms of both interest and logical consistency. Though Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct can generate logically coherent stories, the semantic complexity is obviously lower. For the image generated by Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, it merely describes a scene of a family celebrating Christmas, without presenting rich visual clues or causal relationships between events. Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct exhibit lower performance. The stories generated by them are usually primarily a stacking of multiple events. In the two cases, the models failed to follow the instructions properly by generating a long story with a temporal sequence and even dialogue, rather than a story that could be depicted within a single image. Overall, these cases highlight the critical role of Storytelling models in generating Storytelling Images, while also revealing their lim-






Figure 6: Story-image alignment evaluation of Painter models.




Figure 7: Comparison of generation results for the same story across different Painter models.

itations.

Method	Spearman	Pearson
Avg. Distance	0.838 (0.009)	0.851 (0.007)
KNN Distance	0.802 (0.017)	0.842 (0.009)
Avg. Distance (w/ summarizer)	0.850 (0.007)	0.910 (0.002)
KNN Distance (w/ summarizer)	0.958 (0.000)	0.912 (0.002)

Table 2: Validating the effectiveness of Diversity Evaluator.

**Validating the effectiveness of KNN-based Diversity Evaluator** To validate the effectiveness of our Diversity Evaluator, we first constructed a test set comprising 8 groups of data with varying levels of repetition, each containing 30 samples, and obtained human ratings for the diversity of each group. We then correlate our proposed di-

versity metric scores against these human evaluations, with the results shown in Table 2, which compares metrics using either KNN or simple Average (Avg.) distance, applied with or without our summarizer. According to the result, our proposed approach, KNN Distance combined with the summarizer, achieves the highest correlation with human judgments, yielding an exceptional Spearman coefficient of 0.958 and a strong Pearson coefficient of 0.912, which significantly outperform the ablations. Notably, the same KNN metric without the summarizer achieves only 0.802 and 0.842, highlighting the critical role of the summarizer in extracting relevant elements. Furthermore, the superiority of KNN over Avg. Distance confirms its effectiveness. These strong correlations validate



Figure 8: Stories and corresponding images generated by the StorytellingPainter pipeline. We fix the Painter model to GPT-image-1 with quality set to “auto”.

that our metric robustly captures the perceived diversity of the generated stories.

**Validating the effectiveness of Alignment Evaluator** To validate our Alignment Evaluator, we constructed a test set by sampling 209 key points and manually annotating their ground-truth alignment scores. When benchmarked against this human-annotated set, our evaluator achieved an overall accuracy of 0.737. This result indicates that the evaluator possesses a relatively strong ability to accurately judge whether a given keypoint is visually represented in the image.

### 2.4.3 Usage Discussion

In this paper, we use the Evaluators to assess the effectiveness of the StorytellingPainter pipeline. In real-world application scenarios, combined with human supervision, the Evaluators can also serve as Verifiers to assist in automatically filtering high-

quality stories and images.

## 3 Mini-Storyteller

In StorytellingPainter pipeline, the Storyteller model takes the role of the brain to generate engaging stories. While proprietary LLMs demonstrate superior capabilities in story generation, their performance still lags significantly behind that of expert human creators. Furthermore, smaller open-source models struggle to match the creativity and reasoning abilities of their proprietary counterparts.

Inspired by Eldan and Li (2023), as storytelling is mainly about the essential elements of natural language, such as grammar, vocabulary, facts, and reasoning, Small Language Models (SLMs) have the potential to produce fluent and consistent stories. Thus, in this section, we explore different fine-tuning strategies tailored to enhance story generation quality in the open-source models. After fine-

tuning, we get five lightweight Mini-Storyteller models.

### 3.1 Method

As shown in Section 2, Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct, Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct and Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct fail to follow instructions well to generate stories without a time sequence, and larger open-source models can follow instructions, but the generated stories are not appealing enough. Differently, the two proprietary LLMs demonstrate substantially stronger story generation capabilities compared to the open-source models. Additionally, our proposed StorytellingPainter pipeline can naturally serve as a data generator. Thus, given these observations and conditions, our main idea is to leverage GPT-4.1 as the Storyteller model to produce high-quality samples, enabling the smaller models to learn from this more capable teacher through knowledge distillation. Specifically, we construct our training data with the pipeline in CoR-Guided mode and sampling examples from the training split of CogBench.

In terms of training, we experimented with two common fine-tuning strategies: Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) and Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023).

#### 3.1.1 SFT

For SFT, the student model is trained using a standard Causal Language Modeling objective, where the goal is to maximize the probability of the target response.

The SFT loss function is the standard cross-entropy loss, calculated as the negative log-likelihood of the target tokens:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = - \sum_{(x, y) \in D} \sum_{t=1}^T \log P_{\theta}(y_t | x, y_{<t}) \quad (3)$$

where  $D$  is our SFT dataset,  $(x, y)$  is a prompt-response pair,  $T$  is the number of tokens in the response  $y$ , and  $P_{\theta}$  is the probability of the  $t$ -th token  $y_t$  given the prompt  $x$  and preceding tokens  $y_{<t}$ , as predicted by the model with parameters  $\theta$ .

We directly utilize the high-quality dataset of instruction-response pairs generated by GPT-4.1 for SFT.

#### 3.1.2 DPO

The loss function used in DPO training is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\pi_{\theta}; \pi_{\text{ref}}) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_w, y_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_w | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w | x)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_l | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l | x)} \right) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\pi_{\theta}(y_w | x)$  and  $\pi_{\theta}(y_l | x)$  denote the probabilities assigned by the model (parameterized by  $\theta$ ) to two candidate responses given an input  $x$ , where  $y_w$  is the preferred response and  $y_l$  is the less preferred one. Similarly,  $\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w | x)$  and  $\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l | x)$  represent the probabilities assigned by a reference policy.

To construct preference pairs for training, we use the self-generated stories of the student model as rejected samples and the stronger model’s output as preferred, encouraging the student to align with generations of higher quality. Besides, for Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, and Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, we also tried to utilize outputs from their corresponding smaller-scale models as rejected samples. That is, the rejected samples for Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct are drawn from both its own outputs and those of Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct and those for Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct are from its own outputs those of Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct. We name this strategy as DPO-Mix. For each preference pair, the chosen and rejected samples are generated using the same prompt to ensure direct comparability.

### 3.2 Implementation Details

During dataset construction, we create 2,000 training samples generated by GPT-4.1 for SFT and DPO. Additionally, we construct a 4,000-sample training set for both Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct. For each of these models, the set consists of 2,000 samples from their respective smaller-scale models, Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct, and another 2,000 samples generated by the model itself. We train our models using LLaMA-Factory<sup>1</sup> on Tesla V100 GPUs. Each model is trained with LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) for one epoch using a learning rate selected from  $\{1e-4, 1e-5\}$ , and a total train batch size of 16. We apply a cosine learning rate scheduler with a warmup ratio of 0.1. During the training process, we set aside 10% of the training data for validation.

### 3.3 Results

Table 3 shows the results of our Mini-Storyteller models. We observe a significant improvement

<sup>1</sup><https://llamafactory.readthedocs.io/>

Model	Success Rate (%)	# Word	# Visual Clue	Diversity	Semantic Score	Human
Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct	96.7	459.27	7.33	<b>0.432</b>	36.5	38.6
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-1B-SFT	100	172.13	8.7	0.344	57.2	45.4
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-1B-DPO	96.7	79.97	7.10	0.381	47.8	37.2
Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct	100	389.77	7.80	<u>0.350</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>35.6</u>
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-3B-SFT	100	176.13	8.63	0.338	57.0	54.6
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-3B-DPO	100	84.97	7.63	0.339	50.1	42.8
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	100	359.27	7.53	<u>0.374</u>	<u>34.2</u>	<u>32.1</u>
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.1-8B-SFT	100	172.07	9.0	0.330	<u>58.7</u>	<b>61.1</b>
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.1-8B-DPO	100	323.90	7.4	0.412	40.7	41.4
Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.1-8B-DPO-Mix	100	155.73	<b>9.83</b>	0.318	<b>68.9</b>	<u>58.9</u>
Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct	100	443.20	8.13	0.407	31.1	29.9
Mini-Storyteller-Qwen2.5-1.5B-SFT	100	151.83	8.4	0.309	48.4	43.3
Mini-Storyteller-Qwen2.5-1.5B-DPO	100	201.17	7.83	<u>0.418</u>	<u>40.4</u>	<u>38.6</u>
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	100	165.83	7.87	0.381	37.2	37.8
Mini-Storyteller-Qwen2.5-7B-SFT	100	159.60	9.0	0.319	57.7	55.8
Mini-Storyteller-Qwen2.5-7B-DPO	100	221.43	7.73	0.394	46.3	42.4
Mini-Storyteller-Qwen2.5-7B-DPO-Mix	100	153.63	8.47	0.390	49.5	47.1

Table 3: Performance of Mini-Storyteller models. The T2I model is GPT-image-1 with quality set to “medium”. The highest scores are shown in bold, and the second-highest scores are underlined.

in semantic complexity after training. Generally speaking, the increased Semantic Scores indicate that both SFT and DPO can enhance the Storyteller models’ ability to generate semantically rich stories. Furthermore, the word count for Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct, Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct decreased significantly. This indicates that the two models successfully followed the instructions to generate the required concise stories, rather than long narratives driven by time sequences. Specifically, in terms of Semantic Complexity, SFT is more effective than DPO. For example, through SFT, Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.1-8B-SFT reaches a performance level comparable to GPT-4 and improves upon Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct by 24.4 and 29 points on automated and human Semantic Scores, respectively and achieves the best performance. Note that though SFT shows better performance on improving the Semantic Complexity, it is more likely to impair the diversity of the model’s output. DPO, on the other hand, has a relatively small impact on diversity.

For Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, DPO-Mix shows better performance. While DPO successfully trained the small models (Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct, Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct) to generate the desired short stories, it was less effective on the larger models. Vanilla DPO failed to reduce the word count for Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, and even increased it for the latter. This is because it disrupts their original understanding of the task instructions, causing it instead to generate lengthy, time-sequence-driven stories. DPO-Mix can effectively address this issue by introducing such rejected samples from smaller-scale models and further improves the Semantic Scores.

### 3.4 Case Analysis

Figure 9 illustrates four cases generated by four different Mini-Storytellers. We can see that Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-1B-SFT and Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-3B-DPO can successfully generate concise and compelling stories without time sequence and dialogue after training. The images generated by Mini-Storytellers clearly contain more visual clues to form CoRs. For instance, the “Today: Free Cupcakes for the School Science Fair” in the image generated by Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.1-8B-SFT sets the context for the main event and echoes the actions of the students outside the window and the staff inside. In the image generated by Mini-Storyteller-LLaMA-3.2-3B-DPO, the baseball in the little girl’s hand and the children playing baseball in the background both suggest the reason why she fell. For the image generated by Mini-Storyteller-Qwen2.5-7B-DPO-Mix, the sleep mask on the man’s head suggests that it is already bedtime, and that he is either preparing to sleep or has just been woken up by the boy. The stories in the images also contain various semantic dimensions, including [Time], [Location], [Character], [Character Role], [Event], [Event Casual Relationship], and [Mental State].

## 4 Related Work

Our Storytelling Image Generation task is closely related to the tasks of Storytelling and Story Visualization.

### 4.1 Story Generation

Story generation or storytelling is a classic text generation task that has been studied for years. Fan et al. (2018) showed that hierarchical mod-






Figure 9: Stories and corresponding images generated by the StorytellingPainter pipeline using Mini-Storyteller as the Storyteller model and GPT-image-1 (auto) as the Painter model.

els, self-attention, and model fusion improve story fluency, topicality, and quality. TinyStories (Elidan and Li, 2023) is proposed to train and evaluate SLMs and demonstrates that SLMs can generate fluent, coherent, and grammatically correct multi-paragraph stories with basic reasoning abilities. STORYTELLER (Li et al., 2025) improves the coherence and engagement of automatically generated stories by enhancing plot planning. This task is applicable in many real-world scenarios. Story-Driven (Belz et al., 2024) introduces an interactive, context-aware storytelling system that dynamically adapts narratives in real-time based on environmental and user context during in-car experiences. HoLLMwood (Chen et al., 2024) leverages the creativity of LLMs for screenwriting. IBSEN (Han et al., 2024) is proposed to generate drama scripts with multi-agent technology. Visual Storytelling task (Huang et al., 2016) aims at generating a reasonable and coherent paragraph-level story with the image stream as input. StoryLLaVA (Yang et al., 2025a) generates coherent narratives from sequential images by optimizing story data and employing a multi-phase training strategy. Unlike previous studies, our work on storytelling places greater emphasis on imagining a semantically rich and logically coherent story that takes place in a single moment and can be captured in a single image.

## 4.2 Story Visualization

Story Visualization (Li et al., 2019) is the task of generating a coherent and aligned sequence of images given a sequence of textual captions representing a description of a story. A number of

prior works (Maharana et al., 2021; Maharana and Bansal, 2021; Maharana et al., 2022) have investigated different methods for addressing this task. StoryImager (Tao et al., 2024) introduces a unified, context-aware framework that inherits the storyboard generative ability of a large pre-trained T2I model, supporting story visualization and completion. StoryGPT-V (Shen and Elhoseiny, 2025) leverages the merits of the latent diffusion and LLM to produce images with consistent and high-quality characters grounded on given story descriptions. SEED-Story (Yang et al., 2024) leverages Multimodal Large Language Models to produce extended multimodal stories conditioned on user-provided visual and textual inputs. Roemmele et al. (2025) generate illustrations for stories by prompting LLMs to produce detailed scene descriptions, which are then used to guide T2I models. Their goal is to generate auxiliary illustrations for existing stories, rather than creating images that can independently tell semantically rich stories. Different from the Story Visualization task, our Storytelling Image Generation task aims to generate a single semantically rich image that tells a story, instead of a sequence of simpler images, which indicates that the images we expect exhibit higher semantic density. Moreover, in our proposed pipeline, the story is the output of the task rather than the input.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel Storytelling Image Generation task that aims to generate semantically rich images capable of telling coherent stories. To this end, we present StorytellingPainter, a two-

stage pipeline that combines the creativity of LLMs with the visual synthesis power of T2I models. In order to comprehensively evaluate the pipeline, we also propose an evaluation framework consisting of three evaluators. To improve the storytelling capabilities of smaller open-source LLMs and narrow their performance gap with proprietary LLMs, we leverage this pipeline to generate training data and fine-tune the models using SFT and DPO for distillation, resulting in the Mini-Storyteller models.

The Storytelling Image Generation task holds great potential for a wide range of applications, including cognitive assessment of both humans and models, book illustration, and enhancing the ability of multimodal models to understand and generate semantically complex images, etc. Also, it is a challenging task that needs to be further developed. Though state-of-the-art LLMs can generate stories with rich semantics, there is still a gap compared to the semantic richness of high-quality human-created images. Additionally, the innovative capabilities of current LLMs are also limited, and how to enhance the diversity of model-generated stories warrants further exploration. Besides LLMs, this task also places higher demands on the text-image alignment capability of T2I models, due to the requirement of conveying rich semantics accurately in a single image.

## References

- Jan Henry Belz, Lina Madlin Weilke, Anton Winter, Philipp Hallgarten, Enrico Rukzio, and Tobias Grosse-Puppenthal. 2024. [Story-driven: Exploring the impact of providing real-time context information on automated storytelling](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST '24, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Shauna Berube, Jodi Nonnemacher, Cornelia Demsky, Shenly Glenn, Sadhvi Saxena, Amy Wright, Donna C Tippet, and Argye E Hillis. 2019. Stealing cookies in the twenty-first century: Measures of spoken narrative in healthy versus speakers with aphasia. *American journal of speech-language pathology*, 28(1S):321–329.
- James Betker, Gabriel Goh, Li Jing, Tim Brooks, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Long Ouyang, Juntang Zhuang, Joyce Lee, Yufei Guo, and 1 others. 2023. Improving image generation with better captions. *Computer Science*. <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/dall-e-3.pdf>, 2(3):8.
- Jing Chen, Xinyu Zhu, Cheng Yang, Chufan Shi, Yadong Xi, Yuxiang Zhang, Junjie Wang, Jiashu Pu, Tian Feng, Yujiu Yang, and Rongsheng Zhang. 2024. [HoLLMwood: Unleashing the creativity of large language models in screenwriting via role playing](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 8075–8121, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Louise Cummings. 2019. [Describing the cookie theft picture: Sources of breakdown in alzheimer’s dementia](#). *Pragmatics and Society*, 10:151–174.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *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 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Raúl Domínguez, José F. Vila, Federico Augustovski, Vilma Irazola, Pablo R. Castillo, Roberto Rotta Escalante, Thomas G. Brott, and James F. Meschia. 2006. [Spanish cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the national institutes of health stroke scale](#). *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 81(4):476–480.
- Ronen Eldan and Yuanzhi Li. 2023. [Tinystories: How small can language models be and still speak coherent english?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.07759.
- Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. 2018. [Hierarchical neural story generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 889–898, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harold Goodglass, Edith Kaplan, and Sandra Weintraub. 2001. *BDAE: The Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, PA.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Senyu Han, Lu Chen, Li-Min Lin, Zhengshan Xu, and Kai Yu. 2024. [IBSEN: Director-actor agent collaboration for controllable and interactive drama script generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1607–1619, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, and 1 others. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3.

- Ting-Hao Huang, Francis Ferraro, Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Ishan Misra, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jacob Devlin, Ross Girshick, Xiaodong He, Pushmeet Kohli, Dhruv Batra, and 1 others. 2016. Visual storytelling. In *Proceedings of the 2016 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*, pages 1233–1239.
- Haitham M. Hussein, Amr Abdel Moneim, Tamer Emara, Yousry A. Abd-elhamid, Haitham H. Salem, Foad Abd-Allah, Mohammad A. Farrag, M. Amir Tork, Ali S. Shalash, Khaled H. Ezz el dein, Gamaleldin Osman, Shady S. Georgy, Peter G. Ghali, Patrick D. Lyden, and Ramez R. Moustafa. 2015. [Arabic cross cultural adaptation and validation of the national institutes of health stroke scale](#). *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 357(1):152–156.
- Jiaming Li, Yukun Chen, Ziqiang Liu, Minghuan Tan, Lei Zhang, Yunshui Li, Run Luo, Longze Chen, Jing Luo, Ahmadreza Argha, Hamid Alinejad-Rokny, Wei Zhou, and Min Yang. 2025. [STORYTELLER: An enhanced plot-planning framework for coherent and cohesive story generation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 20818–20846, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yitong Li, Zhe Gan, Yelong Shen, Jingjing Liu, Yu Cheng, Yuexin Wu, Lawrence Carin, David Carlson, and Jianfeng Gao. 2019. [Storygan: A sequential conditional gan for story visualization](#). In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6322–6331.
- Zhiqiu Lin, Deepak Pathak, Baiqi Li, Jiayao Li, Xide Xia, Graham Neubig, Pengchuan Zhang, and Deva Ramanan. 2024. [Evaluating text-to-visual generation with image-to-text generation](#). In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024: 18th European Conference, Milan, Italy, September 29–October 4, 2024, Proceedings, Part IX*, page 366–384, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Adyasha Maharana and Mohit Bansal. 2021. Integrating visuospatial, linguistic and commonsense structure into story visualization. In *EMNLP*.
- Adyasha Maharana, Darryl Hannan, and Mohit Bansal. 2021. Improving generation and evaluation of visual stories via semantic consistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.10026*.
- Adyasha Maharana, Darryl Hannan, and Mohit Bansal. 2022. Storydall-e: Adapting pretrained text-to-image transformers for story continuation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 70–87. Springer.
- Linda E Nicholas and Robert H Brookshire. 1993. A system for quantifying the informativeness and efficiency of the connected speech of adults with aphasia. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 36(2):338–350.
- Mi Sun Oh, Kyung Ho Yu, Ju-Hun Lee, San Jung, I S Ko, Joon Hyun Shin, Soo-Jin Cho, Hui-Chul Choi, Hyang Hee Kim, and Byung-Chul Lee. 2012. [Validity and reliability of a korean version of the national institutes of health stroke scale](#). *Journal of Clinical Neurology (Seoul, Korea)*, 8:177 – 183.
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- OpenAI. 2025. Gpt image 1: State-of-the-art image generation model. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-image-1>.
- Kameshwar Prasad, Deepa Dash, and Amit Kumar. 2012. [Validation of the hindi version of national institute of health stroke scale](#). *Neurology India*, 60 1:40–4.
- 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, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, and 25 others. 2025. [Qwen2.5 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.15115.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS ’23*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Melissa Roemmele, John Joon Young Chung, Tae-wook Kim, Yuqian Sun, Alex Calderwood, and Max Kreminski. 2025. [Llms behind the scenes: Enabling narrative scene illustration](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2509.22940.
- Xiaoqian Shen and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2025. Storygpt-v: Large language models as consistent story visualizers. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*, pages 13273–13283.
- Xiujie Song, Xiaoyi Pang, Haifeng Tang, Mengyue Wu, and Kenny Q. Zhu. 2025a. [Is your image a good storyteller?](#) *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 39(24):25165–25173.
- Xiujie Song, Mengyue Wu, Kenny Q. Zhu, Chunhao Zhang, and Yanyi Chen. 2025b. [A cognitive evaluation benchmark of image reasoning and description for large vision-language models](#). In *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 6392–6409, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Katherine Stasaski and Marti Hearst. 2022. [Semantic diversity in dialogue with natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*,

pages 85–98, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Katherine Stasaski, Grace Hui Yang, and Marti A. Hearst. 2020. [More diverse dialogue datasets via diversity-informed data collection](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4958–4968, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Amy Steinberg, Patrick D. Lyden, and Arielle P. Davis. 2022. [Bias in stroke evaluation: Rethinking the cookie theft picture](#). *Stroke*, 53(6):2123–2125.

Ming Tao, Bing-Kun Bao, Hao Tang, Yaowei Wang, and Changsheng Xu. 2024. Storyimager: A unified and efficient framework for coherent story visualization and completion. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 479–495. Springer.

Li Yang, Zhiding Xiao, Wenxin Huang, and Xian Zhong. 2025a. [StoryLLaVA: Enhancing visual storytelling with multi-modal large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3936–3951, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Shuai Yang, Yuying Ge, Yang Li, Yukang Chen, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, and Yingcong Chen. 2024. [Seed-story: Multimodal long story generation with large language model](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08683*.

Yuming Yang, Yang Nan, Junjie Ye, Shihan Dou, Xiao Wang, Shuo Li, Huijie Lv, Tao Gui, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2025b. [Measuring data diversity for instruction tuning: A systematic analysis and a reliable metric](#). In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 18530–18549, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.