

# Echoes in AI: Quantifying Lack of Plot Diversity in LLM Outputs

Weijia Xu, Nebojsa Jojic, Sudha Rao, Chris Brockett, Bill Dolan

Microsoft Research  
Redmond, WA 98052, USA  
weijiayu@microsoft.com

## Abstract

With rapid advances in large language models (LLMs), there has been an increasing application of LLMs in creative content ideation and generation. A critical question emerges: can current LLMs provide ideas that are diverse enough to truly bolster the collective creativity? We examine two state-of-the-art LLMs, GPT-4 and LLaMA-3, on story generation and discover that LLM-generated stories often consist of plot elements that are echoed across a number of generations. To quantify this phenomenon, we introduce the *Sui Generis* score, which estimates how unlikely a plot element is to appear in alternative storylines generated by the same LLM. Evaluating on 100 short stories, we find that LLM-generated stories often contain combinations of idiosyncratic plot elements echoed frequently across generations, while the original human-written stories are rarely recreated or even echoed in pieces. Moreover, our human evaluation shows that the ranking of *Sui Generis* scores among story segments correlates moderately with human judgment of surprise level, even though score computation is completely automatic without relying on human judgment.

## 1 Introduction

Rapid advances in large language models (LLMs) have spurred an ongoing debate on the usefulness of these models on tasks that require human-level creativity. On the one hand, there are works that highlight the strengths of LLMs in creative writing (Bellemare-Pepin et al., 2024; Orwig et al., 2024), poetry generation (Porter and Machery, 2024), idea generation (Lee and Chung, 2024; Si et al., 2024) and even originality (Guzik et al., 2023). On the other hand, there are also works pointing out that LLM creativity is much weaker than human creativity (Chakrabarty et al., 2024) or that LLM-generated stories are identifiably bad (Sato, 2023; Levenson, 2023). A recent user study finds

---

**Prompt:** It was very early in the morning, the streets clean and deserted, I was walking to the station. [...] I did not yet know my way very well in this town; luckily, a policeman was nearby, I ran up to him and breathlessly asked him the way. He smiled and said: "From me you want to know the way?" "Yes," I said, "since I cannot find it myself."

---

**Original Continuation:** "Give it up! Give it up," he said, and turned away with a sudden jerk, like people who want to be alone with their laughter.

---

**Continuation 1:** "Follow this street for two blocks, then take a left at the bakery, and you'll see the station just ahead," he instructed with a gentle nod.

---

**Continuation 2:** "Keep going straight for two blocks, then take a left and you'll see the station right ahead," he explained, giving a friendly nod.

---

**Continuation 3:** He nodded in understanding, his smile broadening as he pointed down the street, "Take the second left and cross the square; you'll see the station right ahead."

---

**Continuation 4:** "Go straight ahead and take your second left, pass the old library, and the station will be right before your eyes," he responded, tipping his cap.

---

**Continuation 5:** "Alright," he said, his smile broadening, "I'll guide you. Follow me." Grateful, I trailed behind him, my earlier panic subsiding with each step.

---

Table 1: Continuations generated by GPT-4 when prompted with the first part of a short story by Kafka.

that although the use of an AI assistant in writing appears to enhance the creativity of individual writers, it reduces the collective diversity of novel content produced by multiple writers (Doshi and Hauser, 2024).

Although based on qualitative analyses involving human judgment, these findings allude to the phenomenon that, while an individual LLM output might seem novel, when sampling multiple such outputs, the LLM tends to become repetitive and thus lacks the diversity required to truly boost collective creativity. As an example on story generation, Table 1 shows a small subset of 100 story

continuations generated by GPT-4<sup>1</sup> given the first part of *Give It Up*, a short story by Franz Kafka.<sup>2</sup> In all of GPT-4’s continuations, the policeman either offered directions or walked with the man to the station. Neither resembles the original story ending.

In this paper, we aim to quantify such repetitions on the narrative level by introducing a *Sui Generis* score.<sup>3</sup> We use story generation as a testbed. To compute the *Sui Generis* score for a story, we first ask the LLM to generate many alternative continuations of the same story given varying lengths of the story prefix as context. We then count the number of times an original story segment is echoed (on the narrative level) in the alternative continuations. A segment is more likely to appear in other story samples and thus less unique if it is echoed in a larger number of alternative continuations given less context from the previous plot.

We test *Sui Generis* score on 100 stories consisting of around 3,700 segments from two datasets: WritingPrompts that contains short stories posted on Reddit; and plot summaries of TV episodes on Wikipedia. We experiment with two LLMs: GPT-4 and LLaMA-3. Our results highlight the lack of diversity in LLM outputs: LLM-generated stories are often composed of the same combinations of idiosyncratic plot elements that are echoed frequently across its generations, while human-written stories are rarely echoed in LLM generations. As *Sui Generis* score is computed automatically, without human judgment, this result provides a quantitative explanation for the previous qualitative findings that the use of an AI assistant appears to reduce collective diversity (Doshi and Hauser, 2024). Our human evaluation of the surprise level of story segments also shows that the *Sui Generis* score correlates moderately with the average human judgment of surprisal. We observe that the story segments with high scores often correspond to the key plot elements or interesting turning points whereas those with low scores correspond to those that are bland or highly predictable from the context. This may explain the contradictory findings in previous user studies on whether LLM generations have reached human-level creativity, as our study suggests that an LLM generation may

seem novel to a human who has not seen many of its generations in that domain, but may seem banal to someone more familiar with its outputs.

## 2 Related Work

LLMs are increasingly used in creative writing (Kobak et al., 2024; Lee and Chung, 2024). However, there is a debate on whether LLMs boost creativity. On the one hand, there are studies showing that LLM-generated content is considered more creative or preferred by users. For example, Kefford (2023) finds that ideas generated by ChatGPT were more likely to be purchased than those generated by Wharton MBA students. Lee and Chung (2024) find that when participants were asked to generate creative ideas for everyday purposes, the use of ChatGPT increased their creativity. On the other hand, Begus (2023) finds that AI-generated narratives tend to be less imaginative and only occasionally include plot twists. Chakrabarty et al. (2024) invite expert writers to rate the stories generated by LLMs versus professional writers based on a standard test of creativity and discover that LLM-generated stories are less creative than those of professionals.

While these works all focus on evaluating the creativity or novelty of each individual LLM output, Doshi and Hauser (2024) discover that, although writers report an AI assistant being helpful to their creative writing, it reduces the collective diversity of content produced by multiple writers. This suggests that we should examine the *distribution* of LLM creations for a *given* prompt instead of each creation individually.

A recent work on detecting novelty in LLM outputs suggests that “the text must not have been copied from the training data” (McCoy et al., 2023). This definition appears too narrow and surface-level: nothing resembling the original Kafka text is found in the story continuations by GPT-4 (Table 1). Yet by this standard, the generated continuations in story must be treated as novel, even though to human readers it is the original Kafka’s ending that is unusual while the generated continuations are quite conventional and lack diversity. Shaib et al. (2024) analyze different existing scores that can help measure diversity in LLM outputs, but these metrics all focus on surface-level features such as ngram overlaps. However, as Ghosal et al. (2022) observe, “identifying novel text is not straightforward because the text may have less lexical overlap yet

<sup>1</sup>We use temperature  $\tau = 1$  as LLMs are trained with the goal of fully capturing the data distribution with  $\tau = 1$ .

<sup>2</sup><https://www.flashfictiononline.com/article/give-it-up/>

<sup>3</sup>*Sui Generis* is a Latin phrase meaning “of its own kind”, used in English biology and law literature to indicate something unlikely to be repeated or recreated.




Figure 1: Two continuations of the same story with (a) longer prefix, with  $j = 8$  segments, and (b) shorter prefix, with  $j = 2$  segments from the same original story, partially shown in (c). Segments are delineated with []. We highlight two segments in (c),  $i = 7$  in blue and  $i = 9$  in red, that are echoed in these alternative continuations. The red one (visiting a scientist’s lab) is echoed only in continuations conditioned on a long story prefix, while the blue one (discovering a driver inside the car) is echoed frequently even given a short prefix. The *Sui Generis* score more severely penalizes the echoes discovered given shorter prefix (indicating that similar plot is more likely to be repeated by the LLM).

convey the same information.” Thus, in this work, we look beyond phrase-level similarity or diversity and introduce the *Sui Generis* score to measure the uniqueness of text spans on the narrative level.

### 3 Echos and *Sui Generis*

We evaluate the uniqueness of a story segment based on the “alternative continuations” generated by LLMs themselves. Formally, in a story (string)  $S$  segmented into  $n$  constant-length string segments  $S = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$  (as shown in Figure 1(c) with square brackets), at any point  $j \in [1, n - 1]$ , we truncate the story to its prefix  $S_{-j} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_j)$  and consider replacing suffix  $S_j = (s_{j+1}, s_{j+2}, \dots)$  by sampling possible alternative continuations  $C_j$  from the model  $K$  times:

$$C_j^k \sim p_{LLM}(\cdot | S_{-j}), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \quad (1)$$

Each string  $(S_{-j}, C_j^k)$  is thus a full story with its first part taken from the given story  $S$  (either human-written or LLM-generated) and the second part being one possible way an LLM would finish it. Figure 1 shows examples of such continuations with different prefixes: with (a)  $j = 8$  and (b)  $j = 2$  segments from the analyzed story in (c).

Next, to evaluate how often segment  $s_i$  is repeated across generations, we compute its *echo* scores by comparing it to the alternative continuations  $\{C_1^k\}, \{C_2^k\}, \dots, \{C_{i-1}^k\}$  generated from varying lengths of story prefix  $S_{-1}, S_{-2}, \dots, S_{-(i-1)}$ . Specifically, we compute the *echo* score  $p_{i,j}$ , which is an estimated likelihood that a plot element similar to segment  $s_i$  appears in an alternative continuation  $C_j$  ( $j \in [1, i - 1]$ ):

$$p_{i,j} \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_k a(s_i, C_j^k) \quad (2)$$

where  $a(s, C)$  is a binary function that indicates if segment  $s$  or its analog is present in continuation  $C$ . For instance, in Figure 1, both  $a(s_7, C_8^1)$  and  $a(s_9, C_2^1)$  should be 1. We automate this function by prompting GPT-4 using the prompt template shown in Figure 2, as our human evaluation shows that GPT-4’s judgment correlates well with human judgment on this task (see Section 4.3).<sup>4</sup>

The *echo* scores  $p_{i,j}$  thus signal how likely and how early in the story (indicated by position  $j$ ) the

<sup>4</sup>Note that the granularity of the function  $a(s, C)$  can be easily changed to capture lower-level repetitions (e.g. the policeman often suggests to take the second left in various continuations in Table 1) by adapting the prompt template.

Score	Story Segment
	<b>Prompt:</b> In the middle of the night, a piece of paper is slipped under your door. It says, "DUCK!"
13.82	Confused, you grab the paper and open the door . Looking down the apartment complex corridor you see more and more doors open with perplexed heads poking out one by one . No trace is left of whoever put these papers there, they just seem to have appeared all at once . "Duck?" Asks that one neighbour that you have rarely ever spoken to . "Yeah I got it too," you reply, "What do you think it means?" "Dunno" he
3.00	replies as you both turn towards the now gathering crowd . You head towards the crowd, which is incredibly loud with chatter now . "What's the big deal?" "Why should we even care?" Everyone's thinking the same thing yet everyone seems inexplicably interested . Amidst the crowd you notice that
13.82	the last door is still closed . You point in the direction and immediately the crowd goes silent . Everyone begins to walk over to the closed door when the knob turns . It's dark inside . All you can see is a dark figure inside.As it creeps forward you
13.82	notice an eerie grin . A woman creeps out of the dark room . She looks up, straight into your eyes . Your heart beats faster and faster as she holds up her paper . It reads: "Goose"

Table 2: An example of a human-written story with both high-scored and low-scored segments. Scores were computed using GPT-4. The story contains a twist ending which is scored high. The high-scored segments correspond to the key plots and turning points, while the low-scored one is just an extension of the previous plot.

Here is the beginning of a story: [Story prefix $S_{-j}$ ]
Here is a continuation of the story: [Alternative continuation $C_j$ ]
Does the above continuation contain any plot segment similar to the following (disregarding details like character names, specific objects in the scene, or exact dates)? [Story segment $s_i$ ]
Let's think step by step.
[LLM's step-by-step reasoning]
Finally, give a YES or NO answer. So the answer is
[LLM's final answer (YES/NO)]

Figure 2: Prompt template used for estimating function  $a(s_i, C_j)$ , i.e. if the plot in segment  $s_i$  is present in continuation  $C_j$ . The texts in black are part of the prompt while the texts in pink should be generated by the LLM.

plot in segment  $s_i$  is suggested to be generated. We note that the earlier  $j$  is, the more inevitable it is that such plot element will be repeated by the LLM in an alternative continuation. Thus, we compute the *Sui Generis* score of segment  $s_i$  by taking the weighted average of the negative log of echoes  $\{-\log p_{i,1}, -\log p_{i,2}, \dots, -\log p_{i,i-1}\}$  where we give higher weights to  $-\log p_{i,j}$  with smaller  $j$ :

$$SG_i = \frac{-\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \lambda^j \cdot \log p_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \lambda^j} \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a constant that controls the exponential weight decay. The described procedure for computing *Sui Generis* scores involves no human judgment, nor a large database for matching the generated text, but only an LLM's own generations and judgment, evaluating if a story segment or its

equivalent is likely to be regenerated by the model itself. Table 2 shows a story with its segment-level *Sui Generis* scores. We show in the experiments that, compared to human-written stories, segments of LLM-generated stories have lower scores, or in other words, these plot segments tend to be generated repetitively by the LLM, though possibly in different order or in different parts of the story.

A qualitative user study involving expert writers (Chakrabarty et al., 2024) indicated that LLM-generated stories may differ from human-written ones in narrative pacing: In human-written stories, a plot twist is usually carefully foreshadowed and developed to maintain the tension, which is in line with the tendency for uniform information density in language production (Jaeger, 2010). By contrast, we observe that LLM-generated stories often rapidly accelerate over time without fully unraveling the plots.

Armed with the *Sui Generis* score, we can verify this observation quantitatively. Specifically, given the story segments  $s_{1..N}$  through time 1 to  $N$ , we take the *Sui Generis* scores  $SG_{1..N}$  and compute the "drop ratio" between consecutive segments:

$$\text{drop}_i = \max\left(\frac{SG_i - SG_{i+1}}{SG_i} - \theta, 0\right) \quad (4)$$

where  $\theta$  is a predefined threshold. Intuitively, a high drop ratio indicates that the *Sui Generis* score drops immediately after the peak at position  $i$  without unraveling the surprising plot progressively.




Figure 3: Average *Sui Generis* scores of story segments generated by humans versus GPT-4 (in (a) and (c)) or LLaMA-3 (in (b) and (d)) at varying segment positions ( $x$ -axis). The shaded area represents the confidence interval with confidence level  $\gamma = 0.95$ .

## 4 Experimental Setup

### 4.1 Datasets

We test our *Sui Generis* score on 100 stories from two story datasets: 1) the WritingPrompts dataset (Fan et al., 2018), which contains story prompts and the corresponding human-written stories posted on an online forum<sup>5</sup>, and 2) plot summaries of TV episodes crawled from Wikipedia.<sup>6</sup>

For WritingPrompts, we randomly sample 50 stories and directly use the story prompts by humans for LLM story generation. To account for the fact that the paragraph segmentation of stories generated by different human authors and LLMs may vary a lot and thus affecting the segment-level scores, we segment both human- and LLM-generated stories by a fixed length of 50 words.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.reddit.com/r/WritingPrompts/>

<sup>6</sup>We pick the most recent TV episodes in 2023 so they are not included in the training data of LLMs.

<sup>7</sup>Because the average number of words in each paragraph

Examples of such segments are shown in Figure 1 within square brackets [...]. This results in a total of 1,887 segments in the original and LLM-generated stories for WritingPrompts.

On 50 randomly sampled Wiki plot summaries, we use the first two sentences in each plot summary as the prompt for LLM story generation. We segment both human and LLM stories by a fixed length of 30 words, which is the average length of a sentence in Wiki plot summaries.<sup>8</sup> We test on a total of 1,862 segments from the original and LLM-generated stories.

### 4.2 *Sui Generis* Scoring Setup

We sample  $K = 20$  alternative continuations at each position in the story. We set  $\lambda = 0.9$  when computing the weighted average of the negative log of WritingPrompts stories is around 50.

<sup>8</sup>Because the Wiki plot summaries are more condensed than WritingPrompts stories, and usually each sentence can cover very rich plot.

of echoes for the *Sui Generis* score in Eq.3. To compute the drop ratio, we set the threshold  $\theta = 0.5$ .

### 4.3 Large Language Model Setup

We use GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2024) and LLaMA-3 (Dubey et al., 2024) with  $top\_p = 1.0$ , sampling temperature  $\tau = 1.0$  for story generation.<sup>9</sup> When computing the *Sui Generis* score, we use the same story generation model (with  $top\_p = 0.5$  and  $\tau = 1.0$ ) to generate alternative continuations  $C_j$ , and GPT-4 with  $top\_p = 0.5$  and  $\tau = 0$  to estimate the function  $a(s, C)$  (plot entailment), i.e. if similar plot in the original story segment appears in the alternative continuations. Our human evaluation shows that GPT-4’s judgment is highly correlated with human judgment on this task (with a ROC-AUC score of 92%), which is much higher than those of the existing diversity scores that focus more on ngram-level overlaps (more details in Appendix A.1).

## 5 Results

***Sui Generis* Score: Human vs. LLMs** We first compare the average *Sui Generis* scores of story segments produced by humans versus LLMs (including GPT-4 and LLaMA-3). As shown in Figure 3, on both datasets, human-written stories obtain significantly higher *Sui Generis* scores than LLM-generated ones. This indicates that LLM-generated stories are largely composed of idiosyncratic plot elements that are echoed across multiple LLM generations, while human-written stories often contain plot elements that land far in the tail of LLMs’ output distribution.

**Drop Ratio: Human vs. LLMs** As shown in Table 3, LLM-generated stories lead to 7–9 higher drop ratio than human-written ones. This indicates that, in LLM-generated stories, there are more cases where the *Sui Generis* score drops immediately after a peak, while in human-written stories, the score often remains on a high level after rising. We further show that this is related to the overly fast pacing in LLM-generated stories in Section 6.

***Sui Generis* scores correlate with human judgment of surprise level** We invite four human judges, fluent in English, to evaluate the surprise level of story segments in 9 randomly selected stories (159 segments) generated by LLaMA-3 based

<sup>9</sup>As Peepkorn et al. (2024) find that the influence of temperature on the creativity of LLMs is weak.

	Human	LLM
WP: Human vs GPT-4	3.7	11.3
WP: Human vs LLaMA-3	1.7	9.0
Wiki: Human vs GPT-4	0.4	9.1
Wiki: Human vs LLaMA-3	0.5	7.8

Table 3: Comparing the drop ratio (in percentage) of stories generated by humans versus GPT-4 or LLaMA-3 on WritingPrompts (WP) and Wiki data. LLM-generated stories obtain consistently higher drop ratio than human-written ones.

on the story prompts from WritingPrompts. Specifically, we ask each human annotator to read through each story segment by segment and annotate how surprising each segment is from level 1–3 based on the story so far. Results show that segment-level *Sui Generis* scores correlate moderately with the average human judgment of surprise level: the Spearman’s rank correlation between *Sui Generis* scores and average human grading is significant<sup>10</sup> and the magnitude is 0.55. The correlation between *Sui Generis* scoring and the average human grading is even stronger than that between each individual human grading and the average among the other three annotators (with Spearman’s correlation between 0.38 and 0.49). Relationship between human grading and *Sui Generis* scores is visualized in Figure 4, where average human scores (y axis) are shown for segments whose *Sui Generis* scores fall within a bin within a 1.4 interval around the x axis value. While humans rate segments with a wide range of mid-level *Sui Generis* scores as mildly surprising, they agree with *Sui Generis* on segments with highest and lowest scores.

**The story prompt itself affects *Sui Generis* score for both human and LLM stories** We hypothesize that the story prompt will have similar impact on the *Sui Generis* scores of stories generated by humans and LLMs, as certain story ideas in the prompt (e.g. in Figure 1(c)) simply lead themselves to more interesting and diverse continuations. To test the hypothesis, we compute the Spearman’s correlation between the *Sui Generis* scores of pairs of human-written and LLM-generated stories under the same prompt. The correlation between the scores of human- and GPT-4-generated stories is 0.48 with p-value  $< 0.01$ , which indicates a moderate correlation. And the correlation between human- and LLaMA-3-generated stories is 0.34 with p-value  $< 0.01$ , which indicates a weak but

<sup>10</sup>We use the p-value threshold  $p = 0.05$  for all the significance test in this paper unless noted otherwise.




Figure 4: Average human grading of surprisal versus the *Sui Generis* scores on story segments generated by LLaMA-3 based on the prompts from WritingPrompts. The data points are binned by an interval of around 1.4 based on the *Sui Generis* scores.

significant correlation. This suggests that, although human-written stories are scored significantly higher than LLM-generated ones, story prompts that lead to relatively low-scored stories by LLMs also lead to low-scored stories by humans.

***Sui Generis* captures plot-level surprisal beyond token likelihoods** We further investigate how robust the *Sui Generis* score is to paraphrasing in a way that would affect token-level surprisal measurements such as perplexity without significant changes at a narrative level. To this end, we randomly sample 10 human-written stories and prompt LLaMA-3 to paraphrase each story without changing the semantics.<sup>11</sup> Next, we compute the *Sui Generis* and perplexity scores on each of the original and paraphrased stories. Results show that the *Sui Generis* score remains largely unchanged between the original and paraphrased stories (with a 4% drop on average after being paraphrased), while the perplexity score drops by 15% after being paraphrased. Additionally, the ranking of the perplexity scores among the 10 stories changes greatly after the stories are paraphrased: the Spearman’s rank correlation between the perplexity scores on the original and paraphrased stories is 0.55, and the correlation is non-significant. By contrast, the Spearman’s rank correlation between the *Sui Generis* scores on the original versus paraphrased stories is both significant and much stronger (0.75). These results show that *Sui Generis* score is far

<sup>11</sup>We used the prompt “paraphrase each sentence in the story to make it more fluent without changing any of the semantics” and manually verified that the resulting stories are truly paraphrases of the original stories.

less sensitive to the local wording than token-level perplexity, focusing instead on plot-level surprise.

## 6 Discussion

**What are the main characteristics of low-scored stories?** We examine the lowest-scored stories generated by humans and LLMs. These stories typically fall into two categories. The first type includes stories that are too bland given the story prompts (see Table 4 in the Appendix), which is more common in LLM-generated stories than human-written ones. Another type of low-scored stories includes stories that contain rich plots, but the plot elements are too banal and used repetitively in many LLM generations (see the examples in Table 5 in the Appendix).

**What are the main characteristics of high-scored stories?** We further examine the highest-scored stories from both humans and LLMs. The common features across human- and LLM-generated stories are that they usually contain non-traditional plots with rich details (see the example in Table 7 in the Appendix). Additionally, human-written stories offer more interesting twists and non-linear storytelling (e.g. clues, distractions, interlude and flashbacks) than LLM-generated ones, as shown by Table 6 in the Appendix.

**Segment-level *Sui Generis* scores can be used to identify key plots** We further examine segment-level *Sui Generis* scores and find that the high scores usually correspond to the key plots and turning points. For example, in Table 2, the high-scored segments correspond to the key plots (e.g. where people find that everyone has received the same note under their doors, and the twist ending where the last person who opened her door revealed the note she received), while the low-scored segment is an extension of the previous plot.

**High drop ratio in LLM-generated stories** As some expert writers report in a user study that LLM-generated stories differ from human-written ones in narrative pacing (Chakrabarty et al., 2024), we examine whether the high drop ratio in LLM-generated stories compared to human-written ones is related to this phenomenon. Indeed, we find that the high drop ratio in LLM stories is typically caused by the overly fast pacing in LLM-generated stories, which leaves the suspense hanging unexplained, and thus the *Sui Generis* score drops immediately after the high-scored suspense (see the

example in Table 8 in the Appendix). By contrast, human-written stories have slower pacing, introduce suspense more gradually, and provide a final revelation that explains the suspense (see the human-written story under the same prompt in Table 6 in the Appendix).

## 7 Conclusion

We introduced the *Sui Generis* score to quantify the uniqueness of LLM-generated stories compared to its alternative generations. Our experiments on a hundred LLM- versus human-written stories demonstrated the lack of plot-level diversity in LLM-generated stories – they are often composed of echoic plot elements generated repetitively by the same LLM, in contrast to the more varied and unique elements found in human-written stories. Moreover, our human evaluation showed a moderate correlation between *Sui Generis* scores and human judgments of surprise, suggesting that *Sui Generis* score can serve as a useful tool for assessing the uniqueness and surprise level of LLM-generated content. Furthermore, the *Sui Generis* score has the potential to be extended to assess the uniqueness of sequential content in other modalities beyond text. For example, it can be adapted to assess the uniqueness of compositions in music, visual elements in images, and temporal segments in video content.

## References

- Nina Begus. 2023. [Experimental narratives: A comparison of human crowdsourced storytelling and ai storytelling](#).
- Antoine Bellemare-Pepin, François Lespinasse, Philipp Thölke, Yann Harel, Kory Mathewson, Jay A. Olson, Yoshua Bengio, and Karim Jerbi. 2024. [Divergent creativity in humans and large language models](#).
- Tuhin Chakrabarty, Philippe Laban, Divyansh Agarwal, Smaranda Muresan, and Chien-Sheng Wu. 2024. [Art or artifice? large language models and the false promise of creativity](#). In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '24, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Anil R. Doshi and Oliver P. Hauser. 2024. [Generative ai enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content](#). *Science Advances*, 10(28):eadn5290.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Al-lonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stéphane Collot, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gouget, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine



- Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papakipos, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkan Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khanelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhota, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabza, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Maheswari, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaojuan Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#).
- 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.
- Tirthankar Ghosal, Tanik Saikh, Tameesh Biswas, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2022. [Novelty detection: A perspective from natural language processing](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 48(1):77–117.
- Erik E. Guzik, Christian Byrge, and Christian Gilde. 2023. [The originality of machines: AI takes the Torrance Test](#). *Journal of Creativity*, 33(3):100065.
- T Florian Jaeger. 2010. Redundancy and reduction: Speakers manage syntactic information density. *Cognitive psychology*, 61(1):23–62.
- Matt Kefford. 2023. [Wharton study pits chatgpt against mba students in creativity test](#). *Business Because*.
- Dmitry Kobak, Rita González-Márquez, Emőke Ágnes Horvát, and Jan Lause. 2024. [Delving into chatgpt usage in academic writing through excess vocabulary](#).

- Byung Cheol Lee and Jaeyeon Chung. 2024. An empirical investigation of the impact of chatgpt on creativity. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8(10):1906–1914.
- Michael Levenson. 2023. [Science fiction magazines battle a flood of chatbot-generated stories](#). *The New York Times*.
- R. Thomas McCoy, Paul Smolensky, Tal Linzen, Jianfeng Gao, and Asli Celikyilmaz. 2023. [How much do language models copy from their training data? evaluating linguistic novelty in text generation using RAVEN](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:652–670.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. 2024. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- William Orwig, Emma R Edenbaum, Joshua D Greene, and Daniel L Schacter. 2024. The language of creativity: Evidence from humans and large language models. *The Journal of creative behavior*, 58(1):128–136.
- Max Peeperkorn, Tom Kouwenhoven, Dan Brown, and Anna Jordanous. 2024. [Is temperature the creativity parameter of large language models?](#)
- Brian Porter and Edouard Machery. 2024. Ai-generated poetry is indistinguishable from human-written poetry and is rated more favorably. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):26133.
- Mia Sato. 2023. [Ai-generated fiction is flooding literary magazines — but not fooling anyone](#). *The Verge*.
- Chantal Shaib, Joe Barrow, Jiuding Sun, Alexa F. Siu, Byron C. Wallace, and Ani Nenkova. 2024. [Standardizing the measurement of text diversity: A tool and a comparative analysis of scores](#).
- Chenglei Si, Diyi Yang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2024. Can llms generate novel research ideas? a large-scale human study with 100+ nlp researchers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04109*.

---

**Prompt:** Human emotions have effectively died. All emotions must now be manually inputted through a user interface. The newest software upgrade has just come out, but one of the developers has planted a virus that allows for remote access.

**Source:** Human

**Score:** 9.25

**Story Summary:** The story revolves around a man who finds amusement in manipulating people’s emotions through remote access, engaging in what he considers harmless pranks. These pranks include causing unrequited love, inappropriate laughter at funerals, and feelings of loneliness in social settings. However, he discovers that once he disables the remote access, the individuals retain memories of their manipulated emotions and begin to naturally feel remorse. Engrossed in his latest project, he remains oblivious to the consequences of his actions, including a significant spike in suicides linked to his manipulations. Upon realizing the impact of his actions, he faces a moral dilemma at the user interface, contemplating whether to delete the program responsible for the emotional manipulation, symbolized by the flashing "Delete?" prompt above the "Mischievous" option.

---

**Prompt:** You are the devil and you have been summoned via a satanic ritual. As you manifest yourself you find yourself in a quaint living room and meet a sweet old lady who just wants some company.

**Source:** LLaMA-3

**Score:** 1.15

**Story Summary:** The story narrates an unexpected meeting between the Devil, who appears in a cozy living room, and a welcoming elderly lady who summoned him for companionship. Contrary to his expectations of a sinister setting, he finds himself enjoying tea and engaging in heartfelt conversation with the lady. This encounter leaves him reflecting on his existence and the value of warmth and connection over darkness and despair. Moved by the experience, the Devil returns to Hell, contemplating the meaningfulness of their interaction and the possibility of revisiting the comforting presence of the old lady.

---

Table 4: Examples of stories that obtain low *Sui Generis* scores as they are too bland on top of the prompt.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Evaluating Plot Entailment Judgment

To evaluate the accuracy of GPT-4’s judgment on plot entailment, we conduct a human evaluation in which we invite four human judges (who are fluent in English) to judge 20 randomly sampled judgment examples. We give each human judge the same prompt as GPT-4 and ask them to provide their answers among *yes*, *no*, or *partially*. We then convert their answers to prediction scores between 0 and 1 (*yes*→1, *no*→0, *partially*→0.5) and take the average score among the four judges on each example. Finally, we mark the average human judgment as *yes* if the average score is above 0.5 and *no* otherwise. Compared to the average human judgment as the ground-truth, GPT-4 achieves an F1 score of 89% and ROC-AUC score of 92%, indicating that GPT-4’s judgment correlates well with human judgment on this task. Additionally, we also examine if similar level of accuracy can be achieved using common metrics of text diversity. As recommended in [Shaib et al. \(2024\)](#), we examine self-BLEU, compression ratio, homogenization score and n-gram diversity score, which obtain ROC-AUC scores of 58%, 56%, 70%, and 63%, respectively. These metrics underperform GPT-4 prompting greatly in detecting the semantic overlap between plot segments, as they rely mostly on surface-form features like ngram frequencies but fail to capture sentence-level semantics.

---

**Prompt:** Riots cover the Earth in major cities, causing anarchy to prevail. Two anarchists sit back, watching the riots, wondering what happens next.

**Source:** Human

**Score:** 4.65

**Story Summary:** Lenny and Carl are two individuals who have successfully incited global rebellions against major cities on Earth by manipulating information and spreading falsehoods about governments. Their goal is to create chaos and anarchy, believing that in the aftermath, they can establish a new government that they can control for their own benefit. They have contracted a group to spread lies and manipulate news, making governments appear tyrannical and unjust, which eventually leads to widespread revolts. As the final major city falls to the rebellion, Lenny and Carl deploy a hundred people to promise the rebels a new, just, and equal world, calming them with the hope of a better future. However, this promise is a deception, and the new government they plan to establish will not protect the interests of the people as they have been led to believe.

---

**Prompt:** You have died and gone to hell, but it's not what you expect. You wake up naked in a field with nothing but trees around you... it turns out that hell is an early access survival game.

**Source:** GPT-4

**Score:** 0.20

**Story Summary:** The story narrates the experience of a person who wakes up naked and barefoot in a vast, uninhabited green field, with no memory of how they got there, only recalling a blinding white light and a saddening farewell. They quickly realize they are dead, but instead of a traditional hell, they find themselves in "Hell 3.0 – The Survival Game," a digitalized afterlife that takes the form of a survival video game. The protagonist interacts with a holographic interface that includes options like "Inventory," "Skills," and "Quests," and decides to participate in the game. As they navigate this new reality, they face various challenges, including crafting tools, building shelters, finding food, and fighting off ethereal beasts. They acquire skills such as hunting, fishing, and elemental magic, and learn to thrive in this environment, despite the constant threats and the realization that they are stuck in an eternal survival game. Over time, the protagonist becomes adept at surviving, embracing their new reality and drawing strength from their fears.

---

Table 5: Examples of stories that obtain low *Sui Generis* scores as the plots are too banal and predictable.

**Here is the beginning of a story:**  
 Prompt: Aliens have abducted you in a random sampling of men, women and children ...

**Here is a continuation of the story:**  
 our veins as we watched them move around the ship, **their long, slender fingers** dancing over control panels, emitting intricate light patterns ... It was then that I understood: the artificial gravity in the ship was **a fraction of Earth's**. The aliens, despite their advanced technology, hailed from a planet with less gravity than ours. If their gravity was less, then **our physical strength would be significantly greater in comparison**.  
 A plan began to form in my mind. I started to test my strength subtly, lifting heavy objects around the ship with surprising ease. The others noticed and, with a mixture of fear and hope, began to understand. We were stronger here. We had an advantage.  
 One by one, we began to train, pushing our bodies to adapt to the new environment. The children were the quickest to adapt, their young bodies absorbing the changes with ease. The adults took longer, but the determination in their eyes was unyielding.  
 Days turned into weeks, and we became stronger, faster. Our captors, oblivious to our physical transformation, continued their experiments, their luminescent eyes always watching, always analyzing. But they didn't understand human resilience, the power of our spirit. They underestimated us.  
 The day of our rebellion came without warning. It started with a diversion, a group of us creating a ruckus at one end of the ship. As the aliens rushed to quell the disturbance, the rest of us attacked. Our strength, amplified by the low gravity, was overwhelming. We overpowered them with ease, their frail bodies no match for our Earth-born might.  
 We took control of the ship, the control panels surprisingly intuitive. The ship hummed under our command, its alien energy now ours to wield. With the aliens subdued, we set a course for Earth, our home. The journey back was filled with anticipation and relief. We had survived the unthinkable, fought back against the unknown, and won.  
 When the Earth finally came into view, tears welled up in our eyes. We were home. We were safe. The ship descended, the blue beam of light once again piercing the sky. This time, however, it was not a beam of abduction, but a beacon of our triumphant return. We were not just random men, women, and children anymore. We were survivors, warriors, heroes. We were stronger than we ever knew, and we had the scars to prove it.

**Does the above continuation contain any plot segment similar to the following (disregarding details like character names, specific objects in the scene, or exact dates)?**  
 ... planet must have only **a fraction of the Earth's gravity**. In an environment where gravity posed little resistance, **they developed long and slender bodies with minimal muscle mass ...**

*LLM's final answer: YES*

Figure 5: An example of how GPT-4 estimates the function  $a(s_i, C_j)$  by answering the *plot entailment question*. Similar plot elements are marked with the same color.

**Here is the beginning of a story:**  
 Prompt: A man sits on a bench in the middle of a park. Out of boredom, he imagines a back story for every person who crosses his path. He sees a couple jogging toward him in matching sweatsuits ...

**Here is a continuation of the story:**  
 accepted. In the simplicity of that moment, under the starlit sky, they found a promise of a future together that neither had dared to dream of before. It was a commitment not born out of necessity or societal expectation, but out of a genuine desire to share their lives with each other. They didn't need grand gestures or material symbols to validate their feelings. Their love was enough.

The wedding was a small affair. They exchanged vows in a quiet ceremony in the countryside, surrounded by a handful of close friends and family. The setting was picturesque, with nature as their witness. William wore a simple suit, and Esther, a modest white dress that flowed with the breeze. There was no extravagant reception, no elaborate decorations. Just a simple celebration of love, with laughter, good food, and heartfelt toasts.

As the years passed, William and Esther built a life together that was rich in experiences rather than possessions. They traveled, exploring new cultures and cuisines, making memories in every corner of the world. They found joy in the little things, like reading together on quiet evenings, cooking meals for each other, and taking long walks in the park, much like the one where our story began.

Their relationship was not without its challenges, of course. They had their disagreements and moments of doubt, as all couples do. But they always found their way back to each other, their bond strengthened by every hurdle they overcame together. They learned to communicate better, to listen more, and to give each other space when needed. They respected each other's independence and supported each other's dreams.

As they grew older, William and Esther became fixtures in their community. They were known for their generosity and kindness, always willing to lend a helping hand. They didn't have children of their own, but they touched the lives of many, from the neighborhood kids to the elderly. They created a family of choice, surrounded by friends and loved ones who admired and cherished them.

One day, as William sat on a bench in the middle of the park, watching the world go by, he realized how far he had come from the lonely man he once was. He looked over at Esther, who was sitting beside him, her hand in his, and felt a surge of gratitude. They had built a beautiful life together, one that was full of love, laughter, and companionship.

As the sun began to set, casting a golden glow over the park, William turned to Esther and said, "Thank you for saying yes." Esther smiled, squeezing his hand, and replied, "Thank you for asking."

And in that moment, as they sat together in peaceful silence, they knew that they had found in each other a love that was timeless, a love that would endure. They didn't need anything more.

**Does the above continuation contain any plot segment similar to the following (disregarding details like character names, specific objects in the scene, or exact dates)?**  
 ... **opened up a tiny book store not far from William's work.** They would grab lunch together every day. William made a point of it. Unfortunately, William was not the healthiest man. He lost control of his weight and it had caused all sorts of ...

*LLM's final answer: NO*

Figure 6: An example of how GPT-4 estimates the function  $a(s_i, C_j)$  by answering the *plot entailment question*. In this case, no similar plot elements are found in the alternative continuation, so GPT-4 answers "NO".

---

**Prompt:** In the year 1989, a police investigator arrives at the site of an impossible accident: a 2016 Toyota Corolla is wrapped around a lamp post.

**Score:** 12.85

**Summary of The Beginning:** DCI Donahue and DI Michaels investigate reports of explosions and a crash on High Street, initially suspecting fireworks in anticipation of Bonfire Night. Amid concerns about the poor condition of Donahue's patrol car, they discover a wrecked car with no record of its license plate, suggesting involvement in illegal street racing. The story highlights the challenges of law enforcement in dealing with public disturbances and inadequate resources while hinting at a deeper investigation into the city's street racing problem.

**Story Continued:** "DCI Chris Donahue, Metropolitan Police. Any news on the driver?"

"We've just managed to cut her free from the wreckage, Inspector."

He looked over to see the woman being extracted from what was once a perfectly working car. Something about them seemed familiar to him, his heart almost skipping a beat, but he couldn't quite place his finger on it. As the ambulance pulled away, its siren fading, an uneasy feeling trembled up his spine. He turned back to Michaels, who was walking away from another house, presumably asking the other homeowners if they had seen anything.

"Any new developments, Detective?"

"'Fraid not, Chief. Sounds li' this is all we can get for now."

"I suppose all we can do now is phone for a tow-truck to send this car away." Donohue concluded. "I trust you know the number?"

"All too well."

"Good. Let me know of any developments."

As his shift drew to a close, he made his way back to his home. It was still early in the morning, so he still talked very quietly with the babysitter.

"Yeah, she went out like a light, as usual. No real fuss."

"I guess she takes after her mother. So is it 10 pounds this time, Jessica?"

Putting the orange note in her purse, she made her way to the front door.

"Oh, I almost forgot," spoke Jessica. "There was a phone call for you a couple hours ago... saying your daughter was in a car accident? I mean, she couldn't have been, she was watching telly with me the whole time.. must have been some sicko pulling a prank or something."

---

Table 6: An example of a human-written story that obtains high *Sui Generis* score. The story has an interesting plot twist at the end along with clues and distractions in the middle.

---

**Prompt:** A generic RPG story (such as, but not necessarily, "the princess has been kidnapped!") from the villain's point of view. Make the audience sympathetic to his/her cause.

**Score:** 11.44

**Summary of The Beginning:** My story begins in a time when Prince Galion of Valor stood by my side, not just as an ally but as my closest confidant. However, the harmony of our bond was shattered by the arrival of Princess Elara. With her entrancing beauty and a lineage tainted by demonic ancestry, she ensnared Galion, casting me aside into oblivion. As I lurked in the darkness, I uncovered the sinister truth behind Elara's charm. Her intentions were malevolent, plotting to sacrifice Galion in a dark ritual to awaken her ancient demonic forebear.

**Story Continued:** In a desperate bid to bring the truth to light, I stole the sacred Dagger of Truth from the royal vault, a magical relic holding the power to reveal deceit. But my act was misinterpreted, and Galion, blinded by his heart, saw me as the traitor. Deemed a betrayer for my noble intentions, I was exiled to the Ancalus Realm; I was forced to mutate into the fearful villain that I am today.

Time is a healer, but not for me; it hardened my resolve to save my unsuspecting friend and end the reign of the demoness Elara. In a game that many perceive as wicked, I abducted Elara, drawing the only person capable of shattering my solitude - my once dearest friend, Prince Galion. A cry for a duel echoes through the Ancalus Realm. Galion, in his full armor, a symbol of fortitude kicks the door open. His emerald eyes reek of hatred for me, a heart-wrenching sight. But there's no guilt, just an unflinching resolve. Our swords clash, my black steel meets his silver blade. Sweat, blood, heat, and vengeance, fill the air. The brave Galion, oblivious in his wrath.

In the ferocious duel, I manage to wound Galion, only slightly. It breaks my heart, but it is necessary. As his blood trickles down, I use the same sacred Dagger of Truth to smear his wound. Its magic reacts with Galion's pure blood; his eyes glow with the divine light of Knowledge. His bitter hatred softens, replaced by sudden realization and horror. He sees through the Elara's manipulative deceit and her true identity. His heartbreak, monumental but necessary collateral damage.

In the unfolding chaos, I release Elara. The real fight begins. Galion, armed with the Dagger of Truth, vanquishes the demoness. I witness from the periphery, an eerie sense of satisfaction replacing my lonely void. Everything unfolded as I planned. I step-aside, my purpose served, ready to retreat to my lonely silence. I was the villain, yes, but a villain who loved his friend enough to put his life at stake. A villain who, despite the bitter hatred, craved for the safety of the world. They will not remember me as a hero, but we don't choose the roles we play in each other's lives, do we?

As I turn, a hand clutches my shoulder. I stop in my tracks. Turning slowly, I see Galion standing, a strange spark in his eyes. No hat, no anger. Just understanding? Or more? "I never knew, Valtar...you have sacrificed more than any of us," Galion murmurs, his words reverberating through the realm. For once, silence doesn't feel cold. Maybe, just maybe, being the villain isn't that bad after all.

---

Table 7: An example of a GPT-4-generated story that obtains high *Sui Generis* score. The story is different from the traditional stories of evil villains being defeated and provide lots of details and backstories to support and enrich the main plot.



Score	Story Segment
	<b>Prompt:</b> In the year 1989, a police investigator arrives at the site of an impossible accident: a 2016 Toyota Corolla is wrapped around a lamp post.
0.05	In the quaint and ordinarily serene town of Clearwater, Nevada, headlines of an inexplicable incident stole the buzz in the year 1989. Snake-hipped police investigator, Dale McQuarrie, renowned for his observational skills and analytical mind, had been summoned to decipher an extraordinary accident. A car was embraced in an implausible collision—wrapped around a lamp post, as if both were caught in a dance of destruction. But it was not just
0.00	the peculiar accident that captured everyone’s interest. It was the car itself. The metallic, midnight-blue vehicle was labeled as a 2016 Toyota Corolla, a model and make twenty-seven years ahead of its time. Contemporary designs mixed with hinted futurism was more than enough to bewilder the folks around it. The
0.00	spectators, gathered in a cluster, studied the strange vehicle with wide-eyed wonder as Officer McQuarrie arrived to cast his professional gaze upon the scene. Slowly pacing around the car, absorbing every detail, McQuarrie sensed a cold shiver run down his spine. The style of the vehicle, the technology it possessed, was far beyond what he’d witnessed in his career. Hushed whispers of time travel and alien intervention pervaded the crowd, but McQuarrie, a staunch realist, was not quick to jump on that peculiar bandwagon. Inside the Toyota, sat an unconscious man, his hands still gripping the steering wheel, his sandy
13.82	hair matted with blood. McQuarrie signaled for the paramedics, who quickly cut the man free and rushed him to the hospital, leaving McQuarrie to unravel the mystery behind the untimely vehicle. For the following weeks, McQuarrie delved into the investigation, relentlessly probing every lead, examining each thread that the accident
4.64	offered. He contacted Toyota, where after numerous heated exchanges between baffled and skeptical executives, he was assured that the car indeed was a future model yet to be designed. Intriguingly, the man identified as Claude Matthews, a theoretical physicist from Caltech, remained in a comatose state. He was reported missing
11.74	a few days before the accident, last seen working late in his lab on an undisclosed project. More questions were piled onto McQuarrie’s investigation, with answers seemingly as evasive as the car’s origins. Driven by an odd mixture of skepticism and desperation, McQuarrie decided to confront the impossibility, visiting Caltech.
10.25	There, he discovered Matthews’s work on quantum time-travel theory. It proposed a mechanism for theoretical time travel, all hypothetical with no empirical data. The discovery made McQuarrie stumble. Was this the elusive clue he had been searching for? News of Matthew’s regaining consciousness preempted any conclusions McQuarrie was forming. The
0.80	man proved to be a puzzle himself, talking in riddles about the river of time and the vehicle that could sail upon it. However, he insisted that he was running mathematical simulations of his theory and did not remember building a time-traveling car. Weeks turned into months, and then years.
11.83	Conventional explanations collapsed, and narratives were uncertain at best. McQuarrie, in the twilight of his career, had a single unresolved case; the impossible accident of an impossible car in an impossible year. Somehow, the incident remained a piece of local folklore, the tale of a time-traveling car from 2016. But
0.24	McQuarrie, a cop once smug in his realism, began to question his rigidity. He retired, leaving behind a legacy of solved mysteries, but took with him an enigma that taught him an invaluable lesson: Within the confines of the universe, the term "impossible" itself seemed to be an obsolete concept.
0.96	After all, irrelevant of physics and logic, hadn’t he seen a 2016 Toyota Corolla wrapped around a lamppost in the year 1989?
0.38	

Table 8: An example of a GPT-4-generated story with both high-scored and low-scored segments. The peaky scores correspond to the turning points (e.g. when the identity of the man was revealed), but the story ends quickly after the last turning point without a good explanation of the suspense.