

Enhancing Chart-to-Code Generation in Multimodal Large Language Models via Iterative Dual Preference Learning

Zhihan Zhang¹, Yixin Cao², and Lizi Liao¹

¹School of Computing and Information Systems, Singapore Management University

²School of Computer Science, Fudan University

zhihanzhang.2024@phdcs.smu.edu.sg

Abstract

Chart-to-code generation—the process of converting chart images into executable plotting scripts—provides a lossless representation of chart information, requiring models to accurately capture and summarize all visual and structural elements. However, this remains a significant challenge for multimodal large language models (MLLMs), which are not inherently well-aligned with code generation tasks. To bridge this gap, we introduce Chart2Code, a novel iterative dual preference learning framework designed to enhance MLLMs’ chart-to-code generation capabilities through structured code variant generation and fine-grained dual reward signals. We validate Chart2Code across three MLLMs and find that iterative preference learning consistently improves out-of-distribution chart-to-code generation quality. Throughout this process, our dual scoring method, which evaluates both the textual code structure and its visual representation, leads to greater performance improvements, even with a reduced preference dataset size. Further analysis explores the key components of our framework and highlights the interplay between chart-to-code generation and broader chart reasoning, paving the way for future advancements in chart comprehension.¹

1 Introduction

Charts are essential for conveying data-driven insights across various fields, including finance and scientific research, requiring both visual interpretation and logical reasoning. Chart comprehension involves analyzing complex data relationships represented through diverse visual elements such as colors, textual annotations, and multiple subplots. Existing research has primarily focused on closed-ended question answering tasks that involve reasoning over one or two specific aspects, such as identifying the color of a particular data group (Wang

et al., 2024b; Masry et al., 2022). However, this narrow scope does not fully capture the depth of chart understanding, which should be open-ended and holistic. Meanwhile, recent advancements in multimodal large language models (MLLMs) for vision-language tasks have demonstrated their strong capabilities in comprehending natural images, recognizing objects and contextual relationships. This opens new possibilities for applying MLLMs to extract and interpret the rich, structured information embedded in charts.

Existing research on open-ended chart comprehension has primarily focused on chart summarization and captioning tasks (Kantharaj et al., 2022b,a; Tang et al., 2023). While these tasks require more advanced reasoning than closed-ended question answering, they face significant challenges including data acquisition bottleneck and the inclusion of irrelevant information in chart’s textual context. Recently, researchers have shifted their focus to the chart-to-code task (Shi et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2024), aiming to evaluate the chart reasoning abilities through code. However, current open-source MLLMs are not well-aligned with code generation tasks (Zhao et al., 2025), resulting in poor performance in parsing charts into corresponding code and limited execution rate of the generated code.

To bridge this gap, we introduce **Chart2Code**, a novel iterative dual preference learning framework designed to enhance the MLLM’s **Chart-to-Code** generation capability through code variant generation and fine-grained dual reward signals (Figure 1). On each iteration, given a gold-standard plotting script and its corresponding chart image, we systematically manipulate the script along six key dimensions—*chart type*, *color*, *text*, *layout*, *style*, and *data*—to generate structured code variants with inherent reward rankings. Next, we leverage a trained evaluator to assign reward scores to images rendered from target model-generated codes, employing our novel multi-dimensional binary scoring

¹Code and dataset are accessible via GitHub: <https://github.com/Zhihan72/Chart2Code>.

method, which assigns a binary score to each of the six dimensions. To further enhance reward modeling, we introduce a *dual scoring* mechanism that combines our multi-dimensional binary scoring with a heuristic F1-based code scoring method introduced by (Shi et al., 2025). This provides a more rigorous reward mechanism, ensuring comprehensive evaluation of both the textual elements of the code and its visual representation. Finally, we construct preference pairs on these reward scores and optimize the target model using Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) loss function. The newly trained model initializes the next iteration, generating responses for a new batch of gold-standard samples and continuously improving through preference learning.

We validate the Chart2Code framework on three MLLMs—InternVL2.5-2B, LLaVA-v1.6-7B, and Qwen2-VL-7B—with comprehensive ablation studies. With sufficient SFT for initialization, we find that preference learning consistently enhances model’s performance in *out-of-distribution* chart-to-code generation, demonstrating progressive enhancements across iterations. Throughout this process, reward signals play a crucial role in effective iterative training, where more accurate reward mechanisms lead to greater model improvements, despite a reduction in the preference pair size. Additionally, we perform a detailed ablation study, comparing Chart2Code against various configurations, including SFT on all gold-standard codes and preference learning on variants alone. The results indicate that incorporating model-generated codes enables iterative refinement, while synthetic variants serve as structured references that bridge the gap between gold-standard and model-generated codes. These findings highlight Chart2Code’s superiority in advancing chart-to-code generation and lay the foundation for future research in applying reinforcement learning techniques to broader chart-related tasks.

To sum up, our contributions are:

- We introduce Chart2Code, a novel iterative dual preference learning framework to enhance the MLLM’s chart-to-code generation capability.
- We propose a variant generation method for preference construction in plotting codes.
- We validate Chart2Code on various MLLMs and reward signals, and conduct ablation studies that explore the role of each component within it.

2 Related Works

Chart Works. Extensive research has been conducted to *evaluate* MLLM’s ability to comprehend charts in question-answering and captioning tasks (Masry et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024b) and enhance their performance through supervised fine-tuning (Masry et al., 2023, 2025, 2024; Meng et al., 2024). More recently, the chart-to-code generation task has gained significant research interest (Shi et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2024; He et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2025), which entails code generation grounded on visual understanding and thus poses new challenges to leading MLLMs.

Preference Learning. Preference learning has emerged as a prominent approach to enhance the performance of large language models (LLMs) by aligning them with human preferences (Ouyang et al., 2022; Casper et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2023). Offline methods such as DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023) are becoming more popular for their simplicity and efficiency. Iterative application of such an offline procedure has proven effective by repeatedly optimizing on newly generated preference pairs in each iteration (Adolphs et al., 2023; Xiong et al., 2023; Pang et al., 2024).

Despite extensive research on LLMs, efforts to adapt these techniques for MLLMs have been limited. Existing related works mainly rely on two preference generation methods: (1) using externally annotated synthetic data (Li et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2024a; Sun et al., 2024), and (2) sampling the target LLM itself multiple times with self-rewarding (Deng et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2024b; Chen et al., 2024b; Yuan et al., 2024). In the chart-to-code generation scenario, we combine self-generated codes with synthetic variants for iterative dual preference learning, exploring how this hybrid approach enhances model performance.

3 Our Method: Chart2Code

To enhance MLLM’s chart-to-code generation capability, we propose a novel iterative dual preference learning framework, Chart2Code.

3.1 Problem Setting

Given a chart image I_i^g and an instruction x_i ($i \in [1, N]$), where g denotes the gold-standard reference and N represents the size of the gold code dataset, the target model M_t is tasked with generating code C_i^t to replicate the reference image, where t is an integer to indicate the current iteration




Figure 1: Overview of Chart2Code, a novel iterative dual preference learning framework designed to enhance the MLLM’s chart-to-code generation capability through code variant generation and fine-grained dual reward signals.

($t \in [0, T]$). Formally,

$$C_i^0 = M_t(I_i^g, x_i)$$

During evaluation, the corresponding gold-standard code C_i^g for the input image is available as a reference. The image rendered from the model-generated code is denoted as I_i^0 .

3.2 Variant Generation and Rewarding

Dimension and Rule. We define six key aspects, $A = \{a_k : k \in [1, 6]\}$, for evaluating the quality of code replication for a reference image: type, data, layout, color, text, and style. Specifically: *Type* refers to the detailed type like donut pie chart and stacked bar chart. *Data* focuses on the structure and content of the data table represented in the visualization. *Layout* considers the arrangement of subplots, including their number and placement. *Color* assesses the color schemes applied to different data groups. *Text* includes all textual elements, such as axis labels, titles, and group labels. *Style* pertains to aesthetic attributes like grids, borders, and marker types. For each aspect a_k , we define a set of transformation rules $R_k = \{r_{j,k} : j \in [1, n_k]\}$ to guide variant generation. These rules involve modifying, randomly replacing, or removing specific elements in the original gold-standard code, enabling controlled perturbations for evaluation and preference learning (see §4.2).

Variation Path Sampling. Given a reference code C_i^g , we randomly sample a variation path $A_i = \{a_{i,\hat{k}} : 1 \leq \hat{k} \leq 6\}$, where each $a_{i,\hat{k}}$ corresponds to one of the six predefined aspects ($a_{i,x} \neq a_{i,y}$ for $x \neq y$). Starting with the first aspect $a_{i,1}$, we

apply a randomly selected transformation rule $r_{i,1}$ to generate a variant C_i^1 that deviates from C_i^g in one aspect. This process continues iteratively: for each subsequent aspect $a_{i,\hat{k}}$, we randomly select one of its rules $r_{i,\hat{k}}$ and introduce an additional deviation, producing a sequence of progressively altered variants. Ultimately, we obtain a set of variants $V_i = \{C_i^k : 1 \leq \hat{k} \leq 6\}$, where each variant differs from C_i^g by up to six aspects.

Scoring Mechanism. For the single-signal rewarding, we introduce a novel multi-dimensional binary scoring method for evaluating model-generated codes. To ensure a systematic evaluation while avoiding complex code reasoning, our evaluator assigns a binary score to each predefined aspect based on the image rendered by the generated code. Formally, our evaluator M_e assesses the image I_i^0 , produced by model-generated code C_i^0 , against the reference image I_i^g : $r_i^0 = M_e(I_i^g, I_i^0)$, where $r_i^0 = \sum_k r_{i,k}^0$, with each aspect-specific score $r_{i,k}^0$ being a binary integer (0 or 1). If the model-generated code fails to execute, it produces a blank image with a final score of 0. For synthetic variants $V_i = \{C_i^k\}$, the reward values are defined as $R_i^V = \{6 - \hat{k}\}$, where $6 - \hat{k}$ represents the number of unchanged aspects relative to the reference code, ensuring a structured preference ranking. To establish a more rigorous reward mechanism, we introduce a dual scoring mechanism, which combines a heuristic F1-based scoring (§B.2) with the above binary scoring to enforce stricter preference selection. See §3.3 for details.

3.3 Iterative Preference Alignment

In each iteration, we start with a set of gold-standard code-image pairs and instructions, denoted as $\mathcal{D}_t^g = \{(C_i^g, I_i^g, x_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, along with the model from the previous iteration M_t . Through variant generation and model inference, we construct a variant dataset $\mathcal{D}_t^v = \{D_i^v\}_{i=1}^N$, where each instance is represented as: $D_i^v = [(C_i^{\hat{k}}, I_i^{\hat{k}}, r_i^{\hat{k}}) : 0 \leq \hat{k} \leq 6]$ in the single-signal setting. Here, $C_i^{\hat{k}}$ and $I_i^{\hat{k}}$ denote the generated code and corresponding rendered image, while $r_i^{\hat{k}}$ represents the assigned reward signal from either code or image side. When $\hat{k} = 0$, the sample corresponds to the model-generated code and image. In the dual-signal setting, each instance in the variant dataset is represented as: $D_i^v = [(C_i^{\hat{k}}, I_i^{\hat{k}}, r_i^{C, \hat{k}}, r_i^{I, \hat{k}}) : 0 \leq \hat{k} \leq 6]$, where $r_i^{C, \hat{k}}$ is computed by a heuristic code scoring method, and $r_i^{I, \hat{k}}$ is assigned by our trained evaluator via the multi-dimensional binary scoring.

We then construct a preference dataset by integrating synthetic variants with model-generated responses. Within each instance D_i^v from the variant dataset, we generate preference pairs by comparing the reward scores of all possible combinations, resulting in the preference dataset:

$$D_i^p = [(I_i^g, x_i, C_i^{w_m}, C_i^{l_m}) : 1 \leq m \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2}]$$

where $C_i^{w_m}$ and $C_i^{l_m}$ denote the winning and losing codes, respectively, n is the number of samples in D_i^v , and $n(n-1)/2$ represents the total number of possible preference pairs. Notably, in the single-signal setting, pairs with tying scores are discarded. In the dual-signal setting, an additional constraint is imposed: the winning sample must achieve higher scores than the losing sample on both the visual and code aspects. Following this process, we obtain the complete preference dataset, denoted as $\mathcal{D}_t^p = \{D_i^p\}_{i=1}^N$, for further preference learning.

Using the preference pairs, we train a new model M_θ , leveraging the previous iteration’s model M_t as the reference model in the denominator of DPO loss function (Rafailov et al., 2023). The model parameter θ is updated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{DPO}(C_i^{w_m}, C_i^{l_m} | I_i^g, x_i) = -\log \sigma \left(\beta \frac{M_\theta(C_i^{w_m} | I_i^g, x_i)}{M_t(C_i^{w_m} | I_i^g, x_i)} - \beta \frac{M_\theta(C_i^{l_m} | I_i^g, x_i)}{M_t(C_i^{l_m} | I_i^g, x_i)} \right)$$

where σ is the sigmoid function. At the end of this training, we obtain the updated model $M_{t+1} =$

M_θ , which is then used to generate data for the subsequent iteration.

4 Dataset Construction

We create a chart-to-code dataset with gold-standard codes and their variants. In addition, we construct a feedback dataset for evaluator training.

4.1 Self-instruct Code Generation

Source Data. We use plotting scripts of ReachQA training set (He et al., 2024) as our primary data source, with 3,249 scripts and 32 chart types.

Gold Code Generation. To generate gold-standard code-image pairs \mathcal{D}_t^g for each iteration, we employ the self-instruct method (Brown et al., 2020), a technique that enables LLMs to create new examples based on existing ones. Specifically, we employ GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024b) to produce novel chart-plotting scripts by providing code samples as contextual references (§C.1). At each step, we randomly select three code snippets of the same type from source data as few-shot examples (Wang et al., 2023). To ensure chart type diversity, we maintain a distribution of generated samples that aligns with the original source data.

4.2 Rule-based Variant Generation

Detailed Rules. We define a set of structured rules R_k for each of the six key aspects a_k to systematically generate variants (§A.1). These rules involve modifying, randomly replacing, or removing original elements from the gold-standard code. For *type*, a predefined type dictionary maps each chart type to its possible replacements. For *data*, variations involve removing, randomly modifying, or fabricating data dimensions or groups in the chart. For *layout*, changes include rearranging subplots or randomly eliminating one from the visualization. For *text*, variants may remove, rewrite, or shuffle textual elements such as group labels and titles. For *color*, variants may replace all colors with a single color or shuffle the existing color scheme. For *style*, stylistic elements such as legends, grids, borders, and marker types may be altered or removed.

Code Variants Generation. To construct the variant dataset \mathcal{D}_t^v for each iteration, we sample two variation paths for each gold-standard code, and utilize GPT-4o for variant generation (§C.1). For each variation path, we randomly select transformation rules for each aspect and provide GPT-4o with a reference code, a selected transformation

rule, and structured instructions to iteratively generate variants. In this process, each new variant is generated based on the previous variant, incorporating an additional deviation, ensuring a structured reward ranking. Notably, *type* and *layout* aspects may not be applicable to a chart if its type is non-editable or it lacks multiple subplots. As a result, variation path lengths range from 4 to 6 aspects. See examples in §A.2.

4.3 Fine-grained Feedback Collection

To train our evaluator M_e for conducting the multi-dimensional binary scoring method, we create a feedback instruction-following dataset (Xiong et al., 2024). This dataset is generated by collecting detailed explanations during variant generation on a random subset of plotting scripts from the source data. Along the variation paths, we prompt GPT-4o to provide a detailed explanation for each modification, capturing the incremental deviation of the current variant in a specific aspect $a_{i,\hat{k}}$. Each training instance is structured as: (Reference Image, Task Instruction, Variant Image, Evaluation Criteria, **Score**, **Reason**) where the yellow-colored content represents the model’s output. The Reason field consists of explanations across six aspects, with non-deviated aspects marked as “The response meets the requirements in this aspect.” See further details in §A.2.

4.4 Dataset Statistics

Our dataset comprises 4,149 gold examples, 11,906 variants, and 23,072 preference pairs, with their distribution across three iterations shown in Table 1. Notably, the initialization variants are generated with explanations to train our evaluator, with 10% reserved for evaluation. During code generation, non-executable codes are discarded, accounting for 3.9% of the total (excluded from the above counts). For each gold code, we sample two variation paths, with a maximum path length of five. The proportion of paths involving each aspect is as follows: 97.9% for *data*, 97.2% for *text*, 97.7% for *style*, 97.8% for *color*, 56.0% for *type*, and 17.3% for *layout*. The relatively lower proportions for *type* and *layout* are due to the limited number of images that support *type* modifications or involve multiple subplots. See §A.4 for details.

5 Experiment

We validate Chart2Code on three MLLMs under different reward signals and perform studies to as-

Phrase	Gold Code	Variant	Pair w. Resp.
Initial	3,249	3,750	-
Iteration 1	300	2,752	7,802
Iteration 2	300	2,710	7,680
Iteration 3	300	2,694	7,590
<i>Total</i>	4,149	11,906	23,072

Table 1: Distribution of numbers of gold codes, variants, and preference pairs including self-generated responses (Resp.) across iterations.

sess the contribution of components in it.

5.1 Experiment Setup

Model and Baselines. We evaluate a diverse set of large multimodal models (LLMs) across two categories: (1) Proprietary models, including GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024b), GPT-4o-mini (OpenAI, 2024a), Claude-3-Opus (Anthropic, 2024), and Gemini Pro Vision (Team, 2024). (2) Chart-augmented open-source models, such as ChartInstruct-7B (Masry et al., 2024), ChartLlama-13B (Han et al., 2023), ChartVLM-L-14B (Xia et al., 2024), and ChartCoder-7B (Zhao et al., 2025). (3) Latest open-source models, including LLaVA-Next-Mistral-7B (Liu et al., 2023), InternVL2.5-2B (Chen et al., 2024a), and Qwen2-VL-7B (Wang et al., 2024a). Additionally, we use Phi-3.5-Vision (Abdin et al., 2024) as the base model for training the visual evaluator, leveraging its strong cross-modal capabilities and support for multi-image input.

Evaluation Datasets. We evaluate the models on two datasets: ReachQA (He et al., 2024) and ChartMimic (Shi et al., 2025). For ReachQA, we use the plotting scripts from its test set, consisting of 500 examples. For ChartMimic, we evaluate on the Direct Mimic task with 500 examples as well. Since our training data is derived from the ReachQA training set, we consider ReachQA as an *in-distribution* dataset, while ChartMimic serves as an *out-of-distribution* benchmark.

Rewarding and Evaluation. We implement three single-signal reward scoring methods in our framework, which are used for downstream evaluation as well (§B.2). (1) *Heuristic F1-Based Scoring* (Shi et al., 2025) – This method employs a code tracer to track the execution process of the generated code, extracting text, layout, type, and color information for F1-score computation. (2) *GPT Continuous Scoring* (Shi et al., 2025) – This approach prompts GPT-4o to assess the similarity between the gold-standard and generated charts,

Models	ReachQA				ChartMimic			
	Exec. Rate	Heuristic F1	GPT Conti.	Multi-Binary	Exec. Rate	Heuristic F1	GPT Conti.	Multi-Binary
<i>Proprietary Multimodal Large Language Models</i>								
Gemini Pro Vision	74.0	67.0	67.8	3.84	64.2	45.0	38.1	3.47
Claude-3-Opus	89.0	51.7	61.1	2.74	86.4	56.0	45.4	2.98
GPT-4V	88.0	69.5	78.6	3.94	91.4	74.3	68.4	3.43
GPT-4o-mini	81.0	59.6	68.6	3.42	85.6	67.6	70.0	3.22
<i>Chart-augmented Multimodal Large Language Models</i>								
ChartInstruct-7B	2.1	0.9	2.1	0.05	1.3	0.4	1.8	0.07
ChartVLM-L-14B	8.2	2.1	3.9	0.14	12.0	3.9	3.4	0.18
ChartLlama-13B	54.8	11.1	8.1	0.35	55.4	11.7	12.6	0.47
ChartCoder-7B	82.4	59.9	50.4	3.35	88.8	72.0	40.5	3.45
<i>Open-source Multimodal Large Language Models</i>								
InternVL2.5-2B	42.6	13.1	19.6	1.03	48.8	21.9	22.6	1.31
<i>Initial SFT</i>	41.4	25.1	28.9	1.39	34.2	20.3	19.8	1.43
+ Heuristic F1	47.0	28.1	31.8	1.87	48.6	31.4	28.2	1.41
+ GPT Conti.	57.6	30.3	35.3	1.95	56.8	31.3	29.2	1.59
+ Multi-Binary	49.8	29.7	34.3	2.09	52.2	31.7	29.9	1.61
+ Dual Scoring	47.0	28.0	32.8	2.03	53.1	32.7	31.4	1.66
LLaVA-v1.6-7B	45.0	15.9	21.2	0.88	55.6	23.6	20.2	1.09
<i>Initial SFT</i>	57.0	33.9	34.8	1.74	56.2	24.8	23.2	1.38
+ Heuristic F1	63.0	31.7	38.6	1.83	62.2	27.0	24.8	1.41
+ GPT Conti.	63.2	29.4	36.1	1.77	62.0	25.9	24.0	1.38
+ Multi-Binary	62.2	29.8	35.3	1.83	68.0	27.7	26.2	1.48
+ Dual Scoring	69.0	32.4	39.8	1.78	63.2	27.2	25.8	1.52
Qwen2-VL-7B	55.4	22.6	29.3	1.01	62.2	30.0	28.9	1.09
<i>Initial SFT</i>	66.0	52.0	47.3	1.91	57.6	41.0	30.6	1.28
+ Heuristic F1	66.8	52.3	47.7	2.37	60.6	41.5	31.5	1.19
+ GPT Conti.	63.4	51.1	46.8	2.25	59.6	40.9	31.4	1.20
+ Multi-Binary	67.6	54.4	52.5	2.34	62.8	42.5	32.4	1.35
+ Dual Scoring	63.6	52.3	49.7	2.25	62.1	42.9	33.3	1.36

Table 2: Performance of models and baselines on two chart-to-code datasets for evaluation, with four reward signal designs indicated after “+.” “Conti.” is short of “Continuous”; “Exec. Rate” refers to the code execution success rate. The full score for “Multi-Binary” is 6, while the rest are 100. Dark red highlights the highest score per model category, while light red indicates the second-highest.

assigning a continuous score from 0 to 100 (§C.2). (3) *Multi-Dimensional Binary Scoring (Ours)*: Our method leverages a trained evaluator to assess the generated image across six predefined dimensions, assigning a binary score to each aspect. The scoring of variants is performed for (1) and (2) during iteration. We further apply the *dual scoring* method that combines (1) and (3) for rigorous reward modeling, where a preference pair is retained only if the winning sample achieves higher scores than the losing one in both scoring methods.

To evaluate the quality of reward signals, we assess the proposed scoring methods on the feedback evaluation set by measuring the proportion of preference pairs where the scoring method selects the same winner as the gold standard.

Experiment Details. For each open-source model, we implement our iterative dual preference learning framework in §3.3. The process begins with SFT on 3k gold-standard codes with 4 epochs to sufficiently initialize the model. In each iteration, we train the model on a preference dataset via a DPO target with 1 epoch. For our evaluator, we train the base model on the feedback training data (§4.3) via SFT. Notably, we use low-rank adaptation (LoRA) fine-tuning (Hu et al., 2022) for efficient computation. Further details can be found in §B.1.

5.2 Main Results

Results in Table 2 demonstrate that our method consistently improves the performance of all three models across execution rate, code quality, and im-

Model	ReachQA				ChartMimic			
	Exec. Rate	Heur. F1	GPT Conti.	M- Binary	Exec. Rate	Heuri. F1	GPT Conti.	M- Binary
InternVL2.5-2B	42.6	13.1	19.6	1.03	48.8	21.9	22.6	1.31
SFT on Gold	43.2	27.2	30.9	1.49	42.2	24.1	23.3	0.91
PL on Variants	41.6	24.0	28.6	1.24	46.6	28.3	26.8	1.07
PL on (Gold, Resp.)	47.4	29.5	33.5	1.84	44.6	27.4	25.0	0.95
Chart2Code w. Dual	47.0	28.0	32.8	2.03	53.1	32.7	31.4	1.66
LLaVA-v1.6-7B	45.0	15.9	21.2	0.88	55.6	23.6	20.2	1.09
SFT on Gold	56.8	35.1	38.8	1.70	56.2	27.1	24.2	1.05
PL on Variants	55.0	15.1	17.6	0.49	52.4	19.3	17.6	0.60
PL on (Gold, Resp.)	51.4	31.3	34.8	1.63	49.6	24.9	22.8	0.91
Chart2Code w. Dual	69.0	32.4	39.8	1.78	63.2	27.2	25.8	1.52
Qwen2-VL-7B	55.4	22.6	29.3	1.01	62.2	30.0	28.9	1.09
SFT on Gold	65.2	51.3	56.0	2.37	52.8	37.0	35.3	1.41
PL on Variants	50.2	40.1	43.9	2.19	38.6	28.3	27.9	1.23
PL on (Gold, Resp.)	67.0	52.1	48.5	2.08	54.6	38.0	36.4	1.33
Chart2Code w. Dual	63.6	52.3	49.7	2.25	62.1	42.9	33.3	1.36

Table 3: Ablation Study of three settings compared with our method under dual scoring (“Chart2Code w. Dual”). “Conti.” is short of “Continuous”; “Exec. Rate” refers to the execution rate. The full score for “M-Binary” is 6, while the rest are 100. Dark red highlights the highest score per category, while light red indicates the second-highest.

age fidelity, evaluated on various benchmarks and criteria. By incorporating multi-dimensional binary scoring and the dual scoring method, LLaVA-v1.6-7B achieves an execution rate of nearly 70%, exceeding Gemini Pro Vision, while also significantly improving its ability to generate higher-quality code. Although ChartCoder-7B, a code-LLM-based model, achieves the highest performance among open-source models, our approach significantly improves the performance of base MLLMs while using only 10% of its training data.

Preference learning continues to improve out-of-distribution performance beyond supervised fine-tuning. While SFT provides a significant performance improvement on the in-distribution ReachQA test set, its impact on the out-of-distribution ChartMimic dataset remains limited. Notably, InternVL2.5-2B exhibited degraded performance following the initialization of SFT. In contrast, iterative dual preference learning enables models to progressively achieve higher performance levels, leading to substantial improvements in both code and image quality.

Reward signals play a critical role in effective iterative training, even with smaller datasets. Table 4 shows that our multi-dimensional binary scoring method achieves the highest accuracy on the feedback evaluation set, while the dual scoring—integrating this binary image scoring with F1-based code scoring—further improves accuracy to 99%, albeit at the cost of a significant reduction in the preference dataset size. As a more rigorous

Reward Signal	Prop. of Pairs w. Corr. Winner	Prop. of Pairs After Dropping
Heuristic F1	94.4	91.2
GPT Conti.	91.2	96.4
Multi-Binary	96.5	94.4
Dual Scoring	99.8	85.7

Table 4: Performance of scoring methods (%). Left column shows the accuracy on evaluation set, while right column shows the retained preference dataset proportion after filtering tied pairs or/and conflicting dual scores.

reward mechanism, the dual scoring method consistently delivers superior performance across all three models on ChartMimic. This underscores the importance of well-structured reward signals in generating reliable preference pairs to enhance model generalization.

Our method improve performance across all evaluation dimensions, and difficulty levels. Taking LLaVA-v1.6-7B as an example, Figure 2 (a) and (b) illustrate that our approach consistently enhances performance across all evaluation dimensions, regardless of the scoring method, with notable gains in layout, text, and type. Additionally, Figure 3 shows that our approach yields positive improvements across all three difficulty levels in Chartmimic, with the most significant gains observed at the medium level.

6 Ablation Studies and Discussions

Role of Various Components. Our approach integrates model-generated codes, synthetic variants,




Figure 2: Performance of LLaVA-v1.6-7B on ChartMimic and rewarding process. (a) and (b) show its results on ChartMimic before and after training using Heuristic F1 and Multi-dimensional binary scoring methods, respectively. (b) shows its results on ChartMimic at the end of each iteration. (d) shows its rewarding signals during each iteration.

and preference learning. To assess each component’s impact, we conduct an ablation study with three settings (§B.1): (1) *SFT on Gold* - SFT on all gold examples; (2) *PL on Variants* - Preference learning on pairs of synthetic variants; and (3) *PL on (Gold, Resp.)* - Preference learning on pairs of gold-standard codes and model-generated codes. The latter two share the same initialization as our method. As shown in Table 3, our method consistently leads to superior performance. The inclusion of model-generated codes enables the model to iteratively refine its outputs, while synthetic variants serve as a structured reference that bridges the gap between gold-standard and self-generated codes. This hybrid approach proves more effective than relying solely on gold-standard examples, fostering better adaptation and improved generalization.

Progression of iterations. We illustrate the progressive performance improvements of LLaVA-v1.6-7B over three training iterations using the multi-dimensional binary scoring method in Figure 2. As shown in Figure 2 (d), the consistent upward trends across all three reward signals highlight the model’s steady improvement with each iteration. Additionally, Figure 2 (c) presents the downstream evaluation results at the end of each iteration, where execution rates and F1-based scores steadily increase, reaching their peak in the final iteration. Notably, GPT continuous scoring dips in iteration 2 before recovering in iteration 3, suggesting an adjustment phase before further refinement.

Case Study. Figure 5 presents three images generated by LLaVA-v1.6-7B under dual scoring, each from a different difficulty level in ChartMimic (§B.3). For the easy case (donut pie chart), the model correctly identifies the chart type and col-

ors, but mistakenly adds a legend, affecting style accuracy. For the medium case (grouped bar chart), while most aspects are accurate, the model omits two data groups and misassigns colors to labels. For the hard case (bar and heatmap charts), the model incorrectly applies heatmap colors to the bar chart, and both the dimensions and content of the heatmap’s data table contain errors. Despite these mistakes, the model demonstrates strong visual understanding and logical reasoning capabilities.

Chart Reasoning via Code. We investigate the role of code in chart reasoning using 500 QA pairs from CharXiv (Wang et al., 2024b) with LLaVA-v1.6-7B as the base model. Three input settings are compared: image-only, code-only, and combined image-code. Table 6 shows that incorporating plotting code significantly improves performance on descriptive questions and enhances reasoning for complex charts with multiple subplots and data groups. These findings highlight the connection between chart-to-code generation and chart reasoning, suggesting new directions for integrating code into MLLMs’ reasoning processes.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced Chart2Code, an iterative dual preference learning framework that enhances MLLMs’ chart-to-code generation capabilities. Extensive experiments demonstrate that Chart2Code consistently improves MLLMs’ performance across multiple iterations, particularly in out-of-distribution scenarios. Our analysis reveals the intricate interplay between chart-to-code generation and broader chart reasoning, paving the way for future research on applying reinforcement learning techniques to broader chart tasks.

Limitation

While our proposed Chart2Code framework significantly enhances chart-to-code generation in MLLMs, certain limitations remain. First, our method relies on structured code variants for preference learning, which, although systematically generated, may not fully capture all nuances of real-world chart variations. Future work could explore more diverse augmentation techniques or leverage human feedback to further refine preference signals. Additionally, while we validate our approach across multiple MLLMs, extending it to other architectures or larger-scale datasets could provide further insights into its generalizability. Finally, our dual scoring mechanism, though effective, assumes a fixed set of reward dimensions; adapting it dynamically based on model behavior could be an exciting avenue for future research.

References

- Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, Alon Benham, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Qin Cai, Vishrav Chaudhary, Dong Chen, Dongdong Chen, Weizhu Chen, Yen-Chun Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Hao Cheng, Parul Chopra, Xiyang Dai, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Victor Fragoso, Jianfeng Gao, Mei Gao, Min Gao, Amit Garg, Allie Del Giorno, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Wenxiang Hu, Jamie Huynh, Dan Iter, Sam Ade Jacobs, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Nikos Karampatziakis, Piero Kauffmann, Mahoud Khademi, Dongwoo Kim, Young Jin Kim, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Yunsheng Li, Chen Liang, Lars Liden, Xihui Lin, Zeqi Lin, Ce Liu, Liyuan Liu, Mengchen Liu, Weishung Liu, Xiaodong Liu, Chong Luo, Piyush Madan, Ali Mahmoudzadeh, David Majercak, Matt Mazzola, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmilac, Liliang Ren, Gustavo de Rosa, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacroce, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Yelong Shen, Swadheen Shukla, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Andrea Tupini, Praneetha Vaddamanu, Chunyu Wang, Guanhua Wang, Lijuan Wang, Shuohang Wang, Xin Wang, Yu Wang, Rachel Ward, Wen Wen, Philipp Witte, Haiping Wu, Xiaoxia Wu, Michael Wyatt, Bin Xiao, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Weijian Xu, Jilong Xue, Sonali Yadav, Fan Yang, Jianwei Yang, Yifan Yang, Ziyi Yang, Donghan Yu, Lu Yuan, Chenruidong Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwen Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and Xiren Zhou. 2024. [Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.14219.
- Leonard Adolphs, Tianyu Gao, Jing Xu, Kurt Shuster, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. 2023. [The CRINGE loss: Learning what language not to model](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8854–8874, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anthropic. 2024. [The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku](#).
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, Jérémy Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomek Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, Tony Tong Wang, Samuel Marks, Charbel-Raphael Segerie, Micah Carroll, Andi Peng, Phillip J.K. Christoffersen, Mehul Damani, Stewart Slocum, Usman Anwar, Anand Siththaranjan, Max Nadeau, Eric J Michaud, Jacob Pfau, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, Xin Chen, Lauro Langosco, Peter Hase, Erdem Biyik, Anca Dragan, David Krueger, Dorsa Sadigh, and Dylan Hadfield-Menell. 2023. [Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification, Featured Certification.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. 2024a. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24185–24198.
- Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. 2024b. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML’24. JMLR.org.
- Yihe Deng, Pan Lu, Fan Yin, Ziniu Hu, Sheng Shen, Quanquan Gu, James Zou, Kai-Wei Chang, and Wei Wang. 2024. [Enhancing large vision language models with self-training on image comprehension](#). In

- The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.*
- Yucheng Han, Chi Zhang, Xin Chen, Xu Yang, Zhibin Wang, Gang Yu, Bin Fu, and Hanwang Zhang. 2023. [Chartllama: A multimodal llm for chart understanding and generation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.16483.
- Wei He, Zhiheng Xi, Wanxu Zhao, Xiaoran Fan, Yiwen Ding, Zifei Shan, Tao Gui, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. [Distill visual chart reasoning ability from llms to mllms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.18798.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Shankar Kantharaj, Xuan Long Do, Rixie Tiffany Leong, Jia Qing Tan, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2022a. [OpenCQA: Open-ended question answering with charts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11817–11837, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shankar Kantharaj, Rixie Tiffany Leong, Xiang Lin, Ahmed Masry, Megh Thakkar, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2022b. [Chart-to-text: A large-scale benchmark for chart summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4005–4023, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Li, Zhihui Xie, Mukai Li, Shunian Chen, Peiyi Wang, Liang Chen, Yazheng Yang, Benyou Wang, Lingpeng Kong, and Qi Liu. 2024. [VLFeedback: A large-scale AI feedback dataset for large vision-language models alignment](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6227–6246, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. [Visual instruction tuning](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Ahmed Masry, Xuan Long Do, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. 2022. [ChartQA: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2263–2279, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ahmed Masry, Parsa Kavehzadeh, Xuan Long Do, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2023. [UniChart: A universal vision-language pretrained model for chart comprehension and reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14662–14684, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ahmed Masry, Mehrad Shahmohammadi, Md Rizwan Parvez, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2024. [ChartInstruct: Instruction tuning for chart comprehension and reasoning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 10387–10409, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ahmed Masry, Megh Thakkar, Aayush Bajaj, Aaryaman Kartha, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2025. [ChartGemma: Visual instruction-tuning for chart reasoning in the wild](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Industry Track*, pages 625–643, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanqing Meng, Wenqi Shao, Quanfeng Lu, Peng Gao, Kaipeng Zhang, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. 2024. [ChartAssistant: A universal chart multimodal language model via chart-to-table pre-training and multitask instruction tuning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 7775–7803, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- OpenAI. 2024a. [Gpt-4o mini: advancing cost-efficient intelligence](#).
- OpenAI. 2024b. [Hello gpt-4o](#).
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, He He, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason E Weston. 2024. [Iterative reasoning preference optimization](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Pooyan Rahmanzadehgervi, Logan Bolton, Mohammad Reza Taesiri, and Anh Totti Nguyen. 2024. Vision language models are blind. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision (ACCV)*, pages 18–34.
- Chufan Shi, Cheng Yang, Yaxin Liu, Bo Shui, Junjie Wang, Mohan Jing, Linran Xu, Xinyu Zhu, Siheng Li, Yuxiang Zhang, Gongye Liu, Xiaomei Nie, Deng Cai, and Yujiu Yang. 2025. [Chartmimic: Evaluating](#)

- LMM’s cross-modal reasoning capability via chart-to-code generation. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhiqing Sun, Sheng Shen, Shengcao Cao, Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yikang Shen, Chuang Gan, Liangyan Gui, Yu-Xiong Wang, Yiming Yang, Kurt Keutzer, and Trevor Darrell. 2024. [Aligning large multimodal models with factually augmented RLHF](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 13088–13110, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benny Tang, Angie Boggust, and Arvind Satyanarayan. 2023. [VisText: A benchmark for semantically rich chart captioning](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7268–7298, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gemini Team. 2024. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.11805.
- Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. 2024a. [Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zirui Wang, Mengzhou Xia, Luxi He, Howard Chen, Yitao Liu, Richard Zhu, Kaiqu Liang, Xindi Wu, Haotian Liu, Sadhika Malladi, Alexis Chevalier, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. 2024b. [Charxiv: Charting gaps in realistic chart understanding in multimodal LLMs](#). In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Renqiu Xia, Bo Zhang, Hancheng Ye, Xiangchao Yan, Qi Liu, Hongbin Zhou, Zijun Chen, Min Dou, Botian Shi, Junchi Yan, et al. 2024. [Chartx & chartvlm: A versatile benchmark and foundation model for complicated chart reasoning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12185*.
- Tianyi Xiong, Xiyao Wang, Dong Guo, Qinghao Ye, Haoqi Fan, Quanquan Gu, Heng Huang, and Chunyuan Li. 2024. [Llava-critic: Learning to evaluate multimodal models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.02712.
- Wei Xiong, Hanze Dong, Chen Ye, Han Zhong, Nan Jiang, and Tong Zhang. 2023. [Gibbs sampling from human feedback: A provable kl- constrained framework for rlhf](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2312.11456.
- Zhiyu Yang, Zihan Zhou, Shuo Wang, Xin Cong, Xu Han, Yukun Yan, Zhenghao Liu, Zhixing Tan, Pengyuan Liu, Dong Yu, Zhiyuan Liu, Xiaodong Shi, and Maosong Sun. 2024. [MatPlotAgent: Method and evaluation for LLM-based agentic scientific data visualization](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11789–11804, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. 2024. [Self-rewarding language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’24*. JMLR.org.
- Wenqi Zhang, Zhenglin Cheng, Yuanyu He, Mengna Wang, Yongliang Shen, Zeqi Tan, Guiyang Hou, Mingqian He, Yanna Ma, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. 2024. [Multimodal self-instruct: Synthetic abstract image and visual reasoning instruction using language model](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 19228–19252, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuanle Zhao, Xianzhen Luo, Qi Shi, Chi Chen, Shuo Wang, Wanxiang Che, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2025. [Chartcoder: Advancing multimodal large language model for chart-to-code generation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.06598.
- Yiyang Zhou, Chenhang Cui, Rafael Rafailov, Chelsea Finn, and Huaxiu Yao. 2024a. [Aligning modalities in vision large language models via preference fine-tuning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.11411.
- Yiyang Zhou, Zhiyuan Fan, Dongjie Cheng, Sihan Yang, Zhaorun Chen, Chenhang Cui, Xiyao Wang, Yun Li, Linjun Zhang, and Huaxiu Yao. 2024b. [Calibrated self-rewarding vision language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14622*.

A Detailed Dataset Construction

A.1 Rule and Path

Rule List We present the variation rules for six aspects as follows:

- *Type*: Change the chart type to: {type name}.
- *Data*: (1) Remove one or more data groups in the data table. (2) Randomly alter the content within certain data groups while preserving the original dimensional structure. (3) Incorporate additional made-up data series or groups into the dataset.
- *Layout*: (1) Modify the number of rows and columns in the subplot arrangement while maintaining the total number of subplots. (2) Switch the placement of specific subplots within the chart layout. (3) Randomly eliminate a subplot to simplify the overall visualization.

- *Color*: (1) Apply a single color consistently across all data groups. (2) Shuffle the assigned colors for each data group or type. (3) Generate and apply a new set of colors to replace the original ones.
- *Text*: (1) Remove the textual elements in the chart, including axis labels, group labels, and titles. (2) Shorten some textual elements, such as titles, axis labels, and group labels. (3) Randomly alter the textual elements in the chart, such as titles, axis labels, and group labels.
- *Style*: (1) Eliminate the stylistic elements, such as legends, grids, and borders. (2) Randomly alter the stylistic elements including legends, grids, borders, and marker types (e.g., point shapes, line styles).

Type List The chart types are listed below. Editable chart types are indicated in brackets “()”, while non-editable types are presented without brackets.

- *Bar*: base (horizon, sort), horizon (base, sort), sort (base, horizon), group (stack, diverging), stack (group, diverging), diverging (group, stack), 3d (base, horizon, sort, group).
- *Heatmap*: base (triangle), triangle (base).
- *Box*: base (horizon), horizon (base), group (horizon).
- *Violin*: base (horizon), horizon (base).
- *Radar*: base (fill), fill (base).
- *Pie*: base (donut), donut (base), layer (donut).
- *Density*: base (horizon), horizon (base), group (horizon).
- *Graph*: base (undirect), undirect (base).
- *Histogram*: base, overlaid (stack), stack (overlaid).
- *Scatter*: base.
- *Treemap*: base.
- *Area*: base.
- *Line*: base.

A.2 Cases of Variants and Feedback

We display the code variants in two variation paths given a gold-standard figure in Figure 4. This case comes from the feedback dataset, with the explanations in each aspect reported in Table 7. Using these explanations, we structure the samples in the feedback dataset as follows:

Phrase	Gold	Variant	Scoring	Eval.
Initial	-	16.08	-	-
Iteration 1	1.95	12.39	5.16	
Iteration 2	1.90	12.07	5.16	
Iteration 3	1.90	12.13	5.16	~130
<i>Total</i>	5.75	52.67	15.48	130

Table 5: Cost of utilizing GPT-4o-2024-08-06 for data generation, reward scoring, and downstream evaluating across each iteration (Unit: US\$).

```

Reference Image: {gold image}
Instruction: {task instruction}
Response: {variant image}
Evaluation Prompt: {evaluation criteria}
Evaluator:
{aspect 1}: {explanation 1}. Score:{1/0}.
...
{aspect 6}: {explanation 6}. Score:{1/0}.
Final score: {sum of above scores}

```

where the green-colored content represents the model’s output. Taking 3-rd variant in the 1-st path, its feedback training instance is shown in a following box.

A.3 Cases of Model Output

We display three examples from three difficulty levels of ChartMimic to display the model-generated image in Figure 5. The base model used is LLaVA-v1.6-7B, with the dual scoring method as the reward signal.

A.4 Cost Calculator

We use and the batching method with an OpenAI API to prompt GPT-4o-2024-08-06 to (1) generate the gold-standard codes and variants for our iterative training; (2) conduct GPT continuous scoring method as reward signals; and (3) give evaluation results in . Table 5 provides a detailed expense breakdown, with the total cost around 204 US\$.

B Experiment Details

B.1 Training Details

Fine-tuning Details We train for 1 epoch in each iteration for preference alignment and 4 epoch for initializing SFT for sufficient training. We use the same hyperparameters for LoRA fine-tuning for training process, with $lora_r=128$, $lora_alpha=256$ and $lora_alpha=all$. The learning rates for SFT and DPO training are $2e-4$ and $2e-5$ respectively, with a global batch size of 8 and the rest following the official manual of three

MLLMs in our experiments (Liu et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a; Wang et al., 2024a).

Evaluation Details We write the evaluation script of chart-to-code generation task based on the official evaluation scripts of three MLLMs. To ensure sufficient output length for code generation, we set `max_new_tokens` to 2048 across all models.

Compute Resources Experiments were conducted on NVIDIA L40S GPU clusters. The full training process for LLaVA-v1.6-7B, including initial supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and three iterations of DPO training, takes approximately 10 hours on 2 GPUs. Training durations for InternVL2.5-2B and Qwen2-VL-7B are approximately 5 hours and 8 hours, respectively. For evaluation, processing a 500-example benchmark typically requires 1.5 to 2.5 hours for LLaVA-v1.6-7B and Qwen2-VL-7B, while InternVL2.5-2B completes the task in around 45 minutes.

Ablation Study Details The training configurations for *SFT on Gold* are identical to those used in the initial supervised fine-tuning (SFT), with the only difference being that *SFT on Gold* incorporates the generated code from all three iterations. Similarly, the parameter settings for *PL on Variants* and *PL on (Gold, Resp.)* align with those of iterative preference learning, differing only in the composition of the preference dataset.

B.2 Evaluation Metrics

Heuristic F1-based Scoring Since chart images are rendered based on code execution, ChartMimic (Shi et al., 2025) introduces a code tracer to monitor the execution process of both the ground-truth and generated code. The code tracer captures key attributes, including text, layout, type, and color information. The F1 score is computed for each of these elements, and the final score is obtained by averaging the individual F1 scores.

GPT Continuous Scoring We employ the MLLM-as-a-judge approach to generate reward scores for the generated code. Specifically, we provide both the ground-truth chart and the generated chart as input to GPT-4o, instructing it to produce a high-level similarity score ranging from 0 to 100. The prompt template follows the approach outlined in (Shi et al., 2025) and is detailed in §C.2.

B.3 Study of Chart Reasoning via Code

To investigate how plotting codes would enhance model’s performance on chart understanding and reasoning, we conduct experiments on




Figure 3: Performance of LLaVA-v1.6-7B on ChartMimic across three difficulty levels.

Setting	<i>Descriptive</i>	<i>Reasoning</i>	<i>Total</i>
Random	19.9	10.8	12.6
Image	36.0	20.0	32.8
Code1	36.0	17.0	32.2
Image + Code1	43.0	19.0	38.2
Code2	51.3	29.0	46.8
Image + Code2	48.0	27.0	43.8

Table 6: Performance of LLaVA-v1.6-7B on 500 CharXiv Samples. Code1 refers to code generated by the trained LLaVA-v1.6-7B, while Code2 is generated by GPT-4o. Random results are from (Wang et al., 2024b).

500 question-answering pairs from CharXiv (Wang et al., 2024b) using LLaVA-v1.6-7B as the base LMM. We compare three settings, this is, only inputting image, only inputting code, and inputting both. Results in 6 show that the plotting code as intermediary significantly improve model’s performance on descriptive questions, and high-quality code would further enhance chart reasoning capability. The scores for settings involving code are all higher than the input with only image, and the plotting code from GPT-4o leads to improvement on multi-step reasoning questions by a large margin. Furthermore, plotting codes bring improvements on reasoning questions that involve multiple subplots and data groups. In code setting, the model show over 50% and 30% accuracy on descriptive and reasoning questions with over two subplots. For descriptive questions, the code setting leads to the highest accuracies on the counting of lines and their intersections, group labels, and the difference between maximum and minimum values, a challenge for MLLMs (Rahmanzadehgervi et al., 2024). These findings set a precedent to bridge chart-to-code task with chart reasoning, which shed light on the future works.

Aspect	Explanation
1-st Style	While some stylistic elements such as grid lines are minimized in the AI-generated plot, it does miss out on essential stylistic elements from the reference such as specific titles, subplot numbers, legends, and edge colors on stack plots.
2-nd Layout	The reference image contains two subplots arranged side by side, whereas the AI-generated image has only one plot. This does not match the multi-plot layout of the reference.
3-rd Text	The AI-generated image includes some elements of the text content such as the main title and axis labels; however, the wording differs slightly (e.g., "21st Century Energy Changes" vs. "Energy Evolution and Total Consumption in the 21st Century"). Additionally, it excludes details like the subtitle of total energy consumption and legend titles from the reference image.
4-th Color	The AI-generated image does not include the colors specified in the reference image, nor does it expand on the color list to incorporate the new data for Wind. The absence of specific colors and lack of matching visual presentation means it does not score in this area.
5-th Data	The AI-generated image includes additional fictional data for the Wind energy source, which is not present in the reference image data. This addition results in an incorrect representation of data trends and the number of data groups when compared to the reference.

Table 7: Explanations of variants in 1-st path displayed in Figure 4.

C Prompt Template

C.1 Dataset Generation

We provide the prompts for the gold code generation and variant generation (with and without asking for detailed explanation) in this section.

C.2 Experiment Prompting

We provide the prompt templates for the Chart-to-Code task, GPT-4o scoring, and our evaluator’s scoring methodology in this section.













Dimension	Rule	Variation Path 1	Dimension	Rule	Variation Path 2
Gold-reference image			Gold-reference image		
Style	Eliminate the stylistic elements, such as legends, grids, and borders.		Data	Randomly alter the content within certain data groups while preserving the original dimensional structure.	
Layout	Randomly eliminate a subplot to simplify the overall visualization.		Layout	Switch the placement of specific subplots within the chart layout.	
Text	Randomly alter the textual elements in the chart, such as titles, axis labels, and group labels.		Style	Randomly alter the stylistic elements including legends, grids, borders, and marker types (e.g., point shapes, line styles).	
Color	Shuffle the assigned colors for each data group or type.		Text	Remove the textual elements in the chart, including axis labels, group labels, and titles.	
Data	Incorporate additional made-up data series or groups into the dataset.		Color	Apply a single color consistently across all data groups.	

Figure 4: Code variants in two variation paths given a gold-standard figure. The variation dimensions, rules and images of these variants are displayed here.

Feedback data sample from the 3-rd stage in 1-st path in Figure 4. The reference and variant images are provided to MLLMs along with this instance.

Instruction:

You are an excellent judge at evaluating visualization chart plots.

Task:

The AI-generated image is created using matplotlib code generated by a visual language model, and the reference image is created using ground truth matplotlib code. Your task is to score how well the AI-generated image matches the ground truth image.

Scoring Methodology:

The AI-generated image's score is based on the following criteria, totaling a score out of 6 points:

1. **Chart Types (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image include all chart types present in the reference image (e.g., line charts, bar charts, etc.)?
2. **Layout (1 point)** Does the arrangement of subplots in the AI-generated image match the reference image (e.g., number of rows and columns)?
3. **Text Content (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image include all text from the reference image (e.g., titles, annotations, axis labels), excluding axis tick labels?
4. **Data (1 point)** Does the data trends in the AI-generated image accurately resemble those in the reference image and is the number of data groups the same as in the reference image?
5. **Style (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image match the reference in terms of marker types (point shapes, line styles, etc.), legends, grids, and other stylistic details?
6. **Color (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image match the reference in terms of colors (line colors, fill colors, etc.)?

Evaluation:

Compare the two images head to head, assign a score of 1 or 0 for each dimension and sum them up. Provide a few lines for explanation and the rate number at last after "Final Score:".

Model Outputs:

1. **Chart Types**: The AI-generated image includes a stack plot for the energy distribution, which matches one of the chart types in the reference image. However, it lacks the second plot for total energy consumption. Therefore, it gets a full score for including the stack plot. - **Subscore**: 1
 2. **Layout**: The reference image contains two subplots arranged side by side, whereas the AI-generated image has only one plot. This does not match the multi-plot layout of the reference. - **Subscore**: 0
 3. **Text Content**: The AI-generated image includes some elements of the text content such as the main title and axis labels; however, the wording differs slightly (e.g., "21st Century Energy Changes" vs. "Energy Evolution and Total Consumption in the 21st Century"). Additionally, it excludes details like the subtitle of total energy consumption and legend titles from the reference image. - **Subscore**: 0
 4. **Data**: Although the order of the data groups (energy sources) is shuffled, the data trends in the stack plot accurately resemble those in the reference image, and the number of data groups is the same. - **Subscore**: 1
 5. **Style**: While some stylistic elements such as grid lines are minimized in the AI-generated plot, it does miss out on essential stylistic elements from the reference such as specific titles, subplot numbers, legends, and edge colors on stack plots. - **Subscore**: 0
 6. **Color**: The AI-generated image does not specify the colors clearly in the code ('colors' array is empty), and hence it does not match the color scheme in the reference image. - **Subscore**: 1
- Final score**: 3



Figure 5: Examples from three difficulty levels of ChartMimic to display the model-generated image. The base model used is LLaVA-v1.6-7B, with the dual scoring method as the reward signal.

Prompt Template of Gold Code Generation

You are good at writing and editing codes for plotting charts. As a Matplotlib expert, you are asked to write a new Python plotting script. This script will be used to generate a type-specific chart with artificial data. Here are the requirements:

1. There are several script examples from which you can draw inspiration, but try not to repeat patterns already shown in the examples to maximize diversity.
2. Use the Matplotlib library in Python for plotting. You can use auxiliary libraries such as Numpy, but make sure the code works!
3. The type of chart you need to plot is type. Therefore, everything you create must be adapted to fit this type of chart. You may consider introducing more subplots with different type(s) in this chart.
4. The topic of the chart can be anything you like.
5. Based on the given chart type and the topic you choose, you need to construct a suitable backstory, which should be reflected in the title, labels, legend, etc.
6. Based on the backstory, you need to construct contextual data inputs in the form of Python lists or Numpy arrays. Information contained in the data can be adapted as appropriate to fit the type of chart.
7. You must NOT use `random()` to construct the data, as it needs to be explicitly created regardless of your chart type and topic.
8. Be as imaginative and creative as possible in drawing the chart, both in terms of data and plotting details.

Here are some examples to consider:

```
{example 1}  
{example 2}  
{example 3}
```

Now, let's take this task step by step. First, we have to plan out the title and backstory of the chart and create data based on the above. Then, think about how you would write the entire script. Remember:

1. Avoid occlusion of visual elements. If necessary, automatically adjust the image layout before `plt.show()` using `tight layout()`.
2. Avoid overlapping of text in the chart. If the text is too long, break it into multiple lines, or change its position to avoid collapsing with other text.
3. Double-check to ensure the code works. Reduce unnecessary comments and focus on functionality.

Output your code starting with `“python”`.

Prompt Template of Variant Generation

You are good at writing and editing codes for plotting charts. As a Matplotlib expert, you are asked to change a Python plotting code in the following direction:

{rule}

Reference code:

```
“python  
{code}  
“
```

Now, let's take this task step by step. First, please read the reference code carefully and analyze the chart it draws. Then, think about how you would change this code with the given direction.

Remember:

1. If the direction involves random changing or shuffling, you should manually change the corresponding content in the code, instead of creating or calling any function. random library is NOT allowed to use in the code.
2. If the direction involves removing or eliminating, you should remove the corresponding content from the code. Any information that is not visualized in the chart is NOT allowed to be kept in the code.
3. You should avoid redundant comments and focus on the functionality.

Output your code starting with “Changed code:“python”.

Prompt Template of Variant Generation with Explanation

You are good at writing and editing codes for plotting charts. As a Matplotlib expert, you are asked to change a Python plotting code in the following direction:

{rule}

Reference code:

```
“python  
{code}  
“
```

Now, let's take this task step by step. First, please read the reference code carefully and analyze the chart it draws. Then, think about how you would change this code with the given direction.

Remember:

1. If the direction involves random changing or shuffling, you should manually change the corresponding content in the code, instead of creating or calling any function. random library is NOT allowed to use in the code.
2. If the direction involves removing or eliminating, you should remove the corresponding content from the code. Any information that is not visualized in the chart is NOT allowed to be kept in the code.
3. You should avoid redundant comments and focus on the functionality.

Output your code starting with “Changed code:“python”, and give detailed explanation for your modification starting with "Explanation for modifying {rule} aspect:".

Prompt Template of Chart-to-code Task

You are an expert Python developer who specializes in writing matplotlib code based on a given picture. I found a very nice picture in a STEM paper, but there is no corresponding source code available. I need your help to generate the Python code that can reproduce the picture based on the picture I provide.

Now, please give me the matplotlib code that reproduces the picture below, starting with "python" and ending with "".

Prompt Template of Scoring via Our Evaluator

You are an excellent judge at evaluating visualization chart plots.

Task:

The AI-generated image is created using matplotlib code generated by a visual language model, and the reference image is created using ground truth matplotlib code. Your task is to score how well the AI-generated image matches the ground truth image.

Scoring Methodology:

The AI-generated image's score is based on the following criteria, totaling a score out of 6 points:

1. **Chart Types (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image include all chart types present in the reference image (e.g., line charts, bar charts, etc.)?
2. **Layout (1 point)** Does the arrangement of subplots in the AI-generated image match the reference image (e.g., number of rows and columns)?
3. **Text Content (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image include all text from the reference image (e.g., titles, annotations, axis labels), excluding axis tick labels?
4. **Data (1 point)** Does the data trends in the AI-generated image accurately resemble those in the reference image and is the number of data groups the same as in the reference image?
5. **Style (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image match the reference in terms of marker types (point shapes, line styles, etc.), legends, grids, and other stylistic details?
6. **Color (1 point)** Does the AI-generated image match the reference in terms of colors (line colors, fill colors, etc.)?

Evaluation:

—

Comments:

- Chart Types: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Layout: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Text Content: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Data: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Style: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Color: \${your comment and subscore}
- Score: \${your final score out of 6}

—

Compare the two images head to head, assign a score of 1 or 0 for each dimension and sum them up. Provide a few lines for explanation and the rate number at last after "Final Score:".

Prompt Template of Scoring via GPT-4o

You are an excellent judge at evaluating visualization chart plots. The first image (reference image) is created using ground truth matplotlib code, and the second image (AI-generated image) is created using matplotlib code generated by an AI assistant. Your task is to score how well the AI-generated plot matches the ground truth plot.

Scoring Methodology:

The AI-generated image's score is based on the following criteria, totaling a score out of 100 points:

1. **Chart Types (20 points)** Does the AI-generated image include all chart types present in the reference image (e.g., line charts, bar charts, etc.)?
2. **Layout (10 points)** Does the arrangement of subplots in the AI-generated image match the reference image (e.g., number of rows and columns)?
3. **Text Content (20 points)** Does the AI-generated image include all text from the reference image (e.g., titles, annotations, axis labels), excluding axis tick labels?
4. **Data (20 points)** How accurately do the data trends in the AI-generated image resemble those in the original image and is the number of data groups the same as in the reference image?
5. **Style (20 points)** Does the AI-generated image match the original in terms of colors (line colors, fill colors, etc.), marker types (point shapes, line styles, etc.), legends, grids, and other stylistic details?
6. **Clarity (10 points)** Is the AI-generated image clear and free of overlapping elements?

Evaluation:

Compare the two images head to head and provide a detailed assessment. Use the following format for your response:

—

Comments:

- Chart Types: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Layout: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Text Content: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Data: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Style: \${your comment and subscore}
 - Clarity: \${your comment and subscore}
- Score: \${your final score out of 100}

—

Please use the above format to ensure the evaluation is clear and comprehensive.