

Automatic Evaluation for Text-to-image Generation: Task-decomposed Framework, Distilled Training, and Meta-evaluation Benchmark

Rong-Cheng Tu^{1*} Zi-Ao Ma^{1*} Tian Lan^{1*} Yuehao Zhao^{1*}
Heyan Huang¹ Xian-Ling Mao^{1†}

¹School of Computer Science and Technology, Beijing Institute of Technology
{turongcheng, lantiangmftby}@gmail.com maoxl@bit.edu.cn
<https://github.com/maziao/T2I-Eval>

Abstract

Driven by the remarkable progress in diffusion models, text-to-image generation has made significant strides, creating a pressing demand for automatic quality evaluation of generated images. Current state-of-the-art automatic evaluation methods heavily rely on Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs), particularly powerful commercial models like GPT-4o. While these models are highly effective, their substantial costs limit scalability in large-scale evaluations. Adopting open-source MLLMs is an alternative; however, their performance falls short due to significant limitations in processing multi-modal data compared to commercial MLLMs. To tackle these problems, we first propose a task decomposition evaluation framework based on GPT-4o to automatically construct a new training dataset, where the complex evaluation task is decoupled into simpler sub-tasks, effectively reducing the learning complexity. Based on this dataset, we design innovative training strategies to effectively distill GPT-4o’s evaluation capabilities into a 7B open-source MLLM, MiniCPM-V-2.6. Furthermore, to reliably and comprehensively assess prior works and our proposed model, we manually annotate a meta-evaluation benchmark that includes chain-of-thought explanations alongside quality scores for generated images. Experimental results demonstrate that our distilled open-source MLLM significantly outperforms the current state-of-the-art GPT-4o-base baseline, VIEScore, with over 4.6% improvement in Spearman and Kendall correlations with human judgments.

1. Introduction

The rapid advancements in diffusion models have significantly driven the progress of text-to-image generation mod-

els [7, 10, 19, 26, 30, 31, 34–36, 39]. While these models demonstrate the capability to generate highly creative visual content, the generated images often suffer from issues such as distorted appearances of major entities and incorrect alignment with the input text prompt [2, 3, 44]. Automatically evaluating these issues can not only provide effective loss functions for training generative models to enhance their performance but also filter out low-quality generated images during inference, thereby improving user experience [29, 40]. Consequently, there is an urgent need for precise and automatic evaluation methods to assess the quality and fidelity of generated images [16, 28].

To meet this need, early works like CLIP-based and BLIP-based scoring methods [32] have been used to evaluate the semantic alignment between input text and generated images, yet they still have limitations in handling complex semantic relationships [16]. Recently, pre-trained Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) [6, 12, 45, 47] have demonstrated powerful semantic understanding and reasoning capabilities, exhibiting higher correlation with human judgments [16, 28, 46]. This has promoted researchers to develop MLLM-based automatic evaluation methods. These methods typically employ simple prompts, asking MLLMs to directly assess the quality of generated images by implicitly completing multiple complex judgment tasks. However, due to the overly simplistic prompt design, the models need exceptionally advanced semantic understanding and reasoning abilities to perform the evaluation on text-to-image generation task accurately. Consequently, these methods often rely on advanced commercial models like GPT-4o [1] to achieve superior evaluation performance. The high costs associated with these models limit their applicability in large-scale evaluations. Adopting open-source MLLMs is an alternative, but due to their relatively weaker semantic understanding and reasoning abilities, they struggle to effectively handle complex evaluation tasks, resulting in poor evaluation performance.

* Equal contributions

† Corresponding author

In light of this, we aim to enhance the capability of open-source MLLMs in evaluating the quality of generated images. We argue that by decomposing the complex evaluation task into a series of simpler or fine-grained sub-tasks, open-source models can progressively complete them and accurately evaluate the qualities of generated images.

To this end, we propose a novel task-decomposed evaluation framework based on GPT-4o to automatically construct a training dataset to optimize open-source MLLMs for better evaluation performance. Specifically, this framework first adopts GPT-4o to extract entities and their intrinsic properties, and relational attributes from the input text prompt. These extracted details are used to formulate questions for detailed evaluation across three dimensions: visual appearance, intrinsic properties, and relational attributes. Next, GPT-4o answers each question based on the image and its caption, comparing the response with the ground-truth extracted from the input text to produce detailed explanations and quality scores. For each evaluation dimension, we aggregate all predicted results for the questions to provide corresponding explanations and score the dimension’s quality. Finally, by considering all evaluated dimensions, the framework delivers an overall judgment.

Based on the training dataset automatically constructed through the aforementioned framework, we propose a novel and practical paradigm to fine-tune the 7B open-source MLLM, MiniCPM-V-2.6, into a highly efficient automatic evaluation model. Additionally, to comprehensively and reliably evaluate the performance of existing baselines and our fine-tuned model, we manually annotate a meta-evaluation benchmark, which also evaluates the generated images from visual appearance, intrinsic properties and relational attributes [17, 18]. The fine-tuned model, training dataset and meta-evaluation benchmark are openly available. In a nutshell, our contributions are four-fold:

- We propose a fine-grained automatic evaluation framework that decomposes complex evaluation tasks into simpler sub-tasks. It is used to construct a high-quality training dataset, reducing the learning difficulty for open-source MLLMs.
- Based on the training dataset, we propose novel training strategies to effectively optimize the the 7B open-source MLLM, MiniCPM-V-2.6, transforming it into a remarkable image quality evaluation model.
- We manually annotate a test dataset, serving as a meta-evaluation benchmark for assessing the performance of existing evaluation methods and our distilled MLLM.
- Extensive experimental results validate the effectiveness and superiority of our proposed automatic evaluation framework and the fine-tuned evaluation model.

2. Related Work

2.1. Image Generation

In recent years, with the rapid advancement of diffusion models and large-scale image datasets [13, 14, 23, 52], text-to-image generation models [7, 30, 31, 34–36, 38, 42] have achieved remarkable progress. Pioneering works like DDPM [10] successfully trained diffusion models for image generation; Stable Diffusion [31, 36] utilized latent diffusion models to generate high-resolution images; DiT [30] adopted transformer as the backbone to construct diffusion models for high-quality images. Subsequently, an increasing number of transformer-based methods [7, 19, 26, 34, 35] have been proposed to generate high-fidelity images.

While these models [7, 30, 31, 34–36] demonstrate the capability to generate highly creative images, the outputs still suffer from distorted major entities and misalignment with text prompts. These limitations have spurred researchers to develop more precise and automated evaluation methods to assess both the quality of generated images and their correspondence to text prompts.

2.2. Evaluation of Model-generated Images

To automatically evaluate the quality of generated images, in the early years, the metrics Inception Score (IS) [37] and Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [9] were proposed to assess the the clarity and diversity of generated images by comparing them to real images. Moreover, benefiting from the the powerful feature extracting capabilities of the CLIP [32] and BLIP [20] models, the CLIP-based and BLIP-based scoring methods [8, 48] measure the consistency between generated images and corresponding text prompts, but these metrics fail to assess the complex object-level alignment. To address this issue, visual-question-answering (VQA)-based methods [24, 46, 51] are proposed. VQA-based methods first decompose the text prompt into simple questions using Large Language Models (LLMs), and then evaluate the quality of generated images by computing the accuracy of the ‘yes/no’ answers of these questions.

Recently, there is an emerging trend to leverage the reasoning capabilities of MLLMs, like GPT-4o, to directly assess the alignment between generated images and input text, exhibiting better correlation with human judgments and great interpretability [16, 28, 43]. For example, VEScore [16] evaluates the visual appearance quality of the generated images by prompting GPT-4o. However, the high cost of commercial API calls for these powerful models limits their scalability in large-scale evaluations. While open-source MLLMs offer an alternative, their limited capabilities hinder effective image quality evaluation. This limitation primarily arises from the coarse-grained and unclear prompts used in existing methods, making it challenging




Figure 1. The overview of our proposed Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework, consisting of three steps: (1) Evaluation Content Extraction and Question Generation; (2) Caption and Answer Generation; (3) Explanation and Scoring.

for open-source MLLMs to accurately interpret and assess generated content.

3. Approaches




Figure 2. Performance of MiniCPM-V-2.6 and GPT-4o on text-to-image evaluation. Self EC and GPT-4o EC represent the model uses evaluation content extracted by itself and GPT-4o, respectively. Greater values of ρ and τ indicates better performance.


<p><i>A white kitchen sink filled with dishes and eating utensils.</i></p> <p>Extracted Information:</p> <p># Structure Information</p> <p>## Intrinsic Attributes</p> <p>### Sink</p> <p>- color: white</p> <p>- material: porcelain</p> <p>### Dish</p> <p>- type: ceramic</p> <p>- color: white</p> <p>### Plate</p> <p>...</p>	<p>### Glass</p> <p>- type: clear glass</p> <p>- color: clear</p> <p>### Mug</p> <p>- type: ceramic</p> <p>- color: white</p> <p>### Bowl</p> <p>- type: ceramic</p> <p>- color: white</p> <p>### Egg Bowl</p> <p>- type: wooden bowl</p> <p>- color: brown</p> <p>### Spoons</p> <p>- type: silverware</p> <p>...</p>	<p>### Salt</p> <p>- type: container</p> <p>- color: not specified</p> <p>### Pepper</p> <p>- type: container</p> <p>- color: not specified</p> <p>### Herb</p> <p>- type: green</p> <p>- container: glass</p> <p>### Spices</p> <p>- type: container</p> <p>- color: clear</p> <p>### Glass</p> <p>- type: not specified</p> <p>...</p>	 <p>### Spoon</p> <p>- type: not specified</p> <p>- color: not specified</p> <p>### Spoon</p> <p>- type: not specified</p> <p>- color: not specified</p> <p>... (meaningless repetition)</p>
---	--	--	---

Figure 3. A bad case of evaluation content extraction step by MiniCPM-V-2.6 without fine-tuning.

In evaluating text-to-image task, two primary challenges arise: (1) identifying what to evaluate [25, 46]; and (2) de-

termining how to conduct accurate evaluation [16]. For example, as shown in Figure 1 (Step 1), given a text prompt like “a black cat standing on the hood of a white car”, models should first identify the evaluation content such as the color, quantity, visual appearance of the cat and car, as well as their relationships. Following this, the quality of these evaluation content needs to be meticulously assessed. Although advanced commercial models can effectively accomplish this task, the high cost for calling their APIs limit the scalability for large-scale text-to-image evaluation [16]. Conversely, while open-source MLLMs offer a cost-effective alternative, their performance significantly lags behind commercial models. This raises a critical question: are open-source MLLMs truly incapable of handling this task? As shown in Figure 2, our preliminary study reveals that current open-source MLLMs could achieve comparable performance to GPT-4o when the evaluation content is provided. However, their performance significantly decreases when they generate the evaluation content by themselves. The main reason is that open-source MLLMs struggle in following complex instructions to extract the evaluation content, mainly suffering from three error patterns: (1) refusal extraction; (2) content absence; and (3) repetitions. For example, as shown in Figure 3, MiniCPM-V-2.6 [50] tends to generate numerous repetitive evaluation content.¹ This suggests a critical need to enhance their ability to extract these evaluation contents.

To achieve this goal, we propose a Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework to generate a high-quality training dataset for distilling GPT-4o’s evaluation capability. As shown in Figure 1, unlike previous works that directly gen-

¹Please refer to Appendix C for more error patterns of existing open-source MLLMs.

erate evaluations [16, 28], our framework decomposes the complex evaluation task into three sequential sub-tasks: (1) Evaluation Content Extraction; (2) Caption and Answer Generation; and (3) Explanation and Scoring.

3.1. Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Content Extraction (ECE) As shown in Step 1 of Figure 1, we leverage GPT-4o [1] to systematically extract two key evaluation content from the text prompt T : entities E and attributes A . Specifically, the model identifies key nouns as the entities (e.g., cat and car) and examines their intrinsic attributes (e.g., color, quantity) and relational attributes (e.g., spatial relationships). Subsequently, three kinds of questions are elicited to cover the details about these entities and attributes: (1) **Appearance questions (Q_A)** focus on the visual quality of each involved entity; (2) **Intrinsic questions (Q_I)** evaluate the alignment between intrinsic attributes of entities in images and the text prompt; (3) **Relationship questions (Q_R)** assess the relational attributes between entities, ensuring that the image’s spatial and relational attributes align with descriptions in the text prompt. Overall, these extracted evaluation contents covers the necessary details during evaluation.

After collecting the essential evaluation content, the next step is to provide accurate evaluations with explanation and scores [16, 28]. Our preliminary study observes that directly evaluating images might lead to information leakage. For example, given the question “*What is the color of the cat*” for the text prompt “*a black cat standing on the hood of a white car*”, the MLLMs might directly give an answer “*black*”, regardless of the content in the generated image. This problem significantly affects the evaluation performance of MLLMs. To address this limitation, we first utilize GPT-4o to generate specific answers to the evaluation questions by analyzing images (Step 2 in Figure 1), followed by detailed explanations that focus on the alignment between answers and text prompt (Step 3 in Figure 1).

Caption and Answer Generation (CAG) As shown in Step 2 in Figure 1, GPT-4o is first asked to generate detailed captions C for the image I , enhancing the understanding of the evaluated image. Based on the captions and image, detailed answers ($Ans.$) are generated to describe details in the image I for questions (Q_A, Q_I, Q_R).

Explanation and Scoring (E&S) As shown in Step 3 in Figure 1, we employ GPT-4o to generate a brief chain-of-thought explanation $Exp.$ and judgment score S for each question, assessing the alignment between answers and extracted evaluation content. The judgment score ranges from 0 to 10, where higher scores indicate better performance. Additionally, since the visual appearance questions don’t have ground-truth answers, we directly prompt GPT-4o to




Figure 4. The relationship between task decomposition evaluation framework and fine-tuning sub-tasks.

generate a judgment score given the generated answers. Finally, an overall explanation $Exp_{sum.}$ and judgment score $S_{sum.}$ are generated, reflecting the overall quality of the evaluated image.

In summary, we decompose the text-to-image evaluation task into three fine-grained sub-tasks, significantly reducing its complexity. Therefore, the training dataset constructed with this framework will be easy for the open-source MLLMs to learn from, effectively enhancing their image quality evaluation capabilities.

3.2. Training Strategy

After using our proposed evaluation framework to generate numerous samples for constructing the training dataset, we encounter two critical challenges in effectively fine-tuning open-source MLLMs. First, as illustrated in Figure 4, our training samples exhibit much longer evaluations than previous works [16] due to the multiple question-answers and detailed explanations. It introduces challenges for optimization, as critical information may become obscured within lengthy sequences. Second, the dataset suffers from distribution imbalances, primarily in sub-task distribution imbalance and score distribution imbalance, which will significantly affect the effectiveness of training.

Therefore, to address the first issue, we introduce the **Fine-grained Sub-tasks Training Strategy** (Sec-

tion 3.2.1), which decomposes complex and lengthy samples into multiple fine-grained sub-tasks for joint learning, ensuring that critical evaluation information remains prominent throughout the training. Then to mitigate the data imbalance problem, we propose a **Data Rebalance Training Strategy** (Section 3.2.2), ensuring a more uniform distribution of training data, thereby enhancing the robustness and performance of the fine-tuned model.

3.2.1 Fine-grained Sub-tasks Training Strategy

As shown in Figure 4, we formulate a training sample into several fine-grained sub-task samples from ① to ⑥. Each one is formatted into a single- or multi-turn conversation, aiming to enhance one specific capability of MLLMs for evaluation.

Evaluation Content Extraction (①) aims to enhance the ability of open-source MLLMs to extract three types of essential information from the text prompt T and evaluated image I : entities E , attributes A , three kinds of questions (Q_A, Q_I, Q_R) and detailed caption C by optimizing this loss function:

$$L_1 = \text{MLLM}(E, A, (Q_A, Q_I, Q_R), C|T, I) \quad (1)$$

Individual Answer Generation (②) aims to fine-tune MLLMs for predicting the detailed answers for questions given the evaluated image I . During experiments, it is challenging for open-source MLLMs to directly generate answers for all questions due to their limited capabilities. Considering that answers to each question are independent, we simplify the optimization by training MLLMs to predict the answer for each question individually, and optimize the following loss function:

$$L_2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MLLM}(Ans_i|I, Q_i) \quad (2)$$

where Q_i, Ans_i represent the i -th pair of question and answer, and N represent the sum of the numbers of the appearance, intrinsic and relationship questions.

Explanation and Scoring (③ and ④) enables MLLMs to generate the detailed explanations and judgment scores, assessing the alignment between the answers and the text prompt. However, since explanations typically involve much more tokens than scoring, the loss of explanation disproportionately influences this training process when they are jointly optimized, resulting in insufficient learning for score prediction, thus compromising the model’s scoring accuracy. To address this problem, we further separate

the learning of explanation and scoring into two more fine-grained sub-tasks. Specifically, we first optimize the explanation generation:

$$L_3 = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MLLM}(Exp_i|T, Q_i, Ans_i) \quad (3)$$

Then, MLLMs are trained to predict the judgment scores given the explanations:

$$L_4 = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MLLM}(S_i|T, Q_i, Ans_i, Exp_i) \quad (4)$$

Summarization (⑤ and ⑥) As shown in Figure 4, we finally train open-source MLLMs to summarize a final explanation rationale across three evaluation dimensions: visual appearance quality, accuracy of entities and attributes, as well as the relationship alignment.

$$L_5 = \text{MLLM}(Exp_{sum}|\{Exp_i, S_i\}_{i=1}^N) \quad (5)$$

Then, the overall judgment score is predicted:

$$L_6 = \text{MLLM}(S_{sum}|\{Exp_i, S_i\}_{i=1}^N, Exp_{sum}.) \quad (6)$$

During training, samples of these sub-tasks are randomly collected to optimize their corresponding loss functions.

3.2.2 Data Rebalance Training Strategy

We propose two rebalance strategies to reduce the effects of the imbalanced data distribution problems: sub-task distribution imbalance, and score distribution imbalance.

Sub-task Rebalance In our dataset, there are multiple questions associated with each sample, resulting in a significantly higher number of answers and explanations compared to extractions and summarizations. To rectify this imbalance, we maintain the existing number of answers and explanations, while increasing the volume of extraction and summarization samples by augmenting them through repetition.

Score Distribution Rebalance A notable issue in our constructed dataset is the imbalance in score distribution. For example, the number of images with the quality score of 9 is approximately 5.9k, accounting for 42.8% of all images, and is significantly more than other quality scores.² This issue introduces severe bias during fine-tuning, causing distilled open-source MLLMs to be more inclined to assign higher scores to generated images. To solve this problem, we duplicate and re-sample the training samples that are underrepresented, ensuring an equal number of samples across each score range from 0 to 10.

²Please refer to the detailed score distribution analysis in Appendix D.2.

4. Training Set and Human-Annotated Test Set

In this section, we elaborate the details for constructing the training set and our human-annotated test set.

4.1. Training Set Construction

The construction of the training set involves two key phases: (1) text-to-image generation; and (2) text-to-image evaluation.

Text-to-image Generation The text prompts and their corresponding evaluated images are collected in this phase. Specifically, the text prompts for image generation are sourced from two places: (1) 9k samples from the COCO dataset [22]; and (2) 5k samples generated by GPT-4o. To ensure diversity in image quality, we employ three widely-used models to generate images for each text prompt: SD1.5 [36], SDXL [31], and SD3 [7]. Subsequently, for each text prompt, one image is randomly selected for evaluation from the generated images, with selection probabilities of 50% for SD1.5, and 25% each for SDXL and SD3. This results in a final dataset comprising 14k pairs of text prompts and generated images.

Text-to-image Evaluation Each text prompt and its corresponding image are processed by GPT-4o to obtain detailed evaluations, following our proposed framework described in Section 3.1.

4.2. Human-Annotated Meta-Evaluation

To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no fine-grained, score-based benchmark that comprehensively and reliably evaluates the capability of existing models in assessing text-to-image generation.³ To address this gap, in addition to constructing the training set, we have developed a high-quality meta-evaluation benchmark through human annotations. Specifically, three human annotators are asked to annotate the evaluations for each pair of text prompt and image, following our proposed task decomposition evaluation framework. The annotated judgment scores provide the basis for objective evaluation, helping to assess the correlation between model outputs and human judgments. Furthermore, the annotated textual explanations serve as reference explanations for reliable automatic subjective evaluation [18], which helps assess the accuracy of the models. More details about our human annotation process can be found in Appendix B.

³Although Gecko [46] provides a benchmark, it is currently unavailable.

5. Experiments

5.1. Evaluation Metrics

In line with prior studies [16, 18, 41, 49], we conduct both objective and subjective evaluations to assess the effectiveness of our evaluation model and the baseline methods. The objective evaluation measures the correlation scores between model predictions and human judgments, whereas the subjective evaluation assesses the quality of the chain-of-thought textual evaluations.

Objective Evaluation Following previous works [18, 27, 55], Spearman (ρ) [53] and Kendall (τ) [15] correlations are computed to reflect the correlation between the assessments of evaluation model and human judgments, where higher correlation scores denotes better reliability of evaluation models. In this paper, we report the the model’s correlation scores with each human annotator and human average.

Subjective Evaluation As in recent works [18, 41], we use our human-annotated explanations as the references to assist GPT-4o model in determining whether the model-generated chain-of-thought evaluations aligns with human annotations:

$$S_{\text{sub.}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{GPT-4o}(\mathcal{P}, Q_i, \text{Exp}_i^{\text{ref.}}, \text{Exp}_i^{\text{gen.}}) \quad (7)$$

where $\text{Exp}_i^{\text{ref.}}$, $\text{Exp}_i^{\text{gen.}}$ represent the reference and model-generated explanations, respectively. \mathcal{P} is the subjective evaluation prompt, guiding GPT-4o to generate subjective scores ranging from 0 to 5. The final subjective score is the average of all these scores. For more details on the implementation of the subjective evaluation, please refer to Appendix H.

5.2. Overall Comparison Results

To validate the effectiveness of our fine-tuned MiniCPM-V-2.6 in assessing generated image quality, we compared it with existing state-of-the-art methods using Spearman correlation (ρ) and Kendall correlation (τ) scores with human judgments, as shown in Table 1. Based on these results, we identify the following key findings: (1) Our fine-tuned MiniCPM-V-2.6 demonstrates the best performance in the automatic assessment of generated image quality, surpassing existing GPT-4o-based methods overall. For instance, compared to the best-performing competitor, VIEScore_{GPT-4o} [25], our fine-tuned MiniCPM-V-2.6 model achieves over 4.6% improvement in both Spearman and Kendall correlations with human judgments. (2) Our fine-tuned MiniCPM-V-2.6 also outperforms Our_{GPT-4o}

Table 1. Comparison of previous methods and ours on the test set, with top scores (excluding human annotators) in **bold**. Methods marked with * use GPT-4o-distilled fine-tuned models. Details of the training set for VIEScore can be found in Appendix F.

Category	Method	Manual-1		Manual-2		Manual-3		Manual-Avg.	
		ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ
Upper Bound	Manual-Avg.	0.9511	0.8807	0.9452	0.8686	0.9513	0.8793	-	-
Traditional	FID	-0.1183	-0.0871	-0.1000	-0.0724	-0.0897	-0.0685	-0.1231	-0.0862
	LPIPS	-0.1206	-0.0898	-0.0882	-0.0644	-0.1025	-0.0732	-0.1244	-0.0856
	DreamSim	-0.1284	-0.0953	-0.1230	-0.0897	-0.1308	-0.0973	-0.1382	-0.0968
	CLIPScore	0.1532	0.1078	0.1725	0.1210	0.1227	0.0855	0.1505	0.1016
	BLIPv2Score	0.2278	0.1588	0.2280	0.1617	0.2134	0.1477	0.2152	0.1423
	ImageReward	0.4171	0.3065	0.3712	0.2690	0.4134	0.3030	0.4046	0.2839
LLM-based & MLLM-Based	LLMScore _{GPT-4}	0.3009	0.2212	0.2697	0.2012	0.3299	0.2497	0.3096	0.2228
	DSG _{dependent}	0.4742	0.3790	0.4204	0.3339	0.4562	0.3652	0.4582	0.3512
	DSG _{independent}	0.4815	0.3891	0.4382	0.3502	0.4721	0.3827	0.4704	0.3655
	VQAScore _{CLIP-FlanT5}	0.4984	0.3768	0.4864	0.3619	0.5118	0.3854	0.5116	0.3712
	VIEScore _{MiniCPM-V-2.6}	0.2834	0.2251	0.2814	0.2231	0.3016	0.2422	0.2941	0.2250
	VIEScore _{MiniCPM-V-2.6*}	0.4906	0.3878	0.4869	0.3836	0.4889	0.3899	0.5101	0.3897
	VIEScore _{GPT-4o}	0.5522	0.4283	0.5306	0.4101	0.5170	0.4024	0.5545	0.4170
Our Framework	Ours _{GPT-4o}	0.5437	0.4302	0.5355	0.4214	0.5138	0.4061	0.5566	0.4285
	Ours _{MiniCPM-V-2.6*}	0.5334	0.4192	0.5946	0.4644	0.5537	0.4348	0.5802	0.4409

Table 2. Correlation scores with human judgments of ablation study on task decomposition evaluation framework with GPT-4o.

Methods	ρ	τ
w/o Extraction	0.3322	0.2497
w/o Captioning	0.4586	0.3487
w/o Answering	0.4842	0.3564
CAG and E&S Merged	0.4036	0.3141
Ours	0.5048	0.3816

in overall evaluation performance, indicating that our innovative training strategies effectively distill the evaluation capabilities of GPT-4o into MiniCPM-V-2.6. This advantage may stem from our balanced training approach, enabling MiniCPM-V-2.6 to learn a more comprehensive evaluation capability. (3) VIEScore_{GPT-4o} significantly outperforms VIEScore_{MiniCPM-V-2.6}. This result supports our assumption that open-source MLLMs have relatively weaker capabilities in semantic understanding and reasoning abilities, leading to a poor evaluation performance. (4) Ours_{MiniCPM-V-2.6*} achieves better evaluation performance than VIEScore_{MiniCPM-V-2.6*}, demonstrating that decomposing the complex evaluation framework into simpler sub-tasks enables open-source MLLMs to learn more effectively, thereby achieving superior evaluation results.

5.3. Ablation Study on Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework

To verify the effectiveness of each component in our fine-grained evaluation framework and assess their impact on overall performance, we conducted ablation studies based

on 150 examples randomly sampled from our annotated meta-evaluation benchmark. Specifically, we designed the following three variants to compare with the full framework. (1) **w/o Extraction**: in the ECE step, GPT-4o does not extract structure information but directly propose questions based on the text, and then in the E&S step, GPT-4o directly scores based on the input text and the answer from the CAG step. (2) **w/o Captioning**: in CAG step, GPT-4o directly answers the questions based on the image without image caption generation. (3) **w/o Answering**: GPT-4o directly score the question without generating the answer or explanation. (4) **CAG and E&S Merged**: The CAG and E&S steps are combined into one step.

As shown in Table 2, the decreasing performance highlights the necessity of each design in our framework: (1) Compared to the “w/o Extraction” variant, our fine-grained evaluation framework achieves significantly improved evaluation performance. This demonstrates that extracting entities and attributes from the text helps models focus on essential evaluation content, leading to more accurate assessments. (2) the decreasing performance of the variant ‘w/o Captioning’ demonstrates that that when GPT-4o answers questions without first generating an image caption, it may overlook important details of image entities, leading to inaccurate responses and damaging the evaluation performance. (3) Compared to the “w/o Answering” variant, our framework achieves 17% and 40% increases in Spearman ρ and Kendall τ correlations, respectively. This shows that generating detailed answers before scoring prompts the model to analyze the image more deeply, enhancing evaluation performance; (4) The performance of “CAG and E&S




Figure 5. Improved results in fine-tuned MLLMs over base models’ zero-shot results. ρ, τ are the correlation scores with human judgments. Red arrows show improvement ratio.

Merged” variant also drops significantly. When the “CAG” and “E&S” steps are merged, the model gains direct access to the input text prompt when answering questions, leading to information leakage. Consequently, the model may rely on the text prompt rather than the image content, resulting in incorrect answers and reduced evaluation performance.

5.4. Effectiveness of Fine-tuning

5.4.1 Effectiveness of Our Training Corpus

To validate the effectiveness of our constructed training corpus in enhancing the evaluation capabilities of MLLMs, we selected two MLLMs—InternVL2-8B [4] and MiniCPM-V-2.6 [50]—to compare their evaluation performance before and after fine-tuning. Experimental settings are provided in Appendix E, and the results are shown in Figure 5.

These experimental results show that after fine-tuning on our constructed training corpus, both models exhibit significant improvements across all evaluation metrics. For instance, InternVL2-8B achieved a 20.5% increase in ρ , and MiniCPM-V-2.6 improved by 28.6% in τ . These findings demonstrate the general applicability of our constructed dataset in effectively enhancing the evaluation capabilities of MLLMs.

5.4.2 Contributions to Subjective Evaluation

We evaluated the impact of our fine-tuning strategy in improving the quality of textual explanations in evaluations. We conducted a detailed analysis based on the subjective evaluation metric across three aspects: appearance quality, intrinsic consistency, and relationship consistency, and also give the overall evaluation score.

As illustrated in Figure 6, both InternVL2-8B and MiniCPM-V-2.6 show significant improvements in appearance quality, intrinsic consistency and overall scores after fine-tuning. These enhancements confirm the effectiveness of our fine-tuning approach in refining specific aspects of the text-to-image evaluation process. However, there is a slight decline in the relationship consistency scores post-fine-tuning. This reduction can be attributed to the imbal-




Figure 6. Quality scores of subjective evaluation before and after fine-tuning.

Table 3. Correlation scores with human judgments of ablation study on training strategies with MiniCPM-V-2.6.

Methods	ρ	τ
w/o Individual QA	0.3919	0.3030
w/o E&S Separation	0.4816	0.3609
w/o Score Balancing	0.4769	0.3596
Ours	0.5802	0.4409

ance in training data, with fewer questions related to relationship consistency compared to the other two categories, thus limiting the model’s ability to improve in this category.

5.4.3 Ablation Study on Training Strategies

To evaluate the effectiveness of the components in our fine-grained sub-tasks training strategy, we proposed three ablation variants: (1) **w/o Individual QA**: the MLLM generates the responses for all extracted questions at once instead of answering each question individually; (2) **w/o E&S Separation**: the MLLM produces joint explanations and scores in a single output rather than generating them separately; (3) **w/o Score Balancing**: the variant is trained on the dataset without rebalancing the ratio of sub-tasks, high and low score questions.

Based on the experimental results shown in Table 3, we derive the following insights: (1) **Importance of Individual Question Answering**: Compared to the “w/o Individual QA” variant, our fine-tuned MiniCPM-V-2.6 achieves over 50% improvement in Spearman and Kendall correlations with human judgments. This indicates that addressing questions individually prevents interference among them, enhancing the model’s ability to answer accurately. (2) **Effect of Explanation and Scoring Separation**: Fine-tuning with our distilling framework yields better evaluation performance than the “w/o E&S Separation” variant, supporting our assumption that the explanation loss dominates the training process and limits learning for score prediction, thereby reducing the model’s scoring accuracy. (3) **Necessity of Score Balancing**: The results of ours are better than that of the variant “w/o Score Balancing”, demonstrating the critical importance of training on a balanced dataset. An

imbalanced dataset can result in the model overfitting to the more prevalent scores, causing biased predictions and diminishing the effectiveness of the evaluation.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a task decomposition evaluation framework for text-to-image generation, aimed at constructing a high-quality training dataset. On top of that, we introduce two training strategies designed to effectively distill the evaluation capabilities of GPT-4o into open-source MLLMs: Fine-grained Sub-tasks and Data Rebalance. Furthermore, we establish a comprehensive and reliable benchmark to assess the effectiveness of both our distilled models and existing strong baselines. Extensive experiment results demonstrate that our distilled evaluation model significantly outperforms existing metrics for text-to-image evaluation, exhibiting higher correlation with human judgments.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 1, 4
- [2] Hanqun Cao, Cheng Tan, Zhangyang Gao, Yilun Xu, Guangyong Chen, Pheng-Ann Heng, and Stan Z Li. A survey on generative diffusion models. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024. 1
- [3] Pu Cao, Feng Zhou, Qing Song, and Lu Yang. Controllable generation with text-to-image diffusion models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04279*, 2024. 1
- [4] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jiapeng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. How far are we to gpt-4v? closing the gap to commercial multimodal models with open-source suites. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16821*, 2024. 8
- [5] Tri Dao. FlashAttention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024. 3
- [6] Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Xilin Wei, Songyang Zhang, Haodong Duan, Maosong Cao, Wenwei Zhang, Yining Li, Hang Yan, Yang Gao, Xinyue Zhang, Wei Li, Jingwen Li, Kai Chen, Conghui He, Xingcheng Zhang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. Internlm-xcomposer2: Mastering free-form text-image composition and comprehension in vision-language large model, 2024. 1
- [7] Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, Dustin Podell, Tim Dockhorn, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Alex Goodwin, Yan-nik Marek, and Robin Rombach. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis, 2024. 1, 2, 6
- [8] Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. Clipscore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08718*, 2021. 2
- [9] Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 2
- [10] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models, 2020. 1, 2
- [11] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021. 3
- [12] Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Yuxiang Huang, Weilin Zhao, Xinrong Zhang, Zheng Leng Thai, Kaihuo Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Yuan Yao, Chenyang Zhao, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Zhongwu Zhai, Ning Ding, Chao Jia, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Minicpm: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies, 2024. 1
- [13] Tero Karras, Timo Aila, Samuli Laine, and Jaakko Lehtinen. Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation, 2018. 2
- [14] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks, 2019. 2
- [15] Maurice George Kendall. Rank correlation methods. 1948. 6
- [16] Max Ku, Dongfu Jiang, Cong Wei, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. Viescore: Towards explainable metrics for conditional image synthesis evaluation, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6
- [17] Tian Lan, Wenwei Zhang, Chengqi Lyu, Shuaibin Li, Chen Xu, Heyan Huang, Dahua Lin, Xian-Ling Mao, and Kai Chen. Training language models to critique with multi-agent feedback, 2024. 2
- [18] Tian Lan, Wenwei Zhang, Chen Xu, Heyan Huang, Dahua Lin, Kai Chen, and Xian ling Mao. Criticeval: Evaluating large language model as critic, 2024. 2, 6, 1
- [19] Daiqing Li, Aleks Kamko, Ehsan Akhgari, Ali Sabet, Linmiao Xu, and Suhail Doshi. Playground v2.5: Three insights towards enhancing aesthetic quality in text-to-image generation, 2024. 1, 2
- [20] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. 2
- [21] Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca_eval, 2023. 1
- [22] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence

- Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 6
- [23] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, Lubomir Bourdev, Ross Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Piotr Dollár. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context, 2015. 2
- [24] Zhiqiu Lin, Deepak Pathak, Baiqi Li, Jiayao Li, Xide Xia, Graham Neubig, Pengchuan Zhang, and Deva Ramanan. Evaluating text-to-visual generation with image-to-text generation, 2024. 2
- [25] Zhiqiu Lin, Deepak Pathak, Baiqi Li, Jiayao Li, Xide Xia, Graham Neubig, Pengchuan Zhang, and Deva Ramanan. Evaluating text-to-visual generation with image-to-text generation. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2024 - 18th European Conference, Milan, Italy, September 29–October 4, 2024, Proceedings, Part IX*, pages 366–384. Springer, 2024. 3, 6
- [26] Bingchen Liu, Ehsan Akhgari, Alexander Visheratin, Aleks Kamko, Linmiao Xu, Shivam Shrirao, Chase Lambert, Joao Souza, Suhail Doshi, and Daiqing Li. Playground v3: Improving text-to-image alignment with deep-fusion large language models, 2024. 1, 2
- [27] Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. G-eval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment, 2023. 6
- [28] Yujie Lu, Xianjun Yang, Xiujuan Li, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. Llm-score: Unveiling the power of large language models in text-to-image synthesis evaluation, 2023. 1, 2, 4
- [29] Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, Xu Jiang, Karl Cobbe, Tyna Eloundou, Gretchen Krueger, Kevin Button, Matthew Knight, Benjamin Chess, and John Schulman. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback, 2022. 1
- [30] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers, 2023. 1, 2
- [31] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis, 2023. 1, 2, 6
- [32] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1, 2
- [33] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–16. IEEE, 2020. 3
- [34] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation, 2021. 1, 2
- [35] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents, 2022. 2
- [36] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, 2022. 1, 2, 6
- [37] Tim Salimans, Ian Goodfellow, Wojciech Zaremba, Vicki Cheung, Alec Radford, and Xi Chen. Improved techniques for training gans. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016. 2
- [38] Xincheng Shuai, Henghui Ding, Xingjun Ma, Rongcheng Tu, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Dacheng Tao. A survey of multimodal-guided image editing with text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14555*, 2024. 2
- [39] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models, 2022. 1
- [40] Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Daniel M. Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul Christiano. Learning to summarize from human feedback, 2022. 1
- [41] Shichao Sun, Junlong Li, Weizhe Yuan, Ruifeng Yuan, Wenjie Li, and Pengfei Liu. The critique of critique, 2024. 6, 1
- [42] Wenhao Sun, Rong-Cheng Tu, Jingyi Liao, and Dacheng Tao. Diffusion model-based video editing: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07111*, 2024. 2
- [43] Zhiyu Tan, Xiaomeng Yang, Luozheng Qin, Mengping Yang, Cheng Zhang, and Hao Li. Evalalign: Supervised fine-tuning multimodal llms with human-aligned data for evaluating text-to-image models, 2024. 2
- [44] Yixin Wan, Arjun Subramonian, Anaelia Ovalle, Zongyu Lin, Ashima Suvarna, Christina Chance, Hritik Bansal, Rebecca Pattichis, and Kai-Wei Chang. Survey of bias in text-to-image generation: Definition, evaluation, and mitigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01030*, 2024. 1
- [45] 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. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution, 2024. 1
- [46] Olivia Wiles, Chuhan Zhang, Isabela Albuquerque, Ivana Kajić, Su Wang, Emanuele Bugliarello, Yasumasa Onoe, Chris Knutsen, Cyrus Rashtchian, Jordi Pont-Tuset, and Aida Nematzadeh. Revisiting text-to-image evaluation with gecko: On metrics, prompts, and human ratings, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [47] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-gpt: Any-to-any multimodal llm, 2024. 1
- [48] Xiaoshi Wu, Yiming Hao, Keqiang Sun, Yixiong Chen, Feng Zhu, Rui Zhao, and Hongsheng Li. Human preference score v2: A solid benchmark for evaluating human preferences of text-to-image synthesis, 2023. 2
- [49] Chen Xu, Tian Lan, Changlong Yu, Wei Wang, Jun Gao, Yu Ji, Qunxi Dong, Kun Qian, Piji Li, Wei Bi, and Bin Hu. Decider: A dual-system rule-controllable decoding framework for language generation, 2024. 6

- [50] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, et al. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01800*, 2024. [3](#), [8](#)
- [51] Michal Yarom, Yonatan Bitton, Soravit Changpinyo, Roei Aharoni, Jonathan Herzig, Oran Lang, Eran Ofek, and Idan Szpektor. What you see is what you read? improving text-image alignment evaluation, 2023. [2](#)
- [52] Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier. From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2:67–78, 2014. [2](#)
- [53] Jerrold H Zar. Spearman rank correlation. *Encyclopedia of biostatistics*, 7, 2005. [6](#)
- [54] Yuze Zhao, Jintao Huang, Jinghan Hu, Xingjun Wang, Yunlin Mao, Daoze Zhang, Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhikai Wu, Baole Ai, Ang Wang, Wenmeng Zhou, and Yingda Chen. Swift:a scalable lightweight infrastructure for fine-tuning, 2024. [3](#)
- [55] Ming Zhong, Yang Liu, Da Yin, Yuning Mao, Yizhu Jiao, Pengfei Liu, Chenguang Zhu, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. Towards a unified multi-dimensional evaluator for text generation, 2022. [6](#)

Automatic Evaluation for Text-to-image Generation: Task-decomposed Framework, Distilled Training, and Meta-evaluation Benchmark

Supplementary Material

A. Limitations

A.1. Differences between Task Decomposition Framework and Fine-tuning Strategy

As illustrated in Figure 4, the process of the **Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework** for dataset construction differs from the **Fine-grained Sub-tasks Training Strategy** used in optimizing the open-sourced MLLM. This discrepancy arises from two main reasons. Firstly, the dataset construction framework cannot be directly applied to fine-tune open-source MLLMs, as previously discussed in Section 3.2. Secondly, constructing datasets using fine-grained sub-tasks for fine-tuning would be inefficient because the repeated input of images and instructions for each text-image pair significantly increases the cost of dataset construction with GPT-4o. Therefore, the adaptation of the evaluation framework represents a compromise between the financial costs associated with commercial models and the performance limitations of open-source MLLMs.

A.2. Limitations in Subjective Evaluation

In this paper, we leverage GPT-4o automatically evaluate the quality of chain-of-thought explanations in evaluations, *i.e.*, the subjective evaluation. Following previous works [18, 41], we leverage the human-annotated explanations to improve the reliability of using GPT-4o for subjective evaluation, which serves as the references for judging quality and alignment of model-generated explanations. However, it should be noted that the reliability of GPT-4’s subjective evaluations has not yet been effectively validated, and we will supplement this part of the experiment as soon as possible. Meanwhile, GPT-4o-based subjective evaluation introduces additional costs. The cost for calling GPT-4 API on our meta-evaluation dataset is no more than \$5, which is comparable to numerous established benchmarks, like AlpacaEval [21]. Therefore, it is affordable to conduct the subjective evaluation on our proposed meta-evaluation benchmark.

B. Meta-Evaluation Annotation

In this paper, we manually annotate a high-quality meta-evaluation benchmark for assessing the effectiveness of our distilled model and strong baseline models, like VEScore [16] and LLMscore [28]. Specifically, three human annotators are asked to conduct three steps in our proposed Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework to generate the detailed evaluations for each pair of text prompt and model-

generated image: (1) Evaluation Content Extraction: (2) Caption and Answer Generation: (3) Explanation and Scoring: The annotation guidelines for each step are the same as the our designed prompts detailed in Appendix J. The statistical information of our human-annotated meta-evaluation benchmark is shown in Appendix D.1.

C. Bad Cases of Evaluation Content Extraction

Due to the limitations of the comprehension and instruction-following capabilities of small-sized open-source MLLMs which are not fine-tuned on specific tasks, the **Evaluation Content Extraction** cannot be performed successfully under many circumstances. For example, MiniCPM-V-2.6 was confronted with various problems in this step: (1) Refusal: The model refuses to extract evaluation content, as illustrated in Figure 7. (2) Content Absence: There is ab-




Figure 7. Bad case of refusal for evaluation content extraction.

sence of some essential part in the extracted evaluation content, as illustrated in Figure 8. (3) Repetition: The generated text falls into a loop, as illustrated in Figure 3.

D. Dataset Statistics

D.1. Basic Statistics

The statistics of extracted evaluation content in training and test set are listed in Table 4.

In our experiments, the text prompts in the dataset originate from two sources: the COCO dataset and LLM-generated prompts. We employed three generative models to create images based on these prompts: SD1.5, SDXL, and SD3. The distribution of the sources of textual prompts and the generative models used for the images in the dataset is illustrated in Figure 9.




Figure 8. Bad case of content absence. Questions are missing in the extracted content. Meanwhile, the format of the image caption chapter is also incorrect in this case.

Item	Training Set	Test Set
Text-Image Pairs	13,698	301
Entities	30,465	728
Relationships	15,441	393
Questions	109,691	2,520
- Appearance	30,225	692
- Intrinsic	63,532	1,435
- Relationship	15,934	393

Table 4. Basic statistics of train set.




Figure 9. Distribution of generated images.

D.2. Score Distribution of Training Set

The score distribution in the raw training data is extremely imbalanced, manifested by the highest number of samples in the high score segments, followed by samples with score of 0, and fewer samples in the middle score segments. For




Figure 10. Training set distribution within the score range. The red curve represents the distribution of fine-grained training samples and blue for coarse-grained samples. The sample size is counted in thousands (k).

fine-grained data, samples with a score of 9 account for over 45% of all appearance samples, while samples with a score of 10 account for over 70% and 80% of all intrinsic and relational samples, respectively. The degree of imbalance in coarse-grained samples is slightly lighter, but there is still a serious imbalance in the distribution of scores. We set the target quantity for each score segment to the third quartile of the sample size for all score segments. The samples in the segments with less than the target quantity will be repeated multiple times, while the samples in the segments with more than the target quantity will be randomly sampled.

D.3. Sub-task Distribution of Training Set

Sub-task	Data Volume
Extraction	109,584
Answer & Evaluation	128,732
- Appearance	42,470
- Intrinsic	59,400
- Relationship	26,862
Summarization	198,420
- Appearance	50,782
- Intrinsic	51,068
- Relationship	40,420
- Overall	56,150
Total	436,736

Table 5. Data distribution across sub-tasks.

After addressing the issue of score imbalance in the train

Table 6. Results of ablation study on task decomposition evaluation framework with GPT-4o.

Methods	Manual-1		Manual-2		Manual-3		Manual-Avg.	
	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ
w/o Extraction	0.3181	0.2471	0.3281	0.2544	0.2969	0.2336	0.3322	0.2497
w/o Captioning	0.4276	0.3359	0.4563	0.3575	0.4353	0.3413	0.4586	0.3487
w/o Answering	0.4514	0.3431	0.4731	0.3563	0.4447	0.3391	0.4842	0.3564
w/o Decomposition	0.3508	0.2822	0.3643	0.2898	0.3547	0.2850	0.3675	0.2853
new ablation	0.3874	0.3078	0.3723	0.2967	0.3852	0.3086	0.4036	0.3141
Ours	0.4824	0.3774	0.4903	0.3773	0.4630	0.3588	0.5048	0.3816

Table 7. Results of ablation study on training strategies with MiniCPM-V-2.6.

Methods	Manual-1		Manual-2		Manual-3		Manual-Avg.	
	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ
w/o Individual QA	0.3802	0.3068	0.3752	0.2990	0.3688	0.2958	0.3919	0.3030
w/o E&S Separation	0.4755	0.3654	0.4582	0.3517	0.4684	0.3643	0.4816	0.3609
w/o Score Balancing	0.4830	0.3780	0.4588	0.3548	0.4614	0.3657	0.4769	0.3596
Ours	0.5306	0.4214	0.6067	0.4769	0.5744	0.4563	0.5938	0.4566

set, there still exists sample imbalance between sub-tasks. As shown in Table 4, the number of fine-grained questions is approximately 8 times that of text image pairs. Therefore, we replicate the samples of coarse-grained sub-tasks to maintain a relatively balanced data distribution between fine-grained and coarse-grained samples. The data volume of each sub-task is listed in Table 5.

E. Fine-tuning Settings

We fine-tune the open-source MLLMs InternVL2-8B and MiniCPM-V-2.6 to serve as the automatic evaluation model. To ensure the fine-tuned model effectively captures the comprehensive information embedded in the training corpus, we set the context length to 4,096 tokens during fine-tuning, accommodating the majority of samples within the dataset. To optimize the computational efficiency and uphold the performance of the fine-tuned model, we employed Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [11] with the rank of 128 and α of 256. Apart from that, we adopt various methods to accelerate training including ZeRO [33] and Flash Attention 2 [5]. The model training was conducted on 4 Nvidia A100-SXM4-80GB GPUs with a global batch size of 128 over a single epoch, resulting in a total of 3.4 k training steps. All models are fine-tuned with SWIFT framework [54].

F. Fine-tuning for VIEScore

To investigate whether the evaluation framework of VIEScore is suitable for distilling the capabilities of powerful commercial MLLMs into smaller open-source models, we utilized GPT-4o to generate evaluation content in the format of VIEScore on 14k image-text pairs from our train-

ing set. This resulted in a dataset intended for distilling the abilities of GPT-4o into open-source models. We fine-tuned MiniCPM-V-2.6 using this dataset, and the majority of the fine-tuning settings were completely consistent with those used in the fine-tuning our method (as mentioned in Appendix E). Specifically, we increased the number of training epochs from 1 to 3 to ensure that the amount of data learned by the model is comparable to that in our method.

G. Complete Results of Ablation Studies

Here, we present the complete versions of Table 2 and 3 in the main text. Consistent with the conclusions drawn in the main text, it can be observed that utilizing the complete versions of **Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework** and **Fine-grained Sub-tasks Training Strategy** for image quality evaluation consistently outperforms their respective variants. This demonstrates that all the proposed components contribute significantly to the accurate assessment of generated image quality.

H. Subjective Evaluation

The prompt for fine-grained and coarse-grained GPT-4o-based subjective evaluation are shown in Figure 11 and Figure 12, which asks GPT-4o to assess the quality of model-generated evaluation explanations given the human-annotated one as reference. The fine-grained subjective evaluation aims to evaluate the explanation quality for each question, while the coarse-grained subjective evaluation aims to evaluate the quality of overall explanation.

```

# Task Description
You are a powerful multi-modal evaluation assistant tasked with evaluating explanation texts for questions related to generated images.

# Input Data
1. A question about a generated image. The explanation text should clarify the answer to this question.
2. An explanation text to be evaluated against the factual content of the image.
3. A reference explanation text, which correctly represents the image content and serves as the gold standard for evaluation.

# Evaluation Guidelines
Assign a score from 0 to 5, where a higher score indicates better alignment with the reference explanation:
- 0: The evaluated explanation contradicts the reference, is empty, or lacks relevant information.
- 1-2: The evaluated explanation shows poor relevance to the reference, contains insufficient information, or has many errors.
- 3-4: The evaluated explanation generally aligns with the reference but may miss some details or contain minor errors.
- 5: The evaluated explanation fully aligns with the reference, potentially providing richer information with minimal or no errors.

# Precautions
Focus on the factual content conveyed by the reference explanation. Ignore any statements such as 'the answer' or 'ground truth' if they appear.

# Question
{question}

# Explanation to be Evaluated
{gt_exp}

# Reference Explanation
{ref_exp}

# Output Instructions
Provide only one line as the output: the score as an integer value.

Do not include any additional information beyond the score.

```

Figure 11. Prompt template for subjective evaluation of fine-grained explanations.

I. Case Study

We provide an undivided case of evaluation with our proposed framework for open-source MLLMs in Figure 13 and several individual questions in three categories (Appearance Quality, Intrinsic Attribute and Relationship Attribute) in Figure 14.

J. Evaluation Prompt Templates

All prompt templates used in our proposed Task Decomposition Evaluation Framework are illustrated in Figure 15, 16 and 17.

```

# Task Description
You are a powerful multi-modal evaluation assistant tasked with evaluating explanation texts for the quality of generated images.

# Input Data
1. A list of questions about a generated image, reflecting multiple aspects of the image.
2. Ground truth answers and explanations for each question, strictly based on the image content, serving as reference for your evaluation.
3. Explanation to be evaluated, where you assess consistency with the reference and whether it fully covers the provided information.

# Evaluation Guidelines
Assign a score from 0 to 5, where a higher score indicates better alignment with the reference explanation:
- 0: The evaluated explanation contradicts the reference, is empty, or lacks relevant information.
- 1-2: The evaluated explanation shows poor relevance to the reference, contains insufficient information, or has many errors.
- 3-4: The evaluated explanation generally aligns with the reference but may miss some details or contain minor errors.
- 5: The evaluated explanation fully aligns with the reference, potentially providing richer information with minimal or no errors.

# Precautions
Focus on the factual content conveyed by the reference explanation. Ignore any statements such as 'the answer' or 'ground truth' if they appear.

# Questions and Reference Explanation
{ref_exp}

# Explanation to be Evaluated
{gt_exp}

# Output Instructions
Provide only one line as the output: the score as an integer value.

Do not include any additional information beyond the score.

```

Figure 12. Prompt template for subjective evaluation of coarse-grained explanations.

Structure Information

Intrinsic Attributes

Man

- **attribute 1:** quantity: 1
- **attribute 2:** hat: bowler
- **attribute 3:** coat: lab
- **attribute 4:** existence: yes

TV frame

- **attribute 1:** quantity: 1
- **attribute 2:** existence: yes

Relationship Attributes

Appearance

- **entities involved:** Man, TV frame
- **value:** Man appears in TV frame

Image Caption

Man

- **caption:** The man is wearing a bowler hat and a lab coat.

TV frame

- **caption:** The TV frame displays an image of the man.

Questions

Appearance Quality Questions

Man

- **question:** Does the appearance of the man in the lab coat and bowler hat look realistic and align with human intuition?

- **answer:** The appearance of the man in the lab coat and bowler hat is somewhat realistic but has an artistic or surreal quality to it. The man's attire and the setting suggest a professional or scientific environment, but the interaction with the television and the presence of the other man within the TV screen adds an element of surrealism. The overall look aligns with human intuition to a degree but also pushes the boundaries of what is typically expected in a realistic scenario.

- **score:** 6.0

TV frame

- **question:** Does the appearance of the TV frame realistically integrate the man displayed on it?

- **answer:** The TV frame does not realistically integrate the man displayed on it. The man inside the TV appears as though he is superimposed rather than naturally existing within the TV frame, which is evident from the slight discrepancies in lighting and shadow alignment.

- **score:** 4.0

Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Questions

Man

- **question:** Does the man exist in the image?

- **answer:** Yes, the man exists in the image.

- **explanation:** The man is clearly visible in the image, standing next to the television set and interacting with it.

- **score:** 10.0

- **question:** Is the man wearing a bowler hat?

- **answer:** No, the man is wearing a black top hat, not a bowler hat.

- **explanation:** The man in the image is wearing a black top hat, which is different from a bowler hat. The top hat has a distinctively taller and more cylindrical shape, whereas the bowler hat has a more rounded and flat crown. This can be clearly observed in the image, confirming that the hat is a top hat and not a bowler hat.

- **score:** 3.0

- **question:** Is the man wearing a lab coat?

- **answer:** Yes, the man is wearing a white lab coat.

- **explanation:** The man is depicted wearing a white lab coat in the image, which is clearly visible and covers his torso and arms, consistent with the description provided.

- **score:** 10.0



A man in bowler hat and lab coat by people in a TV frame.

TV frame

- **question:** Does the TV frame exist in the image?

- **answer:** Yes, the TV frame exists in the image. It is a vintage model with a wooden frame and a screen that is turned on, displaying an image of a man in a white coat.

- **explanation:** The TV frame is clearly visible in the image, serving as the central object around which the scene is arranged. It is an old-fashioned model with a wooden frame and a screen that is turned on, displaying an image of a man in a white coat. The frame's presence is unmistakable and is a significant element in the image.

- **score:** 10.0

Relationship Attribute Consistency Questions

- **question:** Does the man appear within the TV frame?

- **entities:** Man, TV frame

- **answer:** No, the man does not appear within the TV frame. He is standing next to the TV, and the person appears within the TV screen.

- **explanation:** The man is clearly visible outside the TV, standing next to it, which indicates that he is not within the TV frame. The person appears inside the TV screen, creating an optical illusion.

- **score:** 0.0

Overall Evaluation

- Appearance Quality Summary

- **explanation:** The appearance quality of the man is somewhat realistic with a surreal element, while the TV frame does not integrate the displayed man realistically.

- **score:** 4.0

- Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Summary

- **explanation:** The intrinsic attributes of the man and the TV frame are mostly consistent with the ground truth, with the exception of the hat's type. The man's existence and lab coat, as well as the TV frame's existence, are accurately depicted. However, the hat's type is inconsistent with the ground truth, which affects the overall consistency score.

- **score:** 8.0

- Relationship Attribute Consistency Summary

- **explanation:** The relationship between the man and the TV frame is not consistent with the ground truth, as the man is not appearing within the TV frame as expected.

- **score:** 0.0

- Overall Score

- **explanation:** The overall evaluation shows a moderate level of consistency in appearance quality and intrinsic attributes, but a low level of consistency in relationship attributes. The appearance quality has a surreal element, and the relationship between the man and the TV frame is not consistent with the ground truth.


- **score:** 4.0

Figure 13. A case of the evaluation framework for open-source MLLMs.

Appearance Quality


Naturalness **Detail** **Existence**

Description: Four bees buzzing around the Acropolis of Athens.
Q: Do the four bees look realistic, and do they fit aesthetically with the rest of the composition?
A: The four bees look somewhat realistic, but their presence in the image seems digitally altered. They do not blend seamlessly with the background, and their size and sharpness contrast with the softer focus of the ancient structures and landscape. This contrast makes them stand out in a way that suggests they were not naturally part of the scene.




(a)

Description: A traffic light over a street with a sign that reads K.
Q: Is the sign, located on the traffic light and reading 'K', placed in a realistically convincing manner?
A: The sign with the letter 'K' is not placed on the traffic light in the image. The traffic light itself does not have any visible signs or markings, including 'K'. Therefore, the question of its placement in a realistically convincing manner does not apply.




(b)

Description: A woman leaning against a storefront with an umbrella.
Q: Is the woman depicted in the image leaning against the storefront?
A: No, the woman is not leaning against the storefront. She is standing upright with her arms crossed.



(c)

Description: A panda peacefully sits at the base of The Statue of Christ the King in Lisbon.
Q: Does the panda look realistic and is it setting harmoniously in its environment?
A: The panda appears to be a digitally inserted image that does not blend seamlessly with the surroundings. Its colors and texture are slightly off compared to the natural environment, making it look less realistic. It does not harmoniously integrate into the natural setting of the statue and foliage.




(d)

Intrinsic Attribute


Color **Counting** **Semantic**

Description: A wooden table with a purple laptop and orange pen.
Q: Is the pen color orange as described?
A: The pen in the image is clearly visible and is purple in color, which contradicts the description of it being orange.




(e)

Description: A woman with her hand over her glass while sitting at a dinner table.
Q: Is the woman covering her glass with her hand?
A: The woman's hand is positioned on her face, not covering the glass, which is on the table.




(f)

Description: Three zebra standing next to each other on a dirt hillside.
Q: Are there three zebras standing next to each other in the image?
A: The image clearly shows only two zebras standing next to each other.




(g)

Description: A cluster of ripe bilberries glistens under the dappled sunlight in a mossy forest clearing.
Q: Does the dappled sunlight exist in the image?
A: The image does not show dappled sunlight, which is characterized by patterns of light and shadow. Instead, the lighting is diffuse, meaning it is even and lacks distinct light and shadow patterns.




(h)

Description: Handicapped restroom with open toilet and black and white spotted floor.
Q: Is the restroom accessible to handicapped individuals?
A: The restroom does not appear to be accessible to handicapped individuals. There is no visible handicap sign or accessible features such as a grab bar or a lowered toilet. The space around the toilet is clear, but the absence of these features suggests it is not designed for accessibility.



(i)

Description: A person on skis does a trick on a rail.
Q: Does the rail exist in the image?
A: The image does not show any rails; instead, it captures a skier in mid-air against a backdrop of snow and trees.




(j)

Relationship Attribute


Position **Posture** **Layout**

Description: A group of people in uniforms stand in formation next to a bus.
Q: Are the group of people in formation?
A: The group of people is not in a formal formation. They are standing in a casual arrangement, with some facing the camera and others turned slightly away. Their positions are spread out rather than aligned in a structured formation.




(k)

Description: A large slice of pizza with cheese and marinara sauce on a plate.
Q: Is the large slice of pizza with cheese and marinara sauce on the plate in the image?
A: The image shows a pizza with cheese and marinara sauce, but it is not on a plate. Instead, it is on a wooden surface.




(l)

Description: A group of determined mountaineers trudge through the rain towards the summit of Mount Everest.
Q: Are the mountaineers moving towards Mount Everest in the image?
A: The image does not provide enough context to definitively confirm if the mountaineers are moving towards Mount Everest. However, their gear and the snowy environment suggest they are in a high-altitude mountainous region.




(m)

Description: A baby girl standing in a shopping cart holding an umbrella.
Q: Is the baby girl holding the umbrella?
A: The baby girl is not holding the umbrella. It is placed next to her in the shopping cart.



(n)

Description: A pitcher holds his arm far behind him during a pitch.
Q: Is the pitcher's arm being held far behind him during the pitch?
A: The pitcher's arm is not held far behind him during the pitch. The arm is extended forward, indicating that the pitch is in the process of being thrown rather than in the initial wind-up phase.



(o)

Figure 14. Cases for fine-grained evaluations in three categories.

<p># Your Task You are an expert in information extraction. Your task is to extract attributes of entities and relationships between entities from the text, and to pose a question about each entity's attributes and relationships.</p> <p># Input Data The text is: <code>{text_prompt}</code></p> <p># Extraction Pipeline ## Step 1: Identify Entities Step 1.1: Extract All Names Extract all potential names from the input text. Step 1.2: Evaluate Each Name - Determine Entity Status: For each extracted name, assess whether it qualifies as an entity based on context and predefined criteria. - Include or Exclude: If a name is deemed an entity, include it in the output; otherwise, exclude it.</p> <p>## Step 2: Formulate a Question for Each Entity For each entity, create a critical question regarding the realism, aesthetic appeal, and alignment with human intuition of the entity's appearance in the generated image. Focus questions primarily on overall authenticity rather than getting into detailed specifics.</p> <p>## Step 3: Identify All Attributes for Each Entity Step 3.1: Identify Intrinsic Attributes Intrinsic attributes are properties explicitly mentioned in the input text, such as color, size, shape, material, and quantity. Step 3.1.1: Extract Quantity Attributes Identify words indicating quantity, including articles like "a" and "an", which suggest a quantity of one. For example, in "a cat", "a" indicates one cat. Attribute this quantity to the relevant entity. Step 3.1.2: Extract Other Intrinsic Attributes Analyze words in the input text related to the entity, excluding the entity's name itself. Determine if these words denote intrinsic attributes and identify their types (e.g., color, size, material) and values. Step 3.1.3: Verify Attribute Type and Value Pair Ignore attribute pairs if the value doesn't appear in the text, is part of the entity's name, or is "unspecified". Step 3.1.4: Exclude Positional Attributes Disregard attributes related to position, orientation, distance, or location. Step 3.1.5: Add Existence Attribute For each entity, add an attribute "existence" with a value of "yes" to indicate it should exist in the image. Step 3.1.6: Default Unspecified Quantities If the text doesn't specify a quantity, set it to "unspecified". Step 3.1.7: Consolidate and Output Attributes Add verified attribute type-value pairs to the output. Ensure all entities are included. Step 3.2: Identify Relationship Attributes Relationship attributes describe an entity's relationship with other entities. Step 3.2.1: Analyze Relation Words Identify words in the input text that describe relationships between entities, specifying the relationship type and related entities. Step 3.2.2: Output Relationship Types Add identified relationships and related entities to the output.</p> <p>## Step 4: Construct Questions Based on Extracted Attributes Step 4.1: Construct Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Questions Step 4.1.1: Existence Questions Generate questions such as, "Does the [entity] exist in the image?" where [entity] is the entity's name.</p>	<p>Step 4.1.2: Attribute Value Questions Create a question for each intrinsic attribute pair about the attribute value of the entity. Step 4.1.3: Verify the Number of Questions Ensure the number of questions equals the total number of intrinsic attribute-value pairs, including one existence and one quantity question for each entity. Step 4.2: Construct Relationship Attribute Consistency Questions Step 4.2.1: Relationship Questions For each relational attribute of each entity, formulate a question about its value in relation to other entities. Step 4.2.2: Ensure Coverage Ensure the number of questions matches the number of relationship attribute pairs, with each pair corresponding to one question.</p> <p># Output Template Replace variables in '<code>{{}}</code>' And if the text is like "Three apples", the entity should be "apple", and the attribute should be "three". Instead of "apple 1, apple 2, apple 3" as the entities. Please generate your extracted structured information based on the following markdown template (Do NOT generate // comment in the template):</p> <p># Structure Information ## Intrinsic Attributes ### <code>{{entity}}</code> - attribute 1: <code>{{attribute 1 type}}</code>: <code>{{attribute 1 value}}</code> - attribute 2: <code>{{attribute 2 type}}</code>: <code>{{attribute 2 value}}</code> - attribute 3: attribute 3 type: attribute 3 value ... ### <code>{{next entity or group}}</code> ...</p> <p>## Relationship Attributes ### <code>{{relationship attribute 1}}</code> - entities involved: <code>{{entity 1, entity 2, ...}}</code> - value: <code>{{relationship attribute value}}</code> ### <code>{{next relationship attribute}}</code> ...</p> <p># Questions ## Appearance Quality Questions ### <code>{{entity 1 name}}</code> - question: <code>{{entity 1 appearance quality question}}</code> ### <code>{{next entity}}</code> ...</p> <p>## Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Questions ### <code>{{entity 1 name}}</code> - question 1: <code>{{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 1}}</code> - question 2: <code>{{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 2}}</code> - question 3: <code>{{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 3}}</code> - question 4: <code>{{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 4}}</code> - next question ... ### <code>{{next entity}}</code> ...</p> <p>## Relationship Attribute Consistency Questions - question 1: <code>{{relationship attribute consistency question 1}}</code> - entities: <code>{{entity 1}}</code> - <code>{{entity 2}}</code> - question 2: <code>{{relationship attribute consistency question 2}}</code> ...</p>
---	--

Figure 15. Prompt template for evaluation content extraction.

```

# Your Task
You are an assistant specialized in answering questions based on the content of images.

# Input Data
1. Question Input: These are the questions you are to answer. They consist of three parts: appearance quality questions, intrinsic attribute consistency questions, and relationship attribute consistency questions. The questions are: {questions}
2. Target Image: Use this image to answer the questions.
3. Reference Image: Use this as a reference for authenticity when answering questions about appearance quality based on the target image.

# Answer Pipeline
## Step 1: Generate the Target Image Caption
- Identify all entities in the target image.
- For each entity, generate a caption that includes the entity's name and all attributes.
- Generate a caption for each entity that includes its name and all relationships. These captions are solely for answering the intrinsic attribute consistency questions. If an entity in the image caption does not have those questions, ignore it.

## Step 2: Answer the Appearance Quality Questions
- For each question, identify if the entity is present in the target image. If present, proceed to the next step; if absent, assign a score of 0.
- For each appearance quality question, determine if the entity's appearance in the target image is realistic, aesthetically pleasing, and aligns with human intuition.
- Use the reference image for authenticity when needed.
- Assign a score from 0 to 10 for each question, and provide a brief explanation for the score awarded.
- Scoring Strategy:
  - 0-3: The appearance lacks realism, is not aesthetically pleasing, or does not align with human intuition.
  - 4-7: The appearance is somewhat realistic, aesthetically pleasing, or aligns with human intuition.
  - 8-10: The appearance is very realistic, aesthetically pleasing, and aligns well with human intuition.

## Step 3: Answer the Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Questions
- For each question, check if the entity exists in the target image. If it does, proceed; if not, state that the entity doesn't exist in the image.
- Answer each intrinsic attribute consistency question by detailing the corresponding attribute value from both the target image and its caption. Be thorough in your explanations; avoid simple yes or no answers.

Note: You must address all questions in the question input.

## Step 4: Answer the Relationship Attribute Consistency Questions
- For each question, verify the entity's presence in the target image. If present, continue; otherwise, indicate that the entity does not exist in the image.
- Determine the relationships of each entity in the target image and its caption. Provide a detailed answer, avoiding yes or no responses, and explain your reasoning.

# Output Template
Replace variables in '{{{}}}'
Please generate your result based on following markdown template (Do NOT generate // comment in the template).

# Image Caption
## {{entity 1 name}}
- caption: {{entity 1 caption}}
## {{next entity}}
...

# Answers
## Appearance Quality Questions
### {{entity 1 name}}
- question: {{entity 1 appearance quality question}}
  - explanation: {{explanation}}
  - score: {{score}}
### {{next entity}}
...

## Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Questions
### {{entity 1 name}}
- question 1: {{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 1}}
  - answer: {{answer}}
- question 2: {{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 2}}
  - answer: {{answer}}
- next question
...
### {{next entity}}
...

## Relationship Attribute Consistency Questions
- question 1: {{relationship attribute consistency question 1}}
  - entities: {{entity 1}}, {{entity 2}}
  - answer: {{answer}}
- question 2: {{relationship attribute consistency question 2}}
  - entities: {{entity 1}}, {{entity 2}}
  - answer: {{answer}}
...

```

Figure 16. Prompt template for caption and answer generation.

<p># Your Task You are an expert in assessing the similarity between answers obtained from images and ground truth obtained from text.</p> <p># Input Data 1. Answers from the Image: These are the answers you need to evaluate including three components: - Appearance Quality Answers - Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Answers - Relationship Attribute Consistency Answers The provided answer is: <code>{answer}</code></p> <p>2. Ground Truth: This is the standard to which you will compare the image answers. It consists of two components: - Entities' Attributes - Relationships The structured information is the sole ground truth: <code>{structure.info}</code></p> <p># Scoring Strategy - 0-3: The answer is not consistent with the ground truth at all. - 4-7: The answer is somewhat consistent with the ground truth; semantics are similar but not entirely aligned. - 8-10: The answer is very consistent with the ground truth.</p> <p># Evaluation Pipeline ## Step 1: Evaluate Appearance Quality Answers - Focus solely on the appearance quality of the answers.</p> <p>## Step 2: Evaluate Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Answers - For each intrinsic attribute consistency answer of every entity, compare it with the corresponding ground truth. - If the entity does not appear in the image, assign a score of 0. Otherwise, proceed to the next step. - Offer a short explanation of how well the answer matches the ground truth. - Provide a score reflecting the extent of the match; if there is no match, score it as zero. In cases of mismatch, assign the lowest possible score.</p> <p>## Step 3: Evaluate Relationship Attribute Consistency Answers - For each relationship's attribute consistency answer, compare it with the ground truth. - If the entity does not exist in the image, assign a score of 0. Otherwise, proceed to the next step. - Offer a short explanation of how well the answer matches the ground truth. - Provide a score reflecting the extent of the match; if there is no match, score it as zero. In cases of mismatch, assign the lowest possible score.</p> <p>## Step 4: Overall Evaluation - Combine your findings on appearance quality, summarize your observations, and assign a score based on this summary. - Summarize the degree of match between the image answers and the intrinsic attribute consistency of the ground truth, and assign a score based on this evaluation. - Summarize the degree of match for relationship attribute consistency between the image answers and the ground truth, and assign a score based on this summary.</p>	<p>- Integrate all summaries regarding appearance quality, intrinsic attribute consistency, and relationship attribute consistency. Offer a comprehensive evaluation description and assign a final score based on this description.</p> <p># Output Template Replace Variable in '<code>{{}}</code>' Please generate your output based on following markdown template (Do NOT generate <code>//</code> comment in the template).</p> <p># Evaluation ## Appearance Quality Answers ### <code>{{entity 1 name}}</code> - question: <code>{{entity 1 appearance quality question}}</code> - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> ### <code>{{next entity}}</code> ...</p> <p>## Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Answers ### <code>{{entity 1 name}}</code> - question 1: <code>{{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 1}}</code> - answer: <code>{{answer from the image}}</code> - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> - question 2: <code>{{entity 1 intrinsic attribute consistency question 2}}</code> - answer: <code>{{answer from the image}}</code> - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> - next question ... ### <code>{{next entity}}</code> ...</p> <p>## Relationship Attribute Consistency Answers - question 1: <code>{{relationship attribute consistency question 1}}</code> - entities: <code>{{entity 1}}</code> <code>{{entity 2}}</code> - answer: <code>{{answer from the image}}</code> - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> - question 2: <code>{{relationship attribute consistency question 2}}</code> ...</p> <p>## Overall Evaluation - Appearance Quality Summary: - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> - Intrinsic Attribute Consistency Summary: - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> - Relationship Attribute Consistency Summary: - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code> - Overall Score: - explanation: <code>{{explanation}}</code> - score: <code>{{score}}</code></p>
---	---

Figure 17. Prompt template for explanation and scoring.