

MEF: A Systematic Evaluation Framework for Text-to-Image Models

¹ByteDance Seed

*Full author list in Contributions

Abstract

Rapid advances in text-to-image (T2I) generation have raised higher requirements for evaluation methodologies. Existing benchmarks center on objective capabilities and dimensions, but lack an application-scenario perspective, limiting external validity. Moreover, current evaluations typically rely on either ELO for overall ranking or MOS for dimension-specific scoring, yet both methods have inherent shortcomings and limited interpretability. Therefore, we introduce the Magic Evaluation Framework (MEF), a systematic and practical approach for evaluating T2I models. First, we propose a structured taxonomy encompassing user scenarios, elements, element compositions, and text expression forms to construct the Magic-Bench-377, which supports label-level assessment and ensures a balanced coverage of both user scenarios and capabilities. On this basis, we combine ELO and dimension-specific MOS to generate model rankings and fine-grained assessments respectively. This joint evaluation method further enables us to quantitatively analyze the contribution of each dimension to user satisfaction using multivariate logistic regression. By applying MEF to current T2I models, we obtain a leaderboard and key characteristics of the leading models. We release our evaluation framework and make Magic-Bench-377 fully open-source to advance research in the evaluation of visual generative models.

Date: September 23, 2025

Correspondence: liushu@bytedance.com

Project Page: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/ByteDance-Seed/MagicBench>

1 Introduction

In recent years, the text-to-image (T2I) generation field has progressed rapidly through successive iterations. A new cohort of models, exemplified by Midjourney [20], Ideogram [3], and GPT-4o [34], together with well-established baselines such as Stable Diffusion [24] and DALL·E [2, 22, 23], collectively represent current technological frontier. These models exhibit distinct comparative advantages across core capabilities (Fig. 1): Midjourney series excels at artistic style rendering; Seedream [8] and Ideogram achieve breakthroughs in text rendering accuracy, excelling especially when handling complex textual prompts; and GPT-4o demonstrates strong performance in compositional and semantic understanding.

This diversification intensifies the demands on evaluation methodology. In addition to establishing a rigorous overall ranking, it is also important to conduct diagnostic assessments that efficiently and reliably identify performance differences in specific capabilities, such as quantity, style, and pronoun reference, as well as across representative application scenarios, including commercial design, artistic creation, and personal entertainment.




Figure 1 Example images are generated by T2I models. All prompts and images are sourced from Magic-Bench-377.

In contrast to the evaluation of large language models (LLMs) and vision language models (VLMs), assessing visual content generation introduces distinct challenges.

- First, evaluation outcomes are highly sensitive to subjective factors (Fig. 2), where scores are strongly influenced by the evaluators' visual preferences, cultural background, and professional expertise, especially in the aesthetic dimension. Even for more objective capabilities (e.g., object count accuracy, correctness of entity relations), composite tasks can introduce weighting ambiguities. For instance, within Prompt Following, when simultaneously assessing the numerical and spatial accuracy of a prompt like "three cats and two pillows on a sofa", the relative importance of each component often depends on the evaluator's individual judgment.




Figure 2 An example comparing inputs and outputs for LLM, VLM, and T2I models from a public benchmark [36]. LLMs and VLMs typically have standard answers, while T2Is are open-ended, allowing for diverse valid outputs.

- Second, there exist pronounced coupling effects across evaluation dimensions. For example, structural issues (e.g., disproportionate object scales) directly impact perceived aesthetics, while prompt-image mismatches (e.g., "orca" (Chinese in "虎鲸") being rendered as a tiger (Chinese in "虎") with a whale's mouth (Chinese in "鲸"), in Fig. 3) in turn affect judgments of structural plausibility. These imply that the automation-heavy approaches commonly used for LLMs [4, 11, 15] and VLMs [16, 18, 33] are not well-suited for evaluating visual generative models. Instead, it is necessary to develop more flexible and domain-specific visual assessment systems.



Generate an image of a man riding an orca on Mars.



Generate an image of a man riding a walrus on Mars.



Generate an image of a man riding a tiger shark on Mars.

Figure 3 Coupling between dimensions complicates evaluation. For instance, these images fail to generate the correct subject, which create scoring ambiguity in Prompt Following and Structure Accuracy.

Against this backdrop, we introduce the Magic Evaluation Framework (MEF), a systematic evaluation methodology with two principal contributions:

- We construct a benchmark grounded in application scenarios and objective capability labels, enabling precise identification of model weaknesses in real world use and linking model capability to user experience across contexts. Each prompt is intentionally designed to interleave multiple capabilities, so that a single prompt assesses several skills simultaneously, approximating holistic performance in practical settings. At the same time, refined criteria reduce cross-dimensional interference, improving the fidelity of single-dimension assessments.
- We integrate an ELO-based dynamic competitive ranking mechanism with a multi-dimensional Mean Opinion Score (MOS) protocol for absolute scoring. This cross-validated design provides reliable performance leaderboards and allows for detailed analysis of individual capabilities and the influence of different dimensions. At the same time, we implement an end-to-end quality assurance pipeline to ensure that, while reasonable subjective preferences are accommodated during evaluation, the outcomes remain objectively reliable.

As visual generative models advance, this rigorous evaluation system will be increasingly central to their assessment and development. By connecting model capability iteration with real-world application scenarios, the framework ensures that continual improvements are closely aligned with user experience.

2 Related Work

2.1 Evaluation Methods

Evaluation methodologies for visual generative models have shown some differences between academia and industry, driven by their respective objectives and constraints.

In academia, efforts have predominantly focused on automated evaluation, evolving in two phases. Early approaches trained dedicated reward models [14], leveraged mature computer vision backbones [9], or incorporated LLM based assessors [10]. With the emergence of multimodal models (e.g., GPT-4o, Gemini [26]) possessing strong visual understanding, VLM based evaluation, either used directly or fine-tuned for task-specific objectives [12], has become the prevailing paradigm for automation.

Overall, such methods perform reasonably well on Prompt Following but struggle to diagnose Structural Accuracy and Aesthetic Quality, which exhibit an obvious deviations from human preference.

In industry, evaluation practice prioritizes precise and fine-grained results and therefore employs labor-intensive, human-in-the-loop protocols. Two paradigms are prevalent:

- The first centers on an ELO framework. Representative adopters include DALL·E [2], Imagen [1], Stable Diffusion [7], and third-party Arena platforms [5]. Beyond producing a holistic leaderboard, the ELO mechanism is also extended to dimensional assessments—for example, DALL·E reports ELO scores over Prompt Following, Style, and Coherence. Nevertheless, ELO rankings are inherently relative: pairwise comparisons provide only an order (Model A is better than Model B) but not absolute magnitude of differences, leading to a loss of fine-grained signal, particularly problematic under non-uniform distributions (e.g., strong wins on a small subset but slight losses on the majority).
- The second centers on Mean Opinion Score (MOS). Representative adopters include Ketu [27] and Wan [28]. For instance, Wan applies regression analysis to learn differentiated weights over 14 sub-dimensions and computes a weighted average to obtain a composite ranking. However, this still exhibits limited robustness as a ranking method: weights vary across user groups—professional designers, for example, typically emphasize aesthetic dimension more than general users; moreover, dimension importance weights evolve over time, making static weighting schemes ill-suited to capture shifting priorities.

2.2 Benchmark for T2I Model Evaluation

Current benchmarks for evaluating T2I models have made progress in comprehensively assessing model capabilities. However, they still suffer from issues such as unsystematic and incomplete capability categorization, as well as insufficient alignment with real application scenarios (in Table. 1). For instance, DrawBench [25], with its 200 prompts, covers 11 scattered categories such as color and quantity. Yet, its capability labels are presented in an enumerated manner (e.g., placing "rare words" and "DALL·E dataset" side by side), which may hinder holistic assessment of model capabilities. PartiPrompt [35] extends the scale to 1,632 prompts and introduces a "12 capability categories \times 3 difficulty levels" evaluation matrix. Nonetheless, its category design also tends toward simple enumeration (e.g., treating abstract content, world knowledge, and human figures as parallel categories), which also limits comprehensive capability assessment. Benchmarks targeting compositionality, such as T2I-CompBench++ [12] and GenEval [9], remain narrow in scope: the former covers four capabilities (including attribute binding and object relations), whereas the latter emphasizes object-centric properties (e.g., color and quantity). Both fail to adequately cover complex semantics or specialized forms of expression. GenAI-Bench [17] introduces a two-tiered capability hierarchy—"basic" (entity/attribute) and "advanced" (logic/comparison). However, its 1,600 prompts are not tied to user scenarios, and its advanced capabilities do not account for competencies about textual expression form. DDesignBench [19] contributes 215 prompts targeting design-related scenario, but these are limited to visual design contexts and associated technical abilities, excluding domains such as film, art, and entertainment, thereby limiting its applicability in multi-scenario model selection. Other benchmarks such as WISE [21] (semantic understanding), CUBE [13] (world knowledge), Commonsense [32] (commonsense reasoning), and GradBias [6] (social bias) each focus on a single dimension of capability. While valuable for probing specific weaknesses, they are not suitable for evaluating overall model performance.

From this, we can identify the key challenges faced by current evaluation methodologies:

- The separation between ELO and MOS evaluation paradigms prevents existing systems from satisfying, at once, the dual requirements of credible ranking and fine-grained diagnostics.
- There is a lack of diagnostic tooling calibrated to concrete application scenarios, giving rise to a persistent "technology to experience" gap. A recurring question from model developers is: how much business value does an improvement in technical metrics actually generate?

Together, these challenges pose obstacles to the reliability of visual generative model evaluation and may affect the field's ongoing development. To address this, it is necessary to establish a more comprehensive theoretical framework for evaluation, enhancing both scientific rigor and practical relevance.

In summary, existing efforts have not resolved the disconnection between model capability and real-world application. To bridge this gap, we introduce a new evaluation framework.

		Benchmarks						
		PartiPrompt [35]	DrawBench [25]	T2I-CompBench++ [12]	GenEval [9]	GenAI-Bench [17]	DESIGNBench [19]	Magic-Bench-377
Application Scenarios	Film	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓
	Art	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓
	Entertainment	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓
	Aesthetic Design	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓
	Functional Design	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓
Objective Capabilities	Entity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓
	Quantity	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
	Attribute	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓
	Relation	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
	Action/State	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
	Style	✓	X	X	X	X	X	✓
	Aesthetic	✓	X	X	X	✓	X	✓
	Atmosphere	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓
	Multi-Entity Feature Matching	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓
	Layout & Typography	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Anti-Realism	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓
	Negation	X	X	X	X	✓	X	✓
	Pronoun Reference	X	X	X	X	✓	X	✓
Consistency	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	

Table 1 Coverage differences between Magic-Bench-377 and existing T2I evaluation benchmarks in terms of application scenarios and objective capabilities. Magic-Bench-377 provides broader coverage of both core capabilities and application domains. The methodology for calculating label coverage is provided in Appendix A.

3 Core Framework

Our core contribution is an evaluation system for T2I generation models—the Magic Evaluation Framework (MEF, in Fig. 4). The framework comprises three mutually reinforcing components: (1) a structured benchmark, (2) hybrid evaluation metrics, and (3) an end-to-end quality management system. As a result, MEF can efficiently quantify the performance of both objective capabilities and applications, and provide guidance for iterative model improvement.




Figure 4 Benchmarks, hybrid evaluation metrics, and a quality management system constitute the three core pillars of the Magic Evaluation Framework.

- **Benchmark.** The benchmark consists of 377 text prompts, each annotated with dual labels—hundreds of objective capabilities (e.g., entity-relation understanding, numerical understanding) and 5 application scenarios (e.g., film, art). Based on our prior practice and user research, we develop a systematic taxonomy for text-to-image generation and determine the distribution within the benchmark (Table 2),

		Percentage	
Application Scenarios		Film	20%
		Art	21%
		Entertainment	12%
		Aesthetic Design	25%
		Functional Design	22%
Objective Capability	Entity Description	Quantity	4%
		Attribute	9%
		Relation	12%
		Action / State	10%
	Visual Description	Style	64%
		Aesthetic	35%
		Atmosphere	6%
	Element Composition	Multi-Entity Feature Matching	8%
		Layout & Typography	5%
		Anti-Realism	8%
	Textual Expression Form	Negation	2%
		Pronoun Reference	1%
Consistency		2%	

Table 2 Distribution of objective capability and application scenario labels in the Magic-Bench-377 benchmark. Each evaluation item is annotated with multiple objective capability labels and a single application scenario label. The rationale behind the label distribution is detailed in the section on benchmark construction methodology. (Section 4.3)

balancing high-frequency, high-value, and high-difficulty cases. Consequently, the evaluation can reflect real-world model performance and also distinguish the specific characteristics of different models.

- **Hybrid evaluation metrics.** We adopt an integrated paradigm that combines ELO with MOS. The ELO mechanism aggregates tens of thousands of anonymized head-to-head matches to produce a dynamically updated leaderboard that provides a holistic view of model ranking. The MOS mechanism assesses three core aspects—Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality—on a refined 1–5 scale, providing dimension-level assessments. For each model, we generate four test images per prompt, which are then scored back-to-back by an expert panel. This complementary methods allow us to further estimate the contribution of each dimension to user satisfaction through logistic regression.
- **End-to-end quality management system.** We institute quality controls throughout the pipeline to ensure the reliability of both ELO and MOS. During expert evaluation, we enforce a strict three-phase protocol: Magic-Bench-377 provides broad capability and scenario coverage; evaluators must possess solid grasp of key points to score accurately, and must avoid cross-dimensional interference among the three base dimensions (Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality). Accordingly, all evaluators who undergo standardized training must pass qualification and consistency tests before participation, and are periodically re-certified. During execution, we deploy multiple quality-control (QC) strategies: automatically insert 5% anchor items for real-time monitoring and conduct manual rechecks on 25% of samples by QC specialists. The final MOS report includes raw data and comprehensive statistical analyses, including 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) and significance testing ($p < 0.01$). In this way, every step from implementation to reporting, is supported by traceable, reproducible quality controls, ensuring high statistical power for our conclusions.

4 Magic-Bench-377

4.1 Taxonomy

To facilitate the effective construction of evaluation prompt sets, we develop a taxonomy that systematically captures the core capabilities and application scenarios of T2I models. This taxonomy is established based on prior evaluation experience, user and expert interviews, and sector-wide studies, ensuring that the evaluation datasets are both comprehensive and well-structured (Fig. 5).

Objective Capabilities. We categorize model capabilities by integrating textual prompts and visual elements, dividing them into three mutually exclusive categories:




Figure 5 Taxonomy for T2I Models. The taxonomy encompasses two primary branches: application scenarios and objective capabilities. These labels are designed to be extensible, with some further subdivided into finer categories in practical use.

- **Element.** Refers to visual elements or information that can be expressed by a single semantic unit, typically a word (e.g., owl, running). Depending on the types of visual element expressed, these are further subdivided into Entity, Entity Description, and Image Description.
- **Element Composition.** Refers to visual elements or information arising from the combination of multiple elements (e.g., an imagined creature possessing feature X of entity A, and feature Y of entity B). Based on prior evaluation findings, we emphasize three composition types where current models still exhibit notable limitations: Multi-Entity Feature Matching (multiple entities of the same type with different features), Layout & Typography (spatial composition of multiple entities), Anti-Realism (combinations that violate real world laws).
- **Text Expression Form.** Refers to semantic units not directly pointing to visual elements but testing a

model’s understanding and reasoning over special forms of expression. Examples include Negation (e.g., "a living room without a coffee table") and Pronoun Reference (e.g., "the bear lies on the ground, the cub lies beside it").

Definitions and example prompts for each label are provided in Appendix B, with the "Consistency" label adapted from the GenAI benchmark taxonomy [17].

Application Scenarios. To account for the diversity of real world user demands, we divide application scenarios for T2I models into five categories: Film, Art, Entertainment, Aesthetic Design, and Functional Design. Definitions and example prompts are detailed in Appendix B.

4.2 Benchmark Construction Methodology

As illustrated in Fig. 6, real-world prompts often specify complete scenes that require multiple capabilities, whereas existing benchmarks (e.g., Parti [35], DrawBench [25]) typically assess a single capability per prompt. We observe that interactions among multiple test points¹ can negatively impact the performance on a given test point compared to evaluating it in isolation.




Figure 6 Examples from official showcases of mainstream models and open-source benchmark evaluation datasets. Source: Official Website [31]. Open-source benchmarks tend to be concise and focus on single capability, which differs from practical scenarios where user prompts often describe more diverse scenes and complex entities.

For instance, when numerical and size relations are presented together in a single prompt, the model exhibits an obvious decrease in performance on the numerical aspect, relative to prompts focused solely on numerical relations (Appendix. C). This cross-capability interference can produce a mismatch between user experience and evaluation results, and may overstate performance in realistic use. To better reflect the user

¹Test point is defined based on previously identified weaknesses of T2I models in specific aspects and is a subset of objective capabilities.

perspective, Magic-Bench-377 embeds multiple capabilities within a single prompt. Concretely, each prompt in Magic-Bench-377 is annotated with 1–4 objective capability labels and 1 application scenario label.

4.3 Benchmark Construction Procedure

The construction steps of Magic-Bench-377 are as follows (Fig. 7):

- **Step 1: Designing the label distribution.** Drawing upon previous evaluation experience, we systematically identified objective capabilities that remain challenging for current models (hereafter referred to "model challenges"). By defining capabilities and scenarios based on current user needs and our long-term value judgments, and by utilizing "model challenges" to regulate difficulty levels, we constructed a benchmark that ensures both balanced and comprehensive coverage.
- **Step 2: Recruiting contributors to construct evaluation prompts.** To better align with real world requirements, we recruited a diverse set of contributors with prompt writing experience. Specifically, we engaged (1) professional designers, (2) AI enthusiasts with extensive experience using visual generation tools, and (3) domain experts with rich annotation experience. Prior to prompt construction, all contributors received standardized training to ensure adherence to the predefined prompt construction standards (see Appendix C). Prompt-design task were assigned to the best suited contributor groups according to professional backgrounds, yielding a high quality initial benchmark.

During data construction, we specified the application scenario and capability labels for each prompt, and then selected corresponding textual expressions and visual elements. These elements were subsequently composed in a natural manner, ensuring that the resulting prompts are representative of reasonable user requirements. For instance, when assessing Negation, "there are no scallions in the noodles" serves as a better prompt than "there is no elephant in the room".

- **Step 3: Quality inspection and prompt refinement.** Once the initial benchmark was constructed, we reviewed and revised each prompt to ensure that its quality and overall distribution were consistent with our expectations.




Figure 7 Benchmark Construction Procedure

5 Evaluation Metric

5.1 ELO Score

5.1.1 System Overview

During ELO matchups, we determine the winner based on the image’s overall quality, which essentially aligns with the three dimensions used in MOS evaluation: Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality. If Image A is better on at least one dimension and no worse on the others, A wins over B.

When trade-offs exist, evaluators rely on a holistic assessment that considers the severity of errors across the dimensions.

We designed and implemented a head-to-head platform [29] tailored for visual evaluation, featuring periodic leaderboard update. At the global level, a composite leaderboard derived from the full set of user data can be calculated, while at the individual level, personalized leaderboards are provided. The leaderboard presents the following key statistics: (1) ELO score; (2) 95% confidence intervals; (3) current model rank; (4) cumulative matches played; and (5) win rate.

In the evaluation process, the platform employs a double-blind design: two anonymized model outputs are presented side by side in the user interface. Evaluators then select one of four outcomes: left wins / right wins / both good / both bad.

ELO score estimation. We follow the Chatbot Arena framework [5], construct a win-rate matrix under the Bradley-Terry (BT) model and estimate coefficients via maximum likelihood. Here, we define win rate of model A against other models as $\frac{W_A + 0.5 T_A}{N_A}$, where W_A denotes the number of wins by A, T_A the number of ties, and N_A the total number of matches involving A. Model ELO ratings are then obtained by a linear transformation of the BT coefficients.

$$P(H_t = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\xi'_m - \xi_m}}, \quad (1)$$

Let $H_t \in \{0, 1\}$ be a Bernoulli random variable representing the user’s preference outcome: $H_t = 1$ if the user selects model m ; $H_t = 0$ if the user selects model m' . $\xi_m, \xi_{m'}$ denote the BT coefficients of models m and m' , respectively. Additionally, we fix the baseline model’s ELO rating at 1,000.

Furthermore, we are able to compute the ELO score for each prompt, providing additional insight into prompt-level contributions. Specifically, to compute ELO for $prompt_i$, we retain the full match schedule but replace the outcomes of all matches not involving $prompt_i$ with draws. By iterating this procedure over all prompts, we obtain each prompt’s ELO contribution:

$$\text{ELO}_{\text{model}} \approx \sum_{i=1}^{377} \text{ELO}_{\text{prompt}_i}, \quad \text{err} < 5\% \quad (2)$$

Expert mode and public mode. In expert mode, evaluations are performed by a carefully selected, well-trained group of expert panel, typically fewer than 20 individuals, ensuring consistency and accuracy. In public mode, we broadly recruit participants from diverse sectors such as design, media, and film/TV, as well as AI enthusiasts. The user base exceeds one thousand, providing a more representative reflection of general user preferences. The two modes are completely independent in their matching workflows, computation pipelines, and final leaderboard generation. Comparative analysis of leaderboards from expert and public modes reveals that while most model rankings are aligned, certain divergences exist. These differences can serve to calibrate expert standards, ensuring they better reflect the preferences and needs of general users.

5.1.2 Ensuring Scientific Validity

Confidence interval estimation and baseline model selection. We use bootstrap resampling to obtain the empirical distribution of the BT coefficients [5]: repeatedly resample and refit the model, then compute 95% confidence intervals using the percentile method. Under this setup, since the baseline model’s ELO score is fixed at 1,000 (and thus has no confidence interval), we select a lower-ranked model as the baseline to minimize potential bias in the ranking of top models.

Efficient Match Scheduling Mechanism. Rather than relying on purely random pairings, we aim to improve match efficiency and facilitate faster convergence of ELO scores on the leaderboard. To achieve this, we sample model pairs with fewer historical matches at a higher probability, so newly launched models have a greater chance of being matched in order to accelerate convergence. We also prioritize model pairs whose win-loss probabilities are close to 50%, as these matchups are most effective in narrowing their ELO confidence intervals.

Operationally, we begin by selecting a model pair based on historical match data in accordance with the aforementioned principles. Next, we uniformly sample a prompt from Magic-Bench-377, and randomly select one output from each model’s multiple generations. Finally, these outputs are presented to evaluators.

Minimum number of matches. To ensure leaderboard stability, we set a minimum participation threshold for listed models. The threshold is the maximum of two criteria: the confidence interval width for each model must narrow to 20 ELO points or less, and the ELO change induced by a single match must not exceed 3 points. In our benchmark protocol, this typically requires models to complete more than 4,000 head-to-head matches to appear on the leaderboard.

Anti-cheating mechanisms. Casual interactions by some users, whether for trial or novelty, can introduce noise that affects ranking accuracy. By deploying anti-cheating mechanisms, we achieve a 30% reduction in the ELO confidence interval width across models, which substantially enhances the ranking reliability.

Specifically, we mainly use temporal behavior analysis and anchor item tests to filter out cheating users. Temporal analysis identifies abnormal responses by detecting unusually fast submissions and excessive answer repetition. For example, completion speeds more than three standard deviations faster than the user average, or repeatedly selecting the same option dozens of times, are considered strong indicators of cheating. In addition, anchor item tests (Fig. 8) randomly insert 5% of pairs with verified outcomes, which are pairs exhibiting pronounced quality differences. Users who consistently fail to identify the higher quality image in these items are flagged as invalid evaluators.



Figure 8 Typical examples of anchor pairs. These anchor prompts are selected through iterative rounds of evaluation. On these prompts, participants’ choices exhibit a high degree of consistency.

In expert mode, additional qualification prescreening and dynamic monitoring are implemented. Expert assessors are required to pass a simulated matchup test, achieving at least 85% agreement with the expert cohort ($Kappa > 0.8$) to qualify. During formal evaluation, 25% of assessments are randomly sampled for re-auditing, and experts not meeting quality standards will be temporarily suspended from scoring.

5.2 MOS Score

5.2.1 System Overview

In addition to the ELO based ranking mechanism, MEF incorporates a Mean Opinion Score (MOS) system to further assess model performance. This system conducts absolute evaluations across three dimensions, Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality, each scored on a 1-5 scale by the same expert panel as in ELO expert mode. As shown in Fig. 9:

- Prompt Following assesses the degree of alignment between the generated image and the input textual prompt at the semantic level.
- Structural Accuracy evaluates the completeness of entities within the image, as well as whether their structures and interrelations conform to real world cognitive expectations and physical commonsense.
- Aesthetic Quality considers the visual appeal of the generated image from an artistic perspective, focusing on style rendering, color harmony, composition, and the interplay of light and shadow.




Figure 9 Illustrative evaluation guidelines for the three core MOS dimensions.

5.2.2 Ensuring Scientific Validity

Multi-sample scoring. To reduce the impact of generation stochasticity, the benchmark adopts a multi-sample evaluation mechanism. Specifically, for each test prompt, we generate four independent samples per model to more accurately reflect a model’s average generative capability. Experiments show that when evaluating a single sample only, the probability of significant variation across different generations from the same model can reach 30% (self-comparison test). Using a four-sample averaged evaluation strategy reduces this probability to below 5% ($p < 0.01$), markedly improving evaluation stability. For each prompt, two experts independently score all models’ outputs side-by-side, enabling cross-comparison judgment. This design effectively mitigates biases that might arise from isolated evaluations.

Evaluation standards training. To minimize interference caused by coupling effects among the three dimensions (in Fig. 10), we establish clear guidelines and conduct expert training to ensure these standards are fully understood and correctly applied.

When assessing Prompt Following, evaluators should focus exclusively on the alignment between the generated image and the input prompt, without being influenced by structural or aesthetic quality. Deductions are permitted only if the structural errors are so severe that they directly affect semantic interpretation. Similarly, when evaluating Structural Accuracy or Aesthetic Quality, evaluators should concentrate solely on the core criteria of the respective dimension, disregarding other factors unless severe issues in another dimension directly impact their judgment. Detailed scoring criteria are provided in Appendix E.

To validate the mutual independence across the three MOS dimensions, we compute Pearson correlation coefficients for each assessor. The statistical analysis shows that all inter-dimensional correlations are below 0.3 ($r < 0.3$, Table 3), indicating that the dimensions are nearly decoupled. The correlation between Structural Accuracy and Aesthetic Quality is slightly higher, as severe structural failures can notably impact perceived aesthetics in certain scenarios (in Fig. 11).

	Expert A	Expert B	Expert C	Expert D
Prompt Following & Structural Accuracy	0.172	0.142	0.141	0.123
Prompt Following & Aesthetic Quality	0.111	0.153	0.124	0.091
Structural Accuracy & Aesthetic Quality	0.259	0.272	0.27	0.275

Table 3 The Pearson correlation coefficients between MOS dimensions, illustrated using data from four experts.




Figure 10 Example cases demonstrating how evaluation standards are defined to reduce coupling effects across the three core dimensions.



Figure 11 Severe weaknesses in structural performance tend to undermine the perceived aesthetic quality of an image.

Confidence estimation. Traditional confidence estimation rests on a random sampling assumption and uses $\frac{\sigma^2}{n}$ (where σ^2 is the sample variance and n is the number of items). This approach requires that per-item generation outcomes are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). However, contemporary industry benchmarks are manually curated collections of specialized prompts and thus do not satisfy the random sampling assumption. We therefore propose an improved confidence estimation framework. Suppose the benchmark contains n prompts, each evaluated k independent times. Let $a_{i,j}$ denote the j^{th} evaluation outcome for prompt i . The per-dimension mean score is computed as follows:

$$M = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k a_{i,j} \right) \quad (3)$$

Under the i.i.d. assumption within each prompt, the variance estimator of the MOS score is:

$$\text{var}(M) = \frac{1}{n^2 \times k} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{var}(a_i) \quad (4)$$

Based on our prior evaluation studies, a MOS difference greater than 0.1 between two models on a specific dimension typically suggests a statistically significant difference.

6 Experimental Result

6.1 Experimental setup

This study evaluates mainstream T2I models on Magic-Bench-377 using the MEF framework. For each prompt, every model generates four images, which are used uniformly for both ELO and MOS evaluations. Specifically, the results for public and expert ELO evaluations are derived from 106,287 and 62,736 valid matches, respectively.

6.2 ELO Score

Expert Mode Evaluation Results. As shown in Table 4, GPT-4o and Seedream 3.0 are first-tier models, with GPT-4o leading across all scenarios and Seedream 3.0 performing comparably in Art, Functional Design, and Aesthetic Design. Imagen 3, Ideogram 3.0, and Luma fall into the middle tier with relatively balanced performance, whereas Recraft V3 Raw and Midjourney V6.1 underperform in ELO, primarily due to notable weaknesses in certain dimensions.

Model [31]	Overall		Art		Functional Design		Aesthetic Design		Film		Entertainment	
	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score
GPT-4o	1	1,205	1	1,162	1	1,157	1	1,125	1	1159	1	1173
Seedream 3.0	2	1,178	2	1,147	2	1,108	2	1,117	2	1,139	2	1,115
Imagen 3	7	1,100	6	1,077	7	1,038	7	1,038	7	1,033	8	1,052
Ideogram 3.0	7	1,078	13	988	9	1,026	9	1,020	12	963	9	1,030
Luma	8	1,076	8	1,033	11	1,003	8	1,028	8	1,030	10	1,030
Flux.1 Kontext [pro]	8	1,062	11	994	10	1,019	10	1,018	10	990	11	1018
Reve Image 1.0	9	1,061	12	992	8	1,033	12	994	11	981	7	1,061
Ideogram 2.0	9	1,054	10	1,000	12	1,000	11	1,000	9	1,000	13	1,000
Seedream 2.1	13	1,032	15	982	14	985	13	972	13	959	14	998
Recraft V3 Raw	13	1,021	17	958	13	989	14	970	14	947	15	984
Flux 1.1 [pro]	14	1,011	16	960	15	962	15	937	15	945	12	1,004
Midjourney V6.1	16	1,000	9	1,003	16	936	16	931	17	910	16	964

Table 4 ELO scores under expert mode. The rankings appear non-consecutive, since we display only the key models and preserve their original positions from the full leaderboard.

Public Mode Evaluation Results. As shown in Table 5, Seedream 3.0 achieves the best overall performance and ranks first, followed closely by GPT-4o. At the scenario level, Seedream 3.0 consistently outperforms in Art, Functional Design, Aesthetic Design, and Film, while GPT-4o achieves its best results in Functional Design, Film, and Entertainment. The tier of remaining models is consistent with the expert-mode ELO results.

Model [31]	Overall		Art		Functional Design		Aesthetic Design		Film		Entertainment	
	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score	Rank	ELO Score
GPT-4o	3	1,067	2	1,064	1	1,057	3	1,052	1	1,108	1	1,056
Seedream 3.0	1	1,084	1	1,083	1	1,071	1	1,076	1	1,112	1	1,079
Imagen 3	5	1,031	5	1,039	1	1,028	5	1,024	5	1,043	2	1,035
Ideogram 3.0	8	1,007	11	986	4	1,020	9	998	7	1,015	4	1,019
Luma	8	1,017	7	1,014	9	996	5	1,012	5	1,025	3	1,007
Flux.1 Kontext [pro]	7	1,019	8	1,008	5	1,012	5	1,012	5	1,024	2	1,035
Reve Image 1.0	14	986	14	982	12	980	9	971	12	998	6	1,009
Ideogram 2.0	15	984	16	975	13	970	12	986	11	1,019	12	982
Seedream 2.1	8	1,017	5	1,014	6	1,007	5	1,017	5	1,029	5	1,014
Recraft V3 Raw	11	997	7	1,004	9	994	10	991	9	995	9	989
Flux 1.1 [pro]	13	992	7	1,010	14	967	12	982	10	1,005	10	1,006
Midjourney V6.1	13	989	5	1,023	14	953	12	988	11	995	9	987

Table 5 ELO scores under public mode, with the same set of models as in expert mode.

Comparison of Expert and Public Perspectives. Comparing the two rankings, both Seedream 3.0 and GPT-4o consistently appear at the top, indicating stable high performance across different user groups. The key

difference lies in ELO score dispersion. The expert mode leaderboard shows greater separation, with nearly 200 ELO points between the top and bottom models, whereas the public mode leaderboard is much tighter, with only a 78 ELO point gap. This pattern suggests that experts exhibit greater sensitivity to subtle differences and, as a result, are more likely to select clear winners and losers among models, while general users tend to produce more ties.

Model	Creator	ELO Score		
		Magic-Bench-377 Expert	Magic-Bench-377 Public	Artificial Analysis
GPT-4o	OpenAI	1,205	1,067	1,164
Seedream 3.0	ByteDance	1,178	1,084	1,166
Imagen 3	Google	1,100	1,031	1,097
Ideogram 3.0	Ideogram AI	1,078	1,007	1,093
Luma	Dream Machine	1,076	1,017	1,040
FLUX.1 Kontext [pro]	Black Forest Labs	1,062	1,019	1,101
Reve Image 1.0	Reve AI	1,061	986	1,090
Ideogram 2.0	Ideogram AI	1,054	984	1,045
Recraft V3 Raw	Recraft	1,021	997	1,114
Flux 1.1 [pro]	Black Forest Labs	1,011	992	1,083
Midjourney V6.1	Midjourney	1,000	989	1,047

Table 6 Comparison of leaderboard results between Artificial Analysis and Magic-Bench-377.

Comparison with public leaderboards. We compare MEF ELO scores with the third-party public leaderboard Artificial Analysis (AA)[30] in Table 6. The results show strong consistency between MEF and AA. Seedream 2.1 (the previous version of Seedream series) did not participate in AA, while all other models have corresponding ELO scores on AA. Statistically, the Pearson correlation of ELO scores across these models is close to 0.8, reflecting strong agreement. Achieving this level of correlation with just 377 prompts demonstrates the diverse coverage and strong representational power of Magic-Bench-377. While some models still show differences in ELO performance, these are mainly due to discrepancies in prompt distribution and evaluator composition between the two evaluation systems.

6.3 MOS Score

Based on prior evaluation experience, we selected six representative models for MOS evaluation: Seedream 3.0, GPT-4o, Imagen 3, Ideogram 3.0, Flux 1.1 [pro], and Midjourney V6.1. Table 7 presents the evaluation results of these six models across the three fundamental dimensions—Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality. For each dimension, both overall performance and results for five application scenarios are presented.

As shown in Table 7, mainstream models score above 3 across three dimensions, suggesting that the generated images generally do not exhibit significant deficiencies. However, performance varies by dimension and application scenarios, and no single model leads across the board.

Characteristics of Mainstream Models. By analyzing ELO scores, MOS scores, and the taxonomy labels of the prompts, we observe divergent characteristics among the six models:

- **GPT-4o:** Strong semantic and structural performance. GPT-4o excels in Prompt Following (4.52) and structural accuracy (4.23), consistently outperforming all other models across scenarios, and is thus especially well-suited for professional contexts requiring semantic complexity and structural rigor, such as Entertainment and Functional Design. While its Aesthetic Quality score (3.17) is lower than that of Seedream 3.0 (3.39) and Midjourney V6.1 (3.38), this does not significantly affect its overall performance, as it still achieves the highest ELO scores.
- **Seedream 3.0:** Seedream 3.0 shows balanced performance across the three dimensions without notable shortcomings, and its Aesthetic Quality score (3.39) is the highest among all models. It also demonstrates balanced advantages across scenarios, as reflected in both ELO and MOS scores. These advantages are especially pronounced in Art and Entertainment, which emphasize visual appeal and creativity.

Model		Seedream 3.0	GPT-4o	Imagen 3	Ideogram 3.0	Flux 1.1 [pro]	Midjourney V6.1
Prompt Following	Overall	4.23	4.52	3.96	3.91	3.48	3.36
	Aesthetic Design	4.17	4.42	3.92	3.80	3.34	3.25
	Functional Design	4.19	4.54	3.89	4.06	3.59	3.27
	Film	4.28	4.51	3.85	3.70	3.32	3.04
	Art	4.28	4.53	4.08	3.85	3.48	3.69
	Entertainment	4.28	4.74	4.14	4.12	3.80	3.67
Structural Accuracy	Overall	3.87	4.23	3.79	3.71	3.41	3.31
	Aesthetic Design	3.94	4.36	3.79	3.90	3.47	3.28
	Functional Design	3.78	4.17	3.82	3.69	3.25	3.15
	Film	3.69	4.07	3.55	3.43	3.28	3.23
	Art	4.00	4.18	3.92	3.68	3.53	3.61
	Entertainment	3.98	4.34	3.88	3.84	3.55	3.30
Aesthetic Quality	Overall	3.39	3.17	3.12	3.07	3.15	3.38
	Aesthetic Design	3.38	3.07	3.10	3.07	3.11	3.31
	Functional Design	3.34	3.13	3.12	3.10	3.09	3.31
	Film	3.43	3.28	3.13	3.03	3.19	3.44
	Art	3.42	3.22	3.14	3.04	3.21	3.47
	Entertainment	3.35	3.18	3.11	3.10	3.19	3.41

Table 7 Scores of Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality across five application scenarios, with boldface indicating the top values in each row.

- Midjourney V6.1: Aesthetic specialist. Midjourney V6.1 demonstrates outstanding Aesthetic Quality (3.38), tying for first place, but performs relatively weakly in Prompt Following (3.36) and structural accuracy (3.31). Its strong visual appeal gives it a distinct advantage in Art and Film scenarios, making it ideal for applications focused on visual style exploration, creative art, atmospheric expression, and impactful visual presentation.
- Ideogram 3.0: Mid-tier model with specialized strengths. Ideogram 3.0 also has balanced scores across three dimensions, though lower than top-tier models. Its distinct strength lies in text rendering, making it especially suitable for applications like logo design, posters, and text-image layout for office illustrations where textual clarity is essential. ELO analysis further supports this, showing that Ideogram 3.0 achieves higher win rates on prompts requiring explicit text rendering.
- Flux 1.1 [pro]: Relatively weak performance. Flux 1.1 [pro] records the lowest ELO score (1,010) among the six models, with limited structural and Prompt Following capabilities, but comparatively strong cinematic realism, reflected in high Aesthetic Quality score (3.19) in Film.

To further examine how current models perform across various capabilities, we conducted test points scoring, with the detailed evaluation methodology provided in Appendix D. The experimental results (Table 8) reveal that each model also exhibits divergent characteristics across test points. For instance, GPT-4o leads across multiple test points with pronounced strengths in semantics-related test points, including Text (0.95), Facial Expression (0.95), Element Composition (Multi-Entity Feature Matching 0.81, Layout and Typography 0.93, Anti-Realism 0.95), and Text Expression Form (Negation 0.98, Pronoun Reference 1.00, Consistency 0.81). In contrast, Seedream 3.0 demonstrates superiority in visual and action-related test points, such as Texture (0.93), Full-body and Hand Actions (both 0.93), and Interaction Actions (Contact 0.86, Non-contact 0.83).

Furthermore, test point analysis reveals that all models consistently achieve low scores on certain tasks, such as those involving complex relational reasoning (e.g., comparative and similarity relations), quantity, element composition, and text expression forms. Although mainstream T2I models have made notable progress, significant limitations persist, highlighting areas for future improvement.

6.4 Joint analysis of ELO and MOS

We employ a multivariate logistic regression using individual ELO matchups to estimate how increases in each dimension’s MOS score affect ELO win rate. Given the varying dispersion across the three dimensions, their MOS values are standardized before regression. The model further includes cross-variable interaction (such as $x_1 \cdot x_2$) and level-change interaction (such as $x \cdot \Delta x$) terms to account for potential interdependencies

		Seedream 3.0	GPT-4o	Imagen 3	Ideogram 3.0	Flux 1.1 [pro]	Midjourney V6.1
Element	Text	0.82	0.95	0.57	0.88	0.50	0.48
	Quantity	0.69	0.65	0.60	0.74	0.69	0.55
	Facial Expression	0.88	0.95	0.82	0.68	0.62	0.50
	Texture	0.93	0.88	0.81	0.72	0.72	0.81
	Size	0.87	0.87	0.82	0.71	0.76	0.80
	Comparative Relation	0.69	0.71	0.59	0.61	0.67	0.42
	Compositional Relation	0.76	0.80	0.74	0.58	0.51	0.51
	Content Relation	0.83	0.79	0.79	0.65	0.62	0.58
	Similarity Relation	0.65	0.73	0.64	0.63	0.59	0.54
	Full-body Action	0.93	0.95	0.85	0.86	0.75	0.74
	Partial Action	0.93	0.91	0.87	0.91	0.72	0.74
	Animal Action	0.73	0.92	0.77	0.82	0.66	0.60
	Contact Interaction	0.86	0.87	0.74	0.72	0.64	0.59
	Non-contact Interaction	0.83	0.79	0.70	0.70	0.58	0.50
	State	0.89	0.90	0.87	0.72	0.81	0.76
Element Composition	Multi-Entity Feature Matching	0.58	0.81	0.41	0.35	0.33	0.12
	Layout & Typography	0.87	0.93	0.67	0.77	0.71	0.55
	Anti-Realism	0.66	0.95	0.64	0.66	0.51	0.44
Text Expression Form	Negation	0.28	0.98	0.79	0.69	0.68	0.41
	Pronoun Reference	0.68	1.00	0.61	0.86	0.52	0.43
	Consistency	0.59	0.81	0.68	0.61	0.44	0.39

Table 8 Evaluation results of mainstream T2I models on objective capability test points. Score ranges from 0–1; values in bold indicate the top-performing model for each test point.

and non-linear effects. The one-standard-deviation increase is nonuniform across the 1–5 scale (e.g., a shift from 1 to 2 differs from 4 to 5). For clarity, we present only the aggregated one-standard-deviation increase at the dimension level in Table 9 and Table 10, which respectively show the results for different personas and scenarios. It is worth noting that across all results, Prompt Following emerges as the most important determinant of user selection, as it directly reflects intent fulfillment. This observation aligns with intuitive expectations, since when an image does not accurately represent the core semantics of the prompt, strengths in other dimensions have limited practical significance.

Persona	The increment in absolute ELO match win rate (from a 50% baseline) associated with a one-standard-deviation increase in standardized MOS score.		
	Prompt Following	Structural Accuracy	Aesthetic Quality
General user	12.5%	0.7%	7.1%
Expert	37.7%	14.2%	10.9%
Designer	26.0%	10.0%	22.1%

Table 9 Average evaluation dimension weights across different personas, including those in ELO public and expert mode, as well as the distinctive designer subgroup within both modes. Suppose two images A and B, have the same MOS scores in Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality. Consequently, both images would exhibit identical win rates (50%) in ELO. If image A’s Prompt Following score increases by one-standard-deviation relative to image B, its win rate rises to 62.5% (50% + 12.5%). In comparison, a one-standard-deviation increase in Structural Accuracy raises the win rate to just 50.7% (50% + 0.7%).

Application Scenarios	ELO score of Midjourney V6.1	Experts’ weights		
		Prompt Following	Structural Accuracy	Aesthetic Quality
Art	1003	32.7%	12.5%	10.4%
Entertainment	964	35.8%	15.1%	10.9%
Aesthetic Design	931	38.6%	13.9%	10.0%
Functional Design	936	38.5%	18.6%	9.4%
Film	910	40.6%	11.3%	8.7%

Table 10 Illustration of how dimension weights differ across application scenarios, using experts’ weights as a representative example. The red-highlighted numbers indicate that Prompt Following receives a relatively lower weight in the art scenario, and that Midjourney V6.1 achieves the highest ELO score in this domain.

Population preferences. The weighting of evaluation dimensions varies among different users (in Table 9).

- Experts exhibit a greater increment in win rate compared to general user across all three dimensions—Prompt Following ($\beta = 37.7\%$ vs. 12.5%), Structural Accuracy ($\beta = 14.2\%$ vs. 0.7%), and Aesthetic Quality ($\beta = 10.9\%$ vs. 7.1%). This further corroborates our earlier observation that experts are more sensitive to subtle differences.
- For general users, it is notable that the weight for Structural Accuracy is below 1%, markedly lower than those for Prompt Following (12.5%) and Aesthetic Quality (7.1%). The average Structural Accuracy score for mainstream T2I models already exceeds 3, indicating robust performance. As a result, minor structural deviations such as errors in hands or small background objects have limited impact on general users’ selection of superior images. In contrast, pronounced structural anomalies, such as limb errors resulting in MOS scores of 1 or 2, still strongly diminish overall user preference.

Additionally, cross-occupation analysis shows that designers from both general users and experts exhibit distinctive aesthetic sensitivity. Their aesthetic weight reaches 22.1%, which is 3.1 times that of general users (7.1%). This underscores the strong influence of professional background on selection preferences.

Application-scenario preferences. As shown in Table 10, the dimension weights vary across scenarios, with art being particularly distinctive in that Prompt Following receives the lowest weight among all five scenarios. This helps explain why Midjourney V6.1 ranks much higher in the art scenario—its strong visual impact partially offsets its weakness in Prompt Following, as demonstrated by the three examples in Fig. 12.




Figure 12 These prompts are selected from artistic scenarios, and images are generated by Midjourney, which exhibit a particularly strong visual impact.

7 Conclusion

This paper presents the Magic Evaluation Framework (MEF), a systematic and practical approach for evaluating T2I generation models. The core contributions of the framework encompass two aspects:

- **Evaluation methodology.** MEF ensures thorough assessment from both application and diagnostic perspectives by integrating an ELO-based ranking system with a multi-dimensional, detailed MOS scoring system. ELO captures overall user satisfaction and enables robust model ranking. The MOS scoring complements this by providing fine-grained diagnostic analysis through expert reviews to identify issues in the dimensions of Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy, and Aesthetic Quality. Joint analysis of ELO and MOS further quantifies the impact of each dimension on model performance, guiding iteration priorities. Reliability is ensured through a comprehensive quality control system aligned with the evaluation framework, including expert admission, anchor-item monitoring, statistical testing, and other measures.

- **Evaluation benchmark.** Guided by a label-oriented design strategy, we constructed the Magic-Bench-377 benchmark, which is built upon a multi-level taxonomy. This benchmark comprehensively covers three core capability categories—Element, Element Composition, and Text Expression Form—and five major application scenarios, ensuring that the evaluation addresses both the boundaries of model capabilities and the enhancement of user experience. Furthermore, the hierarchical taxonomy enables convenient extension and refinement of labels, supporting fine-grained test point conclusions and facilitating ongoing adaptation to emerging evaluation needs.

Experimental results indicate that while mainstream models have made significant progress in foundational capabilities, top-tier models still exhibit notable deficiencies, particularly in complex test points. Prompt Following remains the most critical evaluation dimension across user groups and scenarios, while the importance of other dimensions varies. Collectively, these findings provide actionable guidance for model iteration, supporting targeted enhancements in areas with the greatest performance gaps and potential impact.

8 Limitations & Future work

While the MEF provides a systematic framework for evaluating T2I models, several limitations remain that should be addressed in future work:

- **Evaluation of long-tail and combinatorial test factors.** Constrained by cost and efficiency, the current Magic-Bench-377 benchmark includes only 377 test cases, leaving limited coverage of long-tail scenarios and complex combinatorial tasks. Therefore, in our practical evaluation process, we incorporated dedicated assessment sets, which include both manual and automated evaluations, to address these gaps. We encourage peers who utilize the MEF to expand their assessments as well, to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of model capabilities.
- **Automation to improve evaluation efficiency.** As models advance and scenarios diversify, human-based evaluation faces increasing efficiency bottlenecks. Future research will focus on exploring automated evaluation methods that meet accuracy standards, aiming to gradually replace manual assessments and thereby improve efficiency without compromising reliability.
- **Extending to multi-modal capability evaluation.** The current Magic-Bench-377 design is primarily focused on single-image text-to-image generation tasks and does not yet cover scenarios such as multi-modal conditioned generation, or tasks that demand multi-modal outputs. However, user demand in these scenarios is considerable, and as model capabilities evolve, support and performance on these tasks will become central to evaluation. Accordingly, future work will extend both the benchmark and methodology to multi-modal capability scenarios.

References

- [1] Jason Baldridge, Jakob Bauer, Mukul Bhutani, Nicole Brichtova, Andrew Bunner, Kelvin Chan, Yichang Chen, Sander Dieleman, Yuqing Du, Zach Eaton-Rosen, et al. Imagen 3. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07009](#), 2024.
- [2] James Betker, Gabriel Goh, Li Jing, Tim Brooks, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Long Ouyang, Juntang Zhuang, Joyce Lee, Yufei Guo, et al. Improving image generation with better captions. <https://openai.com/>, 2023.
- [3] Z. Bosheah and V. Bilicki. Challenges in generating accurate text in images: A benchmark for text-to-image models on specialized content. *Applied Sciences*, 15(5):2274, 2025. doi: 10.3390/app15052274.
- [4] Y. Chang, X. Wang, J. Wang, Y. Wu, L. Yang, K. Zhu, H. Chen, X. Yi, C. Wang, Y. Wang, et al. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2023.
- [5] Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Ying Sheng, Anastasios Nikolas Angelopoulos, Tianle Li, Dacheng Li, Hao Zhang, Banghua Zhu, Michael Jordan, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Chatbot arena: An open platform for evaluating llms by human preference. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04132](#), 2024.
- [6] M. D’Inca et al. Gradbias: Unveiling word influence on bias in text-to-image generative models. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–12, 2025. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2025.3592901. early access.
- [7] P. Esser, S. Kulal, A. Blattmann, R. Entezari, J. Müller, H. Saini, Y. Levi, D. Lorenz, A. Sauer, and F. Boesel. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03206](#), 2024.
- [8] Yu Gao, Lixue Gong, Qiushan Guo, Xiaoxia Hou, Zhichao Lai, Fanshi Li, Liang Li, Xiaochen Lian, Chao Liao, Liyang Liu, Wei Liu, Yichun Shi, Shiqi Sun, Yu Tian, Zhi Tian, Peng Wang, Rui Wang, Xuanda Wang, Xuefeng Wu, Jie Wu, Xin Xia, Zhongliang Zhai, Xinyu Zhang, Qi Zhang, Yuwei Zhang, Shijia Zhao, Jianchao Yang, and Weilin Huang. Seedream 3.0 technical report. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11346](#), 2025.
- [9] D. Ghosh, H. Hajishirzi, and L. Schmidt. Geneval: An object-focused framework for evaluating text-to-image alignment. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11513](#), 2023.
- [10] Yushi Hu, Benlin Liu, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Mari Ostendorf, Ranjay Krishna, and Noah A. Smith. Tifa: Accurate and interpretable text-to-image faithfulness evaluation with question answering. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11897](#), 2023.
- [11] Hui Huang, Yingqi Qu, Xingyuan Bu, Hongli Zhou, Jing Liu, Muyun Yang, Bing Xu, and Tiejun Zhao. An empirical study of llm-as-a-judge for llm evaluation: Fine-tuned judge model is not a general substitute for gpt-4. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02839](#), 2024.
- [12] K. Huang, C. Duan, K. Sun, E. Xie, Z. Li, and X. Liu. T2i-compbench++: An enhanced and comprehensive benchmark for compositional text-to-image generation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 47(5):3563–3579, 2025. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2025.3531907.
- [13] Nithish Kannen, Arif Ahmad, Marco Andreetto, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Utsav Prabhu, Adji B. Dieng, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, and Shachi Dave. Beyond aesthetics: Cultural competence in text-to-image models, 2024.
- [14] Yuval Kirstain, Adam Polyak, Uriel Singer, Shahbuland Matiana, Joe Penna, and Omer Levy. Picka-pic: An open dataset of user preferences for text-to-image generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06938](#), 2023.
- [15] Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, Sawsan Alqahtani, M Saiful Bari, Mizanur Rahman, Mohammad Abdullah Matin Khan, Haidar Khan, Israt Jahan, Amran Bhuiyan, Chee Wei Tan, Md Rizwan Parvez, et al. A systematic survey and critical review on evaluating large language models: Challenges, limitations, and recommendations. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04069](#), 2024.
- [16] Tony Lee, Haoqin Tu, Chi Heem Wong, Wenhao Zheng, Yiyang Zhou, Yifan Mai, Josselin Somerville Roberts, Michihiro Yasunaga, Huaxiu Yao, Cihang Xie, et al. Vhelm: A holistic evaluation of vision language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07112](#), 2024.
- [17] Baiqi Li, Zhiqiu Lin, Deepak Pathak, Jiayao Li, Yixin Fei, Kewen Wu, Tiffany Ling, Xide Xia, Pengchuan Zhang, Graham Neubig, et al. Genai-bench: Evaluating and improving compositional text-to-visual generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13743](#), 2024.
- [18] Z. Li, X. Wu, H. Du, H. Nghiem, and G. Shi. Benchmark evaluations, applications, and challenges of large vision language models: A survey. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02189](#), 2025.

- [19] K. Lin, Z. Yang, L. Li, J. Wang, and L. Wang. Designbench: Exploring and benchmarking dall-e 3 for imagining visual design. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15144, 2023.
- [20] S.J. Mun and W.H. Choi. Artificial intelligence in neoplasticism: Aesthetic evaluation and creative potential. Computers, 14(4):130, 2025. doi: 10.3390/computers14040130.
- [21] Yuwei Niu, Munan Ning, Mengren Zheng, Bin Lin, Peng Jin, Jiaqi Liao, Kumpeng Ning, Bin Zhu, and Li Yuan. Wise: A world knowledge-informed semantic evaluation for text-to-image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.07265, 2025.
- [22] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In International conference on machine learning, pages 8821–8831. Pmlr, 2021.
- [23] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125, 1(2):3, 2022.
- [24] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 10684–10695, 2022.
- [25] C. Saharia, W. Chan, S. Saxena, L. Li, J. Whang, E. Denton, S. K. S. Ghasemipour, B. K. Ayan, S. S. Mahdavi, R. G. Lopes, et al. Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11487, 2022.
- [26] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805, 2023.
- [27] Kuaishou Kolours Team. Kolours: Effective training of diffusion model for photorealistic text-to-image synthesis. <https://huggingface.co/Kwai-Kolours/Kolours>, 2024.
- [28] A. Wang, B. Ai, B. Wen, C. Mao, C.-W. Xie, D. Chen, F. Yu, H. Zhao, J. Yang, J. Zeng, et al. Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20314, 2025.
- [29] Website. MagicArena. <https://aigcarena.com/>, 2024.
- [30] Websites. AA leaderboard, 2025. URL <https://artificialanalysis.ai/text-to-image/arena/leaderboard-text>. Accessed: August 11, 2025.
- [31] Websites. Official website links, 2025. Models and their official websites:
 GPT-4o (<https://openai.com/>),
 Seedream 3.0, Seedream 2.1 (<https://jimeng.jianying.com/>),
 Imagen 3 (<https://ai.google.dev/>),
 Ideogram 3.0, Ideogram 2.0 (<https://ideogram.ai>),
 Luma (<https://lumalabs.ai/>),
 Flux.1 Kontext [pro], Flux 1.1 [pro] (<https://bfl.ai/>),
 Reve Image 1.0 (<https://preview.reve.com/app/explore>),
 Recraft V3 Raw (<https://www.recraft.ai/>),
 Midjourney V6.1 (<https://www.midjourney.com>).
- [32] X. Wu, D. Yu, Y. Huang, O. Russakovsky, and S. Arora. Conceptmix: A compositional image generation benchmark with controllable difficulty. In NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmark, 2024.
- [33] Tianyi Xiong, Xiyao Wang, Dong Guo, Qinghao Ye, Haoqi Fan, Quanquan Gu, Heng Huang, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-critic: Learning to evaluate multimodal models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02712, 2024.
- [34] Z. Yan, J. Ye, W. Li, Z. Huang, S. Yuan, X. He, K. Lin, J. He, C. He, and L. Yuan. Gpt-imgeval: A comprehensive benchmark for diagnosing gpt4o in image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02782 [cs.CV], 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2504.02782.
- [35] Jiahui Yu, Yuanzhong Xu, Jing Yu Koh, Thang Luong, Gunjan Baid, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Alexander Ku, Yinfei Yang, Burcu Karagol Ayan, Ben Hutchinson, Wei Han, Zarana Parekh, Xin Li, Han Zhang, Jason Baldridge, and Yonghui Wu. Scaling autoregressive models for content-rich text-to-image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10789, 2(3):5, 2022.

- [36] X. Yue, Y. Ni, K. Zhang, T. Zheng, R. Liu, G. Zhang, S. Stevens, D. Jiang, W. Ren, Y. Sun, C. Wei, B. Yu, R. Yuan, R. Sun, M. Yin, B. Zheng, Z. Yang, Y. Liu, W. Huang, H. Sun, Y. Su, and W. Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502 \[cs.CL\]](#), 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2311.16502.

Appendix

A Label Coverage Statistics

To ensure consistency, we adopt the proposed labeling framework to compare label coverage across existing benchmarks. Since specialized benchmarks such as Commonsense and WISE target only a single dimension of objective capability, our comparison focuses on comprehensive benchmarks, including PartiPrompt [35], DrawBench [25], and DDesignBench [19] (which additionally incorporates application scenarios). The comparison is conducted by mapping the skill categories defined in these benchmarks onto our labeling framework.

B Detailed Definitions of Taxonomy and Example Case

Capability Category	Capability Item	Definition	Example
Element Granularity	Entity	Semantic units referring to entities such as people, animals, scenes, costumes, and decorations, including real-world and virtual entities, man-made objects, and natural elements.	<i>A little girl in a dress walking her pet dog in a park encounters a robot.</i>
	Entity Description	Semantic units describing the quantity, attributes, forms, states, or relationships of entities.	Three children dressed in jeans are playing jump rope , while several pink roses are in full bloom beside them.
	Image Description	Semantic units that describe visual elements of a scene, including style, aesthetics, and artistic knowledge.	<i>Light mist rises from a mountain valley, depicted in an ink wash painting with minimalist composition.</i>
Element Composition	Anti-Realism	Combinations that contradict real-world cognition or physical laws.	A ceramic cup floating in the air.
	Layout & Typography	Descriptions of spatial or positional relationships among images, text, or symbols.	<i>A poster with the word "TOPIC" at the top and "Love & Peace" at the bottom.</i>
	Multi-Entity Feature Matching	Multiple entities of the same type with distinct attribute values.	Three purple gemstones and one pink gemstone .
Text Expression Form	Negation	Negative expressions such as "no", "without" or "does not".	<i>A fish tank without any fish.</i>
	Pronoun Reference	Pronouns (he, she, it, they) referring back to entities mentioned earlier in the text, requiring the model to resolve co-reference.	<i>The bear lies on the ground, the cub lies beside it.</i>
	Consistency	Multiple entities of the same type sharing the same attribute.	<i>A group of people all wearing sunglasses, sunbathing on the beach.</i>

Table 11 Definitions and Example Cases of Model Capability Labels. In the example cases, the **bolded text** indicates the elements that are assigned the corresponding category labels.

Application Scenario	Definition	Example
Film	Focuses on user needs for story-driven content creation, such as storyboards, cinematic scenes, or animated sequences. Models are expected to understand narrative details and generate scenes with coherent environments and character interactions.	<i>A terrifying movie scene: in a dark alley at night, a tall man holding a sharp knife stands in front of a couple, with the girl hiding behind her boyfriend.</i>
Art	Focuses on user needs for high-level artistic creation, requiring models to generate outputs aligned with artistic styles, aesthetics, and visual imagination, such as oil painting, watercolor, sketching, or abstract expression.	<i>An artwork combining charcoal drawing and red ink, exploring the theme of depression. In the foreground, crisscrossing barbed wire is depicted, while at the center of the composition a curled-up human figure is enveloped in darkness, evoking a strong sense of isolation.</i>
Entertainment	Focuses on user needs for casual, creative and entertaining content, often reflecting internet culture (e.g., memes, emojis, or playful illustrations). The goal is to stimulate fun, amusement, or humor.	<i>A series of emoji-style designs: Expression 1: A monkey grinning widely, with the caption "Happy". Expression 2: A monkey wearing sunglasses, with the caption "Cool". Expression 3: A monkey holding a flower with a shy expression, with the caption "Shy". Expression 4: A monkey showing a surprised expression, with the caption "Surprise".</i>
Aesthetic Design	Focuses on model use as a visual tool in professional design contexts, such as poster design, logo design, product design, etc. Models are expected to provide visually appealing outputs with high aesthetic quality.	<i>A fashion show poster featuring models in elegant dresses, with "MagicArena" in bold letters, a futuristic tech magazine cover titled "AI FASHION".</i>
Functional Design	Focuses on user needs for practical work and learning materials, such as teaching slides, product manuals, or office diagrams. Outputs emphasize clarity, conciseness and informativeness.	<i>A PowerPoint slide on "Curriculum, Practice, Activities, Collaboration," with each point illustrated by an icon of a leaf.</i>

Table 12 Definitions and Example Cases of Application Scenario Labels.

C Rules for Constructing Evaluation Prompts

- **Clarity and Visualizability.** Prompts should be concise, explicit and easy to visualize, while avoiding vague or non-visualizable descriptions. For example, the prompt “A humanoid bird creature with golden wings spread wide, as if guarding a lush green mountain” contains the phrase “as if guarding a lush green mountain”, which is difficult to visualize, thereby limiting the ability to distinguish model performance.
- **Neutrality and Fairness.** Only generic characters and themes should be used when constructing evaluation data. Descriptions involving regional specificity, references to celebrities, or copyrighted characters must be avoided to ensure fair evaluation across all models. For instance, the prompt “A Double Ninth Festival poster: generate a background image of climbing to honor ancestors, with a festival poem written on the right side” would disadvantage models not trained on Chinese cultural contexts.
- **Diversity within Each Label.** Multiple prompts under the same label should remain diverse, rather than relying on identical elements or expressions. For example, under the texture label, prompts should cover varied textures such as metal, glass and silk, instead of repeatedly using only one or two textures.
- **Multiple Test Points per Prompt.** Prompts should reflect real user requirement by composing multiple capabilities within a single description, rather than isolating capabilities one by one. For instance, a prompt may specify quantity, color, and spatial relations together in Fig. 13.




Figure 13 Combining test points may be related to a decrease in model performance. In all three examples, quantity, size, and color relationships are tested together. Excluding the size relationship results in a better performance on the quantity.

D Test Point Evaluation Method

To enable a more fine-grained analysis of model performance across different objective capabilities, each item in Magic-Bench-377 was decomposed according to its annotated capability labels, resulting in multiple evaluation samples that each test only a single capability. During scoring, evaluators were required to determine whether the generated image satisfied the specific capability requirement. A score of 1 was assigned if the requirement was fully met, and 0 otherwise. This evaluation focused exclusively on the Prompt Following dimension and did not assess Structural Accuracy or Aesthetic Quality.

E ELO and MOS Scoring Standard

The scoring rules for both ELO scores and multi-dimensional MOS scores are introduced below.

ELO Score. The ELO score (in Fig. 14) primarily measures the overall degree to which a generated image satisfies the input text prompt, requiring a holistic consideration of performance across the three dimensions: Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy and Aesthetic Quality. If Image A performs no worse than Image B across all three dimensions, then Image A is judged superior. However, when Image A and Image B each show strengths and weaknesses across different dimensions, the evaluator must make a comprehensive judgment based on the relative weights of the dimensions and the severity of the observed issues.




Figure 14 Representative case examples illustrating the ELO evaluation rules.

MOS Score. The MOS scoring system evaluates model performance across the three core dimensions: Prompt Following, Structural Accuracy and Aesthetic Quality. Each dimension is rated on a 1–5 scale, with the meaning of each score level and the corresponding scoring guidelines detailed in Fig. 15.



	Prompt Following	Structural Accuracy	Aesthetic Quality
Score = 1 Completely Unusable	<p>prompt: Two green boxes are on the table, and two red balls are under the table.</p> <p>The generated image completely fails to reflect the textual requirements.</p>  <p>Completely fails to reflect the intended context.</p>	<p>The image exhibits critical structural flaws, including clear errors in the main subject.</p>  <p>The structures of the headphones, phone and watch are all flawed, with disorganized and illegible text.</p>	<p>The image is entirely devoid of aesthetic quality, producing an uncomfortable visual impression.</p>  <p>The image contains evident and severe structural problems that affect visual perception and cause discomfort.</p>
Score = 2 Basically Unusable	<p>The image does not meet the core textual requirements, with multiple or very obvious semantic errors.</p>  <p>The number and position of objects are incorrect.</p>	<p>The image contains noticeable structural issues, such as unclear or disproportionate parts of the main entity.</p>  <p>A hand with unclear fingers and slight deformation.</p>	<p>The image shows aesthetic flaws, with poor rendering of details such as lighting, shadows, or colors.</p>  <p>Overly saturated colors, outdated overall style.</p>
Score = 3 Basically Usable	<p>The image largely satisfies the core textual requirements, but contains some evident semantic errors.</p>  <p>Correct color and quantity, but partially inaccurate positioning.</p>	<p>The image is generally acceptable, with only minor structural issues.</p>  <p>Extra fingers, but otherwise coherent hand structure.</p>	<p>The image is acceptable overall, with no major issues, though lacking outstanding aesthetic quality.</p>  <p>Medium-quality illustrations with plain visual appeal.</p>
Score = 4 Basically Satisfactory	<p>The image fulfills the core textual requirements, with only minor semantic inaccuracies.</p>  <p>The prompt requirements are met, but one extra ball is present.</p>	<p>The image contains only very subtle structural issues.</p>  <p>Slight deformation in the hand of the child on the left.</p>	<p>Exhibits a certain degree of aesthetic appeal, with strengths in specific aspects.</p>  <p>Character facial details are vivid, and spatial relations are well represented.</p>
Score = 5 Satisfactory	<p>The image completely fulfills all textual requirements.</p>  <p>All prompt requirements are fully satisfied.</p>	<p>The image fully conforms to physical and logical rules, with no structural issues.</p>  <p>Hands, body and posture are entirely coherent and realistic. Inaccurate depiction of the main subject will result in a penalty for prompt following.</p>	<p>The image exhibits outstanding visual quality and strong artistic appeal.</p>  <p>Impressive visual effects and a clear sense of artistry.</p>

Figure 15 Evaluation rules for MOS scoring and illustrative case examples.

F Scoring Interface




Figure 16 MOS scoring interface.




Figure 17 ELO interface.

Contributions

Core Contributor

Xiaojing Dong, Weilin Huang, Liang Li, Yiyi Li, Shu Liu, Tongtong Ou, Shuang Ouyang, Yu Tian, Fengxuan Zhao

Contributor

Xinqi Cheng, Jing Cui, Jing Fang, Meng Guo, Bibo He, Hongwei Kou, Hao Li, Yameng Li, Botao Liu, Yin Liu, Liyue Wang, Junkai Wang, Qingyi Wang, Ruolan Wu, Jianchao Yang, Linkai Zeng, Zhonghua Zhai, Xiaoyin Zhang, Yongjian Zhang, Huating Zhao, Feilong Zuo

Acknowledgments

We thank all colleagues at ByteDance for their support of this project.