

STRUCTURED INFORMATION FOR IMPROVING SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN TEXT-TO-IMAGE GENERATION

Sander Schildermans[†], Chang Tian^{†*}, Ying Jiao^{†*}, Marie-Francine Moens[†]

[†] KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
 {sander.schildermans}@student.kuleuven.be

ABSTRACT

Text-to-image (T2I) generation has advanced rapidly, yet faithfully capturing spatial relationships described in natural language prompts remains a major challenge. Prior efforts have addressed this issue through prompt optimization, spatially grounded generation, and semantic refinement. This work introduces a lightweight approach that augments prompts with tuple-based structured information, using a fine-tuned language model for automatic conversion and seamless integration into T2I pipelines. Experimental results demonstrate substantial improvements in spatial accuracy, without compromising overall image quality as measured by Inception Score. Furthermore, the automatically generated tuples exhibit quality comparable to human-crafted tuples. This structured information provides a practical and portable solution to enhance spatial relationships in T2I generation, addressing a key limitation of current large-scale generative systems.

Index Terms— Structured information, Multimedia

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in text-to-image generation have been driven by diffusion-based models such as Stable Diffusion [1] and DALL-E 3 [2]. These systems are able to synthesize highly realistic and creative imagery from natural language descriptions, with applications in various sectors such as art, advertising and the entertainment industry [3]. Despite these achievements, faithfully representing spatial relationships described in natural language prompts remains a major challenge for state-of-the-art models.

Previous attempts have explored approaches such as prompt optimization [4, 3, 5], spatially grounded generation [6, 7, 8], and semantic refinement [9, 10]. However, these approaches often incur substantial computational overhead and face challenges in generalization due to their complex designs.

* Chang Tian and Ying Jiao are co-first authors.

Corresponding authors: Chang Tian (namechangtian@163.com) and Ying Jiao (ying.jiao@kuleuven.be).

In this paper, we introduce a **lightweight, plug-and-play solution** that augments plain natural language prompts with structured, tuple-based information of objects and their spatial relationships. Concretely, a fine-tuned T5-small [11] model automatically converts natural language texts into the structured information as shown in Figure 1. The structured information is appended to the plain natural language prompts and directly fed into Stable Diffusion XL [12] (SDXL), without any modification to its architecture or parameters.

Our main contributions are:

- We propose a novel tuple-based representation that explicitly encodes objects and their spatial relations in a compact, model-friendly format.
- We propose a lightweight and portable converter that transforms natural language into structured information, built on T5-small with only 60M parameters and requiring limited training data.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate improved handling of spatial relationships, along with higher image quality as measured by Inception Score. Our method outperforms plain prompt inputs and two leading baselines, RealCompo [13] and DPT-T2I [10].
- We propose a plug-and-play generation pipeline that enhances spatial alignment while remaining portable and easy to integrate.

2. RELATED WORK

Relevant studies can be grouped into text-to-image generation and semantic parsing. However, tuple extraction has not yet been applied to automatic prompt construction for text-to-image generation. Distinct from prior works, our method introduces the idea to enhance the representation of spatial relationships in text-to-image generation.

2.1. Text-to-image Generation

Deep learning has significantly advanced numerous applications [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], with text-to-image generation representing an important area of progress. Efforts to




Fig. 1. An example of structured information extraction. Given a plain natural language prompt, the fine-tuned language model produces tuple-based representations that explicitly encode objects and their spatial relations, providing a compact and model-friendly input format.

enhance the performance of text-to-image generation can be broadly classified into following research directions.

Prompt Optimization. Prior studies focus on improving the clarity and aesthetics of prompts. Promptist [4] applies reinforcement learning to rewrite prompts for greater coherence. Promptify [5] leverages large language models to generate stylistic variations or prompt extensions. PromptCharm [3] enables interactive refinement of prompts. While these approaches enhance image quality, they provide limited gains in the spatial relationship [13, 10].

Layout-Aware and Spatially Grounded Generation. Recent works aim to enhance spatial grounding and layout control in text-to-image generation. ReCo [6] introduces position tokens to improve spatial alignment, while Spa-Text [7] integrates segmentation maps with region-specific text. DenseDiffusion [8] modifies intermediate attention maps for more precise layout control. VPGen [21] adopts a modular pipeline that sequentially generates objects, layouts, and renderings. RealCompo [13] offers a training-free approach that combines diffusion and layout-aware models through a noise-balancing mechanism, improving object placement while maintaining realism. Despite their effectiveness, these methods often involve substantial computational overhead.

Cross-Modal Alignment and Semantic Refinement. ELLA [22] integrates LLM representations at different timesteps into the diffusion process to refine semantic consistency. Feedback-based methods further enhance alignment: Pick-a-pic [9] and ImageReward [23] employ human preference modeling, while DreamSync [24] applies self-training with vision-language models. DPT-T2I [10] introduces a discriminative adapter for T2I models, probing their discriminative capabilities and leveraging fine-tuning to improve text-image alignment.

2.2. Semantic Parsing

Prior research in natural language processing has demonstrated the effectiveness of converting natural language into structured, machine-readable formats [25, 26]. For example, [27] introduced semantic tuple extraction for text summarization, while [28] provided a broader overview of parsing methods across diverse applications.

3. METHOD

We first construct the datasets used for fine-tuning T5-small and for evaluation (Section 3.1). Next, we fine-tune T5-small and employ it to generate structured information, which augments plain prompts for image generation with Stable Diffusion XL (Section 3.2). Finally, we evaluate the generated images (Section 3.3). A visualization of the proposed pipeline is presented in Figure 2. We refer to our method as **Structured-Prompter**.

3.1. Dataset Construction

We use the TV-Logic dataset [29], which provides relational text descriptions paired with synthetic images of simple colored shapes. Its emphasis on spatial relations makes it particularly suitable for evaluating the proposed method. To reduce ambiguity and noise in evaluation, we restrict the dataset to two-object scenes, excluding the counting and manipulation subsets. The resulting subset used in our experiments consists of:

- 500 training prompts,
- 100 validation prompts,
- 1000 test prompts.

For each prompt sample in the training and validation sets, we generate tuple-based structured information with the assistance of GPT-4o. This structured representation consists of two components:

- **Object tuples:** (color, shape),
- **Spatial relation tuples:** (subjectID, relation, objectID).

An example of the conversion from plain text to the tuple format is shown in Figure 1. This format is compact, efficiently generated, and well aligned with the natural language patterns that diffusion models are trained on.

For each prompt in the validation set, we manually extract structured information to serve as a reference for comparison with the structured information generated by the fine-tuned




Fig. 2. An overview of the StructuredPrompter framework.

language model during empirical evaluation. In total, the validation set contains 100 prompts, each paired with manually extracted structured information.

3.2. Augmented Prompts

Given a plain natural language prompt X as input and the GPT-4o-extracted structured information Y as ground truth, we fine-tune the language model $f(\cdot)$ to predict \hat{Y} . The fine-tuning process is optimized with cross-entropy loss, as shown in the following equations:

$$\hat{Y} = f(X), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE} = - \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i \log \hat{Y}_i, \quad (2)$$

where N is the number of tokens in the structured output, Y_i is the ground-truth token distribution at position i , and \hat{Y}_i is the predicted probability distribution over the vocabulary at position i .

The training process is evaluated on the validation set every five epochs. If performance does not improve within the subsequent five epochs, we consider the training to have converged.

In this work, we employ T5-small as the language model for structured information extraction. On the validation set, it achieved scores above 0.98 in both BLEU and ROUGE, confirming its reliability. Its compact model size further demonstrates the feasibility of lightweight tuple extraction. Detailed statistics are reported in Table 1.

The extracted structured information is then concatenated with plain natural language prompts to form augmented prompts, which are provided as inputs to Stable Diffusion XL for image generation. This process requires no modifications to the diffusion model and adds minimal overhead, making it portable across text-to-image models.

3.3. Evaluation

Spatial Relationships. We employ Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct [30] as a judge to verify whether the generated images correctly convey the information specified in the plain prompts. For instance, given the prompt “B is on the right of A” and a generated image, we query Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct with “Is B on the right of A? Please answer Yes or No.” A correctly generated image should support a Yes response.

In addition to spatial relationships, we also evaluate color and shape alignment. The results are in the Table 2.

Image Quality. We further assess the overall visual quality of the generated images using the Inception Score [31].

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Implementation Details

We conduct experiments using three random seeds (40, 41, and 42). The training batch size is 4 with a gradient accumulation step of 8. The learning rate is set to $1e-4$, optimized using Adam with 10 warm-up steps and a weight decay of 0.01. All experiments are implemented in PyTorch 2.5.1 and Transformers 4.50, and executed on an NVIDIA A100 GPU. Additional details are available in the GitHub repository of this work ¹.

4.2. Impact Of Parameter Scale

As shown in Table 1, we adopt fine-tuned T5-small as the backbone model for structured information extraction. Using 500 samples generated with GPT-4o, it achieves a BLEU score of 0.98 and a ROUGE score of 0.99. These results demonstrate that T5-small is a lightweight yet effective extractor of structured information. In contrast, Llama-3.2-1B

¹The code and data will be publicly available upon publication at <https://github.com/Sander445/StructuredPrompter>.

# Training Samples	Llama-3.2-1B		Llama-3-8B		T5-small	
	BLEU (Epoch)	ROUGE (Epoch)	BLEU (Epoch)	ROUGE (Epoch)	BLEU (Epoch)	ROUGE (Epoch)
100	0.0000 (0)	0.08 (0)	0.0306 (0)	0.25 (0)	0.0689 (20)	0.21 (20)
200	0.0097 (10)	0.08 (10)	0.0367 (20)	0.30 (20)	0.9156 (20)	0.894 (20)
300	0.0125 (20)	0.18 (20)	0.0493 (0)	0.35 (0)	0.9828 (20)	0.99 (20)
400	0.0000 (0)	0.08 (0)	0.0544 (20)	0.26 (20)	0.9844 (20)	0.99 (20)
500	0.0113 (10)	0.14 (10)	0.0509 (20)	0.28 (20)	0.9889 (15)	0.99 (15)

Table 1. Best BLEU and ROUGE scores on the validation set (with corresponding convergence epochs) for Llama-3.2-1B, Llama-3-8B and T5-small across different training sample sizes. We use T5-small, fine-tuned on 500 training samples, as our language model for structured information extraction.

Model	Input Type	Spatial	Color	Shape
SDXL	Plain	0.446 ± 0.015	0.484 ± 0.021	0.470 ± 0.008
SDXL	Plain + Structured (ours)	0.473 ± 0.004	0.499 ± 0.012	0.483 ± 0.015
DPT-T2I	Plain	0.465 ± 0.024	0.452 ± 0.012	0.479 ± 0.021
RealCompo	Plain	0.310 ± 0.009	0.339 ± 0.021	0.375 ± 0.027

Table 2. Evaluation results with Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct on the test set (mean ± std over 3 seeds). Reported values indicate the proportion of “Yes” responses across all generated images. The experimental results are reported as averages over three runs with 3 random seeds.

and Llama-3-8B yield unreliable outputs, frequently producing malformed sequences. A plausible explanation is that the larger parameter scale of the Llama models leads to overfitting when fine-tuned with a limited number of samples.

4.3. Quantitative Results

As shown in Table 2, appending structured information substantially improves the modeling of spatial relationships. This improvement arises because the structured representation emphasizes spatial elements and attributes while maintaining strong alignment with the natural language patterns on which diffusion models are trained. Notably, our method also outperforms plain prompts in terms of color and shape alignment between the generated images and the input prompts. These results demonstrate that tuple-based structured information provides effective features for text-to-image generation with SDXL. An explanation is that the vast pre-training data of SDXL contains ontology-like knowledge, which facilitates integration with structured information.

Moreover, in Table 2, our method outperforms two leading baselines in the community, DPT-T2I and RealCompo, demonstrating that it offers a portable, plug-and-play, and effective solution for enhancing spatial relationships in text-to-image tasks.

As shown in Table 4, we use the Inception Score (IS) to evaluate the visual quality of the generated images, where higher values indicate better quality. After appending structured information, our method achieves higher IS values than plain prompts, outperforming or matching two leading baselines. These results further confirm the effectiveness of struc-

tured information for text-to-image generation.

4.4. Qualitative Results

Figure 3 presents a qualitative comparison between plain prompts and prompts augmented with structured information. While the plain prompt produces left image with mixed attributes and incorrect spatial arrangements, the addition of structured information resolves these issues and generates the intended scene. These results visually demonstrate the effectiveness of our method for text-to-image generation.

4.5. Comparison With Manual Extraction

As described in Section 3.1, we constructed 100 prompt samples paired with manually extracted structured information. We also used a fine-tuned T5-small model to automatically extract structured information. Both types of structured information were appended to the original plain prompts and used as inputs to SDXL. The empirical results in Table 3 indicate that automatically generated tuples achieve results comparable to manually created tuples, with even slightly better performance on spatial relations. This finding confirms that a lightweight T5-small model is sufficient for reliable tuple generation.

5. CONCLUSION

We proposed a lightweight and portable method to enhance spatial faithfulness in text-to-image generation by appending structured information to plain text prompts. Leverag-

Model	Conversion Method	Spatial	Color	Shape
SDXL	Manual	0.453 ± 0.047	0.473 ± 0.040	0.450 ± 0.035
SDXL	Fine-tuned T5-small (ours)	0.457 ± 0.031	0.480 ± 0.030	0.450 ± 0.026

Table 3. Evaluation results of Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct on curated 100 prompt samples for structured information extraction, comparing human annotations with language model outputs (mean \pm std over 3 seeds).

Model	Input Type	Inception Score
SDXL	Plain	6.71 ± 0.52
SDXL	Plain + Structured (ours)	6.94 ± 0.58
DPT-T2I	Plain	5.58 ± 0.43
RealCompo	Plain	6.90 ± 0.38

Table 4. Inception Score (mean \pm std) for all models.




Fig. 3. Qualitative comparison on the prompt: “Add a purple cube at the center. Add a brown cube in front of it on the right.” (a) SDXL with plain prompt fails to render the intended arrangement. (b) With structured information, the output correctly places a brown cube in front-right of the purple cube.

ing a fine-tuned T5-small model with Stable Diffusion XL, our method achieves measurable improvements in spatial accuracy, as validated by Qwen2.5-VL judgments and the Inception Score. The approach is plug-and-play, requiring no retraining of diffusion models, introduces minimal computational overhead since a small language model suffices, and delivers strong improvements in spatial reasoning while preserving visual quality.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, et al., “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 10684–10695.
- [2] Mohamad-Hani Temsah, Abdullah N Alhuzaimi, et al., “Art or artifact: evaluating the accuracy, appeal, and educational value of ai-generated imagery in dall-e 3 for illustrating congenital heart diseases,” *Journal of Medical Systems*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 54, 2024.
- [3] Zhijie Wang, Yuheng Huang, Da Song, Lei Ma, and Tianyi Zhang, “Promptcharm: Text-to-image generation through multi-modal prompting and refinement,” in *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2024, pp. 1–21.
- [4] Yaru Hao, Zewen Chi, Li Dong, and Furu Wei, “Optimizing prompts for text-to-image generation,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 66923–66939, 2023.
- [5] Stephen Brade, Bryan Wang, et al., “Promptify: Text-to-image generation through interactive prompt exploration with large language models,” in *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 2023, pp. 1–14.
- [6] Zhengyuan Yang, Jianfeng Wang, Zhe Gan, et al., “Reco: Region-controlled text-to-image generation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 14246–14255.
- [7] Omri Avrahami, Thomas Hayes, Oran Gafni, Sonal Gupta, Yaniv Taigman, Devi Parikh, Dani Lischinski, Ohad Fried, and Xi Yin, “Spatext: Spatio-textual representation for controllable image generation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2023, pp. 18370–18380.
- [8] Yunji Kim, Jiyoung Lee, Jin-Hwa Kim, Jung-Woo Ha, and Jun-Yan Zhu, “Dense text-to-image generation with attention modulation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 7701–7711.

- [9] Yuval Kirstain, Adam Polyak, Uriel Singer, Shahbuland Matiana, Joe Penna, and Omer Levy, “Pick-a-pic: An open dataset of user preferences for text-to-image generation,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, pp. 36652–36663, 2023.
- [10] Leigang Qu, Wenjie Wang, Yongqi Li, et al., “Discriminative probing and tuning for text-to-image generation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 7434–7444.
- [11] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu, “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer,” *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 21, no. 140, pp. 1–67, 2020.
- [12] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, et al., “Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [13] Xinchen Zhang, Ling Yang, Yaqi Cai, et al., “Re-alcompo: Balancing realism and compositionality improves text-to-image diffusion models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 96963–96992, 2024.
- [14] Dan Li, Shuai Wang, Jie Zou, Chang Tian, Elisha Nieuwburg, Fengyuan Sun, and Evangelos Kanoulas, “Paint4poem: A dataset for artistic visualization of classical chinese poems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.11682*, 2021.
- [15] Chang Tian, Wenpeng Yin, and Marie Francine Moens, “Anti-overestimation dialogue policy learning for task-completion dialogue system,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, 2022, pp. 565–577.
- [16] Chang Tian, Wenpeng Yin, Dan Li, and Marie-Francine Moens, “Fighting against the repetitive training and sample dependency problem in few-shot named entity recognition,” *Ieee Access*, vol. 12, pp. 37600–37614, 2024.
- [17] Chang Tian, Matthew Blaschko, Wenpeng Yin, Mingzhe Xing, Yinliang Yue, and Marie Francine Moens, “A generic method for fine-grained category discovery in natural language texts,” in *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2024, pp. 3548–3566.
- [18] Chang Tian, Mingzhe Xing, Zenglin Shi, Matthew B Blaschko, Yinliang Yue, and Marie-Francine Moens, “Using causality for enhanced prediction of web traffic time series,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.00612*, 2025.
- [19] Chang Tian, Marie-Francine Moens, and Matthew Blaschko, “Deep learning for human computer communication,” 2025.
- [20] Chang Tian, Matthew B Blaschko, Mingzhe Xing, Xiuxing Li, Yinliang Yue, and Marie-Francine Moens, “Large language models reasoning abilities under non-ideal conditions after rl-fine-tuning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.04848*, 2025.
- [21] Jaemin Cho, Abhay Zala, and Mohit Bansal, “Visual programming for step-by-step text-to-image generation and evaluation,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 6048–6069, 2023.
- [22] Xiwei Hu, Rui Wang, Yixiao Fang, Bin Fu, Pei Cheng, and Gang Yu, “Ella: Equip diffusion models with llm for enhanced semantic alignment,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05135*, 2024.
- [23] Jiazheng Xu, Xiao Liu, Yuchen Wu, et al., “Imageward: Learning and evaluating human preferences for text-to-image generation,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 15903–15935, 2023.
- [24] Jiao Sun, Deqing Fu, Yushi Hu, et al., “Dreamsync: Aligning text-to-image generation with image understanding feedback,” in *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2025, pp. 5920–5945.
- [25] Zeru Shi, Kai Mei, Mingyu Jin, Yongye Su, Chaoji Zuo, Wenyue Hua, Wujiang Xu, Yujie Ren, Zirui Liu, Mengnan Du, et al., “From commands to prompts: Llm-based semantic file system for aios,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [26] Xinyu Liu, Shuyu Shen, Boyan Li, Peixian Ma, Runzhi Jiang, Yuxin Zhang, Ju Fan, Guoliang Li, Nan Tang, and Yuyu Luo, “A survey of text-to-sql in the era of llms: Where are we, and where are we going?,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2025.
- [27] Yubin Ge, Sullam Jeoung, and Jana Diesner, “Extractive summarization via fine-grained semantic tuple extraction,” in *Proceedings of the 17th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, 2024, pp. 121–133.
- [28] Peng Jiang and Xiaodong Cai, “A survey of semantic parsing techniques,” *Symmetry*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 1201, 2024.

- [29] Peixi Xiong, Michael Kozuch, and Nilesh Jain, “Textual-visual logic challenge: Understanding and reasoning in text-to-image generation,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 318–334.
- [30] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, et al., “Qwen2. 5-vl technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025.
- [31] Tim Salimans, Ian Goodfellow, et al., “Improved techniques for training gans,” 2016.