

Bridging Interleaved Multi-Modal Reasoning as a Unified Decision Process

Zican Hu^{12*} Xuyang Hu^{3*} Yiming Liu⁴ Zuwei Long² Wei Liu²
Yunzhuo Hao⁵ Jiawei Gu⁶ Linjie Li⁶ Yu Cheng⁷ Zhenhong Sun⁸
Weibo Gu² Xing Sun² Zhi Wang^{1✉}

¹ Nanjing University ² Tencent Youtu Lab ³ Shanghai AI Laboratory
⁴ Tsinghua University ⁵ Zhejiang University ⁶ University of Washington
⁷ The Chinese University of Hong Kong ⁸ Australian National University
Contact: zicanhu@smail.nju.edu.cn zhiwang@nju.edu.cn

Abstract

Unified multi-modal models (UMMs) have shown promising interleaved text-image reasoning capabilities, yet effectively optimizing such multi-turn generation via reinforcement learning (RL) remains an open challenge. Existing approaches apply RL exclusively to text steps, relegating image generation to supervised surrogates, preventing policy gradients from propagating through the full interleaved trajectory across heterogeneous modalities. This leaves the potential of RL for UMMs largely untapped. In the paper, we introduce **BRAID** (Bridging inteRleAved multi-modal reasoning as a unified Decision process), a simple framework that casts multi-turn text-image-text reasoning as a unified Markov decision process (MDP), enabling joint optimization of textual and visual generation via a single, principled RL objective. BRAID computes a shared trajectory-level advantage and propagates it coherently into both text tokens and image denoising paths, each optimized through its modality-native policy gradient mechanism. To further address long-horizon credit assignment, BRAID employs a vision-language model (VLM) judge that scores each intermediate image on its reasoning utility, supplying dense turn-level feedback to sharpen learning at critical visual branches. Experiments on spatial reasoning and visual perception benchmarks show that BRAID consistently outperforms various baselines, confirming that a unified MDP formulation with vision-thinking guidance is essential for effective multi-modal reasoning.

1 Introduction

Recent emergence of unified multi-modal models (UMMs) [1, 2] that seamlessly bridge understanding and generation across modalities within a single framework has opened a new frontier in multi-modal reasoning: interleaved Text-Image-Text Chain-of-Thought (TIT-CoT), where verbal thinking alternates with intermediate image generation to externalize perceptual steps beyond the reach of language [3, 4, 5]. The underlying premise, often termed the *visual superiority hypothesis* [6], is that for physically grounded tasks, visual generation affords a more faithful




Figure 1: SFT, Half-optimized RL, and BRAID.

*Equal contributions. This work was conducted during internship at Tencent Youtu Lab. ✉Corresponding authors.

world model than verbal reasoning, whose expressiveness is inherently bounded by the symbolic nature of language. So far, this premise has been pursued exclusively through supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on curated TIT-CoT traces [7, 8], an approach bottlenecked by the cost and scarcity of high-quality interleaved data. Reinforcement learning (RL) offers a principled alternative: by learning from task rewards rather than curated data, it enables models to autonomously discover novel reasoning strategies that go beyond what static data can teach, as already shown in language [9, 10] and multi-modal reasoning [11, 12].

However, existing formulations leave TIT-CoT half-optimized: policy gradients flow through text tokens alone, while intermediate image generation remains outside the training loop, undermining the very advantage on which interleaved reasoning is premised. COOPER [13] optimizes visual generation, but through a separate supervised stage. While DeepEyes [14] is trained end-to-end with RL, its policy gradients reach only the visual tool calling rather than the image generation process, still leaving visual reasoning outside the optimization loop. Meantime, RL for image generation is well established: DDPO [15] and DPOK [16] cast diffusion denoising as an MDP, and subsequent work extends this to flow matching in FlowGRPO [17] and DiffusionNFT [18]. These formulations provide a ready-made RL toolkit for the visual branch of a unified model, yet none has been integrated into an interleaved reasoning setting. The concurrent work, UniGRPO [19], applies RL to both modalities, but limited to single-turn text-to-image generation. These observations point to a critical missing piece: *a unified RL framework that jointly optimizes textual and visual reasoning within an interleaved TIT-CoT trajectory, enabling end-to-end credit assignment across modality boundaries and exploration over the full combinatorial space of interleaved strategies.*

To close this gap, we propose **BRAID** (Bridging interLeAved multi-modal reasoning as a unified Decision process), which casts multi-turn text-image-text reasoning as a unified MDP. This formulation allows both textual and visual generation turns to be optimized jointly under one RL objective, without requiring separate training stages or modality-specific reward designs. Built on BAGEL [2], BRAID formulates every turn in a $\{\text{text} \rightarrow \text{image} \rightarrow \text{text} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{answer}\}$ trajectory as a macro-action. However, unifying the two modalities under a single objective is non-trivial: the text branch yields per-token autoregressive likelihoods while the image branch traverses continuous denoising paths via flow matching, and naively combining them collapses the optimization due to incompatible scales. BRAID addresses the modality boundary by deriving a shared trajectory-level advantage and channeling it into *modality-native policy gradients*: autoregressive token generation for text and a likelihood-free flow-matching objective for image. Further, BRAID introduces a vision-thinking process reward to address credit assignment over the long-horizon TIT-CoT rollout: a VLM judge scores each intermediate image on its utility to the reasoning trajectory, providing turn-level feedback to sharpen learning at critical visual branches. We hope BRAID serves as a step toward simple, general-purpose RL frameworks for UMMs, and inspires further investigation into principled, modality-agnostic policy optimization paradigms.

Experiments show that BRAID improves BAGEL by **+5.73** avg. across seven benchmarks, surpassing GPT-4o with only 7B parameters, with pronounced gains on SAT (**+14.00**) and V*Bench (**+10.76**). Notably, Maj@*n* shows BRAID’s solution space scales efficiently with sampling budget while baselines plateau, and case studies reveal that the optimized image branch produces faithful intermediates and also transfers strong instruction-following capability to text-to-image generation.

2 Related Work

Interleaved Multi-Modal Reasoning. Chain-of-Thought prompting [20, 21] decomposes complex reasoning into intermediate steps, yet pure text limits expressiveness for visually grounded tasks where spatial/geometric relations are more naturally captured by images [22, 23]. Recent unified architectures address this gap by integrating generation and understanding within a single backbone, enabling interleaved text-image reasoning traces with intermediate visual states [24, 25]. These architectures follow two designs: fully autoregressive (AR) models that treat both modalities as discrete tokens under a unified next-token objective [1, 26], and hybrid AR-diffusion models that employ selective activation of modality-specific parameters (AR for text, diffusion for images) [2, 27]. Both lines demonstrate that cross-modal reasoning can be made intrinsic to a single model through dedicated objectives and curated interleaved data [7, 28, 29]. BRAID builds on the hybrid backbone for its superiority in delegating each modality to its best-suited generative mechanism [30, 31, 32].

RL Fine-tuning. Verifiable-reward RL has emerged as a principled paradigm for enhancing reasoning beyond the ceiling of supervised data, first in LLMs [9, 10] and subsequently in VLMs that are still limited to textual action space [11, 33]. A parallel line adapts RL to image generation by casting diffusion denoising as an MDP [15, 16, 34], with subsequent work generalizing to flow-matching models in FlowGRPO [17], accelerating learning through direct forward-process optimization in DiffusionNFT [18], and unifying these variants under a single policy-gradient framework in DanceGRPO [35]. However, these two lines of work operate within single-modality generation, and neither accommodates the setting where a unified model emits interleaved text-image outputs. BRAID aims to bridge this divide by formulating RL over the joint multi-modal reasoning trajectory.

RL for Interleaved Multi-Modal Reasoning. A growing body of work applies RL to fine-tune unified models. For AR backbones, Emu3.5 [5] scales post-training with verifiable-reward RL, and other studies adopt the same paradigm with a hybrid reward design [36, 37]. For hybrid architectures, prior work typically excludes the visual branch from the RL loop: COOPER [13] trains image generation in a separate supervised stage, and DeepEyes [14] backpropagates policy gradients to the visual tool calling rather than the image generation process itself. Further, the concurrent work UniGRPO [19] does jointly optimize both modalities under a single RL objective, but is limited to single-turn text-to-image generation. In summary, no existing pipeline applies RL to the multi-turn interleaved reasoning setting where each text/image turn conditions subsequent generation. BRAID fills this gap by casting the full interleaved trajectory as a unified decision process and deriving modality-native gradients end-to-end within a single policy.

3 Preliminaries

Group Relative Policy Optimization. GRPO [10] samples, for each prompt q , a group of G rollouts $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^G$ from the behavior policy $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$, scores each τ_i with a scalar reward $r(\tau_i)$, and assigns a group-normalized advantage as $\hat{A}(\tau_i) = \frac{r(\tau_i) - \mu(r(\tau))}{\sigma(r(\tau)) + \kappa}$, where $\mu(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ denote the mean and standard derivation, and κ is a small constant for numerical stability. The policy π_θ is then updated by a clipped surrogate objective with a KL penalty against a frozen reference model π_{ref} as

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\pi_\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \frac{1}{|\tau_i|} \sum_{t=1}^{|\tau_i|} \min(\rho_{i,t} \hat{A}_i, \text{clip}(\rho_{i,t}, 1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon) \hat{A}_i) \right] - \eta D_{\text{KL}}[\pi_\theta \| \pi_{\text{ref}}], \quad (1)$$

where $|\tau_i|$ is the length of rollout τ_i , $\rho_{i,t} = \pi_\theta(\tau_{i,t}|q, \tau_{i,<t}) / \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\tau_{i,t}|q, \tau_{i,<t})$ is the per-token importance ratio, ε is the clipping threshold, and η controls the KL regularization strength.

RL for Image generation. Image steps are modeled by flow matching [38]. Given context c , the policy parameterizes a conditional velocity field $v_\theta(x_t, c, t)$ that transports a noisy sample $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ to a clean image x_0 via the probability-flow ODE along the continuous time axis $t \in [0, 1]$. On interpolated samples $x_t = (1-t)x_0 + t\epsilon$, flow matching regresses v_θ onto the ground-truth velocity:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t, x_0, x_1, c} \|v_\theta(x_t, c, t) - (\epsilon - x_0)\|^2. \quad (2)$$

Applying RL to flow-matching generators requires injecting reward signals into this objective. Rather than estimating the intractable likelihood $\log p_\theta(x_0|c)$, DiffusionNFT [18] turns Eq. (2) into a reward-aware regression by splitting each sample into a positive and a negative branch weighted by a soft label $r(x_0, c) \in [0, 1]$, i.e., the reward representing the optimality probability:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[r(x_0, c) \|v_\theta^+(x_t, c, t) - (\epsilon - x_0)\|^2 + (1 - r(x_0, c)) \|v_\theta^-(x_t, c, t) - (\epsilon - x_0)\|^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

with implicit predictors $v_\theta^\pm := (1 \mp \beta) v_{\theta_{\text{old}}} \pm \beta v_\theta$ that linearly mix the current policy v_θ with a frozen behavior velocity $v_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$, where β is a hyperparameter. High-reward samples pull v_θ toward the data target, while low-reward ones push it away, injecting the RL signal directly into the forward training loss without any likelihood or score estimation.

4 Method

Here, we first cast TIT-CoT reasoning as a two-level MDP that unifies text and image generation in (§4.2). Then, we introduce the unified optimization mechanism that channels the shared trajectory-




Figure 2: Overview of BRAID. (a) Interleaved TIT-CoT reasoning formulated as a two-level MDP. (b) Unified policy optimization via GRPO for text and DiffusionNFT for image. (c) Decoupled advantage estimation combining terminal reward and vision-thinking process reward.

level advantage into modality-native policy gradients in (§4.3). Finally, we present the vision-thinking process reward design that enables efficient credit assignment for image turns in (§4.4).

4.1 Problem Formulation

We formulate a UMM policy π_θ that unifies text and image generation within a single model [2]. Given a prompt $c = (q, \{T_q^n\}_{i=1}^M)$ pairing a textual query q with $M \geq 1$ images, the model produces an *interleaved* reasoning trajectory $\tau \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | c)$ as

$$\tau = (T_1, I_1, T_2, I_2, \dots, T_K, I_K, T_{\text{ans}}), \quad (4)$$

which alternates between text chunks T_k and intermediate images I_k across multiple turns, and ends with a textual answer T_{ans} . Both modalities are generated from π_θ using a shared multi-modal attention backbone [7]. We denote this structure as *Text-Image-Text Chain-of-Thought* (TIT-CoT).

4.2 Interleaved Reasoning as a Unified MDP

To optimize text and image turns under a joint RL framework, we formulate the generation of a TIT-CoT trajectory as a two-level MDP as $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}_{\text{turn}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{step}})$. The outer level $\mathcal{M}_{\text{turn}}$ abstracts each reasoning turn as a *macro-action* that emits either a text chunk T_k or an intermediate image I_k . The inner level $\mathcal{M}_{\text{step}}$ unrolls each macro-action into a sequence of *micro-actions*, i.e., tokens for text generation and denoising paths for image generation, where the turn-level advantage can be consistently propagated to every micro-action within that turn.

Turn-level MDP. The interleaved reasoning over $2K+1$ turns is mapped to the following MDP:

$$\begin{aligned} s_k &\triangleq (c, \tau_{<k}) & \pi(a_k | s_k) &\triangleq \pi_\theta(a_k | c, \tau_{<k}) & P(s_{k+1} | s_k, a_k) &\triangleq \delta_{s_k \oplus a_k} \\ a_k &\triangleq \begin{cases} T_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{txt}} \\ I_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{img}} \end{cases} & \rho(s_0) &\triangleq \delta_{(c, \emptyset)} & R(s_k, a_k) &\triangleq \begin{cases} r(\tau) & \text{if } k = 2K+1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The state s_k concatenates the prompt c with all preceding turns $\tau_{<k}$, and $\rho(\cdot)$ is the initial state distribution. The action a_k is either a text chunk T_k or an image I_k , sampled from the policy $\pi_\theta(a_k | s_k)$ whose text and image experts share a unified backbone. The transition P is the deterministic append $s_{k+1} = s_k \oplus a_k$, the reward R is a sparse rule-based signal assigned only at the final answer T_{ans} . By collapsing each text chunk or intermediate image into a single macro-action, this abstraction renders the two modalities *homogeneous* at the outer level: text and image turns are seamlessly integrated into a single MDP that shares a unified state space, transition dynamics, and reward signal, thereby enabling a coherent RL formulation over the entire interleaved reasoning trajectory.

Step-level MDP. Each turn-level action a_k is realized by rolling out a lower-level MDP $\mathcal{M}_{\text{step}}$ that operates at a fine-grained scale. The specific form depends on the modality:

- For a text turn $a_k = T_k$, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{step}}$ is the standard autoregressive token generation: at step i , the micro-state is the running prefix $s_k^i := (s_k, a_k^{<i})$, the micro-action is the next token $a_k^i := T_k^i$, and π_θ is factorized as $\pi_\theta(T_k | s_k) = \prod_{i=1}^{|T_k|} \pi_\theta(T_k^i | s_k, T_k^{<i})$, where $|T_k|$ is the text length.
- For an image turn $a_k = I_k$, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{step}}$ is the iterative denoising procedure via flow matching: at denoising timestep $t \in [0, 1]$, the micro-state is the noisy image $s_k^t := x_t$, the micro-action is the predicted flow velocity $a_k^t := v_\theta(x_t, s_k, t)$, and the state transition follows the probability-flow ODE as $x_{t_{n-1}} = x_{t_n} + v_\theta(x_{t_n}, s_k, t_n) \cdot dt$, with the clean image $I_k = x_0$ as the terminal state, where $n = N, N-1, \dots, 1$ is the denoising step along the time axis.

Let $\mathcal{K}_{\text{txt}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\text{img}}$ index text and image turns, respectively. Because all turns reside in a single MDP, the joint policy over a complete trajectory factorizes naturally along the turn sequence:

$$\log \pi_\theta(\tau | c) = \sum_{k=1}^{2K+1} \log \pi_\theta(a_k | s_k). \quad (5)$$

Expanding each macro-action into its step-level form then reveals two *modality-native* branches:

$$\log \pi_\theta(\tau | c) = \underbrace{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{txt}}} \sum_{i=1}^{|T_k|} \log \pi_\theta(T_k^i | s_k, T_k^{<i})}_{\text{text branch}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{img}}} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \pi_\theta(x_{t_{n-1}}^k | x_{t_n}^k, s_k)}_{\text{image branch (flow-matching)}}. \quad (6)$$

Although the two branches differ in computational mechanism (autoregressive token generation for text and flow-matching denoising for image generation), their structural parallelism ensures that a shared trajectory-level advantage can be consistently back-propagated through both modality-native policy gradients, a property we exploit in the unified RL objective in §4.3.

4.3 Unified Policy Optimization

We train the unified policy $\pi_\theta = (\pi_\theta^{\text{txt}}, \pi_\theta^{\text{img}})$ by jointly optimizing both branches on grouped rollouts, leveraging the structural parallelism established in Eq. (6): a shared turn-level advantage $\hat{A}(s_k, a_k)$ is back-propagated through each modality-native surrogate, a GRPO-style clipped objective for the text branch and a DiffusionNFT loss [18] for the image branch, yielding the unified objective:

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{txt}}} \mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\pi_\theta^{\text{txt}}(T_k | s_k); \hat{A}(s_k, T_k)) - \lambda \cdot \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{img}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}(\pi_\theta^{\text{img}}(I_k | s_k); \hat{A}(s_k, I_k)), \quad (7)$$

where λ balances the two modalities. Eqs. (5)-(7) together realize BRAID’s core principle: despite distinct generative mechanisms, text and image branches are optimized within a unified RL loop, sharing one interleaved trajectory, one turn-level advantage, and one joint backward pass.

To inject $\hat{A}$ into flow matching without likelihood estimation, we map it to a soft reward label $r_k = \sigma(\hat{A}(s_k, I_k)/v) \in [0, 1]$ with temperature v , and plug it into the DiffusionNFT loss of Eq. (3):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[r_k \left\| v_\theta^+(x_t, s_k, t) - (\epsilon - x_0) \right\|^2 + (1 - r_k) \left\| v_\theta^-(x_t, s_k, t) - (\epsilon - x_0) \right\|^2 \right], \quad (8)$$

where $x_0 = I_k$ is the clean image, ϵ is Gaussian noise, $x_t = (1 - t)x_0 + t\epsilon$ is the interpolated sample, and $v_\theta^\pm = (1 \mp \beta)v_{\theta_{\text{old}}} \pm \beta v_\theta$ are implicit predictors as described in §3. Intuitively, a high $\hat{A}_k$ steers the velocity field v_θ toward the generated image I_k , while a low $\hat{A}_k$ steers it away, thereby propagating the terminal reward signal to image generation directly via the flow-matching loss.

4.4 Vision-Thinking Process Reward

The trajectory-level advantage $\hat{A}(\tau)$ broadcasts a single terminal-reward scalar uniformly to every turn. As the TIT-CoT horizon grows, this undifferentiated signal increasingly obscures which intermediate steps truly matter for the final answer. The issue is amplified for image turns: unlike autoregressive text, image generation must produce coherent, pixel-level content in each non-autoregressive pass, demanding a far sharper learning signal than a sparse, delayed reward can provide.

To address this, we introduce a *vision-thinking process reward* that scores each intermediate image on its utility to the reasoning trajectory, providing dense credit assignment for image turns. Specifically, we employ a VLM judge¹ to score each intermediate image I_k according to a set of complementary criteria $\mathcal{C}$, yielding a per-turn *vector* of process rewards: $\mathbf{r}^{\text{vis}} = [r^{(c)}]_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}|}$. In practice, we instantiate $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{vc}, \text{vf}, \text{ru}, \text{tr}\}$, covering four salient aspects of a visual thought:

- **Visual Correctness** $r^{(\text{vc})}$: whether the intended visual operation is executed accurately;
- **Visual Fidelity** $r^{(\text{vf})}$: whether the image is coherent and free of hallucinated content;
- **Reasoning Utility** $r^{(\text{ru})}$: whether the image provides useful evidence to the final answer;
- **Trustworthiness** $r^{(\text{tr})}$: whether the image is unlikely to mislead a reasonable reasoner.

Decoupled Advantage Estimation. Since the visual process reward is intrinsically multi-objective, its components typically operate on disparate and dynamically shifting scales during training. This complicates the development of a flexible weighting scheme for aggregating the process reward components. To circumvent this issue, we pool all image turns within the group of rollouts into a visual set $\mathcal{I}_G$, compute the advantages for each reward component independently, and simply merge them with equal weight at the advantage level:

$$\hat{A}^{\text{vis}}(s_k, I_k) = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{r_k^{(c)} - \mu_{\mathcal{I}_G}(r^{(c)})}{\sigma_{\mathcal{I}_G}(r^{(c)})}, \quad I_k \in \mathcal{I}_G, \quad (9)$$

where $\mu_{\mathcal{I}_G}(\cdot)$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{I}_G}(\cdot)$ denote the mean and standard derivation calculated from $\mathcal{I}_G$. Analogously, we incorporate the terminal reward $r(\tau)$ with the visual process reward in a decoupled way as

$$\hat{A}(s_k, a_k) = \begin{cases} \hat{A}^{\text{ans}}(s_k, T_k), & \text{for text turns,} \\ \hat{A}^{\text{ans}}(s_k, I_k) + \lambda_{\text{vis}} \cdot \hat{A}^{\text{vis}}(s_k, I_k), & \text{for image turns,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{A}^{\text{ans}}(\cdot)$ is the advantage calculated from the terminal reward $r(\tau)$, and λ_{vis} balances two advantages. By decoupling advantage estimation, each reward signal is normalized relative to its own baseline before aggregation. This architecture mitigates sensitivity to scale mismatch and temporal fluctuations, facilitating more robust and interpretable control over the process reward integration.

5 Experiments

Dataset and Evaluation. Following the literature [7], our training corpus spans a wide range of eight task families: Matterport3D [39], RealSee3D [40], Perspective, DirectionalQuery, 360+ x [41], PositionedDirection, Jigsaw [42], and VisualSearch [43]. In each task, the dataset is partitioned into SFT and RL pools under three ratios: $\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$, $\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$, and $\mathcal{D}^{\cap}$. We default to the partial-overlap regime $\mathcal{D}^{\cap}$, which bridges supervised initialization and on-policy exploration. We evaluate on seven benchmarks spanning two categories: 1) spatial reasoning, including MMSI-Bench [44], SAT [45], MMVP [46], and CV-Bench 3D [47]; 2) visual perception, covering BLINK [48], V*Bench [49], and CV-Bench 2D [47]. All evaluations are conducted under the VLMEvalKit framework [50]. Appendix A.1 shows details of datasets and benchmarks.

Baselines and Training Recipe. We compare our method to two categories of baselines: 1) proprietary and open-source VLMs: GPT-5.4, GPT-4o [51], and Qwen2.5-VL [52]; 2) competitive UMMs: Janus-Pro [30], Chameleon [1], and BAGEL [2]. For RL training, we remove the KL loss term, and set the key hyperparameters: rollout batch size 64, update batch size 32, 8 rollouts per prompt. For DiffusionNFT, we set $\beta = 0.4$ and use 20 sampling steps for training and evaluation. All experimental details are documented in Appendix A.

5.1 Main Results

Comparison among Unified Models. Table 1 summarizes the performance of all tested methods on all benchmarks. Among UMMs of comparable scale, BAGEL already establishes a strong baseline (59.46 avg.), substantially outperforming Janus-Pro (46.05) and Chameleon (27.49), which validates its hybrid AR-diffusion architecture as a capable backbone for multi-modal reasoning (even from

¹We use GPT-5.2 in all experiments; see Appendix A.4 for the full prompt.

Table 1: Performance comparison on multimodal spatial reasoning and visual perception benchmarks. Best results in **bold** and second best underlined.

Model	Size	Spatial Reasoning				Visual Perception			Avg.
		MMSI	SAT	MMVP	CV-Bench 3D	BLINK	VStar	CV-Bench 2D	
Visual Understanding-only VLM									
GPT-5.2	–	32.90	43.33	<u>82.33</u>	<u>86.92</u>	63.70	65.97	<u>76.81</u>	64.57
GPT-4o	–	25.40	42.00	85.33	83.08	58.13	67.54	75.77	62.46
Qwen2.5-VL	7B	28.80	52.67	77.00	74.25	56.81	<u>76.96</u>	68.25	62.11
Qwen2.5-VL	72B	31.70	66.00	81.67	87.58	<u>61.81</u>	85.86	79.09	70.53
Unified Models									
Janus-Pro	7B	27.70	21.33	63.33	66.50	38.82	40.83	63.82	46.05
Chameleon	7B	22.20	10.67	41.67	46.58	23.19	22.51	25.59	27.49
BAGEL	7B	26.60	44.67	75.67	83.41	54.76	57.59	73.53	59.46
Our Methods									
SFT	7B	29.20	49.67	78.67	81.67	57.02	62.82	74.85	61.99
Δ (vs BAGEL)		+2.60	+5.00	+3.00	-1.74	+2.26	+5.23	+1.32	+2.53
BRAID	7B	31.80	58.67	81.33	82.17	57.76	68.35	76.26	65.19
Δ (vs BAGEL)		+5.20	+14.00	+5.66	-1.24	+3.00	+10.76	+2.73	+5.73

limited data) and motivates our choice of building upon it. Nevertheless, a notable gap remains between BAGEL and understanding-only VLMs: even the same-scale Qwen2.5-VL-7B (62.11) surpasses it by 2.65 points, with the margin widening further against Qwen2.5-VL-72B (70.53). It suggests that the generative versatility of unified architectures does not automatically translate into strong visual reasoning without dedicated post-training.

Spatial Reasoning and Visual Perception Performance. Effective on-policy exploration presupposes a policy that can already generate reasonable rollouts. Our SFT stage fulfills precisely this prerequisite: it improves over BAGEL by **+2.53** points on average, with gains observed on nearly every benchmark, thereby furnishing a reliable initialization for the subsequent RL phase. From this initialization, RL yields an additional **+2.73**-point average gain over BAGEL, lifting BRAID to **65.19** and surpassing GPT-4o (62.46) despite employing only 7B parameters. Notably, the most pronounced gains concentrate on SAT (**+14.00**) and V*Bench (**+10.76**), which demand mental viewpoint transformation or fine-grained visual discrimination – precisely the capabilities where unified models have historically trailed understanding-only counterparts. This confirms that BRAID can narrow such deficits without any architectural change. The sole regression appears on CV-Bench 3D (-1.24), which we attribute to a distributional gap in the SFT data; encouragingly, BRAID recovers part of this loss, reducing the deficit from -1.74 (SFT) to -1.24.




Figure 3: Maj@n and Avg@n curves on VStar and SAT benchmarks with varying number of samples $n = \{3, 5, 9, 17\}$. Complete results are available in Table 5.

Reasoning Capacity Boundary. Figure 3 examines the reasoning ceiling via Maj@n and Avg@n metrics across varying samples. On VStar, BRAID’s Maj@n curve climbs steadily from 66.5 to 70.7 as n grows from 3 to 17, while curves of SFT and BAGEL plateau early, suggesting that RL endows the model with a broader and more exploitable solution space. SAT exhibits the same pattern: BRAID attains 61.3 at Maj@17, exceeding SFT (56.7) and BAGEL (52.3) by **+4.6** and **+9.0**, respectively.

The Avg@ n curves reinforce this interpretation: BRAID’s mean per-sample quality is consistently higher, ruling out the possibility that its majority-vote advantage stems solely from greater output diversity. Taken together, these scaling trends confirm that RL not only aligns the model with the reward signal but also incentivizes genuinely stronger reasoning capabilities.

5.2 Ablation Study

To isolate the contribution of each component, we evaluate two ablated variants under the same training recipe: (1) BRAID w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$, which freezes the image generation parameters during RL and only optimizes the text branch, following the design of COOPER [13]; and (2) BRAID w/o r^{vis} , which removes the vision-thinking process reward and relies solely on the terminal reward $r(\tau)$ for advantage estimation. Results are reported in Table 4 and Figure 4 with key findings as

- Dropping r^{vis} (BRAID vs. w/o r^{vis}) results in a moderate decline (65.19 vs. 62.68 avg.), mainly on VStar (−4.48) and SAT (−2.67), two benchmarks reliant on fine-grained visual reasoning. Training accuracy, however, does not collapse: the shared trajectory-level advantage still couples the two modalities, allowing the terminal reward signal to backpropagate to image turns.
- Excluding the image branch (w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$) incurs a steeper decline, notably on VStar (−6.00) and CV-Bench 2D (−4.32). However, its format reward curve converges faster, presumably because the text branch receives an undiluted reward as the sole trainable modality. In contrast, BRAID trades slower early format convergence for a higher accuracy ceiling, confirming that jointly optimizing the image branch produces richer visual intermediates that benefit downstream reasoning.
- $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ opens the gradient pathway for image-turn optimization, while r^{vis} supplies a dedicated signal that steers those gradients toward reasoning-relevant outputs. Neither alone suffices: BRAID outperforms the two ablations by **+3.09** and **+2.51** on average, confirming that both components are essential. Notably, removing $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ is more damaging than removing r^{vis} , underscoring that bringing the image branch into the RL loop (BRAID’s central premise) is the more critical factor.




Figure 4: Ablation results. Left: Final test accuracy across seven benchmarks. Middle: Training average accuracy. Right: Training average format reward. Complete results are available in Table 4.

5.3 Analysis

Rollout-to-Update Ratio. We study how the rollout-to-update batch ratio affects training stability. Our default (2:1, rollout 64 / update 32) maintains a rollout buffer that stabilizes gradient estimates. We compare this against a more aggressive setting (Ratio = 1:1, rollout and update batch is 64) that immediately consumes all rollouts in a single update. As shown in Table 7 and Figure 5, the 1:1 ratio leads to a notable decline of avg. 65.19 to 61.93. The accuracy curve exhibits pronounced oscillations and recovers slowly, indicating that aggressive updates can destabilize the policy. Interestingly, despite the overall degradation, CV-Bench 3D improves to **84.83** under the 1:1 ratio, even surpassing the default 2:1 setting (82.2). We conjecture that higher update frequency encourages aggressive exploration that coincidentally favors this task but destabilizes others; the 2:1 ratio therefore better balances exploration and stable improvement.




Figure 5: Complete results are available in Table 7.

Data Allocation Strategy. We compare three data-allocation regimes (detailed in Appendix A.1): a disjoint split with equal budget ($\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$, $\omega=0$), a disjoint split favoring SFT ($\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$, $\omega=0$), and a replay regime ($\mathcal{D}^\cap$, $\omega\approx 0.32$) where the RL pool partially overlaps with SFT data. Results are reported in Table 6 and Figure 6. The $\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$ SFT checkpoint already exhibits weakness on several benchmarks (e.g., CV-Bench 2D drops to 65.24), indicating that an insufficient SFT budget yields a suboptimal initialization that constrains downstream RL gains. We therefore did not proceed with RL training from this checkpoint. With adequate SFT initialization ($\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$), RL brings consistent gains and reaches **62.63** avg. The replay regime $\mathcal{D}^\cap$ further improves this to **65.19** avg., with pronounced gains on SAT (+9.34 over $\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ RL) and VStar (+3.43). This confirms that replaying a portion of SFT data during RL bridges imitation learning and on-policy exploration, enabling the model to revisit familiar prompts under its own policy and thereby consolidate supervised knowledge while continuing to discover novel reasoning strategies.




Figure 6: Complete results are available in Table 6.

5.4 Case Study

Interleaved Reasoning. We qualitatively compare BRAID and its ablations on a visual search task (Appendix C). BRAID generates diverse, high-fidelity intermediate images that directly support correct reasoning. In contrast, w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ produces distorted visuals that induce hallucinated text reasoning, and w/o r^{vis} introduces fabricated artifacts. Although all variants reach the correct answer on this instance, only BRAID’s reasoning chain is grounded in faithful visual evidence, consistent with its superior robustness under Maj@ n sampling.




Figure 7: Text-to-image generation comparison.

Text-to-Image Generation. Figure 7 shows whether BRAID’s RL training transfers to standalone generation on demo prompts requiring spatial compositionality and numerical accuracy. Without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$, the image branch fails to follow instructions (cat placed beside the fishbowl; balloon count exceeds five). Removing r^{vis} improves spatial relations but still lacks numerical precision. Only BRAID correctly satisfies both prompts, indicating that the vision-thinking reward provides optimization direction that generalizes beyond interleaved reasoning (full comparison in Appendix D).

6 Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Work

We presented BRAID, a framework that casts interleaved text-image-text reasoning as a unified MDP, enabling joint optimization over both textual and visual generation within a unified policy. By deriving a shared trajectory-level advantage and channeling it into modality-native policy gradients, BRAID propagates reward signals end-to-end across modality boundaries. A complementary vision-thinking process reward, scored by a VLM judge, supplies turn-level feedback that sharpens credit assignment at critical image branches. Experiments on seven spatial-reasoning and visual-perception benchmarks demonstrate that BRAID consistently outperforms various baselines.

Several limitations point to promising future directions. First, BRAID is built upon BAGEL’s hybrid AR-diffusion backbone; extending to fully autoregressive UMMs [4], where discrete image tokens are generated via next-token prediction, would broaden the framework’s applicability. Second, the vision-thinking reward currently relies on an external VLM judge, inducing inference cost and dependency; distilling it into a compact, jointly trained PRM would improve both efficiency and reproducibility. Finally, the current formulation assumes a fixed interleaving pattern; exploring adaptive turn structures and richer credit-assignment mechanisms, such as hierarchical advantage decomposition across turns, could further unlock RL’s potential for interleaved multi-modal reasoning.

References

- [1] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024.
- [2] Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, Guang Shi, and Haoqi Fan. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025.
- [3] Jun Gao, Yongqi Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Wenjie Li. Interleaved-modal chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.19488*, 2024.
- [4] Xinlong Wang, Xiaosong Zhang, Zhengxiong Luo, Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Jinsheng Wang, Fan Zhang, Yuezhe Wang, Zhen Li, Qiying Yu, et al. Emu3: Next-token prediction is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18869*, 2024.
- [5] Yufeng Cui, Honghao Chen, Haoge Deng, Xu Huang, Xinghang Li, Jirong Liu, Yang Liu, Zhuoyan Luo, Jinsheng Wang, Wenxuan Wang, et al. Emu3.5: Native multimodal models are world learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26583*, 2025.
- [6] Jialong Wu, Xiaoying Zhang, Hongyi Yuan, Xiangcheng Zhang, Tianhao Huang, Changjing He, Chaoyi Deng, Renrui Zhang, Youbin Wu, and Mingsheng Long. Visual generation unlocks human-like reasoning through multimodal world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.19834*, 2026.
- [7] Jiawei Gu, Yunzhuo Hao, Huichen Will Wang, Linjie Li, Michael Qizhe Shieh, Yejin Choi, Ranjay Krishna, and Yu Cheng. Thinkmorph: Emergent properties in multimodal interleaved chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.27492*, 2025.
- [8] Ethan Chern, Zhulin Hu, Steffi Chern, Siqi Kou, Jiadi Su, Yan Ma, Zhijie Deng, and Pengfei Liu. Thinking with generated images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22525*, 2025.
- [9] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shitong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in LLMs via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [10] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [11] Fanqing Meng, Lingxiao Du, Zongkai Liu, Zhixiang Zhou, Quanfeng Lu, Daocheng Fu, Tiancheng Han, Botian Shi, Wenhai Wang, Junjun He, Kaipeng Zhang, Ping Luo, Yu Qiao, Qiaosheng Zhang, and Wenqi Shao. Mm-eureka: Exploring the frontiers of multimodal reasoning with rule-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.07365*, 2025.
- [12] Yi Yang, Xiaohui He, Haotian Pan, Xiaojiang Jiang, Yao Deng, Xiaoyang Yang, Hao Lu, Dawei Yin, Fei Rao, Miao Zhu, et al. R1-onevision: Advancing generalized multimodal reasoning through cross-modal formalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10615*, 2025.
- [13] Zefeng Zhang, Xiangzhao Hao, Hengzhu Tang, Zhenyu Zhang, Jiawei Sheng, Xiaodong Li, Zhenyang Li, Li Gao, Daiting Shi, Dawei Yin, and Tingwen Liu. COOPER: A unified model for cooperative perception and reasoning in spatial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04563*, 2025.
- [14] Ziwei Zheng, Michael Yang, Jack Hong, Chenxiao Zhao, Guohai Xu, Le Yang, Chao Shen, and Xing Yu. Deepeyes: Incentivizing “thinking with images” via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14362*, 2025.
- [15] Kevin Black, Michael Janner, Yilun Du, Ilya Kostrikov, and Sergey Levine. Training diffusion models with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13301*, 2023.
- [16] Ying Fan, Olivia Watkins, Yuqing Du, Hao Liu, Moonkyung Ryu, Craig Boutilier, Pieter Abbeel, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Kangwook Lee, and Kimin Lee. Dpok: Reinforcement learning for fine-tuning text-to-image diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79858–79885, 2023.

- [17] Jie Liu, Gongye Liu, Jiajun Liang, Yangguang Li, Jiaheng Liu, Xintao Wang, Pengfei Wan, Di Zhang, and Wanli Ouyang. Flow-grpo: Training flow matching models via online RL. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05470*, 2025.
- [18] Kaiwen Zheng, Huayu Chen, Haotian Ye, Haoxiang Wang, Qinsheng Zhang, Kai Jiang, Hang Su, Stefano Ermon, Jun Zhu, and Ming-Yu Liu. Diffusionnft: Online diffusion reinforcement with forward process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.16117*, 2025.
- [19] Jie Liu, Zilyu Ye, Linxiao Yuan, Shenhan Zhu, Yu Gao, Jie Wu, Kunchang Li, Xionghui Wang, Xiaonan Nie, Weilin Huang, and Wanli Ouyang. UniGRPO: Unified policy optimization for reasoning-driven visual generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.23500*, 2026.
- [20] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837, 2022.
- [21] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 22199–22213, 2022.
- [22] Yushi Hu, Weijia Shi, Xingyu Fu, Dan Roth, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, and Ranjay Krishna. Visual sketchpad: Sketching as a visual chain of thought for multimodal language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:139348–139379, 2024.
- [23] Sachit Menon, Richard Zemel, and Carl Vondrick. Whiteboard-of-thought: Thinking step-by-step across modalities. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 20016–20031, 2024.
- [24] Fanxu Meng, Haotong Yang, Yiding Wang, and Muhan Zhang. Chain of images for intuitively reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09241*, 2023.
- [25] Zihui Cheng, Qiguang Chen, Xiao Xu, Jiaqi WANG, Weiyun Wang, Hao Fei, Yidong Wang, Alex Jinpeng Wang, Zhi Chen, Wanxiang Che, et al. Visual thoughts: A unified perspective of understanding multimodal chain-of-thought. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.
- [26] Jinheng Xie, Weijia Mao, Zechen Bai, David Junhao Zhang, Weihao Wang, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Yuchao Gu, Zhijie Chen, Zhenheng Yang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Show-o: One single transformer to unify multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12528*, 2024.
- [27] Ang Li, Charles Wang, Deqing Fu, Kaiyu Yue, Zikui Cai, Wang Bill Zhu, Ollie Liu, Peng Guo, Willie Neiswanger, Furong Huang, et al. Zebra-cot: A dataset for interleaved vision language reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.16746*, 2025.
- [28] Chengzu Li, Wenshan Wu, Huanyu Zhang, Yan Xia, Shaoguang Mao, Li Dong, Ivan Vulić, and Furu Wei. Imagine while reasoning in space: Multimodal visualization-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.07542*, 2025.
- [29] Shengbang Tong, David Fan, Jiachen Li, Yunyang Xiong, Xinlei Chen, Koustuv Sinha, Michael Rabbat, Yann LeCun, Saining Xie, and Zhuang Liu. Metamorph: Multimodal understanding and generation via instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 17001–17012, 2025.
- [30] Chengyue Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zhiyu Wu, Yiyang Ma, Xingchao Liu, Zizheng Pan, Wen Liu, Zhenda Xie, Xingkai Yu, Chong Ruan, and Ping Luo. Janus: Decoupling visual encoding for unified multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13848*, 2024.
- [31] Chunting Zhou, Lili Yu, Arun Babu, Kushal Tirumala, Michihiro Yasunaga, Leonid Shamis, Jacob Kahn, Xuezhe Ma, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. Transfusion: Predict the next token and diffuse images with one multi-modal model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11039*, 2024.

- [32] Runpei Dong, Chunrui Han, Yuang Peng, et al. DreamLLM: Synergistic multimodal comprehension and creation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [33] Wenxuan Huang, Bohan Jia, Zijie Zhai, Shaosheng Cao, Zheyu Ye, Fei Zhao, Zhe Xu, Xu Tang, Yao Hu, and Shaohui Lin. Vision-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.06749*, 2025.
- [34] Jinmei Liu, Haoru Li, Zhenhong Sun, Chaofeng Chen, Yatao Bian, Bo Wang, Daoyi Dong, Chunlin Chen, and Zhi Wang. Beyond the Dirac Delta: Mitigating diversity collapse in reinforcement fine-tuning for versatile image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.12401*, 2026.
- [35] Zeyue Xue, Jie Wu, Yu Gao, Fangyuan Kong, Lingting Zhu, Mengzhao Chen, Zhiheng Liu, Wei Liu, Qiushan Guo, Weilin Huang, et al. Dancegrpo: Unleashing grpo on visual generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07818*, 2025.
- [36] Zigang Geng, Yibing Wang, Yeyao Ma, Chen Li, Yongming Rao, Shuyang Gu, Zhao Zhong, Qinglin Lu, Han Hu, Xiaosong Zhang, et al. X-omni: Reinforcement learning makes discrete autoregressive image generative models great again. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.22058*, 2025.
- [37] Ming Nie, Chunwei Wang, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, and Li Zhang. Towards unified multimodal interleaved generation via group relative policy optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.
- [38] Yaron Lipman, Ricky TQ Chen, Heli Ben-Hamu, Maximilian Nickel, and Matt Le. Flow matching for generative modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02747*, 2022.
- [39] Angel Chang, Angela Dai, Thomas Funkhouser, Maciej Halber, Matthias Niessner, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Andy Zeng, and Yinda Zhang. Matterport3d: Learning from rgb-d data in indoor environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.06158*, 2017.
- [40] Linyuan Li, Yan Wu, Xi Li, Lingli Wang, Tong Rao, Jie Zhou, Cihui Pan, and Xinchun Hui. Realsee3d: A large-scale multi-view rgb-d dataset of indoor scenes (version 1.0), 2025.
- [41] Hao Chen, Yuqi Hou, Chenyuan Qu, Irene Testini, Xiaohan Hong, and Jianbo Jiao. 360+ x: A panoptic multi-modal scene understanding dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19373–19382, 2024.
- [42] Zifu Wang, Junyi Zhu, Bo Tang, Zhiyu Li, Feiyu Xiong, Jiaqian Yu, and Matthew B Blaschko. Jigsaw-r1: A study of rule-based visual reinforcement learning with jigsaw puzzles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23590*, 2025.
- [43] Hao Shao, Shengju Qian, Han Xiao, Guanglu Song, Zhuofan Zong, Letian Wang, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. Visual cot: Unleashing chain-of-thought reasoning in multi-modal language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16999*, 2, 2024.
- [44] Sihan Yang, Runsen Xu, Yiman Xie, Sizhe Yang, Mo Li, Jingli Lin, Chenming Zhu, Xiaochen Chen, Haodong Duan, Xiangyu Yue, et al. Mmsi-bench: A benchmark for multi-image spatial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23764*, 2025.
- [45] Arijit Ray, Jiafei Duan, Reuben Tan, Dina Bashkirova, Rose Hendrix, Kiana Ehsani, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Bryan A Plummer, Ranjay Krishna, Kuo-Hao Zeng, et al. Sat: Spatial aptitude training for multimodal language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07755*, 3, 2024.
- [46] Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuexiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Eyes wide shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9568–9578, 2024.
- [47] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai C Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, et al. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:87310–87356, 2024.

- [48] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 148–166. Springer, 2024.
- [49] Penghao Wu and Saining Xie. V*: Guided visual search as a core mechanism in multimodal llms. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13084–13094, 2024.
- [50] Haodong Duan, Junming Yang, Yuxuan Qiao, Xinyu Fang, Lin Chen, Yuan Liu, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, et al. Vlmevalkit: An open-source toolkit for evaluating large multi-modality models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 11198–11201, 2024.
- [51] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.
- [52] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report, 2025.

Appendix

A	Experimental Details	14
A.1	Data Configuration	14
A.2	Evaluation Benchmarks	15
A.3	Training Recipe	15
A.4	Vision-Thinking Process Reward Prompt	16
B	Additional Results	17
B.1	Ablation Study	17
B.2	Analysis of Reasoning Capacity	17
B.3	Analysis of Training Recipe	17
C	Interleave Reasoning Case	19
D	Text-to-Image Generation Quality	22

A Experimental Details

A.1 Data Configuration

Following ThinkMorph and its follow-ups [7], our training corpus spans eight task families (Matterport3D, RealSee3D, Perspective, DirectionalQuery, 360+ x , PositionedDirection, Jigsaw, VisualSearch), each contributing both SFT and RL split. To study how the SFT/RL data budget interacts with our two-stage pipeline, we define an *overlap ratio* $\omega \triangleq |\mathcal{D}_{\text{SFT}} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\text{RL}}|/|\mathcal{D}_{\text{RL}}| \in [0, 1]$, and consider three data-allocation regimes (per-task counts in Table 2): **(1)** a *disjoint* regime ($\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$, $\omega=0$) with a 2:1 SFT/RL budget, favoring supervised initialization; **(2)** a *disjoint* regime ($\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$, $\omega=0$) with a 1:1 budget, isolating the effect of equal-sized splits; and **(3)** a *replay* regime ($\mathcal{D}^{\cap}$) where the RL pool augments the original RL split with additional samples drawn from the SFT pool (20,000/15,200, $\omega \approx 0.32$), so that part of the RL prompts revisit SFT examples under on-policy rollouts. We adopt regime **(3)** as our default.

Table 2: Per-task sample counts under the three data-allocation regimes. In $\mathcal{D}^{\cap}$, the RL pool extends the original RL split with 4,800 samples drawn from the SFT pool, yielding an overlap ratio $\omega \approx 0.32$.

Task	$\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ ($\omega=0$)		$\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$ ($\omega=0$)		$\mathcal{D}^{\cap}$ ($\omega \approx 0.32$)	
	SFT	RL	SFT	RL	SFT	RL
Matterport3D	4,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	3,000
RealSee3D	4,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	3,000
Perspective	4,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	3,000
DirectionalQuery	1,400	1,000	1,200	1,200	1,400	1,200
360+ x	400	200	300	300	400	300
PositionedDirection	200	200	200	200	200	200
Jigsaw	2,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
VisualSearch	4,000	2,000	2,500	2,500	4,000	2,500
Total	20,000	10,400	15,200	15,200	20,000	15,200

A.2 Evaluation Benchmarks

We evaluate on seven benchmarks spanning two categories. All evaluations are conducted under the VLMEvalKit [50] framework with accuracy as the primary metric.

Spatial Reasoning. (1) **MMSI-Bench** [44] is a multi-image spatial intelligence benchmark comprising 1,000 multiple-choice questions across 10 fundamental spatial tasks (e.g., object motion tracking, camera ego-motion, scene reconstruction), curated from over 120,000 images by 3D-vision experts. (2) **SAT** [45] evaluates dynamic and static spatial reasoning, including egocentric movement, allocentric perspective shifts, depth relations, and action consequence prediction. It contains over 218,000 QA pairs across 22,000 synthetic scenes generated with the ProcTHOR engine, plus 150 real-image QA pairs for out-of-distribution testing. (3) **MMVP** [46] targets systematic failures of vision encoders by constructing “CLIP-blind pairs”—image pairs that CLIP encodes similarly despite clear visual differences in orientation, counting, color, or viewpoint. It contains approximately 150 image pairs formulated as multiple-choice questions. (4) **CV-Bench 3D** [47] is the 3D split of the Cambrian Vision-Centric Benchmark, evaluating depth ordering and relative distance understanding via natural language questions derived from OMNI3D annotations.

Visual Perception. (1) **BLINK** [48] contains 3,807 multiple-choice questions reformulated from 14 classic computer vision tasks (relative depth, visual correspondence, multi-view reasoning, forensic detection, spatial relations, etc.) that humans can solve “in a blink” but multimodal LLMs find challenging. (2) **V*Bench** [49] evaluates fine-grained visual perception in high-resolution, visually crowded images, comprising 191 multiple-choice questions on attribute recognition (color, material) and spatial relationship reasoning for small or occluded objects that require targeted visual search. (3) **CV-Bench 2D** [47] is the 2D split of the Cambrian Vision-Centric Benchmark, assessing spatial relationship understanding and object counting via questions derived from ADE20k and COCO annotations.

A.3 Training Recipe

Table 3: Key hyperparameters for RL training.

Hyperparameter	Value	Hyperparameter	Value
Rollout batch size	64	NFT β	0.4
Update batch size	32	NFT training timesteps	1
Rollouts per prompt	8	Denoising steps	20
PPO epochs	1	Timestep shift	3.0
Training steps	120	CFG text scale	4.0
Clip ratio (high / low)	0.28 / 0.20	CFG image scale	2.0
Entropy coefficient	0.0	CFG interval	[0.4, 1.0]
KL loss	disabled	Noise level	0.7
Sampling temperature	1.0	Max latent size	64
Max interleaved rounds	3	VLM judge	GPT-5.2
Max thinking tokens	2048	Reward weights	0.25 each
Max total tokens	32768		

We build on BAGEL-7B [2] and train with a two-stage pipeline: SFT followed by RL. Both stages use FSDP2 with hybrid sharding, gradient checkpointing, and the VAE frozen throughout. During RL, all other modules (LLM, ViT, understanding head, generation head) are unfrozen and jointly optimized.

For the SFT stage, we follow ThinkMorph [7] and train on curated TIT-CoT trajectories under the $\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ data regime (detailed in Section A.1). For the RL stage, we adopt the replay regime $\mathcal{D}^\cap$ ($\omega \approx 0.32$) as default, where the RL pool partially overlaps with SFT data to bridge imitation learning and on-policy exploration. We sample rollouts with temperature 1.0 and allow up to 3 interleaved image rounds per trajectory, with a maximum of 2048 thinking tokens per round and 32768 total

tokens. Image generation uses 20 denoising steps (for both training and evaluation) with a timestep shift of 3.0, classifier-free guidance scales of 4.0 (text) and 2.0 (image), and a guidance interval of $[0.4, 1.0]$. The noise level for intermediate images is set to 0.7. Table 3 summarizes the key hyperparameters.

A.4 Vision-Thinking Process Reward Prompt

To instantiate the per-turn visual process reward r^{vis} , we employ GPT-5.2 as the VLM judge. Given the question, the problem image(s), and the generated intermediate image I_k , the judge follows a three-step protocol (question understanding $\rightarrow$ image analysis $\rightarrow$ scoring) and emits four integer scores in $[1, 10]$, corresponding one-to-one to the four criteria $\{r^{(\text{vc})}, r^{(\text{vf})}, r^{(\text{ru})}, r^{(\text{tr})}\}$ defined in Sec. 4.4. The full system prompt is shown below.

You are an expert evaluator for a vision-language model (VLM) that reasons by generating intermediate images as visual tools. Your task: evaluate one generated intermediate image within a multi-step reasoning trajectory.

STEP 1 — UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION & PROBLEM IMAGE(S)

Read the question carefully. Identify:

- What specific visual information is needed to answer it?
- What is provided by the problem image(s), and what remains ambiguous?
- What type of visual operation would best help answer this question?

STEP 2 — ANALYZE THE GENERATED IMAGE

Describe concretely what it shows. Compare it carefully against the problem image(s) — what is preserved, what is changed, what is new, what might be fabricated? Be very precise: zoom in on small details, distinguish between nearby objects, and verify that what the model claims to target is actually what the generated image shows.

STEP 3 — SCORE on the 4 dimensions below (1–10 each, integers only).

1. `action_correctness` — Did the model choose the RIGHT visual operation and execute it correctly? 10 = perfect execution. 1 = completely wrong.
2. `visual_faithfulness` — Does the generated image faithfully represent the actual content of the problem image(s)? Only penalize fabrications that could mislead reasoning. 10 = pixel-accurate. 1 = entirely fabricated.
3. `reasoning_contribution` — Does this image provide NEW, CORRECT information that could advance reasoning toward the correct answer? 10 = decisive new evidence. 1 = useless or actively misleading.
4. `misleading_risk` — Could this image cause a reasonable model to reach a **wrong** answer? 10 = completely safe. 1 = virtually guarantees wrong answer.

Be willing to use the full 1–10 range. A score of 8+ means genuinely good.

Return **only** valid **json** (no markdown, no extra text):

```
{"action_correctness": <int>, "visual_faithfulness": <int>,
"reasoning_contribution": <int>, "misleading_risk": <int>}
```

B Additional Results

B.1 Ablation Study

Table 4: Ablation study on different components of BRAID across seven spatial reasoning and perception benchmarks. Best results in **bold** and second best underlined.

Model	Spatial Reasoning				Perception			Avg.
	MMSI	SAT	MMVP	CV-Bench 3D	BLINK	VStar	CV-Bench 2D	
BAGEL	26.60	44.67	75.67	83.41	54.76	57.59	73.53	59.46
SFT	<u>29.20</u>	49.67	78.67	81.67	<u>57.02</u>	62.82	<u>74.85</u>	61.99
BRAID w/o r^{vis}	28.40	<u>56.00</u>	<u>79.00</u>	<u>82.17</u>	55.81	<u>63.87</u>	73.48	<u>62.68</u>
BRAID w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$	28.90	54.33	<u>79.00</u>	81.50	56.70	62.35	71.94	62.10
BRAID	31.80	58.67	81.33	<u>82.17</u>	57.76	68.35	76.26	65.19

Table 4 reports the complete numerical results of the ablation study discussed in Section 5.2, covering all seven benchmarks for BAGEL, SFT, and the two ablated variants. Several per-benchmark patterns are worth noting. On MMSI, all RL variants outperform SFT, indicating that even without r^{vis} or $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$, the text-branch RL alone provides gains on multi-image spatial tasks. On CV-Bench 3D, both BRAID and w/o r^{vis} recover the SFT regression (82.17 vs. 81.67), whereas w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ does not (81.50), suggesting that optimizing the image branch is necessary to recover 3D spatial understanding. The perception benchmarks (BLINK, VStar, CV-Bench 2D) show the largest gap between the full model and ablations, confirming that fine-grained visual tasks benefit most from the combination of image-branch RL and dense process reward.

B.2 Analysis of Reasoning Capacity

Table 5: Performance comparison of different methods on Vstar and SAT benchmarks under majority voting (maj@n) and average (avg@n) at $n \in \{3, 5, 9, 17\}$.

Benchmark	Method	maj@n				avg@n			
		n=3	n=5	n=9	n=17	n=3	n=5	n=9	n=17
Vstar	BAGEL	62.82	64.39	65.53	65.97	58.81	59.16	59.39	59.22
	SFT	65.97	67.54	66.49	67.53	62.13	61.15	61.08	61.19
	BRAID	66.49	69.11	68.06	70.68	64.82	64.98	64.94	63.53
SAT	BAGEL	45.33	52.00	53.67	52.33	47.67	46.93	47.04	47.78
	SFT	54.67	53.33	56.67	56.67	49.55	50.27	51.44	51.59
	BRAID	55.33	53.33	60.67	61.33	58.11	59.93	61.48	60.75

Table 5 provides the full Maj@n and Avg@n results across $n \in \{3, 5, 9, 17\}$ on VStar and SAT, corresponding to the curves in Figure 3. BRAID consistently achieves the highest scores at all sampling budgets, with the gap widening as n increases. Notably, on VStar the Maj@17 gap between BRAID and SFT is +3.15, whereas the Avg@17 gap is +2.34, indicating that BRAID benefits from both higher per-sample quality and greater diversity. On SAT, BRAID’s Avg@n improves monotonically from 58.11 to 60.75 as n grows, while SFT and BAGEL plateau or decline, suggesting that RL produces a policy whose samples are more complementary and less redundant.

B.3 Analysis of Training Recipe

Table 6 presents the full results under the three data-allocation regimes discussed in Section 5.3. The $\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$ SFT checkpoint underperforms BAGEL on CV-Bench 2D (65.24 vs. 73.53), a -8.29 drop that we attribute to the reduced SFT budget failing to cover sufficient visual perception data. By contrast,

Table 6: Effect of data-allocation regimes ($\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$, $\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$, $\mathcal{D}^\cap$) at the SFT and RL stages across seven benchmarks. Best results in **bold** and second best underlined. “–” indicates that we did not run RL from this SFT checkpoint due to its noticeable weaknesses on several benchmarks.

Stage	Data Regime	Spatial Reasoning				Perception			Avg.
		MMSI	SAT	MMVP	CV-Bench 3D	BLINK	VStar	CV-Bench 2D	
BAGEL		26.60	44.67	75.67	83.41	54.76	57.59	73.53	59.46
SFT	$\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$ ($\omega=0$)	26.70	46.67	77.33	80.91	<u>58.34</u>	58.63	65.24	59.12
	$\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ ($\omega=0$)	29.20	49.67	78.67	81.67	57.02	62.82	74.85	61.99
RL	$\mathcal{D}^{1:1}$ ($\omega=0$)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	$\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ ($\omega=0$)	<u>31.40</u>	<u>49.33</u>	<u>79.67</u>	<u>81.83</u>	57.76	<u>64.92</u>	<u>74.88</u>	<u>62.83</u>
	$\mathcal{D}^\cap$ ($\omega \approx 0.32$)	31.80	58.67	81.33	82.17	57.76	68.35	76.26	65.19

the $\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ regime provides a stable SFT initialization that enables effective downstream RL. The replay regime $\mathcal{D}^\cap$ further improves upon $\mathcal{D}^{2:1}$ RL on all benchmarks except BLINK (tied at 57.76), with the largest gains on SAT (+9.34) and VStar (+3.43). This pattern suggests that replaying SFT prompts under on-policy rollouts is particularly beneficial for tasks requiring multi-step spatial reasoning, where the model can consolidate learned strategies while exploring new ones.

Table 7: Effect of the rollout-to-update batch size ratio across seven spatial reasoning and perception benchmarks. “Ratio” denotes the rollout batch size to update batch size ratio used during RL training. Best results in **bold** and second best underlined.

Model	Spatial Reasoning				Perception			Avg.
	MMSI	SAT	MMVP	CV-Bench 3D	BLINK	VStar	CV-Bench 2D	
BAGEL	26.60	44.67	75.67	<u>83.41</u>	54.76	57.59	73.53	59.46
SFT	<u>29.20</u>	49.67	78.67	81.67	57.02	<u>62.82</u>	74.85	<u>61.99</u>
Ratio = 1:1	24.60	<u>50.00</u>	<u>79.67</u>	84.83	59.07	60.20	<u>75.12</u>	61.93
Ratio = 2:1	31.80	58.67	81.33	82.17	<u>57.76</u>	68.35	76.26	65.19

Table 7 reports the complete benchmark results for the rollout-to-update ratio analysis. The 2:1 ratio achieves the best average (65.19 vs. 61.93), with pronounced advantages on MMSI (+7.20), SAT (+8.67), and VStar (+8.15). The 1:1 ratio, despite its overall lower performance, achieves the highest score on CV-Bench 3D (84.83) and BLINK (59.07), both exceeding even the 2:1 setting. We hypothesize that the more aggressive update frequency acts as implicit exploration pressure, which benefits benchmarks where the SFT initialization is already close to a local optimum but fails to generalize on tasks requiring stable policy improvement over many steps.

C Interleave Reasoning Case

We present a qualitative comparison of BRAID and its ablated variants on a visual search task from the VStar benchmark.

Question and Answer

Problem Image:



Question: What is the license plate number of the police van?

Options: (A) OU68 EPD (B) QU68 EPO (C) OV68 EDP (D) OU86 EPD

Ground Truth: (A) OU68 EPD

BRAID — Rollout 1 (✓ Correct)

<think>To find the correct answer, first examine the image and locate the police van, which is the main vehicle in the scene. Focus on the rear section of the van, as the license plate is always displayed at the back of public service vehicles. On the bottom center of the rear doors, just above the yellow safety strip and below the right door handle, there is a yellow plate with black text. This plate is the vehicle's registration number. Carefully read the sequence of characters on this plate: it consists of a two-letter vanity plate followed by three digits, then another three characters. The style and spacing match a typical license plate, and the characters are clearly separated by spaces. That specific yellow plate, with the visible text inside it, is where you should place the red bounding box.</think><image_start>

Generated Image:



<image_end><think>With the yellow license plate at the lower center of the rear doors now highlighted, you can focus on the black text printed on the yellow background. The sequence is a two big characters, then a gap, followed by three digits, then another gap and three more characters. Comparing that exact sequence to the options, only the option (A) OU688EPO matches this pattern: the digit in the first sequence is the same as the second one in the options, the second sequence in the second and the two last characters match in the two letters

and you can see on the plate. Because the highlighted area is the only area you can clearly read the plate, this identified is the correct answer: A.</think><answer>A</answer>

BRAID — Rollout 2 (✓ Correct)

<think>To locate the relevant region, first look at the police van in the image. The question asks for the license plate, so focus on the rear of the vehicle. At the bottom center of the back, just above the bumper and between the two rear door sections, there is a rectangular plate with a black background and yellow border. Inside this rectangle, there are black characters arranged in a combination of letters and numbers. This rectangular area, containing the black-and-yellow license plate, is where the red bounding box should be drawn.</think><image_start>

Generated Image:



<image_end><think>With the correct license plate now clearly highlighted, you can concentrate on reading the characters inside the rectangle. The plate shows a two-letter country code starting with “OU”, then the number “68” repeated twice, and the letters “EPD” at the end. Matching this full sequence against the answer choices, it corresponds exactly to option (A), so the correct answer is A.</think><answer>A</answer>

BRAID w/o r^{vis} — Rollout 1 (✓ Correct, but hallucinated content)

<think>To locate the relevant region, first focus on the back of the police van, since license plates are typically placed there. Scan the lower central part of the rear doors, just above the bumper and below the rear windows. There you can see a rectangular yellow plate with a black border and black text on it. This plate contains the vehicle’s registration number. The red bounding box should be drawn tightly around this yellow rectangular plate at the bottom middle of the rear doors, enclosing all the black alphanumeric characters printed on it.</think><image_start>

Generated Image:



<image_end><think>With the license plate now clearly highlighted, you can read the characters printed on it. The plate shows a combination starting with the letters “OU68” followed by “EPD” and ending with the same letter “D” at the far right. Comparing this complete sequence with the multiple-choice options, it matches exactly option (A), so the correct answer is A.</think><answer>A</answer>

BRAID w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ — Rollout 1 (✓ Correct, but misleading image)

<think>To locate the relevant region, first focus on the police van in the image. The question asks about the license plate, so look at the rear of the vehicle. At the bottom center of the back, just above the bumper and between the two rear doors, there is a rectangular plate with a yellow background and black text. This is the license plate whose number needs to be read. The red bounding box should be drawn tightly around this rectangular plate at the license plate position on the back of the police van.</think><image_start>

Generated Image:



<image_end><think>From the cropped view of the license plate area, I can now examine the characters more closely. The yellow plate is visible in the left-center portion of the image. Reading the black characters from left to right, the first group appears to be “GI01” and the second group reads “EPD”. The character shapes are fairly clear — the first letter has a distinct curve consistent with “G” rather than “O”, and the second character is a straight vertical stroke matching “I”. The digits in the middle appear to be “01” based on their rounded and straight forms. Therefore the full registration reads “GI01 EPD”. Matching this against the available options, this corresponds to option (A).</think><answer>A</answer>

Analysis. This case reveals several observations about the role of image quality in TIT-CoT reasoning:

- (1) **BRAID produces diverse and faithful visual intermediates.** The two BRAID rollouts adopt distinct visual strategies: Rollout 1 generates a tightly cropped view of the license plate for precise character reading, while Rollout 2 produces a full-scene image with the plate region highlighted. Both yield high-fidelity images where “OU68 EPD” is clearly legible, directly supporting downstream text reasoning.
- (2) **Without r^{vis} , images contain hallucinated artifacts.** The w/o r^{vis} variant generates an image containing a hallucinated second license plate (“E-EI SV”) alongside the actual plate. Although the model correctly identifies the relevant plate here, the fabricated visual content introduces unnecessary ambiguity that would likely mislead reasoning on harder instances.
- (3) **Without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$, images degrade and mislead reasoning.** The w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ variant generates a distorted, blurry crop where the plate characters are garbled. The text model hallucinates “GI01 EPD” from the corrupted visual evidence and arrives at the correct answer through faulty reasoning (incorrectly mapping “GI01 EPD” to option A). The reasoning chain is fundamentally unreliable: the model cannot distinguish correct from fabricated visual evidence.
- (4) **Correct answers can mask fragile reasoning.** All variants arrive at the correct answer, yet only BRAID produces a trajectory where the visual evidence genuinely supports the conclusion.

The ablated variants achieve correctness *despite* their visual intermediates, not *because* of them, a distinction that manifests as lower robustness under Maj@ n evaluation (Section 5.1).

D Text-to-Image Generation Quality

Beyond interleaved reasoning, we examine whether the RL training in BRAID also improves standalone text-to-image generation quality. We compare generations from BAGEL, SFT, BRAID w/o r^{vis} , BRAID w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$, and the full BRAID on three prompts that test different aspects of instruction following: spatial compositionality, numerical accuracy, and creative concept binding.




Figure 8: Text-to-image generation comparison across prompts testing spatial compositionality (Row 1), numerical accuracy (Row 2), and creative concept binding (Row 3).

Analysis. The generation results in Figure 8 reveal that BRAID’s RL training yields improvements in both image quality and instruction adherence:

(1) **Spatial compositionality.** For “A cat sitting inside a fishbowl”, BAGEL, SFT, and w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ all place the cat *next to* the fishbowl rather than inside it, failing to satisfy the spatial relation specified by the prompt. Both w/o r^{vis} and BRAID correctly render the cat inside the bowl, but BRAID additionally preserves higher visual fidelity with a fish coexisting in the scene.

(2) **Numerical accuracy.** For “Exactly five balloons”, BAGEL generates approximately eight, SFT produces four, w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ produces an over-saturated chaotic scene with many balloons, and w/o r^{vis} generates seven to eight. Only BRAID correctly generates exactly five balloons, demonstrating that the joint RL objective improves precise counting ability.

(3) **Creative concept binding.** For “Hourglass with galaxies as sand”, BAGEL, SFT, and w/o r^{vis} all produce an hourglass with regular sand and merely place it against a galaxy background, failing to bind the “galaxies as sand” concept. The w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ variant shows a galaxy swirl inside the hourglass, and BRAID further improves this with a clearly visible galaxy serving as the flowing sand material.

These observations suggest that the vision-thinking process reward r^{vis} provides optimization direction that transfers beyond the interleaved reasoning setting to general text-to-image generation. The reward signal, which evaluates visual correctness and faithfulness during TIT-CoT training, implicitly teaches the image branch to better follow compositional instructions. Notably, w/o $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NFT}}$ consistently shows the weakest instruction following among RL-trained variants, confirming that without the DiffusionNFT gradient pathway, the image branch cannot internalize the reward-driven improvements.