

# AGENTS’ ROOM: NARRATIVE GENERATION THROUGH MULTI-STEP COLLABORATION

**Fantine Huot, Reinald Kim Amplayo, Jennimaria Palomaki, Alice Shoshana Jakobovits, Elizabeth Clark & Mirella Lapata**

Google DeepMind

{fantinehuot, reinald, jpalomaki, jakobovits, eaclark, lapata}@google.com

## ABSTRACT

Writing compelling fiction is a multifaceted process combining elements such as crafting a plot, developing interesting characters, and using evocative language. While large language models (LLMs) show promise for story writing, they currently rely heavily on intricate prompting, which limits their use. We propose AGENTS’ ROOM, a generation framework inspired by narrative theory, that decomposes narrative writing into subtasks tackled by specialized agents. To illustrate our method, we introduce TELL ME A STORY<sup>1</sup>, a high-quality dataset of complex writing prompts and human-written stories, and a novel evaluation framework designed specifically for assessing long narratives. We show that AGENTS’ ROOM generates stories that are preferred by expert evaluators over those produced by baseline systems by leveraging collaboration and specialization to decompose the complex story writing task into tractable components. We provide extensive analysis with automated and human-based metrics of the generated output.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Creating long-form content requires meticulous research, advanced planning, an engaging writing style, and the ability to craft stories that captivate. J.K. Rowling is claimed to have had most of the Harry Potter story planned out before she started writing. She knew there would be seven books, which characters would be important and how they would develop, and which key plot twists would serve the overall story. In addition, she carried out substantial research to create the fictional universe which provides the backdrop of the story. Breaking down a story into distinct sections is typical for longer narratives, with most stories boiling down to a few shared elements like exposition, rising action, climax, falling action, and resolution (Freitag, 1896; Pavis, 1998). Practical guides to writing successful screenplays (Cutting, 2016; Hauge, 2017) outline a similar structure, following the setup, the new situation, progress, complications and higher stakes, the final push, and the aftermath. Academic papers (Schimel, 2012) follow a common format which can be distilled into title, abstract, introduction, main body, conclusions, and references, with well-known conventions about the contents of each section (e.g., the introduction should convey the essence of the author’s argument or idea). Writing news articles (Ricketson & Graham, 2017) also involves standard subtasks like a research phase (gathering material), an outline phase (planning the key points in each section), and a writing phase.

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive writing capabilities (Yang et al., 2022; Nur Fitria, 2023; Shao et al., 2024; Bai et al., 2024), however, generating long-form content is still a challenge. Well-known problems include maintaining a consistent narrative, tone, or factual accuracy over extended stretches of text (Chakrabarty et al., 2024b; Wang et al., 2023b; Alabdulkarim et al., 2021; Balepur et al., 2023; Yamshchikov & Tikhonov, 2023), and showcasing a unique voice or humor that makes writing truly memorable. Despite displaying flashes of creativity, they often replicate patterns found in their training data, which hinders the generation of original concepts, plotlines, or phrasing. Added problems include the lack of datasets or benchmarks for long-form writing (Bai et al., 2024) and standardized evaluation criteria for assessing creative writing either by humans or machines (Chhun et al., 2022; 2024; Chakrabarty et al., 2024a).

<sup>1</sup>We release the dataset at: <https://github.com/google-deepmind/tell-me-a-story>




Figure 1: AGENTS’ ROOM, a multi-agent framework for collaborative writing. A central orchestrator calls the individual agents and consolidates their contributions into the scratchpad. We color-code each piece of the scratchpad with the contributing agent’s color.

Existing methods often rely on detailed prompts to guide the generation process (Yang et al., 2022; Xie et al., 2023), prompt chaining (Mirowski et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2022), and planning strategies (Yang et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024) as a means of breaking down the complex writing task into more manageable components. In this paper, we conceptualize long-form writing as a multi-agent collaboration problem. Rather than attempting a decomposition of the writing task within a *single* agent (Chen et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2024), we leverage collaboration among *multiple* agents, with specialized abilities (Talebirad & Nadiri, 2023; Zhang et al., 2024b; Han et al., 2024). We propose AGENTS’ ROOM<sup>2</sup> (Figure 1), a generation paradigm which consists of two types of agents, namely *planning* and *writing* agents. Planning agents flesh out key components of the content but do not write the story as such. For example, a planning agent might specialize in character descriptions, whereas another might focus on the plot or central conflict. Writing agents are responsible for generating the final output text and are also specialized, e.g., one may focus on the introduction, and another on the conclusions. The two types of agents work collaboratively to complete the writing task, sharing and managing information through a *scratchpad* which maintains outputs from planning agents and makes them available to writing agents. An *orchestrator* is responsible for calling the agents in order depending on the task at hand.

Compared to single LLM-powered agents, this multi-agent approach offers several advantages:

- LLMs can be specialized into various distinct agents (e.g., zero-shot prompted or fine-tuned) performing a single function with high precision;
- it avoids well-known problems with lengthy and under-specified instructions which require multiple iterations to build context and fully define an appropriate solution;
- it can be applied to problems whose solution is not known beforehand, and results from exploring a vast research space or involves very long output (e.g., writing a book);
- it naturally lends itself to human-in-the loop automation where machine-based agents can be replaced with human ones when needed.

We formalize AGENTS’ ROOM as a general writing framework and apply it to creative writing. Specifically, we focus on writing long-form stories (1,000-2,000 tokens), and create specialized agents drawing inspiration from narrative theory (e.g., Card 1999; Noble 1999; Pavis 1998). To evaluate our method, we introduce TELL ME A STORY, a new dataset of human-created writing prompts and fiction stories, and a novel evaluation framework designed for assessing multiple dimensions of story quality. Experimental results show that AGENTS’ ROOM generates stories that are preferred (by humans and automatic metrics) over those produced by baseline systems which do not leverage collaboration or specialization.

<sup>2</sup>AGENTS’ ROOM is very loosely modeled after writers’ room, a collaborative space where writers, (usually of a television series), come together to write and refine scripts.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Story Generation** The advent of large pre-trained language models has provided a common framework for generating stories which sound fluent but often struggle with maintaining coherence and plausibility. Attempts to enhance coherence and control the trajectory of events often decompose the generation task into planning an outline or sketch, and then elaborating on it, e.g., by filling in descriptions and specific details of each story. Examples of intermediate plans include sequences of entities and their actions (Yao et al., 2019), outlines (Fan et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023a), plot structures (Goldfarb-Tarrant et al., 2020), and more elaborate descriptions including details about the setting of the story, its characters, and main plot points (Yang et al., 2022; 2023). Other work uses common sense knowledge to impose constraints on the characters and their interactions (Peng et al., 2022), ensemble-based models to render event sequences more plausible (Ammanabrolu et al., 2020), stylistic constraints (Kong et al., 2021), and twists through constrained decoding (Huang et al., 2023). These efforts have demonstrated that generating stories as a one-step process is challenging, and ultimately various interventions are required to improve overall story quality. Our work follows on from this realization, and breaks down the writing task into subtasks, undertaken by different agents who collaboratively plan and write a story. Collaborative writing is often used in academic or professional contexts to leverage the strengths and perspectives of various contributors, and has also been shown to enhance creativity (Barrett et al., 2021).

Using LLMs as tools to assist humans with writing stories is an active research area (Chakrabarty et al., 2024b; Mirowski et al., 2023; Ippolito et al., 2022). In our experiments, stories are written exclusively by models without humans in the loop. However, our framework is fairly general allowing for human-machine collaboration at various stages of content creation.

**Multi-agent Systems** LLM-based agents have recently shown robust reasoning and planning capabilities across various application domains (Zhao et al., 2023; Bubeck et al., 2023). Multi-agent systems involve multiple independent LLMs working together to solve complex tasks that are beyond the capability of any individual agent (Talebirad & Nadiri, 2023; Park et al., 2023; Han et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024). The agents are typically specialized in different aspects of a problem or have different roles, allowing the system to approach tasks in a more coordinated, distributed, and modular way. LLM-based multi-agent systems have recently demonstrated promising results in multiple areas including software development (Hong et al., 2024), robotic tasks such as motion planning (Mandi et al., 2024), simulations of human behavior (Park et al., 2023; Hua et al., 2024), the creation of gaming environments (Hu et al., 2024), recommender systems (Zhang et al., 2024a), simulations of financial trading (Li et al., 2023), and policy making (Xiao et al., 2023). We are not aware of existing multi-agent frameworks for long-form writing. We draw inspiration from related work demonstrating that collaborative problem-solving improves LLM task-solving capabilities (Hao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b). Our agents each adopt a specialized writing subtask and communicate through a shared scratchpad (or memory) which allows to effectively recall and utilize contextually-relevant past knowledge. In our experiments, we predefine the number and type of agents best suited to our story writing task, rather than dynamically generate agents based on story content (Chen et al., 2024).

**Evaluation** Story evaluation is admittedly a challenging task for humans and machines. Human evaluation is usually considered as the gold standard, but it is expensive, time-consuming (Guan & Huang, 2020), and can be subjective. It also cannot capture diversity since a model that copies directly from the training set would potentially pass the human quality bar without displaying any generalization or creativity (Hashimoto et al., 2019). Automated evaluation metrics based on lexical overlap or semantic similarity between generated stories and their human references have been shown to correlate poorly with human judgements (Chhun et al., 2022). In this paper, we introduce an LLM-based evaluator (Liusie et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2024; Bohnet et al., 2024) to perform side-by-side comparisons of system outputs which correlates with human judgements. Inspired by recent proposals on how to assess human creativity (Chakrabarty et al., 2024a), we distill the story evaluation task into a few dimensions (e.g., plot, language use) which humans and machines can judge reliably.

**Algorithm 1** AGENTS’ ROOM framework

---

```

 $s \leftarrow x$  ▷ Initialize the scratchpad
while  $o(s, \mathcal{A}) == \text{True}$  and  $t < T$  do ▷ While the orchestrator assigns a next agent
   $a_t = o(s, \mathcal{A})$ 
   $y_t = a_t(s)$ 
   $s \leftarrow (s; (l_t, y_t))$ 
  if  $\text{type}(a_t) == \text{writing}$  then ▷ If the agent is a writing agent, write to the final output
     $y \leftarrow (y; y_t)$ 
  end if
end while
return  $y$  ▷ Return the final output

```

---

### 3 AGENTS’ ROOM

In this section, we formalize AGENTS’ ROOM, the proposed multi-agent framework for collaborative writing. Given a complex writing task  $x$ , we generate output  $y$ , by decomposing the writing process into multiple subtasks tackled by specialized agents. The full AGENTS’ ROOM framework is summarized in Algorithm 1 and explained below.

**Agents** We define an *agent*  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  as a specialized model that takes text as input and returns text as output, specified by a unique identifier label  $l$  and a mapping  $f : \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$ . Each agent is specialized in a specific subtask. Under this definition, an agent can be a LLM fine-tuned for the subtask, a zero-shot prompted LLM with a specific input prompt, a deterministic text processing function (e.g., string formatting and parsing), or even a human interacting with the system. Herein, we focus on LLM-based agents, but we formalize the general framework’s modeling assumptions (e.g., agent inputs and outputs as text instead of latent variables) to allow future work to incorporate human agents as well (e.g., by iteratively editing LLM-generated text). We define two types of agents (see below), namely *planning* and *writing* agents, which differ both in function and in their mode of interaction with the generated output.

**Multi-agent Communication** Communication between agents is critical for the successful completion of their tasks. While different forms of communication are possible, such as debate (Khan et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b) or competition (Cheng et al., 2024), in this work we focus on *collaborative* communication since it would transfer most naturally to human-LLM collaborations. Collaborative agents work together towards a shared goal, exchanging information to enhance a collective solution.

**Scratchpad** The overall system requires a mechanism for sharing and managing information across the different agents. We assume our agents have access to a shared *scratchpad*  $s \in \mathcal{V}^*$  that maintains individual agents’ outputs and is passed along to the next agent. The scratchpad is initialized with the initial writing prompt  $x$  and is then updated after each agent call. At each step  $t$ , the current agent  $a_t$  takes as input the current scratchpad  $s_t$  and generates output  $y_t$ . At each step, the scratchpad is updated with the agent’s unique identifier and output such that  $s_{t+1} \leftarrow (s_t; (l_t, y_t))$ . We include the agent’s label so that individual agents can easily reference and parse specific portions of the scratchpad to complete their subtask. Note that in this framework, the scratchpad does not contain the specific input prompt of a given LLM agent. Indeed, it is considered part of each agent’s subtask to process the output  $y_t$  into a suitable format to be used by other agents. Since agents have access to the scratchpad, this means that they can avoid writing redundant and duplicate information.

**Orchestrator** We have opted for a centralized architecture, where a central *orchestrator* determines the order upon which individual agents are called, and whether calling on each agent is necessary (e.g., depending on the task). Given a scratchpad  $s_t$  and a set of available agents  $\mathcal{A}$ , the orchestrator  $o : \mathcal{V}^* \times \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  determines the next agent  $a_{t+1}$  to call. It can be modeled as a Markov process, since each step depends entirely on the state of the scratchpad at step  $t$ . This orchestrator can be a discrete deterministic process, can have learnt transition probabilities, or can be arbitrarily complex. The orchestrator determines the stopping condition, i.e., when there is no more agent to call, or when a maximum number of steps  $T$  has been reached.

**Planning Agents** Previous work (see Section 2) shows that LLMs benefit from an intermediate planning stage before generating the final output. These intermediate steps improve the overall output but are not included in the final output. We define *planning agents* as agents that specialize in generating these intermediate steps and write exclusively to the scratchpad. For instance, when writing a story, planning agents can draft character descriptions and plot elements; when writing an essay, they can outline the argumentative structure and retrieve references to substantiate claims. Since their outputs are in text format, a human-in-the-loop could review or edit these intermediate stages to guide the generative process.

**Writing Agents** Certain complex tasks, such as generating particularly long outputs or with sections written in different styles, remain challenging for a LLM to generate in one go. In such cases, the final output benefits from being generated section by section through separate agent calls. We define *writing agents* as agents specializing in writing specific parts of the final output. In addition to writing to the scratchpad, these writing agents iteratively write pieces of the final output  $y$ . Therefore, the final output can be formalized as the concatenation of the outputs of all the writing agents. For story writing, writing agents can specialize in specific parts of the narrative arc, such as the exposition or the climax; when writing an essay, they can each tackle different sections, such as the arguments in favor versus against.

## 4 FICTION WRITING TASK

In this section, we present an instantiation of the AGENTS’ ROOM framework for fiction writing: given an initial writing prompt  $x$ , generate narrative  $y$ . We also introduce TELL ME A STORY<sup>1</sup>, a new dataset of high-quality human-created writing prompts and fiction stories.

### 4.1 SPECIALIZED AGENTS INSPIRED BY NARRATIVE THEORY

We design specialized agents for our fiction writing task by drawing inspiration from narrative theory. We design four *planning agents*, each specialized in a specific aspect of story planning: [CONFLICT] defines the central conflict (e.g., a young boy has to fight an evil wizard who killed his parents), [CHARACTER] develops the character(s) (e.g., the young man is brave, caring, determined, loyal to his friends with a strong moral compass), [SETTING] develops the setting (e.g., most of the story takes place in the Hogwards School of Witchcraft and Wizardry, a fictional boarding school of magic for young wizards), and [PLOT] outlines the plot elements (e.g., the boy discovers he is the son of famous wizards and will attend Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry). These planning agents target specific weaknesses observed in LLM-generated stories. Indeed, LLMs struggle writing compelling plots and consistent characters throughout long stories (see Section 2).

In addition to these content planning agents, we design five *writing agents*, each specialized in distinct elements of a typical story structure: [EXPOSITION], [RISING ACTION], [CLIMAX], [FALLING ACTION], and [RESOLUTION]. We adopt this structure since it is widely used and quite versatile (Freytag, 1896; Pavis, 1998), leaving other narrative structures for future work. When generating in one go, LLMs struggle at meeting the length requirements, resulting in stories that are generally too short (see Section 7). These writing agents decompose the writing of the final output into writing section by section, thus resulting in longer outputs.

We model each of these agents as an LLM with a specific prompt template that formats the scratchpad into an appropriate prompt for each agent’s subtask. Detailed scratchpad formatting and prompt templates for each agent are provided in Appendix B. To coordinate between the different agents, we define a deterministic *orchestrator* that first calls the planning agents as follows: [CONFLICT] → [CHARACTER] → [SETTING] → [PLOT], then calls the writing agents: [EXPOSITION] → [RISING ACTION] → [CLIMAX] → [FALLING ACTION] → [RESOLUTION]. We choose to use a deterministic orchestrator for simplicity, given the strong narrative theory prior. In future work, more refined orchestrators with learned objectives can be explored, possibly expanding to a wider range of narrative structures. As a first step towards building adequate reward models for training such orchestrators, we investigate automated evaluation strategies for the long-form fiction writing task in Section 6.




Figure 2: Prompts from the TELL ME A STORY dataset (corresponding stories are in Appendix A).

## 4.2 SYNTHETIC DATA GENERATION FOR AGENT TRAINING

For each specialized agent, we explore both zero-shot prompted and fine-tuned approaches, since a different degree of subtask specialization can be achieved through each approach. The fine-tuned approach requires agent outputs, which are not readily available; planning agent outputs such as plot and setting are usually not provided in datasets, while writing agent outputs require the stories to be split into its constituent parts. Similar to previous work (Schick et al., 2022; Narayan et al., 2023; Josifoski et al., 2023), we propose to generate synthetic outputs for these agents through distilled backtranslation.

Specifically, given as input writing prompts *and* stories from a dataset (see Section 4.3), we zero-shot prompt a larger teacher LLM to (1) generate the planning agent outputs, and (2) segment the story into distinct parts (e.g., exposition, climax). Note that unlike typical distillation methods, our task is more straightforward; all that is required is to reverse engineer the agent outputs from an existing story rather than generate them from scratch. The teacher LLM outputs are then used to generate synthetic training datasets for both planning and writing agents. Detailed prompt templates are provided in Appendix C.

## 4.3 TELL ME A STORY DATASET

Creative writing presents a particular challenge from a data collection perspective; it is not akin to any traditional annotation or evaluation task where a requester provides some input and some set of guidelines for marking up that input in a consistent manner.

While standards exist for “good” writing, they evaluate the quality of writing across multiple interdependent and independent dimensions, all at once. In addition to this, the skill of writing really represents several skills that are learned over the course of a person’s lifetime and educational experience.

Furthermore, evaluating writing necessarily requires the subjective stance of the evaluator.

Taking into consideration all of these complexities, we collected TELL ME A STORY through writing workshops to replicate the organic environment in which a collaborative writing process can take place. We provided a group of writers (28 in total) with broad instructions for quality based on collation of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (currently in its 7th edition), the GRE/GMAT writing assessment rubrics, and various mass market style guides.

Writers created their own prompts, wrote an initial draft, received feedback from peers, revised, and then submitted to a workshop lead for a second round of feedback and final approval. Workshop leads could ask for additional edits or accept as is. Workshops lasted on average 3-4 weeks. The average rate of production for workshops generally reached no more than 2–3 writing samples per writer per week. We provide example prompts in Figure 2 and example stories in Appendix A.

Table 1: Comparison of TELL ME A STORY against existing open-ended story generation benchmarks. We report statistics on the number of training, validation, and testing instances; Input/Target denote the average number of tokens in the input (aka prompt) and target text.

Dataset	number of examples			avg. token length	
	Training	Validation	Testing	Input	Target
WRITINGPROMPTS (Fan et al., 2019)	272,600	15,620	15,138	28	735
ROCSTORIES (Mostafazadeh et al., 2016)	176,688	9,816	4,909	9	41
CHANGEMYVIEW (Hua et al., 2019)	42,462	6,480	7,562	18	104
WIKILOTS <sup>3</sup>	69,288	8,661	8,662	4	195
<b>TELL ME A STORY</b>	123	52	55	113	1,498

Table 1 compares TELL ME A STORY against commonly used story generation benchmarks. Our dataset is small in scale and thus not suited to training a model from scratch. Our prompts are more detailed compared to other benchmarks (see Input column) and the target stories are genuinely long (e.g. double in size compared to WRITINGPROMPTS). Note that some of these datasets, although useful for system development, are not strictly speaking narratives. WIKILOTS is a collection of plots from Wikipedia rather than stories, ROCSTORIES are five-sentence long common sense stories, and CHANGEMYVIEW contains pairs of posts and their counter-arguments.

## 5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We describe details on the implementation of our framework and explore a number of AGENTS’ ROOM variants. We also compare our system against baseline approaches.

**End-to-End Baselines** The state-of-the-art approach for generating narratives consists of generating the story in one go. This end-to-end approach can be achieved either through zero-shot prompting or through fine-tuning, which we denote as  $E2E_{ZS}$  and  $E2E_{FT}$ , respectively.

**AGENTS’ ROOM Variants** We use the *plan+write* tag to denote the AGENTS’ ROOM variant with the writing and planning agents as previously described (see Section 4.1). To explore trade-offs between the different types of agents, we investigate two additional variants, *plan* and *write*, where we use only planning, or only writing agents, respectively. In the specific case of the *plan* variant with only planning agents, we still need a writing agent to finalize the story, since planning alone does not result in a final story. Therefore, the *plan* variant includes a single simple writing agent, which we denote as the [FINALIZER]. The prompt template for the [FINALIZER] agent is provided in Appendix B. We investigate both zero-shot and fine-tuned agents. For each AGENTS’ ROOM variant, we explore two settings, one with only zero-shot agents, and one with only fine-tuned agents, denoted as  $AR_{ZS}$  and  $AR_{FT}$ , respectively. Since agents are called independently, it is possible to mix and match between zero-shot and fine-tuned agents, but we keep the two settings separate to derive clearer signal for each approach.

**Implementation** For all E2E baselines and AGENTS’ ROOM agents, we use a Gemini 1.5 Flash<sup>4</sup> backbone, a lightweight and cost-efficient model that has demonstrated good performance across a wide range of generative tasks (Reid et al., 2024). In particular, it features long context capabilities (up to one-million tokens) which makes it suitable for handling the scratchpad with multiple agents’ contributions. We use an input token length out of  $\{1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192\}$  depending on the length of the scratchpad and a target token length of 4,096. While the outputs generated by the E2E systems are generally shorter than what is requested in the original prompt (see Section 7), we observe no improvements when increasing the target token length. We hypothesize that the observed limits on output lengths are likely due to the backbone model being trained on data with mostly shorter outputs.

<sup>3</sup>Available at: <https://github.com/markriedl/WikiPlots>

<sup>4</sup>Available at: <https://cloud.google.com/apix>

For the synthetic training data generation described in Section 4.2, we use Gemini Ultra<sup>4</sup> (Team et al., 2023) as the teacher model. Given that our dataset only contains a small number of training examples, we fine-tune our models (E2E<sub>FT</sub> and individual agents for AR<sub>FT</sub>) using LoRA-tuning (Hu et al., 2021), a computationally-efficient approach that updates only a small portion of the model weights. We perform LoRA-tuning with rank 4 and a learning rate of  $1^{-6}$  (picked after a hyperparameter search through  $\{1^{-4}, 1^{-5}, 1^{-6}, 1^{-7}\}$ ). We LoRA-tune for 250 steps with a batch size of 16, saving checkpoints every 20 steps. We then select the checkpoint with lowest loss on the validation set.

## 6 EVALUATION

We evaluate the quality of the generated outputs along several dimensions through human judgment elicitation and automated evaluation methods.

### 6.1 HUMAN EVALUATION

We evaluate system output by soliciting pairwise preferences (Louviere & Woodworth, 1990) along four dimensions, as well as an overall preference. We distill previous proposals (Chakrabarty et al., 2024b; Chhun et al., 2022) on how to evaluate creative writing into the following criteria:

- **Plot** — Does the story have a recognizable structure, e.g., with a connected beginning, middle, and end? Does it exhibit events and turns that move the plot forward without logical or conceptual inconsistencies?
- **Creativity** — Does the story have engaging characters, themes, and imagery? Does it avoid overly cliched characters and storylines, unintentional tropes, and stereotypes? Does it include original elements that were not explicitly mentioned in the prompt?
- **Development** — Are the characters and settings contextualized with relevant details that allow the reader to understand their place in the story? Are appropriate levels of detail and complexity provided to lend the story a feeling of realness and believability?
- **Language Use** — Does the language used feel varied and rich? Does the story exhibit rhetorical, linguistic and literary devices to create interesting effects? Does it avoid bland or repetitive phrases?

The full instructions are reproduced in Appendix D. Participants are shown two stories and asked to decide which one is better in each dimension. They can also respond that the two stories are about the same. We recruited annotators who were writers or had a degree in related disciplines (e.g., literature). Participants are allowed to rate up to five samples in one sitting, due to our task being cognitively taxing and time-consuming. We assign samples to participants following a Latin Square design, such that each participant does not rate the same writing prompt more than once. We randomize the order in which the two stories are shown to mitigate presentation order as a potential bias. We gather ratings for all examples included in the TELL ME A STORY test set and compare outputs from all E2E and AGENTS’ ROOM variants (see Figure 3); we also include the human-written stories as an upper bound. We obtained a total of 9,900 pairwise ratings which we converted into systems’ relative strengths using a Bradley-Terry model (Bradley & Terry 1952; see Section 6.2). Inter-annotator agreement was  $\kappa = 0.46$  ( $p < 0.01$ ,  $N = 150$ ,  $k = 3$ ), as measured by Fleiss’ Kappa, which we interpret to be satisfactory given the subjectivity of our task.

### 6.2 AUTOMATIC EVALUATION

Many previous studies (see Yang & Jin 2024 and the references therein) have highlighted the challenges associated with evaluating narratives automatically. Metrics based on lexical matching correlate poorly with human judgments (Chhun et al., 2022; Chakrabarty et al., 2024a) and do not effectively measure story quality (e.g., is the story original and well-written with plausible characters). In this work, we report reference-based metrics, specifically Rouge-L (Lin, 2004) and BertScore (Zhang et al., 2020), but also adopt several surface-based metrics intended to capture differences between human writing and LLM-generated stories. Specifically, we compute *story length* to determine whether models are able to generate long stories and quantify *structural differences* between



Table 2: Comparison between human and model generated stories using automatic metrics (TELL ME A STORY test set): #words (average number of words per story), #para (average number of paragraphs per story), Article (percentage of sentences starting with an article), Pro (percentage of sentences starting with a pronoun), Unique (percentage of unique words), Intra (intra-story trigram repetition), Inter (inter-story trigram repetition), Overlap (proportion of trigrams overlapping with the prompt). We also report two reference-based metrics, Rouge-L and BertScore. AR is a shorthand for AGENTS’ ROOM systems; subscripts  $Z_S$  and  $F_T$  respectively refer to zero-shot and fine-tuned systems.

Models	#words	#para	Article	Pro	Unique	Intra	Inter	Overlap	Rouge	BertSc
Humans	1,439	32.91	10.01	32.37	50.35	15.53	19.24	.0020	—	—
E2E $Z_S$	1,207	32.24	12.74	40.45	44.57	28.78	33.35	.0034	20.71	.8152
E2E $F_T$	1,193	32.25	12.58	43.39	44.02	28.21	31.31	.0036	20.73	.8138
AR $Z_S$ plan	926	20.95	13.82	40.68	43.88	29.70	33.49	.0017	19.58	.8119
AR $Z_S$ write	3,278	63.80	25.32	39.91	34.97	47.50	44.09	.0022	17.34	.8103
AR $Z_S$ plan + write	3,034	58.65	15.97	41.43	35.05	44.73	43.25	.0022	17.57	.8123
AR $F_T$ plan	856	21.05	18.02	39.29	44.65	23.85	28.05	.0027	19.24	.8146
AR $F_T$ write	3,129	61.90	17.45	44.80	36.35	46.39	42.39	.0021	17.53	.8150
AR $F_T$ plan + write	3,006	56.85	17.52	43.03	34.30	46.31	41.60	.0019	17.60	.8152

human and machine stories (e.g., number of sentences starting with an article or a pronoun). We also measure the ratio of *unique words* in a story which gives an idea of creative language use, and *intra-* and *inter-story trigram repetition* (Yao et al., 2019; Goldfarb-Tarrant et al., 2020) which capture diversity within a story and across stories (high inter-story repetition suggests models generate similar stories even when given different prompts). Finally, trigram *overlap with the prompt* is used to indicate whether models can creatively elaborate on the information provided.

In addition, we develop a LLM-based evaluator (Liusie et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2024; Bohnet et al., 2024) to perform *side-by-side* comparisons of system output. We design prompts targeting the same dimensions of story quality adopted in our human evaluation.

Specifically, we adapt the evaluation criteria described in Section 6.1 into a prompt template shown in Appendix E. This template asks the evaluator for a detailed assessment of the two stories presented, followed by a final conclusion, which is then parsed to obtain preference scores for each dimension.

We provide an example usage in Appendix E. Given  $N$  system outputs for each of  $M$  input prompts, we evaluate all possible (unordered) pairs of outputs for each input (while shuffling the order in which the outputs are presented), producing  $M \times N \times (N - 1)/2$  different pairwise ratings. Finally, we obtain a wins matrix  $W$  where  $w_{i,j}$  is the number of times system  $i$  wins over system  $j$ . This matrix is then used to obtain the systems’ relative strengths after fitting a Bradley-Terry model (Bradley & Terry, 1952). We use Gemini 1.5 Pro<sup>4</sup> as our LLM evaluator, as suggested in Bohnet et al. (2024).

## 7 RESULTS

Table 2 compares human and model generated stories using surface- and reference-based metrics. As far as story length is concerned, we observe that E2E stories are slightly shorter than human ones, while planning models are shortest overall. However, models which include writing agents produce considerably longer stories (by a factor of two) with more dialogue as suggested by the increased number of paragraphs. We also find machine stories to be more generic in their sentence structure as evidenced by the higher proportion of stories which start with an article or pronoun. Human-written stories are also more diverse (less repetitive) as shown by the higher ratio of unique words and less repeated trigrams (Inter and Intra in Table 2). The most repetitive models are also the ones that produce the longest stories. In terms of overlap with the prompt, we find AGENTS’ ROOM systems to copy least, at a rate similar to that of human writers. Rouge-L rewards the E2E systems most, as




Figure 3: Overall system ranking across dimensions of plot, creativity, development, and language, according to human ratings (a) and a LLM-based evaluator (b).

they least deviate from the prompt gold standard stories, while BertScore is not very discriminating, equally preferring the simplest ( $E2E_{ZS}$ ) and most complicated system ( $AR_{FT} plan+write$ ).

Figure 3 reports system rankings obtained from human judgments and the LLM-based evaluator.

**Human-written stories are preferred overall** As shown in Figure 3a, human judgments reveal a performance gap between machine writers ( $E2E$  and  $AGENTS'$  ROOM) and professional writers, a finding that is in line with Chakrabarty et al. (2024a). We observe this gap across all dimensions, but we note that it is smaller in the language use dimension. This result suggests that while machine-generated stories still fall short in terms of compelling plots and unique ideas, LLMs, in their current state, may be useful as writing assistants.

**$AGENTS'$  ROOM outperforms baseline systems** Across all dimensions of evaluation, human evaluators prefer  $AGENTS'$  ROOM stories with writing agents over those produced by baseline systems, with the  $AR_{FT} write$  and  $AR_{FT} plan+write$  systems performing best. The  $AR plan$  variants do not perform that well, most likely due to the single [FINALIZER] agent being too simplistic to make good use of the planned elements provided in the scratchpad. We note that fine-tuned agents yield better results over zero-shot ones, which shows that generating synthetic data by back-translating from gold standard outputs (see Section 4.2) is an effective strategy for training specialized agents for different subtasks.

**The LLM evaluator agrees with humans and itself** The LLM-based rankings in Figure 3b reveal similar tendencies to human ratings. The LLM overall prefers human stories and those generated by the  $AR plan + write$  system against all other model variants, even though it does not discriminate very strongly between those two. LLM-based judgments of story quality correlate significantly with human ratings across all dimensions, both by systems (Spearman’s rank correlation  $\rho = 0.62$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $N = 45$ ) and by items ( $\rho = 0.41$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $N = 9,900$ ). The LLM and humans have the highest agreement when assessing story development ( $\rho = 0.83$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and creativity ( $\rho = 0.85$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Similarly to the findings in Bohnet et al. (2024), we also find that the LLM evaluator scores are consistent: 90.2% of the time the LLM prefers the same story in a second run, when the stories are presented in the opposite order.

## 8 CONCLUSION

We propose  $AGENTS'$  ROOM, a general framework for multi-agent collaborative writing, and describe its instantiation for the long-form fiction writing task. Drawing inspiration from narrative theory, we decompose the complex writing task into subtasks tackled by specialized agents. To illustrate this framework, we present TELL ME A STORY, a high-quality dataset of prompts and long-form stories collected through multiple rounds of writing workshops with human participants. We show that  $AGENTS'$  ROOM generates stories that are preferred by human evaluators over those produced by baseline systems. Moreover, we demonstrate effective training strategies for developing specialized agents by leveraging synthetically-generated data. We introduce a human evaluation

framework for evaluating long-form narratives across several dimensions, and an LLM-based evaluator that correlates significantly with human raters. With improved automated evaluation, future work can explore more sophisticated orchestrators, including the development of reward models and learning objectives for such orchestrators.

#### ETHICS STATEMENT

There are a number of ethical considerations when using generative language models. While the work we present here makes a step towards improving the quality of text generation systems, it is important to note that current systems are still far from perfect in this respect and may make mistakes. In particular, generative models may perpetuate biases present in their training data. Even when writing fiction, the models may inadvertently amplify societal biases or reinforce stereotypes, leading to the production of biased content. Therefore, the generated outputs should be meticulously verified and used with caution.

#### REPRODUCIBILITY STATEMENT

For reproducibility, we release the TELL ME A STORY dataset on which we conduct our experiments, complete with its train, validation, and test splits, as described in Section 4.3. We specify the model backbones, implementation details, and where to access the checkpoints in Section 5. All prompt templates and scratchpad formatting templates are provided in Appendix. For the evaluation, we provide the exact rater instructions in Appendix D and the LLM evaluator prompts in Appendix E.

#### REFERENCES

- Amal Alabdulkarim, Siyan Li, and Xiangyu Peng. Automatic story generation: Challenges and attempts. In Nader Akoury, Faeze Brahman, Snigdha Chaturvedi, Elizabeth Clark, Mohit Iyyer, and Lara J. Martin (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Narrative Understanding*, pp. 72–83, Virtual, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.nuse-1.8. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.nuse-1.8>.
- Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Ethan Tien, Wesley Cheung, Zhaochen Luo, William Ma, Lara J. Martin, and Mark O. Riedl. Story realization: Expanding plot events into sentences. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):7375–7382, Apr. 2020. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v34i05.6232. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/6232>.
- Yushi Bai, Jiajie Zhang, Xin Lv, Linzhi Zheng, Siqi Zhu, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. Longwriter: Unleashing 10,000+ word generation from long context llms, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.07055>.
- Nishant Balepur, Jie Huang, and Kevin Chang. Expository text generation: Imitate, retrieve, paraphrase. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 11896–11919, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.729. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.729>.
- Margaret S. Barrett, Andrea Creech, and Katie Zhukov. Creative collaboration and collaborative creativity: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 2021.
- Bernd Bohnet, Kevin Swersky, Rosanne Liu, Pranjal Awasthi, Azade Nova, Javier Snaider, Hanie Sedghi, Aaron T Parisi, Michael Collins, Angeliki Lazaridou, et al. Long-span question-answering: Automatic question generation and qa-system ranking via side-by-side evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00179*, 2024.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.12712>.

- Orson Scott Card. *Characters and Viewpoints*. Elements of Fiction Writing. Writer’s Digest Books, 1999.
- Tuhin Chakrabarty, Philippe Laban, Divyansh Agarwal, Smaranda Muresan, and Chien-Sheng Wu. Art or artifice? large language models and the false promise of creativity. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’24, New York, NY, USA, 2024a. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400703300. doi: 10.1145/3613904.3642731. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642731>.
- Tuhin Chakrabarty, Vishakh Padmakumar, Faeze Brahman, and Smaranda Muresan. Creativity support in the age of large language models: An empirical study involving professional writers. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Creativity and Cognition*, pp. 132–155, New York, NY, USA, 2024b. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704857. doi: 10.1145/3635636.3656201. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3635636.3656201>.
- Guangyao Chen, Siwei Dong, Yu Shu, Ge Zhang, Jaward Sesay, Börje Karlsson, Jie Fu, and Yemin Shi. Autoagents: A framework for automatic agent generation. In Kate Larson (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-24*, pp. 22–30. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2024. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2024/3. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2024/3>. Main Track.
- Wenhu Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YfZ4ZPt8zd>.
- Pengyu Cheng, Tianhao Hu, Han Xu, Zhisong Zhang, Yong Dai, Lei Han, and Nan Du. Self-playing adversarial language game enhances llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10642*, 2024.
- Cyril Chhun, Pierre Colombo, Fabian M. Suchanek, and Chloé Clavel. Of human criteria and automatic metrics: A benchmark of the evaluation of story generation. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na (eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 5794–5836, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.509>.
- Cyril Chhun, Fabian M. Suchanek, and Chloé Clavel. Do language models enjoy their own stories? prompting large language models for automatic story evaluation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.13769>.
- James E Cutting. Narrative theory and the dynamics of popular movies. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 23(6), 2016.
- Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. Strategies for structuring story generation. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez (eds.), *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2650–2660, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1254. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1254>.
- Gustav Freytag. *Freytag’s technique of the drama: an exposition of dramatic composition and art*. Scholarly Press, 1896.
- Seraphina Goldfarb-Tarrant, Tuhin Chakrabarty, Ralph Weischedel, and Nanyun Peng. Content planning for neural story generation with aristotelian rescoring. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 4319–4338, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.351. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.351>.

- Jian Guan and Minlie Huang. UNION: An Unreferenced Metric for Evaluating Open-ended Story Generation. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 9157–9166, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.736. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.736>.
- Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V. Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges. In Kate Larson (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-24*, pp. 8048–8057. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2024. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2024/890. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2024/890>. Survey Track.
- Shanshan Han, Qifan Zhang, Yuhang Yao, Weizhao Jin, Zhaozhuo Xu, and Chaoyang He. Llm multi-agent systems: Challenges and open problems, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03578>.
- Rui Hao, Linmei Hu, Weijian Qi, Qingliu Wu, Yirui Zhang, and Liqiang Nie. Chatllm network: More brains, more intelligence, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.12998>.
- Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, Hugh Zhang, and Percy Liang. Unifying human and statistical evaluation for natural language generation. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 1689–1701, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1169. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1169>.
- Michael Hauge. *Storytelling Made Easy: Persuade and Transform Your Audiences, Buyers, and Clients – Simply, Quickly, and Profitably*. Indie Books International, 2017.
- Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. MetaGPT: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VtmBAGCN7o>.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- Sihao Hu, Tiansheng Huang, Fatih Ilhan, Selim Tekin, Gaowen Liu, Ramana Kompella, and Ling Liu. A survey on large language model-based game agents, 2024.
- Wenyue Hua, Lizhou Fan, Lingyao Li, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Yingqiang Ge, Libby Hemphill, and Yongfeng Zhang. War and peace (waragent): Large language model-based multi-agent simulation of world wars, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17227>.
- Xinyu Hua, Zhe Hu, and Lu Wang. Argument generation with retrieval, planning, and realization. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez (eds.), *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2661–2672, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1255. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1255>.
- Tenghao Huang, Ehsan Qasemi, Bangzheng Li, He Wang, Faeze Brahman, Muhao Chen, and Snigdha Chaturvedi. Affective and dynamic beam search for story generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 11792–11806, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.789. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.789>.
- Daphne Ippolito, Ann Yuan, Andy Coenen, and Sehmon Burnam. Creative writing with an ai-powered writing assistant: Perspectives from professional writers, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.05030>.

- Martin Josifoski, Marija Sakota, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. Exploiting asymmetry for synthetic training data generation: SynthIE and the case of information extraction. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1555–1574, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.96. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.96>.
- Akbir Khan, John Hughes, Dan Valentine, Laura Ruis, Kshitij Sachan, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Edward Grefenstette, Samuel R Bowman, Tim Rocktäschel, and Ethan Perez. Debating with more persuasive llms leads to more truthful answers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06782*, 2024.
- Xiangzhe Kong, Jialiang Huang, Ziquan Tung, Jian Guan, and Minlie Huang. Stylized story generation with style-guided planning. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pp. 2430–2436, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.215. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-acl.215>.
- Yukyung Lee, Soonwon Ka, Bokyung Son, Pilsung Kang, and Jaewook Kang. Navigating the path of writing: Outline-guided text generation with large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.13919>.
- Yang Li, Yangyang Yu, Haohang Li, Zhi Chen, and Khaldoun Khashanah. TradingGPT: Multi-Agent System with Layered Memory and Distinct Characters for Enhanced Financial Trading Performance. Papers 2309.03736, arXiv.org, September 2023. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/p/arx/papers/2309.03736.html>.
- Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pp. 74–81, Barcelona, Spain, July 2004. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
- Yinhong Liu, Han Zhou, Zhijiang Guo, Ehsan Shareghi, Ivan Vulic, Anna Korhonen, and Nigel Collier. Aligning with human judgement: The role of pairwise preference in large language model evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16950*, 2024.
- Adian Liusie, Potsawee Manakul, and Mark JF Gales. Zero-shot nlg evaluation through pairwise comparisons with LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07889*, 2023.
- Jordan J Louviere and George G Woodworth. Best worst scaling: A model for largest difference judgments [working paper]. *Faculty of Business*, 1990.
- Zhao Mandi, Shreeya Jain, and Shuran Song. Roco: Dialectic multi-robot collaboration with large language models. In Japan Yokohama (ed.), *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 286–293, 2024.
- Piotr Mirowski, Kory W. Mathewson, Jaylen Pittman, and Richard Evans. Co-writing screenplays and theatre scripts with language models: Evaluation by industry professionals. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’23, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450394215. doi: 10.1145/3544548.3581225. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581225>.
- Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Nathanael Chambers, Xiaodong He, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, Lucy Vanderwende, Pushmeet Kohli, and James Allen. A corpus and cloze evaluation for deeper understanding of commonsense stories. In Kevin Knight, Ani Nenkova, and Owen Rambow (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 839–849, San Diego, California, June 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N16-1098. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N16-1098>.
- Shashi Narayan, Joshua Maynez, Reinald Kim Amplayo, Kuzman Ganchev, Annie Louis, Fantine Huot, Anders Sandholm, Dipanjan Das, and Mirella Lapata. Conditional generation with a question-answering blueprint. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11: 974–996, 2023.

- William Noble. *Conflict, Action and Suspense*. Elements of Fiction Writing. Writer's Digest Books, 1999.
- Tira Nur Fitria. Artificial intelligence (ai) technology in openai chatgpt application: A review of chatgpt in writing english essay. *ELT Forum Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12:44–58, 03 2023. doi: 10.15294/elt.v12i1.64069.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph O'Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST '23, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400701320. doi: 10.1145/3586183.3606763. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606763>.
- Patrice Pavis. *Dictionary of the theatre: Terms, concepts, and analysis*. University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Xiangyu Peng, Siyan Li, Sarah Wiegrefe, and Mark Riedl. Inferring the reader: Guiding automated story generation with commonsense reasoning. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pp. 7008–7029, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.findings-emnlp.520. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-emnlp.520>.
- Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- Matthew Ricketson and Caroline Graham. *Writing Feature Stories: How to research and write articles- from listicles to longform*. Routledge, 2017.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Zhengbao Jiang, Fabio Petroni, Patrick Lewis, Gautier Izacard, Qingfei You, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Edouard Grave, and Sebastian Riedel. Peer: A collaborative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11663*, 2022.
- Joshua Schimel. *Writing Science: How to Write Papers That Get Cited and Proposals That Get Funded*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Yijia Shao, Yucheng Jiang, Theodore Kanell, Peter Xu, Omar Khattab, and Monica Lam. Assisting in writing Wikipedia-like articles from scratch with large language models. In Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 6252–6278, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.347. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-long.347>.
- Yashar Talebirad and Amirhossein Nadiri. Multi-agent collaboration: Harnessing the power of intelligent llm agents, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03314>.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- Yichen Wang, Kevin Yang, Xiaoming Liu, and Dan Klein. Improving pacing in long-form story planning. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 10788–10845, Singapore, December 2023a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.723. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.723>.
- Yuxin Wang, Jieru Lin, Zhiwei Yu, Wei Hu, and Börje F. Karlsson. Open-world story generation with structured knowledge enhancement: A comprehensive survey. *Neurocomputing*, 559:126792, 2023b. ISSN 0925-2312. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2023.126792>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925231223009153>.

- Zhenhailong Wang, Shaoguang Mao, Wenshan Wu, Tao Ge, Furu Wei, and Heng Ji. Unleashing the emergent cognitive synergy in large language models: A task-solving agent through multi-persona self-collaboration. In Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 257–279, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.15. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-long.15>.
- Bushi Xiao, Ziyuan Yin, and Zixuan Shan. Simulating public administration crisis: A novel generative agent-based simulation system to lower technology barriers in social science research, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.06957>.
- Zhuohan Xie, Trevor Cohn, and Jey Han Lau. The next chapter: A study of large language models in storytelling. In C. Maria Keet, Hung-Yi Lee, and Sina Zarrieß (eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, pp. 323–351, Prague, Czechia, September 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.inlg-main.23. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.inlg-main.23>.
- Ivan P. Yamshchikov and Alexey Tikhonov. What is wrong with language models that can not tell a story? In Nader Akoury, Elizabeth Clark, Mohit Iyyer, Snigdha Chaturvedi, Faeze Brahman, and Khyathi Chandu (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Narrative Understanding*, pp. 58–64, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.wnu-1.8. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wnu-1.8>.
- Dingyi Yang and Qin Jin, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.14622>.
- Kevin Yang, Yuandong Tian, Nanyun Peng, and Dan Klein. Re3: Generating longer stories with recursive reprompting and revision. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 4393–4479, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.296. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.296>.
- Kevin Yang, Dan Klein, Nanyun Peng, and Yuandong Tian. DOC: Improving long story coherence with detailed outline control. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 3378–3465, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.190. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.190>.
- Lili Yao, Nanyun Peng, Ralph Weischedel, Kevin Knight, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. Plan-and-write: Towards better automatic storytelling. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pp. 7378–7385, 2019.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS ’23*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2024. Curran Associates Inc.
- An Zhang, Yuxin Chen, Leheng Sheng, and Xiang Wang Tat-Seng Chua. On generative agents in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR ’24*, pp. 1807–1817, New York, NY, USA, 2024a. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704314. doi: 10.1145/3626772.3657844. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657844>.
- Jintian Zhang, Xin Xu, Ningyu Zhang, Ruibo Liu, Bryan Hooi, and Shumin Deng. Exploring collaboration mechanisms for LLM agents: A social psychology view. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 14544–14607, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024b. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.782>.



Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with BERT. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkeHuCVFDr>.

Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey of large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.18223>.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging LLM-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuchen Eleanor Jiang, Peng Cui, Tiannan Wang, Zhenxin Xiao, Yifan Hou, Ryan Cotterell, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Recurrentgpt: Interactive generation of (arbitrarily) long text, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13304>.

## A EXAMPLES FROM TELL ME A STORY DATASET

### Example Prompt

Write a story about a mythological character meeting someone from the present. The story should be between 1,300 and 1,350 words and should be funny. The main character should be Poseidon. He and his wife are traveling to a beach resort. There should be a family at the resort, and the father annoys Poseidon. Poseidon uses his powers to get revenge on the man. At the end, Poseidon should create a storm. The ending is happy.

### Example Story

“I can’t believe that air wench made me check my trident,” Poseidon complained.

“She’s a flight attendant, dear, and the overhead bins were full.” Amphitrite, his wife, said.

Poseidon shifted impatiently at the gate, waiting for his checked luggage. “Did you see how carelessly they handled it? They could have created a magnitude nine earthquake. Would have served them right too.”

“Yes, dear.” Amphitrite had settled in a chair and flipped to the next page in her book. She hoped Poseidon wouldn’t bellyache the entire trip, but she wasn’t optimistic.

After that jerk Odysseus blinded Polyphemus, his cyclops son, Poseidon didn’t have the patience to deal with the mortals. For over three thousand years, he had disappeared to his underwater palace with Amphitrite. He kept busy piddling around the house. He tried meditation to deal with his anger. However, he gave up after a few decades (a few days in god years) because he found his own thoughts irritating. A couple of times a week Delphin, his dolphin friend, would come over for coffee and keep him abreast of what was going on in the terrestrial world.

Poseidon managed to escape interaction with mortals for the most part. Sure, he produced the occasional hurricane or earthquake to entertain himself. Avoiding people had been good for his temperament and his soul. Over the last hundred years, however, it became impossible to blissfully ignore the mortals.

Industrial advancements and increased pollution began to impact Poseidon’s bejeweled palace. The once shimmering gold coral had faded to a dull white. The glistening gems now appeared drab, covered in algae. Poseidon’s anger grew with each passing year. The mortal’s poor choices along with his rage heated the ocean, and he sent increasingly violent storms and earthquakes. The consequences did not deter the humans.

The moody deity had become unbearable to live with. Amphitrite suggested that maybe some time away from the palace in the fresh air would do him some good. After a great deal of badgering, Poseidon reluctantly agreed. She booked a fabulous seven-day, six night stay at an all-inclusive beach resort in Turks and Caicos.

Trident finally in hand, Poseidon and Amphitrite boarded the shuttle to the resort. It was on this shuttle that Poseidon met a nemesis to rival Athena – Doug. He knew Doug’s name because his wife, Courtney, shouted it no fewer than eighty times on the twenty-minute ride. He also learned the names of their three children, Ethan, Dalton, and Clementine.

“Cool pitchfork, bro,” Doug said to his new enemy. Poseidon opened his mouth to correct him, but he had already shifted his attention. “Dalton, stop trying to push your brother out the window. I don’t care if he bit you.”

As a younger god, Poseidon might have washed him away in a tsunami or made him fall in love with a bull.

Three-thousand years gave him time to reflect, however, and he decided to spare Doug his wrath – for now.

Once at the resort, Poseidon was eager to sit on the beach with a margarita and relax.

“Hurry up, Amphitrite! The good chairs are going to be gone,” he said. “We can unpack later.” Beach bag in hand, he rushed his wife out the door.

They found two empty chairs in a prime location close to the bar and with an uninterrupted view. Poseidon started to unpack his bag, and Doug emerged from the water waving frantically.

“No, no!” he shouted as he ran on shore. “Those are saved. See our towels.”

Poseidon felt the rage swelling up. Amphitrite grabbed his hand. “Do you really need all five?” she asked Doug. “I mean, I expect the kids are going to spend most of their time playing.”

“Yeah, well, see. We got here first, so yeah. Sorry,” Doug said.

Poseidon squeezed Amphitrite’s hand so hard that she winced a little. “Let’s just sit over there,” she said pointing with her free hand.

“The view isn’t as good. And look how far away it is from the bar,” he complained. Amphitrite gave an exasperated sigh. “Fine!” he begrudgingly agreed. He still kicked sand on Doug’s towel as he shuffled away.

Poseidon angrily sipped his margarita as he watched Doug’s family splash and laugh in the waves. As hard as he tried to relax, he just couldn’t let it go. He looked for a team of horses he could command to stampede and ruin their good time. He even considered a shiver of sharks, but he didn’t want to ruin everyone’s day.

A flock of seagulls gathered on the beach. They would have to do, Poseidon decided. He telepathically forced the birds’ attention. He raised his mighty hand and pointed to the family playing in the distance. The seagulls abandoned their discarded french fries. Low squawks warned of their imminent attack. The birds circled the family. The squawks grew louder and they swooped and pecked their targets. The children let out piercing screams that excited the seagulls more.

Doug and crew covered their heads with their arms and ran for the safety of their empty chairs. The persistent flock followed. The swarm was unyielding, and the family finally had to retreat back to their room to escape having their eyes pecked out.

Poseidon let out a hearty laugh. Amphitrite turned to her husband and tilted her head. “Really?”

“What?” he asked innocently as he gathered their belongings to move to the unoccupied chairs.

The second day, Poseidon tried to avoid Doug. He really did. Doug, however, kept springing up, as a nemesis is prone to do. Poseidon awoke early to enjoy the sunrise in peace. Unfortunately, the family had beat him to the beach because they were having their portrait made. The children shrieked and ran wild. Doug and Courtney yelled at the kids to settle down. How unfortunate that right as they were set for the perfect photo, an unusually large wave crashed to shore. It knocked the group in their matching white button ups and

khaki shorts to the ground. The children sobbed as they returned to their room with their soaked and defeated parents.

At dinner, an inebriated Doug saw a resemblance between Poseidon and a statue honoring him in the dining hall.

“Hey, Barnacle Beard!” Doug repeated all night. Poseidon showed great restraint when he manifested the slightest tremor. It knocked Doug unsteady, and he fell face-first into the dessert cart.

“I can’t do another five days, Amphitrite. I just can’t,” Poseidon said as he threw his Hawaiian shirts and flip-flops in his suitcase.

“Sure you can. It’s a big resort. We can avoid them. Besides, it’s nonrefundable. We’re staying,” said Amphitrite.

The next morning, Poseidon stepped on the balcony with his coffee. Of course, Doug managed to ruin his day before it even began. Amphitrite joined Poseidon as they watched his archenemy in disgust. Doug found an innocent sea turtle to harass. With selfie-stick in hand, he posed with the giant reptile as it snapped and tried to retreat. Doug grew bored. He slurped the last of his iced coffee and flung the cup, plastic straw and all, into the ocean.

“Bring me my trident!” Poseidon boomed.

Amphitrite nodded. She knew what must be done.

Poseidon raised his trident in the air and let out a menacing bellow. Dark clouds filled the skies and the ocean swirled. Massive waves crashed against the shore. Lightning struck the sea and a rumble of thunder rattled the window. Poseidon slammed his trident against the floor with all his built-up rage. The earth quaked. The unfortunate souls out early to enjoy a beautiful day ran for cover. Hail stones pelted Doug. He dropped his phone in the surf as he hastened to escape the wrath of the storm.

The storm raged for five days. Poseidon lounged on the beach, sipping his margarita. He felt the thick raindrops on his face and the violent wind tousling his beard. The sounds of the thunderclaps lulled him into a healing meditation. It was the greatest vacation of his life.

### Example Prompt

Write a short story about a myth or legend being fulfilled in an unusual or unexpected way, or even cleverly bypassed. The story should be between 1,200 and 1,300 words. It should take place during the Covid-19 pandemic in Europe. The narrative should involve vampires. The genre should be comedic horror. The story should contain visuals of a medieval castle and of a modern European town. It should occur at night. The narrative should also contain situations where one character does not understand the other character's perspective. The story should end with the vampires surviving to prey on human victims in the near future.

### Example Story

On April 19, 2020, Dracula awoke from his centuries-long slumber. In a rural corner of Transylvania, he rose from a sleek, albeit dusty coffin in the recesses of a cobwebbed wine cellar. It had been ages since he laid eyes on his castle keep. When he last drifted off to sleep, at the turn of the nineteenth century, he had been sated on the blood of Turks from a long ten-year adventure through the mountains of the Ottoman Empire.

He slept like the dead, not because he was, but because he was a god of his own religion. His eternal life's work, as it had always been, was to simply live forever. But each time he reached a point where he was beginning to enjoy his life of bloody rampaging and serial murdering, his presence became too noticeable to people of power, from regional dukes to church officials. At that time, he was always forced back into the vampire closet, so to speak, hiding himself and his coffin away to play another day in the distant future.

But this day was another opportunity for Dracula to continue his eternal journey in the twenty-first century. Dracula dressed in his traditional cape and walked out of his castle doors just as the sun was setting. He turned around and was shocked to see that his once foreboding castle appeared to have been co-opted by some powerful warlord in the region.

As he glanced around, he noticed a small sign posted at the entry to the castle, "Voted best Airbnb three years running!" While he did not quite comprehend the Airbnb aspect of this phrase, he feared that silly notions of enfranchisement had perhaps finally made their way into the local merchant class.

"Voting?" he thought to himself as he transformed into a bat and darted into the crisp night air, "What is next? The abolishment of the Sultanate?"

Dracula arrived in the capital city of Cluj-Napoca around midnight to see that there had been many changes to the territory since he last visited. He had become accustomed to awakening to massive technological and societal changes, but he was more than a little shocked to find that there was not a soul on the streets of the city. Every business, tavern, and home was closed up with the curtains drawn.

Had some suspicious village priest found out he was on his way? Or was this another year of invasion by the Turks? Perhaps the Cossacks had finally found their footing and made a move for power?

Dracula came upon a lovely and quaint bungalow on a side street, not far from the Piata Unirii. He peered into a window and saw two young men seated on a long sofa, watching a flat, glowing box filled with moving pictures in the corner. He gave a brisk knock on the window. One of the men approached with a curious but cross expression. Dracula then, in his most alluring voice, asked his classic question:

"Will you invite me in?"

The man looked him dead in the eye, and said with an air of minor annoyance, “Food deliveries can be left at the door. We are in lockdown, man! You know the drill. Thanks.” With that, the man closed the curtain and went back to his friend and his strange box.

Over the next three hours, Dracula moved from one house to the other asking the same question. The answers varied wildly, from threats about calling for a man named “the police” to suggestions that he shove something or another in a most personal bodily space.

In response, Dracula upped his own strategies. He made grand offers of riches, women, and whatever trinkets he thought might convince the person to invite him inside, but no one agreed. He even captured a lone black cat outside a home. Then, he held the fluffy terror up to the window and gestured a threat of violence against it as he demanded for an elderly woman to invite him in.

The mustachioed old woman replied, “That isn’t my cat.

Bugger off.” Then, she promptly returned her attention to a small square, light filled device in her hand. It appeared these glowing boxes were somehow a part of the problem.

Dracula walked the streets of the ancient city, surveying its electrified lights and frozen, horseless carriages. He quickly realized that the printing press had continued its spread across Europe, and he carefully read each and every paper he came across, trying to find some explanation for this decrease in his food supply. He sat down on an iron bench at the center of the deserted city center plaza and picked up a folded newspaper that had been shoved below the worn bars of the seat.

In bold letters, it read, “COVID-19 brings the world to a standstill. Citywide lockdowns imposed in Cluj-Napoca until further notice.”

For the first time in centuries, Dracula felt the gnawing hunger of a body needing blood. Normally, by now he was taking his first nap after an alcohol-tinged midnight snack after the local tavern finally kicked out its patrons for the evening. Even in past years, when wars took many of the local men out of the city, he could at least expect to feed on some poor elderly man asleep in the streets.

Then, as if he could not feel low enough, he saw a mocking sign on the lamppost next to him. It was a caricatured image of himself, Dracula, with his cape covering his mouth, and the words, “Use your sleeve and do the vampire sneeze!”

Yes, he was sure of it now. This virus was mocking him.

Dracula knew he had to come up with a plan. He could go back to his castle on an empty stomach, and perhaps catch a few stray dogs along the way to tide him over for a short decade’s sleep. But then he would need to awaken again in ten years time and would be back to square one. Dracula tired of this haphazard existence, and longed for a purpose to continue his eternal life. If only he could find a place where he could be himself and be allowed to live in bloody, greedy, sanguine-soaked glory in peace.

Suddenly, in the distance, he saw a man walking down the street in a hurry. He rose up and draped his cape around himself, preparing to attack, only to realize he could not detect the scent of flowing blood from this man. As the man drew closer, Dracula dropped his cape and yet the man continued walking towards him. Dracula knew then that the man must be a fellow vampire.

Dracula had been correct. The vampire, dressed in a light blue uniform, said he had seen him knocking on windows. With an air of sympathy in his voice, the vampire asked Dracula

if he was hungry.

Dracula nodded and followed his newfound friend down the darkened street.

The vampire introduced himself as Demeter. He told Dracula that he had, years ago, found an occupation that could provide him with ample blood day and night. Soon the pair stopped in front of a vast, white building with multiple stories. People moved busily in and out of the structure and many individuals, dressed in a uniform similar to Demeter, shuffled in and out of various doors.

Dracula stopped Demeter and asked, “What sort of professional are you?”

Demeter replied, “A phlebotomist. I draw blood for hospital patients. And I am always looking for an assistant who has a gift for finding a good vein.”

### Example Prompt

Write a story about a stranger coming to a small town and shaking up the order of things. The story should be about 950 words and be a science fiction story. The story should be framed with three old men gossiping about the stranger. The story should be in the third person point-of-view. The stranger is found wandering in a rural town and is taken to a very small hospital. A doctor is called in to treat him. The stranger should recognize the doctor as an alien. The doctor tells the patient about the aliens’ conspiracy to infiltrate earth. There should also be subtle hints that one of the old men is an alien. The ending should be scary.

### Example Story

“I swear to God, he was wanderin’ in just his britches outside Sizzlin’ Charlie’s. Imogene was eatin’ there when the law showed up,” Earl said. “These kids,” Joe Don replied. “I heard he was sputterin’ some nonsense ‘bout the aliens gittin’ him.”

For forty years, the group of three old-timers had gathered at the Country Mart convenience store. They sat around the same metal table in the same rust orange vinyl chairs. They drank their black coffee, smoked their cigarettes, and aired their grievances.

“I reckon they oughta lock up a crazy like that and throw away the key. What’re they doin’ with him?” Buddy asked.

“He’s at the hospital. They called in some lady doctor from the crazy house in Big Spring. I’ll tell you what, he oughta be sittin’ in jail. Not trickin’ some headshrinker into makin’ scuses for him,” Earl said as he sipped his coffee. The men were so wrapped up in their gossip that they did not notice Dr. Lydia Brooks. She grabbed a bottle of water and a granola bar. She walked by the group and smiled and placed her items on the counter.

“Y’all’re worse than a sewing circle,” said the clerk as he rang up Dr. Brooks. Earl blushed and pulled the rim of his baseball cap down. Buddy looked down at the table, and Joe Don gave her a wink. Dr. Brooks paid and gathered her items. She waved and said, “You fellas have a great day.”

Dr. Brooks hopped in her black luxury SUV and drove down Main Street to the county hospital. She received curious stares as she sped through the small West Texas town of fifteen hundred. There was not a single stoplight in town and only a handful of businesses. She used the term “hospital” loosely to describe the twenty bed medical facility. Only one patient sat in the emergency room waiting room. The slow pace was unsettling to Dr. Brooks.

She arrived at room 107 and spied through the barely cracked door. A motherly nurse calmly reassured the disoriented patient. She squeezed his hand. "I know you're scared, dear. The doctor will be here any minute, and then we're gonna get you home."

The terrified stranger's eyes darted around the room. He caught a glimpse of the doctor's jade green eyes peering through the crack, and he shuddered at her glance. Dr. Brooks furrowed her brow upon finding the patient conscious. She realized her involuntary expression and plastered on a fake toothy smile. She lightly knocked before entering the room.

"Good morning. I'm Dr. Brooks," she said as she held out her hand. The patient glared at the doctor, refusing to extend his hand in return. She pulled back from the rejected handshake and fiddled with her long ponytail.

"He's been pretty agitated since he came to," the nurse said.

"That's certainly understandable," said Dr. Brooks. "I know you must have other patients to attend to."

The nurse didn't really have any other patients, but she could take a hint. The man grabbed her hand tighter. His stunned expression seemed to beg her to stay. "The doctor's gonna take good care of you." She patted his shoulder and left the room.

Dr. Brooks's smile morphed into a menacing smirk. The man tightly pulled the sheet up to his neck and cowered in fear. He struggled to speak. He worked his mouth and was finally able to utter, "I kn-kn-know who y-y-you are. Y-y-you were on the sh-ship."

Flashes of the night before came back to him. He remembered the bright lights almost blinding him. He was able to make out two almost reptilian creatures and two forms that seemed human.

Although he fought to move, he was being held down. Not by physical restraints but rather by an energy. He screeched in pain as the beings conducted painful medical experiments. He faded in and out of consciousness. He couldn't remember his name or where he was from. However, he did remember those piercing green eyes.

Dr. Brooks cackled. "Well, I suppose it's your word against mine. A distinguished doctor versus a stranger found wandering down Main Street in his underwear."

She reached in the pocket of her lab coat and pulled out a syringe. "They all think you're crazy. It's perfect, really. We've been infiltrating the small towns for years. Soon, it will be the bigger cities. We can do our research and conduct our experiments without notice." She moved closer to him and poked him in the chest with her long pointed finger. "All because no one believes nutjobs like you."

The man tried to move, but he felt the pressure of the same energy that restrained him in the spacecraft. She tilted her head, lifted the syringe, and stabbed him in the chest. His muscles contracted, and he let out a piercing scream. His body then went limp. She shoved the syringe in her pocket and threw herself on the floor and backed into the corner. She let out a fake cry for help.

The old timers gathered the next morning at the Country Mart to drink their black coffee and compare notes about the excitement the previous day.

"Faye was on duty when it happened. Said he tried to strangle the lady doctor. I swear to God," Earl said.



Buddy chimed in. “She’s real lucky. Weirdos like that have super-human strength.”

“I know that’s right,” Earl said. “Faye said that’s what kilt him. Had him a heart attack.”

Joe Don looked up from the newspaper he was reading, “I heard he was hollerin’ somethin’ ‘bout her bein’ an alien.” He leaned back, took a sip of black coffee, and stared at his friends with his piercing green eyes.

## B SPECIALIZED AGENTS’ PROMPT TEMPLATES

Each specialized LLM-based agent has a specific prompt template that formats the scratchpad into a suitable prompt for the LLM call.

### B.1 SCRATCHPAD

Concretely, the scratchpad is typically formatted as follows:

#### [SCRATCHPAD] Format

[Creative Writing Task] <the original writing prompt>

[Central Conflict] <the output of the conflict agent>

[Character Descriptions] <the output of the character agent>

[Setting] <the output of the setting agent>

[Key Plot Points] <the output of the plot agent>

[Exposition] <the output of the exposition agent>

[Rising Action] <the output of the rising action agent>

[Climax] <the output of the climax agent>

[Falling Action] <the output of the falling action agent>

[Resolution] <the output of the resolution agent>

The number and order of items in the scratchpad is of course a function of which agents have been called so far.

### B.2 PLANNING AGENTS

#### [CONFLICT] Agent Prompt

Given <identifiers found in the scratchpad>, describe the central conflict in detail (more than 5 sentences). The description should answer the following questions:

- ★ What’s the protagonist’s main goal in this story?
- ★ Why do they want it?
- ★ What’s stopping them from achieving it?

<scratchpad>

### [CHARACTER] Agent Prompt

Given <identifiers found in the scratchpad>, describe the characters in detailed bullet points (more than 5 sentences for each character). The description should answer the following questions:

- \* What do the characters sound like? Are they talkative or quiet? What kind of slang do they use? What is their sense of humor like?
- \* What do they look like? Do they have any defining gestures? What’s the first thing people notice about them?
- \* What are their motivations and internal characteristics? What are their flaws? What are their values? What are they afraid of? How will they change and grow over the course of this story?

<scratchpad>

### [SETTING] Agent Prompt

Given <identifiers found in the scratchpad>, describe the setting in detail (more than 5 sentences). The description should answer the following questions:

- \* Where does the story take place? Is it set in a fictional world, or is it simply set in someone’s backyard?
- \* When does the story take place? What decade is it set in? How much time elapses over the course of the story?

<scratchpad>

### [PLOT] Agent Prompt

Given <identifiers found in the scratchpad>, describe the key plot points in detailed bullet points. <scratchpad>

The <identifiers found in the scratchpad> are extracted from the scratchpad and formatted to fit the prompt. For instance, for a scratchpad that contains the original prompt, the [CONFLICT] and [CHARACTER] agents’ contributions, the resulting <identifiers found in the scratchpad> would be: “a Creative Writing Task, the Central Conflict, and the Character Descriptions”.

## B.3 WRITING AGENTS

### [<SECTION>] Agent Prompt

Given <identifiers found in the scratchpad>, continue the story by writing the <section> part.

<If previous sections have been written, include the following in the prompt:>

Begin your portion of the story in a way that naturally flows from the previous ending. Match the writing style, vocabulary, and overall mood of the existing text. Do not re-explain details or events that have already been described.

<If this is not the meant to be the last section, include the following in the prompt:>

Focus only on the <section> part of the story. Do not write about the following parts of the story. Do not end the story.

<scratchpad>

In these writing agents’ prompt templates:

- `<section>` is one of “Exposition”, “Rising Action”, “Climax”, “Falling Action”, or “Resolution”,
- `<identifiers found in the scratchpad>` are extracted from the scratchpad and formatted to fit the prompt. For these writing agents they are formatted as follows: “a Creative Writing Task, the Content Plan (Central Conflict, Character Descriptions, Setting, Key Plot Points), and the Previous Parts of the Story (Exposition, Rising Action, Climax)”, where the enumerated elements correspond to what is in the scratchpad.

In the specific case of the AGENTS’ ROOM [PLANNING] variant, with only the planning agents, we still need a single writing agent to finalize the story, which we denote as the [FINALIZER]. This [FINALIZER] agent uses the following prompt template:

#### [FINALIZER] Agent Prompt

Given `<identifiers found in the scratchpad>`, write a story using the information below.  
`<scratchpad>`

## C PROMPT TEMPLATES FOR SYNTHETIC DATA GENERATION

For the planning agents, we use the same prompt templates as in Appendix B.2 to generate the synthetic training data, except in this case, we provide the gold standard data in the scratchpad. As a consequence, the scratchpad is formatted as follows:

#### [SCRATCHPAD] Format

[Creative Writing Task] `<the original writing prompt>`  
 [User-Written Response] `<the gold output>`

The `<identifiers found in the scratchpad>` are formatted as “a Creative Writing Task and a User-Written Response”.

For the writing agents, we use the following prompt template to split to gold standard stories into distinct sections:

#### [WRITING] Synthetic Data Generation

Split the following story into sections:

- ★ [Exposition]: The exposition gives the reader the background info they need to jump right into the story’s world. This is often found towards the beginning of the story.
- ★ [Rising Action]: The rising action is the moments in the story that lead up to the climax — choices the main characters have made and the events happening that are at odds with the characters’ goals. This is where the story builds and the reader begins to invest in the characters.
- ★ [Climax]: The climax is the primary turning point and what the story has been building towards.
- ★ [Falling Action]: The falling action is the period of time in a story that follows the climax and leads to the resolution. It can be used to clarify the events of the climax, ease any built-up tension, or wrap up loose ends.
- ★ [Resolution]: This is the end of the story. It answers the remaining unanswered questions in the plot. The resolution is also the time to show the next step in the characters’ lives.

For each section, give the section header (marked as [Exposition], [Rising Action], [Climax], [Falling Action], and [Resolution]) followed by the first sentence of that section, copied exactly from the story.

[User-Written Response] <the gold output>

## D HUMAN EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

For this task, you will be presented with a writing prompt and two short stories corresponding to this prompt. Your task is to compare the quality of the two stories across several dimensions. This is a judgment task rather than an annotation task. As such, you should use your own judgment when you assign ratings, calibrated by the rubrics we provide.

This rating task consists of three steps: (1) Compare the quality of the two stories across four dimensions. (2) Rate which story you preferred. (3) (optional) Leave comment / feedback on the stories. In the following we provide detailed instructions for each step:

### D.1 RATE THE QUALITY OF THE STORY

Your task is to compare the quality of two stories along four different dimensions (plot, creativity, development, language use), as described in the Rubric table below.

While the dimensions may have overlap and work in interdependent ways, they are intended to capture distinct aspects of what makes a good story. Therefore, a story may score highly in one dimension and poorly in another. Furthermore, the features (marked as a, b, c) that make up a dimension may be thought of as cumulative. For example, a story may have strong characters but suffer from an underdeveloped setting.

The Rubric table is intended to help you calibrate your judgment so that you can roughly determine when a story is very good or even excellent along a particular dimension because it exhibits all of the features of that dimension. Conversely, if a story fails to exhibit most or all of the features of a dimension, then you may score the story as being poor or very poor along that dimension. The features are meant to be illustrative but not exhaustive; you may determine that a story should score poorly or well due to the absence or presence of additional features for a given dimension based on your judgment.

Another important thing to note about the features that make up the dimensions we're asking you to rate is that they describe conventions that may be followed or flouted; a story may contain intentional plot devices like non-linear timelines, discontinuity, and other stylistic choices to create effects. As with other features, these elements of a story should inform your judgment on their own merit (so that they only negatively impact your rating if they are ineffective or confusing and positively impact your rating if they are used well to make the story more interesting and unique).

We use a 3-point comparative rating scale for each of the dimensions. The rating scale can be thought of as described below:

Rating	
A is better	Response A is better than Response B in that dimension.
About the same	Both responses are about the same in that dimension.
B is better	Response B is better than Response A in that dimension.

The focus of this rubric is the quality of the writing, and not how well the stories follow the writing prompt. In particular, when rating with this rubric, we encourage you not to focus on the number of words mentioned in the writing prompts, but rather on the features described in the table below.

Dimension	Features
Plot	a. The story has a recognizable structure, e.g. with a connected beginning, middle, and end. b. The story exhibits events and turns that move the plot forward. c. The story does not have logical or conceptual inconsistencies. Surprising or disruptive elements are intentional, e.g., they serve the story and do not feel jarring, odd, or out of place.
Creativity of Ideas, Themes, and Topics	a. Engaging characters, themes, and imagery. The ideas do not feel generic or bland. b. Avoidance of overly cliched characters and storylines, unintentional tropes, and stereotypes. When used, tropes and cliches serve a purpose (e.g. comedic effect, twist on a common trope etc). c. The story includes original elements that were not explicitly mentioned in the prompt.
Development	a. Characters and settings are introduced and contextualized with relevant details that allow the reader to understand their place in the story. b. Appropriate levels of detail and complexity are provided to lend the story a feeling of realness and believability.  <i>Reminder: The features that make up a dimension may be thought of as cumulative. A story with a well-developed character, but in a lackluster setting (or vice-versa) would score lower in Development than a story that does well on both aspects.</i>
Language Use	a. The language used feels varied and rich: Variance of sentence structure, verbiage, and vocabulary. b. The story exhibits rhetorical, linguistic and literary devices (e.g. ambiguity, alliteration, etc) to create interesting effects c. The story avoids bland or repetitive phrases (unless used intentionally to create a narrative, thematic, or linguistic effect).

We provided examples rated along these rubrics. While the examples include explanations, these are there as an aid, and you are not requested to provide explanations for your ratings.

## D.2 WHICH STORY DO YOU PREFER?

Do you find the story interesting, engaging, funny, or emotionally-rich? In addition to getting your judgments of the dimensions, we would also like to know whether you enjoyed reading the story. Similar to the dimensions, we will ask you to score which story you prefer:

- A is better
- About the same
- B is better

When rating, do not hesitate to be very critical.

## D.3 OPTIONAL: LEAVE COMMENTS OR FEEDBACK ON THE STORIES

Thank you for completing the ratings! If you have any additional comments or feedback you would like to provide on the story, feel free to add them in the “comments” section.

## E PROMPT TEMPLATE FOR THE LLM EVALUATOR

The following prompt template is used by the LLM to evaluate two system outputs *side-by-side* (we replace <story a> and <story b> with the two stories being evaluated):

**[LLM EVALUATOR] Prompt Template**

You will conduct a side-by-side evaluation. You will be given two system-generated stories. Your task is to compare the two stories and determine which one is better based on the following dimensions:

- *Plot*: The story should have a recognizable structure, e.g., with a connected beginning, middle, and end. The story should exhibit events and turns that move the plot forward. The story should not have logical or conceptual inconsistencies. Surprising or disruptive elements should be intentional, e.g., they serve the story and do not feel jarring, odd, or out of place.
- *Creativity*: There should be engaging characters, themes, and imagery. The ideas should not feel generic or bland. There should be avoidance of overly cliched characters and storylines, unintentional tropes, and stereotypes. When used, tropes and cliches should serve a purpose (e.g., comedic effect, twist on a common trope etc). The story should include original elements that were not explicitly mentioned in the prompt.
- *Development*: Characters and settings should be introduced and contextualized with relevant details that allow the reader to understand their place in the story. Appropriate levels of detail and complexity should be provided to lend the story a feeling of realness and believability.
- *Language Use*: The language used should feel varied and rich: Variance of sentence structure, verbiage, and vocabulary. The story should exhibit rhetorical, linguistic and literary devices (e.g., ambiguity, alliteration, etc) to create interesting effects. The story should avoid bland or repetitive phrases (unless used intentionally to create a narrative, thematic, or linguistic effect).

Provide a detailed assessment of the two stories in terms of these four dimensions. Conclude your assessment with scores for each dimension using the template below. Do not add any emphasis, such as bold and italics, on your assessment.

[Assessment Ending Template]

Based on my assessment, the better story for each dimension is:

Plot:	[A or B or Same]
Creativity:	[A or B or Same]
Development:	[A or B or Same]
Language Use:	[A or B or Same]
Overall:	[A or B or Same]

[Story A]  
<story a>

[Story B]  
<story b>

[Assessment]

Below we show example output from the LLM evaluator from which we extract preference scores. In this case, the evaluator preferred story A on all dimensions.

### [LLM EVALUATOR] Example Output

Story A has a more defined plot structure with a clear beginning, rising action, climax, and resolution. The summoning of Horus, his reaction to the modern world, and his eventual acceptance create a compelling narrative arc. Story B, while touching upon interesting themes, lacks a clear climax and resolution. The story feels incomplete, leaving the reader with unanswered questions about Horus's fate and Ash's journey.

Story A exhibits more creativity in its portrayal of Horus and his interactions with Amelia. The falcon god's bewilderment, anger, and eventual acceptance are depicted with nuance and depth. The story also introduces original elements, such as the restoration of the canopic jar, which adds a layer of symbolism and reinforces the theme of reconciliation. Story B relies on more generic depictions of a god's reaction to the modern world, lacking the originality and depth seen in Story A.

Both stories provide adequate development of their main characters, Amelia and Ash, respectively. However, Story A excels in its development of Horus, providing a more nuanced and believable portrayal of a god grappling with the realities of a changed world. The story delves into his emotions, his struggles, and his eventual acceptance, making him a more compelling and relatable character. Story B's portrayal of Horus, while touching upon his disillusionment, lacks the same level of depth and complexity.

Story A utilizes a richer and more varied language, employing vivid imagery, sensory details, and a wider range of vocabulary. The story effectively uses rhetorical devices, such as repetition and contrast, to emphasize the differences between the ancient and modern worlds. Story B, while adequately written, lacks the same level of linguistic richness and sophistication.

Based on my assessment, the better story for each dimension is:

Plot:	A
Creativity:	A
Development:	A
Language Use:	A
Overall:	A