
Text as Neural Operator: Image Manipulation by Text Instruction

Tianhao Zhang* Hung-Yu Tseng Lu Jiang Weilong Yang Honglak Lee Irfan Essa
Google Research
Mountain View, CA, USA
<bryanzhang,hungyutseng,lujiang,weilongyang,honglak,irfanessa@google.com

Abstract

In this paper, we study a new task that allows users to edit an input image using text instructions. In this image generation task, the inputs are a reference image and an instruction in natural language that describes desired modifications to the input image. We propose a GAN-based method to tackle this problem. The key idea is to treat text as neural operators to locally modify the image feature. To this end, our model decomposes the generation process into finding where (spatial region) and how (text operators) to apply the modification. We show that the proposed model performs favorably against recent baselines on three public datasets.

1 Introduction

Image synthesis from text has been a highly active research area. This task is typically set up as a conditional image generation problem where a Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) [10] is learned to generate realistic images according to the text description in the format of either natural languages [51, 49, 57, 29] or scene graphs [20, 50]. Recent works [30, 37, 27] start incorporating other modalities such as images or attributes as additional conditional input signal.

An interesting problem that requires more attention in this direction is *how to manipulate image content through text instruction*, which we call Image Manipulation by Text Instruction. In this setting, a user is able to apply various changes to a reference image to add, remove, or modify its content by sending text instructions. For example, Figure 1 shows the generated images by our model for three typical instructions: 1) adding a new object at a location, 2) removing an existing object, and 3) changing the object’s attributes (size, shape, color, etc).

Image manipulation by text instruction is inspired by cross-modal image retrieval, a fundamental problem in information retrieval for its crucial role in a variety of industrial applications such as product search [23, 54, 11]. In this retrieval setting [47], users search an image database using an input query that is formed of an image plus some text that describes desired modifications to the input image. Cross-modal retrieval is essentially the same as our problem except it aims at retrieving as opposed to generating the target image. Interestingly, as we will show, the generated image can be used to retrieve target images with competitive accuracy, providing a more explainable search experience that allows users to inspect the result before the retrieval.

The closest problem to ours on conditional image generation is text-guided image manipulation [37, 27]. In this setting, a reference image is used to augment the text description such that the generated image contains *all attributes* described in the text as well as visually resembles the reference image. The problem studied in this paper differs from previous setting in two ways. First, the text in the prior setting is descriptive, summarizing attributes of the target image. In contrast, this paper focuses on the text instruction, depicting a complex operation through natural language that involves not only the adjectives (attributes), but also the verbs (actions) and adverbs (locations). Second, the

*Work done as a Google AI Resident.




Figure 1: **Image manipulation by text instruction.** Each input contains a reference image and a text instruction. The results are synthesized images by our model.

image in the prior setting [37, 27] often contains a single salient object so the modification tends to be universal to the object as a whole. In comparison, our modification is local as it mostly requires changes to only one of the many objects in the reference image.

The main research question studied in this paper is how to model the complex text instructions for effective conditional image manipulation. To this end, we propose a novel approach called Text-Instructed Manipulation GAN or TIM-GAN. The key idea is to treat language as *neural operators* to locally modify the image feature in a way such that the modified feature is useful in synthesizing the target image by the GAN model. To learn generic operators, two aspects in the generation process is decomposed, i.e., spatial region (where to edit) and specific computation (how to edit). For the former “where to edit”, our model learns an attention mechanism transforming spatial-indicative words to a spatial region in the image. For the second question, we introduce a novel text-adaptive routing network to generate text operators dynamically from the input instructions.

Experimental results on three datasets (Clevr [47], Abstract scene [58], and Cityscapes [6]) demonstrate that the image manipulation by the proposed approach is not only realistic, but also corresponds to the editing context described in the instruction. The contribution of this paper is two-fold. (1) We propose a new idea of modeling complex text as neural operator for conditional image generation. (2) We demonstrate that the proposed TIM-GAN significantly outperforms recent Conditional-GANs on three datasets with respect to various evaluation metrics.

2 Related Work

Conditional generative adversarial networks. Generative adversarial networks GANs [10, 35, 2, 3] have made rapid progress on image generation in recent years. Built on the basis of GANs, the *conditional* GAN aims to synthesize the image according to the input context. The input context can be images [18, 55, 24, 16, 36], audio sequences [25], human poses [33], or semantic segmentation masks [48, 40, 28]. Particularly, text-to-image synthesis [51, 20, 49, 57, 29, 50, 26] learns a mapping from textual descriptions to images. Recently, GeNeVA [8] extended the mapping for iterative image generation in which a new object is added one-by-one following textual descriptions. Different from text-to-image synthesis, the proposed problem is multimodal, aiming at learning to *manipulate* image content through text instructions.

Conditional image manipulation. The goal is to manipulate image without degrading the quality of the edited images. To enable user-guided manipulation, a variety of frameworks [52, 53, 14, 31, 17, 42, 4, 37, 27] have been proposed to use different control signals. For instance, Zhang et al. [53] use sparse dots to guide the image colorization process. There are additional works on image manipulation by bounding boxes subsequently refined as semantic masks [13] or by code [34]. Numerous image stylization [14, 31] and blending [17] approaches augment the images by referencing an exemplar image. Closest to ours are the TA-GAN [37] and ManiGAN [27] schemes that take the image caption as input to describe attributes for conditional image manipulation. In this work, we propose to manipulate the images according to complex text *instructions*. Different from the image caption used by the TA-GAN and ManiGAN methods, the instruction we take as input specifies 1) the region of the image to be edited (*where*) and 2) the type of editing to be conducted (*how*).

Feature Composition. The key idea of this work is to model text as operator. This can be seen as a feature composition function to combine the image and text features for image generation. Feature composition has been studied more extensively in other problems such as visual question answering [22, 39, 5, 32], visual reasoning [21, 44], image-to-image translation [56, 24], etc. In this work, we design a routing mechanism for image generation such that the intermediate neural




Figure 2: **Method overview.** Given an input image x and a text instruction t , the proposed TIM-GAN first predicts a spatial attention mask M (*where* to edit, Section 3.1) and a text operator f_{how} (*how* to edit, Section 3.2). The image feature ϕ_x is then modified by the text operator f_{how} on the predicted mask M . Finally, the edited image \hat{y} is synthesized from the manipulated image feature $\phi_{\hat{y}}$.

blocks can be effectively shared among similar text operators. Our method is related to feature-wise modulation, a technique to modulate the features of one source by referencing those from the other. Examples of recent contributions are: text image residual gating (TIRG) [47], feature-wise linear modulation (FiLM) [41], and feature-wise gating [9]. Among numerous existing works on feature composition, this paper compares the closely related methods including a state-of-the-art feature composition method for image retrieval [47] and three strong methods for conditional image generation [57, 37, 8], in addition to the standard routing mechanism [43] in the ablation study.

3 Methodology

Our goal is to manipulate a given reference image according to the modification specified in the input text instruction. We accomplish this task by modeling instructions as neural operators to locally modify the image feature. To learn generic operators, we decompose the generation process into learning *where* and *how* to apply the modification.

An overview of the proposed TIM-GAN method is illustrated in Figure 2. Given the input image x and text instruction t , we first extract the image feature ϕ_x as well as the text features ϕ_t^{where} and ϕ_t^{how} . The text features ϕ_t^{where} and ϕ_t^{how} encodes the *where* and *how* information about the modification, respectively. To indicate the region on the image x to be edited, we predict a spatial attention mask M from the feature ϕ_t^{where} . Thereafter, we design a new network routing mechanism for building an operator f_{how} , from the feature ϕ_t^{how} , to modulate the feature editing. Finally, the resulting image \hat{y} is generated from the manipulated image feature $\phi_{\hat{y}}$ using the image decoder G .

By disentangling *how* from *where* to modify, our model learns more generic text operators that can be applied at various locations. Specifically, a spatial mask M is learned, from the embedding of location-indicative words ϕ_t^{where} , to highlight the spatial region, according to which the image feature ϕ_x is modified by:

$$\phi_{\hat{y}} = (1 - M) \odot \phi_x + M \odot f_{\text{how}}(\phi_x, \phi_t^{\text{how}}; \Theta_{\text{how}}(t)), \quad (1)$$

where \odot is element wise dot product. The first term is a gated identity establishing the input image feature as a reference to the output modified feature.

The second term f_{how} is an operator function indicating the specific computation flow over the image feature (i.e., *how* to modify). We introduce a new text-adaptive router to execute a sequence of neural blocks dynamically for each text instruction. A route is parameterized by $\Theta_{\text{how}}(t)$ that is generated from ϕ_t^{how} ; the remainder parameters are shared across all text instructions. In the rest of this section, we will detail the computation of M and f_{how} .

3.1 Where to Edit: Spatial Mask

We use the scaled dot-product self-attention [46] to summarize the location-indicative words in an instruction. Let $S = [w_1, \dots, w_l] \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times d_0}$ denote the instruction where $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ is the pretrained




Figure 3: **Where and how to edit.** (a) The calculation of spatial mask M from text feature ϕ_t^{where} and image feature ϕ_x . (b) The proposed text-adaptive routing mechanism executes various paths as text operators. The operator is parameterized by (α, β, γ) generated from text feature ϕ_t^{how} .

BERT embedding [7] for the i -th word. The query, key and value in the attention are computed by:

$$Q = SW_Q, \quad K = SW_K, \quad V = SW_V \quad (2)$$

where $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0 \times d}$ are weight matrices to learn, and d is the output dimension. After reducing matrix Q to a column vector \hat{q} by average pooling along its first dimension, we obtain the attended text embedding by:

$$\phi_t^{\text{where}} = V^T \text{softmax}\left(\frac{K\hat{q}}{\sqrt{d}}\right), \quad (3)$$

in which the softmax function is supposed to assign higher attention weights for locational words. Likewise, we obtain the text feature ϕ_t^{how} for salient operational words in the instruction (e.g., “add”, “red”, “cylinder”), computed by a separate self-attention head similar to that of ϕ_t^{where} .

After that, we pass the image feature ϕ_x to a convolution block (e.g., a ResBlock [12]) to get the output $v \in \mathbb{R}^C$. The spatial mask is then computed from ϕ_t^{where} using image features as the context:

$$M = f_{\text{where}}(\phi_x, \phi_t^{\text{where}}) = \delta(W_m * (f_{\text{MLP}}(\phi_t^{\text{where}}) \odot v)) \in [0, 1]^{H \times W \times 1}, \quad (4)$$

where σ is the sigmoid function, $*$ represents 2d-convolution product with kernel W_m (see Figure 3a). We use two layers of MLP with the ReLU activation. The spatial attention can be derived from M by performing ℓ_1 normalization over the spatial dimensions. In this paper, we choose to use the unnormalized mask for improved generalization performance.

3.2 How to Edit: Text-Adaptive Routing

Instructions are not independent. Similar instructions perform similar operations, e.g., “add a large cylinder” and “add a red cylinder”. Motivated by this idea, we model text operators in a routing network [43] where the text feature is used to dynamically select a sequence of neural blocks (or a path). Our routing network is illustrated in Figure 3b which has l layers of m blocks of identical structures. Each block consists of a conv layer followed by an instance normalization layer [45]. The routing parameter α_i decides to connect or disconnect a block in a layer. An execution path is hence parameterized by a series of α for all layers.

Different from prior routing mechanisms [43, 1, 38], ours is text-adaptive which selects not only a path but also the associated parameters along the path. To be specific, in addition to α , text features also generate β and γ to perform text-specific normalization in the selected block. This design increases the learning capacity of text operators, while still allowing blocks to be shared among similar instructions. Our idea is partially inspired by the success of style transfer methods [15].

Ideally, the path selector α can only take discrete values. However, this approach is not differentiable and continuous approximation needs to be applied. To do so, we adopt the Gumbel-Max trick [19]

to sample a block from a categorical distribution. Let $\pi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ be the categorical variable with probabilities $P(\alpha = i) \propto \pi_i$ which indicates the probability for selecting block i . We have:

$$\arg \max_i [P(\alpha = i)] = \arg \max_i [g_i + \log \pi_i] = \arg \max_i [\hat{\pi}_i], \quad (5)$$

where $g_i = -\log(-\log(u_i))$ is a re-parameterization term, and $u_i \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$. To make it differentiable, the argmax operation is approximated by a continuous softmax operation: $\alpha = \text{softmax}(\hat{\pi}/\tau)$, where τ is the temperature controlling the degree of the approximation. Lower temperature better approximates the max operation but introduces higher variance of the gradients.

Based on the relaxation, a text operator can be parameterized by $\Theta_{\text{how}}(t)$ defined in Eq. (1) as:

$$\Theta_{\text{how}}(t) = f_{\text{MLP}}(\phi_t^{\text{where}}) = \{(\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) | \alpha_i \in [0, 1]^m, \gamma_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}^m, i \in \{1, \dots, l\}\}, \quad (6)$$

where the text feature ϕ_t^{where} generates real vectors $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$ for text-adaptive routing in all layers.

Finally, as shown in Figure 3, the image feature is modified by:

$$a^{(i+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{ij} (\gamma_{ij} \frac{o_{ij} - \mu(o_{ij})}{\delta(o_{ij})} + \beta_{ij}), \quad (7)$$

where o_{ij} is the output of the j -th conv block in layer i . δ and μ compute channel-wise mean and variance across spatial dimensions, and are applied at test time unchanged. The operator in Eq. (7) takes the input of $a^{(1)} = \phi_x$ and outputs the modified image feature as $a^{(l)}$.

3.3 Final Losses

We use the following loss functions to train the proposed model:

Adversarial loss \mathcal{L}_{GAN} : We use the adversarial loss to ensure the realism of the manipulated images,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GAN}} = E_{y \sim P_{\text{data}}} [\log D(y)] + E_{\hat{y} \sim P_{\text{model}}} [1 - \log D(\hat{y})], \quad (8)$$

where D denotes the discriminator.

Regression loss $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{feat}}, \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{img}}$: Given the ground-truth image y and its feature ϕ_y , we impose consistency losses on the modified image feature $\phi_{\hat{y}}$ and the generated image \hat{y} , respectively. The ℓ_1 loss is applied to ensure the consistency on both feature and image levels.

Attention loss $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{attn}}$: During training, we use an ℓ_1 loss to penalize the distance between the predicted mask M and ground-truth mask, where the ground-truth mask is derived by comparing the absolute difference between the reference and ground-truth image.

The full training function is:

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_{\text{GAN}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{GAN}} + \lambda_1^{\text{feat}} \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{feat}} + \lambda_1^{\text{img}} \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{img}} + \lambda_1^{\text{attn}} \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{attn}}, \quad (9)$$

where λ controls the importance of each term.

4 Experimental Results

We conduct extensive experiments to quantitatively and qualitatively compare the proposed method with baseline approaches. The results validate that the generated images by our method are not only realistic, but also correspond to the context from the text description. Additional qualitative results are presented in the supplementary material. We will release the source code and dataset to facilitate further research in this field.

4.1 Experimental Setups

Datasets. We use three public datasets: Clevr [47], Abstract scene [58] and Cityscapes [6]. All datasets consist of images of multiple objects accompanied by complex text instructions. The first two datasets are used to compare to recent works on cross-modal retrieval [47] and conditional GAN [8], in which we use the same images and text queries provided in [47, 8]. Since there is no dataset of real-scene level RGB images suitable for our task (i.e., provide the text instruction and ground-truth

Table 1: **Quantitative comparisons.** We use the FID scores to measure the realism of the generated images, and the retrieval score (RS) to estimate the correspondence to text instruction.

Method	Clevr			Abstract scene			Cityscape		
	FID ↓	RS@1 ↑	RS@5 ↑	FID ↓	RS@1 ↑	RS@5 ↑	FID ² ↓	RS@1 ↑	RS@5 ↑
DM-GAN [57]	27.9	1.6±0.1	5.6±0.1	53.8	2.1±0.1	6.6±0.1	18.7	4.6±0.2	15.7±0.2
TIRG-GAN [47]	34.0	<u>48.5±0.2</u>	<u>68.2±0.1</u>	52.7	23.5±0.1	38.8±0.1	<u>6.1</u>	25.0±0.3	<u>88.9±0.3</u>
TA-GAN [37]	58.8	40.8±0.1	64.1±0.1	<u>44.0</u>	<u>26.9±0.2</u>	<u>46.3±0.1</u>	6.7	<u>36.8±0.4</u>	<u>79.8±0.3</u>
GeNeVA [8]	46.1	34.0±0.1	57.3±0.1	72.2	17.3±0.2	31.6±0.2	10.5	14.5±0.4	46.1±0.3
Ours	<u>33.0</u>	95.9±0.1	97.8±0.1	35.1	35.4±0.2	58.7±0.1	5.9	77.2±0.4	99.9±0.1
Real images	17.0	100	100	14.0	100	100	4.4	100	100

manipulation results), we extend our method to manipulate semantic segmentation in Cityscapes. By doing so, we show the potential of our method for synthesizing RGB images from the modified segmentation mask. We describe details about these datasets in the supplementary materials.

Baselines. We compare to the following baseline approaches in our experiments:

- **DM-GAN:** The DM-GAN [57] model is a recent text-to-image synthesis framework. To adapt it to our task, we use our image encoder to extract the image feature and concatenate it with its original text feature as its input signal.
- **TIRG-GAN:** TIRG [47] is a state-of-the-art method for cross-modal image retrieval task. It takes the same input as ours but only produces the image feature for retrieval. We build a baseline TIRG-GAN based on TIRG by using our image decoder G to synthesize the image from the feature predicted by the TIRG model.
- **TA-GAN:** TA-GAN [37] is trained by learning the mapping between the caption and the image. The manipulation is then conducted by changing the caption of the image. Since there is no image caption in our task, we concatenate the pre-trained features of the input image and text instruction as the input caption feature for the TA-GAN model.
- **GeNeVA:** GeNeVA [8] learns to generate the image step-by-step according to the text description. To fit it to our task, we use it for single-step generation from the same inputs as ours.

Metrics. In all experiments, we use the Fréchet Inception Distance score (FID) to measure the realism of the edited images, and the retrieval score (RS) to estimate the correctness of the manipulation. For the retrieval score, we adopt the evaluation protocols similar to [47, 49]. Specifically, we use the generated image as a query to retrieve the target images in the test set. We extract the image features of all query and target images by an autoencoder pre-trained on each dataset and use simple cosine similarity as our retrieval metric. The score $RS@N$ indicates the recall of the ground-truth image in the top- N retrieved images. The computations of FID and RS scores are detailed in the supplementary materials.

4.2 Quantitative Results

Realism and Retrieval Score. The results are shown in Table 1. The proposed method performs favorably against all baseline approaches cross datasets. Although DM-GAN appears to generate more realistic images on the Clevr dataset, its retrieval scores are very poor ($< 2\%$), indicating it merely memorizes random images without properly editing the input image. On the other hand, the TIRG-GAN, TA-GAN, and GeNeVA schemes also demonstrate inferior editing performance (i.e., RS scores). In comparison, our approach not only maintains a decent realism score but also yields significantly higher retrieval scores.

User preference study. We conduct two user studies to understand the visual quality and semantic relevance of the generated content. Given a pair of images generated by two different methods, users are asked to choose 1) which one is more *realistic* while ignoring the input image and text; 2) which one is more relevant to the text instruction by comparing the *content* of the generated and the ground-truth image. In total, we collect 960 answers from 30 users. As shown in Figure 4, the proposed TIM-GAN outperforms other methods by a large margin in both metrics.

Ablation study. We test various ablations of our model. Results are shown in Table 2. We verify three of our key designs by leaving the module out from the full model. (1) In the first trial, the




Figure 4: **User preference studies.** We present manipulated images on the Clevr and abstract scene datasets and ask the users to select the one which (a) is more *realistic* and (b) is more *semantically relevant* to the ground-truth image.




Figure 5: **Where and how to edit.** (a) We visualize the predicted self-attention weights and spatial attention masks. The self-attention weights are labeled above each word, and highlighted if the weights are greater than 0.2. (b) We show the t-SNE visualization of the routing parameters α predicted from different types of instructions on the Clevr dataset.

learned mask M is removed and replaced with an identity matrix. (2) In the second trial, the f_{how} operator is substituted with a fixed network with the same number of layers and parameters that takes the input of concatenated features of image and text. (3) In the last trial, we examine the standard routing by treating the text-adaptive parameters β, γ as latent variables in our full model. The ablation studies validate the necessity of the proposed attention mask and network routing schemes.

4.3 Qualitative Results

Qualitative results are shown in Figure 6. As shown, TA-GAN and TIRG-GAN tend to copy the reference images. In most cases, DM-GAN only generates random objects following a similar input layouts. GeNeVA can make local modifications to images, but often does not follow the text instructions. By comparison, our model is able to generate images guided by the text instructions with better quality.

Figure 5 visualizes our intermediate results for where and how to edit. The former is shown by the text self-attention and spatial attention in Figure 5a. Figure 5b shows the t-SNE plot of the routing parameters. As shown in Figure 5b, instructions of similar types are grouped together, suggesting neural blocks are shared among similar text operators. It is interesting to find our method can automatically uncover the subtle relationship between operators, e.g., “add” and “make size larger” operators are closer indicating more neural blocks are shared between these similar operations.




Figure 6: **Selected generation results.** We show the manipulation results by different approaches on the Clevr (*top*), Abstract scene (*middle*) and Cityscapes (*bottom*) datasets.

Table 2: **Ablation Studies.** Performance on ablated versions of our model.

Methods	f_{where}	f_{how}		Clevr			Abstract scene		
		text-adaptive	non-adaptive	FID ↓	R@1 ↑	R@5 ↑	FID ↓	R@1 ↑	R@5 ↑
Ours Full	✓	✓	✗	33.0	95.9±0.1	97.8±0.1	35.1	35.4±0.2	58.7±0.1
no f_{where}	✗	✓	✗	34.8	81.7±0.1	89.6±0.1	48.7	28.7±0.1	44.4±0.1
no f_{how}	✓	✗	✗	34.7	49.5±0.1	67.4±0.1	36.0	33.8±0.2	56.7±0.2
no text-adaptive	✓	✗	✓	45.9	29.9±0.2	49.1±0.1	37.4	33.1±0.2	54.5±0.1

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied a multi-modal image generation task that allows users to edit an input image using text instructions. We proposed a new approach treating text instructions as neural operators to locally modify the image feature. To learn more genetic operators, our method decomposes where and how to apply the modification, introducing a new text-adaptive network routing mechanism. We evaluate our method on three datasets and show competitive results with respect to metrics on image quality, semantic relevance, and retrieval performance.

Broader Impact

Our research goal is to promote content creation guided by natural language instructions. As a general rule of thumb, our approach, similar to other content generation techniques, should not be used to manipulate or generate prohibited or deceiving contents. Future research on RGB images may implicate ethical and fairness issues. The concerns can come from two aspects. On the language side, our method uses the BERT model and probably inherits some undesirable gender or racial bias. On the vision side, especially for images of identifiable bodies or faces, it is unsure whether our approach would differentially impact groups of people of certain appearance (e.g., skin color), age (young or aged), or with a physical disability. These concerns ought to be considered carefully before our research is ready to be used in real-world applications.

References

- [1] K. Ahmed and L. Torresani. Star-caps: Capsule networks with straight-through attentive routing. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 4
- [2] M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein gan. In *ICML*, 2017. 2
- [3] A. Brock, J. Donahue, and K. Simonyan. Large scale gan training for high fidelity natural image synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2019. 2
- [4] H. Chang, J. Lu, F. Yu, and A. Finkelstein. Pairedcyclegan: Asymmetric style transfer for applying and removing makeup. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2
- [5] Y. Chen, S. Gong, and L. Bazzani. Image search with text feedback by visiolinguistic attention learning. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2
- [6] M. Cordts, M. Omran, S. Ramos, T. Rehfeld, M. Enzweiler, R. Benenson, U. Franke, S. Roth, and B. Schiele. The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding. In *CVPR*, 2016. 2, 5
- [7] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. 4
- [8] A. El-Nouby, S. Sharma, H. Schulz, D. Hjelm, L. El Asri, S. Ebrahimi Kahou, Y. Bengio, and G. W. Taylor. Tell, draw, and repeat: Generating and modifying images based on continual linguistic instruction. In *ICCV*, 2019. 2, 3, 5, 6
- [9] A. Ghosh, R. Zhang, P. K. Dokania, O. Wang, A. A. Efros, P. H. Torr, and E. Shechtman. Interactive sketch & fill: Multiclass sketch-to-image translation. In *ICCV*, 2019. 3
- [10] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *NIPS*, 2014. 1, 2
- [11] X. Guo, H. Wu, Y. Cheng, S. Rennie, G. Tesauro, and R. Feris. Dialog-based interactive image retrieval. In *NeurIPS*, 2018. 1
- [12] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016. 4
- [13] S. Hong, X. Yan, T. S. Huang, and H. Lee. Learning hierarchical semantic image manipulation through structured representations. In *NeurIPS*, 2018. 2
- [14] X. Huang and S. Belongie. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In *ICCV*, 2017. 2
- [15] X. Huang and S. Belongie. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In *ICCV*, 2017. 4
- [16] X. Huang, M.-Y. Liu, S. Belongie, and J. Kautz. Multimodal unsupervised image-to-image translation. In *ECCV*, 2018. 2
- [17] W.-C. Hung, J. Zhang, X. Shen, Z. Lin, J.-Y. Lee, and M.-H. Yang. Learning to blend photos. In *ECCV*, 2018. 2
- [18] P. Isola, J.-Y. Zhu, T. Zhou, and A. A. Efros. Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. In *CVPR*, 2017. 2
- [19] E. Jang, S. Gu, and B. Poole. Categorical reparameterization with gumbel-softmax. In *ICLR*, 2017. 4
- [20] J. Johnson, A. Gupta, and L. Fei-Fei. Image generation from scene graphs. In *CVPR*, 2018. 1, 2
- [21] J. Johnson, B. Hariharan, L. Van Der Maaten, J. Hoffman, L. Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and R. Girshick. Inferring and executing programs for visual reasoning. In *ICCV*, 2017. 2
- [22] J.-H. Kim, S.-W. Lee, D. Kwak, M.-O. Heo, J. Kim, J.-W. Ha, and B.-T. Zhang. Multimodal Residual Learning for Visual QA. In *NeurIPS*, 2016. 2
- [23] A. Kovashka, D. Parikh, and K. Grauman. Whittlesearch: Image search with relative attribute feedback. In *CVPR*, 2012. 1
- [24] H.-Y. Lee, H.-Y. Tseng, Q. Mao, J.-B. Huang, Y.-D. Lu, M. Singh, and M.-H. Yang. Drit++: Diverse image-to-image translation via disentangled representations. *IJCV*, pages 1–16, 2020. 2
- [25] H.-Y. Lee, X. Yang, M.-Y. Liu, T.-C. Wang, Y.-D. Lu, M.-H. Yang, and J. Kautz. Dancing to music. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 2

- [26] B. Li, X. Qi, T. Lukasiewicz, and P. Torr. Controllable text-to-image generation. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 2
- [27] B. Li, X. Qi, T. Lukasiewicz, and P. H. Torr. Manigan: Text-guided image manipulation. In *CVPR*, 2020. 1, 2
- [28] K. Li, T. Zhang, and J. Malik. Diverse image synthesis from semantic layouts via conditional imple. In *ICCV*, 2019. 2
- [29] W. Li, P. Zhang, L. Zhang, Q. Huang, X. He, S. Lyu, and J. Gao. Object-driven text-to-image synthesis via adversarial training. In *CVPR*, 2019. 1, 2
- [30] Y. Li, L. Jiang, and M.-H. Yang. Controllable and progressive image extrapolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.11711*, 2019. 1
- [31] Y. Li, M.-Y. Liu, X. Li, M.-H. Yang, and J. Kautz. A closed-form solution to photorealistic image stylization. In *ECCV*, 2018. 2
- [32] J. Liang, L. Jiang, L. Cao, Y. Kalantidis, L.-J. Li, and A. G. Hauptmann. Focal visual-text attention for memex question answering. *TPAMI*, 41(8):1893–1908, 2019. 2
- [33] L. Ma, X. Jia, Q. Sun, B. Schiele, T. Tuytelaars, and L. Van Gool. Pose guided person image generation. In *NIPS*, 2017. 2
- [34] J. Mao, X. Zhang, Y. Li, W. T. Freeman, J. B. Tenenbaum, and J. Wu. Program-guided image manipulators. In *ICCV*, 2019. 2
- [35] X. Mao, Q. Li, H. Xie, R. Y. Lau, Z. Wang, and S. Paul Smolley. Least squares generative adversarial networks. In *ICCV*, 2017. 2
- [36] Y. A. Mejjati, C. Richardt, J. Tompkin, D. Cosker, and K. I. Kim. Unsupervised attention-guided image-to-image translation. In *NeurIPS*, 2018. 2
- [37] S. Nam, Y. Kim, and S. J. Kim. Text-adaptive generative adversarial networks: manipulating images with natural language. In *NeurIPS*, 2018. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [38] A. Newell, L. Jiang, C. Wang, L.-J. Li, and J. Deng. Feature partitioning for efficient multi-task architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04339*, 2019. 4
- [39] H. Noh, P. Hongsuck Seo, and B. Han. Image question answering using convolutional neural network with dynamic parameter prediction. In *CVPR*, 2016. 2
- [40] T. Park, M.-Y. Liu, T.-C. Wang, and J.-Y. Zhu. Semantic image synthesis with spatially-adaptive normalization. In *CVPR*, 2019. 2
- [41] E. Perez, F. Strub, H. De Vries, V. Dumoulin, and A. Courville. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *AAAI*, 2018. 3
- [42] T. Portenier, Q. Hu, A. Szabo, S. A. Bigdeli, P. Favaro, and M. Zwicker. Faceshop: Deep sketch-based face image editing. *ACM TOG (Proc. SIGGRAPH)*, 37(4):99, 2018. 2
- [43] C. Rosenbaum, T. Klinger, and M. Riemer. Routing networks: Adaptive selection of non-linear functions for multi-task learning. In *ICLR*, 2018. 3, 4
- [44] A. Santoro, D. Raposo, D. G. Barrett, M. Malinowski, R. Pascanu, P. Battaglia, and T. Lillicrap. A simple neural network module for relational reasoning. In *NIPS*, 2017. 2
- [45] D. Ulyanov, A. Vedaldi, and V. Lempitsky. Improved texture networks: Maximizing quality and diversity in feed-forward stylization and texture synthesis. In *CVPR*, 2017. 4
- [46] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, 2017. 3
- [47] N. Vo, L. Jiang, C. Sun, K. Murphy, L.-J. Li, L. Fei-Fei, and J. Hays. Composing text and image for image retrieval-an empirical odyssey. In *CVPR*, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6
- [48] T.-C. Wang, M.-Y. Liu, J.-Y. Zhu, A. Tao, J. Kautz, and B. Catanzaro. High-resolution image synthesis and semantic manipulation with conditional gans. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2
- [49] T. Xu, P. Zhang, Q. Huang, H. Zhang, Z. Gan, X. Huang, and X. He. AttnGAN: Fine-grained text to image generation with attentional generative adversarial networks. In *CVPR*, 2018. 1, 2, 6
- [50] L. Yikang, T. Ma, Y. Bai, N. Duan, S. Wei, and X. Wang. Pastegan: A semi-parametric method to generate image from scene graph. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 1, 2
- [51] H. Zhang, T. Xu, H. Li, S. Zhang, X. Wang, X. Huang, and D. N. Metaxas. StackGAN++: Realistic image synthesis with stacked generative adversarial networks. *TPAMI*, 41(8):1947–1962, 2018. 1, 2
- [52] R. Zhang, P. Isola, and A. A. Efros. Colorful image colorization. In *ECCV*, 2016. 2
- [53] R. Zhang, J.-Y. Zhu, P. Isola, X. Geng, A. S. Lin, T. Yu, and A. A. Efros. Real-time user-guided image colorization with learned deep priors. *ACM TOG (Proc. SIGGRAPH)*, 9(4), 2017. 2
- [54] B. Zhao, J. Feng, X. Wu, and S. Yan. Memory-augmented attribute manipulation networks for interactive fashion search. In *CVPR*, 2017. 1
- [55] J.-Y. Zhu, T. Park, P. Isola, and A. A. Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *ICCV*, 2017. 2
- [56] J.-Y. Zhu, R. Zhang, D. Pathak, T. Darrell, A. A. Efros, O. Wang, and E. Shechtman. Toward multimodal image-to-image translation. In *NIPS*, 2017. 2
- [57] M. Zhu, P. Pan, W. Chen, and Y. Yang. Dm-gan: Dynamic memory generative adversarial networks for text-to-image synthesis. In *CVPR*, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 6

[58] C. L. Zitnick and D. Parikh. Bringing semantics into focus using visual abstraction. In *CVPR*, 2013. [2](#), [5](#)