

ArtFusion: Controllable Arbitrary Style Transfer using Dual Conditional Latent Diffusion Models

Dar-Yen Chen

chendaryen@outlook.com



Figure 1: Results of our ArtFusion using classifier-free guidance along the style and content conditions. We can adjust the degree of content and style fusion during inference, dynamically ranging from under- to over-stylization. From left to right, the content and style guidance scales are [0.15, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4] and [0.15, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 3, 5, 7], respectively.

Abstract

Arbitrary Style Transfer (AST) aims to transform images by adopting the style from any selected artwork. Nonetheless, the need to accommodate diverse and subjective user preferences poses a significant challenge. While some users wish to preserve distinct content structures, others might favor a more pronounced stylization. Despite advances in feed-forward AST methods, their limited customizability hinders their practical application. We propose a new approach, ArtFusion, which provides a flexible balance between content and style. In contrast to traditional methods reliant on biased similarity losses, ArtFusion utilizes our innovative Dual Conditional Latent Diffusion Probabilistic Models (Dual-cLDM). This approach mitigates repetitive patterns and enhances subtle artistic aspects like brush strokes and genre-specific features. Despite the promising results of conditional diffusion probabilistic models (cDM) in various generative tasks, their introduction to style transfer is challenging due to the requirement for paired training data. ArtFusion successfully navigates this issue, offering more practical and controllable stylization. A key element of our approach involves using a single image for both content and style during model training, all the while maintaining effective stylization during inference. ArtFusion outperforms existing approaches on outstanding controllabil-

ity and faithful presentation of artistic details, providing evidence of its superior style transfer capabilities. Furthermore, the Dual-cLDM utilized in ArtFusion carries the potential for a variety of complex multi-condition generative tasks, thus greatly broadening the impact of our research.

1. Introduction

The objective of style transfer is to synthesise an image I_{cs} that aptly integrates the content from image I_c with the unique stylistic patterns of a given artistic work, I_s . Seminal work by Gatys *et al.* [17] introduced an optimization-based approach. It iteratively enhances the similarity of content and style features using a pretrained deep neural network. Despite the influence [41, 54, 69] of this method, it has certain inherent limitations, most notably its time-consuming nature. This shortcoming sparked a shift towards research into feed-forward networks for direct, rapid stylized I_{cs} generation, initiated by Johnson *et al.* [29].

While style transfer models have progressed from transferring a singular style [29, 37, 67] or a limited number of styles [6, 15, 42, 39, 74, 8, 61] to arbitrary styles [26, 2, 34, 68, 62, 40, 71, 43, 28, 18, 73, 38, 20], contemporary AST models still grapple with major issues. Challenges include a lack of adjustable results tailored to user subjective demands, leading to undesirably rigid results, under-stylization, or over-stylization [9] that often disappoint the

users. Furthermore, these models frequently suffer from repetitive artifacts and a poignant loss of artistic details owing to bias in style similarities [45, 8, 75, 12, 1, 7].

Diffusion probabilistic models (DM) [21] are growing in popularity in the field of computer vision (CV), celebrated for their high-quality, diverse image generation. With the incorporation of various inference guidance techniques [14, 23, 48], conditional DMs (cDMs) can offer flexible control over output results, suggesting a promising pathway for addressing AST’s challenges. Nevertheless, direct training of cDMs for style transfer encounters a roadblock: the necessity for paired data in maximum likelihood learning, a condition unsatisfied in many complex multi-condition generative tasks, including style transfer. While disentangled inference guidance [35] and optimization-based algorithms [30] attempt to solve this, they require heavy computation and careful hyperparameter tuning. Hence, we raise the question: Can a cDM be trained effectively for AST?

We present ArtFusion, the first diffusion-based AST model, built upon the latent diffusion model (LDM) [55]. ArtFusion introduces the dual conditional conditional LDM (Dual-cLDM) that treats both content and style as conditions. During the training phase, our model transforms the style transfer task into a self-reconstruction task while retaining robust stylization capacity during the inference phase. With likelihood learning, we can avoid biased similarity loss, where the similarity measure does not accurately reflect human perception, and artifacts followed. This novel approach, coupled with the proposed two-dimensional classifier-free guidance (2D-CFG) during sampling (refer to Fig. 1 and 4), facilitates balanced control between the content and style, thereby catering to users’ subjective preferences effectively. Furthermore, ArtFusion capitalizes on DM’s intrinsic ability to generate diverse and highly coherent stylization, outperforming previous feed-forward approaches in deftly expressing subtle style characteristics and showcasing efficiency over inference-only DM methods.

In summary, we offer the following key contributions:

1. ArtFusion, the first diffusion-based feed-forward AST model, provides an effective solution for AST.
2. Dual-cLDM, which breaks the paired data limitation in cDM training, promises to catalyze advancements in other multi-condition generative tasks.
3. 2D-CFG offers an adjustable tradeoff between content and style, enhancing the applicability of AST.
4. Comprehensive experiments demonstrating the effectiveness of our approach, showcasing its ability to faithfully transfer style without bias.




Figure 2: The inference framework of the Dual-cLDM for style transfer. Initiated from isotropic Gaussian-distributed noise \hat{z}_T , the dual conditional backbone progressively denoises using both content and style as conditions. Post-denoising, the \hat{z}_0 is decoded using the first-stage decoder.

2. Limitations and Biases of Style Similarity

While pretrained VGG [63] has traditionally played a pivotal role in style transfer, it brings with its drawbacks and biases. Having been trained on natural images for classification tasks, VGG’s repurposing for style extraction from artistic images encounters certain obstacles. Specifically, its capabilities in capturing certain aspects of style, such as color hue and geometric patterns, does not effectively extend to more abstract elements crucial to art, such as brush strokes, textures of various painting mediums (*e.g.* oil-painting, watercolor, sketch), or genre nuances. Such essential artistic features might be infrequent in natural images, or may even be consciously disregarded by classification-oriented models. As a result, although prior works might show strength with geometric or vivid styles, they falter with more abstract ones, leading to a loss of intricate art details. Consequently, the output might deviate from the intended stylistic vision, restricting its adaptability to varied artistic demands.

Beyond the inherent issues of classification-pretrained VGG models, another limitation arises from the widespread use of second-order statistics style loss in style transfer. While beneficial for matching feature statistics, this loss inadvertently encourages repetitive artifacts [7]. The second-order statistics mean/variance or Gram matrix approach to style representation captures the statistical distribution of features, but neglects their real distribution and spatial arrangements. This results in style transfer that may overemphasize certain aspects, particularly dominant textures of the style image, to minimise the statistical similarity. Consequently, statistics style loss often leads to a lack of global coherence, creates annoying artifacts, and misses subtle artistic characteristics [75], once again. This points to an implicit and flawed aspect of this conventional choice of objective - it does not explicitly define what constitutes style, relying instead on a statistical measure that is assumed, but




Figure 3: Left: Dual-cLDM Architecture. Pretrained VGG extracts style features f_s , while content features z_c are encoded using the first-stage VAE encoder. The content refiner processes z_c into z_r , refining content from inherent style. The refined z_r is then concatenated with the noisy latent z_t . Style features f_s , along with timestep embeddings, are injected via adaptive normalization. Right: The architecture of the Content Refiner. This design aims to reduce the depth dimension of z_c .

not assured, to encapsulate style.

These limitations underscore the necessity for novel approaches in style transfer that can more adeptly handle the complexity and subtlety inherent to artistic styles.

3. Related Work

3.1. Feed-forward Arbitrary Style Transfer

Feed-forward networks, brimming with potential, have been a focal point of research in Arbitrary Style Transfer (AST). A myriad of researchers [11, 13, 33, 34, 50, 9, 12, 75, 7, 45, 26, 72, 66, 60] have made significant contributions to this field. Typically, AST models operate with an objective function describing the similarities between content and style representations of output and input images. Nonetheless, this approach confronts two key challenges: firstly, the bias in content and style representations, and secondly, the lack of flexibility in output control, inevitably limiting the capability to cater to diverse aesthetic preferences.

Several methods have attempted to counter the bias issue [45, 11, 13, 50, 72, 12] by exploring self-attention mechanisms in AST. Deng *et al.* [12] notably developed a pure transformer-based architecture to tackle content bias. Cheng *et al.* [9] adjusted the style loss to alleviate style bias. To improve the quality of stylized images, adversarial loss [19] has been incorporated into AST [3, 53, 27, 7, 75]. Recently, Chen *et al.* [7] and Zhang *et al.* [75] have used contrastive learning to mitigate bias from pretrained feature extractors and statistics style loss. Despite the efficacy of these solutions, the issue of style bias persists as a challenge. Moreover, there has been minimal improvement in

the area of output controllability. To address these issues, we propose a novel approach that employs diffusion probabilistic models with maximum likelihood learning for AST, eliminating the necessity for computing biased similarities and ensuring remarkably versatile and manipulable outputs.

3.2. Diffusion Probabilistic Model

In recent years, diffusion probabilistic models (DM) have gained prestige. They have shown the capacity for generating high-quality images. As a result, more research [65, 14, 4, 49, 24, 22, 32, 47, 59, 23, 48] is being invested in this area. Among them, controlling the progressive inference process is a significant direction [14, 23]. It provides DM with unprecedented controllability. On the other hand, Rombach *et al.* [55] and Hu *et al.* [25] integrate VQ-GAN [16] with DM. This integration allows the dimensional reduction of images through first-stage VAEs, making the denoising process less time-consuming.

Conditional DM (cDM) have found widespread application in numerous generative tasks [58, 70, 57, 36, 46, 48, 55, 31]. SR3 was proposed by Saharia *et al.* [58] for super-resolution. Wang *et al.* [70] achieved success in semantic synthesis. Inpainting was researched by Lugmayr *et al.* [46] and Rombach *et al.* [55]. Furthermore, Nichol *et al.* [48] and Rombach *et al.* [55] developed stunning text-to-image diffusion models. Despite these impressive accomplishments, cDMs are confronted with a significant challenge - the need for paired data for training. This requirement often poses an obstacle for complex generative tasks like AST that require alignment with multiple conditions, *e.g.* content and style. Some progress has been made by developing post

hoc approaches using pretrained DMs. For instance, Kwon and Ye [35] proposed a content/style inference guidance. Also, Kawar *et al.* [30] presented optimization-based methods. Nevertheless, these methods demand extensive computational inference resources and carefully tuned hyperparameters. Our work introduces the pioneering learning-based diffusion model for style transfer tasks, designed to generate stylized images directly, hence significantly enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the AST.

4. Approach

Our proposed ArtFusion is built on a variant of LDM [55], delivering high-fidelity stylizations that express subtle artistic elements that are often overlooked in previous works. This is facilitated by a step-by-step denoising process throughout the stylization process (refer to Fig. 2). Moreover, we empower users with the flexibility to balance between source content and reference style in the outputs, catering to diverse stylization preferences. Moving forward, this section initially offers an overview of LDM, followed by a detailed explanation of our proposed framework, and its constituent components. Lastly, we elucidate novel techniques for manipulating the results of stylization.

Preliminaries. LDM works with a two-stage framework that combines a VAE and a diffusion backbone. The key VAE decreases the spatial dimensionality of the image while preserving its semantic essence, resulting in a concise, low-dimensional latent space. The diffusion backbone operates within this latent space, eliminating the need to handle redundant data in the high-dimensional pixel space, thus alleviating the computational burden. Denote the encoder and decoder of the first-stage VAE as E and D respectively, the image as I , and the diffusion backbone as ϵ_θ . LDM can be viewed as sequential denoising autoencoders $\epsilon_\theta(z_t, t)$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$. The training objective is to predict the noise at stage t and yield a less noisy version, z_{t-1} . Here, z_t is derived from a diffusion process on $z_0 = E(I)$, this process is modelled as a Markov Chain of length T , wherein each step involving a slight Gaussian perturbation of the preceding state. To keep the notation simple, we will use $\epsilon_\theta(z_t)$ to denote the time-dependent $\epsilon_\theta(z_t, t)$

By applying the reweighted variational lower bound [14], the objective of LDM become:

$$\mathcal{L}_{LDM} = \mathbb{E}_{z, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}), t \sim \mathcal{U}(1, \dots, T)} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(z_t)\|_2^2] \quad (1)$$

4.1. Dual Conditional LDM

As demonstrated in Fig. 3, we establish our approach on the dual conditional LDM (Dual-cLDM) backbone, leveraging a U-Net[56]-based structure, similar to the one employed in [55]. Our training method diverges from conventional style transfer procedures that utilize separate inputs

for the content and style images. Instead, a single image serves the dual purpose of providing both the content and the style input, such that $I_{cs} = I_c = I_s$. Consequently, our task shifts from style transfer to self-reconstruction.

First-stage VAE. We draw on a pretrained VAE from LDM [55], which has a downsampling factor of 16 and a latent dimension of 16. Consequently, for an image I with a shape of $3 \times 256 \times 256$, the encoded latent $z = E(I)$ takes on a shape of $16 \times 16 \times 16$.

Conditioning Mechanisms. We derive the style feature f_s for the style image I_s by concatenating means and variances from layers within the pre-trained VGG [63] network. Propagating f_s through an MLP and subsequently integrating it into the timestep embedding allows us to condition the model using adaLN-Zero [51]. An intuitive approach for conditioning the content image I_c involves using $z_c := E(I_c)$ as the content feature and combining it with the noisy version z_t via concatenation. However, an unintended consequence could arise during training. The model might overly rely on z_c and neglect f_s , resulting in the compromise of the stylization ability. This issue stems from the fact that z_c not only contains the content information but also the complete style information. To circumvent this problem, we introduce a content refiner module that assists the model in refining pure content information from z_c .

VGG Style Feature Extractor. We utilize the pre-trained VGG-16 [63], which has been trained on ImageNet [10], to extract features from the style image I_s . The style features are formed by concatenating the means and variances of each feature map in the five style layers [29] `relu1_2`, `relu2_2`, `relu3_3`, `relu4_3` and `relu5_3`, which results in a f_s with a length of 2944.

Content Refiner. The content refiner, a critical component of our model, serves to refine content and eliminate style from the latent representation z_c , producing z_r . During training, both content and style are encapsulated within a single image input. By applying two layers of point-wise convolutions, the content refiner strategically reduces the depth dimension of z_c , forcing the elimination of certain information. Since the model can extract style information from the f_s during training, the content refiner naturally leans towards preserving content while discarding style. Hence, the z_r output is a refined representation, primarily comprising content with lessened style influence. Unless stated otherwise, the content refiner in our approach reduces the original depth dimensions from 16 to 12.

Training Algorithm. To harness classifier-free guidance for both content and style, we use shared weights for training the dual conditional and two partial conditional models. Specifically, $\epsilon_\theta(z_t, z_c, \emptyset_s)$ and $\epsilon_\theta(z_t, \emptyset_c, f_s)$ solely use content or style as condition, respectively. \emptyset_s is the learnable null style, and \emptyset_c is the all zero null content. Throughout the training, we use probabilities $p_c = 0.1$ and $p_s = 0.5$




Figure 4: Our 2D-CFG results enable simultaneous content and style manipulation for optimized output, demonstrating flexibility and diversity, thereby offering users with freedom of choice.

for the content-only and style-only models, respectively.

Objective. In our training process, $I_{cs} = I_c = I_s$ act as the condition, thus transforming Equation 1 into:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{z, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}), t, I_{cs}} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, z_c, f_s)\|_2^2] \quad (2)$$

Inference Algorithm. The inference denoising process is visually depicted in Fig. 2. Stylization results are generated by progressively denoising the randomly initialized \hat{z}_T with $\epsilon_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, z_c, f_s)$. We have provided a detailed explanation of the denoising process in the supplementary materials A. Despite being trained for self-reconstruction, our model can still effectively utilize content and style features to achieve remarkable style transfer during inference when fed with different content and style images.

4.2. Two-Dimensional Classifier-free Guidance

Earlier feed-forward AST models have developed several manipulation methods, such as style interpolation [45, 13, 50] and spatial control [50]. Our proposed model, ArtFusion, not only accommodates these functions but also introduces a more flexible adjustment – the two-dimensional classifier-free guidance (2D-CFG), which is an extension of the classifier-free guidance [23]. Using 2D-CFG, users can guide the inference process to lean towards either content or style. With two scaling factors, s_{cnt} and s_{sty} , assigned for content and style respectively, the innovative



Figure 5: Style visualization from partial $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, \emptyset_c, f_s)$ reveals ArtFusion’s faithful expression of style features.

two-dimensional guidance provides a competitive element in the gradual denoising sampling, driving content and style vie for dominance:

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta, s_{cnt}} = s_{cnt} \epsilon_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, z_c, f_s) - (s_{cnt} - 1) \epsilon_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, \emptyset_c, f_s) \quad (3)$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta, s_{sty}} = s_{sty} \epsilon_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, z_c, f_s) - (s_{sty} - 1) \epsilon_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, z_c, \emptyset_s) \quad (4)$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, z_c, f_s) = \tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta, s_{cnt}} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta, s_{sty}} - \epsilon_{\theta}(\hat{z}_t, z_c, f_s) \quad (5)$$




Figure 6: Comparison with SOTA results.

5. Experiments

5.1. Qualitative Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the controllability and fidelity of style reproduction in our proposed method, ArtFusion. ArtFusion demonstrates controllability by enabling stylization level adjustments. This aspect is illustrated in Fig. 1, which presents a spectrum of stylization ranging from vivid content to strong stylization. Additionally, ArtFusion’s two-dimensional classifier-free guidance offers an unprecedented level of nuanced output adjustments. This capability is showcased in Fig. 4, where ArtFusion concurrently manipulates content and style, thus easily adapting to various preferences. Moreover, ArtFusion demonstrates proficiency in integrating style characteristics with the content, thereby yielding striking style transfer results. Apart from controlling capacities, ArtFusion also manifests talent in style representation. The model adeptly integrates distinctive style characteristics, such as the blurry edges typical of Impressionist art, with the content to yield compelling results. Fig. 5 serves as proof of this ability, showcasing ArtFusion’s faithfulness in style representation.

Our style-conditional model, $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, \mathcal{O}_c, f_s)$, is central to this process. This model learns to reconstruct I_s independently of z_c content information, establishing a correspondence with the arrangement of style inputs. For common patterns in the dataset, this link becomes more pronounced. As exemplified in Fig. 5, the results are logical, especially observable in the depiction of castles in the 2nd row, and bottom-up growing trees in the 4th row. By learning the likelihood, our model can grasp the essential traits of various elements, moving closer to comprehending the essence of “real art,” a fundamental challenge in style transfer.




Figure 7: Comparison with style learned by SOTA, using noise content and 20 rounds stylization. ArtFusion avoids repetitive patterns and demonstrates faithful depictions.

5.2. Comparison

In this section, we compare our method, ArtFusion, with DiffuseIT [35], the cutting-edge diffusion-based approach, and seven representative feed-forward AST models: StyTr² [12], Styleformer [72], CAST [75], IEST [7], AdaAttn [45], ArtFlow [1], and AdaIN [26]. On the basis of maintaining the content semantics, the comparison is focused on the criteria: alignment with style references. DiffuseIT [35], although innovative in its use of pretrained DMs and DINO ViT [5] similarities, tends to struggle with content and style degradation. This results in inferior outcomes to other models. The feed-forward AST models [12, 72, 75, 7, 45, 1, 26] often demonstrate a noticeable bias in style representation, leading to a divergence between their generated outputs and original artworks. The presence of repetitive artifacts and a lack of style texture detail in their generated outputs, as displayed in Fig. 8, support this observation.

In contrast, ArtFusion effectively learns the correlation between style conditions and actual artworks, leading to results with superior alignment to style references. It can




Figure 8: Close-up view of ArtFusion’s superior fine style texture representation compared to SOTA models. Each example’s second row provides a magnified view.

	Our	DiffuseIT	StyTr ²	StyleFormer	CAST	IEST	AdaAttn	ArtFlow	AdaIN
$\mathcal{L}_{\mu/\sigma}$	1.140	1.190	0.498	0.526	0.849	0.793	0.498	0.245	0.272

Table 1: VGG style similarity of last example (Stonehenge) in Fig. 8. This highlights the inconsistency between visual perception and conventional style similarity.

capture the core style characteristics that are typically overlooked in prior similarity learning models. Enlarged details in Fig. 8 reveal the original-like impression, the texture of oil painting, and similar brush strokes in our results.

5.3. Comparison on Style

Fig. 7 presents a comparative analysis between ArtFusion and other models, with a focus on how each model comprehends and reproduces styles. We intensify the style and minimise the content impact by applying noise content and 20 consecutive stylization rounds. DiffuseIT [35] employs the [CLS] token of DINO ViT for style similarity, which leads to a strong content structure and results that closely resemble style images. This reveals a limitation in the current DINO ViT similarity - an inability to effectively separate content from style, a critical requirement for

style transfer. The pretrained VGG style similarity [12, 26] prompts models to replicate major patterns from the style reference, leading to the creation of repetitive artifacts and obstructing the capture of subtle style components. CAST [75] replaces the statistics similarity with contrastive learning, but still shows a significant style bias and struggles to grasp unique characteristics. The outcomes tend to be structurally alike, indicating an issue within contrastive learning.

ArtFusion, in contrast, sidesteps these issues. It shuns repetitive patterns and heavy content contexts, resulting in outputs that authentically reflect the style references. This affirms the capacity for unbiased style learning, accentuating its unique advantage in style transfer. Attributed to the iterative nature of the denoising process, ArtFusion is able to capture the fine-grained details and essence of style references, resulting in a high-fidelity representation of styles.



Figure 9: Impact of compression ratio in the content refiner. Only the content refiner retains content and eliminates style in z_c , the model can effectively rely on f_s for style transfer. The style guidance scale increases from left to right.

5.4. Analysis of Bias in Style Similarity

We examine the alignment of visual perception with quantification results, specifically focusing on the commonly used pretrained VGG mean/variance style loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mu/\sigma}$ [26]. This evaluation is represented in Fig. 8 and Tab. 1. Remarkably, the $\mathcal{L}_{\mu/\sigma}$ metric produces results that do not align with visual quality. Despite their seemingly superior loss scores, both AdaIN [26] and ArtFlow[1] generate stylized images marked by substantial color distortion and spurious artifacts, deviating visually from the style reference. In contrast, our model presents the unique brush touch of the style reference, not seen in other models, and stays faithful to other aspects of the style. However, our model incurs a higher loss, comparable to that of DiffuseIT [35], which displays clear distortion. These findings underline the discrepancy between $\mathcal{L}_{\mu/\sigma}$ and the perceptual quality, serving as a caution against the exclusive reliance on style similarity for achieving optimal style transfer results.

5.5. Ablation on Content Refiner

In this section, we investigate the impact of the content refiner on stylization output under varying compression levels of the content feature z_c (Fig. 9). "Compression" here denotes the reduction of the depth dimension of z_c . Analysis indicates that the absence of compression causes z_c to carry an excess of style information, which should ideally be contributed by the style features f_s . As a result, the model over-relies on z_c and is unable to utilize the style information from f_s , causing a significant drop in stylization




Figure 10: Smooth style interpolation between two styles.

performance during inference (see the 5th row in Fig. 9). On the other hand, over-compression of the content feature leads to inadequate preservation of content semantics, noticeable as an apparent loss of content structure in the output (see the 2nd and 3rd rows in Fig. 9). Based on our empirical results, compressing the 16-dimensional z_c down to a 12-dimensional z_r achieves an optimal equilibrium.

5.6. Interpolation

Interpolating predicted noise between styles in each intermediate latent space allows for a smooth, gradual shift from one artistic style to another. Visual examples of the two-dimensional interpolation process are provided in Fig. 10. This process enables the seamless blending of artistic features, allowing for the creation of unique, hybrid styles. Furthermore, when we utilize the content image itself as one of the styles, a one-dimensional content-style tradeoff is introduced. This spectrum empowers users to finetune the balance between retaining content and adopting a new style, further showcasing the model's outstanding versatility.

6. Conclusion

We have presented ArtFusion, a novel, controllable approach to arbitrary style transfer (AST) that leverages dual conditional latent diffusion models (Dual-cLDM). This framework overcomes the common data limitations associated with diffusion models and avoids biases in feature extractors. With this innovation, ArtFusion effectively expresses and mirrors unique artistic attributes derived from style inputs. ArtFusion introduces a new level of flexibility to AST through two-dimensional classifier-free guidance (2D-CFG) and noise interpolation. Significantly, our results demonstrate that ArtFusion effectively prevents common issues found in existing models, such as repetitive patterns, and excels at reproducing nuanced artistic aspects.

The Dual-cLDM employed in ArtFusion harbors potential applications beyond AST, opening the door to other complex generative tasks, and broadening the horizons for diffusion models. While our model demonstrates a leap forward in the realm of style transfer, a comprehensive understanding of artistic characteristics continues to be a stimulating challenge for future research and exploration.

References

- [1] Jie An, Siyu Huang, Yibing Song, Dejing Dou, Wei Liu, and Jiebo Luo. Artflow: Unbiased image style transfer via reversible neural flows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.
- [2] Jie An, Tao Li, Haozhi Huang, Li Shen, Xuan Wang, Yongyi Tang, Jinwen Ma, Wei Liu, and Jiebo Luo. Real-time universal style transfer on high-resolution images via zero-channel pruning. *CoRR*, abs/2006.09029, 2020.
- [3] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein gan, 2017.
- [4] Jacob Austin, Daniel D. Johnson, Jonathan Ho, Daniel Tarlow, and Rianne van den Berg. Structured denoising diffusion models in discrete state-spaces. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [5] Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 9650–9660, October 2021.
- [6] Dongdong Chen, Lu Yuan, Jing Liao, Nenghai Yu, and Gang Hua. Stylebank: An explicit representation for neural image style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, July 2017.
- [7] Haibo Chen, Lei Zhao, Zhizhong Wang, Zhang Hui Ming, Zhiwen Zuo, Ailin Li, Wei Xing, and Dongming Lu. Artistic style transfer with internal-external learning and contrastive learning. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [8] Haibo Chen, Lei Zhao, Zhizhong Wang, Huiming Zhang, Zhiwen Zuo, Ailin Li, Wei Xing, and Dongming Lu. Dualast: Dual style-learning networks for artistic style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 872–881, June 2021.
- [9] Jiaxin Cheng, Ayush Jaiswal, Yue Wu, Pradeep Natarajan, and Prem Natarajan. Style-aware normalized loss for improving arbitrary style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 134–143, June 2021.
- [10] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009.
- [11] Yingying Deng, Fan Tang, Weiming Dong, Haibin Huang, Chongyang Ma, and Changsheng Xu. Arbitrary video style transfer via multi-channel correlation. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(2):1210–1217, May 2021.
- [12] Yingying Deng, Fan Tang, Weiming Dong, Chongyang Ma, Xingjia Pan, Lei Wang, and Changsheng Xu. Stytr2: Image style transfer with transformers. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022.
- [13] Yingying Deng, Fan Tang, Weiming Dong, Wen Sun, Feiyue Huang, and Changsheng Xu. Arbitrary style transfer via multi-adaptation network. In *Acm International Conference on Multimedia*. ACM, 2020.
- [14] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Quinn Nichol. Diffusion models beat GANs on image synthesis. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [15] Vincent Dumoulin, Jonathon Shlens, and Manjunath Kudlur. A learned representation for artistic style. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [16] Patrick Esser, Robin Rombach, and Björn Ommer. Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis, 2020.
- [17] Leon A. Gatys, Alexander S. Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [18] Golnaz Ghiasi, Honglak Lee, Manjunath Kudlur, Vincent Dumoulin, and Jonathon Shlens. Exploring the structure of a real-time, arbitrary neural artistic stylization network. *CoRR*, abs/1705.06830, 2017.
- [19] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- [20] Shuyang Gu, Congliang Chen, Jing Liao, and Lu Yuan. Arbitrary style transfer with deep feature reshuffle. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8222–8231, 2018.

- [21] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 6840–6851. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [22] Jonathan Ho, Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, David J. Fleet, Mohammad Norouzi, and Tim Salimans. Cascaded diffusion models for high fidelity image generation. *CoRR*, abs/2106.15282, 2021.
- [23] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Deep Generative Models and Downstream Applications*, 2021.
- [24] Emiel Hoogeboom, Didrik Nielsen, Priyank Jaini, Patrick Forré, and Max Welling. Argmax flows and multinomial diffusion: Learning categorical distributions. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [25] Minghui Hu, Yujie Wang, Tat-Jen Cham, Jianfei Yang, and P. N. Suganthan. Global context with discrete diffusion in vector quantised modelling for image generation, 2021.
- [26] Xun Huang and Serge Belongie. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In *ICCV*, 2017.
- [27] Phillip Isola, Jun-Yan Zhu, Tinghui Zhou, and Alexei A. Efros. Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, July 2017.
- [28] Yongcheng Jing, Xiao Liu, Yukang Ding, Xinchao Wang, Errui Ding, Mingli Song, and Shilei Wen. Dynamic instance normalization for arbitrary style transfer. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(04):4369–4376, Apr. 2020.
- [29] Justin Johnson, Alexandre Alahi, and Li Fei-Fei. Perceptual losses for real-time style transfer and super-resolution. In Bastian Leibe, Jiri Matas, Nicu Sebe, and Max Welling, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016*, pages 694–711, Cham, 2016. Springer International Publishing.
- [30] Bahjat Kawar, Shiran Zada, Oran Lang, Omer Tov, Huiwen Chang, Tali Dekel, Inbar Mosseri, and Michal Irani. Imagic: Text-based real image editing with diffusion models, 2022.
- [31] Gwanghyun Kim, Taesung Kwon, and Jong Chul Ye. Diffusionclip: Text-guided diffusion models for robust image manipulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2426–2435, June 2022.
- [32] Diederik P Kingma, Tim Salimans, Ben Poole, and Jonathan Ho. On density estimation with diffusion models. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [33] Dmytro Kotovenko, Artsiom Sanakoyeu, Sabine Lang, and Bjorn Ommer. Content and style disentanglement for artistic style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2019.
- [34] Dmytro Kotovenko, Artsiom Sanakoyeu, Pingchuan Ma, Sabine Lang, and Bjorn Ommer. A content transformation block for image style transfer. In *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2019.
- [35] Gihyun Kwon and Jong Chul Ye. Diffusion-based image translation using disentangled style and content representation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [36] Bo Li, Kaitao Xue, Bin Liu, and Yu-Kun Lai. Vqbb: Image-to-image translation with vector quantized brownian bridge, 2022.
- [37] Chuan Li and Michael Wand. Precomputed real-time texture synthesis with markovian generative adversarial networks. In Bastian Leibe, Jiri Matas, Nicu Sebe, and Max Welling, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016*, pages 702–716, Cham, 2016. Springer International Publishing.
- [38] Xueting Li, Sifei Liu, Jan Kautz, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Learning linear transformations for fast arbitrary style transfer. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019.
- [39] Yijun Li, Chen Fang, Jimei Yang, Zhaowen Wang, Xin Lu, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Diversified texture synthesis with feed-forward networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, July 2017.
- [40] Yijun Li, Chen Fang, Jimei Yang, Zhaowen Wang, Xin Lu, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Universal style transfer via feature transforms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [41] Yanghao Li, Naiyan Wang, Jiaying Liu, and Xiaodi Hou. Demystifying neural style transfer. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, pages 2230–2236, 2017.
- [42] Minxuan Lin, Fan Tang, Weiming Dong, Xiao Li, Changsheng Xu, and Chongyang Ma. Distribution

- aligned multimodal and multi-domain image stylization. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.*, 17(3), jul 2021.
- [43] Tianwei Lin, Zhuoqi Ma, Fu Li, Dongliang He, Xin Li, Errui Ding, Nannan Wang, Jie Li, and Xinbo Gao. Drafting and revision: Laplacian pyramid network for fast high-quality artistic style transfer. 2021.
- [44] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In David Fleet, Tomas Pajdla, Bernt Schiele, and Tinne Tuytelaars, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2014*, pages 740–755, Cham, 2014. Springer International Publishing.
- [45] Songhua Liu, Tianwei Lin, Dongliang He, Fu Li, Meiling Wang, Xin Li, Zhengxing Sun, Qian Li, and Errui Ding. Adaattn: Revisit attention mechanism in arbitrary neural style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [46] Andreas Lugmayr, Martin Danelljan, Andres Romero, Fisher Yu, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Repaint: Inpainting using denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11461–11471, June 2022.
- [47] Eric Luhman and Troy Luhman. Knowledge distillation in iterative generative models for improved sampling speed, 2021.
- [48] Alex Nichol, Prafulla Dhariwal, Aditya Ramesh, Pranav Shyam, Pamela Mishkin, Bob McGrew, Ilya Sutskever, and Mark Chen. Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models, 2021.
- [49] Alexander Quinn Nichol and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models, 2021.
- [50] Dae Young Park and Kwang Hee Lee. Arbitrary style transfer with style-attentional networks. *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5873–5881, 2018.
- [51] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09748*, 2022.
- [52] Fred Phillips and Brandy Mackintosh. Wiki Art Gallery, Inc.: A Case for Critical Thinking. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 26(3):593–608, 08 2011.
- [53] Alec Radford, Luke Metz, and Soumith Chintala. Unsupervised representation learning with deep convolutional generative adversarial networks, 2015.
- [54] Eric Risser, Pierre Wilmot, and Connelly Barnes. Stable and controllable neural texture synthesis and style transfer using histogram losses, 2017.
- [55] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, 2021.
- [56] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. *CoRR*, abs/1505.04597, 2015.
- [57] Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Huiwen Chang, Chris A. Lee, Jonathan Ho, Tim Salimans, David J. Fleet, and Mohammad Norouzi. Palette: Image-to-image diffusion models, 2022.
- [58] Chitwan Saharia, Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Tim Salimans, David J Fleet, and Mohammad Norouzi. Image super-resolution via iterative refinement. *arXiv:2104.07636*, 2021.
- [59] Tim Salimans and Jonathan Ho. Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [60] Artsiom Sanakoyeu, Dmytro Kotovenko, Sabine Lang, and Björn Ommer. A style-aware content loss for real-time hd style transfer. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 698–714, 10 2018.
- [61] Falong Shen, Shuicheng Yan, and Gang Zeng. Neural style transfer via meta networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2018.
- [62] Lu Sheng, Ziyi Lin, Jing Shao, and Xiaogang Wang. Avatar-net: Multi-scale zero-shot style transfer by feature decoration. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2018 IEEE Conference on*, pages 1–9, 2018.
- [63] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- [64] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric A. Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. *CoRR*, abs/1503.03585, 2015.
- [65] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. *ArXiv*, abs/2010.02502, 2021.
- [66] Jan Svoboda, Asha Anooosheh, Christian Osendorfer, and Jonathan Masci. Two-stage peer-regularized feature recombination for arbitrary image style transfer. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2020.

- [67] Dmitry Ulyanov, Vadim Lebedev, Andrea Vedaldi, and Victor Lempitsky. Texture networks: Feed-forward synthesis of textures and stylized images. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48*, ICML'16, page 1349–1357. JMLR.org, 2016.
- [68] Huan Wang, Yijun Li, Yuehai Wang, Haoji Hu, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Collaborative distillation for ultra-resolution universal style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- [69] Pei Wang, Yijun Li, and Nuno Vasconcelos. Rethinking and improving the robustness of image style transfer. In *The IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2021.
- [70] Weilun Wang, Jianmin Bao, Wengang Zhou, Dongdong Chen, Dong Chen, Lu Yuan, and Houqiang Li. Semantic image synthesis via diffusion models, 2022.
- [71] Zhizhong Wang, Lei Zhao, Haibo Chen, Lihong Qiu, Qihang Mo, Sihuan Lin, Wei Xing, and Dongming Lu. Diversified arbitrary style transfer via deep feature perturbation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 7789–7798, 2020.
- [72] Xiaolei Wu, Zhihao Hu, Lu Sheng, and Dong Xu. Styleformer: Real-time arbitrary style transfer via parametric style composition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 14618–14627, 2021.
- [73] Yuan Yao, Jianqiang Ren, Xuansong Xie, Weidong Liu, Yong-Jin Liu, and Jun Wang. Attention-aware multi-stroke style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2019.
- [74] Hang Zhang and Kristin Dana. Multi-style generative network for real-time transfer. In Laura Leal-Taixé and Stefan Roth, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2018 Workshops*, pages 349–365, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [75] Yuxin Zhang, Fan Tang, Weiming Dong, Haibin Huang, Chongyang Ma, Tong-Yee Lee, and Changsheng Xu. Domain enhanced arbitrary image style transfer via contrastive learning. In *ACM SIGGRAPH*, 2022.

Supplementary Material




Figure 11: Samples with size 1920×480 . 2D-CFG scales s_{cnt}/s_{sty} from top to bottom: $0.4/3.0$, $0.55/2.0$ and $0.25/2.0$.




Figure 12: Samples with size 1280×640 . 2D-CFG scales s_{cnt}/s_{sty} from top to bottom: $0.25/1.5$ and $0.25/2.0$.

A. Details of Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models

Given the data x_0 , the Gaussian diffusion process, denoted by q , incrementally adds noise to x_0 to create noisy data at each timestep $t = 1, \dots, T$ as per the following equation:

$$q(x_t|x_{t-1}) := \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t}, \beta_t \mathbf{I}) \quad (6)$$

In this equation, $\beta_{t=1}^T$ represents the hyper variance schedule that dictates the extent of noise introduced at each timestep. We denote $\alpha_t := 1 - \beta_t$ and $\bar{\alpha}_t := \prod_{s=1}^t \alpha_s$ to express q in an alternate form:

$$\begin{aligned} q(x_t|x_0) &= \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}x_0, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_t)\mathbf{I}) \\ &= \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}x_0 + \epsilon\sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t}, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This assists in an efficient sampling of x_t . With an appropriate variance schedule β_t and sufficiently large T , the distribution $q(x_T)$ will converge to $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$. In such a case, given $x_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$, the Gaussian diffusion model p_θ seeks to approximate and parametrize the reverse distribution $q(x_{t-1}|x_t)$. According to Sohl-Dickstein *et al.* [64], $q(x_{t-1}|x_t)$ can be treated as a diagonal Gaussian distribution as T approaches infinity and β_t tends to zero. Therefore, we can represent the parametrized p_θ as:

$$p_\theta(x_{t-1}|x_t) := \mathcal{N}(x_{t-1}; \mu_\theta(x_t, t), \Sigma_\theta(x_t, t)) \quad (8)$$

Here, $\mu_\theta(x_t, t)$ and $\Sigma_\theta(x_t, t)$ are learned deviation and mean. Ho *et al.* [21] observe that instead of directly optimizing the variational lower-bound for p_θ by learning both μ_θ and Σ_θ , the model can fix $\Sigma_\theta(x_t, t)$ to either $\beta_t \mathbf{I}$ or $\tilde{\beta}_t \mathbf{I}$, where $\tilde{\beta}_t := \frac{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t - 1}{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \beta_t$ represents a rescaling of β_t . Moreover, we can represent μ_θ as:

$$\mu_\theta(x_t, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}} \left(x_t - \frac{1 - \alpha_t}{\sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t}} \epsilon_\theta(x_t, t) \right) \quad (9)$$

With the prediction ϵ_θ of the involved noise ϵ in Eq. 7. The optimization goal can be transferred to minimize the difference between ϵ_θ and ϵ . This simplified objective is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{simple} := \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim q(x_0), t \sim \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, T\}), \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(x_t, t)\|_2^2] \quad (10)$$

The main optimization goal, therefore, is to align the predicted and actual noise terms as closely as possible.

B. Implementation Details

We employed the MS-COCO dataset [44] to train the partial conditional $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, z_c, \emptyset_s)$, the model that exclusively conditions on content. Meanwhile, the WikiArt dataset [52] was selected for training both $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, z_c, f_s)$ and $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, \emptyset_c, f_s)$ due to its diverse artistic styles. All the images used in the training process were randomly cropped into a 256x256 size. Our model was trained on a single NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3080 Ti GPU. Throughout the training process, we maintained an exponential moving average (EMA) of ArtFusion with a decay rate of 0.9999. Unless otherwise specified, our results were sampled using the EMA model with 250 DDIM [65] steps and setting the 2D-CFG scales as $s_{cnt}/s_{sty} = 0.6/3$. The hyperparameters used for the architecture and training process of ArtFusion are detailed in Tab. 2 and 3, respectively. We did not conduct hyperparameter sweeps in this study.

z -shape	z_r -shape	Channels	Channel Multi.	Head Dim.	Embed. Dim.	Attn. Resolution
$16 \times 16 \times 16$	$12 \times 16 \times 16$	384	1, 2	64	1024	16, 8

Table 2: Hyperparameters for the architecture of ArtFusion.

Diffusion Steps	Noise Schedule	Batch Size	Iterations	Optimizer	Learning Rate
1000	Linear	128	175K	AdamW	$1e - 4$

Table 3: Hyperparameters for the training process of ArtFusion.

C. Inference Analysing

C.1. Sampling Steps

Figure 13 showcases a series of stylized results from varying DDIM [65] steps. Interestingly, our observations indicate that beyond 10 sampling steps, any additional steps have only a marginal improvement in the visual quality of the results. This implies that despite our default setting of 250 steps, a reduction to merely 10 sampling steps does not lead to a noticeable deterioration in the quality of the output.




Figure 13: Impact of DDIM sampling steps on stylization outcomes. 10 sampling steps are enough for high-fidelity results.

C.2. Inference Time

We evaluated the inference time of our model in comparison to other SOTA methods, as outlined in Table 4. These comparisons utilized images of 256x256 resolution on an RTX 3080 Ti GPU. DiffuseIT [35], another diffusion-based method, requires notably extended inference times compared to our model. This increased time is due to DiffuseIT’s reliance on DINO ViT [5], which requires execution in both forward and backward directions during each sampling step to provide guidance. On the other hand, our model maintains a competitive inference time, approximately $3\times$ as long as ArtFlow [1] when sampling with 10 steps. Considering the continued advancements in accelerated denoising inference processes, we expect the current efficiency gap to diminish in the near future.

	Ours	Ours 10 steps	DiffuseIT	StyTr ²	Styleformer	CAST	IEST	AdaAttn	ArtFlow	AdaIN
time	3.658s	0.196s	60.933s	0.051s	0.022s	0.018s	0.018s	0.024s	0.063s	0.017s

Table 4: Inference time comparison among SOTA methods.

D. Limitation

Our model tends to overfit on the most recurring patterns in the WikiArt dataset, namely, frontal human faces. Among various art categories, portraits represent 15% of the entire dataset. This overfitting is evident in multiple cases, as showcased in style visualizations from $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, Q_c, f_s)$ in Fig. 14. For instance, images comprising human faces or objects with human-like attributes, as well as images featuring upside-down faces, appear to predominantly overfit on horizontal facial patterns (as evident in the 1st – 6th columns). However, this issue seems to alleviate or even vanish when images incorporate other discernible style features (as observable when comparing the 4th and 7th – 9th columns). Moving forward, we intend to overcome this limitation through the implementation of more robust data augmentation strategies.



Figure 14: Visualization of style composition with human faces. It highlights cases of overfitting in style references that include face-like objects, without strong style patterns.

E. Additional Qualitative Results

High Resolution. We assess the scalability of ArtFusion by testing it on higher-resolution content images, while keeping the size of the style images at 256×256 (refer to Fig. 11 and 12). ArtFusion adeptly scales to high resolutions without any fine-tuning, preserving high levels of detail and yielding aesthetically pleasing results.

Manipulation. The controlling capabilities of our model transcend conventional limits, as demonstrated by the 2D-CFG samples (refer to Fig. 15) and style interpolations between four styles (see Fig. 16). Additionally, we demonstrate how the application of gradient masks in style interpolation allows for precise spatial control over style proportions in Fig. 17. The suite of manipulation methods we have introduced enhances the versatility and practicality of AST for real-world applications.

Comparison. Additional comparison with SOTA approaches [35, 12, 72, 75, 7, 45, 1, 26] is illustrated in Fig. 18. We encourage a closer examination of these figures, as the zooming-in details truly showcase the superior performance of our model. It is here where the real strengths of ArtFusion shine – in its fine-grained details.




Figure 15: Additional two-dimensional classifier-free guidance results.




Figure 16: Interpolation results between four styles.




Figure 17: Results of spatial control with size 1024×480 . The first row is the content and style images. The second row showcases the spatial control results along with the corresponding gradient masks.




Figure 18: Additional comparison with SOTA results.