

InteractEdit: Zero-Shot Editing of Human-Object Interactions in Images

Jiun Tian Hoe¹ Weipeng Hu¹ Wei Zhou^{2†} Chao Xie^{3†} Ziwei Wang¹
 Chee Seng Chan⁴ Xudong Jiang¹ Yap-Peng Tan¹

<https://jiuntian.github.io/interactedit>

¹Nanyang Technological University ²Sun Yat-sen University ³Nanjing Forestry University ⁴Universiti Malaya

[†]Work done at Nanyang Technological University




Figure 1. Sample results of editing Human-Object Interaction in the source image (left). Existing methods overly preserve the structure, making interaction edits ineffective. Our method focuses on modifying interactions while maintaining the subject and object identity.

Abstract

This paper presents *InteractEdit*, a novel framework for zero-shot Human-Object Interaction (HOI) editing, addressing the challenging task of transforming an existing interaction in an image into a new, desired interaction while preserving the identities of the subject and object. Unlike simpler image editing scenarios such as attribute manipulation, object replacement or style transfer, HOI editing involves complex spatial, contextual, and relational dependencies inherent in humans-objects interactions. Existing methods often overfit to the source image structure, limiting their ability to adapt to the substantial structural modifications demanded by new interactions. To address this, *InteractEdit* decomposes each scene into subject, object, and background components, then employs Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) and selective fine-tuning to preserve pretrained

interaction priors while learning the visual identity of the source image. This regularization strategy effectively balances interaction edits with identity consistency. We further introduce *IEBench*, the most comprehensive benchmark for HOI editing, which evaluates both interaction editing and identity preservation. Our extensive experiments show that *InteractEdit* significantly outperforms existing methods, establishing a strong baseline for future HOI editing research and unlocking new possibilities for creative and practical applications. Code will be released upon publication.

1. Introduction

Human-Object Interaction (HOI) understanding has become a pivotal research direction in computer vision, enabling breakthroughs in activity recognition [54], augmented reality [46, 84], and human-robot collaboration

[14, 32]. Recent progress in HOI detection and generation has significantly enhanced our ability to recognize and simulate human-object interactions. However, the task of editing existing HOIs remains largely unexplored and poses unique challenges. Unlike detection and generation [25, 28, 34, 42, 49], HOI editing requires **modifying the interaction** while **preserving the original identity** of the subject and object, a task complicated by the intricate relationships and dependencies between these elements.

Despite notable advancements in image editing [70], most methods focus on altering attributes, objects, or styles, often assuming a rigid structural layout. Interaction editing, in contrast, **requires substantial structural changes** to align with new interactions while maintaining subject and object identity. This complexity makes HOI editing a significantly harder and less addressed problem in the field. For instance, consider an image of *a person holding skateboard* as illustrated in Fig. 1. Editing the interaction to depict *the person ride skateboard* involves not only changing the action but also substantially modifying the spatial arrangement and poses while ensuring the identity remains consistent. Such capabilities enhance gaming and virtual worlds, e-commerce, and visual storytelling by allowing modifications to character actions, refining product interactions in ads, and refining interactions in narrative scenes.

In this work, we propose a novel **zero-shot** interaction editing task, which takes on four core challenges:

- a) **Intricate Interaction Relationships:** The interdependent spatial and contextual relationships between subjects, objects, and actions make direct edits difficult without disrupting the overall realism.
- b) **Rigid Image Structure:** Interaction editing requires non-rigid structural changes to align with new interactions while preserving the identity, but existing methods often overfit to the source image structure.
- c) **Loss of Pretrained Knowledge:** During fine-tuning, the critical knowledge about target interactions in pretrained models may be corrupted, leading to suboptimal edits that fail to accurately reflect desired modifications.
- d) **Lack of Evaluation Metrics:** The absence of a standardized benchmark for interaction editing hinders meaningful comparisons between methods.

To address these challenges, we propose **InteractEdit** (see Fig. 2), a novel framework designed to regularize fine-tuning to prevent overfitting while preserving target interaction priors. Our approach enables zero-shot HOI editing without requiring reference images of target interactions. Rather than processing the entire image as a whole, we decompose the HOI into subject, object, and background, encoding them as distinct concept clues.

To further combat overfitting, we implement Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [26], which applies low-rank updates to the attention weights. LoRA captures the critical at-

tributes of the subject and object while excluding structural details that could hinder non-rigid interaction edits. Our editing process is also enhanced by selective training mechanisms that specifically target essential attention components, crucial for balancing interaction modification with identity consistency. We keep Query weights (W^Q) fixed to preserve target interaction knowledge from the pretrained model, maintaining the model ability to query and interpret the target interaction-relevant. Only the Key and Value weights (W^K and W^V) are trained to learn and adapt to the appearance of the source image.

To evaluate the effectiveness of InteractEdit, we established **IEBench**, namely **InteractEdit Benchmark**, the first benchmark for standardized evaluation of interaction editing methods. It introduces the *HOI Editability* score, which measures how well the edited image reflects the target interaction, and *Identity Consistency*, which evaluates how well the identity of the subject and object are preserved. Additionally, the composite *Overall* score offers a balanced measure of interaction editability and identity consistency before and after editing, facilitating a thorough evaluation and comparison between different methods.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- (i) We introduce a novel zero-shot HOI editing task, which modifies interactions in existing images while preserving the identity, without requiring reference images of the target interaction. To support this task, we introduce IEBench, a comprehensive benchmark to evaluate interaction editing methods.
- (ii) We propose **InteractEdit**, a new framework for HOI editing that leverages a disassembly-reassembly strategy to decouple and reassemble HOI components, disentangling intricate relationships for effective editing. To mitigate issues like overfitting and loss of interaction priors, we incorporate LoRA and selective fine-tuning mechanisms to constrain unnecessary changes. These techniques guide fine-tuning to adapt to the source image’s appearance while preserving interaction knowledge in the pretrained model.
- (iii) Extensive experiments show that InteractEdit significantly outperforms existing image editing approaches on the HOI editing task, achieving higher interaction edit success while maintaining identity consistency. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic framework for zero-shot interaction editing, addressing key challenges that remain underexplored and providing a foundation for future research.

2. Related Work

Human-Object Interactions (HOIs) are typically represented using interaction pairs (human, action, object) along with bounding boxes that localize the human and the object within an image. The task of HOI detection involves identi-

fying these interactions by detecting humans and objects in an image and classifying the action that connects them. Recent advances in HOI detection [20, 40, 42, 49, 86, 87] have addressed challenges related to recognizing rare and unseen interactions, improving the generalizability of models.

HOI generation [16, 25, 28, 34], is a recently emerging field that focuses on generating images conditioned on specified HOI triplets. For example, InteractDiffusion [25] employs diffusion models to generate images based on given triplets and bounding boxes, producing scenes that align with the specified interaction. While HOI generation is valuable for data augmentation and creative applications, it does not address the need to edit existing interactions within images. Interaction editing requires the ability to modify an interaction while preserving the original identity.

Our proposed work aims to address this gap by presenting a framework for interaction editing. This framework enables modification of existing HOI in images, ensuring that the visual integrity of the original elements is maintained while changing the interaction.

Diffusion Models [24, 60, 71, 72, 74] generate high-quality images by progressively refining noisy data and are more stable than traditional models like GANs [9]. Conditional diffusion models guide this process using various inputs, including text prompts [18, 59, 63–65, 67], layout [2, 7, 43, 62, 80, 89], personalized embeddings [85] and visual conditions [52, 88]. While HOI-based diffusion models [25] enable interaction-aware generation, editing existing interactions while preserving identity coherence remains underexplored. Our work leverages diffusion models with text conditioning for interaction editing.

Image Editing Diffusion Models can be categorized into single- or multi-subject customization, local editing, text-guided image editing, and image translation [70]. Single- [11, 41, 68] or multi- [21, 38, 47, 48, 50, 58, 77, 79] subject customization involves generating or modifying images containing one or more specific subjects by providing a small subset of images of the subject. Local editing [10, 55, 56, 69] includes object manipulation [83] (adding, removing, replacing objects), attribute manipulation (changing color or texture), spatial transformation [44, 69] (translation, scaling, local distortion), and inpainting [78] (filling missing parts of an image). Text-guided image editing [3, 4, 17, 22, 27, 35, 73, 75, 76] involves using natural language prompts to direct changes in images, allowing for targeted or broad modifications such as altering style, adding objects, or changing attributes based on descriptive input. Image translation [33, 51] covers both style change (applying new visual styles) and transforming images from a source domain, like depth maps, to a target domain, such as photorealistic images. Mainstream subject customization methods often rely on a set of images, limiting their practicality. Break-A-Scene [1] has shown the po-

tential to learn multi-concepts from a single image, which is crucial for real-world image editing where obtaining multiple images is impractical.

Interaction editing is distinct from these tasks. Unlike conventional methods that modify object attributes or positions while maintaining the overall structure, interaction editing focuses on changing only the interaction while preserving the identity. A concurrent work, HOIEdit [82], addresses HOI editing using multiple reference images of target interactions. It relies on a collection of reference examples to guide the editing process, which limits its practicality in real-world scenarios where obtaining multiple reference images containing the target interactions is either infeasible or inconvenient.

Unlike HOIEdit, our method enables zero-shot HOI editing by preserving pretrained interaction knowledge, eliminating the need for reference images of target interactions, and making it applicable to diverse editing tasks. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to systematically address zero-shot interaction editing.

LoRA [26] is widely used in diffusion-based image editing for fine-tuning acceleration [73], character and concept injection [19], and style transfer [12]. In contrast, we leverage LoRA in a new role: as an effective regularization technique, capturing essential attributes while ignoring fine-grained structural details to enable non-rigid edits.

3. Method

Given an input image I_{source} that contains an initial human-object interaction represented as a triplet $\langle s, i_{\text{original}}, o \rangle$, where s is subject, o is object and i_{original} is their interaction, our goal is to semantically modify their interaction to a target interaction i_{target} . This modification aims to preserve the original identity of the subject s and the object o , while allowing necessary background adjustments. The resulting image I_{target} should depict the scene with the new interaction i_{target} , maintaining the realism and coherence of the new human-object interaction $\langle s, i_{\text{target}}, o \rangle$, while preserving the identity of the original subject and object.

3.1. Preliminary

Image editing generally involve two stages: *inversion* and *editing*. The inversion algorithm F_{inv} encodes an input images into **inversion clues** Φ , which capture the key information needed for reconstruction. Our work focuses on this stage. These inversion clues are then used in the editing stage to generate the desired content. The inversion process is represented as:

$$\Phi = F_{\text{inv}}(I_{\text{source}}, C_{\text{source}}), \quad (1)$$

where C_{source} represents the original text prompt. In the editing stage, the algorithm integrates the inversion clues Φ




Figure 2. Overview of the InteractEdit framework. HOI components are disassembled into subject, object, and background clues during inversion (Sec. 3.3). LoRA regularization enables non-rigid edits by capturing essential attributes while ignoring fine-grained structural details (Sec. 3.4). Selective fine-tuning preserves interaction priors while adapting to the source image’s identity (Sec. 3.5). Editing reassembles these components with the target interaction, using trained LoRA weights to guide the diffusion model (Sec. 3.6).

into the base model to reconstruct an image that preserved the original content while adhering to the new target instruction. The edit algorithm F_{edit} generates the edited image as follow:

$$I_{\text{target}} = F_{\text{edit}}(\Phi, C_{\text{target}}), \quad (2)$$

where C_{target} represents the target text prompt.

Break-A-Scene [1] is an inversion technique that bridges Textual Inversion [13] and DreamBooth [66] for single-image multi-concept extraction. Given an input image I_{source} and a set of N masks $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^N$ representing distinct concepts, it extracts the textual clues $\{\Phi_i\}_{i=1}^N$, which can be incorporated into the target text prompts to generate new instances of these concepts. Additionally, Break-A-Scene fine-tunes the model weights Φ_{fit} to retain the source image information to improve reconstruction. While effective at disentangling explicit concepts like static objects, it struggles with non-rigid editing, such as HOI editing, which requires altering the spatial relationships and poses of subjects and objects. Its fine-tuning process tends to overfit the original structures, limiting adaptability to new interactions. Our approach imposes regularized inversion process on Break-A-Scene framework to better support non-rigid HOI edits.

3.2. InteractEdit: Overall framework

The inversion process fine-tunes the pretrained model on the source image to enable the reconstruction during editing. Without constraints, this fine-tuning tends to overfit the structural details of the source image, corrupting critical knowledge about target interactions encoded in the pretrained model. This undermines the goal of zero-shot HOI editing, which relies on pretrained priors to align the image structure with the target interaction. Preserving target interaction knowledge is crucial, as it exists only in the pretrained model and cannot be inferred from the source image. Thus, an effective inversion process must balance adapting to the source image and retaining interaction priors essential

for accurate editing.

Fig. 2 presents the overall framework of InteractEdit. Sec. 3.3 describes the disassembly of the HOI into its individual components, Sec. 3.4 explains how Low-Rank Adaptation mitigates overfitting, while Sec. 3.5 details how selective fine-tuning preserves the interaction prior of the pretrained model while learning the visual identity from the source image. Finally, Sec. 3.6 outlines the editing process. More details are given in supplementary.

3.3. Disassemble Human-Object Interaction

Editing HOI in images is particularly challenging due to the highly coupled relationships between the human, object, and background. Directly editing this interdependent relationships often leads to one of two outcomes: either the interaction fails to change as intended, or the original visual identity is not preserved.

To address this issue, we disassemble the HOI concept into its constituent elements: the *human (subject)*, the *object*, and the *background*. This disassembly is accomplished using Break-A-Scene [1], which encodes these elements into individual concepts clues, Φ_s , Φ_o and Φ_{bg} . However, with Break-A-Scene, these concept clues will overfit to the structural details of the original image, including spatial relationships, arrangements, and poses, if all parameters are fine-tuned without sufficient regularization. This leads to memorization of specific structural configurations rather than learning generalizable representations. Additionally, it corrupts the target interaction prior in the pretrained model, reducing the adaptability to new interactions.

As a result, the model struggles with non-rigid edits, limiting its ability to alter poses or spatial layouts. This overfitting prevents effective HOI editing, causing the generated edits fail in reflecting the desired modifications.

3.4. Regularizing Inversion with LoRA

We hypothesize that fully fine-tuning the model causes overfitting to the source image, thereby limiting its adaptability to new target interactions. To address this, we adopt Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [26], which applies low-rank updates to the attention weight matrices. These updates capture only the essential attributes required for identity preservation while ignoring structural details that hinder non-rigid interaction edits.

Each LoRA-adapted weight matrix W is expressed as:

$$W = W_{\text{original}} + \Delta W, \quad \Delta W = AB^T, \quad (3)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$, with r as the rank hyperparameter and d as the dimensionality of weight matrix.

Training only the low-rank matrices A and B constrains the model’s fine tuning capacity, preventing overfitting to the source image and preserving critical target interaction knowledge encoded in the pretrained model. LoRA retains the important target interaction knowledge while allowing the model to learn and reconstruct the identity of the source image. This balance enables effective interaction edits while maintaining identity consistency and adapting to interaction modifications. We apply LoRA to the U-Net.

3.5. Selective Fine-Tuning for Prior Retention

The diffusion models use a U-Net architecture, which comprises multiple blocks arranged in an encoder-decoder structure. Each block incorporates self-attention and cross-attention mechanisms to capture relationships within the image features and between the image and conditioning information, respectively.

In each attention layer, input features are transformed into Query (Q), Key (K) and Value (V) representations. The attention mechanism is described as:

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{Softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V, \quad (4)$$

where $Q = XW^Q$, $K = XW^K$, and $V = XW^V$ are linear transformations of the input X using weight matrices W^Q , W^K , and W^V , respectively, and d_k is the dimensionality of the Key vectors used for scaling. Q encodes what features a token is “looking for,” K represents what features a token offers to be attended to, and V carries the actual information used to generate the output.

For HOI editing, we aim to retain the pretrained model’s interaction knowledge while learning the visual characteristics of the source image. To achieve this, we employ a selective fine-tuning strategy:

- **Self-Attention Layer** capture spatial dependencies within an image. To retain the model’s ability to recognize and encode interaction-relevant structural features, we freeze the Query weights (W_{self}^Q). Only Key (W_{self}^K)

and Value (W_{self}^V) weights are trained to learn the visual traits of the source image.

- **Cross-Attention Layers** align text-based conditioning with image features. Similarly, we keep W_{cross}^Q fixed to preserve the model’s ability to retrieve relevant interaction information from the text prompt. Meanwhile, we train W_{cross}^K and W_{cross}^V to incorporate the visual traits from the source image.

By freezing the Query weights in both self- and cross-attention, the model retains its ability to attend to relevant features for interaction reasoning while selectively modifying Key and Value weights to adjust appearance without corrupting interaction priors. This approach ensures a balance between interaction editability and identity preservation, allowing the model to generalize effectively to diverse interaction edits.

3.6. HOI Editing

The fine-tuning phase learns inversion clues as follows:

$$\Phi = [\Phi_s, \Phi_o, \Phi_{\text{bg}}, \Phi_{\text{ft}}] = F_{\text{inv}}(I_{\text{source}}, C_{\text{source}}), \quad (5)$$

where $\Phi_s, \Phi_o, \Phi_{\text{bg}}$ are the textual clues representing the subject, object, and background, respectively, and Φ_{ft} represents the fine-tuned model weights.

In the editing phase, we generate an image that depicts the target interaction while preserving the original identity. To achieve this, we reassemble the textual concept clues (Φ_s, Φ_o , and Φ_{bg}) into a new prompt that replaces the original action i_{original} with the target interaction i_{target} . The target prompt C_{target} is structured as:

$$C_{\text{target}} = \text{“a photo of } [\Phi_s] i_{\text{target}} [\Phi_o] \text{ at } [\Phi_{\text{bg}}]. \text{”}$$

With the target prompt prepared, we generate the edited image I_{target} using the diffusion model ϵ_θ and selectively fine-tuned parameters Φ_{ft} . The generation of I_{target} is performed through the iterative denoising process starting from random noise \mathbf{z}_T . At each timestep t , where $t = T, T - 1, \dots, 1$, the model predicts the denoised image:

$$\mathbf{z}_{t-1} = \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, t, C_{\text{target}}; \Phi_{\text{ft}}). \quad (6)$$

The final output image I_{target} is obtained when $t = 0$:

$$I_{\text{target}} = \mathbf{z}_0. \quad (7)$$

This iterative denoising process serves as a practical realization of Eq. (2), where Φ including the textual clues ($\Phi_s, \Phi_o, \Phi_{\text{bg}}$) and LoRA weights Φ_{ft} .

In this process, the fine-tuned weights Φ_{ft} guide the synthesis by integrating the visual identity learned from the inversion stage, while the textual clues ($\Phi_s, \Phi_o, \Phi_{\text{bg}}$) provide semantic guidance for maintaining identity. The remaining pretrained parameters retain the target interaction knowledge. This ensures that the generated image adheres to the target interaction i_{target} specified by the prompt C_{target} , while preserving the identity of the source image.

Table 1. Comparison of InteractEdit with existing baselines in terms of HOI editability evaluated on IEBench. **Bold** indicates the best, underline denotes the second-best.

Method	Overall	HOI Editability	Identity Consistency
Null-Text Inversion [22, 53]	0.3873	<u>0.390</u>	0.385
PnP Diffusion [76]	<u>0.4220</u>	0.240	0.604
MasaCtrl [5]	0.3703	0.260	0.481
HOIEdit [82]	0.3658	0.240	0.492
Imagic [35]	0.3923	0.192	0.593
CDS [57]	0.4065	0.194	<u>0.619</u>
DAC [73]	0.3555	0.160	0.551
LEDITS++ [3]	0.2933	0.150	0.437
InstructPix2Pix [4]	0.3903	0.269	0.512
ReNoise [15]	0.4033	0.274	0.533
TurboEdit [8]	0.4140	0.326	0.502
SVDiff [21]	0.4045	0.255	0.554
EditFriendlyDDPM [31]	0.4143	0.320	0.509
DDS [23]	0.4070	0.226	0.588
InfEdit [81]	0.4000	0.179	0.621
Break-A-Scene [1]	0.3673	0.142	0.593
Break-A-Scene XL	0.3825	0.165	0.600
InteractEdit	0.5308	0.504	0.558

4. Interaction Editing Benchmark (IEBench)

While HOI editing has been previously explored in HOIEdit, its evaluation remains limited by a small-scale benchmark covering only 3 actions. In response, we introduce a more comprehensive benchmark with 25 actions across 13 objects, 28 source images, 100 source images to target interaction pairs. Moreover, HOIEdit primarily relies on text-image and image-image similarity for evaluation, which fails to reliably measure edit success, as CLIP is known to be deficiencies in action recognition [39]. To address these issues, we introduce a robust benchmark and propose more precise metrics for evaluating HOI editing.

HOI Editability measures the success of HOI editing task by assessing whether the target interaction is correctly generated. We use PVic [87], a state-of-the-art HOI detector, to identify interaction in the edited image. If the targeted interaction is detected, the edit is scored 1.0; otherwise, 0.0. The HOI Editability score is the average success rate across all generated images.

Identity Consistency (IC) assess how well the identity of the subject and object are preserved after editing. Background consistency is excluded, as some interaction edits inherently require background modifications. For both the source and edited images, we use GroundingDINO [45] to detect the subject and object based on their textual labels, then apply the Segment Anything Model (SAM) [37] to obtain segmentation masks. These masked regions are used to extract feature embeddings via DINOv2 [61], and the cosine similarity is computed between the embeddings from the source and edited images. The IC score is the mean similarity of the subject and the object, averaged over all generated images. DINOv2 is chosen for feature extraction

due to its strong object-centric representation and ability to capture fine-grained details, making it well-suited for assessing identity consistency in edited images.

To evaluate the performance of HOI editing comprehensively, we combine HOI Editability and Identity Consistency into an overall evaluation metric, the IEBench **Overall Score** (σ):

$$\sigma = \frac{\text{HOI Editability} + \text{Identity Consistency}}{2}. \quad (8)$$

This composite score equally weighs HOI Editability and visual consistency, ensuring a balanced evaluation that reflects both the objective of modifying interactions and the importance of preserving visual identity.

We construct **IEBench** from HICO-DET [6], selecting source images and target interactions based on the following criteria: (1) the source image must depict a single HOI instance, (2) the target interaction must be plausible for the object category, and (3) the target interaction must produce significant visual changes. IEBench consists of 100 source image and target interaction pairs derived from 28 source images, each with 3 to 5 target interactions. It is designed to assess how well methods modify interactions while preserving identity. We hope that it will serve as a valid benchmark to advance future research for this task. More details are in Sec. 11 of supplementary.

5. Experiments

We conducted experiments at 512x512 resolution, basing our method on Stable Diffusion XL [63]. Following Break-A-Scene [1], we use the two-stage training approach. In the first stage, we optimize only textual clues $\Phi_s, \Phi_o, \Phi_{bg}$ for 1000 steps with a learning rate of 5e-4. In the second stage, we jointly trained the LoRA weights Φ_{ft} and the textual clues for 200 additional steps with a learning rate of 1e-4. Both stages utilize Adam optimizer [36] with a batch size of 1 and weight decays of 1e-4. During the inference stage, we set the number of denoising steps to $T = 50$. When possible, we run all methods on SDXL v1.0, while others are run on their respective default base models. Additional implementation details are in Sec. 8 of supp. material.

5.1. Qualitative results

Figure 3 presents a qualitative comparison with existing baselines, highlighting the effectiveness of our method in balancing HOI editability and identity consistency. Existing methods typically struggle to address both aspects simultaneously. NTI and InstructPix2Pix fail to preserve the identity of the subject and object, while InfEdit, CDS, and Break-A-Scene retain the identity but rigidly adhere to the structural composition of the source image, limiting their ability to adapt to the target interaction. For example, when modifying *blow cake* to *hold cake*, NTI correctly renders




Figure 3. Qualitative comparison with baselines. The Source column shows the source image and its original interaction. Two target interactions are generated per instance. Our method achieves the best HOI editability. More comparisons are in Figs. 6 and 7 (supplementary).

Table 2. Ablation study of InteractEdit. Disass., SFT, and LoRA represents Disassemble HOI, Selective Fine-Tuning, and Regularization with LoRA.

Method	Disass.	SFT	LoRA	Overall	HOI Editability	Identity Consistency
Baseline				0.3820	0.143	0.621
w/o SFT & LoRA	✓			0.3825	0.165	0.600
w/o LoRA		✓		0.4378	0.274	0.602
w/o SFT	✓		✓	0.5090	0.466	0.552
w/o Disass.		✓	✓	0.4840	0.401	0.567
Ours	✓	✓	✓	0.5308	0.504	0.558

the *hold cake* action but drastically alters the appearance of the person and cake, making them unrecognizable.

In contrast, our method is the only approach capable of successfully generating the *hold cake* interaction while preserving visual identity. This success stems from integrating LoRA and selective fine-tuning during the inversion. LoRA acts as a regularization mechanism, preventing overfitting to the structural details of the source image, whereas the selec-



Figure 4. Qualitative ablation study. The row below image shows the source and target interaction.

tive fine-tuning helps preserve the target interaction knowledge in the pretrained model. Together, these techniques allow our method to effectively modify interactions while

ensuring visual consistency. More qualitative results are in Sec. 9 of the supp. material.

5.2. Quantitative results

For each pair of source image and target interaction in IEBench, we generate 10 outputs using different random seeds, resulting in a total of 1000 edited images. Table 1 compares our method against existing baselines in terms of HOI editability, Identity Consistency (IC), and Overall score. Our approach outperforms all others, shedding new light on the task of HOI editing.

For HOI Editability score, our method achieves 0.504, marking a notable improvement of 29.2% over the best performing baseline, NTI. For identity consistency, our method scores 0.558, successfully preserving identity while facilitating substantial changes in interaction. Balancing these aspects, our method achieves the highest Overall score of 0.5308, significantly surpassing PnP Diffusion, by 25.8%.

These results empirically demonstrate that our method substantially enhances interaction editability while preserving good identity consistency, achieving the optimal balance among all baselines. This improvement is driven by our LoRA-based inversion regularization, which prevents overfitting to the source image, and our Selective Fine-Tuning strategy, which retains the target interaction knowledge.

5.3. Ablation studies

HOI editing presents significant challenges, such as overfitting to the source image and ineffective use of pretrained interaction knowledge, limiting the adaptability to new target interactions. To address these issues, we conduct an ablation study to assess the contributions of our selective fine-tuning strategy and Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA). The results are summarized in Tab. 2 and visualized in Fig. 4. The baseline refers to SDXL with DreamBooth [66] and Textual Inversion [13].

Disassembling the HOI components using Break-A-Scene provides a minor improvement in HOI editability, raising the score from 0.143 to 0.165. This indicates that while concept disentanglement helps in separating subject, object, and background, it alone is insufficient for effective interaction editing. Selective fine-tuning, which involves training only the Key and Value matrices while keeping Query weights fixed, allows the model to preserve pretrained target interaction knowledge while learning the appearance features of the source image. This approach boosts the HOI Editability score to 0.274 and maintains identity consistency. To further counter overfitting, we incorporate LoRA, which limits model capacity by updating only low-rank matrices. This prevents corruption of pretrained interaction knowledge and preserves critical structural and semantic features. With LoRA, the HOI Editability score climbs to 0.504, with a slight decrease in identity consistency,




Figure 5. User Preferences

yet achieving the highest Overall score of 0.5308.

Without selective fine-tuning, the HOI Editability score falls to 0.466, demonstrating that training all attention components compromises the model’s capacity to retain target interaction knowledge. Likewise, without disentangling HOI components, the HOI Editability score drops to 0.401, showing that entangled representations hinder effective interaction modifications.

These findings underscore that our proposed selective fine-tuning and LoRA on disentangled representations effectively work together to balance interaction modification and identity preservation, addressing the fundamental challenges in HOI editing.

5.4. User study

To assess user preferences, we conducted a study involving 30 participants who were asked to choose the best result from six different methods applied to 15 interaction edits. Fig. 5 shows that 68.2% preferred our method, TurboEdit and NTI each received 8.7%, Break-A-Scene XL achieved 8.2%, EditFriendly DDPM obtained 4.4%, and HOIEdit was only 1.8%. The strong preference for our approach underscores the effectiveness of our approach in skillfully modifying interactions while maintaining identity, achieving a balance between realism and editing success. More details are in Sec. 10 of the supp. material.

6. Conclusion

This paper introduces a novel zero-shot interaction editing task and proposed InteractEdit to tackle its challenges. HOI editing remains a formidable problem, requiring interaction modifications while preserving identity. Existing methods struggle to balance HOI editability and identity consistency, as some overfit to the source image and overwrite pretrained interaction priors, while others fail to effectively leverage these priors, leading to suboptimal edits. To address this, InteractEdit employs a LoRA-based inversion regularization to mitigate overfitting and a selective fine-tuning strategy to preserve target interaction knowledge while adapting appearance from the source image. Extensive quantitative and qualitative evaluations demonstrate that our method significantly outperforms state-of-the-art approaches, setting a new benchmark for HOI editing.

References

- [1] Omri Avrahami, Kfir Aberman, Ohad Fried, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Dani Lischinski. Break-a-scene: Extracting multiple concepts from a single image. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2023 Conference Papers*, pages 1–12, 2023. 3, 4, 6, 1
- [2] Omri Avrahami, Thomas Hayes, Oran Gafni, Sonal Gupta, Yaniv Taigman, Devi Parikh, Dani Lischinski, Ohad Fried, and Xi Yin. Spatext: Spatio-textual representation for controllable image generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18370–18380, 2023. 3
- [3] Manuel Brack, Felix Friedrich, Katharia Kornmeier, Linoy Tsaban, Patrick Schramowski, Kristian Kersting, and Apolinário Passos. Ledits++: Limitless image editing using text-to-image models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8861–8870, 2024. 3, 6
- [4] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A. Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3, 6
- [5] Mingdeng Cao, Xintao Wang, Zhongang Qi, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Yinqiang Zheng. Masactrl: Tuning-free mutual self-attention control for consistent image synthesis and editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 22560–22570, 2023. 6, 1
- [6] Yu-Wei Chao, Yunfan Liu, Xieyang Liu, Huayi Zeng, and Jia Deng. Learning to detect human-object interactions. In *2018 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision (wacv)*, pages 381–389. IEEE, 2018. 6
- [7] Minghao Chen, Iro Laina, and Andrea Vedaldi. Training-free layout control with cross-attention guidance. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 5343–5353, 2024. 3
- [8] Gilad Deutch, Rinon Gal, Daniel Garibi, Or Patashnik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Turboedit: Text-based image editing using few-step diffusion models. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2024 Conference Papers*, pages 1–12, 2024. 6, 3
- [9] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:8780–8794, 2021. 3
- [10] Dave Epstein, Allan Jabri, Ben Poole, Alexei Efros, and Aleksander Holynski. Diffusion self-guidance for controllable image generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:16222–16239, 2023. 3
- [11] Patrick Esser, Robin Rombach, and Bjorn Ommer. Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12873–12883, 2021. 3
- [12] Yarden Frenkel, Yael Vinker, Ariel Shamir, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Implicit style-content separation using b-lora. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 181–198. Springer, 2024. 3
- [13] Rinon Gal, Yuval Alaluf, Yuval Atzmon, Or Patashnik, Amit H Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01618*, 2022. 4, 8
- [14] Jiawei Gao, Ziqin Wang, Zeqi Xiao, Jingbo Wang, Tai Wang, Jinkun Cao, Xiaolin Hu, Si Liu, Jifeng Dai, and Jiangmiao Pang. Coohei: Learning cooperative human-object interaction with manipulated object dynamics. *NeurIPS*, 37:79741–79763, 2024. 2
- [15] Daniel Garibi, Or Patashnik, Andrey Voynov, Hadar Averbuch-Elor, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Renoise: Real image inversion through iterative noising, 2024. 6, 3
- [16] Mengmeng Ge, Xu Jia, Takashi Isobe, Xiaomin Li, Qinghe Wang, Jing Mu, Dong Zhou, Li Wang, Huchuan Lu, Lu Tian, et al. Customizing text-to-image generation with inverted interaction. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 10901–10909, 2024. 3
- [17] Zigang Geng, Binxin Yang, Tiankai Hang, Chen Li, Shuyang Gu, Ting Zhang, Jianmin Bao, Zheng Zhang, Houqiang Li, Han Hu, et al. Instructdiffusion: A generalist modeling interface for vision tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12709–12720, 2024. 3
- [18] Shuyang Gu, Dong Chen, Jianmin Bao, Fang Wen, Bo Zhang, Dongdong Chen, Lu Yuan, and Baining Guo. Vector quantized diffusion model for text-to-image synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10696–10706, 2022. 3
- [19] Yuchao Gu, Xintao Wang, Jay Zhangjie Wu, Yujun Shi, Yunpeng Chen, Zihan Fan, Wuyou Xiao, Rui Zhao, Shuning Chang, Weijia Wu, et al. Mix-of-show: Decentralized low-rank adaptation for multi-concept customization of diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [20] Yixin Guo, Yu Liu, Jianghao Li, Weimin Wang, and Qi Jia. Unseen no more: Unlocking the potential of CLIP for generative zero-shot HOI detection. In *ACM Multimedia 2024*, 2024. 3
- [21] Ligong Han, Yinxiao Li, Han Zhang, Peyman Milanfar, Dimitris Metaxas, and Feng Yang. Svdiff: Compact parameter space for diffusion fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 7323–7334, 2023. 3, 6
- [22] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross attention control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01626*, 2022. 3, 6, 1
- [23] Amir Hertz, Kfir Aberman, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Delta denoising score. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2328–2337, 2023. 6, 3
- [24] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 3
- [25] Jiun Tian Hoe, Xudong Jiang, Chee Seng Chan, Yap-Peng Tan, and Weipeng Hu. Interactdiffusion: Interaction control in text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6180–6189, 2024. 2, 3

- [26] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2, 3, 5
- [27] Hexiang Hu, Kelvin CK Chan, Yu-Chuan Su, Wenhui Chen, Yandong Li, Kihyuk Sohn, Yang Zhao, Xue Ben, Boqing Gong, William Cohen, et al. Instruct-imagen: Image generation with multi-modal instruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4754–4763, 2024. 3
- [28] Xinting Hu, Haoran Wang, Jan Eric Lenssen, and Bernt Schiele. Personahoi: Effortlessly improving personalized face with human-object interaction generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.05823*, 2025. 2, 3
- [29] Ziqi Huang, Tianxing Wu, Yuming Jiang, Kelvin C.K. Chan, and Ziwei Liu. ReVersion: Diffusion-based relation inversion from images. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2024 Conference Papers*, 2024. 2
- [30] Inbar Huberman-Spiegelglas, Vladimir Kulikov, and Tomer Michaeli. An edit friendly DDPM noise space: Inversion and manipulations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12469–12478, 2024. 3
- [31] Inbar Huberman-Spiegelglas, Vladimir Kulikov, and Tomer Michaeli. An edit friendly DDPM noise space: Inversion and manipulations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12469–12478, 2024. 6
- [32] Nan Jiang, Tengyu Liu, Zhexiong Cao, Jieming Cui, Zhiyuan Zhang, Yixin Chen, He Wang, Yixin Zhu, and Siyuan Huang. Full-body articulated human-object interaction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9365–9376, 2023. 2
- [33] Zeyinzi Jiang, Chaojie Mao, Yulin Pan, Zhen Han, and Jingfeng Zhang. Scedit: Efficient and controllable image diffusion generation via skip connection editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8995–9004, 2024. 3
- [34] Jian-Yu Jiang-Lin, Kang-Yang Huang, Ling Lo, Yi-Ning Huang, Terence Lin, Jihui-Ciang Wu, Hong-Han Shuai, and Wen-Huang Cheng. Record: Reasoning and correcting diffusion for hoi generation. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2024. 2, 3
- [35] 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. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition 2023*, 2023. 3, 6, 2
- [36] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. 6
- [37] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 6
- [38] Nupur Kumari, Bingliang Zhang, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Multi-concept customization of text-to-image diffusion. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3
- [39] Jiaming Lei, Lin Li, Chungping Wang, Jun Xiao, and Long Chen. Seeing beyond classes: Zero-shot grounded situation recognition via language explainer. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 1602–1611, 2024. 6
- [40] Qinqian Lei, Bo Wang, and Tan Robby T. Ez-hoi: Vlm adaptation via guided prompt learning for zero-shot hoi detection. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. 3
- [41] Dongxu Li, Junnan Li, and Steven Hoi. Blip-diffusion: Pre-trained subject representation for controllable text-to-image generation and editing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [42] Liulei Li, Wenguan Wang, and Yi Yang. Human-object interaction detection collaborated with large relation-driven diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20155*, 2024. 2, 3
- [43] Yuheng Li, Haotian Liu, Qingyang Wu, Fangzhou Mu, Jianwei Yang, Jianfeng Gao, Chunyuan Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Gligen: Open-set grounded text-to-image generation. In *CVPR*, pages 22511–22521, 2023. 3
- [44] Haofeng Liu, Chenshu Xu, Yifei Yang, Lihua Zeng, and Shengfeng He. Drag your noise: Interactive point-based editing via diffusion semantic propagation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6743–6752, 2024. 3
- [45] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023. 6
- [46] Yunze Liu, Yun Liu, Che Jiang, Kangbo Lyu, Weikang Wan, Hao Shen, Boqiang Liang, Zhoujie Fu, He Wang, and Li Yi. Hoi4d: A 4d egocentric dataset for category-level human-object interaction. In *CVPR*, pages 21013–21022, 2022. 1
- [47] Zhiheng Liu, Ruili Feng, Kai Zhu, Yifei Zhang, Kecheng Zheng, Yu Liu, Deli Zhao, Jingren Zhou, and Yang Cao. Cones: Concept neurons in diffusion models for customized generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05125*, 2023. 3
- [48] Zhiheng Liu, Yifei Zhang, Yujun Shen, Kecheng Zheng, Kai Zhu, Ruili Feng, Yu Liu, Deli Zhao, Jingren Zhou, and Yang Cao. Cones 2: Customizable image synthesis with multiple subjects. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 57500–57519, 2023. 3
- [49] Jinguo Luo, Weihong Ren, Weibo Jiang, Xi'ai Chen, Qiang Wang, Zhi Han, and Honghai Liu. Discovering syntactic interaction clues for human-object interaction detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 28212–28222, 2024. 2, 3
- [50] Jian Ma, Junhao Liang, Chen Chen, and Haonan Lu. Subject-diffusion: Open domain personalized text-to-image generation without test-time fine-tuning. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2024 Conference Papers*, pages 1–12, 2024. 3

- [51] Chenlin Meng, Yutong He, Yang Song, Jiaming Song, Jianjun Wu, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Stefano Ermon. SDEdit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 3
- [52] Sicheng Mo, Fangzhou Mu, Kuan Heng Lin, Yanli Liu, Bochen Guan, Yin Li, and Bolei Zhou. Freecontrol: Training-free spatial control of any text-to-image diffusion model with any condition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07536*, 2023. 3
- [53] Ron Mokady, Amir Hertz, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Null-text inversion for editing real images using guided diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6038–6047, 2023. 6, 1
- [54] Romero Morais, Vuong Le, Svetha Venkatesh, and Truyen Tran. Learning asynchronous and sparse human-object interaction in videos. In *CVPR*, pages 16041–16050, 2021. 1
- [55] Chong Mou, Xintao Wang, Jiechong Song, Ying Shan, and Jian Zhang. Dragondiffusion: Enabling drag-style manipulation on diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02421*, 2023. 3
- [56] Chong Mou, Xintao Wang, Jiechong Song, Ying Shan, and Jian Zhang. Diffeditor: Boosting accuracy and flexibility on diffusion-based image editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8488–8497, 2024. 3
- [57] Hyelin Nam, Gihyun Kwon, Geon Yeong Park, and Jong Chul Ye. Contrastive denoising score for text-guided latent diffusion image editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9192–9201, 2024. 6, 2
- [58] Kam Woh Ng, Xiatian Zhu, Yi-Zhe Song, and Tao Xiang. Partcraft: Crafting creative objects by parts. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [59] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10741*, 2021. 3
- [60] Alexander Quinn Nichol and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8162–8171. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [61] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 6
- [62] Quynh Phung, Songwei Ge, and Jia-Bin Huang. Grounded text-to-image synthesis with attention refocusing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7932–7942, 2024. 3
- [63] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023. 3, 6
- [64] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- [65] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, 2021. 3
- [66] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 22500–22510, 2023. 4, 8
- [67] Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Saurabh Saxena, Lala Li, Jay Whang, Emily L Denton, Kamyar Ghasemipour, Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Burcu Karagol Ayan, Tim Salimans, et al. Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding. In *NeurIPS*, pages 36479–36494, 2022. 3
- [68] Jing Shi, Wei Xiong, Zhe Lin, and Hyun Joon Jung. Instantbooth: Personalized text-to-image generation without test-time finetuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8543–8552, 2024. 3
- [69] Yujun Shi, Chuhui Xue, Jun Hao Liew, Jiachun Pan, Hanshu Yan, Wenqing Zhang, Vincent YF Tan, and Song Bai. Dragdiffusion: Harnessing diffusion models for interactive point-based image editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8839–8849, 2024. 3
- [70] Xincheng Shuai, Henghui Ding, Xingjun Ma, Rongcheng Tu, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Dacheng Tao. A survey of multimodal-guided image editing with text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14555*, 2024. 2, 3
- [71] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2256–2265. PMLR, 2015. 3
- [72] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 3
- [73] Xue Song, Jiequan Cui, Hanwang Zhang, Jingjing Chen, Richang Hong, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Doubly abductive counterfactual inference for text-based image editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9162–9171, 2024. 3, 6, 2
- [74] Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 3
- [75] Linoy Tsaban and Apolinário Passos. Ledits: Real image editing with ddpm inversion and semantic guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00522*, 2023. 3
- [76] Narek Tumanyan, Michal Geyer, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. Plug-and-play diffusion features for text-driven

- image-to-image translation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1921–1930, 2023. 3, 6, 1
- [77] Qixun Wang, Xu Bai, Haofan Wang, Zekui Qin, Anthony Chen, Huaxia Li, Xu Tang, and Yao Hu. Instantid: Zero-shot identity-preserving generation in seconds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07519*, 2024. 3
- [78] Su Wang, Chitwan Saharia, Ceslee Montgomery, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Shai Noy, Stefano Pellegrini, Yasumasa Onoe, Sarah Laszlo, David J Fleet, Radu Soricut, et al. Imagen editor and editbench: Advancing and evaluating text-guided image inpainting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 18359–18369, 2023. 3
- [79] X Wang, Siming Fu, Qihan Huang, Wanggui He, and Hao Jiang. Ms-diffusion: Multi-subject zero-shot image personalization with layout guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07209*, 2024. 3
- [80] Jinheng Xie, Yuexiang Li, Yawen Huang, Haozhe Liu, Wentian Zhang, Yefeng Zheng, and Mike Zheng Shou. Boxdiff: Text-to-image synthesis with training-free box-constrained diffusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 7452–7461, 2023. 3
- [81] Sihan Xu, Yidong Huang, Jiayi Pan, Ziqiao Ma, and Joyce Chai. Inversion-free image editing with natural language. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition 2024*, 2024. 6, 3
- [82] Tang Xu, Wenbin Wang, and Alin Zhong. Hoiedit: Human-object interaction editing with text-to-image diffusion model. *The Visual Computer*, pages 1–13, 2025. 3, 6, 1, 8
- [83] ChangHee Yang, ChanHee Kang, Kyeongbo Kong, Hanni Oh, and Suk-Ju Kang. Person in place: Generating associative skeleton-guidance maps for human-object interaction image editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8164–8175, 2024. 3
- [84] Yuhang Yang, Wei Zhai, Hongchen Luo, Yang Cao, and Zheng-Jun Zha. Lemon: Learning 3d human-object interaction relation from 2d images. In *CVPR*, pages 16284–16295, 2024. 1
- [85] Hu Ye, Jun Zhang, Sibio Liu, Xiao Han, and Wei Yang. Ip-adapter: Text compatible image prompt adapter for text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06721*, 2023. 3
- [86] Hangjie Yuan, Shiwei Zhang, Xiang Wang, Samuel Albanie, Yining Pan, Tao Feng, Jianwen Jiang, Dong Ni, Yingya Zhang, and Deli Zhao. Rlipv2: Fast scaling of relational language-image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023. 3
- [87] Frederic Z. Zhang, Yuhui Yuan, Dylan Campbell, Zhuoyao Zhong, and Stephen Gould. Exploring predicate visual context in detecting human-object interactions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 10411–10421, 2023. 3, 6
- [88] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3836–3847, 2023. 3
- [89] Guangcong Zheng, Xianpan Zhou, Xuewei Li, Zhongang Qi, Ying Shan, and Xi Li. Layoutdiffusion: Controllable diffusion model for layout-to-image generation. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3

InteractEdit: Zero-Shot Editing of Human-Object Interactions in Images

Supplementary Material

7. Framework Details

We build on Break-A-Scene [1] and treat the subject, object and background as three distinct concepts. In each source image, the HOI is represented by these components, encoded as randomly initialized, learnable token embeddings ($\Phi_s, \Phi_o, \Phi_{bg}$). These embeddings are incorporated into text prompts and optimized during fine-tuning. Each concept is associated with a mask M_i , where $i \in s, o, bg$, which defines its spatial region within the image. At each training step, a subset of $k \leq N$ concepts is randomly selected, and a corresponding text prompt C_{source} is constructed. For example, if the subject and background are chosen, the text prompt takes the form: “a photo of $[\Phi_s]$ and $[\Phi_{bg}]$.” Following Break-A-Scene, a masked version of standard diffusion loss is then applied, ensuring that only the pixels covered by the selected concept masks contribute to optimization:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_t, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1), t} [\|\epsilon \odot M_U - \epsilon_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}_t, t, C_{\text{source}}) \odot M_U\|_2^2], \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{z}_t is the noisy latent at timestep t , C_{source} is the text prompt, M_U is the union of the corresponding masks, ϵ is the added noise, and, $\epsilon_{\theta}(\cdot)$ is the denoising network.

To further disentangle different concepts, an additional loss is imposed on the cross-attention maps to explicitly align each concept token Φ_i with its corresponding spatial region defined by the mask M_i , where $i \in s, o, bg$ (subject, object, and background). The cross-attention loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{attn}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_t, t, i} [\|\text{CA}_{\theta}(\Phi_i, \mathbf{z}_t) - M_i\|_2^2], \quad (10)$$

where $\text{CA}_{\theta}(\Phi_i, \mathbf{z}_t)$ is the cross-attention map between the token Φ_i and the noisy latent \mathbf{z}_t . The U-Net contains attention layers at various resolutions. For our method, cross-attention maps are extracted at a 16×16 resolution, averaged across all corresponding U-Net layers, and normalized to the range (0,1). This regularization ensures that each learned concept token effectively corresponds to its spatial region, preventing entanglement between different concepts.

The total loss combines the masked reconstruction loss and the cross-attention alignment loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} + \lambda_{\text{attn}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{attn}}, \quad (11)$$

where $\lambda_{\text{attn}} = 0.01$ following Break-A-Scene.

We fine-tune the model on the source image at a resolution of 512×512 and generate edited images at 1024×1024 , aligning with the native resolution of Stable Diffusion XL. During fine-tuning, we integrate LoRA regularization

(Sec. 3.4) and Selective Fine-Tuning (Sec. 3.5) to balance identity preservation and interaction adaptability.

Within the U-Net architecture, we adopt a selective training approach where only the Key (W_K) and Value (W_V) weights in the self-attention and cross-attention layers are updated, while the Query (W_Q) weights remain frozen. These updates are performed using low-rank modifications with LoRA to constrain fine-tuning and prevent overfitting. Specifically, the original pretrained weights (W_{original}) remain frozen, and only the low-rank LoRA weights (A and B) are trained. Together, these LoRA-adapted weights across all U-Net blocks form Φ_{fit} , which encapsulates the learned adjustments that adapt the model to the source image while maintaining interaction priors.

8. Implementation Details

To facilitate fair comparisons in the HOI editing task, we re-implemented existing methods as part of our benchmark. This re-implementation aims to standardize evaluation practices and support future research efforts in this area. The re-implemented methods will be made open-source alongside our benchmark. In this section, we provide detailed descriptions of how each method was implemented.

Null-Text Inversion [53] is implemented with Prompt-to-Prompt [22], following the official code¹. Null-Text Inversion enables real-image inversion, and the editing process is performed with Prompt-to-Prompt. For inversion, we use a null inversion prompt (“”), while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”. We use Stable Diffusion v1.5 with a guidance scale of 7.5 and 50 sampling steps.

PnP Diffusion [76] is implemented following the official diffusers code². We adhere to the default hyperparameters: $\tau_f = 0.8, \tau_A = 0.5, \text{timesteps} = 50$ and use Stable Diffusion 2.1. For inversion, we use a null inversion prompt (“”), while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

MasaCtrl [5] is implemented following the official code³. We use Stable Diffusion v1.4 as are unable to reproduce the method on Stable Diffusion XL. We follow the default hyperparameters: $S = 4, L = 10$. For inversion, we use a null inversion prompt (“”), while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

HOIEdit [82] is implemented following the official code

¹<https://github.com/google/prompt-to-prompt>

²<https://github.com/MichalGeyer/pnp-diffusers>

³<https://github.com/TencentARC/MasaCtrl>




Figure 6. Qualitative comparison with more existing baselines. The Source column shows the source image and its original interaction. For each instance, two target interactions are generated. Our method demonstrates the best HOI editability.

⁴ We use Stable Diffusion v1.4 and follow the default hyperparameters: $S = 4, L = 10$. Following the paper, for inversion, we use a null inversion prompt (“”), while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “[subject] ; R_{ζ} [object]”, which yields the best outcome in preserving identity while accurately modifying the interaction, where ; R_{ζ} is trained interaction token using ReVersion [29]. To train the interaction token, for all 25 actions in IEBench, we randomly select 10 images as the training image.

Imagic [35] is implemented following the community-provided code ⁵. We use Stable Diffusion v1.5 and adopt the default hyperparameters from the community code: $\eta = 1.2$, Although this value differs from the official implemen-

tation, we find it produces better results in our experiments. For editing, the target prompt is formatted as: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

CDS [57] is implemented following the official code ⁶. We use Stable Diffusion v1.5 and follow the default hyperparameters: $\ell_{\text{con}} = 3.0, \ell_{\text{DDS}} = 1.0$. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

DAC [73] is implemented following the official code ⁷. We use Stable Diffusion v2.1 and follow the default hyperparameters: annealing of 0.8, and use a guidance scale of 4.0 and 30 inference steps. For abduction 1, which performs

⁴<https://github.com/Kenneth-Wong/hoiedit>
⁵https://github.com/huggingface/diffusers/blob/main/examples/community/imagic_stable_diffusion.py

⁶<https://github.com/HyelinNAM/ContrastiveDenoisingScore>

⁷<https://github.com/xuesong39/DAC>



Figure 7. Qualitative comparison with more existing baselines. The Source column shows the source image and its original interaction. For each instance, two target interactions are generated. Our method demonstrates the best HOI editability.

the inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for abduction 2, which related to the editing, we use the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

LEDITS++ [3] is implemented following the official code⁸. We use Stable Diffusion XL and follow the default parameters: edit guidance scale of [5.0, 10.0] and edit threshold of [0.9, 0.85] with edit direction of [reverse, forward] for source and target concepts. Since LEDITS++ requires the invert prompt to be the target concept, we let it be “[source interaction]”, while the target prompt is “[target interaction]”.

InstructPix2Pix [4] is implemented follow-

⁸https://github.com/huggingface/diffusers/tree/main/src/diffusers/pipelines/ledits_pp

ing the community-provided code⁹. We use Stable Diffusion XL based pretrained weight `diffusers/sd-xl-instructpix2pix-768` and adopt the following hyperparameters: image guidance of 1.5, guidance scale of 3.0 and 100 inference steps. The target prompt is formatted as: “Make [subject] [target interaction] [object]”, as the method requires the prompt to be given as an instruction.

ReNoise [15] is implemented following the official code¹⁰. We use Stable Diffusion XL Turbo and use the following hyperparameters: 4 inversion steps, 4 inference steps, 9 renoise steps, $\lambda_{\text{pair}} = 20.0$, $\lambda_{\text{patch-KL}} = 0.065$. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

TurboEdit [8] is implemented following the official code¹¹. We use Stable Diffusion XL Turbo and use the following hyperparameters: pseudo-guidance scale $w = 1.5$ and 4 denoising steps. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

SVDiff [21] is implemented following the community-provided code¹². We use Stable Diffusion v1.5. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

Edit Friendly DDPM [30] is implemented following the official code¹³. We use Stable Diffusion v1.5 and use the following default hyperparameters: strength = 15, $T_{\text{skip}} = 36$, $\eta = 1$ and 100 inference steps. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

DDS [23] is implemented following the official code¹⁴. We use Stable Diffusion v2.1 and use the default hyperparameters. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

InfEdit [81] is implemented following the official code

⁹https://github.com/huggingface/diffusers/tree/main/examples/instruct_pix2pix

¹⁰<https://github.com/garibida/ReNoise-Inversion>

¹¹<https://github.com/GiilDe/turbo-edit>

¹²<https://github.com/mkshing/svdiff-pytorch>

¹³https://github.com/inbarhub/DDPM_inversion

¹⁴https://github.com/google/prompt-to-prompt/blob/main/DDS_zeroshot.ipynb

¹⁵. Following the paper, we use Stable Diffusion v1.5 (SimianLuo/LCM_Dreamshaper_v7) and use the following default hyperparameters: source guidance scale of 1, target guidance scale of 2, cross replace steps of 0.3, self replace steps of 0.3, target blend threshold of 0.3, source blend threshold of 0.3, and inference steps of 15. For inversion, we use a source prompt which follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [source interaction] [object]”, while for editing, the target prompt follows the format: “a photo of [subject] [target interaction] [object]”.

Break-A-Scene [1] is implemented following the official code ¹⁶. We use Stable Diffusion v2.1 and use the following default hyperparameters: $\lambda_{\text{attn}} = 0.01$. We fine-tune 400 steps in stage 1 and 800 steps in stage 2 with the default learning rate of $5e-4$ and $2e-6$, which we found to work well empirically. For fair comparison, we re-implement **Break-A-Scene XL** which is based on Stable Diffusion XL (SG161222/RealVisXL_V4.0). We use $\lambda_{\text{attn}} = 0.01$ and fine-tune 1000 steps in stage 1 and 200 steps in stage 2, with a learning rate of $3e-4$ and $2e-6$ respectively, which we found to work well empirically.

8.1. Resources Analysis

To analyze the resource usage of each method, we evaluate the time and memory consumption, as detailed in Tab. 3. All experiments are conducted using a single NVIDIA A100 SXM4 80GB GPU, and the analysis is based on the resource usage required to complete IEBench. For most image editing methods, the total time taken is the sum of the time spent on source image inversion (28 inversions) and generating the edited images (1000 edits). However, some methods deviate from this standard workflow:

- **HOIEdit**: Requires training an interaction token for each action. For IEBench, with 18 different target actions, the training process takes a total of 58,320 seconds.
- **Imagic**: Performs inversion using both the target prompt and source images, requiring 100 inversions for IEBench.
- **DAC**: Involves two types of inversion: Induction-1 (once per source image, 28 inversions) and Induction-2 (per source-target pair, 100 inversions, see Others column in Tab. 3).
- **InstructPix2Pix**: Requires extensive pretraining on a large instruction-image pair dataset. The pretraining dataset¹⁷, contains 313010 edit instruction-image pairs. InstructPix2Pix was trained for 15,000 steps using 8x NVIDIA A100 GPUs with a batch size of 32¹⁸.
- **ReNoise**: Performs inversion for each generated image, resulting in 1000 inversions for IEBench.
- **TurboEdit**: Integrates inversion into the editing process.

¹⁵<https://github.com/sled-group/InfEdit>

¹⁶<https://github.com/google/break-a-scene>

¹⁷[timbrooks/instructpix2pix-clip-filtered](https://github.com/timbrooks/instructpix2pix-clip-filtered)

¹⁸<https://huggingface.co/diffusers/sdxl-instructpix2pix-768>




Figure 8. User preferences for each interaction edit.

Due to the inherent properties of latent inversion, some methods (Null-Text Inversion with Prompt-to-Prompt, PnP Diffusion, MasaCtrl, HOIEdit, LEDITS++, and Edit-Friendly DDPM) initialize the editing from a fixed inverted noise rather than random noise, resulting in deterministic editing outcomes with no variation across multiple generations. Nevertheless, to ensure a fair comparison with other methods, we report the time required to generate 10 edits, maintaining consistency with the evaluation protocol.

Our proposed method, InteractEdit, achieves comparable computational efficiency to existing methods while significantly enhancing HOI editability. Unlike HOIEdit, which relies on costly interaction token training, InteractEdit operates in a zero-shot manner without requiring interaction inversion. Furthermore, InteractEdit requires less than 15GB of GPU memory, making it practical for mainstream GPUs.

9. More Qualitative Results

In Fig. 6, we provide a more visual comparison on same source images as in Fig. 3 for methods that are not in the main paper. Fig. 12 extends the comparison to additional source images. Compared to other methods, our method successfully enables interaction edits while maintaining the identity.

Table 3. Comparison between InteractEdit and existing baselines in terms of resource cost. Total time taken is computed as the total required time to complete IEBench, while average time taken is averaged over the number of image generated. Most methods perform inversion per source image and editing per generated image, except for HOIEdit, Imagic, DAC, ReNoise, and TurboEdit, which follow different workflows. † indicates methods requiring pretraining, pretraining time is not included in this table. * “Others” refers to the total time taken for training interaction tokens. ‡ “Others” refers to Induction-2, which requires 100 times. For further details, refer to Sec. 8.1.

Method	Base	Time Taken (s)			Total (min)	Average (s)	GPU Memory (GB)	
		Inversion	Editing	Others			Inversion	Editing
NTI	SDv1.5	18.81	4.56		85	5.09	11.14	11.15
PnP	SDv2.1	50.16			130	7.81	3.84	7.97
MasaCtrl	SDv1.4	3.68	10.36		174	10.46	6.07	12.48
HOIEdit	SDv1.4	46.93	14.07	81000*	1606	96.38	11.07	20.57
Imagic	SDv1.5	244.98	3.81		472	28.31	18.83	19.93
CDS	SDv1.5	-	34.19		570	34.19	-	10.23
DAC	SDv2.1	330.52	5.07	335.88‡	799	47.91	16.43	9.71
LEDITS++	SDXL	4.13	4.46		76	4.58	9.45	9.45
InstructPix2Pix †	SDXL	-	74.44		1241	74.44	-	12.36
ReNoise	SDXL Turbo	4.99	0.36		89	5.35	8.38	9.36
TurboEdit	SDXL Turbo	-	1.31		22	1.31	-	23.88
SVDiff	SDv1.5	330.01	22.4		527	31.64	15.89	12.65
Edit Friendly DDPM	SDv1.5	9.07	5.79		101	6.04	6.32	6.95
DDS	SDv2.1	-	9.23		154	9.23	-	7.32
InfEdit	SDv1.5	-	3.92		65	3.92	-	15.58
Break-A-Scene	SDv2.1	274.3	1.42		152	9.10	27.79	4.09
Break-A-Scene XL	SDXL	502.15	5.34		323	19.40	65.84	14.55
InteractEdit	SDXL	466.27	5.92		316	18.98	14.11	14.74

10. User Study Details

We select NTI, TurboEdit, and EditFriendly DDPM for the user study as they were the most effective interaction editing methods before our approach. HOIEdit is included due to its specialization in HOI editing, while Break-A-Scene XL serves as our baseline. For a fair comparison, the participants selected the best result from six methods across 15 interaction edits, with options randomly shuffled to minimize bias.

To assess user preferences, we conducted an online survey where participants were instructed to evaluate the edits based on three criteria: (1) adherence to the target interaction—how well the edit reflects the intended action, (2) identity consistency—whether the subject and object retain their original appearance, and (3) realism—how natural and visually plausible the edit appears.

In our user study, participants evaluated edits ranging from subtle action transitions to significant pose and structural modifications. Complex edits such as *jump* → *hold/ride/sit on skateboard* require adjusting both the subject’s pose and the spatial relationship with the object, making them particularly challenging for existing methods. Similarly, *ride* → *feed/wash/kiss horse* involve close-contact interactions that demand precise alterations to the subject’s positioning while preserving identity consistency.

Edits involving a sports ball, such as *kick* → *catch/dribble/hold ball* assess a model’s ability to modify hand and foot placement while maintaining a natural transition between actions. Similarly, *hold* → *jump/ride/sit on skateboard* require adapting the subject’s posture while ensuring the skateboard remains a consistent object in the scene. Finally, hand-object interaction edits like *hit* → *catch/hold/hit ball* evaluate whether the model can effectively modify the action without introducing artifacts or unnatural grasp on the object. These diverse edits allow us to assess how well different methods handle a range of interaction modifications, from subtle changes to full-body pose adjustments.

Fig. 8 provides insights into user preferences for different interaction edits. Across 14 out of 15 interaction edits, our method is the most preferred. In some more challenging edits, such as *hold skateboard* → *sit on skateboard* and *ride horse* → *kiss/wash/feed horse*, our method significantly outperforms others, due to its ability to modify interaction while preserving identity. For more common interaction, like *kick ball* → *dribble ball*, *hit ball* → *catch/throw ball*, preferences are more diverse, suggesting that multiple methods can achieve reasonable results in simpler interaction modifications.



Figure 9. Source images included in IEBenchmark, covering a diverse range of human-object interactions.

Table 4. Objects and Their Candidate Target Interactions in IEBenchmark.

Object	Target Interactions
Broccoli	cut, eat, hold, smell, wash
Dining table	clean, eat at, sit at
Skateboard	hold, jump, ride, sit on
Chair	hold, lie on, sit on, stand on
Book	carry, hold, read
Snowboard	hold, jump, ride
Surfboard	hold, jump, ride, sit on
Sports ball	catch, dribble, hit, hold, kick, throw
Cake	blow, cut, eat, hold, make
Horse	feed, kiss, ride, walk, wash
Dog	feed, groom, hug, walk, wash
Pizza	cut, eat, hold, make, pick up
Cat	feed, hold, hug, kiss, wash

11. IEBenchmark Details

Our proposed IEBenchmark consists of 28 source images covering 25 actions and 13 objects, forming a total of 100 unique \langle source image, target interaction \rangle pairs. The full set of actions includes: *feed, make, pick up, sit on, hit, ride, walk, cut, eat at, jump, throw, dribble, smell, kick, hug, eat, hold, catch, sit at, wash, stand on, kiss, groom, carry, and lie*

on. The objects included in the benchmark are: *skateboard, chair, pizza, broccoli, horse, book, snowboard, cat, cake, dining table, sports ball, dog, and surfboard*.

To ensure diverse and meaningful interaction editing scenarios, each object is paired with multiple target interactions, as detailed in Tab. 4. The complete set of source images used in IEBenchmark is illustrated in Fig. 9.

Listing 1 describes the process of determining whether an edited image successfully reflects the target interaction using an HOI detector, while Listing 2 outlines the method for computing identity consistency by comparing feature embeddings of the subject and object in the source and edited images.

The final evaluation scores for each method are obtained by averaging HOI Editability (binary success rate) and Identity Consistency (cosine similarity) across all instances in IEBenchmark, providing a comprehensive assessment of both interaction accuracy and appearance preservation.

12. More Ablation Studies

Fig. 10 presents the effect of varying the rank of Key and Value matrices, r_K and r_V , on HOI editability, showing a sharp decline when r_K exceed r_V . Fig. 11 evaluates their impact on Identity Consistency, showing that both high r_K with low r_V and low r_K with high r_V lead to poor consistency. while increasing the rank generally improves HOI




Figure 10. HOI editability for different ranks of K and V.




Figure 11. Identity consistency for different ranks of K and V.

editability, excessively high values may lead to diminished gains. We set both r_K and r_V to 64, achieving a balance between HOI editability and Identity Consistency.

13. Societal Impact

Our work on human-object interaction (HOI) editing has the potential to benefit multiple fields while also presenting ethical considerations that must be carefully managed.

On the positive side, our method enables more precise and efficient image editing, which can support applications in education, entertainment, accessibility, and digital content creation. In gaming and virtual worlds, it allows for more diverse and realistic character interactions, enhanc-

```

1 def compute_hoi_match(edited_image, act, obj):
2     """
3     Compute HOI Match by detecting interactions
4     in the edited image.
5
6     Args:
7         edited_image: Edited image.
8         act: Action (verb) for the target
9         interaction.
10        obj: Object for the target interaction.
11
12     Returns:
13         score (1 if successful, else 0).
14     """
15     # Step 1: Detect all interactions in the
16     # edited image
17     detections = HOIDetector.detect(edited_image)
18
19     # Step 2: Filter interactions based on target
20     # action and object with a confidence
21     # threshold
22     matches = HOIDetector.filter(
23         detections,
24         act,
25         obj,
26         confidence=0.1,
27     )
28
29     # Step 3: Select the interaction with the
30     # highest confidence
31     score = 1 if len(matches) > 0 else 0
32
33     return score

```

Listing 1. Pseudocode for computing HOI match

ing user immersion. In e-commerce and advertising, businesses can generate adaptable product demonstrations without requiring extensive photoshoots. In visual storytelling, artists and content creators can efficiently modify interactions to better convey narratives. Additionally, this technology could aid educational tools by providing interactive visual explanations of real-world interactions.

However, the ability to modify interactions in existing images also introduces ethical risks, particularly regarding misuse and misinformation. The potential to alter interactions in photographs raises concerns about deepfake-style manipulation, deceptive content, and misleading visual narratives. There is a risk that such technology could be used for unethical purposes, such as fabricating events or modifying evidence. Ensuring responsible usage requires clear guidelines, watermarking, or detection mechanisms to prevent misuse in sensitive contexts.

14. Limitations

While InteractEdit enables effective zero-shot HOI editing, it has several limitations. First, it relies on the pretrained diffusion model’s prior knowledge, making it struggle with

```

1 def compute_identity_consistency(source_image, edited_image, subject_label, object_label):
2     """
3     Compute Identity Consistency (IC) by comparing subject and object embeddings.
4
5     Args:
6     source_image (Image): Original source image.
7     edited_image (Image): Edited image generated by the HOI editing model.
8     subject_label (str): Label of the subject (e.g., "person").
9     object_label (str): Label of the object (e.g., "dog", "ball").
10
11     Returns:
12     float: Average cosine similarity score between subject and object embeddings.
13     """
14     # Step 1: Detect subject and object bounding boxes in source and edited images
15     source_subject_box = GroundingDINO.detect_entity(source_image, subject_label)
16     source_object_box = GroundingDINO.detect_entity(source_image, object_label)
17     edited_subject_box = GroundingDINO.detect_entity(edited_image, subject_label)
18     edited_object_box = GroundingDINO.detect_entity(edited_image, object_label)
19
20     # Step 2: Segment subject and object using SAM with detected bounding boxes
21     source_subject_mask = SAM.segment(source_image, source_subject_box)
22     source_object_mask = SAM.segment(source_image, source_object_box)
23     edited_subject_mask = SAM.segment(edited_image, edited_subject_box)
24     edited_object_mask = SAM.segment(edited_image, edited_object_box)
25
26     # Step 3: Extract feature embeddings using SigLIP
27     source_subject_feat = SigLIP.extract_features(source_image, source_subject_mask)
28     source_object_feat = SigLIP.extract_features(source_image, source_object_mask)
29     edited_subject_feat = SigLIP.extract_features(edited_image, edited_subject_mask)
30     edited_object_feat = SigLIP.extract_features(edited_image, edited_object_mask)
31
32     # Step 4: Compute cosine similarity for subject and object
33     subject_similarity = cosine_similarity(source_subject_feat, edited_subject_feat)
34     object_similarity = cosine_similarity(source_object_feat, edited_object_feat)
35
36     # Step 5: Compute final Identity Consistency score (average of subject & object similarity)
37     identity_consistency = (subject_similarity + object_similarity) / 2
38
39     return identity_consistency

```

Listing 2. Pseudocode for computing Identity Consistency

uncommon or unseen interactions, leading to unrealistic edits when prior knowledge is lacking. Enhancing the model’s knowledge base or incorporating additional guidance could address this issue.

Second, InteractEdit is limited to modifying a single interaction per image and cannot handle multiple simultaneous interactions, which are common in real-world scenarios. Extending the framework to support multi-interaction editing requires further advancements in structured interaction representation.

Third, while more efficient than methods requiring full retraining, such as HOIEdit [82], InteractEdit still involves fine-tuning, making it more computationally demanding than purely text-guided editing. Reducing resource overhead while maintaining edit quality remains an important direction for future work.



Figure 12. More qualitative comparison. Our method demonstrates the best HOI editability.