

CASteer: Steering Diffusion Models for Controllable Generation

Tatiana Gaintseva^{1,2} Chengcheng Ma³ Ziquan Liu¹ Martin Benning⁴
 Gregory Slabaugh¹ Jiankang Deng^{2,5} Ismail Elezi²

¹Queen Mary University of London ²Huawei Noah’s Ark ³CASIA
⁴University College London ⁵Imperial College London



Figure 1. Some of the properties of CASteer: (a) adding concrete concepts (apples); (b) switching from a concrete concept (cat) to another one (giraffe); (c) switching from an identity (Leonardo DiCaprio) to another one (Keanu Reeves); (d) removing an identity to a generic man; (e) adding an abstract concept (happiness); (f) removing an abstract concept (angriness); (g) removing a concrete concept (apple); (h) style transfer to origami style. In all cases, CASteer is training free.

Abstract

Diffusion models have transformed image generation, yet controlling their outputs for diverse applications, including content moderation and creative customization, remains challenging. Existing approaches usually require task-specific training and struggle to generalize across both concrete (e.g., objects) and abstract (e.g., styles) concepts. We propose CASteer (**C**ross-**A**ttention **S**teering) a training-free framework for controllable image generation using steering vectors to influence a diffusion model’s hidden representations dynamically. CASteer computes these vectors offline by averaging activations from concept-specific generated images, then applies them during inference via a dynamic heuristic that activates modifications only when necessary, removing concepts from affected images or adding them to unaffected ones. This approach enables precise control over a wide range of tasks, including removing harmful content, adding desired attributes, replacing objects, or altering styles, all without model retraining. CASteer handles

both concrete and abstract concepts, outperforming state-of-the-art techniques across multiple diffusion models while preserving unrelated content and minimizing unintended effects. The code is available at <https://github.com/Atmyre/CASteer>.

1. Introduction

Recent advances in diffusion models [1, 2] have revolutionized image [3] and video generation [4], achieving unprecedented realism. These models operate by gradually adding noise to data during a forward process and then learning to reverse this noise through a series of iterative steps, effectively reconstructing the original data from randomness. By leveraging this denoising process, diffusion models generate high-quality, realistic outputs, making them a powerful tool for creative and generative tasks.

While diffusion models enable transformative creative applications, their capacity to generate hyper-realistic content introduces ethical and practical challenges that extend

beyond immediate harms like deepfakes or misinformation. These models inherently risk amplifying societal vulnerabilities—from eroding trust in digital media to enabling targeted manipulation—but their ethical implications are inseparable from their technical limitations. Current safeguards often address symptoms (e.g., blocking explicit content) rather than developing foundational frameworks to control model behaviour across diverse use cases, limiting their adaptability to evolving risks and applications.

Existing methods for content moderation or concept removal in diffusion models exhibit narrow specialization, hindering their broader applicability. For instance, LoRA-based approaches [5] excel at removing concrete objects or styles but often struggle with abstract concepts (e.g., violence, ideological symbolism) and scale poorly when handling multiple concepts, requiring separate adapters or costly retraining. Text-prompt editing techniques [6] show flexibility for abstract harm reduction but lack precision for fine-grained control of concrete attributes, often failing to generalize across concept distributions. Crucially, these methods are siloed by design: solutions tailored for safety (e.g., nudity filters) do not concurrently address creative tasks like style transfer or character customization [7], necessitating redundant technical pipelines. This fragmentation reflects a broader gap in the field: the absence of unified mechanisms to dynamically steer model outputs across diverse objectives—from ethical safeguards to user-driven content editing—without task-specific engineering.

In this work, we propose CASteer, a training-free method for controllable image generation that leverages the concept of *steering* to influence the network’s hidden representations dynamically. Unlike traditional approaches that require LoRA training, our method operates by computing steering vectors offline. For each concept of interest, we generate k *positive* images (where $k \geq 1$) containing the concept and k *negative* images not containing it and compute the steering vectors by subtracting the averaged hidden representations of the network across *negative* images from that of *positive* ones. During inference, we apply the precomputed vectors to the network’s activations, enabling precise control over the presence or absence of specific concepts in the generated output.

CASteer is versatile, capable of addressing a wide range of concept manipulation tasks, including removing undesirable concepts (e.g., nudity), adding desired ones (e.g., happiness), replacing objects (e.g., swapping one character for another), or altering styles (e.g., converting to a cubist aesthetic). In all cases, these transformations are achieved by adding or removing steering vectors based on the specific requirements of the task. To ensure precision and avoid unintended interference, we design a heuristic that dynamically applies steering vectors only when necessary. That is, for concept removal, the heuristic ensures that steering is

applied exclusively to images containing the target concept, preventing unnecessary alterations to unrelated content.

In summary, our **contributions** are the following:

- We **propose** a novel framework for controllable image generation using *steering* vectors, enabling the addition (or removal) of desirable (or undesirable) concepts without requiring model retraining or fine-tuning.
- We **demonstrate** the flexibility of our method by adding and removing concrete concepts (e.g., specific characters), abstract concepts (e.g., nudity), and multiple concepts, showing its adaptability across diverse use cases.
- We **achieve** state-of-the-art performance across a wide range of tasks and multiple diffusion models, including SD 1.4 and SDXL, validating the robustness of our approach. Our method is able to work on both standard and distilled (e.g., Turbo) diffusion models.

2. Related work

Data-driven AI Safety. Ensuring the safety of image and text-to-image generative models hinges on preventing the generation of harmful or unwanted content. Common approaches include curating training data with licensed material [8, 9], fine-tuning models to suppress harmful outputs [2, 10], or deploying post-hoc content detectors [11, 12]. While promising, these strategies face critical limitations: data filtering introduces inherent biases [10], detectors are computationally efficient but often inaccurate or easily bypassed [13, 14], and model retraining becomes costly when new harmful concepts emerge. Alternative methods leverage text-domain interventions, such as prompt engineering [10], negative prompts [15, 16], or orthogonalizing embeddings of prompt tokens [6]. Yet these remain vulnerable to adversarial attacks, lack flexibility as they operate in discrete space of token embeddings and often fail to address the disconnect between text prompts and visual outputs—models can still generate undesired content even when text guidance is “safe.” Our approach instead operates in the joint image-text latent space of diffusion models, enabling more robust and granular control over generated content without relying solely on textual constraints.

Model-driven AI Safety. Current methods [13, 17, 18] erase unwanted concepts by fine-tuning models to shift probability distributions toward null or surrogate tokens, often combined with regularization or generative replay [19]. While effective, these approaches lack precision, inadvertently altering or removing unrelated concepts. Advanced techniques like SPM [7] and MACE [20] improve specificity via LoRA adapters [5], leveraging transport mechanisms or prompt-guided projections to preserve model integrity. However, while promising for concrete concepts (e.g., Mickey Mouse) they still struggle with abstract concepts (e.g., nudity) and require parameter updates. In contrast, CASteer eliminates training entirely, enabling di-

rect, non-invasive concept suppression in the model’s latent space without collateral damage to unrelated features.

Controllable Image Generation and Editing. While concept erasure is a specific safety challenge, controllable image generation encompasses broader capabilities, from concept addition and composition [21–23] and appearance customization [24] to style-consistent multi-image synthesis [25] and concept intensity modulation [26, 27]. However, most techniques excel only within narrow task domains: methods like Prompt-to-Prompt [26] enable fine-grained control over text-specified concepts (e.g., amplifying or replacing elements), yet fail to fully suppress undesired content, particularly when concepts are implicit or absent from prompts. This task-specific specialization limits their utility for safety-critical erasure, where complete removal is required. CASTeers bridges this gap, enabling precise, universal concept suppression without relying on textual priors or compromising unrelated model capabilities. Another area of research focuses on finding interpretable directions in various intermediate spaces of diffusion models [28–31], which can then be used to control the semantics of generated images. Based on this idea, SDID [23] recently proposed to learn a vector for each given concept, which is then added to intermediate activation of a bottleneck layer of diffusion model during inference to provoke the presence of this concept in generated image. In our work we propose a training-free method for constructing interpretable directions in intermediate activation spaces of diffusion models for more precise control of image generation.

Unified Framework for Controllable Generation. While existing approaches for controlling diffusion models often specialize in narrow tasks—concept erasure, style transfer, or adjusting features, our method establishes a framework unifying these capabilities. Our method does not require architectural modifications or retraining, and achieves state-of-the-art results across diverse challenges (safety-critical concept suppression, fine-grained style adaptation, semantic-preserving edits) through a single training-free paradigm compatible with most diffusion architectures.

3. Methodology

3.1. Method overview

Modern diffusion models with UNet-like [32] Transformers [33] as a backbone use cross-attention layers to guide text-to-image generation. For every image patch and prompt embedding, each cross-attention layer generates a vector matching the size of the image patch embedding. After summation, these vectors transmit text-prompt information to corresponding image regions [26]. To control the semantics of generated images, we modify cross-attention outputs during inference. This allows preventing unwanted semantics (e.g., nudity) or enforcing desired se-




Figure 2. Computing steering vector. We prompt diffusion model with two prompts that differ in a desired concept, e.g. “anime style” and save CA outputs at each timestamp t and each CA layer i . We average these outputs over image patches and get averaged CA outputs $ca_{it}^{pos-avg}$ and $ca_{it}^{neg-avg}$ for each t and i . We then subtract the latter from the former, getting a steering vector for the layer i and timestamp t ca_{it}^{anime}

mantics (e.g., “baroque style” or “happiness”), regardless of the input text prompt’s semantics.

3.2. Construction of steering vectors

We propose to construct steering vectors for each concept we aim to manipulate. These vectors correspond to the cross-attention outputs we modify. Each steering vector matches the size of cross-attention outputs and encodes the desired concept’s information. Depending on the task, we add or subtract these vectors from cross-attention outputs, thereby adding or removing specific concepts from the patches of generated image.

We construct steering vectors as follows. Given a concept X to manipulate, we create paired positive and negative prompts differing only by the inclusion of X . For example, if $X = \text{“baroque style”}$, example prompts are $p_{pos} = \text{“A picture of a man, baroque style”}$ and $p_{neg} = \text{“A picture of a man”}$. Assume a U-Net Transformer has N Transformer blocks, each containing one cross-attention (CA) layer, totaling N CA layers. We generate images from both prompts, saving outputs from each of the N cross-attention layers across all T denoising steps. This yields NT cross-attention output pairs $\langle ca_{it}^{pos}, ca_{it}^{neg} \rangle$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$, where i denotes the layer and t the denoising step. Each ca_{it}^{pos} and ca_{it}^{neg} has dimensions $patch_num_i \times emb_size_i$, corresponding to the number of patches and embedding size at layer i . We then average ca_{it}^{pos} and ca_{it}^{neg} over image patches to obtain averaged cross-attention outputs:




Figure 3. Main pipeline. For adding the concept of X , at each denoising step t , we add steering vector ca_{it}^X multiplied by intensity α to the CA outputs of the layer i . For removing the concept of X , at each denoising step t we compute the dot products between CA outputs of the layer i and steering vector ca_{it}^X , and subtract ca_{it}^X from CA outputs of CA layer i , multiplied by this dot product and erasing intensity β

$$ca_{it}^{pos-avg} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{patch_num_i} ca_{itk}^{pos}}{patch_num_i}, \quad (1)$$

$$ca_{it}^{neg-avg} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{patch_num_i} ca_{itk}^{neg}}{patch_num_i}, \quad (2)$$

where $ca_{it}^{pos-avg}$ and $ca_{it}^{neg-avg}$ are vectors of size emb_size_i . Then, for each of these N layers and each of T denoising steps, we construct a corresponding steering vector carrying a notion of X by subtracting its averaged cross-attention output that corresponds to the negative prompt from that corresponding to the positive one and:

$$ca_{it}^X = f_{norm}(ca_{it}^{pos-avg} - ca_{it}^{neg-avg}). \quad (3)$$

where f_{norm} is a normalization function: $f_{norm}(v) = \frac{v}{\|v\|_2}$. These steering vectors can be intuitively seen as the directions in a space of intermediate representations of a model (in the space of cross-attention activations) that point from an area of embeddings not containing a notion of X to an area of embeddings that contain a notion of X .

3.3. Using steering vectors to control generation

We can use the generated steering vector to perform several types of image manipulations such as concept addition, concept deletion and concept switching.

Concept Addition. We can add a concept X in the resulting image, even if it is not present in the text prompt. We do so by adding a steering vector ca_{ij}^X for a concept X to the outputs of the corresponding cross-attention layer i on the denoising step t , as:

$$ca_{itk}^{out_new} = f_{renorm}(ca_{itk}^{out} + \alpha ca_{it}^X), \quad (4)$$

Here $1 \leq k \leq patch_num_i$, $renorm$ is a function that re-normalizes the resulting vector $ca_{itk}^{out_new}$ so that its L_2 -norm is equal to that of initial vector ca_{itk}^{out} , and α is a hyperparameter that controls the strength of concept addition. With a larger alpha, we can produce more the concept X in the generated image. Note that value of α can be negative, resulting in adding the notion opposite to that contained in X to the resulting image.

Concept Deletion (Erasure). Perhaps the most important feature of our work is concept deletion (erasure), even in cases where the concept is present in the given text prompt. We can do so by subtracting the steering vector ca_{it}^X for a concept X from the outputs of the corresponding cross-attention layer i on the denoising step t . One can suppose that this can be done similarly to concept addition:

$$ca_{itk}^{out_new} = f_{renorm}(ca_{itk}^{out} - \alpha ca_{it}^X), \quad (5)$$

where $1 \leq k \leq \text{patch_num}_i$, $\alpha > 0$. However, there might be different magnitudes for concept X in the original text prompt (e.g. prompts “an angry man” or “a furious man” express different levels of anger). Also a concept X can have different magnitudes of expression in different patches of the image being generated. Consequently, different values of α are needed to completely suppress X for different prompts and individual image patches in every case, while not affecting other features in the generated image. We find that the dot product between ca_{it}^X and corresponding CA output ca_{itk}^{out} serves as a good assessment of amount of X that should be present in the image part corresponding to k^{th} patch of $ca_{it}^{out_new}$. Consequently, we perform the subtraction as follows:

$$ca_{itk}^{out_new} = f_{renorm}(ca_{itk}^{out} - \beta(ca_{it}^X \cdot ca_{itk}^{out})ca_{itk}^X), \quad (6)$$

Here $1 \leq k \leq \text{patch_num}_i$ and β is a hyperparameter controlling strength of concept suppression.

Concept Switch. Our method is flexible to allow concept switching, replacing one concept X for another concept Y . To do so, we first construct steering vectors ca_{it}^{XY} from X to Y using the same idea described above, using similar prompts with the only difference that the positive prompt contains X (“a girl with an apple”) while the negative one contains Y (“a girl with pear”). Then we use this steering vector to modify cross-attention outputs as:

$$ca_{itk}^{out_new} = f_{renorm}(ca_{itk}^{out} - \beta(ca_{it}^{XY} \cdot ca_{itk}^{out})ca_{itk}^X), \quad (7)$$

where $1 \leq k \leq \text{patch_num}_i$, and β is a hyperparameter controlling strength of concept switch. Consequently, during generation, if given the prompt “a girl with an apple”, the model will generate an image corresponding to “a girl with a pear”, effectively switching the concept of an apple with that of a pear.

3.4. Practical considerations

Multiple Prompts for Steering Vector. We described in the previous section how to construct and use steering vectors to alter one concept, based on one pair of prompts, e.g., “a picture of a man” and “a picture of a man, baroque style”. As mentioned, a steering vector can be seen as the direction in the space of intermediate representations of a model that points from an area of embeddings not containing a concept X , to an area that contains it. In order for this direction to be more precise, we propose to construct steering vectors based on multiple pairs of prompts instead of one. More precisely, we obtain $P \geq 1$ pairs of $ca_{itp}^{pos_avg}$ and $ca_{itp}^{neg_avg}$, $1 \leq p \leq P$, then average them over P :

$$ca_{it}^{pos_avg} = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P ca_{itp}^{pos_avg}}{P}, ca_{it}^{neg_avg} = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P ca_{itp}^{neg_avg}}{P} \quad (8)$$

and obtain steering vectors as $ca_{it}^X = ca_{it}^{pos_avg} - ca_{it}^{neg_avg}$.

Steering multiple concepts. It is easy to manipulate multiple concepts during a generation by applying steering vectors corresponding to these concepts to the cross-attention output successively.

Efficiency: Transferring vectors from distilled models.

Adversarial Diffusion Distillation (ADD) [34] is a fine-tuning approach that allows sampling large-scale foundational image diffusion models in 1 to 4 steps, while producing high-quality images. There is an ADD-fine-tuned version of the SDXL model publicly available, named SDXL-Turbo. We observe that steering vectors obtained from the Turbo model can successfully be used for steering generations of its corresponding non-Turbo variant. More formally, having a pair of prompts, we obtain $ca_i^{pos_avg}$ and $ca_i^{neg_avg}$ from the Turbo model using 1 denoising step. Note that there is no second index t as we use only one denoising iteration, i.e. $T = 1$. We then construct steering vectors for the concept X as $ca_i^X = ca_i^{pos_avg} - ca_i^{neg_avg}$ and then use it to steer non-Turbo variant of the model by using ca_i^X for each denoising step $1 \leq j \leq T$.

4. Experiments

4.1. Implementation details

Following recent work [6, 7, 13] we report our main quantitative results using StableDiffusion-v1.4 (SD-v1.4) [2] model. Note that SD-1.4 model does not have a corresponding Turbo version, so for these experiments we use per-step steering vectors computed from the original SD-1.4. We apply steering to all of the CA layers in the model. We set $\beta = 2$ for the concept erasure task in all our experiments, as using this value can be seen as removing information of the desired concept from the image patch and substituting it with the same amount of opposite information.

4.2. Results

4.2.1. Concept erasure

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our method on concept erasure. We show that our method succeeds in suppressing both abstract (e.g., “nudity”, “violence” or style) and concrete concepts (e.g., “Mickey” or “Leonardo DiCaprio”). Moreover, we demonstrate the advantages of our method in removing implicitly defined concrete concepts (e.g., if a concept is “Mickey”, prompting “a mouse from a Disneyland” should not result in a generation of Mickey).

Abstract concept erasure. We evaluate our approach on **five adversarial nudity prompts datasets**: I2P [16], P4D [37], Ring-a-Bell [38], MMA-Diffusion [39], and UnlearnDiff [40]. We compare our method with training-free approaches [16, 35], as well as training-based methods [13, 17, 18, 20, 23, 36]. We use the established SAFREE [6]

Table 1. Attack Success Rate (ASR) and generation quality comparison with training-free and training-based safe text-to-image (T2I) generation methods. The best results are in **bold**. We gray out training-based methods for a fair comparison. SD-v1.4 is the backbone model for all methods. We measure the FID scores of safe T2I models by comparing their generated outputs with the ones from SD-v1.4.

Method	No Weights Modification	Training-Free						COCO		
			I2P ↓	P4D ↓	Ring-A-Bell ↓	MMA-Diffusion ↓	UnlearnDiffAtk ↓	FID ↓	CLIP ↑	TIFA ↑
SD-v1.4	-	-	0.178	0.987	0.831	0.957	0.697	-	31.3	0.803
ESD [13]	✗	✗	0.140	0.750	0.528	0.873	0.761	-	30.7	-
SA [18]	✗	✗	0.062	0.623	0.329	0.205	0.268	54.98	30.6	0.776
CA [17]	✗	✗	0.178	0.927	0.773	0.855	0.866	40.99	31.2	0.805
MACE [20]	✗	✗	0.023	0.146	0.076	0.183	0.176	52.24	29.4	0.711
SDID [23]	✗	✗	0.270	0.933	0.696	0.907	0.697	22.99	30.5	0.802
UCE [35]	✗	✓	0.103	0.667	0.331	0.867	0.430	<u>31.25</u>	<u>31.3</u>	<u>0.805</u>
RECE [36]	✗	✓	0.064	<u>0.381</u>	0.134	0.675	0.655	37.60	30.9	0.787
SLD-Medium [16]	✓	✓	0.142	0.934	0.646	0.942	0.648	31.47	31.0	0.782
SLD-Strong [16]	✓	✓	0.131	0.861	0.620	0.920	0.570	40.88	29.6	0.766
SLD-Max [16]	✓	✓	0.115	0.742	0.570	0.837	0.479	50.51	28.5	0.720
SAFREE [6]	✓	✓	0.034	0.384	<u>0.114</u>	<u>0.585</u>	<u>0.282</u>	36.35	31.1	0.79
CASSteer (ours)	✓	✓	<u>0.057</u>	0.159	0.025	0.581	0.148	28.51	31.4	0.82

Table 2. Comparison of Artist Concept Removal tasks: Famous (left) and Modern artists (right).

Method	Remove “Van Gogh”				Remove “Kelly McKernan”			
	LPIPS _e ↑	LPIPS _u ↓	Acc _e ↓	Acc _u ↑	LPIPS _e ↑	LPIPS _u ↓	Acc _e ↓	Acc _u ↑
SD-v1.4	-	-	0.95	0.95	-	-	0.80	0.83
CA	0.30	0.13	0.65	0.90	0.22	0.17	0.50	0.76
RECE	0.31	0.08	0.80	0.93	0.29	0.04	0.55	0.76
UCE	0.25	0.05	0.95	0.98	0.25	0.03	0.80	0.81
SLD-Medium	0.21	0.10	0.95	0.91	0.22	0.18	0.50	0.79
SAFREE	0.42	0.31	0.35	0.85	0.40	0.39	0.40	0.78
CASSteer (Ours)	0.43	0.27	0.25	0.90	0.47	0.22	0.13	0.74

approach to assess quality of our method via Attack Success Rate (ASR) on adversarial nudity prompts [36]. For generation quality, we use FID [41], CLIP score [42], and TIFA [43] on COCO-30k [44], evaluating on 1k samples. We use 216 prompt pairs of the form (“X, nudity“, “X”) to generate steering vectors. Here X are different prompts for generating people. More details about the format of prompts can be found in supplementary material Sec. B.

We present the results in Tab. 1, showing that our method achieves the best ASR values among training-free methods in 4 of 5 tasks. Moreover, in two tasks (Ring-a-Bell and UnlearnDiff), CASSteer shows best overall performance surpassing also the training-based methods. Furthermore, CASSteer generates images with high visual quality as shown by metrics in CLIP and TIFA metrics on COCO data surpassing all other methods, and second-best overall FID, outperforming all training-free methods. Thus, CASSteer clearly is capable of deleting unwanted information while maintaining general high quality. Note that these datasets feature adversarial prompts, i.e., the “nudity” concept is encoded in the prompts implicitly. We also include results on

concept removal on this task using SDXL [3] model in the supplementary material.

Following SAFREE [6] and ESD [13], we also evaluate our method on two **artist-style removal tasks**. One task focuses on the styles of five famous artists (Van Gogh, Picasso, Rembrandt, Warhol, Caravaggio) and the other uses five modern artists (McKernan, Kinkade, Edlin, Eng, Ajin: Demi-Human), with the task being removing the style of Van Gogh and McKernan. Following SAFREE [6], we use LPIPS [45] and prompt GPT-4o to identify an artist on generated images as evaluation metrics.

We present the results on Tab. 2. We follow SAFREE [6] evaluation procedure, please refer to it or our supplementary for more details on the procedure and metrics. From Tab. 2, we see that CASSteer shows the best results in style removal (see columns LPIPS_e and Acc_e), while preserving other styles well (see columns LPIPS_u and Acc_u). Among all the approaches, CASSteer achieves great balance between target style removal and preservation of other styles.

Concrete concepts erasure. We follow the experimental setup of SPM [7] for concrete concept erasure. In this setting, the concept to be erased is *Snoopy*, and images of five additional concepts (*Mickey*, *Spongebob*, *Pikachu*, *dog* and *legislator*) are generated to test the capability of the method to preserve content not related to the concept being removed. The first four of these are specifically chosen to be semantically close to the concept being removed to show the model’s ability to do precise erasure. We augment each concept using 80 CLIP [46] templates, and generate 10 for each concept-template pair, so that for each concept there are 800 images. We use 50 prompt pair of form (“X, with Snoopy”, “X”) to generate steering vectors of *Snoopy*. We evaluate



“A mouse from Disneyland”

“A yellow Pokemon”

Figure 4. Illustration of SPM failure to remove implicitly defined concepts. Top: CASTeer, Bottom: SPM, both with SD-1.4.

Table 3. **Quantitative evaluation of concrete object erasure.** The best results are highlighted in bold, second-best are underlined.

	Snoopy		Mickey		Spongebob		Pikachu		Dog		Legislator	
	CS↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	CS↑ FID↓	
SD-1.4	78.5	74.7	-	74.1	-	74.7	-	65.2	-	61.0		
ESD	48.3	58.0	121.0	64.0	104.7	68.6	68.3	63.9	49.5	59.9	50.9	
SPM	60.9	74.4	22.1	74.0	21.4	74.6	12.4	65.2	9.0	61.0	5.5	
SAFREE	54.7	68.1	72.8	70.2	76.6	71.9	46.2	<u>65.4</u>	70.9	59.9	55.4	
CASTeer (ours)	<u>49.0</u>	<u>71.9</u>	<u>69.2</u>	<u>73.0</u>	<u>74.4</u>	<u>73.8</u>	<u>35.3</u>	65.6	<u>31.8</u>	<u>60.9</u>	<u>36.8</u>	

the results using CLIP Score (CS) [42] and FID [41]. We calculate CS using the similarity between the concept and the image and utilize it to confirm the level of the existence of the concept within the generated content. We use FID to assess how much images of additional concepts generated by the erased model differ from those of generated by the original model, with a higher FID value demonstrating more severe generation alteration after erasing. We present the results in Tab. 3. Our method reaches the second-best overall results getting a good balance between erasing the desired concept and leaving the other notions intact. ESD [13] erases Snoopy well, but also highly affects other concepts, especially related ones such as *Mickey* or *Spongebob*. SAFREE shows a reduced level of *Snoopy* erasure together with a higher level of alteration of other concepts. SPM has a lower intensity of *Snoopy* erasure but keeps other concepts more intact. Note that SAFREE and CASTeer experience a rise in CLIP score for the *dog* concept after erasing Snoopy. We hypothesize this happens because the removal of *Snoopy* component from the prompt including *dog* results in more realistic images of dogs. We provide more qualitative results in the supplementary material (sec. D).

Does SPM truly outperform our method? We check what happens if we define the prompts implicitly, e.g., SPM trained on the *Mickey* concept and run on “A mouse from Disneyland”, showing the results in Fig. 4. We clearly see that SPM fails to erase the concepts, when they are not explicitly defined. In contrast, our method does a much better



Figure 5. Examples of concept addition with CASTeer. From left to right: Adding apples, prompt “a cat sitting on a table”; Adding a hat, prompt “a girl walking down the beach”; Adding more clothes, prompt “a girl on a beach”; Adding happiness, prompt “a face of a man”. Top: results produced by SDXL, bottom: results produced by SDXL with CASTeer applied.

job of erasing the concepts, despite being implicitly defined. We provide more results in the supplementary sec. H.

Overall experimental results show that CASTeer is able to perform precise erasure of both concrete and abstract concepts and concepts defined implicitly while leaving other concepts intact and not affecting the overall quality of generated images. More qualitative results showing the performance of CASTeer on prompts related and not related to the target concept can be found in the supplementary material.

4.2.2. Results: Concept addition

In Fig. 5, we show how CASTeer can add both concrete and abstract concepts. In the first two images, CASTeer adds concrete concepts (e.g., apples and hat). In the third image, we add the nudity concept with a negative value of alpha (see Eq. 4), resulting in adding more clothes. Finally, in the last image, we show that CASTeer can be used to add abstract concepts, such as happiness. Additionally, in Fig. 6 we show results of adding the concept of “*angry*” with varying intensity $\alpha \in [-6, 6]$ when prompted with the neutral prompt of “a realistic colorful portrait of a man”. We calculate steering vectors for the concept of “*angry*” as described in Sec. B.1. We see that CASTeer allows for a change in angeriness with almost no alteration of other features of the image. For all the experiments in concept addition, as well as concept switch and interpolation described below, **steering vectors are computed using Turbo version of SDXL** and steering is only applied to the last half of the CA layers in SDXL. For more details, see Sec. E in the supplementary.

4.2.3. Results: Concept switch

We show qualitative results of concept switching using CASTeer on an SDXL [3] model with steering vectors produced from Turbo version of SDXL. We perform switching as described in Eq. 7. In Fig. 6 (left), we present results on switching the identity of a person from “*Leonardo*




Figure 6. Examples of concept switch and interpolation using CASteer. (a) Switching a concept of “Leonardo DiCaprio” with “Keanu Reeves”. (top row) “Leonardo DiCaprio drinking coffee”, (middle row) “Brad Pitt drinking coffee”, (bottom row) “Barack Obama drinking coffee”. We see how CASteer switches Leonardo DiCaprio with Keanu Reeves, but does not alter Brad Pitt or Barack Obama. (b) (top row) Interpolating between a caterpillar to a butterfly, (bottom row) Interpolating between a cat and a giraffe. (c) Adding “angriness” in the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of a man”. We observe that when we add negative intensity, it actually generates a happy person.

“DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves”. We observe that CASteer enables precise identity switch (Leonardo DiCaprio \rightarrow Keanu Reeves), while not affecting other identities (Brad Pitt or Barack Obama). More results on identity switch and switching of other concepts are presented in supplementary, sec. F.I. . We also present results on the identity removal task in sec. I.

4.2.4. Results: Concept interpolation

In this section, we provide qualitative results on interpolation between two concrete concepts. We calculate steering vectors for switching concepts $X \rightarrow Y$ and then add this steering vector with varying intensity to the prompt containing X as described in Eq. 4. This results in a transition between the image depicting X to the image depicting Y . In Fig. 6 we see that CASteer enables transition even between concepts of different shapes, e.g., “caterpillar” \rightarrow “butterfly” or “cat” to “giraffe”. More results on concepts interpolation can be found in supplementary sec. G.

4.2.5. Results: Style Transfer

In Fig. 7, we show the results of our method performing style transfer on the real images, transferring their style to anime, origami, gothic and retro styles. We show that our method is able to generate high-quality images while altering the style to the desired one. We give more details and results in style transfer in supplementary sec. K.

4.3. Ablation Study

Steering only a fraction of layers. In our experiments with SD-1.4 we applied steering to all the cross-attention layers



Figure 7. Results of style transfer. From top to bottom: original, anime, origami and gothic artistic styles.

of the model. For more powerful models such as SDXL, we find that it is sufficient for many tasks to apply steering only to the last $k \leq n$ cross-attention layers, where n is the total number of cross-attention layers in the model. We ablate three ways of choosing the subset of cross-attention layers for steering: Steering only the first or only the last k cross-attention layers, or steering only the k^{th} layer, $0 \leq k \leq n$. Our empirical findings suggest the following: 1) It is not sufficient to steer only one layer; 2) There is a trade-off between the level of expression of the desired concept in a resulting image and alteration of general image layout. If we steer all of the layers, the overall layout may change

drastically. Note that layers of modern diffusion models are usually divided into encoder and decoder parts of the U-Net model, which is used as a backbone in most of the diffusion models. We find that steering CA layers only in the decoder part of the U-Net provides a good balance between target concept manipulation and preservation of other features. More details on this are in supplementary sec. E.

Steering MLPs. We experimented with steering MLP layers instead of cross-attention ones. However, the generated images did not have semantic meaning and were visually unaesthetic.

5. Conclusion

We presented Casteer, a novel training-free method for controllable image generation, able to erase, add and switch concepts, in addition to being able to perform style transfer. Our method works by using steering vectors in the cross-attention layers of diffusion models. We show that our method is general and versatile to work with different versions of diffusion, including distilled models. Our method reaches state-of-the-art results in several problems and different evaluation benchmarks while producing visually pleasing images.

References

- [1] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. 1
- [2] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022. 1, 2, 5
- [3] 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. In *ICLR*, 2024. 1, 6, 7, 24
- [4] Rohit Girdhar, Mannat Singh, Andrew Brown, Quentin Duval, Samaneh Azadi, Sai Saketh Rambhatla, Akbar Shah, Xi Yin, Devi Parikh, and Ishan Misra. Emu video: Factorizing text-to-video generation by explicit image conditioning. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1
- [5] 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 *ICLR*, 2022. 2
- [6] Jaehong Yoon, Shoubin Yu, Vaidehi Patil, Huaxiu Yao, and Mohit Bansal. SAFREE: training-free and adaptive guard for safe text-to-image and video generation. *CoRR*, abs/2410.12761, 2024. 2, 5, 6
- [7] Mengyao Lyu, Yuhong Yang, Haiwen Hong, Hui Chen, Xuan Jin, Yuan He, Hui Xue, Jungong Han, and Guiguang Ding. One-dimensional adapter to rule them all: Concepts, diffusion models and erasing applications. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 5, 6, 33
- [8] Dana Rao. Responsible innovation in the age of generative ai. 2023. 2
- [9] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. LAION-5B: an open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2
- [10] Zhan Shi, Xu Zhou, Xipeng Qiu, and Xiaodan Zhu. Improving image captioning with better use of captions. *CoRR*, abs/2006.11807, 2020. 2
- [11] Praneeth Bedapudi. Nudenet: Neural nets for nudity detection and censoring. 2022. 2
- [12] Javier Rando, Daniel Paleka, David Lindner, Lennart Heim, and Florian Tramèr. Red-teaming the stable diffusion safety filter. *CoRR*, abs/2210.04610, 2022. 2
- [13] Rohit Gandikota, Joanna Materzynska, Jaden Fiotto-Kaufman, and David Bau. Erasing concepts from diffusion models. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 5, 6, 7
- [14] SmithMano. Tutorial: How to remove the safety filter in 5 seconds. 2022. 2
- [15] Daiki Miyake, Akihiro Iohara, Yu Saito, and Toshiyuki Tanaka. Negative-prompt inversion: Fast image inversion for editing with text-guided diffusion models. *CoRR*, abs/2305.16807, 2023. 2
- [16] Patrick Schramowski, Manuel Brack, Björn Deiseroth, and Kristian Kersting. Safe latent diffusion: Mitigating inappropriate degeneration in diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2, 5, 6
- [17] Nupur Kumari, Bingliang Zhang, Sheng-Yu Wang, Eli Shechtman, Richard Zhang, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Ablating concepts in text-to-image diffusion models. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 5, 6
- [18] Alvin Heng and Harold Soh. Selective amnesia: A continual learning approach to forgetting in deep generative models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2, 5, 6
- [19] Hanul Shin, Jung Kwon Lee, Jaehong Kim, and Jiwon Kim. Continual learning with deep generative replay. In *NeurIPS*, 2017. 2
- [20] Shilin Lu, Zilan Wang, Leyang Li, Yanzhu Liu, and Adams Wai-Kin Kong. MACE: mass concept erasure in diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 5, 6
- [21] Dewei Zhou, You Li, Fan Ma, Xiaoting Zhang, and Yi Yang. MIGC: multi-instance generation controller for text-to-image synthesis. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [22] Ganggui Ding, Canyu Zhao, Wen Wang, Zhen Yang, Zide Liu, Hao Chen, and Chunhua Shen. Freecustom: Tuning-free customized image generation for multi-concept composition. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- [23] Hang Li, Chengzhi Shen, Philip Torr, Volker Tresp, and Jindong Gu. Self-discovering interpretable diffusion latent directions for responsible text-to-image generation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3, 5, 6
- [24] Cusuh Ham, Matthew Fisher, James Hays, Nicholas Kolkin, Yuchen Liu, Richard Zhang, and Tobias Hinz. Personalized residuals for concept-driven text-to-image generation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3

- [25] Amir Hertz, Andrey Voynov, Shlomi Fruchter, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Style aligned image generation via shared attention. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [26] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross-attention control. In *ICLR*, 2023. 3
- [27] Rohit Gandikota, Joanna Materzynska, Tingrui Zhou, Antonio Torralba, and David Bau. Concept sliders: Lora adaptors for precise control in diffusion models. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [28] Mingi Kwon, Jaeseok Jeong, and Youngjung Uh. Diffusion models already have A semantic latent space. In *ICLR*, 2023. 3
- [29] Yong-Hyun Park, Mingi Kwon, Jaewoong Choi, Junghyo Jo, and Youngjung Uh. Understanding the latent space of diffusion models through the lens of riemannian geometry. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [30] Chenyang Si, Ziqi Huang, Yuming Jiang, and Ziwei Liu. Freeu: Free lunch in diffusion u-net. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- [31] Narek Tumanyan, Michal Geyer, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. Plug-and-play diffusion features for text-driven image-to-image translation. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3
- [32] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *MICCAI*, 2015. 3
- [33] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NeurIPS*, 2017. 3
- [34] Axel Sauer, Dominik Lorenz, Andreas Blattmann, and Robin Rombach. Adversarial diffusion distillation. In Ales Leonardis, Elisa Ricci, Stefan Roth, Olga Russakovsky, Torsten Sattler, and Gül Varol, editors, *ECCV*, 2022. 5
- [35] Rohit Gandikota, Hadas Orgad, Yonatan Belinkov, Joanna Materzynska, and David Bau. Unified concept editing in diffusion models. In *WACV*, 2024. 5, 6
- [36] Chao Gong, Kai Chen, Zhipeng Wei, Jingjing Chen, and Yungang Jiang. Reliable and efficient concept erasure of text-to-image diffusion models. In *ECCV*, 2024. 5, 6
- [37] Zhi-Yi Chin, Chieh-Ming Jiang, Ching-Chun Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, and Wei-Chen Chiu. Prompting4debugging: Red-teaming text-to-image diffusion models by finding problematic prompts. In *ICML*, 2024. 5
- [38] Yu-Lin Tsai, Chia-Yi Hsu, Chulin Xie, Chih-Hsun Lin, Jia-You Chen, Bo Li, Pin-Yu Chen, Chia-Mu Yu, and Chun-Ying Huang. Ring-a-bell! how reliable are concept removal methods for diffusion models? In *ICLR*, 2024. 5
- [39] Yijun Yang, Ruiyuan Gao, Xiaosen Wang, Tsung-Yi Ho, Nan Xu, and Qiang Xu. Mma-diffusion: Multimodal attack on diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 5
- [40] Yimeng Zhang, Jinghan Jia, Xin Chen, Aochuan Chen, Yihua Zhang, Jiancheng Liu, Ke Ding, and Sijia Liu. To generate or not? safety-driven unlearned diffusion models are still easy to generate unsafe images ... for now. In *ECCV*, 2024. 5
- [41] Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *NeurIPS*, 2017. 6, 7
- [42] Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. Clipscore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning. In *EMNLP*, 2021. 6, 7
- [43] Yushi Hu, Benlin Liu, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Mari Ostendorf, Ranjay Krishna, and Noah A. Smith. TIFA: accurate and interpretable text-to-image faithfulness evaluation with question answering. In *ICCV*, 2023. 6
- [44] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft COCO: common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 2014. 6
- [45] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A. Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *CVPR*, 2018. 6
- [46] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 6
- [47] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. In *ICLR*, 2021. 42

CASteer: Steering Diffusion Models for Controllable Generation

Supplementary Material

A Algorithms	1
B Prompts for generating steering vectors	1
B.1. Prompts for human-related concepts	1
B.2. Prompts for erasing concrete concepts	2
B.3. Prompts for style manipulation	2
B.4. Prompts for concept switch and interpolation	2
C Details on style removal	2
D Qualitative results on removing Snoopy	3
E Steering a fraction of CA layers	8
F. More results on concept switch	21
G More results on interpolating	24
H SPM vs CASteer on adversarial prompts	33
I. Changing and removing identity.	36
J. Interpreting steering vectors	40
K More results on Style Transfer	42

A. Algorithms

We give the algorithms of our model. In Algorithm 1, we describe how we compute the steering vectors, while in Algorithm 2, we describe how we use them to perform concept erasure and concept addition. The algorithms closely follow the descriptions in Sec. 3.2 and Sec 3.3.

B. Prompts for generating steering vectors

In this section, we describe the construction of prompt pairs that we use to compute steering vectors for our experiments.

B.1. Prompts for human-related concepts

For manipulating abstract human-related concepts, we use prompt pairs of the form:

(“b c, e”, “b c”)

Here $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$ where

$\mathbf{B} = \{“a girl”, “two men”, “a man”, “a woman”, “an old man”, “a boy”, “boys”, “group of people”\}$

$\mathbf{C} = \{“on a beach”, “zoomed in”, “talking”, “dancing on the street”, “playing guitar”, “enjoying nature”, “smiling”, “in futuristic spaceship”, “with kittens”, “in a strange$

Algorithm 1 Computing steering vectors

Require: Diffusion model DM with n CA layers, number of denoising steps T , concepts X, Y, P prompt pairs $(\mathcal{P}_p^X, \mathcal{P}_p^Y)$, $1 \leq p \leq P$, p_p^X containing X and p_p^Y containing Y , number of image patches on layers $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^n$

Get $z_T \sim \mathbb{N}(0, I)$ a unit Gaussian random variable;

$$z_T^X \leftarrow z_T$$

$$z_T^Y \leftarrow z_T$$

for $p = 1 \dots, P$ **do**

for $t = T, T - 1, \dots, 1$ **do**

$z_{t-1}^Y, \{ca_{itp}^Y\} \leftarrow DM(z_t^Y, \mathcal{P}_p^Y, t)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$

$z_{t-1}^X, \{ca_{itp}^X\} \leftarrow DM(z_t^X, \mathcal{P}_p^X, t)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$

end for

end for

$$ca_{it}^{X.avg} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m_i} \sum_{p=1}^P ca_{itpk}^X}{P m_i}$$

$$ca_{it}^{Y.avg} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m_i} \sum_{p=1}^P ca_{itpk}^Y}{P m_i}$$

$$ca_{it}^X = ca_{it}^{X.avg} - ca_{it}^{Y.avg}$$

$$ca_{it}^X = \frac{ca_{it}^X}{\|ca_{it}^X\|_2} \quad \triangleright \text{Normalize}$$

Algorithm 2 Using steering vectors

Require: Diffusion model DM with n CA layers, number of denoising steps T , concepts X, Y , input prompt \mathcal{P} , number of image patches on layers $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^n$, mode (‘add’ or ‘remove’), steering intensity (α if mode=‘add’ or β if mode=‘remove’)

Get $z_T \sim \mathbb{N}(0, I)$ a unit Gaussian random variable;

for $t = T, T - 1, \dots, 1$ **do**

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

$z_{tmp}, ca_{itk}^{out} \leftarrow DM(z_t^Y, \mathcal{P}, t)$

$norm_{itk} = \|ca_{itk}^{out}\|_2$

if mode == ‘add’ **then**

$ca_{itk}^{out.new} \leftarrow ca_{itk}^{out} + \alpha ca_{it}^X$

else if mode == ‘remove’ **then**

$ca_{itk}^{out.new} \leftarrow ca_{itk}^{out} - \beta (ca_{it}^X \cdot ca_{itk}^{out}) ca_{it}^X$

end if

$norm_{itk}^{new} = \|ca_{itk}^{out.new}\|_2$

$ca_{itk}^{out.new} \leftarrow norm_{itk} \frac{ca_{itk}^{out.new}}{norm_{itk}^{new}} \quad \triangleright \text{Renormalize}$

$z_{t-1}^Y \leftarrow DM(z_{tmp}, ca_{itk}^{out}) \quad \triangleright \text{Continue inference}$

end for

end for

pose”, “realism, colorful background”, “”, “},

and \mathbf{e} describes the concept we want to manipulate. We use $\mathbf{e} = “nudity”$ for nudity erasure, $\mathbf{e} = “angry”$ for anger

interpolation, “happy” for happiness interpolation.
 $|\mathbf{b}| = 8$, $|\mathbf{C}| = 12$, which results in a total of 216 prompt pairs for each concept e .

Examples of prompts for nudity erasure:
 (“a girl on a beach, nudity”, “a girl on a beach”)
 (“boys in futuristic spaceship, nudity”,
 “boys in futuristic spaceship”)

Inside each prompt pair, the same generation seed is used.

B.2. Prompts for erasing concrete concepts

For erasing concrete concepts, we use prompt pairs of the form:

($v\mathbf{p}$, with \mathbf{e} ”, “ \mathbf{p} ”)

Here $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}$, where \mathbf{P} is a set of 50 ImageNet classes, namely:

$\mathbf{P} = \{\text{“tench”, “goldfish”, “great white shark”, “tiger shark”, “hammerhead”, “electric ray”, “stingray”, “cock”, “hen”, “ostrich”, “brambling”, “goldfinch”, “house finch”, “junco”, “indigo bunting”, “robin”, “bulbul”, “jay”, “magpie”, “chickadee”, “water ouzel”, “kite”, “bald eagle”, “vulture”, “great grey owl”, “European fire salamander”, “common newt”, “eft”, “spotted salamander”, “axolotl”, “bullfrog”, “tree frog”, “tailed frog”, “loggerhead”, “leatherback turtle”, “mud turtle”, “terrapin”, “box turtle”, “banded gecko”, “common iguana”, “American chameleon”, “whiptail”, “agama”, “frilled lizard”, “alligator lizard”, “Gila monster”, “green lizard”, “African chameleon”, “Komodo dragon”, “African crocodile”, “American alligator”}\}$,

and \mathbf{e} describes the concept we want to manipulate, e.g. we use $\mathbf{e} = \text{“Snoopy”}$ for *Snoopy* erasure, $\mathbf{e} = \text{“Mickey”}$ for *Mickey* erasure.

$|\mathbf{P}| = 50$, which results in a total of 50 prompt pairs for each concept e .

Examples of prompts:

(“junco, with Snoopy”, “junco”)
 (“mud turtle, with Mickey”, “mud turtle”)

Inside each prompt pair, the same generation seed is used.

B.3. Prompts for style manipulation

For erasing or adding style, we use prompt pairs of the form:

(“ \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{e} style”, “ \mathbf{p} ”)

Here $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}$, where \mathbf{P} is a set of 50 ImageNet classes as used for concrete concept erasure, and \mathbf{e} describes the style we want to manipulate, e.g. “baroque or “Van Gogh”.

$|\mathbf{P}| = 50$, which results in a total of 50 prompt pairs for each style e .

Examples of prompts:

(“junco, baroque style”, “junco”)
 (“mud turtle, Van Gogh style”, “mud turtle”)

Inside each prompt pair, the same generation seed is used.

B.4. Prompts for concept switch and interpolation

For interpolating concrete concepts, we use prompt pairs of the form:

(“ \mathbf{e}_1 ”, “ \mathbf{e}_2 ”)

Here \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 describe concepts we want to switch or interpolate, e.g. ($\mathbf{e}_1 = \text{“cat”}$, $\mathbf{e}_2 = \text{“giraffe”}$) or ($\mathbf{e}_1 = \text{“Leonardo DiCaprio”}$, $\mathbf{e}_2 = \text{“Keanu Reeves”}$)

For each prompt pair, we generate 50 pairs of images with different seeds, resulting in a total of 50 CA output vector pairs for each pair of concepts.

C. Details on style removal

The task focuses on the styles of five famous artists (Van Gogh, Picasso, Rem784 brandt, Warhol, Caravaggio) and the other uses five modern artists (McKernan, Kinkade, Edlin, Eng, Ajin: Demi Human). Following SAFREE, we use *LPIPS* and prompt GPT-4o to identify an artist on generated images as evaluation metrics.

Following recent works, we experiment with removing one style of famous artist (Van Gogh) and one style of a modern artist (McKernan). We assess both how well our methods remove the desired style (e.g., Van Gogh) and preserve other styles in the same batch (e.g. Picasso, Rembrandt, Warhol and Caravaggio, if we remove Van Gogh). $LPIPS_e$ shows *LPIPS* values for the images generated, when prompted with target style (“Van Gogh” or “Kelly McKernan”), and $LPIPS_u$, shows *LPIPS* values for the images generated with the other 4 styles. Acc_e shows the accuracy of GPT-4o answers when asked to identify an artist on images generated with target style in prompt (“Van Gogh” or “Kelly McKernan”), and Acc_u shows the accuracy of GPT-4o answers when asked to identify an artist on images generated with other styles in prompt. The goal of any style removal method is to lower $LPIPS_e$ and Acc_e (i.e., successfully remove target style) while maintaining $LPIPS_u$ and Acc_u high (i.e., not affecting the generation of other styles).

Questions to GPT-4o are formulated as “Is this picture in s style? Just tell me Yes or No.”, where s represents style, e.g., $s = \text{“Andy Warhol”}$ or $s = \text{“Van Gogh”}$. The number of “Yes” answers divided by the number of total answers is considered as *Acc* metric. We report results averaged over 3 runs for this metric.

D. Qualitative results on removing Snoopy

Here we provide qualitative results on removing the Snoopy concept using CASTeering with the SDXL model. We show results on generating images with two prompt templates: “A photo of a cool X ” and “A cartoon X ”, where $X \in$ [“Snoopy”, “Mickey”, “Spongebob”, “Pikachu”, “dog”, “legislator”]. CASTeering is applied with removal strength $\beta = 2$

We see that our method removes Snoopy well (see fig. 8 and 9) while preserving other concepts well (see fig. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19). In fact, most of the images of non-related concepts generated with CASTeering applied are almost identical to those generated by vanilla SDXL. Note that in the case of prompt being “A cartoon dog”, many images of dogs generated by vanilla SDXL exhibit some similarity to “Snoopy”, and CASTeering changes these images to steer them back from being visually close to “Snoopy”(see fig. 16). In the case when dogs are not visually similar to “Snoopy”, no changes occur (see fig. 17).



Figure 8. Images generated with the prompt “A cartoon Snoopy” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASTeering applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.



Figure 9. Images generated with the prompt “A photo of a cool Snoopy” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASTeering applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.



Figure 10. Images generated with the prompt “A cartoon Mickey” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASTeering applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.



Figure 11. Images generated with the prompt “A photo of a cool Mickey” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASteer applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.



Figure 12. Images generated with the prompt “A cartoon Spongebob” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASteer applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.



Figure 13. Images generated with the prompt “A photo of a cool Spongebob” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASteer applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.




Figure 14. Images generated with the prompt “A cartoon *Pikachu*” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: Casteer applied for removing the concept of “*Snoopy*”.



Figure 15. Images generated with the prompt “A photo of a cool *Pikachu*” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: Casteer applied for removing the concept of “*Snoopy*”.



Figure 16. Images generated with the prompt “A cartoon *dog*” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: Casteer applied for removing the concept of “*Snoopy*”.



Figure 17. Images generated with the prompt “A photo of a cool dog” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASTeering applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.




Figure 18. Images generated with the prompt “A cartoon dog” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASTeering applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.



Figure 19. Images generated with the prompt “A photo of a cool dog” with different seeds. Top: original SDXL, bottom: CASTeering applied for removing the concept of “Snoopy”.

E. Steering a fraction of CA layers

In this section, we provide qualitative experiments on steering only a fraction of CA layers.

We ablate on three ways of choosing a subset of CA layers for steering:

- Steering only k first CA layers, $0 \leq k \leq n$;
- Steering only k last layers, $0 \leq k \leq n$;
- Steering only k^{th} CA layer, $0 \leq k \leq n$.

We evaluate CASteer under these settings for four kinds of tasks discussed in this paper: concept addition 4, concept removal 6, concept switch 7 and concept interpolation. In a task of concept addition, we add a concept of happiness (fig. 20, 21, 22), in a task of concept removal, we remove anger (fig. 23, 24, 25), in the task of concept switch, we switch Leonardo DiCaprio to Keanu Reeves (fig. 29, 30, 31) and in the task of concept interpolation, we interpolate between caterpillar and butterfly (fig. 26, 27, 28). In all the figures we illustrate results on these tasks for values of k between 0 and 60 with a step of 3 for compactness. For the task of concept addition, we use $\alpha = 50$ (see 4), for the tasks of concept removal and concept switch we use $\beta = 2$ (see 6 and 7), and for the task of interpolation we add a steering vector for concepts (“caterpillar”, “butterfly”) to the prompt “a caterpillar” with the intensity of $\alpha = 20$ (see 4).

Our empirical findings suggest the following: 1) It is not sufficient to steer only one layer (see fig. 22, 25, 31, 28). In all of the 4 tasks the effect of steering any single layer is negligible, not causing the desired effect. In the case of concept addition 20 we use high steering strength $\alpha = 50$, and it still does not produce the desired outcome. We hypothesize that this is caused by that all of the CA layers except k are non-steered and carry information from the original prompt, so steering only one layer cannot override this information. 2) There is a trade-off between the level of expression of the desired concept in a resulting image and the alteration of general image layout and features. If we steer most of the layers, the overall layout may change drastically from that of the original image (see fig. 29, 30, 26, 27), and it may cause in the change of identity or other features in the steered image compared to the original one (see fig. 20, 21, 23, 24, where identity of the person changes if we steer many layers). Layers of modern diffusion models are usually divided into “up” and “down” parts, referring to compression and decompression parts of the U-Net model, which is used as a backbone in most diffusion models. We find that steering CA layers only in “up” part of the U-Net (i.e. last 36 layers of the model) provides a good balance between target concept manipulation and preservation of other features, such as general layout or identity. On fig. 29 and 26 we see that when steering only “up” layers ($k=24$) the general layout and features of the image correspond to that of the original image, and only identity or target object

shape is affected.

Based on this finding, in all our experiments on concepts switch and interpolation, we use CASteer in a setting of steering only all the “up” layers.



Figure 20. Results on adding the concept of “happy” using Casteer on the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of a man” with steering only k last CA layers, $60 \geq k \geq 1$. Top left corner: image generated without Casteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using Casteer with varying k



Figure 21. Results on adding the concept of “happy” using Casteer on the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of a man” with steering only k first CA layers, $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without Casteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using Casteer with varying k



Figure 22. Results on adding the concept of “happy” using Casteer on the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of a man” with steering only CA layer number k , $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without Casteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using Casteer with varying k



Figure 23. Results on removing the concept of “angry” using CASteer on the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of an angry man” with steering only k last CA layers, $60 \geq k \geq 1$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k




Figure 24. Results on removing the concept of “angry” using CASteer on the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of an angry man” with steering only k first CA layers, $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k



Figure 25. Results on removing the concept of “angry” using Casteer on the prompt “a realistic colorful portrait of an angry man” with steering only CA layer number k , $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without Casteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using Casteer with varying k



Figure 26. Results on interpolating the concepts of “caterpillar” and “butterfly” using Casteer on the prompt “a caterpillar” with steering only CA layer number k , $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without Casteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using Casteer with varying k




Figure 27. Results on interpolating the concepts of “caterpillar” and “butterfly” using CASteer on the prompt “a caterpillar” with steering only k first CA layers, $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k



Figure 28. Results on interpolating the concepts of “caterpillar” and “butterfly” using CASteer on the prompt “a caterpillar” with steering only CA layer number k , $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k



Figure 29. Results on switching the concepts of “Leonardo DiCaprio” and “Keanu Reeves” using CASteer on the prompt “Leonardo DiCaprio on a bicycle” with steering only CA layer number k , $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k



Figure 30. Results on switching the concepts of “Leonardo DiCaprio” and “Keanu Reeves” using CASteer on the prompt “Leonardo DiCaprio on a bicycle” with steering only k first CA layers, $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k



Figure 31. Results on switching the concepts of “Leonardo DiCaprio” and “Keanu Reeves” using CASteer on the prompt “Leonardo DiCaprio on a bicycle” with steering only CA layer number k , $1 \leq k \leq 60$. Top left corner: image generated without CASteer, images from top to bottom, left to right: images generated using CASteer with varying k

F. More results on concept switch

In this section, we provide more qualitative results on switching between concrete concepts. Note that more results on identity switch are provided in the following [sec. I](#)



Figure 32. Switching between concepts of “cat” and “giraffe” using Casteer. Top: images generated by vanilla SDXL, bottom: images with Casteer applied.



Figure 33. Switching between concepts of “caterpillar” and “butterfly” using Casteer. Top: images generated by vanilla SDXL, bottom: images with Casteer applied.



Figure 34. Switching between concepts of “Snoopy” and “Winnie-the-Pooh” using Casteer. Top: images generated by vanilla SDXL, bottom: images with Casteer applied.

G. More results on interpolating

In this section, we present more results on object interpolation using SDXL [3] model.

For concrete concept interpolation, e.g. between “cat” and “giraffe”, we compute steering vectors for pairs of concepts to interpolate as described in sec. B.4. Then, having steering vectors for a pair of concepts (X, Y) , we add this steering vector multiplied with different intensity α as described in eq.4 to CA outputs of diffusion model prompted with prompt containing X .

Figures 35, 37, 39, 41 illustrate examples of concept interpolation using steering vectors computed from **full SDXL** model, and figures 36, 38, 40, 42 illustrate examples of concept interpolation using steering vectors computed from **SDXL-Turbo** model. These examples show that steering vectors from both full SDXL and SDXL-Turbo are expressive enough to enable good-quality interpolation.

For abstract concept interpolation, e.g. reducing or increasing happiness or anger, we compute steering vectors for the desired concept (e.g. “happy” or “angry”) as described in sec. B.1. Then, having steering vectors for the desired concept X , we add it with varying intensity to the CA outputs of the diffusion model. The addition is performed as described in Algorithm 2. Note that in this case intensity might be negative, resulting in suppressing the appearance of the target concept in a generated image; or it can be positive, provoking the appearance of the desired concept on the generated image.



Figure 35. Interpolating between cat and giraffe using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“cat”, “giraffe”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a cat sitting on a table”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from full SDXL model.**



Figure 36. Interpolating between cat and giraffe using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“cat”, “giraffe”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a cat sitting on a table”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from SDXL-Turbo model.**




Figure 37. Interpolating between cat and giraffe using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“cat”, “giraffe”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a cat”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from full SDXL model.**




Figure 38. Interpolating between cat and giraffe using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“cat”, “giraffe”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a cat”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from SDXL-Turbo model.**




Figure 39. Interpolating between caterpillar and butterfly using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“caterpillar”, “butterfly”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a caterpillar”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from full SDXL model.**



Figure 40. Interpolating between caterpillar and butterfly using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“caterpillar”, “butterfly”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a caterpillar”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from SDXL-Turbo model.**



Figure 41. Interpolating between caterpillar and butterfly using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“caterpillar”, “butterfly”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a caterpillar”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from full SDXL model.**



Figure 42. Interpolating between caterpillar and butterfly using steering vectors for pair of concepts (“caterpillar”, “butterfly”) and adding it with varying intensity (α) to the prompt “a caterpillar”. **In this example, steering vectors are computer from SDXL-Turbo model.**

H. SPM vs Casteer on adversarial prompts

In this section, we present more qualitative examples of Casteer outperforming SPM [7] on adversarial prompts, i.e. prompts containing implicitly defined concepts. SD-1.4 is used as a backbone for both methods. We use prompts “*A mouse from Disneyland*” and “*A girl with a mouse from Disneyland*” to test erasing of concept of “*Mickey*” and prompts “*A yellow Pokemon*” and “*A girl with a yellow Pokemon*” to test erasing of concept of “*Pikachu*”.



Figure 43. Examples of 8 generated images from CASTeers and SPM when prompted “A mouse from Disneyland”. **Top:** generation of CASTeers, **Bottom:** generations of SPM. We use the same diffusion hyperparameters and seeds when generating corresponding images from CASTeers and SPM



Figure 44. Examples of 8 generated images from CASTeers and SPM when prompted “A girl with a mouse from Disneyland”. **Top:** generation of CASTeers, **Bottom:** generations of SPM. We use the same diffusion hyperparameters and seeds when generating corresponding images from CASTeers and SPM



Figure 45. Examples of 8 generated images from CASTeers and SPM when prompted “A yellow Pokemon”. **Top:** generation of CASTeers, **Bottom:** generations of SPM. We use the same diffusion hyperparameters and seeds when generating corresponding images from CASTeers and SPM




Figure 46. Examples of 8 generated images from CASteer and SPM when prompted “A girl with a yellow Pokemon”. **Top:** generation of CASteer, **Bottom:** generations of SPM. We use the same diffusion hyperparameters and seeds when generating corresponding images from CASteer and SPM.

I. Changing and removing identity.

In this section, we provide more qualitative examples of changing a person’s identity using “Concept Switch” method (see sec.?? in the main paper). We switch from “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves” (Fig.47a, 49a, 48a) and from “Taylor Swift” to “Angelina Jolie” (Fig.50a, 51a, 52a). In these experiments, we apply CASteer only to the last 36 layers of the model (see sec.E). The left column of the figures corresponds to the original generated images without CASteer applied, the middle column show CASteer applied for switching concepts with intensity $\beta = 1$, and the right column shows CASteer applied for switching concepts with intensity $\beta = 2$. Figures show that with $\beta = 2$ identity of “Leonardo DiCaprio” and “Taylor Swift” are successfully changed to “Keanu Reeves” and “Angelina Jolie”, respectively, while not affecting other features of the image and almost not changing the overall layout. At the same time, other identities are not affected. With $\beta = 1$, we get images expressing parts of both identities, i.e. “Leonardo DiCaprio” and “Keanu Reeves”, or “Taylor Swift” and “Angelina Jolie”.

Identity removal We formulate the task of identity removal as switching from the identity concept to the neutral one. For example, switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “a man” and from “Taylor Swift” to “a woman”. Fig.47b, 49b, 48b show results for using CASteer for switching from “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “a man”, and Fig.50b, 51a, 52a show results for using CASteer for switching from “Taylor Swift” to “a woman”. The left column of the figures corresponds to the original generated images without CASteer applied, the middle column show CASteer applied for switching concepts with intensity $\beta = 1$, and the right column shows CASteer applied for switching concepts with intensity $\beta = 2$. Figures show that CASteer can successfully remove the target identity without affecting other identities and maintaining consistency with text prompts. Note that in the case of switching for “a man” or “a woman”, low-level details of images are affected more than when switching from one particular identity to another (as “Taylor Swift” \rightarrow “Angelina Jolie”). For example, the hair of Brad Pitt changes a little when the steering vector for changing “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves” is applied. However, the identity is still fully preserved.



(a) Switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves”

(b) Switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “a man”

Figure 47. CASteer applied for switching identity of “Leonardo DiCaprio” to (a) “Keanu Reeves” and (b) “a man” to images of Leonardo DiCaprio (top), Brad Pitt (middle) and Barack Obama (bottom). On each figure, the left column: images generated without CASteer applied, the middle column: switching with strength $\beta = 1$, right column: switching with strength $\beta = 2$. Prompt of the form “X drinking coffee” with the same seed is used for all the generations, where X is one of “Leonardo DiCaprio”, “Brad Pitt”, “Barack Obama”



(a) Switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves”

(b) Switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “a man”

Figure 48. CASteer applied for switching identity of “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves”(a) and “a man”(b) to images of Leonardo DiCaprio (top), Brad Pitt (middle) and Barack Obama (bottom). On each figure, the left column: images generated without CASteer applied, the middle column: switching with strength $\beta = 1$, right column: switching with strength $\beta = 2$. Prompt of the form “X in a party dress with a cake in his hands” with the same seed is used for all the generations, where X is one of “Leonardo DiCaprio”, “Brad Pitt”, “Barack Obama”



(a) Switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves”

(b) Switching “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “a man

Figure 49. Casteer applied for switching identity of “Leonardo DiCaprio” to “Keanu Reeves”(a) and “a man”(b) to images of Leonardo DiCaprio (top), Brad Pitt (middle) and Barack Obama (bottom). On each figure, the left column: images generated without Casteer applied, the middle column: switching with strength $\beta = 1$, right column: switching with strength $\beta = 2$. Prompt of the form “X on a bicycle” with the same seed is used for all the generations, where X is one of “Leonardo DiCaprio”, “Brad Pitt”, “Barack Obama”



(a) Switching “Taylor Swift” to “Angelina Jolie”

(b) Switching “Taylor Swift” to “a woman

Figure 50. Casteer applied for switching identity of “Taylor Swift” to “Angelina Jolie”(a) and “a woman”(b) to images of Taylor Swift (top), Marilyn Monroe (middle) and Beyonce (bottom). On each figure, the left column: images generated without Casteer applied, the middle column: switching with strength $\beta = 1$, and the right column: switching with strength $\beta = 2$. Prompt of the form “X playing chess” with the same seed is used for all the generations, where X is one of “Taylor Swift”, “Marilyn Monroe”, “Beyonce”



Figure 51. Casteer applied for switching identity of "Taylor Swift" to "Angelina Jolie"(a) and "a woman"(b) to images of Taylor Swift (top), Marilyn Monroe (middle) and Beyonce (bottom). On each figure, the left column: images generated without Casteer applied, middle column: switching with strength $\beta = 1$, right column: switching with strength $\beta = 2$. Prompt of the form "X with red hair eating an ice cream" with the same seed is used for all the generations, where X is one of "Taylor Swift", "Marilyn Monroe", "Beyonce"



Figure 52. Casteer applied for switching identity of "Taylor Swift" to "Angelina Jolie"(a) and "a woman"(b) to images of Taylor Swift (top), Marilyn Monroe (middle) and Beyonce (bottom). On each figure, the left column: images generated without Casteer applied, the middle column: switching with strength $\beta = 1$, right column: switching with strength $\beta = 2$. Prompt of the form "X with a teddy bear" with the same seed is used for all the generations, where X is one of "Taylor Swift", "Marilyn Monroe", "Beyonce"

J. Interpreting steering vectors

In this section, we propose a way to interpret the meaning of steering vectors generated by CASTeering. Suppose we have steering vectors generated for a concept $\mathbf{X} \{ca_{it}^{\mathbf{X}}\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq t \leq T$, where n is the number of model layers and T is a number of denoising steps performed for generating steering vectors. To interpret these vectors, we prompt the diffusion model with a placeholder prompt “X” and at each denoising step, we substitute outputs of the model’s CA layers with corresponding steering vectors. This makes the diffusion model be only conditioned on the information from the steering vectors, completely suppressing other information from the text prompt.

Fig. 53 shows interpretations for the steering vectors of concepts “hat”, “polka dot dress”, “Snoopy”, “angry”, “happy”, from top to bottom. Note that vectors for concepts “hat”, “polka dot dress” and “Snoopy” were generated using prompt pair templates for concept deletion, i.e. pairs of the form (“fish with Snoopy”, “fish”), (“a girl with a hat”, “a girl”) (see sec. B.2), and this is reflected in generated images, as they show these concepts not alone, but in a form of a girl in a hat, a girl in a polka dot dress or a boy with a Snoopy. As for the last two concepts (“angry”, “happy”), their steering vectors were generated using prompt pair templates for human-related concepts (see sec. B.1), and they illustrate these concepts as is.

We note that images of each concept exhibit common features, e.g. all the images of hats and polka dots feature only female persons, and images corresponding to “angry” and “happy” concepts have certain styles. We believe this reflects how diffusion models perceive different concepts, and that this interpretation technique can be used for unveiling the hidden representations of concepts inside the diffusion model, but we leave it to future work.




Figure 53. Visualization of generations of the model conditioned only on steering vectors. Images in rows from top to down were generated using steering vectors for the concepts “hat”, “polka dot dress”, “Snoopy”, “angry”, “happy”

K. More results on Style Transfer

In this section, we present more results on Style Transfer on real images using CASTeer.

CASTeer performs Style Transfer on real images as follows: we apply the reverse diffusion process following DDIM [47] for t number of steps, where $1 \leq t \leq T$. Then we denoise image back using CASTeer (addition algorithm, see eq.4). t controls the trade-off between loss of image details and intensity of style applied. On fig. 54, 55, 56, 57 we show results on style transfer to four different styles with varying t . Intensity= 0.3 here means that $t = 0.3T$. With such a process, we often get satisfying results with no major loss of details. However, when t is high, the loss of image content occurs (see bottom lines of figures). This is due to the fact that the inversion is not sufficiently accurate.



Figure 54. Examples of Style Transfer of real images into “anime” style. From top to bottom: original image, style transfer applied with intensities from 0.1 to 0.7 with a step of 0.1




Figure 55. Examples of Style Transfer of real images into “origami” style. From top to bottom: original image, style transfer applied with intensities from 0.1 to 0.7 with a step of 0.1




Figure 56. Examples of Style Transfer of real images into “Gothic Art” style. From top to bottom: original image, style transfer applied with intensities from 0.1 to 0.7 with a step of 0.1



Figure 57. Examples of Style Transfer of real images into “Retro Art” style. From top to bottom: original image, style transfer applied with intensities from 0.1 to 0.7 with a step of 0.1