

Lasagna: Layered Score Distillation for Disentangled Object Relighting

Dina Bashkirova¹
dbash@bu.edu

Arijit Ray¹
array@bu.edu

Rupayan Mallick²
rm2083@georgetown.edu

Sarah Adel Bargal²
sb2122@georgetown.edu

Jianming Zhang⁴
jianmzha@adobe.com

Ranjay Krishna³
ranjay@cs.washington.edu

Kate Saenko^{1,5}
saenko@bu.edu

Abstract

Professional artists, photographers, and other visual content creators use object relighting to establish their photo’s desired effect. Unfortunately, manual tools that allow relighting have a steep learning curve and are difficult to master; Although generative editing methods now enable some forms of image editing, relighting is still beyond today’s capabilities; existing methods struggle to keep other aspects of the image—colors, shapes, and textures—consistent after the edit. We propose *Lasagna*, a method that enables intuitive text-guided relighting control. *Lasagna* learns a lighting prior by using score distillation sampling to distill the prior of a diffusion model, which has been finetuned on synthetic relighting data. To train *Lasagna*, we curate a new synthetic dataset *ReliT*, which contains 3D object assets re-lit from multiple light source locations. Despite training on synthetic images, quantitative results show that *Lasagna* relights real-world images while preserving other aspects of the input image, outperforming state-of-the-art text-guided image editing methods. *Lasagna* enables realistic and controlled results on natural images and digital art pieces and is preferred by humans over other methods in over 91% of cases. Finally, we demonstrate the versatility of our learning objective by extending it to allow colorization, another form of image editing. The code for *Lasagna* can be found at <https://github.com/dbash/lasagna>.

1. Introduction

Professional visual artists spend hours editing their photos. Editing requires a wealth of knowledge about the 3D scene: the geometry of objects, their position, and how the direction of the light source affects their appearance [5, 17]. Manual

¹Boston University

²Georgetown University

³University of Washington

⁴Adobe Research

⁵Facebook AI Research




Figure 1. Given a single input image (top row) and a text prompt specifying a lighting condition (e.g. light pointing from the left or the right) *Lasagna* performs geometry-aware relighting of images of various levels of realism, from natural photos to minimalist digital art, and allows text-guided light conditioning (fourth and fifth rows). State-of-the-art InstructPix2Pix [7] (second row), given the prompt that works best in our experiments, struggles to perform realistic relighting, while ControlNet [49] (third row) trained on relighting data often alters crucial aspects of the image.

editing tools like Photoshop [1] and Procreate [22] can be tedious and time-consuming for novices and professionals alike. While specialized methods for relighting and shading exist [21, 48, 50], they require supervised training to estimate object intrinsics and therefore lack generalization.

Recent diffusion-based editing methods [7, 19, 26] promise to offer a more user-friendly editing experience through language interactions and generalize to a variety



Figure 2. With *Lasagna*, we can perform controlled relighting with language guidance only (light direction shown at the top). Given a simple language prompt that specifies the lighting direction, *Lasagna* performs shape-aware relighting and generalizes to both natural images and digital art examples of various levels of abstraction.

of image domains. Unfortunately, today’s methods have limited success in control over lighting, shading or reflection, due to a lack of such geometry-based knowledge in their pre-training. As shown in Figure 1, if we instruct a state-of-the-art image editing method InstructPix2Pix [7] to relight images, it fails to control light direction, doesn’t apply realistic relighting in general, and also doesn’t preserve the overall appearance and content. One effective way to improve specific editing capabilities is finetuning with supervision, however, existing datasets for relighting are typically too small to allow generalization [28, 39]. Finetuning on synthetic data has shown to be a promising alternative [24] for geometry-aware edits. However, as shown in Figure 1, directly applying a model, which was trained on synthetic data, for relighting real images leads to undesired changes to other crucial aspects of the input.

To provide an intuitive and realistic text-guided relighting solution, we propose *Lasagna* – a method for subtle geometry-aware image edits guided by a user’s language instruction (e.g. “a photo of a dog with {direction} lighting”). There are two key technical contributions behind *Lasagna*. First, inspired by DreamFusion [29], *Lasagna* learns to extract the geometry prior from a diffusion model using score distillation sampling. Second, *Lasagna* decomposes relighting as a luminosity adjustment in the pixel space, which allows for a restricted edit that does not alter other aspects of an input image. Together, these two techniques disentangle object relighting from other types of editing. Representing

lighting edits as a pixel-wise luminosity adjustment is inspired by tools like Photoshop [1] and Procreate [22], thus such layered representation can be especially useful and intuitive for visual content creators.

To train *Lasagna*, we propose *ReliT*, a large-scale synthetic dataset of scenes with objects rendered with varying light sources and directions. *ReliT* is created using the 3D object assets from Objaverse [11] and contains over 14,000 objects. *ReliT* training introduces a relighting prior to a diffusion model and to learn a robust association between the language guidance and the lighting direction, disentangling it from other factors of variation. Though this prior is trained using synthetic images only, *Lasagna* leverages it to perform controlled and geometrically accurate relighting on real world images and even digital art pieces.

We show examples of *Lasagna*’s outputs in Figure 2, showing its efficacy on datasets from three different domains: natural photos from the Dreambooth dataset, digital art pieces, and the test set of the proposed *ReliT* dataset. Our experimental results indicate a clear advantage of *Lasagna* over state-of-the-art text-guided image editing methods as well as the baseline finetuned for relighting, with our method being preferred in over 91% of cases according to a human evaluation study. We also illustrate the versatility of *Lasagna* by extending it for sketch colorization.

2. Related Work

We situate our work within the space of text-guided image editing. We draw on score distillation sampling to train our model for object relighting.

Text-guided image editing and translation became a topic of active research shortly after the emergence of LLM- and VLM-based text-conditional image generation methods, such as Stable Diffusion [33], Imagen [36] and DALLE [31, 32]. Earlier text-guided editing methods used CLIP [30] to train a separate generator to learn a realistic edit for a given input image [2, 13, 20], while other methods like SDEdit [23], Plug-and-Play [40], DDIB [38] and Imagic [19] directly use a diffusion prior to edit the input image. Prompt2Prompt (P2P) [15] performs editing by swapping cross-attention maps, while InstructPix2Pix [7] further uses P2P to generate extract pseudo-supervision for image editing based on a single editing prompt. Another direction in image editing is text-guided inpainting [9, 43] that edits a masked part of an image according to the guiding prompt.

While these methods achieve remarkable editing results, the majority of them predict an edited image directly, which often results in undesired alterations in the aspects of the input image that are not supposed to be edited, which is especially critical for geometry-aware edits, such as relighting. A concurrent work, Delta Denoising Score [16], uses a version of score distillation sampling to perform few-shot image editing, directly editing the image pixels, however, it underperforms on geometry-aware edits like relighting due to a lack of such knowledge in the diffusion model. Text2Live [2] learns a RGB-A edit layer using a CLIP [30] prior, which is also limited for geometry-aware edits. In contrast, *Lasagna* uses a relighting fine-tuned diffusion model prior, which leads to more realistic edits, and restricts the editing effect via functional layer composition. To the best of our knowledge, *Lasagna* is the first method that uses a diffusion model prior to perform object relighting without any real training data.

Score distillation sampling. (SDS) was introduced in DreamFusion [29] and then further improved in the follow-up works [10, 42, 45] for text-conditional 3D object generation with NeRFs [25], allowing distillation of a diffusion model prior via differentiable image parameterization. One of the biggest advantages of differential image parameterization is that it allows introduction of custom sampling constraints. Works that use score distillation sampling include a few 2D image generation results [29, 42, 45] to show text-conditional image generation capabilities, but to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to use *image-conditional* SDS for disentangled image editing.

Object relighting can be roughly divided into inverse rendering-based approaches [3, 18, 21, 48, 50] that decompose the geometric properties of the object, such as reflectance, normals and material, and image editing methods [8, 12, 44, 47] that predict the relighting edit directly in the pixel space. While the latter methods often produce inconsistent shading results due to the lack of geometric prior, inverse rendering-based methods are trained on curated datasets and, therefore, struggle to generalize. Recent works on relighting perform 3D scene reconstruction with NeRFs [6, 37, 46], which requires a set of images from different view points and a known light source, limiting its applicability to a wide variety of domains such as digital art. In contrast, *Lasagna* requires a single image and leverages the rich prior of a diffusion model, which leads to better generalization to a wide range of image domains and allows a more intuitive way to condition relighting with text prompts.

Relighting datasets. While there exist some real-world [28, 39] and synthetic [14, 47] relighting datasets, they are relatively small, containing less than 1000 distinct objects which lead to overfitting. In contrast, our proposed *ReliT* dataset contains more than 13K distinct 3D objects from Objaverse [11] and 50 high-quality background environment maps, drastically increasing diversity compared to the existing datasets.

3. Lasagna

Our goal is to achieve disentangled object relighting with text guidance using a strong diffusion model prior. To achieve this, we first introduce score distillation sampling in Section 3.1 that allows image generation with custom constraints, we then discuss how score distillation sampling can be used for disentangled image editing by introducing editing layers in Section 3.2, and explain how to extend the layered editing framework to disentangled relighting. Finally, since off-the-shelf diffusion models lack a fine-grained language prior for lighting, we introduce it via training an image-conditional adaptor on a novel synthetic dataset for controlled relighting, which we discuss in Section 3.3.

3.1. Preliminaries: diffusion and score distillation sampling

Given an input image $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and the embeddings $\tau(c)$ of the conditioning text prompt c , a diffusion model learns to predict the noise ϵ added to an image \mathbf{x} with a denoising model $\hat{\epsilon}_\phi$ at a random time step t via weighted denoising score matching:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Diff}} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{X}, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} [w(t) \|\hat{\epsilon}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_t, t, \tau(c)) - \epsilon\|_2^2] \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_t = \alpha_t \mathbf{x} + \sigma_t \epsilon$ and $w(t)$ is a weighting function dependent on the timestep t . DreamFusion [29] introduced




Figure 3. Schematic overview of *Lasagna* for relighting. Given an input base layer \mathbf{x}_{base} , e.g. real photo, *Lasagna* learns an editing layer using score distillation sampling: **1**) a generator g_θ predicts two relighting layers – a multiply layer \mathbf{x}_s and a divide layer \mathbf{x}_l that decrease and increase luminosity respectively; **2**) an input layer \mathbf{x}_{base} is composed with the relighting layers \mathbf{x}_l and \mathbf{x}_s into an edited image \mathbf{y} ; **3**) \mathbf{y} is perturbed with a random noise and passed to a frozen diffusion model with a ControlNet adaptor trained on *ReliT* dataset to compute a denoising error conditioned on the guiding prompt (in red) that specifies lighting direction; **4**) the weighted denoising error is backpropagated to update the generator parameters θ according to Eq. 2.

score distillation sampling (SDS) to train a NeRF [25] representing a 3D object using the 2D prior of a diffusion model. To learn a 3D representation, DreamFusion uses differential parametrization [27] – a general framework in which parameters θ of a differential generator g are trained to produce an image $\mathbf{x} = g(\theta)$ minimizing a loss function $f(\mathbf{x})$, where f is typically computed based on the output or features of another model. This formulation enables the use of an arbitrary generator function g – in case of DreamFusion, a NeRF – and allows to incorporate additional generation constraints. To train a differentiable generator g , DreamFusion proposes to use the following gradient update rule:

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{SDS}} = \mathbf{E}_{t,\epsilon} [w(t)(\hat{\epsilon}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_t, t, \tau(c)) - \epsilon) \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \theta}] \quad (2)$$

where in case of DreamFusion, g is a differential renderer, and θ are the parameters of an MLP representing a NeRF.

3.2. Layered score distillation sampling

Given an input image $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{X}$ and an editing text prompt c , our goal is to predict an edited version of \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} , s.t. \mathbf{y} follows the editing prompt c while preserving all other aspects of \mathbf{x} fixed. Since directly predicting the editing result \mathbf{y} from \mathbf{x} often leads to changing the aspects of \mathbf{x} unrelated to the edit (as shown in Figures 6 and 4), we propose a *layered* approach in which a separate image – referred to as the *editing layer* in the remainder of the paper – is predicted and composed with the input image via a fixed edit-specific layer composition function $f: \mathcal{R}^{H \times W \times C_1}, \mathcal{R}^{H \times W \times C_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{H \times W \times C_3}$ to achieve editing results. An input base layer

\mathbf{x}_{base} is passed to a generator g_θ parametrized by θ (in our experiments – UNet [34], analogously to Text2Live [2]) that predicts an editing layer \mathbf{x}_{edit} (this approach trivially extends to multiple editing layers, we focus on a single layer for simplicity). Then, \mathbf{x}_{base} and \mathbf{x}_{edit} are composed into an editing result $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{base}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{edit}})$ that is passed to a frozen diffusion model to compute a denoising error from Eq. 2 for a randomly sampled time step t . Finally, the denoising error is backpropagated to update the parameters θ . An additional regularization function can be added to the denoising loss to enforce additional properties or constraints of an edit.

Layered editing for shading and relighting. Inspired by the relighting functionality proposed in image editing tools like Procreate, we define relighting as a luminosity adjustment function. The generator g_θ predicts two editing layers – a shading and a lighting layer $\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_l \sim \mathcal{R}^{H \times W \times 1}$, with $0 \leq \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_l \leq 1$ – that adjust the input image luminosity via Hadamand product and division, respectively. The underlying composition function is defined as $f_{\text{relighting}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{base}}, \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_l) = \mathbf{x}_{\text{base}} \odot \mathbf{x}_s \oslash \mathbf{x}_l$. To introduce a minimal change in luminosity, we add a regularization loss $L_{\text{reg}}(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x}\|_1$ for both layers. An overview of the *Lasagna* relighting is illustrated in Figure 3. The final gradient update rule is as follows:

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{SDS}} = \mathbf{E}_{t,\epsilon} [(w(t)(\hat{\epsilon}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_t, t, \tau(c)) - \epsilon) + L_{\text{reg}}(\mathbf{x})) \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \theta}] \quad (3)$$

The resulting editing layers can *only adjust luminosity* by design, preserving other aspects of an input image unchanged.



Figure 4. Comparison of shading results of the baseline methods: ControlNet trained on *ReliT*, Prompt2Prompt [15], InstructPix2Pix [7], Text2Live [2], DDS [16] and *Lasagna* on the test set of *ReliT*, out-of-distribution (OOD) real photos from the DreamBooth dataset [35] and digital art examples generated by Stable Diffusion v2.1. More results can be found in Section 9 in Appendix.

3.3. Introducing language-guided lighting prior to diffusion models

As shown in Figure 5, lighting is an aspect of an image that is hard to control via language with an off-the-shelf pretrained diffusion model due to the limitations in the language prior. Therefore, we introduce additional lighting prior by fine-tuning a ControlNet [49] adaptor on a novel *ReliT* dataset based on the popular synthetic Objaverse [11] dataset of 3D models. The ControlNet [49] adaptor enables image and text conditioning, which allows relight an input image conditioned on a text prompt specifying lighting parameters.

***ReliT* dataset** is generated using a subset of “thing” objects from the Objaverse dataset with a few notable modifications in the rendering pipeline: 1) we applied randomly sampled realistic background maps from 50 HDRI images collected from <https://polyhaven.com/> distributed with a CC0 license; 2) for each object in the dataset, we kept the camera position fixed; 3) we rendered frames with spot light source placed in one of the 12 locations around the object. Each of the 12 locations is fixed for the entire dataset, please see Figure 10 in the Appendix for an illustration of the examples from *ReliT*. In addition to 12 relighting images per object, we collected renderings with the panel light source that achieves uniform lighting with minimal shadows. We collected 13975 training object examples and 164 testing examples. *ReliT* will be made publicly available upon acceptance of this manuscript.

Training ControlNet with *ReliT*. To introduce a robust language guidance for lighting, we trained a ControlNet adaptor [49] that allows image conditioning for diffusion models. Given an input image \mathbf{x}_u from *ReliT* with uniform lighting, a ground truth image \mathbf{x}_i of a corresponding object with the spot light at location p_i , and a guidance text prompt $c = \text{“A photo of a \{category\} with \{i\} lighting”}$, with the lighting position index i , the denoising model with a ControlNet adaptor $\hat{\epsilon}_c$ parametrized by θ_c is trained via a weighted score matching loss with image conditioning:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ControlNet}} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_u, \epsilon} [w(t) \|\epsilon - \hat{\epsilon}_c(\mathbf{x}_{i,t}|t, \tau(c), \mathbf{x}_u)\|_2^2] \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{i,t} = \alpha_t \mathbf{x}_t + \sigma_t \epsilon$. By minimizing the denoising loss in Eq. 4, ControlNet learns to perform relighting of an input image \mathbf{x}_u corresponding to the light source location specified in the conditioning text prompt. However, as shown in Figure 6, ControlNet fails to preserve other aspects of the image, e.g. changes the colors or the shape of the input object and background, therefore, we propose *Lasagna* for disentangling the relighting prior from ControlNet.

4. Experiments

4.1. Setup

We use Stable Diffusion v1.5 [33] in all our relighting experiments, and we augment it with a ControlNet [49] adaptor to finetune on *ReliT*. We finetune the model for 250,000 iterations on a single A6000 GPU with batch size 4, which takes about 36 hours. We use the input prompt “A photo of {category} with l lighting”, with the category name provided in the Objaverse metadata and l being a light source position index in 0 – 11, going counter-clockwise around an object, 0 being placed directly atop the object, 3 being placed top left w.r.t the object, 6 facing the object, 9 being placed top right, the light source pointed at the object in all setups. During training, A ControlNet is given a conditioning image of the object with a panel light and a guiding prompt and is trained to denoise the corresponding ground truth relighted image.

For relighting layered SDS with *Lasagna*, we use the open-source implementation¹ of DreamFusion to train a UNet [34] with a sigmoid activation function to produce two single-channel layers – a multiply layer for shading and a divide layer for lighting. We use the AdamW optimizer with learning rate 5×10^{-3} and a classifier-free guidance scale of 10, regularization weight 1, and train for 700 iterations on a single input image, which takes about 140 seconds. We set the range of timesteps used for score distillation sampling to 0.02 – 0.98. Additionally, we provide proof-of-concept sketch-to-digital art translation results with alpha layer composition in Section 4.5.

4.2. Datasets

We finetune a ControlNet adaptor based on a Stable Diffusion model on our novel *ReliT* dataset of 13,975 objects dataset as described in Section 3.3. We test the precise relighting quality of *Lasagna* and compare it with the baseline text-guided editing methods on 164 test examples from *ReliT* (see Section 8.1 in Appendix for more details).

To test the relighting capability on natural images, we use the examples from the DreamBooth [35] dataset that has photos of 28 different objects on various backgrounds. We select one image per object, choosing the examples with the most uniform light. To analyze generalization to other domains, we test our method on 164 digital art images of 13 categories generated with Stable Diffusion v2.1. with the input prompt “A minimal digital art of a {category}”, which we refer to as the Digital Art dataset in this paper (more details in Section 8.2 in Appendix).

4.3. Baselines

We compare the quality of relighting of *Lasagna* with the popular text-guided image editing methods: ControlNet [49]

¹<https://github.com/ashawkey/stable-dreamfusion>




Figure 5. Ablation study results on layered score distillation sampling with *ReliT* prior compared to StableDiffusion v2.1 prior. Prompt-based relighting guidance with a pretrained Stable Diffusion leads to unreliable relighting results and introduces artifacts. Finetuning a ControlNet on *ReliT* introduces a strong association between the guidance text prompt and the lighting, which results in a substantially more reliable relighting edit.



Figure 6. Relighting results on the training set examples of *ReliT* with ControlNet indicate that the model learned to relight the input object given the input light source location index comparably well but struggles to preserve other aspects of the input image, such as colors and shape, fixed. In contrast, *Lasagna* that distills the lighting prior from the same ControlNet adaptor achieves relighting on par with ControlNet while keeping other aspects of the input image.

trained on *ReliT*, Prompt2Prompt (P2P) [15], Text2Live [2], InstructPix2Pix [7] and DDS [16]. The closest baseline approaches to *Lasagna* are Text2Live that distills CLIP prior into an editing layer and DDS that uses a variant of SDS to edit an image inplace. Text2Live uses an additional green-screen loss to improve the edit fidelity, which is not meaningful for edits such as relighting, therefore, for a fair comparison, we report the Text2Live results both with and without the use of the green-screen loss (Text2LiveGS and

Text2Live). We use the default image editing parameters provided in the official implementation. For all the baselines, we select the prompts and hyperparameters that yield the best relighting results via visual inspection (see details in Section 9 of Appendix).

4.4. Evaluation metrics

Our experimental results on the test set of *ReliT* with standard distance metrics such as MSE (see Table 1 in the Appendix) indicate that pixel-wise metrics do not accurately reflect the relighting quality, as they favor the methods that return an image almost identical to the input and are not sensitive to the relighting quality. Standard relighting metrics such as a re-rendering error [21] are not suitable for our setup since they are based on the estimated object intrinsics, therefore, we report the human evaluation results for all datasets using a Two-alternative Forced Choice (2AFC) protocol. Given an input image, a pair of relighting results produced by *Lasagna* and a randomly chosen baseline, the participants were asked “Given an input image, which of the following images presents a more realistic relighting of the input object, with light coming from top left?”. We collected 3 evaluations per random pair from each of the datasets discussed in Section 4.2, a total of 5684 evaluations, and present the percentage of votes in favor of *Lasagna* compared to each baseline in Figure 7 (more details about human evaluation can be found in Section 10 of the Appendix).




Figure 7. Percentage of cases in which the participants chose *Lasagna* over each baseline considered in the human study. More details and illustrations of the human evaluation results can be found in Section 10 in the Appendix.

4.5. Results

The human evaluation results reported in Figure 7 indicate a clear advantage of *Lasagna* over the baselines that use an off-the-shelf diffusion model and a ControlNet pipeline trained for relighting. The participants prefer *Lasagna* over ControlNet in more than 91% of the cases on the Dream-Booth dataset, more than 86% on the Digital Art dataset, and in more than 85% of the cases on the test set of *ReliT* on which ControlNet was trained on, which indicates the importance of prior distillation. *Lasagna* also outperforms the closest baselines – Text2Live for layered editing and DDS that uses score distillation sampling – with a 92% preference on *ReliT*, 86% preference on Digital Art and 91% on the DreamBooth examples, suggesting that all of the components introduced in *Lasagna* are crucial for high-quality relighting. *Lasagna* is also preferred to state-of-the-art P2P and InstructPix2Pix in more than 91% cases, suggesting the efficiency compared to general image editing methods. The qualitative examples in Figure 4 show that *Lasagna* performs relighting on-par with the finetuned ControlNet and superior to the text-guided image editing methods that use an off-the-shelf diffusion model or CLIP, which indicates that adding a text-grounded relighting prior is crucial for achieving controlled relighting. Unlike ControlNet and Instruct-Pix2Pix that alter input image colors, textures and shapes, both Text2Live and *Lasagna* perform editing with separate editing layers, and therefore they both preserve all other aspects of the input image.

Notably, the relighting prior from a synthetic *ReliT* dataset generalizes well to the images from other domains, such as natural images from DreamBooth and minimal digital art examples from the Digital Art dataset, which can be beneficial for various creative applications. Another important difference of *Lasagna* that makes it stand out compared to the baselines is that it does not require tedious prompt tuning thanks to *ReliT* finetuning on a single prompt template, and it has a relatively small number of hyperparameters (CFG and regularization scale).

Layered editing for colorization. To illustrate the versatility of the proposed prior distillation approach for image editing, we show some qualitative results on sketch



Figure 8. Alpha layer colorization results for sketch-to-digital art translation with the guiding prompt “A realistic digital art of an X ”, where X is the object class name.

colorization in Figure 8. We use the prior of an off-the-shelf diffusion model and modify our pipeline as follows: 1) generator g_θ generates two editing layers – a colorization layer x_{rgb} and a transparency layer x_α ; 2) the layer composition function f_{color} is an elementwise weighted combination of the input layer and the colorization layer: $f_{\text{color}} = x_\alpha \circ x_{\text{rgb}} + (1 - x_\alpha) \circ x_{\text{base}}$. To improve edit quality and diversity, we swap SDS for variational score distillation (VSD) [45]; we use a CLIP image feature similarity [4, 41] for structure regularization (more details on this in Section 6.2 in the Appendix). These results indicate that we can achieve spatial conditioning with score distillation sampling and the proposed layer composition approach, which can be further improved via regularization.




Figure 9. Failure cases of *Lasagna*.

Limitations As shown in Figure 9, *Lasagna* sometimes fails on the very abstract input images, and is prone to adding some over-exposure lighting artifacts in the background, a limitation that can be mitigated via foreground masking, which is a potential direction for future work.

5. Conclusion

We show that other text-guided image editing methods fail at relighting due to the limitations in the diffusion model prior, and finetuning on a synthetic relighting dataset helps introduce the prior necessary for relighting, yet it leads to a sim-to-real domain gap altering other aspects of the image. We present a layered image editing method, *Lasagna*, that disentangles a relighting prior from a model fine-tuned on synthetic data to mitigate the sim-to-real gap and allow a high-quality relighting of images of arbitrary domains.

References

- [1] Adobe. Photoshop. <https://www.adobe.com/products/photoshop.html>. 1, 2
- [2] Omer Bar-Tal, Dolev Ofri-Amar, Rafail Fridman, Yoni Kashtan, and Tali Dekel. Text2live: Text-driven layered image and video editing. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 707–723. Springer, 2022. 3, 4, 5, 7
- [3] Jonathan T Barron and Jitendra Malik. Color constancy, intrinsic images, and shape estimation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2012: 12th European Conference on Computer Vision, Florence, Italy, October 7–13, 2012, Proceedings, Part IV 12*, pages 57–70. Springer, 2012. 3
- [4] Dina Bashkirova, José Lezama, Kihyuk Sohn, Kate Saenko, and Irfan Essa. Masksketch: Unpaired structure-guided masked image generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1879–1889, 2023. 8
- [5] Edward S Bomback. Manual of photographic lighting. (*No Title*), 1971. 1
- [6] Mark Boss, Raphael Braun, Varun Jampani, Jonathan T Barron, Ce Liu, and Hendrik Lensch. Nerd: Neural reflectance decomposition from image collections. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 12684–12694, 2021. 3
- [7] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18392–18402, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7
- [8] Alexandra Carlson, Ram Vasudevan, and Matthew Johnson-Roberson. Shadow transfer: Single image relighting for urban road scenes. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–1909, 2019. 3
- [9] Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Jarred Barber, AJ Maschinot, Jose Lezama, Lu Jiang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Kevin Murphy, William T Freeman, Michael Rubinstein, et al. Muse: Text-to-image generation via masked generative transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00704*, 2023. 3
- [10] Rui Chen, Yongwei Chen, Ningxin Jiao, and Kui Jia. Fantasia3d: Disentangling geometry and appearance for high-quality text-to-3d content creation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13873*, 2023. 3
- [11] Matt Deitke, Dustin Schwenk, Jordi Salvador, Luca Weihs, Oscar Michel, Eli VanderBilt, Ludwig Schmidt, Kiana Ehsani, Aniruddha Kembhavi, and Ali Farhadi. Objaverse: A universe of annotated 3d objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13142–13153, 2023. 2, 3, 6
- [12] Sourya Dipta Das, Nisarg A Shah, and Saikat Dutta. Msrnet: Multi-scale relighting network for one-to-one relighting. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2107, 2021. 3
- [13] Rinon Gal, Or Patashnik, Haggai Maron, Amit H Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Stylegan-nada: Clip-guided domain adaptation of image generators. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 41(4):1–13, 2022. 3
- [14] Majed El Helou, Ruofan Zhou, Johan Barthas, and Sabine Süsstrunk. Vidit: Virtual image dataset for illumination transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.05460*, 2020. 3

- [15] 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, 5, 7
- [16] Amir Hertz, Kfir Aberman, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Delta denoising score. 2023. 3, 5, 7
- [17] Fil Hunter, Steven Biver, Paul Fuqua, and Robin Reid. *Light—science & magic: An introduction to photographic lighting*. Routledge, 2021. 1
- [18] Kevin Karsch, Varsha Hedau, David Forsyth, and Derek Hoiem. Rendering synthetic objects into legacy photographs. *ACM Transactions on graphics (TOG)*, 30(6):1–12, 2011. 3
- [19] 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 *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6007–6017, 2023. 1, 3
- [20] Gihyun Kwon and Jong Chul Ye. Clipstyler: Image style transfer with a single text condition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18062–18071, 2022. 3
- [21] Zicheng Liao, Kevin Karsch, and David Forsyth. An approximate shading model for object relighting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5307–5314, 2015. 1, 3, 7
- [22] Savage Interactive Pty Ltd. Procreate App. <https://procreate.com/>. 1, 2
- [23] Chenlin Meng, Yutong He, Yang Song, Jiaming Song, Jiajun Wu, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Stefano Ermon. Sdedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 3
- [24] Oscar Michel, Anand Bhattad, Eli VanderBilt, Ranjay Krishna, Aniruddha Kembhavi, and Tanmay Gupta. Object 3dit: Language-guided 3d-aware image editing. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2307, 2023. 2
- [25] Ben Mildenhall, Pratul P Srinivasan, Matthew Tancik, Jonathan T Barron, Ravi Ramamoorthi, and Ren Ng. Nerf: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis. *Communications of the ACM*, 65(1):99–106, 2021. 3, 4
- [26] 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. 1
- [27] Alexander Mordvintsev, Nicola Pezzotti, Ludwig Schubert, and Chris Olah. Differentiable image parameterizations. *Distill*, 3(7):e12, 2018. 4
- [28] Lukas Murmann, Michael Gharbi, Miika Aittala, and Fredo Durand. A dataset of multi-illumination images in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4080–4089, 2019. 2, 3
- [29] Ben Poole, Ajay Jain, Jonathan T Barron, and Ben Mildenhall. Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14988*, 2022. 2, 3
- [30] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [31] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8821–8831. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [32] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 1(2): 3, 2022. 3
- [33] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 3, 6, 13
- [34] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention—MICCAI 2015: 18th International Conference, Munich, Germany, October 5-9, 2015, Proceedings, Part III 18*, pages 234–241. Springer, 2015. 4, 6
- [35] 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. 5, 6
- [36] 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. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:36479–36494, 2022. 3
- [37] Pratul P Srinivasan, Boyang Deng, Xiuming Zhang, Matthew Tancik, Ben Mildenhall, and Jonathan T Barron. Nerv: Neural reflectance and visibility fields for relighting and view synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7495–7504, 2021. 3
- [38] Xuan Su, Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Dual diffusion implicit bridges for image-to-image translation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 3
- [39] Marco Toschi, Riccardo De Matteo, Riccardo Spezialetti, Daniele De Gregorio, Luigi Di Stefano, and Samuele Salti. Relight my nerf: A dataset for novel view synthesis and relighting of real world objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20762–20772, 2023. 2, 3
- [40] 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 Con-*

- ference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 1921–1930, 2023. 3
- [41] Yael Vinker, Ehsan Pajouheshgar, Jessica Y Bo, Roman Christian Bachmann, Amit Haim Bermano, Daniel Cohen-Or, Amir Zamir, and Ariel Shamir. Clipasso: Semantically-aware object sketching. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 41(4): 1–11, 2022. 8, 12
- [42] Haochen Wang, Xiaodan Du, Jiahao Li, Raymond A Yeh, and Greg Shakhnarovich. Score jacobian chaining: Lifting pretrained 2d diffusion models for 3d generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12619–12629, 2023. 3
- [43] 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
- [44] Yifan Wang, Brian L Curless, and Steven M Seitz. People as scene probes. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part X 16*, pages 438–454. Springer, 2020. 3
- [45] Zhengyi Wang, Cheng Lu, Yikai Wang, Fan Bao, Chongxuan Li, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. Prolificdreamer: High-fidelity and diverse text-to-3d generation with variational score distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16213*, 2023. 3, 8, 12
- [46] Yingyan Xu, Gaspard Zoss, Prashanth Chandran, Markus Gross, Derek Bradley, and Paulo Gotardo. Renerf: Relightable neural radiance fields with nearfield lighting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 22581–22591, 2023. 3
- [47] Zexiang Xu, Kalyan Sunkavalli, Sunil Hadap, and Ravi Ramamoorthi. Deep image-based relighting from optimal sparse samples. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (ToG)*, 37(4):1–13, 2018. 3
- [48] Yu-Ying Yeh, Koki Nagano, Sameh Khamis, Jan Kautz, Ming-Yu Liu, and Ting-Chun Wang. Learning to relight portrait images via a virtual light stage and synthetic-to-real adaptation. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 41(6):1–21, 2022. 1, 3
- [49] 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. 1, 6
- [50] Xianling Zhang, Nathan Tseng, Ameerah Syed, Rohan Bhasin, and Nikita Jaipuria. Simbar: Single image-based scene relighting for effective data augmentation for automated driving vision tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3718–3728, 2022. 1, 3

6. Implementation and method details

6.1. Relighting

For relighting, we use a version of a convolutional UNet model with a single encoder and two decoder branches, one that produces a highlight layer, and another one predicts a shading layer. The encoder consists of 4 convolutional layer blocks with 16, 32, 64 and 128 filters, respectively. Both branches use a final sigmoid activation function and the final values are clipped to the range $[0.1, 1]$ to avoid numerical overflow and overly saturated results.

To train a diffusion model on *ReliT*, we use the Hugging-Face implementation of StableDiffusion v1.5 with 512×512 resolution with the ControlNet adaptor. We keep the diffusion model frozen and finetune the ControlNet adaptor for 250,000 iterations on a single A6000 GPU with batch size 4, starting learning rate 10^{-5} , and a default DDPM noise scheduler.

For layered score distillation sampling, we freeze both the diffusion model and the ControlNet adaptor, and only finetune the convolutional UNet generator producing the editing layers. We train it for 700 steps with batch size 4 for a single image, with a different timestep t randomly sampled for each example in a batch, which achieves faster convergence. We observed that, contrary to the default score distillation sampling that requires a large classifier-free guidance (CFG) scale to achieve a well defined sampling, a GFC scale no more than 15 leads to visually more realistic relighting results. In our experiments, we use $\text{CFG} = 10$ for the Dreambooth dataset, $\text{CFG} = 7$ for the *ReliT* test set and $\text{CFG} = 12$ for the Digital Art dataset. Additionally, we use an L_1 regularization term to minimize the over-exposure artifacts. For all the datasets, we use the following prompt to learn the editing layers: “A photo of a {category name} with {X} lighting”, with the corresponding object category name and light direction index X .

6.2. Colorization

For colorization, we use a single-branch convolutional UNet generator with the same configuration as in the relighting experiments. The generator produces a single RGBA editing layer that determines the color overlay with the input sketch. Since an off-the-shelf Stable Diffusion model already has a strong prior for colorization, we do not perform finetuning and use the default model instead.

To achieve a more visually pleasing and diverse translation results, we use a Variational Score Distillation (VSD) [45] that achieves superior text-to-3D generation results. VSD trains an additional LoRA adaptor to predict a denoising score for the 3D rendering result. Following this approach, we use a ControlNet adaptor instead of LoRA to predict a denoising score for the colorization result *conditioned on the input sketch*. We train the generator for 4000

iterations with the CFG scale of 8, and we use an additional structure similarity loss based on the CLIP image encoder features as introduced in Clipasso [41] with the loss multiplier of 2000.

6.3. Baselines

Text2Live We have two versions: one with a green screen (as default in the paper, and one without a green screen loss since shading as an image layer is hard to describe in text. For the latter, we omit the green screen loss in the total loss calculation. All configs are kept the same as recommended in the official implementation. For the text describing the green screen, we make it the object name. If we are omitting the green screen loss, we leave it blank. For the text describing the full edited image, we make a prompt: “a digital art of a [object name] shaded with light coming from the left.” For the text describing the input image: “a digital art of a [object name].”

Prompt2Prompt We set the cross-replace weight to be 0.8, and the self-replace weight to be 0.6. All other parameters are as default in official implementation.

DDS: Delta Denoising Score We now present the setup for the other two baseline methods, for the DDS method: we use a guidance scale of 7.5, with minimum and maximum number of time steps to be 50 and 1050 respectively. The total number of iterations are 500 for each image optimization. The text edit prompt we use in this case are “a photo of [object] with dramatic light from left” for *ReLiT* and *Dream-Booth* or “a digital art of [object] with dramatic light from left” for *Generated Art Dataset*. At first we keep the values as in the official implementation of the DDS. The the values of the time step and other configurations are obtained using a grid search approach.

InstructPix2Pix Similar to DDS, in the InstructPix2Pix we first keep the configuration as given in the official implementation and then change accordingly using the grid search approach. The guidance scale for text is 7.5 with the guidance scale on image as 1.5. The number of time steps used here are 120. “Add dramatic light from left on it” is the text prompt used in this particular baseline for all three datasets as presented in the next section.

7. Stable Diffusion lighting prior limitations

8. Datasets

8.1. ReLiT

An illustration of the examples from the proposed *ReliT* dataset can be found in Figure 10. *ReliT* contains 13975 distinct training set objects and 164 test set objects lit with the point light at 12 predefined light source locations around the object from atop. In addition to the renderings,




Figure 10. Examples from the *ReliT* dataset: uniformly lit image in the first column, and the same object with spot light source placed at each of the 12 prederined locations around it.

ReliT includes a metadata file with object category name and captions. The *ReliT* dataset will be released upon paper acceptance.

8.2. Generated Digital Art

We generated the synthetic Digital Art dataset using the Stable Diffusion V2.1 [33] using the text prompt “A *minimal digital art of a {category}*” for the following 13 categories: birthday cake, car, cat, chair, corgi, cup, hamburger, high heel, ice cream, ice pop, orange, strawberry cheesecake, turtle. The Digital Art dataset will be released upon paper acceptance.

9. More results

More relighting examples by *Lasagna* and the baseline methods can be found in Figures 11 and 12 for the Dream-Booth dataset, in Figures 14 and 15 for the test set of *ReliT* dataset, and on Figures 16, 17, 18 and 19 for the Digital Art dataset.

10. Human Evaluation Details and Illustrations

Instructions given to the human evaluation participants can be found in Figure 20. Our human evaluation results on Amazon Mechanical Turk illustrated in Figure 24 indicate that relighting is an edit type that is hard to evaluate without expertise and special training. As illustrated in Figures 21, 22 and 23, participants of the AMTurk study that were given the instructions in Figure 20, often favor the results that are almost identical to the input image and do not present any changes in the lighting to the *Lasagna* results with a valid lighting. We hypothesise that the participants are making

such choices since the direct replica of the input image is often perceived as a more realistic looking image overall.

In order to mitigate such a bias towards the overall perceived realism on the relighting quality evaluation, we conduct an expert human evaluation study including three participants with the computer science background. The participants had no prior knowledge of how each of the evaluated methods editing results look like, and were given the same instructions as the participants of the AMTurk study (Figure 20). The results of the expert evaluation study have a significantly higher expert agreement range across the examples, with the variance of the Two-Forced-Choice scores being over 3.5 times lower than that of the AMTurk evaluation study, suggesting a more reliable assessment.

Automatic metrics such as mean square error (MSE) or LPIPS score w.r.t. the ground truth relit images from the test set of *ReliT*, as shown in Table 1, tend to favor the results that are perceptually indistinguishable from the input images, such as Prompt2Prompt or DDS translation (please see the results illustrated in Figures 11- 19). Since these metrics are more sensitive to the general changes in w.r.t. the input image and do not accurately reflect the translation accuracy, we opt for a human evaluation instead.




Figure 11. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the DreamBooth data (instructed to relight from top left).




Figure 12. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the DreamBooth data (instructed to relight from top left).




Figure 13. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the *ReliT* test set data (instructed to relight from top left).




Figure 14. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the *ReliT* test set data (instructed to relight from top left).




Figure 15. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the *ReliT* test set data (instructed to relight from top left).




Figure 16. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the Digital Art data (instructed to relight from top left).



Figure 17. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the Digital Art data (instructed to relight from top left).



Figure 18. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the Digital Art data (instructed to relight from top left).




Figure 19. More *randomly sampled* relighting examples on the Digital Art data (instructed to relight from top left).

Instructions

Thanks for participating in this HIT!

We give an image on the left (**Input**) to an AI that is tasked to apply a light pointing at an object in the image coming from the top left.

We ask you to choose between two options (**Option 1** and **Option 2**) that looks like the best version of the **Input** image with a torch lighting from the top left.

Please keep attention to the details related to light, such as shadow direction, highlights, and whether the light and shadows are correct given the object shape.

It is also important to keep in mind that when light is applied to an object, it should preserve other aspects same as in the **Input** image, like object shape, color, texture, and orientation, as well as the background. Below, you will find a few examples of good and bad lighting results, along with explanations.

Please choose one of the two options that most closely resembles the real lighting as shown above.

Figure 20. Instructions for the human evaluation task.

	MSE ↓	LPIPS ↓
Prompt2Prompt	0.0123 ± 0.0001	$6.33 \times 10^{-5} \pm 2 \times 10^{-9}$
InstructPix2Pix	0.05 ± 0.0001	$9.97 \times 10^{-5} \pm 6 \times 10^{-9}$
Text2Live	0.0166 ± 0.0001	$7.4 \times 10^{-5} \pm 3 \times 10^{-9}$
Text2Live $\lambda_{GS} = 0$	0.0164 ± 0.0002	$6.8 \times 10^{-5} \pm 2 \times 10^{-9}$
DDS	0.0156 ± 0.0001	$6.9 \times 10^{-5} \pm 2 \times 10^{-9}$
ControlNet	0.0349 ± 0.002	$1.5 \times 10^{-4} \pm 2 \times 10^{-9}$
<i>Lasagna</i>	0.0159 ± 0.001	$7.2 \times 10^{-5} \pm 8 \times 10^{-9}$

Table 1. Relighting accuracy (mean squared error) on the subset of *ReliT* training and test sets with ControlNet and *Lasagna*.




Figure 21. Illustration of the relighting choice made by the participants in a human evaluation study performed on the AMT indicates how hard the evaluating for relighting is for a participants without a specialized training and expertise.



Figure 22. Illustration of the relighting choice made by the participants in a human evaluation study performed on the AMT indicates how hard the evaluating for relighting is for a participants without a specialized training and expertise.




Figure 23. Illustration of the relighting choice made by the participants in a human evaluation study performed on the AMT indicates how hard the evaluating for relighting is for a participants without a specialized training and expertise.




Figure 24. Percentage of cases in which the participants chose *Lasagna* over each baseline considered in the human study conducted via AMTurk.