

CoLay: Controllable Layout Generation through Multi-conditional Latent Diffusion

Chin-Yi Cheng
Google Research

Ruiqi Gao
Google DeepMind

Forrest Huang
Google Research

Yang Li
Google Research

1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

{cchinyi, ruiqig, liyang}@google.com




Figure 1. Multi-conditional layout generation. Left: UI layouts generated by CoLay trained on the CLAY dataset with four conditions. Right: webpage layouts generated by CoLay trained on the C4 dataset with two conditions.

Abstract

Layout design generation has recently gained significant attention due to its potential applications in various fields, including UI, graphic, and floor plan design. However, existing models face two main challenges that limits their adoption in practice. Firstly, the limited expressiveness of individual condition types used in previous works restricts designers' ability to convey complex design intentions and constraints. Secondly, most existing models focus on generating labels and coordinates, while real layouts contain a range of style properties. To address these limitations, we propose a novel framework, CoLay, that integrates multiple condition types and generates complex layouts with diverse style properties. Our approach outperforms prior works in terms of generation quality and condition satisfaction while empowering users to express their design intents using a flexible combination of modalities, including natural lan-

guage prompts, layout guidelines, element types, and partially completed designs.

1. Introduction

A layout is a general representation where elements with attributes are placed and arranged within a given boundary. It is widely used in many design and engineering domains, including user interfaces (UI), visual graphics, books, architecture floor plans, and integrated circuits (IC) layouts. A layout design task is a process where designers keep creating and editing elements with the goal to maximize objectives while satisfying constraints. For example, in UI design, designers aim to make the UI layout visually appealing and easy to use, while complying all the functional requirements and design principles. Such a process is usually tedious, iterative, and therefore time-consuming. Therefore,

automating the layout design process has become an important research topic.

Many recent works [4, 19, 25] generate layouts conditionally, where designers can control the generated results by providing a certain type of condition, such as element properties, guideline grids, or text prompts. However, there are two main challenges for existing models to be used in design practice:

1. **Limited expressiveness of individual conditions** Conditions are usually high-level abstractions of the original designs that more closely align to users' intents, enabling them to guide model generation with little effort. The cost of these abstractions is the limited expressiveness. For example, on the top left of Figure 1, guidelines are convenient for expressing the desired grids for aligning the elements, but they will never be able to describe the class for the elements. Moreover, a condition can become inefficient and hard to use in certain situations. When using text prompt to express complex space division, for example, we may need to write many sentences instead of simply defining a guideline grid. Therefore, none of the conditions can perfectly handle every possible user intent for layout generation.
2. **Lack of style attributes in generated layouts** Most models in existing works generate only box coordinates and class labels. However, a realistic, completed layout should include style properties, such as foreground and background colors, font size, font weight, and text alignment. Although this limitation comes from the datasets, we argue that many existing models may also suffer from the linearly increased token length when generating layouts with multiple style properties.

Our solution to overcome the limited expressiveness on single condition is inspired by real UI design workflows. In the design process, designers always use many representations and tools, such as language, table of specs, design templates, or guideline grids to explore and communicate ideas. They can intuitively select the right tool or combination of tools to address their intent in different situations since they are already familiar with these tools. Therefore, if we provide designers a model with a set of conditions similar to the tools they use daily, they may be able to easily compose these conditions to address complex ideas as needed. Based on this assumption, we propose CoLay, controllable layout generation through multi-conditional latent diffusion, which can be flexibly conditioned on four commonly used conditions: text prompt, class and count, given design, and guidelines, and generate high quality layouts.

Since existing datasets may not contain these conditions, we provide methods to generate and extract conditions from existing datasets, such as prompting LLMs for text summaries of the UIs. We also propose three new metrics to evaluate the relevance between the conditions and the UIs:

CycSim for text prompt, C-Usage for class and count, and Design Distance for given design.

Overcoming the challenge of the lack of style attributes requires a new dataset. Therefore, we leverage C4 [31], a public dataset of web corpus, and extract the CSS attributes from the rendered view hierarchy of each webpage. With C4, we extend CoLay's capability on generating layouts with more complete visual properties, and show that our latent diffusion approach can scale up well with additional attributes.

Our experiments show that CoLay outperforms prior works with a significant margin in FID scores, condition metrics, and user study. These improvements are built on top of the existing latent diffusion model, PLayer [4]. We propose a variety of methods to improve it, such as removing the dependency on number of elements, exploring the drop probability for conditions, and sampling with different classifier-free guidance weights for the conditions. Furthermore, we demonstrate a unified experience where users can create and edit layouts step-by-step using the conditions as a toolkit for expressing their thoughts.

In summary, our contributions in CoLay include:

- We formulate layout generation as a multi-condition task and include four conditions to express and control complex design intents.
- We provide a method to automatically generate prompts for existing layout datasets and introduce a new metric, CycSim, for measuring the text-layout alignment.
- We generate realistic layouts with CSS style properties instead of a mock-up with boxes and labels.
- We improve the layout generation quality by a large margin compared to the current SOTA models.
- We create a unified, flexible workflow for user to generate and edit layouts by making the model capable of handling any arbitrary subset of the four conditions.

2. Related Work

2.1. Conditional Layout Generation

Using generative models for layout generation in vector graphic format has been widely studied [9, 17, 23]. It is common to represent layouts as a sequence of elements, and therefore, many prior works use sequential models such as transformers as backbone and explore different methods for generation, including autoregressive [9, 20, 29] and non-autoregressive [1, 4]. The best generation quality among recent works are achieved by discrete [16] and latent diffusion models [4]. Besides generation quality, it is also important to examine whether the model is capable of generating complex layouts with large number of elements. Most of the existing works use a small number (< 30) as the maximum number of elements, whereas CoLay can handle complex datasets like C4 [31].

Conditional generation has also been explored to enable user control, including element attributes and counts [19, 20, 24], relationships [21], images [2, 39, 42], guidelines [4], and text prompts [25]. However, multi-conditional generation with conditions across multiple domains are under-explored. Moreover, although FlexDM [15] recently explored predicting text style in a layout, it cannot perform well on generating layouts with a large number of elements. Therefore, these limitations make existing models difficult to be used in practice.

2.2. Conditional Diffusion Models

Conditional diffusion models [14] have demonstrated high effectiveness for controllable generation in various settings, such as image-to-image translation [33], text-to-image generation [32, 35] and text-to-video generation [13]. By treating any conditional information as an extra input to the model, conditional diffusion models can be trained with the same training objective as their unconditional counterparts. In addition, classifier-free guidance [11] is an effective technique to further improve the sample quality of conditional diffusion models, where a conditional and an unconditional model are jointly estimated, and the model prediction is modified to be a linear combination of two model outputs.

Conditional diffusion models have also been generalized to multi-conditional settings. For example, [6, 7, 27] study the problem of composing models trained with different single conditions to enable multi-conditional generation. However, these methods either require additional MCMC sampling steps leading to slow generation, or strong assumption that the multiple conditions are conditionally independent at all noise levels. For the conditions we study in this paper, such assumption does not hold. Therefore, we directly feed the model with a random subset of the multiple conditions during training, such that during inference, the model can generate samples given an arbitrary subset of conditions.

3. Multi-conditional Layout Generation

3.1. Datasets

We conduct experiments for CoLay using two publicly available datasets, CLAY [22] and C4 [31], for UI and webpage layouts respectively. Although CLAY and C4 differ in many aspects such as size, average number of elements, and screen resolution, the main reason we add C4 to our experiments is to test whether the latent diffusion method can be generalized to large number of attributes. Prior works on layout generation generate only class and box coordinates because existing datasets including CLAY, RICO-Semantic [26], and PublayNet [41], only have these two types of attributes. With C4, we can render the webpages as html files and extract the CSS style properties for each element.

Table 1. Dataset specifications. Note that the original C4 dataset contains 80 million layouts, and in this work we use a 5 million subset of it. Also, for CLAY we use the same resolution as [4] for fair comparison.

Name	Type	Size	# Attr.	Avg. # N	Res. in px
CLAY	UI	50K	5	19.62	36x64
C4	Web	5M	16	37.71	1024x1024

Table 2. Attributes used in CLAY and C4. The attributes listed in the same row share the dimension. For example, the (r, g, b, a) colors have the same range of values from 0 to 255. Also, the attribute value of the invalid element is equal to $d + 1$.

Type	Attributes	d-CLAY	d-C4
Class	<i>class</i>	24	4
Coords.	$x_{min}, y_{min}, x_{max}, y_{max}$	64	1024
Foreground	(r, g, b, a)	N/A	256
Background	(r, g, b, a)	N/A	256
Font Size	<i>font-size</i>	N/A	128
Font Weight	<i>font-weight</i>	N/A	9
Alignment	<i>alignment</i>	N/A	9

In addition, a characteristic common to both CLAY and C4 is that their layouts have hierarchy and order. For example, a container element can contain buttons, images, and other containers. In a sequence of layout elements, if we put the images before their parent container, they will be occluded since the parent container is a larger box that covers all the children elements. Other layout datasets such as RICO-Semantics and PublayNet are much simpler and mostly flat, and therefore, are not included in the experiments.

3.2. Layout and Conditions

We formulate the layout as a sequence of elements: $E = \{e^1, e^2, \dots, e^N\}$, and each element is composed by its attributes, $e^n = \{a_1^n, a_2^n, \dots, a_D^n\}$, where the number of attributes D varies by dataset. In CoLay, we fix $N = 64$, by padding E with invalid elements $e_{invalid}$ and discarding the layouts with $N > 64$. Following prior works [4, 9, 38], each attribute is converted to a one-hot vector, so we can obtain $E \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times d_{total}}$, where $d_{total} = \sum_{i=1}^D d_i$. The dimension of the one-hot vector d_i for each attribute a_i can be found in Table 2.

Text Prompt: None of the CLAY and C4 dataset have the corresponding text prompts for the layouts. To obtain the prompt-layout pairs, we feed view-hierarchy of each sample in these datasets to a PaLM-2-Bison [8]-based LLM, and ask it to generate a paragraph of screen summary




Figure 2. Model architecture. (a) The VAE model is trained to convert the layouts between vector graphic and latent space, and the denoising network is trained on the encoded latent representations. (b) Each condition is encoded by a specific encoder and passed through a dropping mechanism. (c) During sampling, the denoising network will generate \hat{z}_0 , and the decoder will decode it back to layout.

$P' = \{p^1, p^2, \dots, p^J\}$, where p^j represents each word token in the summary. The view hierarchies are first converted into a simplified HTML format similar to prior work [37], and sent along with instructions for the LLM to summarize the UI layout as prompts for the LLM. These summaries are then treated as the text prompt and paired with layout E for training. Please refer to the appendix for the LLM task formulation.

Class and Count: The class and count condition is defined as $C = \{c^1, c^2, \dots, c^K\}$, and K is the number of classes. C is obtained by computing the count of each class in a layout. For example, $\{3, 0, \dots, 0\}$ means that there are three elements in the layout, and all of them belong to the first class.

Given Design: The given design E' is a partially completed layout. In [4], this task is formulated as inpainting, where some elements are masked out to be recreated. However, in reality, users may not have the original or desired layout to start with, so they cannot create the corresponding masks. Therefore, instead of using masks, we extract the random subset from the original layout E and pad the missing ones as invalid elements at the end of the sequence.

Guidelines: We follow PLayer and represent the guidelines of a layout as $G = \{g^1, g^2, \dots, g^M\}$, and each guideline is defined by concatenating one-hot vector of its axis and position. The guidelines are extracted from the layout by projecting the four coordinates of each box to the X and Y axes and removing the duplication.

3.3. Metrics

The quality of conditional layout generation is evaluated by the sample quality and level of satisfaction of the conditions. In line with recent layout generation works [4, 16, 28], we choose Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [10] as the main metric for evaluating sample quality. We also de-

fine a metric for each of the four conditions used in CoLayer to evaluate their levels of satisfaction.

FID: FID measures the distance between the real and generated image distributions by encoding the image samples using a pre-trained Inception [36] model and computing the Fréchet Distance between the embeddings. For all the experiments, we sample 1024 samples from both real and generated layouts and render them as images. For CLAY, we use the same color legend as [4]; and for C4, since the layouts already contain style properties, we directly render these properties with dummy text.

CycSim for Text Prompt: Although CLIP score has been commonly used to measure the text-image alignment, it is not applicable to layouts since the CLIP model is not trained on the pairs of layout rendering and prompt. Therefore, we propose CycSim, cycle similarity as the metric to measure the prompt-layout alignment. The idea of CycSim is inspired by the cycle-consistency proposed by CycleGAN [43]. The intuition is that the layouts with prompts that have similar meanings may be visually similar, and the prompts with visually similar layouts may also share similar meanings. Based on this intuition, we develop two scores, CycSim-P and CycSim-L.

- **CycSim-P:** For a prompt P , we first generate the layout E_P and find E_P 's top-k visually similar layouts $\mathbf{E} = \{E_{top1}, E_{top2}, \dots, E_{topk}\}$ from the dataset samples. Then we define CycSim-P as the average sentence similarity between P and the corresponding prompts of \mathbf{E} .
- **CycSim-L:** For a generated layout E_P , we first use the input prompt P to find its top-k similar prompts $\mathbf{P} = \{P_{top1}, P_{top2}, \dots, P_{topk}\}$. Then CycSim-L is defined by computing the average visual similarity between E_P and the corresponding layouts of \mathbf{P} .

We define the visual similarity between a pair of layouts as their cosine similarity of the Inception embeddings. For

sentence similarity between two prompts, we encode them using Universal Sentence Encoder [3] and compute the cosine similarity. We set $k = 100$ in the experiments.

C-Usage for Class and Count: To evaluate the class and count usage, we first compute the $L1$ distance $\delta(C, C')$ between the input class count C and the class count of the generated layout C' . We set the distance between c_k and c'_k to zero if $c_k \leq c'_k$. The C-Usage is then computed by averaging $1 - (\delta(C, C') / \sum C)$ across generated samples. The reason we clip the distance is that, in practice, the model still has to generate necessary elements even when the user did not specify the count in a class or specified less than needed. For example, if the user specified four images, it does not mean buttons and text are not needed for a legit layout.

Design Distance for Given Design: To check whether the given design E' is fully used in the final layout E , we define Design Distance as the average of the one-way Chamfer Distance from E' to E across the generated samples. We do not need the other direction of the Chamfer Distance because E does not have to be contained in E' .

G-Usage for Guidelines: We use the same definition as PLay [4] for G-Usage, which is defined by $|G^{inter}|/|G|$, where G^{inter} is the intersection of the input guidelines G and the guidelines G' extracted from the generated layout. Similar to C-Usage, G' can contain more guidelines than G since the model may need to place elements at positions that are not specified by G .

4. Architecture

4.1. Multi-conditional Latent Diffusion

We follow PLay [4] and use a transformer-based latent diffusion model for layout generation. The goal is to generate layouts in the continuous, compact latent space and decode the generated latent vectors back to the vector graphic space. The model is composed of three major components: a variational auto-encoder (VAE), a multi-condition encoder, and a denoising network, as shown in Figure 2. The training process has two stages. In the first stage, we train the VAE to map the layouts between the continuous latent space and the discrete vector graphic space, and then we train the multi-condition encoder and denoising network together for generation.

A major difference from PLay [4] is that we removed the dependency on the number of elements N . In [4], the denoising network is conditioned on t , G , and N , causing a severe issue: the model is not learning how to generate the proper number of elements to fulfill the conditions. For example, a complex guideline grid implies that more elements are needed in the layout, and vice versa. To resolve this, we include the invalid elements as part of the layout. In this way, the model always generate $N = 64$ elements

and learns to arrange valid and invalid elements based on the conditions. We will see the improvement in Sec. 5.

4.1.1 First-stage VAE

The encoder $\mathcal{E}(E)$ of the VAE encodes the layout elements $E \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_{total}}$ as the latent vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \hat{d}}$, and the decoder $\mathcal{D}(z)$ decodes z back to E . Both $\mathcal{E}(E)$ and $\mathcal{D}(z)$ are non-autoregressive transformer encoders. Following the prior works [1, 4], no positional encoding is used for the VAE since the coordinates already provide explicit positional information. We train the first-stage VAE by augmenting E with its random subsets E' , so that the encoder can be versatile enough to handle both the complete layouts and the given, partially completed layouts.

Different from [4], which claims that VAE mainly serves the purpose of mapping the discrete space to continuous space for continuous diffusion process, one of the important findings in CoLay is that, the VAE also compresses information by shortening the token length. In many existing works on layout generation, including the ones using discrete diffusion process, such as LayoutDM [16], each token represents a property instead of an element, and therefore, the length of the sequence is $N \times D$ instead of N . In 5, we will show existing work struggles when N is large. Moreover, when generating properties beyond label and box coordinates, such as color and font size, the property-based token length will grow linearly with D and make the task more difficult to learn, where the element-based token length will remain the same.

4.1.2 Multi-condition Encoder

We design the multi-condition encoder, $\hat{P}, \hat{C}, \hat{E}, \hat{G} = \tau_\psi(P, C, E', G)$, as a set of condition encoders with a hierarchical dropout mechanism. During training, all the conditions is randomly dropped together with probability p_{cfg} for classifier-free guidance, and then each condition is dropped independently with probability p_{cond} . There are three advantages of this dropout mechanism. First, as mentioned in [40], when learning on one of conditions, dropout prevents the model from extracting information from other conditions. Secondly, it augments the dataset by providing more conditions-layout pairs. Lastly, and most importantly, it allows the model to learn on random combinations of conditions and provides flexible options to the user during generation. For example, if the model is trained on four conditions, users can control the layout generation by providing any subset of these four conditions.

Condition Sampling: We further augment the condition-layout pairs by sampling random subsets of each condition during training. As discussed in [4], sampling random subsets of the condition not only augment the

dataset, but also provides flexibility for the user to control the model. Using guideline condition as an example, users can provide a complex grid of guidelines when they have to follow many design rules, or simply draw a couple of guidelines when they only have a rough idea. The specifications and sampling method for each encoder can be found below.

- **Text Prompt Encoder:** The encoded text prompt $\hat{P} = (P_{seq}^{\hat{P}}, P_{pool}^{\hat{P}})$ is obtained from a pre-trained BERT model [5], where $P_{seq}^{\hat{P}}$ is the sequential embedding, and $P_{pool}^{\hat{P}}$ is the pooled embedding. Since the text prompt P is composed by multiple sentences that describes different parts or features of the layout, we can sample random subsets of the sentences from P to simulate the situations where users provide different granularity and details of text prompts.
- **Class and Count Encoder:** The encoder of the class and count condition is a two-layer transformer encoder. In training we randomly sample the classes by replacing zeros as counts of the unused classes.
- **Given Design Encoder:** We reuse the trained first-stage encoder $\mathcal{E}(E)$ to encode the given design condition, as its representation E' is the same as layout E . Similar to the class and count condition, the given design conditions are generated by extracting random subsets from E during training, and therefore, additional sampling is not required.
- **Guideline Encoder:** The guideline condition is encoded using a two-layer transformer encoder. In PLay, the probability p^m to sample a guideline g^m is determined by its weight h , which is the total length of box edges overlapping with this guideline, normalized by the sum of weights of all guidelines. Since the same sum of weights can be achieved by many guidelines with small weights or few guidelines with large weights, we normalize the weight by the averaged weight over all guidelines in the layout and reformulate the probability as:

$$p^m = (p_{base})^{\bar{h}/h} \quad (1)$$

The sampled guidelines from X and Y axes are concatenated and then encoded by the guideline encoder.

All the encoded conditions, \hat{P} , \hat{C} , \hat{E} , and \hat{G} , have the same embedding dimension as the query dimension of the denoising network, so that they can be either injected into the transformer layers or concatenated for joint cross-attention.

4.1.3 Denoising Network

We also use a non-autoregressive transformer encoder as the denoising network. It predicts the noise ϵ given the latent representation z_t and conditioned on the encoded conditions \hat{P} , \hat{C} , \hat{E} , \hat{G} , and time step t . The loss function is defined

using the simplified MSE loss proposed by [12]:

$$\mathcal{L} := \mathbb{E}_{t, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\|\epsilon - \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, \hat{P}, \hat{C}, \hat{E}, \hat{G}, t)\|^2 \right] \quad (2)$$

We inject the conditions into the transformer layers in three ways: direct concatenation, feature-wise affine, and cross attention. For conditions that have element-wise correspondence, such as the given design E' , we concatenate them with z_t along the element axis; for conditions that have global effects, such as t and the pooled prompt embedding P_{pool} , we use a feature-wise affine layer [30] to modulate the features; and lastly, for other types of conditions such as P_{seq} , we follow [34] to concatenate the conditions with z_t as key and value for cross-attention. We also discovered that the model with a joint cross-attention layer that concatenates all the encoded conditions with z_t outperforms the model with separate cross-attention layer for each condition.

4.2. Sampling with Multiple Guidance Weights

In sampling, we first initialize z_T , and iteratively denoise it to \hat{z}_0 using the denoising network. We apply classifier-free guidance [11] to enhance the sample quality. A naive approach is using the same guidance weight for multiple conditions. However, given the different modalities of the conditions in our case, the ideal guidance weight for each condition may differ. Therefore, we propose an approach to handle multiple guidance weights, with the minimum number of functional evaluation calls. We describe it in a more general case: assume the model is conditioned on L conditions $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_L\}$, and the corresponding guidance weights are monotonically increasing: $w_1 \leq w_2 \leq \dots \leq w_L$. Then the modified noise prediction is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\epsilon}_{\theta}(z_t, \mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_L, t) \\ &= (1 + w_1)\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, \mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_L, t) - w_1\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t) \\ &+ \sum_{i=2}^L (w_i - w_{i-1})(\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, \mathcal{C}_i, \dots, \mathcal{C}_L, t) - \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t)). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Finally, \hat{z}_0 is decoded back to the vector graphic domain using the first-stage decoder $\hat{E}_0 = \mathcal{D}(\hat{z}_0)$.

5. Experiments

5.1. Comparison and Ablations

In this section, we compare CoLay with recent works and report the ablation study under different settings, datasets, and condition combinations. We select PLay [4] and LayoutDM [16] as baseline models for comparison because they represent the best latent and discrete diffusion models for layout generation, respectively. Since LayoutDM is not a conditional model, we re-implement it with the guideline condition and classifier-free guidance, while keeping

Table 3. Ablation and baseline comparisons. All models are trained on CLAY with guideline condition only. GL-Sample: applying new guideline sampling method; B-1024: using a large batch size; Gen-All: generating invalid tokens together; Sort: sorting generated layout.

Model	N	GL-Sample	B-1024	Gen-All	Sort	FID ↓	G-Usage ↑
LayoutDM	64	✓		N/A	N/A	89.25	0.997
PLay	64					11.41	0.962
	64	✓				11.28	0.978
	64	✓	✓			10.60	0.972
	64	✓	✓	✓		8.86	0.979
CoLay	64	✓	✓	✓	✓	8.77	0.979
LayoutDM	25	✓		N/A	N/A	11.88	0.986
CoLay	25	✓	✓	✓	✓	6.71	0.988

Table 4. Quantitative results on multi-conditional models trained on CLAY. Each row represents a model trained with a specific combination of conditions. The models are evaluated by FID scores and metrics that measure the level of satisfaction on conditions.

Conditions				Metrics					
<i>G</i>	<i>E'</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>P</i>	FID ↓	G-Usage ↑	Given-Dist. ↓	C-Usage ↑	CycSim-L ↑	CycSim-P ↑
✓	✓	✓	✓	6.23	0.984	0.031	0.960	0.774	0.503
✓	✓	✓		6.94	0.986	0.030	0.961	✗	✗
✓	✓			7.23	0.986	0.031	✗	✗	✗
✓				8.77	0.979	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓		✓	✓	8.22	0.982	✗	0.940	0.776	0.504
✓			✓	8.42	0.979	✗	✗	0.775	0.503
		✓	✓	8.54	✗	✗	0.952	0.773	0.504
			✓	8.93	✗	✗	✗	0.779	0.506

other parameters the same. We also use the same transformer encoder as the denoising network for CoLay, PLay, and LayoutDM. Please refer to Appendix for implementation details.

From Table 3 we can find that LayoutDM cannot perform reasonably when $N = 64$, and it under-performs CoLay when $N = 25$. These results verify one of the main advantages of using latent diffusion for layout generation: compressing the sequence length from $N \times D$ to N . The encoder of our first-stage VAE compresses all the attributes in each element as a single vector, and therefore, the token length can remain the same, making the denoising task less difficult compared to discrete diffusion models. We can also observe that CoLay outperforms PLay by a large margin after applying several changes: the new guideline sampling method introduced in 4.1.2 improves the G-Usage; using larger batch size and sorting the generated layout by their lexicographical order both improve the FID; and lastly, as discussed in 4.1, generating with invalid elements boosts the FID score significantly.

In Table 4 and Table 5, we investigate how CoLay performs on CLAY and C4, respectively, when training with different combinations of conditions. It is reasonable that

the FID scores drop when adding more conditions since more information is provided to the model. We can also observe consistent numbers on the metrics for condition satisfactory, showing no negative impact among the added conditions. It is worth mentioning that CoLay reduces the FID score on C4 by half compared to PLay, demonstrating its robustness on a dataset that has an order of magnitude higher complexity.

As we want the model trained on four conditions to be capable of handling every combination of conditions during inference, we investigate how the condition drop probability p_{cond} and guidance weights affect generation quality. Table 6 shows that the optimal $p_{cond} = 0.5$ as it uniformly samples different combinations of conditions during training. Also, with a grid search on the guidance weights for each combination of conditions, we improve the FID significantly compared to a uniform weight. Nevertheless, there are some noticeable gaps in FID scores between the model trained on all conditions and models specialized on a specific combination, we leave the further improvement of all-conditional model for future research.

Table 5. Quantitative Results on the C4 dataset. Similar to Table 4, each row illustrates the performance of a model.

Model	Cond.	FID	G-Usage	Given-Dist.	C-Usage	CycSim-P	CycSim-L
PLay	(C, E', G)	26.27	0.823	0.003	0.952	x	x
CoLay	(C, E', G)	12.45	0.895	0.002	0.974	x	x
CoLay	(P, C, E', G)	11.21	0.905	0.002	0.978	0.534	0.750

Table 6. Top: FID scores on different values of condition drop probability. Bottom: FID scores on different combinations of conditions. Single: using a single guidance weight. Multi: using different weights for each condition and search for optimal weights. Specialized: trained on the specific combination.

Combinations				p_{cond}	FID		
G	E'	C	P	-	Single	Multi	Specialized
✓	✓	✓	✓	0.00	8.98		
✓	✓	✓	✓	0.25	6.88		
✓	✓	✓	✓	0.50	6.54		
✓	✓	✓	✓	0.75	6.66		
✓	✓	✓	✓	0.50	6.54	6.23	6.23
✓	✓	✓		0.50	6.85	6.62	6.94
✓	✓			0.50	7.37	7.28	7.23
✓				0.50	9.76	9.69	8.77

5.2. Multi-conditional Generation and Editing

In this section we demonstrate the experience of flexibly creating and editing layouts using the conditions provided by CoLay. As shown in the step-by-step examples in Figure 3, a designer may start by describing some concepts as text prompt, leaving other conditions as empty. Then they can iterate the design by adding new conditions or modifying the conditions extracted from the generated layout, such as editing the composition of guidelines, changing the count of element classes, or regenerating a specified region.

5.3. User Study

Metrics such as FID scores and CLIP scores do not always reflect human preferences [18]. Therefore, we also conduct user studies to verify the generation quality by human judgement. Following the user study done by [4], we invite six designers and ask each of them to select the preferred design from 48 pairs of layouts. As shown in Table 7, CoLay is preferred by designers over PLay and is comparable to ground truth samples.

5.4. Limitations

The layout generation quality is highly correlated to the data quality. However, both CLAY and C4 are collected years

Table 7. User study results. Please refer to Appendix for details.

	G.T.	CoLay	PLay
G.T.	N/A	0.092	0.312
CoLay	-0.092	N/A	0.255
PLay	-0.312	-0.255	N/A

ago without applying any filters on the layout quality, and therefore, many of the layouts in these datasets are either bad designs or are outdated in terms of design styles. Also, as the text prompt pairs are screen summaries generated by LLMs, they may not be able to represent visual properties or concepts in great detail.

6. Conclusion

We propose CoLay, a multi-conditional latent diffusion model for layout generation trained with four commonly used conditions by designers: text prompt, class count, given design, and guidelines. We introduce new methods on both preparing and evaluating these conditions. Our model is also capable of generating style attributes and scale to complex layouts in multiple domains. CoLay not only outperforms existing methods but also provide a flexible workflow for designers to control the layout generation process by synthesising combinations of conditions.

References

- [1] Diego Martin Arroyo, Janis Postels, and Federico Tombari. Variational transformer networks for layout generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13642–13652, 2021. **2, 5**
- [2] Yunning Cao, Ye Ma, Min Zhou, Chuanbin Liu, Hongtao Xie, Tiezheng Ge, and Yuning Jiang. Geometry aligned variational transformer for image-conditioned layout generation. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 1561–1571, 2022. **3**
- [3] Daniel Cer, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Cespedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, et al. Universal sentence encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11175*, 2018. **5**
- [4] Chin-Yi Cheng, Forrest Huang, Gang Li, and Yang Li. Play:




Figure 3. Multi-conditional generation and editing. We use a step-by-step example to illustrate the experience of creating and editing layouts with multiple conditions using CoLay.

Parametrically conditioned layout generation using latent diffusion. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. JMLR.org, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8

- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. 6
- [6] Yilun Du, Conor Durkan, Robin Strudel, Joshua B Tenenbaum, Sander Dieleman, Rob Fergus, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Arnaud Doucet, and Will Sussman Grathwohl. Reduce, reuse, recycle: Compositional generation with energy-based diffusion models and memc. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8489–8510. PMLR, 2023. 3
- [7] Tomas Geffner, George Papamakarios, and Andriy Mnih. Score modeling for simulation-based inference. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Score-Based Methods*, 2022. 3
- [8] Rohan Anil Google, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland, Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui, Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Kenealy, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Moussalem, Zachary Nado, John Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Castro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone, Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang, Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. Palm 2 technical report, 2023. 3
- [9] Kamal Gupta, Justin Lazarow, Alessandro Achille, Larry S Davis, Vijay Mahadevan, and Abhinav Shrivastava. Layout-transformer: Layout generation and completion with self-attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1004–1014, 2021. 2, 3
- [10] 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. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 4
- [11] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022. 3, 6
- [12] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 6
- [13] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P Kingma, Ben Poole, Mohammad Norouzi, David J Fleet, et al. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022. 3
- [14] Jonathan Ho, Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, David J Fleet, Mohammad Norouzi, and Tim Salimans. Cascaded diffusion models for high fidelity image generation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1):2249–2281, 2022. 3
- [15] Naoto Inoue, Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. Towards flexible multi-modal document models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14287–14296, 2023. 3

- [16] Naoto Inoue, Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. Layoutdm: Discrete diffusion model for controllable layout generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10167–10176, 2023. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [17] Akash Abdu Jyothi, Thibaut Durand, Jiawei He, Leonid Sigal, and Greg Mori. Layoutvae: Stochastic scene layout generation from a label set. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9895–9904, 2019. [2](#)
- [18] Hadi Kazemi, Fariborz Taherkhani, and Nasser Nasrabadi. Preference-based image generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 3404–3413, 2020. [8](#)
- [19] Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. Constrained graphic layout generation via latent optimization. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 88–96, 2021. [2](#), [3](#)
- [20] Xiang Kong, Lu Jiang, Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Yuan Hao, Haifeng Gong, and Irfan Essa. Blt: bidirectional layout transformer for controllable layout generation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XVII*, pages 474–490. Springer, 2022. [2](#), [3](#)
- [21] Hsin-Ying Lee, Lu Jiang, Irfan Essa, Phuong B Le, Haifeng Gong, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Weilong Yang. Neural design network: Graphic layout generation with constraints. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 491–506. Springer, 2020. [3](#)
- [22] Gang Li, Gilles Baechler, Manuel Tragut, and Yang Li. Learning to denoise raw mobile ui layouts for improving datasets at scale. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–13, 2022. [3](#)
- [23] Jianan Li, Jimei Yang, Aaron Hertzmann, Jianming Zhang, and Tingfa Xu. Layoutgan: Generating graphic layouts with wireframe discriminators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.06767*, 2019. [2](#)
- [24] Jianan Li, Jimei Yang, Jianming Zhang, Chang Liu, Christina Wang, and Tingfa Xu. Attribute-conditioned layout gan for automatic graphic design. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 27(10):4039–4048, 2020. [3](#)
- [25] Jiawei Lin, Jiaqi Guo, Shizhao Sun, Zijiang James Yang, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. Layoutprompter: Awaken the design ability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06495*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#)
- [26] Thomas F Liu, Mark Craft, Jason Situ, Ersin Yumer, Radomir Mech, and Ranjitha Kumar. Learning design semantics for mobile apps. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 569–579, 2018. [3](#)
- [27] Nithin Gopalakrishnan Nair, Wele Gedara Chaminda Bandara, and Vishal M Patel. Unite and conquer: Cross dataset multimodal synthesis using diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00793*, 2022. [3](#)
- [28] Nelson Nauata, Sepidehsadat Hosseini, Kai-Hung Chang, Hang Chu, Chin-Yi Cheng, and Yasutaka Furukawa. House-gan++: Generative adversarial layout refinement network towards intelligent computational agent for professional architects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13632–13641, 2021. [4](#), [3](#)
- [29] David D Nguyen, Surya Nepal, and Salil S Kanhere. Diverse multimedia layout generation with multi choice learning. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 218–226, 2021. [2](#)
- [30] Ethan Perez, Florian Strub, Harm De Vries, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron Courville. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018. [6](#)
- [31] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020. [2](#), [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] Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Huiwen Chang, Chris Lee, Jonathan Ho, Tim Salimans, David Fleet, and Mohammad Norouzi. Palette: Image-to-image diffusion models. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2022 Conference Proceedings*, pages 1–10, 2022. [3](#)
- [34] Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Saurabh Saxena, Lala Li, Jay Whang, Emily Denton, Seyed Kamyar Seyed Ghasemipour, Burcu Karagol Ayan, S Sara Mahdavi, Rapha Gontijo Lopes, et al. Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11487*, 2022. [6](#)
- [35] 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](#)
- [36] Christian Szegedy, Sergey Ioffe, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Alexander A Alemi. Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning. In *Thirty-first AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2017. [4](#)
- [37] Bryan Wang, Gang Li, and Yang Li. Enabling conversational interaction with mobile UI using large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2023, Hamburg, Germany, April 23-28, 2023*, pages 432:1–432:17. ACM, 2023. [4](#), [2](#)
- [38] Xiang Xu, Karl DD Willis, Joseph G Lambourne, Chin-Yi Cheng, Pradeep Kumar Jayaraman, and Yasutaka Furukawa. Skexgen: Autoregressive generation of cad construction sequences with disentangled codebooks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04632*, 2022. [3](#)
- [39] Kota Yamaguchi. Canvasvae: Learning to generate vector graphic documents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5481–5489, 2021. [3](#)

- [40] 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. 5
- [41] Xu Zhong, Jianbin Tang, and Antonio Jimeno Yepes. Publaynet: largest dataset ever for document layout analysis. In *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 1015–1022. IEEE, 2019. 3
- [42] Min Zhou, Chenchen Xu, Ye Ma, Tiezheng Ge, Yuning Jiang, and Weiwei Xu. Composition-aware graphic layout gan for visual-textual presentation designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00303*, 2022. 3
- [43] Jun-Yan Zhu, Taesung Park, Phillip Isola, and Alexei A Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2223–2232, 2017. 4

CoLay: Controllable Layout Generation through Multi-conditional Latent Diffusion

Supplementary Material

Table 8. FID scores in all different condition combinations on the CLAY dataset. In each row, the weights represent the optimal weights for this combination of conditions. Single and Multi in every row use the same model that is trained on four conditions. Single: using a single guidance weight, 2.5, for all conditions. Multi: using different weights for each condition and search for optimal weights. Specialized: a specialized model for this condition combination (row). Note that we only include specialized models for some combinations due to limited time and resource.

Dataset: CLAY						
Combinations/Weights				FID		
G	E'	C	P	Single	Multi	Specialized
1.8	1.3	1.9	2.3	6.54	6.23	6.23
1.9	2.0		2.4	6.73	6.49	—
	2.2	1.9	2.4	6.81	6.72	—
2.4	2.2	2.2		6.85	6.62	6.94
	2.1	2.7		6.92	6.67	—
2.6	2.3			7.37	7.28	7.23
	2.5		3.3	7.58	7.18	—
2.2		3.7	2.3	8.48	8.19	8.22
2.3		3.7		8.67	8.41	—
		3.6	3.6	8.79	8.49	8.54
2.1			3.8	9.17	8.66	8.42
	2.6			9.41	9.13	—
3.3				9.76	9.69	8.77
		3.8		10.65	10.09	—
			3.4	10.95	9.82	8.93

Table 9. FID scores in all different condition combinations on the C4 dataset. In each row, the weights represent the optimal weights for this combination of conditions. Single and Multi in every row use the same model that is trained on four conditions. Single: using a single guidance weight, 2.5, for all conditions. Multi: using different weights for each condition and search for optimal weights. Specialized: a specialized model for this condition combination (row). Note that we only include specialized models for some combinations due to limited time and resource

Dataset: C4						
Combinations/Weights				FID		
G	E'	C	P	Single	Multi	Specialized
2.1	2.0	1.9	2.4	11.21	10.66	10.66
2.2	2.2	2.4		11.02	10.75	12.45
2.1	2.0		2.1	11.15	10.73	—
2.2	1.8			11.17	10.69	—
2.2		3.3		14.18	14.09	—
2.2			3.7	14.21	13.85	—
	2.1	3.4		14.34	13.61	—
	1.8	2.6	2.5	14.38	13.61	—
2.8				14.52	14.33	—
	2.1		3.5	14.54	14.07	—
2.3		3.3	2.6	14.56	14.12	—
	2.9			19.50	19.14	—
			2.6	24.54	24.36	—
			3.1	24.37	24.06	—
			3.6	27.06	25.12	—

7. Additional Statistics on Datasets

We provide additional statistics on the CLAY and C4 datasets in Figure 4.

8. Sampling with Condition Combinations

In Table 8 and 9, we demonstrate how CoLay trained on all four conditions performs when generating samples using different number of conditions and different combinations of conditions. Interestingly, we observe that in some condition combinations, the four-condition model can outperform the specialized models by searching the optimal classifier-free guidance weights. We also notice that in Table 9, the FID scores decrease much more on the C4 dataset when generating layouts with less number of conditions. For example, the FID score drops from 10.66 to XXXX when using the class condition alone.

9. Implementation Details

The denoiser we use for CoLay, PLayer, and LayoutDM in this paper is a transformer encoder that has 4 layers and 8 heads with 512 for the QKV dimension and 2048 for the MLP dimension. The latent dimension \hat{d} for z is 8 for CLAY and 32 for C4. We also increase the QKV dimension to 1024 when training on C4. Both the guideline encoder and class count encoder share similar architecture as the denoiser with the number of layers decreased to 2.

CoLay is implemented using *JAX* and *Flax* and trained using 16 Google Cloud TPU v3 cores with batch size of 1024. The number of training steps for CLAY and C4 are 500k and 1.5m, respectively. We use ADAM optimizer with $b_1 = 0.9$, $b_2 = 0.98$.




Figure 4. Dataset statistics. (a) Number of element distribution for CLAY and C4, where the x-axis represents the number of elements in a layout and the y-axis is the corresponding probability. (b) Left: type distribution for CLAY; right: type distribution for C4.

10. UI Summary Task using LLMs

Since there are no human-annotated text captions associated with the C4 and CLAY datasets, and the only publicly available dataset of text-UI pairs are relatively small in its scale, we use an LLM based on the PaLM-2-Bison model to obtain text prompts for C4 and CLAY datasets.

Given a UI from C4 or CLAY, we first flatten it and extract the interactable elements from them. This usually represent elements that has content in it, or are clickable, or are of an interactable class (i.e., non-container classes in CLAY). Then, we represent this set of elements in a flattened HTML format. The content of the elements and its type are represented in the HTML. For non-text contents, we utilize the alt-text from the UI as the content representation of them. As an example, a login page with a text instruction of “Enter your crednetials below”, two text fields for username and password, and a “Login” button can be represented as follows:

```
<screen>
<p>Enter your credentials below:</p>
<input>Username</input>
<input>Password</input>
<button>Login</button>
```

```
</screen>
```

This representation follows prior work that utilizes LLMs for UI-based interactions [37]. The HTML representation of the UIs are then combined with various types of prompt text to obtain various types of summaries of the UIs. These summaries focus on the layout, functionality, usability, and a high-level overview of the UIs. The prompts are listed as follows.

Layout prompt:

Below is a simplified HTML code of a (mobile app / website):

```
<screen> ... (screen of the UI) </screen>
```

Briefly describe the layout of the (mobile app / website) in a few sentences.

Functionality prompt:

Below is a simplified HTML code of a (mobile app / website):

```
<screen> ... (screen of the UI) </screen>
```

Table 10. Quantitative Results on the CLAY dataset using different types of prompts. Note that the models in this table is conditioned on text prompts only.

Prompt Type	FID	CycSim-L	CycSim-P
Layout	8.93	0.779	0.506
Functionality	9.00	0.767	0.409
Usability	9.44	0.769	0.304
High-level Overview	8.95	0.770	0.459

Describe the functionality of the (mobile app / website).

Usability prompt:

Below is a simplified HTML code of a (mobile app / website):

```
<screen> ... (screen of the UI) </screen>
```

What can a user do with the (mobile app / website)?

High-level overview prompt:

Below is a simplified HTML code of a (mobile app / website):

```
<screen> ... (screen of the UI) </screen>
```

Summarize the UI of the (mobile app / website).

The results of after passing these prompts for LLM inference are treated as text captions of the UIs in CoLay, for further training. Figure 5 shows an example of a UI layout paired with the four types of summaries listed above:

From the experiment results in Table 10, we find that the model trained on the layout description prompts performs the best on generation quality (FID) and text-layout alignment (CycSim). The potential reason is that all the three other prompt types contain information about the content, which is less relevant to the layout elements. For example, the UI layout will remain the same no matter the image is a sleeping person or a bed. The rank of the performance among these prompt types may change if we include content, such as article title and images, as input conditions in the future.

11. User Study Details

We follow the user study setup in [4, 28] and invite six designers who have experience on UI design. We prepare 96 questions using three groups of randomly selected layouts:

layouts generated by CoLay, layouts generated by PLayer, and the ground truth layouts in CLAY. For each question we pick two layouts from different groups and ask the participant to choose the better one based on the design quality, and we ensure each question is answered by three different participants. When computing the results for each question, the group will receive +1 score if it is preferred by the designer, -1 vice versa. Both groups will receive 0 if the designer thinks they are equally good or bad. The final score each group-to-group comparison is normalized by the number of questions in that category.

12. Additional Qualitative Results

(a) Layout:

The mobile app has a center image, a bottom text, a bottom button, and a bottom number. The image is in the center of the screen. The text is below the image. The button is below the text. The number is below the button. There is a home icon in the top left corner and a title in the top left corner.

(b) Functionality:

The mobile app is a sleep app. It has a home screen with a title "How to use" and a button "Home". The home screen also has an image view and a usage last message. The usage last message is "start enjoying a good night's sleep". The app also has a usage action start button. When the user clicks the start button, the app will start a sleep timer. The sleep timer will count down from 6. When the timer reaches 0, the app will play a sound to help the user fall asleep.

(c) Usability:


The user can:

- View an image of a sleeping person.
- Read a message that encourages them to start enjoying a good night's sleep.
- Click a button to start the app.
- See a progress bar that shows how far they have progressed through the app.
- Click an image to return to the home screen.
- Read a title that explains how to use the app.

(d) High-level Overview:

The UI of the mobile app is a simple one-screen app with a large image of a sleeping person in the center. At the bottom of the screen, there is a button to start the app, a message that encourages the user to start enjoying a good night's sleep, and a number 6. In the top left corner of the screen, there is a home button and a title that says "How to Use".

(e) Rendered UI



(f) Legend

Container	Text
Image	Button
List_item	Pictogram
Label	Toolbar
Drawer	Text_input
Spinner	Card_view
Navigation_bar	Check_box
Page_indicator	Switch
Number_stepper	Progress_bar
	Date_picker

Figure 5. Example UI layout paired with four types of generated UI summaries. From (a) to (d): generated summaries with different prompts. (e) Rendered input HTML. (f) Color legend.




Figure 6. CLAY results with full conditions.”

<p>The mobile app has a top bar with two radio buttons for news and weather. The center of the screen has a preview of the home screen. The bottom bar has two buttons for cancel and save. The title is at the top of the screen.</p>	<p>IMAGE: 1 PICTOGRAM: 0 BUTTON: 4 TEXT: 0 LABEL: 0 TEXT_INPUT: 0 MAP: 0 CHECK_BOX: 0 SWITCH: 0 PAGER_INDICATOR: 0 SLIDER: 0 RADIO_BUTTON: 0 SPINNER: 0 PROGRESS_BAR: 0 ADVERTISEMENT: 0 DRAWER: 0 NAVIGATION_BAR: 0 TOOLBAR: 1 LIST_ITEM: 0 CARD_VIEW: 0 CONTAINER: 5 DATE_PICKER: 0 NUMBER_STEPPER: 0</p>			
<p>The mobile app has a top navigation bar with 7 tabs: - Browse by location - Top feeds - Official feeds - Alert feeds - New feeds - NOAA weather radio - Recent played Each tab has a label and a description. The bottom of the screen has 5 icons.</p>	<p>IMAGE: 0 PICTOGRAM: 10 BUTTON: 0 TEXT: 14 LABEL: 0 TEXT_INPUT: 0 MAP: 0 CHECK_BOX: 0 SWITCH: 0 PAGER_INDICATOR: 0 SLIDER: 0 RADIO_BUTTON: 0 SPINNER: 0 PROGRESS_BAR: 0 ADVERTISEMENT: 0 DRAWER: 0 NAVIGATION_BAR: 0 TOOLBAR: 0 LIST_ITEM: 0 CARD_VIEW: 0 CONTAINER: 9 DATE_PICKER: 0 NUMBER_STEPPER: 0</p>			
<p>The mobile app has a top bar with a title, a search button, and a home button. The app has two reaction images, each with a conditions button. The app has a reaction input field at the top.</p>	<p>IMAGE: 0 PICTOGRAM: 0 BUTTON: 0 TEXT: 1 LABEL: 0 TEXT_INPUT: 0 MAP: 0 CHECK_BOX: 0 SWITCH: 0 PAGER_INDICATOR: 0 SLIDER: 0 RADIO_BUTTON: 0 SPINNER: 0 PROGRESS_BAR: 0 ADVERTISEMENT: 0 DRAWER: 0 NAVIGATION_BAR: 0 TOOLBAR: 2 LIST_ITEM: 3 CARD_VIEW: 0 CONTAINER: 4 DATE_PICKER: 0 NUMBER_STEPPER: 0</p>			
<p>The mobile app has a title "Invite friend via" at the center of the screen. There are 6 icons at the bottom of the screen, each with a text description. From left to right, the icons are: facebook, android beam, fake gps search location, bluetooth, facebook net, messaging.</p>	<p>IMAGE: 0 PICTOGRAM: 0 BUTTON: 0 TEXT: 7 LABEL: 0 TEXT_INPUT: 0 MAP: 0 CHECK_BOX: 0 SWITCH: 0 PAGER_INDICATOR: 0 SLIDER: 0 RADIO_BUTTON: 0 SPINNER: 0 PROGRESS_BAR: 0 ADVERTISEMENT: 0 DRAWER: 1 NAVIGATION_BAR: 0 TOOLBAR: 0 LIST_ITEM: 0 CARD_VIEW: 0 CONTAINER: 6 DATE_PICKER: 0 NUMBER_STEPPER: 0</p>			
<p>The mobile app has a toolbar at the top right corner with two buttons: "add phone" and a phone icon. In the center of the screen, there is an image. At the bottom of the screen, there is a message "verification seems to be taking longer than expected you can try again or add your" and a button "retry".</p>	<p>IMAGE: 1 PICTOGRAM: 0 BUTTON: 1 TEXT: 0 LABEL: 0 TEXT_INPUT: 0 MAP: 0 CHECK_BOX: 0 SWITCH: 0 PAGER_INDICATOR: 0 SLIDER: 0 RADIO_BUTTON: 0 SPINNER: 0 PROGRESS_BAR: 0 ADVERTISEMENT: 0 DRAWER: 0 NAVIGATION_BAR: 0 TOOLBAR: 2 LIST_ITEM: 0 CARD_VIEW: 0 CONTAINER: 0 DATE_PICKER: 0 NUMBER_STEPPER: 0</p>			

Figure 7. (continued) CLAY results with full conditions.
















<p>The website has a top navigation bar with links to home, news, about us, membership, court booking, play, coaching, holiday camps and more. The website has a bottom navigation bar with links to previous and next. The website has a large image of a tennis court in the middle. The website has text on the left side of the image describing the benefits of membership. The website has text on the right side of the image describing the club.</p>	<p>text: 18 image: -- container: 29</p>			
<p>The website has a header with the logo and links to the homepage, privacy policy, terms of use and contact us. The main content area has a title "latest posts under: technology", followed by a list of recent posts. The footer has a list of categories and the latest post.</p>	<p>text: 29 image: -- container: 30</p>			
<p>The website has a simple layout with a header, a main content area, and a footer. The header contains the website title, the date and time of the error, and a link to the Ray ID. The main content area contains information about the error, including what it is, what can be done to resolve it, and a link to additional troubleshooting information. The footer contains a link to a survey asking visitors if the page was helpful.</p>	<p>text: 23 image: -- container: --</p>			
<p>The website has a top banner with the website's title and a social media icon. The main content is a news article about the release of the Sleeping Beauty Diamond Edition. The article is accompanied by a link to the press release and a photo of the Blu-ray/DVD cover. The article is also followed by a bio of the author and a list of related articles.</p>	<p>text: -- image: 2 container: 30</p>			
<p>The website has a header with the title of the page and contact information. The main content is in the center of the page and it includes a brief introduction to the topic, a list of variables to consider when purchasing ambulance lights, and a description of each variable. The footer has the same contact information as the header.</p>	<p>text: -- image: -- container: 20</p>			

Figure 8. C4 results with full conditions. Note that we use dummy text to represent font-size and text alignment and represent font-weight by the thickness of the borders. "--" in the type and count condition here represents "not given."

<p>The website has a top bar with the logo and links to the main pages. The main content is a message saying that the page doesn't exist. The bottom bar has copyright information and a search bar.</p>	<p>text: 11 image: 1 container: 20</p>			
<p>The website has a header at the top, a main content area in the middle, and a footer at the bottom. The header contains the title of the website and a search bar. The main content area contains the latest articles, a page not found message, and links to other articles. The footer contains contact information and a copyright notice.</p>	<p>text: 15 image: 3 container: 25</p>			
<p>The website has a header with two language options, a title, and two tags. The main content is a large paragraph with the article text. The footer has the date, author, and comment count.</p>	<p>text: 13 image: -- container: 22</p>			
<p>The website has a header with the title of the article and the date. The main content is in the middle, and the footer has some contact information.</p>	<p>text: -- image: -- container: 12</p>			
<p>The website has a header with a logo and contact information, a navigation bar with links to different pages, a main content area with the trip details, and a footer with additional information such as airfare, contact, and terms.</p>	<p>text: 20 image: -- container: --</p>			

Figure 9. (continued) C4 results with full conditions.