

GradeADreamer: Enhanced Text-to-3D Generation Using Gaussian Splatting and Multi-View Diffusion

Trapoom Ukarapol
Tsinghua University

ukarapol10@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Kevin Pruvost
Tsinghua University

pkw23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Text-to-3D generation has shown promising results, yet common challenges such as the Multi-face Janus problem and extended generation time for high-quality assets. In this paper, we address these issues by introducing a novel three-stage training pipeline called GradeADreamer. This pipeline is capable of producing high-quality assets with a total generation time of under 30 minutes using only a single RTX 3090 GPU. Our proposed method employs a Multi-view Diffusion Model, MVDream, to generate Gaussian Splats as a prior, followed by refining geometry and texture using StableDiffusion. Experimental results demonstrate that our approach significantly mitigates the Multi-face Janus problem and achieves the highest average user preference ranking compared to previous state-of-the-art methods. The project code is available at <https://github.com/trapoom555/GradeADreamer>.

1. Introduction

3D Content Creation is pivotal in numerous fields, including virtual and augmented reality, game design, head modeling, and beyond. One particularly innovative area is text-to-3D generation, which enables the creation of imaginative 3D models based on textual descriptions. This has emerged as a rapidly growing research area in recent years. Considerable advancements were achieved through deep learning techniques [36, 3, 8] in the beginning.

Currently, more novel methods [4, 21, 32, 35, 14, 17, 27, 24, 30, 40, 5] utilize 3D representations, such as NeRF [26] or Gaussian Splatting [16], for 3D asset representation. These methods optimize the process by distilling a pre-trained text-to-image generation model to guide 3D content generation. Papers such as Dreamfusion [27] and Magic3D [21] employ StableDiffusion [29] which use it as supervision for the optimization process of the 3D Model via Score Distillation Sampling (SDS) [27].




Figure 1: High-quality assets generated by GradeADreamer


Apart from SDS [27], several other score distillation methods have been proposed. For example, Variational Score Distillation (VSD) [35], first introduced in ProlificDreamer [35], argues that SDS [27] leads to poor quality because it requires a high classifier-free guidance (CFG) [12] weight. In contrast, VSD [35] is compatible with the low CFG [12] used in text-to-image generation models. Additionally, Interval Score Matching (ISM) [20] utilizes Denoising Diffusion Implicit Models (DDIM) [33] inversion to obtain more consistent pseudo-ground-truths during distillation. Score distillation remains a debated and actively researched subfield. Our results demonstrate that using a simple SDS [27] is sufficient to produce higher quality assets than previously thought as shown in Figure 1.

A common problem in text-to-3D generation is the Multi-Face Janus Problem [6], which involves view

inconsistency in score-distilling text-to-3D generation, leading to unrealistic and geometrically collapsed 3D objects as illustrated in Figure 2. A Multi-View Diffusion Model, such as MVDream [32], addresses this problem by conditioning the generated image from the text-to-image diffusion model with camera poses, thereby improving the model’s viewpoint awareness. This method can significantly reduce the Multi-Face Janus Problem [6]. However, despite these advancements, MVDream [32] often produces poorer styles compared to StableDiffusion [29], due to the limitations of the rendered dataset [32].



(a) Corgi with multiple faces



(b) Panda with multiple faces

Figure 2: Examples of Multi-Face Janus Problem [6] (Generated with ProlificDreamer [35])

To achieve high-quality 3D asset generation with a low occurrence rate of the Multi-Face Janus Problem [6] and low generation time, we propose GradeADreamer, a solution with a pipeline described in three passes. To start, we initialize random 3D Gaussian Splats [16] and optimize them with the Multi-View Diffusion Model, MVDream [32], to establish a base for further optimization. Next, we enter a Gaussian Splats Refinement phase, where we refine the Gaussian Splats [16] using StableDiffusion [28] to achieve better geometrical details. After this, we employ an efficient mesh extraction method described in DreamGaussian [34]. Finally, we perform a Texture Optimization pass, utilizing the Appearance Refinement technique outlined in Fantasia3D [4].

All passes focus solely on using SDS [27] as the score distillation method to optimize each stage of the 3D content generation pipeline. We leverage Gaussian Splatting [16] and mesh as our 3D representations for geometry optimization and texture optimization, respectively.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

1. We propose GradeADreamer, a high-quality text-to-3D generation model that significantly reduces the occurrence of the Multi-face Janus Problem [6] and achieves faster generation time.
2. We introduce a three-stage optimization process that disentangles geometry and texture optimization while utilizing the Multi-view diffusion model for prior Gaussian Splats [16] generation.
3. We evaluate GradeADreamer both qualitatively and quantitatively, demonstrating that it outperforms previous state-of-the-art text-to-3D generation methods [27, 21, 35] in several aspects, including user preference, Multi-face Janus [6] occurrence rate, and generation time.
4. We publicly open-source our text-to-3D generation code and integrate our project in threestudio [11].

2. Related Works

2.1. 3D Representations

In the current state of research for text-to-3D generation, there are multiple 3D Representations being used, the most popular ones are Neural Radiance Fields (NeRF) [26] and Gaussian Splats [16]. They are particularly useful for this field of research as they are both trainable and they also currently are the most efficient representations to use for that purpose. NeRF trains a neural network [26] whereas Gaussian Splatting optimizes 3D Gaussians [16]. The current trends exhibit a comparable prevalence of NeRF-based text-to-3D studies [35, 39, 23, 18, 15] and those based on Gaussian Splatting [34, 38, 19, 25, 37].

The differences between NeRF [26], Gaussian Splats [16], and other more traditional 3D representations lie in their optimization capabilities. Techniques such as photogrammetry are not efficient for these tasks. NeRF [26] and Gaussian Splats [16], on the other hand, are specifically designed to be optimized in the tasks such as 3D rendering and reconstruction, offering more advanced and efficient solutions for generating detailed 3D models from textual descriptions.

The selection of NeRF [26] or Gaussian Splatting [16] for text-to-3D generation depends largely on the specific requirements of the research task. NeRF typically yields higher-quality results but requires more time to converge compared to Gaussian Splatting methods [5, 34]. This trade-off between quality and convergence time underscores the importance of choosing the appropriate 3D generation

technique based on the specific computational resources and performance criteria of the research objectives.

2.2. Score Distillation Methods

Due to the limited availability of 3D data for training text-to-3D models, Score Distillation Methods are widely used to effectively distill knowledge from pre-trained text-to-image diffusion models, such as StableDiffusion [28]. This approach leverages the strengths of these well-trained text-to-image models to achieve state-of-the-art performance in text-to-3D generation. By transferring the expertise from 2D to 3D, Score Distillation Methods enhance the capability to generate accurate and detailed 3D models from textual descriptions, overcoming the data scarcity challenge in the 3D domain.

Score Distillation Sampling (SDS) [27] and Variational Score Distillation (VSD) [35] have demonstrated significant promise in recent state-of-the-art advancements in text-to-3D generation. While SDS and VSD share this foundational approach, VSD sets itself apart from SDS by employing particle-based variational inference [1, 7, 22]. This technique is perceived to offer advantages by mitigating issues such as oversaturation and oversmoothing. However, our findings show that a well-designed pipeline using SDS alone can effectively address these challenges, demonstrating that SDS can achieve comparable performance without the additional complexity introduced by VSD.

2.3. Mesh Extraction from Gaussian Splatting

Gaussian Splatting [16] represents 3D space using Gaussian Splats, which are not directly compatible with the traditional 3D mesh formats commonly employed in industry. Consequently, additional steps are required to convert these splats into conventional mesh representations suitable for practical applications.

For this task, studies such as SuGaR [10] initially utilize a traditional mesh extraction method as outlined in the original Gaussian Splatting paper [16]. Subsequently, they refine this approach by employing a hybrid representation of meshes and Gaussian Splats. This refinement enhances accuracy and smoothness, enabling the achievement of state-of-the-art results.

Most of the research done on mesh extraction is based not just on Gaussian Splats [16] as input but also on images [10, 2, 9, 31] from which the mesh should be extracted from. A subtask that is not explored enough would be efficient mesh extraction from Gaussian Splats alone.

3. Approach

We introduce a novel text-to-3D training pipeline designed to maintain low generation time while mitigating the Multi-face Janus Problem [6]. Our pipeline is composed of three distinct stages:

1. Gaussian Splats Prior Generation
2. Gaussian Splats Refinement
3. Texture Optimization

The training pipeline is executed sequentially. We follow the approach of Fantasia3D [4] in disentangling geometry and texture optimization. The first two stages focus on geometry optimization, while the last stage is responsible for texture optimization. However, unlike Fantasia3D [4], which requires a handcrafted mesh for initialization, our pipeline can produce 3D models without any mesh prior. An overview of our proposed pipeline is shown in Figure 3.

3.1. 3D Representation Choices

For the first and second stages, we utilize Gaussian Splatting [16] as our 3D representation. This choice is based on its significantly faster convergence compared to Neural Radiance Fields (NeRF) [26] for 3D generation tasks, as demonstrated by DreamGaussian [34]. To achieve high-quality textured meshes, we extract meshes from the Gaussian Splats [16] and then proceed with texture refinement during the later stages of our pipeline.

3.2. Training Stages

3.2.1 Gaussian Splats Prior Generation

Starting with random Gaussian Splats [16], we employ MVDream [32], a 2D multi-view diffusion model, as our guidance model to optimize the random Gaussian Splats [16] into a Gaussian Prior with coarse details of the result. This approach effectively reduces the likelihood of encountering the Multi-face Janus Problem [6].

3.2.2 Gaussian Splats Refinement

In this stage, we refine the Gaussian Splats [16] to enhance the geometry using StableDiffusion 2.1 [29] as our guidance. This step is crucial because MVDream [32] can only generate low-resolution images (256x256), whereas the StableDiffusion 2.1 [29] can produce higher resolution outputs (512x512). We also observe, similar to MVDream [32], that the StableDiffusion 2.1 [29] yields better generation styles, likely due to the influence of the rendered training dataset on MVDream [32] outputs.

Following the Gaussian Refinement stage, we extract the mesh using an efficient mesh extraction algorithm as described by DreamGaussian [34].




Figure 3: **Overview of GradeADreamer.** The proposed method consists of three optimization steps. The first step involves optimizing random Gaussian Splats using MVDream to obtain a Gaussian Splats prior (see Section 3.2.1). In the second step, this prior is refined using StableDiffusion (see Section 3.2.2). Finally, the third step employs texture optimization on a mesh, guided by StableDiffusion (see Section 3.2.3).

3.2.3 Texture Optimization

In the final stage, we optimize the spatially varying Physically-Based Rendering (PBR) material model on the mesh. Specifically, we focus on three distinct components of the material model: the diffuse map $k_d \in \mathbb{R}^3$, which represents the inherent color of the material without any lighting effects; the roughness and metallic term $k_{rm} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, which determines the micro-surface detail and metalness of the material; and the normal variation term $k_n \in \mathbb{R}^3$, which details surface texture by perturbing the normal vectors of the surface. For this step, we follow the techniques outlined in Fantasia3D [4] to achieve high-quality, detailed textures.

3.3. Score Distillation Choices

We examine the differences between Score Distillation Sampling (SDS) proposed in Dreamfusion [27] and Variational Score Distillation (VSD) proposed in ProlificDreamer [35]. Our observations are as follows:

- **Training Time** : We observe that using Variational Score Distillation (VSD) [35] extends the training time compared to using SDS [27].
- **Quality of Results** : Our results demonstrate that using SDS [27] is sufficient for generating high-quality

3D models in text-to-3D generation tasks.

Based on these findings, we employ SDS [27] as our objective for score distillation in all three stages of our pipeline.

The gradient of the SDS loss, as described in [27], can be expressed by the following equation:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SDS}} = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon, t} \left[w(t) (\epsilon_{\phi}(x_t | y, t) - \epsilon) \frac{\partial x}{\partial \theta} \right] \quad (1)$$

where θ represents the parameters of a 3D representation, x is an image rendered from this 3D representation through a transformation function g expressed as $x = g(\theta)$. x_t is a residual noise image predicted by a pretrained 2D diffusion model ϵ_{ϕ} conditioned on a prompt embedding y and a timestep t . And ϵ is a noisy image drawn from a normal distribution, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$.

4. Experiments

In this section, we detail our experiment implementation and validate the proposed approach’s effectiveness through both quantitative and qualitative analyses by comparing GradeADreamer to previous state-of-the-art methods in text-to-3D generation.

4.1. Implementation Details

4.1.1 Training Resources

Our entire pipeline can be run on a single RTX 3090 GPU, with a generation time of only 30 minutes per 3D asset. In stage 1, it takes 12 GB of GPU RAM and 4 minutes; stage 2 requires 15 GB and 6 minutes; and stage 3 uses 16 GB and 16 minutes. The remaining 4 minutes are allocated for mesh extraction, Gaussian Splats [16] export, and the final result validation step.

4.1.2 Hyperparameters

Initialization We initialize 6000 points of Gaussian Splats [16]. We’ve found that using a large number of initial Gaussian Splats [16] extends the optimization time and may not converge in some cases.

Gaussian Splats Prior Generation In the first stage, similar to Dreamtime [13], we employ a linear annealing timestep from 0.98 to 0.02 for the entire 700 optimization steps. We’ve found that applying the linear annealing timestep yields better results in geometry. The densification and pruning interval is set to 55. Following DreamGaussian [34], the gradient threshold for densification is set to 0.01, and we perform an opacity reset at step 500. In this stage, we use a batch size of 1, consisting of 4 image views as proposed in MVDream [32].

Gaussian Splats Refinement In the second stage, there are 700 optimization steps. We utilize a linear annealing timestep from 0.98 to 0.02 for the first 200 steps. For steps 200-300, we uniformly sample the timestep from the range 0.02 to 0.98, $t \sim \mathcal{U}(0.02, 0.98)$, and we anneal it to $t \sim \mathcal{U}(0.02, 0.50)$ for the last 400 steps to focus on distilling elaborate details, following ProlificDreamer [35]. We set the densification interval to 50 and the opacity reset interval to 300. The batch size is set to 2, as we observe that it converges faster than a batch size of 1 and yields a reasonable geometric appearance.

Gaussian Training In the first two stages, we use a linear decaying positional learning rate for Gaussian Splatting from 0.001 to 1.6×10^{-6} over 300 steps, and we set the feature and opacity learning rates to 0.005 and 0.05, respectively.

Texture Optimization For the last stage, we follow the hyperparameters provided by Fantasia3D [4], optimizing for 2000 iterations with a batch size of 4 using an SDS [27] weight strategy equal to 1. We employ SDS [27] as a score distillation objective for all stages with a classifier-free guidance (CFG [12]) value of 100.

4.2. Baselines

We utilize three previous state-of-the-art text-to-3D generation models as our baselines: DreamFusion [27], Magic3D [21], and ProlificDreamer [35]. Our results will be compared to these baselines both qualitatively and quantitatively in the following sections.

4.3. Qualitative Evaluations

We qualitatively assess the performance of our proposed method, GradeADreamer, against the established baselines. As illustrated in Figure 4, our results significantly improve the geometric features of the generated assets, addressing the geometry flaws caused by the Multi-face Janus Problem [6] that other baselines [27, 21, 35] encounter. Additionally, our method produces high-frequency, high-quality textures, whereas DreamFusion [27] and Magic3D [21] struggle with issues of over-saturation and over-smoothing. For more qualitative results, please refer to the Appendix B.

4.4. Quantitative Evaluations

4.4.1 User Study

We conducted a user study to evaluate our text-to-3D model against other baselines [27, 21, 35]. The study involved 54 participants who were asked to rank 3D models generated from 15 different prompts. These results were non-cherry-picked, meaning all data was selected without selectively showcasing only the best outcomes. This approach ensures a fair comparison and avoids the bias and misleading outcomes that come from cherry-picking. Participants ranked the results from best to worst for each prompt. As shown in Figure 5, Our model decisively outperformed the others, achieving a significantly higher win rate for the top rank compared to the baselines [27, 21, 35]. Additionally, the average rankings presented in Table 1 demonstrate that our model gets the highest average ranking among the four selected methods. This study shows that the 3D models created by our pipeline were consistently preferred by users.

Name	Average Ranking (\downarrow)
DreamFusion	3.29
Magic3D	3.23
ProlificDreamer	2.02
GradeADreamer (ours)	1.49

Table 1: Average ranking from the user study

4.4.2 3D-FID Score

We also performed an additional evaluation method utilizing a variant of the Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) score. The FID score is a widely used metric for comparing two



Figure 4: Qualitative results




Figure 5: Rank distribution comparison from user study

datasets, specifically quantifying how well generated content captures the statistical properties of the original content. This metric is predominantly used in the context of 2D image generation, where it requires the generated images and a set of ground truth images or approximate target results for comparison.

In our study, GradeADreamer operates on 3D generated content, necessitating certain modifications to the standard FID calculation. To address this, we employed a 3D-FID score. The process for calculating the 3D-FID score involves generating a reference image using StableDiffusion [28], followed by calculating a 2D-FID score for a series of multiple views of the 3D generated model. Specifically, we used 10 different views by rotating the model along the yaw axis. The final 3D-FID score is obtained by averaging the scores from each of these views.

In our comparison table of 3D-FID scores (see Table 2), we computed the average score from 15 randomly gener-

ated content samples. Each Text-to-3D model was tasked with generating the same content, and the 3D-FID score was calculated for each model, followed by averaging the scores from the 15 samples. This rigorous evaluation demonstrated the robustness of GradeADreamer, as evidenced by its 3D-FID score.

Name	3D-FID (↓)
DreamFusion	68.41
Magic3D	75.96
ProlificDreamer	58.75
GradeADreamer (ours)	47.69

Table 2: 3D-FID Score

4.4.3 Multi-face Janus Problem

We measured the occurrence in percentage of the Multi-face Janus Problem [6] over 15 prompts using our model, compared to other baselines [27, 21, 35]. As shown in Table 3, by using MVDream [32] as a guidance model for the first stage, we achieved a significantly lower occurrence rate of the Multi-face Janus Problem [6], approximately 6 to 7 times lower than the baselines [27, 21, 35].

Name	% Multi-face (↓)
DreamFusion	35.71
Magic3D	35.71
ProlificDreamer	40.00
GradeADreamer (ours)	6.67

Table 3: Percentage of Multi-face Janus problem [6] occurrence

4.4.4 Runtime

We evaluated the generation time per prompt for the selected four methods to assess the efficiency of our proposed method. The results are summarized in Table 4.

Our model achieves a significant reduction in generation time compared to Magic3D [21] and ProlificDreamer [35], making it highly suitable for applications requiring quick asset generation. The equivalence in speed to DreamFusion [27], one of the fastest models, highlights the effectiveness of our pipeline without compromising on the quality of the generated assets, as proven in Table 1 and Table 2. This efficiency is crucial for the applications and scenarios where rapid prototyping and iteration are necessary.

Name	Generation Time (↓)
DreamFusion	30 mins
Magic3D	1 hour
ProlificDreamer	10 hours
GradeADreamer (ours)	30 mins

Table 4: Generation time per prompt

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we present GradeADreamer, a novel text-to-3D generation pipeline designed to produce high-quality 3D assets while addressing the Multi-face Janus Problem [6] and maintaining low generation time. Our pipeline comprises three stages: Gaussian Splats Prior Generation, Gaussian Splats Refinement, and Texture Optimization. The first two stages leverage Gaussian Splatting as a 3D representation to optimize geometry, while the third stage focuses on texture optimization using Mesh representation to ensure high-quality textures.

To mitigate the Multi-face Janus Problem [6], we employ a Multi-view Diffusion model, MVDream [32], in the initial stage to generate priors, and subsequently use StableDiffusion [29] for enhanced generation quality. Our experimental results demonstrate that GradeADreamer achieves the highest average ranking in user studies and the lowest generation time, around 30 minutes per asset, compared to all baseline models. Additionally, the occurrence rate of the Multi-face Janus Problem [6] significantly decreased.

Limitations Despite these advancements, GradeADreamer has some limitations. For example, the performance is constrained by the StableDiffusion [29] Text Encoder, and there are still instances of the Multi-face problem since we still use StableDiffusion [29] as guidance for the last two stages. Furthermore, there is potential for improvement in the mesh extraction method from Gaussian Splats to obtain higher quality mesh.

In summary, GradeADreamer represents a significant step forward in the field of text-to-3D generation, combining efficiency with high-quality output and effectively addressing key challenges in the domain. Future work will focus on overcoming the current limitations and further enhancing the performance and quality of the generated assets.

6. Contribution

Trapoom Ukarapol Propose the main idea of GradeADreamer, implementing the pipeline, generate results, qualitative evaluation, Multi-face Janus Evaluation, user study, presentation and paper work.

Kevin Pruvost Mesh extraction experiments, geometry optimization experiments, generate results, 3D-FID evaluation, user study, presentation and paper work.

7. Acknowledgement

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Deep Learning 2024 Spring course at Tsinghua University for providing us with a robust foundational knowledge of deep learning and offering us the opportunity to undertake a project aligned with our interests. We are particularly grateful to Professor Xiaolin Hu and Professor Jun Zhu, the course lecturers, for their invaluable guidance. Additionally, we extend our appreciation to Professor Hualiu Ping and Professor Liu Yongjin for supplying the necessary computational resources. Finally, we would like to thank the 54 participants in our user study for their valuable contributions.

References

- [1] Changyou Chen, Ruiyi Zhang, Wenlin Wang, Bai Li, and Liqun Chen. A unified particle-optimization framework for scalable bayesian sampling, 2018.
- [2] Danpeng Chen, Hai Li, Weicai Ye, Yifan Wang, Weijian Xie, Shangjin Zhai, Nan Wang, Haomin Liu, Hujun Bao, and Guofeng Zhang. Pgsr: Planar-based gaussian splatting for efficient and high-fidelity surface reconstruction, 2024.
- [3] Kevin Chen, Christopher B. Choy, Manolis Savva, Angel X. Chang, Thomas Funkhouser, and Silvio Savarese. Text2shape: Generating shapes from natural language by learning joint embeddings, 2018.
- [4] Rui Chen, Yongwei Chen, Ningxin Jiao, and Kui Jia. Fantasia3d: Disentangling geometry and appearance for high-quality text-to-3d content creation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 22246–22256, October 2023.
- [5] Zilong Chen, Feng Wang, Yikai Wang, and Huaping Liu. Text-to-3d using gaussian splatting, 2024.
- [6] Wikipedia contributors. Janus — wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, 2024. [Online; accessed 08-June-2024].
- [7] Hanze Dong, Xi Wang, Yong Lin, and Tong Zhang. Particle-based variational inference with preconditioned functional gradient flow, 2023.
- [8] H. Duan, Y. Long, S. Wang, H. Zhang, C. G. Willcocks, and L. Shao. Dynamic unary convolution in transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis & Machine Intelligence*, 45(11):12747–12759, nov 2023.
- [9] Lue Fan, Yuxue Yang, Minxing Li, Hongsheng Li, and Zhaoxiang Zhang. Trim 3d gaussian splatting for accurate geometry representation, 2024.
- [10] Antoine Guédon and Vincent Lepetit. Sugar: Surface-aligned gaussian splatting for efficient 3d mesh reconstruction and high-quality mesh rendering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12775*, 2023.
- [11] Yuan-Chen Guo, Ying-Tian Liu, Ruizhi Shao, Christian Laforte, Vikram Voleti, Guan Luo, Chia-Hao Chen, Zi-Xin Zou, Chen Wang, Yan-Pei Cao, and Song-Hai Zhang. threestudio: A unified framework for 3d content generation. <https://github.com/threestudio-project/threestudio>, 2023.
- [12] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance, 2022.
- [13] Yukun Huang, Jianan Wang, Yukai Shi, Boshi Tang, Xianbiao Qi, and Lei Zhang. Dreamtime: An improved optimization strategy for diffusion-guided 3d generation, 2024.
- [14] Ajay Jain, Ben Mildenhall, Jonathan T. Barron, Pieter Abbeel, and Ben Poole. Zero-shot text-guided object generation with dream fields. 2022.
- [15] Yash Kant, Ziyi Wu, Michael Vasilkovsky, Guocheng Qian, Jian Ren, Riza Alp Guler, Bernard Ghanem, Sergey Tulyakov, Igor Gilitschenski, and Aliaksandr Siarohin. Spad : Spatially aware multiview diffusers, 2024.
- [16] Bernhard Kerbl, Georgios Kopanas, Thomas Leimkühler, and George Drettakis. 3d gaussian splatting for real-time radiance field rendering. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 42(4), July 2023.
- [17] Nasir Mohammad Khalid, Tianhao Xie, Eugene Belilovsky, and Popa Tiberiu. Clip-mesh: Generating textured meshes from text using pretrained image-text models. *SIGGRAPH Asia 2022 Conference Papers*, December 2022.
- [18] Xiaolong Li, Jiawei Mo, Ying Wang, Chethan Parameshwara, Xiaohan Fei, Ashwin Swaminathan, CJ Taylor, Zhuowen Tu, Paolo Favaro, and Stefano Soatto. Grounded compositional and diverse text-to-3d with pretrained multi-view diffusion model, 2024.
- [19] Zhiqi Li, Yiming Chen, Lingzhe Zhao, and Peidong Liu. Controllable text-to-3d generation via surface-aligned gaussian splatting, 2024.
- [20] Yixun Liang, Xin Yang, Jiantao Lin, Haodong Li, Xiaogang Xu, and Yingcong Chen. Luciddreamer: Towards high-fidelity text-to-3d generation via interval score matching, 2023.
- [21] Chen-Hsuan Lin, Jun Gao, Luming Tang, Towaki Takikawa, Xiao-hui Zeng, Xun Huang, Karsten Kreis, Sanja Fidler, Ming-Yu Liu, and Tsung-Yi Lin. Magic3d: High-resolution text-to-3d content creation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023.
- [22] Qiang Liu and Dilin Wang. Stein variational gradient descent: A general purpose bayesian inference algorithm, 2019.
- [23] Qihao Liu, Yi Zhang, Song Bai, Adam Kortylewski, and Alan L Yuille. Direct-3d: Learning direct text-to-3d generation on massive noisy 3d data. In *41st IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. IEEE, 2024.
- [24] Gal Metzer, Elad Richardson, Or Patashnik, Raja Giryes, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Latent-nerf for shape-guided generation of 3d shapes and textures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.07600*, 2022.
- [25] Qiaowei Miao, Yawei Luo, and Yi Yang. Pla4d: Pixel-level alignments for text-to-4d gaussian splatting, 2024.

- [26] 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, 2020.
- [27] Ben Poole, Ajay Jain, Jonathan T. Barron, and Ben Mildenhall. Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [28] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, 2021.
- [29] 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 (CVPR)*, pages 10684–10695, June 2022.
- [30] 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. 2022.
- [31] Qihong Shen, Zike Wu, Xuanyu Yi, Pan Zhou, Hanwang Zhang, Shuicheng Yan, and Xinchao Wang. Gamba: Marry gaussian splatting with mamba for single view 3d reconstruction, 2024.
- [32] Yichun Shi, Peng Wang, Jianglong Ye, Long Mai, Kejie Li, and Xiao Yang. Mvdream: Multi-view diffusion for 3d generation. *arXiv:2308.16512*, 2023.
- [33] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models, 2022.
- [34] Jiaxiang Tang, Jiawei Ren, Hang Zhou, Ziwei Liu, and Gang Zeng. Dreamgaussian: Generative gaussian splatting for efficient 3d content creation, 2024.
- [35] 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. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [36] Jiajun Wu, Chengkai Zhang, Tianfan Xue, William T. Freeman, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. Learning a probabilistic latent space of object shapes via 3d generative-adversarial modeling, 2017.
- [37] Taoran Yi, Jiemin Fang, Junjie Wang, Guanjun Wu, Lingxi Xie, Xiaopeng Zhang, Wenyu Liu, Qi Tian, and Xinggang Wang. Gaussiandreamer: Fast generation from text to 3d gaussians by bridging 2d and 3d diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- [38] Xuanyu Yi, Zike Wu, Qihong Shen, Qingshan Xu, Pan Zhou, Joo-Hwee Lim, Shuicheng Yan, Xinchao Wang, and Hanwang Zhang. Mvgamba: Unify 3d content generation as state space sequence modeling, 2024.
- [39] Jingbo Zhang, Xiaoyu Li, Ziyu Wan, Can Wang, and Jing Liao. Text2nerf: Text-driven 3d scene generation with neural radiance fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11588*, 2023.
- [40] Yumin Zhang, Xingyu Miao, Haoran Duan, Bo Wei, Tejal Shah, Yang Long, and Rajiv Ranjan. Exactdreamer: High-fidelity text-to-3d content creation via exact score matching. 2024.

A. Evaluation Prompts

We selected 15 commonly used prompts for text-to-3D generation from several research papers to ensure fair evaluations. The prompts are listed in Table 5

#	Prompt
1	A DSLR photo of a panda
2	A high quality photo of a furry corgi
3	A blue jay standing on a large basket of rainbow macarons
4	A ripe strawberry
5	A DSLR photo of an ice cream sundae
6	A DSLR photo of car made out of sushi
7	A pineapple
8	A DSLR photo of an astronaut is riding a horse
9	A model of a house in Tudor style
10	A highly detailed sand castle
11	A plate piled high with chocolate chip cookies
12	A zoomed out DSLR photo of a baby bunny sitting on top of a stack of pancakes
13	A photo of a horse walking
14	A DSLR photo of a plate of fried chicken and waffles with maple syrup on them
15	A bulldog wearing a black pirate hat

Table 5: Prompts used for Evaluations

B. Additional Qualitative Results

We provide more text-to-3D qualitative comparisons of our proposed method against the other baselines in Figure 6, 7, and 8.




Figure 6: More qualitative results





Figure 7: More qualitative results

“A plate piled high with chocolate chip cookies”


“A highly detailed sand castle”

“A DSLR photo of a plate of fried chicken and waffles with maple syrup on them”


DreamFusion



Magic3D



ProlificDreamer



GradeADreamer (ours)



Figure 8: More qualitative results