

LTSim: Layout Transportation-based Similarity Measure for Evaluating Layout Generation

Mayu Otani

Naoto Inoue

Kotaro Kikuchi

Riku Togashi

CyberAgent

Abstract

We introduce a layout similarity measure designed to evaluate the results of layout generation. While several similarity measures have been proposed in prior research, there has been a lack of comprehensive discussion about their behaviors. Our research uncovers that the majority of these measures are unable to handle various layout differences, primarily due to their dependencies on strict element matching, that is one-by-one matching of elements within the same category. To overcome this limitation, we propose a new similarity measure based on optimal transport, which facilitates a more flexible matching of elements. This approach allows us to quantify the similarity between any two layouts even those sharing no element categories, making our measure highly applicable to a wide range of layout generation tasks. For tasks such as unconditional layout generation, where FID is commonly used, we also extend our measure to deal with collection-level similarities between groups of layouts. The empirical result suggests that our collection-level measure offers more reliable comparisons than existing ones like FID and Max.IoU.

1. Introduction

Layout generation is the task of organizing elements, *e.g.*, images and text in a document layout, to create a visually appealing composite. This topic is primarily explored for graphic design applications, such as user interface development [6] and magazine authoring [32]. Recent progress in generative models has led to the development of various models for this task [16, 17, 21]. Despite this growing interest in layout generation, the evaluation of generated layouts remains underexplored. Existing literature has introduced several automatic measures for assessing layout quality, yet it lacks a comprehensive discussion on their behaviors and limitations. Our in-depth analyses reveal that we have overlooked these measures’ drawbacks.

In layout generation, a layout is represented by a set of elements. Each element is a labeled bounding box whose label represents element categories, such as images, texts,





Figure 1. We propose LTSim, a layout similarity measure based on optimal transportation. This flexible measure allows us to define the similarity among arbitrary layout pairs. Since LTSim does not depend on learned representations, it can be applied to any dataset without the need for training.

or icons. Figure 1 illustrates layout representations where the element color represents its category. Evaluating the quality of generated layouts often involves comparing them to real ones, either individually or in groups. For example, tasks like predicting element positions based on their categories are evaluated by comparing the generated layout with its real counterpart. For unconditional generation, we measure the discrepancy between real and generated distributions, similar to natural image generation evaluation. Popular evaluation tools, such as DocSim [26] and Max.IoU [17], build element matching across layouts and aggregating the element-to-element similarities to derive a final score.

One drawback of these similarity measures is that they deal with limited types of layout differences. As a result, they often fail to identify the most similar layout among differing ones. As shown in Figure 2 (a) and (b), these measures struggle with layouts having different element numbers and category mismatches. For instance, as seen in (a), DocSim gives the same similarity score to both layouts, while the right one has more differences from the anchor. In (b), all existing measures fail to identify a more similar layout among two different ones. These issues arise from the presumption of specific types of differences, *i.e.*, dif-

How do the measures assess similarity?

(a) When the number of elements in the layouts differs



(b) When a category present in one layout is absent in the other




Figure 2. Existing measures are unable to quantify certain differences between layouts. (a) DocSim and DocEMD fail to identify which layout has smaller differences from the anchor. (b) All measures except ours judge that two layouts have the same similarity to an anchor.

ferences between elements within the same category. For instance, DocSim first finds one-by-one matches of elements in the same category and computes the similarity of matched elements, ignoring unmatched elements. Moreover, the existing measures do not consider cross-category element matching, imposing a constant penalty for missing categories.

To alleviate the issue, we propose a layout similarity measure, named LTSim (Fig. 1). We design the optimal transportation-based similarity, inspired by the work for object detection evaluation [25]. Optimal transportation allows for flexible element matching, including many-to-many and cross-category matching. This flexibility expands the application of similarity-based evaluation from limited to arbitrary layout pairs such as those having extra elements and category mismatches. We further extend our measure to a collection-level measure using Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) [9], enabling comparison between two layout groups. While FID [13] is commonly used for such comparisons as in image generation, our measure offers a distinct advantage; it eliminates the need for a dataset-specific feature extractor. This broadens our measure’s applicability across various domains including UI and document layouts, without training.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We develop a similarity measure, LTSim, based on optimal transport over layout elements. Our measure quantifies layout differences that are overlooked by existing measures.
- We extend the layout similarity for collection-level comparison. Unlike FID, this measure does not require representation learning for specific datasets.

While realizing these, our measure follows basic similarity

criteria of existing ones, ensuring no catastrophic gaps from results in prior research.

2. Related Work

2.1. Layout Generation

The task of layout generation is actively addressed in the computer graphics and vision communities. Earlier work adapts an optimization-based approach that constructs a cost function to measure layout quality and optimizes the layout parameters [23, 24]. Recent studies focus on learning a layout generation model [14] and consider real-world layouts as a proxy of high-quality layouts, rather than manually defining the layout quality. The generation models include the generative models, such as VAE [1, 19, 26], GAN [17, 21], diffusion models [5, 12, 15], as well as those based on maximum likelihood estimation [11, 16, 18].

In practice, the user of a model often desires to control the model’s output to satisfy user-specific requirements. For this reason, two different problem settings are explored: *unconditional generation*, generating layouts from scratch, and *conditional generation*, generating layouts from partial or noisy observations, such that the element categories are known, but the positions and sizes are unknown.

2.2. Similarity Learning

Prior works in [2, 22, 27] address representation learning or similarity learning for downstream tasks such as layout retrieval. They introduce neural network models tailored for layouts and train the models on IoU-based similarity [22, 27] or reconstruction supervision [2]. While these studies predict layout similarity, they haven’t been adopted for layout generation evaluation due to inherent challenges like the need for dataset-specific training and performance in-

Table 1. Layout similarity measures. ‘Sample Equality’ represents whether the measure has an equal scale across layouts. ‘Sensitivity #Elements/Categories’ shows if the measure can quantify the extent of the differences. ▲under ‘Computational Cost’ indicates that advanced computing resources, like GPUs or parallel computing, may be needed to speed up the process. ‘Uses’ shows examples of papers that use the measure for evaluation. For a comprehensive list of the usage by recent papers, please refer to the supplementary material.

	Comp. Level	Samp. Equality	Sens. #Elem.	Sens. Categ.	Train-free	Comput. Cost	Uses
DocSim	layout	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	[15, 18]
MeanIoU	layout	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	[2, 22]
DocEMD	layout	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	[12]
LTSim	layout	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—
Max.IoU	collection	—	✗	✗	✓	✓	[15–17]
FID	collection	—	✓	✓	✗	▲	[15–18]
LTSim-MMD	collection	—	✓	✓	✓	▲	—

stability. These obstacles pose critical issues in the development of a reliable evaluation tool.

Our approach bypasses such issues by eliminating data-specific representation learning. Our proposed measure is inspired by OC-cost, a dissimilarity measure to compare detection results [25]. Oc-cost evaluates object detection results by assessing the cost of correcting predicted bounding boxes to ground-truth ones. Our measure is also based on the cost of moving elements from one layout to the other.

3. Review of Layout Generation Evaluation

Previous studies have created tools to evaluate layout generation, yet their behaviors are rarely discussed. For the benefit of future research, we offer a comprehensive review of layout generation evaluation. The characteristics of similarity measures are summarized in Tab. 1. We classify measures into layout-level and collection-level comparisons. The former compares two layouts, while the latter compares two groups of layouts.

In this paper, we represent a layout as a collection of n elements $\mathcal{L} = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Each element is denoted as $e_i = (b_i, c_i)$, where b_i is a bounding box’s normalized coordinates, and c_i is a label indicating the element category. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_s\}$ be a collection of real layouts, and $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_t\}$ be generated ones.

DocSim DocSim is a similarity for a layout pair [26]. In DocSim, each element in one layout is connected to an element in another. The weight of these connections shows how similar the elements are. The weight is defined as:

$$W(e_i, \hat{e}_j) = \alpha(b_i, \hat{b}_j) 2^{-\Delta_C(b_i, \hat{b}_j) - \Delta_S(b_i, \hat{b}_j)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the smaller size of the element pair, $\Delta_C(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the relative Euclidean distance between the elements’ center locations, and $\Delta_S(\cdot, \cdot)$, the shape difference. When




Figure 3. DocSim’s drawbacks. Top: DocSim assigns much higher similarity values for layout pairs with larger elements than those with small elements. Bottom: DocSim happens to reward differences between layouts.

an element pair has different categories, $W(e_i, e_j) = 0$. After calculating the weights for edges, the maximum weight matching is obtained, and the weights of the matching are averaged as a similarity score of the pair.

DocSim has the following drawbacks:

- **Inconsistent scale:** The element size determines the weight scale with $\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$. Due to this design, the upper bound of DocSim varies depending on the element size as in Fig. 3. This means that layouts with larger elements have much more impact on evaluation scores.
- **Unexpected rewards for differences:** Since the DocSim score is the average weight of matched elements, removing small elements can result in a higher score than the one for an identical pair (Fig. 3).

MeanIoU MeanIoU is a common measure in segmentation tasks. MeanIoU calculates the intersection of two segmentation maps in the same category divided by their union. This is done for each class and the average is taken. Layout representation learning research [2, 22] uses a MeanIoU-based measure for layout retrieval evaluation. While MeanIoU is uncommon in layout generation research, it can be an option when viewing a layout as a labeled segmentation map. One limitation is the constant penalty for the occurrence of categories that do not appear in one layout as in Fig. 2 (b). Each category mismatch results in a zero IoU, causing a decrease in MeanIoU.

Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) FID [13] is a common evaluation tool for data generation tasks. FID measures the discrepancy between the distributions of real and generated samples within a feature space. The performance of FID hence relies on a feature extractor. However, in contrast to image generation evaluation, there’s no consensus in the layout generation community on the choice of a feature extractor. Some researches [15, 17] directly encode elements’ positions and labels by a Transformer-based model. Conversely, others [5] render layouts to raster images and convert them into Inception features [29], as is done in image generation evaluations.

Maximum IoU (Max.IoU) Max.IoU, proposed in [17], is a training-free, collection-level metric. Max.IoU was originally designed for label-conditional layout generation where layouts are generated from label multisets sampled from a reference collection. Thus, this measure only evaluates layouts that have a corresponding one in the reference collection with the same label multiset.

The computation of Max.IoU is also based on maximum weight matching. Let $\mathcal{P}^* = \{(\mathcal{L}_i, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, \min(|\mathcal{C}|, |\hat{\mathcal{C}}|)\}$ be a maximum weight matching between layout collections \mathcal{C} and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$, Max.IoU is computed as:

$$\text{MaxIoU}(\mathcal{C}, \hat{\mathcal{C}}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}^*|} \sum_{\mathcal{P}^*} \text{MaxIoU}_\beta(\mathcal{L}_i, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i) \quad (2)$$

$\text{MaxIoU}_\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a layout-level similarity that is also computed by obtaining maximum weight matching $\mathcal{Q}^* = \{(b_i, \hat{b}_i) \mid c_i = \hat{c}_i, i = 1, \dots, \min(|\mathcal{L}|, |\hat{\mathcal{L}}|)\}$ in a bipartite graph between two element groups.

$$\text{MaxIoU}_\beta(\mathcal{L}_i, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}^*|} \sum_{\mathcal{Q}^*} \text{IoU}(b_i, \hat{b}_i). \quad (3)$$

IoU is Intersection over Union between two elements.

Unlike DocSim, a similarity score for a layout pair is normalized between 0 and 1, thus each sample equally contributes to the final performance score. The limitation is that Max.IoU evaluates only layout pairs with an identical

label multiset. This requirement can result in ignoring the majority of samples when elements’ categories are also the generation target. While recent studies involving category prediction [15, 16] evaluate models using this measure, we reveal its unreliability in such a setting.

Layout Principles *Overlap* and *Alignment* are often considered to check for design rule violations [21]. The assumption behind this principle is that elements in a good layout should overlap less and align more. Overlap calculates the total overlapping area percentage among all element pairs. Alignment rewards six types of alignment in element pairs: horizontal/vertical center, top, bottom, left, and right alignments. As real layouts may not always adhere to these layout principles, we recommend reporting the scores of real layouts when evaluating a model using this measure. If a model scores better than real layouts, the model may be overly optimized for these layout principles.

Others There are some relevant measures but their use is not common in layout generation. **DocEMD** [12] is proposed for evaluating document layout creation. It views elements as a 2D point set spread in their areas and measures layout dissimilarity using the summation of Earth Mover’s Distance (EMD) on these sets. Similar to DocSim, its scale varies by layout, leading to unstable impacts on evaluation scores. DocEMD is also unable to quantify differences with category mismatches. Our measure also uses EMD over two element sets but offers a more flexible cost for EMD so that it quantifies layout differences with category mismatches. **Wasserstein distance** [1] is a collection-level similarity measure. This measure views a layout collection as a distribution of element categories and element coordinates. It respectively computes EMD for the category and coordinates distributions to assess the discrepancy between real and generated layouts. Although this measure provides a rough perspective of the discrepancy, the oversimplified comparison may lead to unreliable conclusions.

We summarize challenges in layout similarities as below.

- **Restriction on element matching:** DocSim and Max.IoU require one-to-one element matching, thereby limiting their application to tasks. MeanIoU and DocEMD mitigate this by grouping elements of the same category and representing them with 2D points or segmentation maps. However, these measures impose constant penalties for category mismatches and fail to quantify fine-grained differences between layouts.
- **Need for dataset-specific feature extractor:** Layout generation applications span various fields [6, 30, 33]. Evaluation measures like FID, which rely on a pre-trained feature extractor, may not be applicable in certain domains due to insufficient layout datasets for pre-training

these extractors. Furthermore, prior work reports that FID does not always agree with perceived quality [7, 31].

4. Layout Transportation Similarity

This work offers two layout similarity measures for comparison at both layout and collection levels.

4.1. Layout-level Similarity

We define the dissimilarity between two layouts as the optimal cost to move elements from one layout to the other. the cost is obtained by solving this optimization problem:

$$\gamma^* = \arg \min_{\gamma} \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{i,j} \mu(e_i, \hat{e}_j), \quad (4)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_{i,j} = \frac{1}{n}, \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{i,j} = \frac{1}{m}, \gamma_{i,j} \geq 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\mu(\cdot, \cdot) > 0$ is a cost function between two elements, and m and n are the number of elements in each layout. By solving this problem, we establish a *soft* alignment between the elements denoted as γ^* .

We here define the cost function based on similarities of bounding boxes' position and labels as follows:

$$\mu(e_i, \hat{e}_j) = 1 - \frac{\delta_{\text{bbox}}(b_i, \hat{b}_j) + \delta_{\text{label}}(c_i, \hat{c}_j)}{2}. \quad (6)$$

The positional similarity is computed as

$$\delta_{\text{bbox}}(b_i, \hat{b}_j) = \frac{1 + \text{GIoU}(b_i, \hat{b}_j)}{2}, \quad (7)$$

where $\text{GIoU}(\cdot, \cdot) \in [-1, 1]$ is the generalized IoU [28], thus this function ranges from zero to one. The value gets closer to one when two bounding boxes overlap more. The label similarity is an indicator function

$$\delta_{\text{label}}(c_i, \hat{c}_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & (c_i = \hat{c}_j) \\ 0 & (c_i \neq \hat{c}_j) \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

Unlike prior measures, elements in similar positions still be able to get rewards, even if they are in different categories.

After obtaining the soft alignment of elements, we total the transportation cost as a dissimilarity between \mathcal{L} and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$:

$$\text{EMD}(\mathcal{L}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}) = \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{i,j}^* \mu(e_i, \hat{e}_j). \quad (9)$$

$\text{EMD}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a dissimilarity that ranges from zero to one. We transform this dissimilarity into a LTSim similarity as:

$$\text{LTSim}(\mathcal{L}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}; \sigma) = \exp\left(-\frac{\text{EMD}(\mathcal{L}, \hat{\mathcal{L}})}{\sigma}\right), \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is a scaling parameter that we introduce for the collection-level measure described in the next section. For layout-level similarity, we simply set $\sigma = 1.0$.

Unlike traditional measures such as DocSim, Max.IoU, and DocEMD, which focus on element similarity within the same category, our measure employs a soft matching strategy, *i.e.*, many-to-many cross-category matching. This enables our measure to quantify the differences in layouts with varying numbers of elements or category mismatches.

4.2. Collection-level Similarity

Tasks like unconditional layout generation use collection-level evaluation such as Max.IoU and FID. We extend LTSim for collection-level comparison using Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) [9]. MMD is a common choice for distribution comparison [3]. Given a pairwise affinity function, MMD assesses the discrepancy of collections by comparing the average similarity within and across collections.

Here, we consider a collection of real layouts $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_s\}$, and a generated one $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_t\}$. With an unbiased empirical estimator of the squared MMD, the discrepancy between \mathcal{C} and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is evaluated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{MMD}}^2(\mathcal{C}, \hat{\mathcal{C}}) &= \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \sum_{i \neq j}^s k(\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j) \\ &+ \frac{1}{t(t-1)} \sum_{i \neq j}^t k(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_j) \\ &- \frac{2}{st} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^t k(\mathcal{L}_i, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_j). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We define an affinity function as:

$$k(\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j) = \text{LTSim}(\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j; \sigma), \quad (12)$$

where we set the scaling parameter σ to a median of $\text{EMD}(\cdot, \cdot)$ on real layout pairs [8]. We have to assess every layout pair within and across collections, but parallel computing lets us efficiently get an MMD measurement¹.

5. Experiments

While assessing alignment with human perception may seem like a straightforward method for examining evaluation measures, its reliability for layout similarity is questioned as discussed in [27], making subjective evaluation a weak validation tool. We therefore conducted a series of experiments to investigate key properties of evaluation measures, such as responses to perturbations and collection size

¹LTSim can process ~460 pairs/sec. on a laptop with Intel Core i5. We use Google Cloud Dataflow to accelerate the computation of MMD. Details are described in the supplementary material




Figure 4. Retrieval examples on RICO and PUBLAYNET. The leftmost is the query layout and the others are top-1 retrieval by LTSim, DocSim, MeanIoU, and FID-FeatSim.

effects. Furthermore, in the supplementary material, we offer a collection of qualitative examples and a thorough comparison of the measures’ preferences across diverse layout differences, enabling readers to verify the behavior of these measures.

Dataset We use RICO [6] and PUBLAYNET [33]. Experiments are done with their validation sets except for the one in Sec. 5.3 where we re-evaluate generation models on the test sets. RICO provides layouts of mobile apps’ user interfaces. Each element is labeled as one of 25 element categories such as text button, image, and icon. Its validation and test sets include 2,109 and 4,218 layouts, respectively. PUBLAYNET is a dataset of scientific papers. Each element is labeled with one of five element categories, such as table, image, and text. Its validation and test sets include 16,619 and 11,142 layouts, respectively. The data splits above may differ from the official ones due to the data filtering, *e.g.*, excluding samples with more than 25 elements, as in [15].

Compared measures We compare LTSim/-MMD with DocSim, MaxIoU_β , Max.IoU , MeanIoU, and FID. We test FID in [15] based on learned features that encode boxes’ spatial representation and labels. We also investigate the capability of the learned feature space used in FID [15]. Specifically, we compute the similarity between two layout features as $\exp(-\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 / 2\sigma^2)$ where $\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are learned features and σ is the median of the squared euclidean distance of every layout pairs in the dataset. We call this measure FID-FeatSim. FID and FID-FeatSim serve

as representatives of data-driven evaluations, whereas DocSim, MaxIoU_β , Max.IoU , and MeanIoU stand as examples of manually designed methods.

5.1. Layout-level Similarity

5.1.1 Layout Retrieval

To qualitatively demonstrate how each layout similarity measure behaves, we show layout retrieval results in Fig. 4. For each query layout, we retrieve the top nearest sample. The result by MaxIoU_β is not displayed as most queries do not have comparable samples due to its requirement for category multiset matching. Notably, DocSim’s results significantly differ from the others, while the other measures yield similar results with minor differences. We assume that this difference stems from DocSim’s emphasis on element sizes. We observe that FID-FeatSim sometimes fails to retrieve similar layouts on PUBLAYNET. A possible explanation for these failures is that the learned features used in FID-FeatSim lose their representation capability around the space where training samples are not enough, which leads to unstable performance. This is a primary challenge of the representation learning-based approach. The retrieval results on RICO also demonstrate how each measure considers category matching. MeanIoU retrieves layouts with identical element categories in different placements, while ours retrieves layouts with similarly positioned elements and some label mismatches. This is because ours does not view label mismatch as a decisive factor, instead, it pays attention to both positional and label similarity.

	LTSim	Max.IoU $_{\beta}$	MeanIoU	FID-FeatSim	DocSim
RICO					
LTSim		0.99	0.97	0.80	0.65
Max.IoU $_{\beta}$	0.99		0.97	0.79	0.65
MeanIoU	0.97	0.97		0.78	0.64
FID-FeatSim	0.80	0.79	0.78		0.52
DocSim	0.65	0.65	0.64	0.52	
PUBLAYNET					
LTSim		0.77	0.55	0.44	0.58
Max.IoU $_{\beta}$	0.77		0.58	0.42	0.60
MeanIoU	0.55	0.58		0.32	0.39
FID-FeatSim	0.44	0.42	0.32		0.47
DocSim	0.58	0.60	0.39	0.47	

Table 2. Rank correlation between the measures. We rank layout pairs by their similarity using each measure and compute Kendall’s τ across them. The darker colors depict a strong correlation.

5.1.2 Correlation between Measures

We do not intend to introduce a drastic change in layout evaluation criteria, but rather to broaden the scope of assessable pairs. Therefore, we verify the agreement between ours and the existing measures. In this experiment, we rank layout pairs using the similarity measures, and then calculate the rank correlation between each pair of rankings. We ensure that each layout pair has the same category multiset so that MaxIoU $_{\beta}$ can compute its similarity. As a rank correlation measure, we use Kendall’s τ . Strong agreement leads to values near 1, while disagreement leads to -1. The result shown in Tab. 2 suggests that, for layout pairs whose element labels are identical, LTSim positively agrees with existing measures, except for DocSim. The low correlation between DocSim and other metrics implies that DocSim may lead to inconsistent conclusions with other measures. On PUBLAYNET, while the measures still show positive correlations, the values drop overall.

5.2. Collection-level Similarity

5.2.1 Reliability Analysis

For a reliable comparison of layout generation models, measures should accurately gauge the degree of difference between collections. To validate this, we perturb a layout dataset to create layout collections with varying degrees of differences from the original and examine whether the measures accurately reflect the degree of difference. We use two types of perturbations: i) *Positional noise* shifts the bounding box position within a normalized offset uniformly sampled from a range from 0 to 0.1, and ii) *Label noise* replaces

a label with a different one. These noises are independently applied to elements at a certain rate. We then calculate the similarity or discrepancy between the original and the perturbed datasets. We adjust the perturbation injection rate from 0.1 to 0.5 and run 10 trials for each setting. Examples of perturbed layouts are in the supplementary material.

Figure 5 shows the result on RICO validation set that has 2,109 layouts. Each box represents the range of measures with 10 trials. We observe Max.IoU values overlap across different perturbation injection rates. This implies that Max.IoU can potentially yield unreliable results, as it might assign higher similarity to a pair of layout collections with larger differences than the one with smaller differences. FID shows stability but cannot differentiate collections with a perturbation rate of 10% from those with 20%. On the other hand, LTSim-MMD successfully distinguishes collections with different degrees of difference.

5.2.2 Effect of Collection Size

Parallel computing can accelerate MMD calculations, but it remains relatively costly. Using a smaller sample size for a preliminary estimate will facilitate quick model development. We examine how the size of the layout collection impacts LTSim-MMD estimation. We sample a subset of the perturbed datasets 10 times for each and reassess LTSim-MMD. The size of the reference collection remains unchanged. Figure 6 shows that LTSim-MMD consistently ranks perturbed collections, with only minor changes even when the dataset size is halved with a 42% decrease in computation costs in this setting. This result suggests that our measure works even with small datasets, making it useful for model validation during training.

5.3. Evaluating Generated Layouts

We evaluate generated layouts on tasks in [15]. We use the test sets in this experiment.

Unconditional generation Models generate layouts so that the generated layouts look like real ones. We test collection-level measures, *i.e.*, Max.IoU, FID, LTSim-MMD, on this task. Table 3 shows the result. FID and LTSim-MMD both rank the same model as the best, while Max.IoU prefers a different one. Max.IoU, designed for label-conditioned generation, evaluates only a small subset of layouts whose label multiset is identical to one of the reference samples. In RICO experiments, Max.IoU evaluates only 18% of generated layouts on average among all results. This skews the layout distribution under evaluation, leading to a different conclusion compared to other collection-level measures. This result shows the risk of using Max.IoU for tasks other than label-conditioned generation. We observe a similar trend on PUBLAYNET.




Figure 5. These box plots show the responses to perturbations by Max.IoU, FID, and LTSim-MMD. The overlaps imply that the measure may fail to distinguish the quality of layout collections.




Figure 6. LTSim-MMD on varying collection size. This measure still provides a good estimate even on the halved dataset.

		Unconditional Gen.			Label-conditioned Gen.			
		Max.IoU \uparrow	FID \downarrow	LTSim-MMD \downarrow	DocSim \uparrow	MeanIoU \uparrow	Max.IoU \uparrow	LTSim \uparrow
RICO	BART [20]	38.06	11.90	1.08	16.25	29.01	24.93	75.46
	BLT [18]	21.98	178.19	26.21	13.34	22.93	20.46	73.64
	LayoutDM [15]	48.36	6.65	0.26	16.79	32.41	27.69	76.24
	MaskGIT [4]	57.69	52.11	3.93	16.87	30.41	26.23	75.92
	VQDiffusion [10]	43.42	7.46	0.58	16.46	29.01	25.20	75.57
PUBLAYNET	BART [20]	45.09	16.60	1.89	13.08	27.25	32.00	76.27
	BLT [18]	32.07	116.81	26.59	10.47	24.53	21.49	74.77
	LayoutDM [15]	39.05	13.91	0.85	12.69	26.38	31.04	75.74
	MaskGIT [4]	51.40	32.27	7.73	13.22	27.87	31.92	76.58
	VQDiffusion [10]	37.76	15.41	0.93	12.79	26.34	32.09	75.89

Table 3. Evaluation results on unconditional and label-conditioned generation. The darker colors indicate the higher ranks. The measurement values except FID are scaled by 100 for visibility.

Label-conditioned generation In this task, given element categories, *e.g.*, one image and two text buttons, the model predicts the sizes and positions for them. We test layout-level measures and Max.IoU, with results displayed in Tab. 3. MeanIoU, Max.IoU and LTSim yield identical model rankings on RICO. In this task, all samples are properly involved in Max.IoU, avoiding the issue seen in unconditional generation. As discussed, DocSim places significant emphasis on element sizes, leading to a ranking different from other measures. We observe minor disagreement across the measures on PUBLAYNET as expected from the lower correlations in Tab. 2.

6. Discussions

Which measures should we use? **DocSim:** Its emphasis on element sizes can result in unintuitive similarities. There’s no strong research basis for using it. **Max.IoU:** It is suitable for label-conditioned generation, but not recom-

mended for other tasks involving label generation such as unconditional generation. **FID:** FID often yields similar results to ours. However, its effectiveness relies on a feature extractor, which shows questionable results in Sec. 5.2.1. Ensuring the feature extractor’s reliability is crucial, yet highly challenging. **LTSim/-MMD:** We suggest using them as a primary measure. As LTSim is designed to handle layouts with different label sets, it covers tasks involving label prediction. For collection-level comparison, LTSim-MMD is beneficial. When its computational cost is not affordable, we suggest a preliminary evaluation using a small subset and a full dataset evaluation for the final assessment.

Limitations The main challenge is LTSim-MMD’s computational cost. We need to evaluate every pair within and across the collections. Although parallel computing alleviates the issue, reducing the cost will be an important topic when precise evaluation with a massive dataset is required.

Layout generation aims to create plausible and novel layouts. However, current evaluation measures, including ours, may favor layouts that are simply duplicates of training samples. It would be interesting to develop an evaluation measure that penalizes the generation of layouts overly similar to reference ones.

7. Conclusion

The maintenance of evaluation tools is crucial for ensuring the sound development of the field. We review the layout generation evaluation’s similarity measures and uncover their challenges. Based on the findings, we introduce a new measure, LTSim. Our measure quantifies various layout differences often missed by existing measures. We also extend this measure for collection-level comparisons. Empirical results show that our measure offers a more reliable comparison tool suitable for a range of layout generation tasks.

References

- [1] Diego Martin Arroyo, Janis Postels, and Federico Tombari. Variational transformer networks for layout generation. In *CVPR*, 2021. [2](#), [4](#)
- [2] Yue Bai, Dipu Manandhar, Zhaowen Wang, John P. ColloMosse, and Yun Fu. Layout representation learning with spatial and structural hierarchies. In *AAAI*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [3] Mikolaj Bińkowski, Dougal J. Sutherland, Michael Arbel, and Arthur Gretton. Demystifying MMD GANs. In *ICLR*, 2018. [5](#)
- [4] Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Lu Jiang, Ce Liu, and William T. Freeman. MaskGIT: Masked generative image transformer. In *CVPR*, 2022. [8](#)
- [5] Chin-Yi Cheng, Forrest Huang, Gang Li, and Yang Li. PPlay: Parametrically conditioned layout generation using latent diffusion. In *ICML*, 2023. [2](#), [4](#)
- [6] Biplab Deka, Zifeng Huang, Chad Franzen, Joshua Hirschman, Daniel Afegan, Yang Li, Jeffrey Nichols, and Ranjitha Kumar. Rico: A mobile app dataset for building data-driven design applications. In *ACM UIST*, 2017. [1](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [7] Ming Ding, Wendi Zheng, Wenyi Hong, and Jie Tang. CogView2: Faster and better text-to-image generation via hierarchical transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.14217*, 2022. [5](#)
- [8] Kenji Fukumizu, Arthur Gretton, Gert Lanckriet, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Bharath K Sriperumbudur. Kernel choice and classifiability for rkhs embeddings of probability distributions. In *NeurIPS*, 2009. [5](#)
- [9] Arthur Gretton, Karsten M. Borgwardt, Malte J. Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander Smola. A kernel two-sample test. *JMLR*, 13(25), 2012. [2](#), [5](#)
- [10] Shuyang Gu, Dong Chen, Jianmin Bao, Fang Wen, Bo Zhang, Dongdong Chen, Lu Yuan, and Baining Guo. Vector quantized diffusion model for text-to-image synthesis. In *CVPR*, 2022. [8](#)
- [11] Kamal Gupta, Justin Lazarow, Alessandro Achille, Larry S. Davis, Vijay Mahadevan, and Abhinav Shrivastava. Layout-Transformer: Layout generation and completion with self-attention. In *ICCV*, 2021. [2](#)
- [12] Liu He, Yijuan Lu, John Corring, Dinei Florencio, and Cha Zhang. Diffusion-based document layout generation. In *ICDAR*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [13] Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. GANs trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *NeurIPS*, 2017. [2](#), [4](#)
- [14] Danqing Huang, Jiaqi Guo, Shizhao Sun, Hanling Tian, Jieru Lin, Zheng Hu, Chin-Yew Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. A survey for graphic design intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01371*, 2023. [2](#)
- [15] Naoto Inoue, Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. LayoutDM: Discrete diffusion model for controllable layout generation. In *CVPR*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [16] Zhaoyun Jiang, Jiaqi Guo, Shizhao Sun, Huayu Deng, Zhongkai Wu, Vuksan Mijovic, Zijiang James Yang, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. LayoutFormer++: Conditional graphic layout generation via constraint serialization and decoding space restriction. In *CVPR*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#)
- [17] Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. Constrained graphic layout generation via latent optimization. In *ACM MM*, 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [18] Xiang Kong, Lu Jiang, Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Yuan Hao, Haifeng Gong, and Irfan Essa. BLT: Bidirectional layout transformer for controllable layout generation. In *ECCV*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [8](#)
- [19] Hsin-Ying Lee, Lu Jiang, Irfan Essa, Phuong B. Le, Haifeng Gong, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Weiling Yang. Neural design network: Graphic layout generation with constraints. In *ECCV*, 2020. [2](#)
- [20] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *ACL*, 2020. [8](#)
- [21] Jianan Li, Jimei Yang, Aaron Hertzmann, Jianming Zhang, and Tingfa Xu. LayoutGAN: Synthesizing graphic layouts with vector-wireframe adversarial networks. *IEEE TPAMI*, 43(7), 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#)
- [22] Dipu Manandhar, Dan Ruta, and John ColloMosse. Learning structural similarity of user interface layouts using graph networks. In *ECCV*, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [23] Peter O’Donovan, Aseem Agarwala, and Aaron Hertzmann. Learning layouts for single-page graphic designs. *IEEE TVCG*, 20(8), 2014. [2](#)
- [24] Peter O’Donovan, Aseem Agarwala, and Aaron Hertzmann. DesignScape: Design with interactive layout suggestions. In *CHI*, 2015. [2](#)
- [25] Mayu Otani, Riku Togashi, Yuta Nakashima, Esa Rahtu, Janne Heikkilä, and Shin’ichi Satoh. Optimal correction cost for object detection evaluation. In *CVPR*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#)

- [26] Akshay Gadi Patil, Omri Ben-Eliezer, Or Perel, and Hadar Averbuch-Elor. Read: Recursive autoencoders for document layout generation. In *CVPRW*, 2020. 1, 2, 3
- [27] Akshay Gadi Patil, Manyi Li, Matthew Fisher, Manolis Savva, and Hao Zhang. Layoutgmn: Neural graph matching for structural layout similarity. In *CVPR*, 2021. 2, 5
- [28] Hamid Rezaatofighi, Nathan Tsoi, JunYoung Gwak, Amir Sadeghian, Ian Reid, and Silvio Savarese. Generalized intersection over union. In *CVPR*, 2019. 5
- [29] Christian Szegedy, Sergey Ioffe, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Alexander A. Alemi. Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning. In *AAAI*, 2017. 4
- [30] K. Yamaguchi. CanvasVAE: Learning to generate vector graphic documents. In *ICCV*, 2021. 4
- [31] Huiting Yang, Danqing Huang, Chin-Yew Lin, and Shengfeng He. Layout generation as intermediate action sequence prediction. In *AAAI*, 2023. 5
- [32] Xinru Zheng, Xiaotian Qiao, Ying Cao, and Rynson W. H. Lau. Content-aware generative modeling of graphic design layouts. *ACM TOG*, 38(4), 2019. 1
- [33] Xu Zhong, Jianbin Tang, and Antonio Jimeno Yepes. PubLayNet: largest dataset ever for document layout analysis. In *ICDAR*, 2019. 4, 6

Supplementary Material

A. Evaluations in Recent Papers

Table A is a list of recent layout generation papers and the evaluation methods used in their experiments. We observe that the use of FID is quite common. However, it is important to recognize that the FID measure may be different due to the difference in layout feature extractors.

	Conditional Generation	Unconditional Generation
LayoutGAN [14]	N/A	Align., Overlap,
LayoutVAE [9]	N/A	NLL, IoU variant
NDN [12]	FID, Align., Const. consistency	N/A
VTN [1]	N/A	Align., Overlap, Wasserstein dist., IoU variant, DocSim
LayoutTransformer [4]	N/A	NLL, Coverage, Overlap
LayoutGAN++ [10]	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap, Const. violation	N/A
LayoutMCL [16]	N/A	FID, Align., fake positive rate
Jiang <i>et al.</i> [7]	N/A	Align., Overlap, Wasserstein dist., Chamfer dist.
BLT [11]	FID, DocSim, IoU variant, Align., Overlap	IoU variant, Align., Overlap
Yang <i>et al.</i> [17]	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap
PLay [3]	FID, G-Usage	N/A
LayoutDM [6]	FID, DocSim, Max.IoU, Const. violation	FID, Align.
LayoutDM* [2]	FID, Max.IoU, IoU variant, Align., Overlap	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap
LDGM [5]	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap
LayoutFormer++ [8]	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap, Const. violation	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap
DLT [13]	FID, DocSim, IoU variant, Align., Overlap	FID, IoU variant, Align., Overlap
LayoutDiffusion [18]	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap
LayoutPrompter [15]	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap, Const. violation	FID, Max.IoU, Align., Overlap

Table A. Evaluation measures reported in prior work.

B. Computational Cost of LTSim-MMD

LTSim can process ~460 pairs/sec. on a laptop with Intel Core i5, resulting in ~90min. to compute MMD on 1K generated and 2K real layouts on RICO. To accelerate this, we use Google Cloud Dataflow. The evaluation of every pair within the RICO validation set, which comprises 4.4 million pairs, is completed in approximately 19 minutes with \$2. We choose the n1-highmem-2 machine type, and set the maximum worker size to 100. Increasing worker size will offer more scalability without a significant cost increase.

C. Perturbed Layout Examples

Figure C shows examples of perturbed layout datasets in ???. We use two types of perturbations:

- *Positional noise* shifts the bounding box position within a normalized offset uniformly sampled from a range from 0 to 0.1, and
- *Label noise* replaces a label with a different one.


These noises are independently applied to elements at a certain rate. We adjust the perturbation injection rate from 0.1 to 0.5. The leftmost column shows the layouts in the original dataset, while the remaining columns show the perturbed ones. As the perturbation inject rate gets larger, differences from the original layouts increase.



Figure C. Examples of perturbed layouts used in the reliability analysis experiment ???. “Original” shows an excerpt from the original dataset. With the increase of perturbation injection rate, the dataset changes from left to right.


D. Measures' Preferences

Figure D shows examples of each measure's preferences. We evaluate whether layout A or B is closer to the anchor using the measures and show each measure's preference. Below each example, we provide a brief explanation for these preferences.




All the measures respond similarly to simple spatial changes in elements.

DocEMD views an element as a set of 2D points, thus splitting one element into smaller ones does not significantly reduce the similarity according to DocEMD.



When narrow elements shift slightly, IoU often yields zero, causing a swift decrease in similarity by IoU-based measures like Max.IoU_β and MeanIoU. Our measure uses generalized IoU instead, resulting in a different assessment.

As we discussed in the paper, our measure does not view label mismatch as a decisive factor, thus, prefer one with a highly similar placement in this example.



In DocEMD, the similarity is not significantly impacted by merging or splitting elements. In this example, DocEMD looks to favor a layout that has a more common area with the anchor. DocSim often assigns a higher similarity to layouts with larger elements.

When the difference in element numbers exceeds a threshold, DocSim determines the layouts as entirely dissimilar, resulting in zero similarity.

Figure D. Examples of the measures' preferences.

E. Evaluation on Layout Completion

We also report the evaluation results for the layout completion task in Tab. E, which requires predicting the remaining elements from a few ones in a reference layout. The measures produce slightly different model rankings on RICO and PUBLAYNET. Despite being a conditional generation task, layout completion may have varying numbers and categories of predicted elements compared to reference layouts. Current measures often struggle with such layout pairs, potentially causing inconsistent results.

		Layout Completion			
		DocSim	MeanIoU	Max.IoU	LTSim
RICO	BART	7.05	19.58	53.02	62.54
	BLT	0.76	12.32	13.63	52.73
	LayoutDM	8.84	22.08	57.43	63.49
	MaskGIT	11.08	23.08	55.68	62.53
	VQDiffusion	8.25	19.14	53.97	62.72
PUBLAYNET	BART	7.56	31.01	44.23	73.65
	BLT	0.05	18.21	13.68	64.46
	LayoutDM	8.55	26.96	38.06	72.44
	MaskGIT	9.90	30.99	48.12	74.04
	VQDiffusion	8.28	26.05	37.73	72.22

Table E. Evaluation results on layout completion. The darker colors indicate the higher ranks. The measurement values are scaled by 100 for visibility.

F. Visualizing Element Matching in LTSim

Figure Fig. F illustrates the soft element matching in LTSim. The gray edges represent the optimal transportation $\gamma_{i,j}^*$, with thicker edges indicating larger weights. The examples demonstrate that our measure exploits cross-category and many-to-many element matching.




Figure F. Visualization of soft element matching in LTSim. These edges, representing the optimal transportation γ^* , are thicker for matches with a higher weight.

G. Additional Retrieval Results

We show additional retrieval results in the following figures. For each query, top-5 retrieval results by LTSim, DocSim, MeanIoU, and FID-FeatSim are displayed.







Figure G. Top-5 retrieval results by LTSim, DocSim, MeanIoU, FID-FeatSim.







RICO




PUBLAYNET




PUBLAYNET



PUBLAYNET



PUBLAYNET



References

- [1] Diego Martin Arroyo, Janis Postels, and Federico Tombari. Variational transformer networks for layout generation. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [2] Shang Chai, Liansheng Zhuang, and Fengying Yan. LayoutDM: Transformer-based Diffusion Model for Layout Generation. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [3] Chin-Yi Cheng, Forrest Huang, Gang Li, and Yang Li. PLayer: Parametrically conditioned layout generation using latent diffusion. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [4] Kamal Gupta, Justin Lazarow, Alessandro Achille, Larry S. Davis, Vijay Mahadevan, and Abhinav Shrivastava. LayoutTransformer: Layout generation and completion with self-attention. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- [5] Mude Hui, Zhizheng Zhang, Xiaoyi Zhang, Wenxuan Xie, Yuwang Wang, and Yan Lu. Unifying Layout Generation with a Decoupled Diffusion Model. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [6] Naoto Inoue, Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. LayoutDM: Discrete diffusion model for controllable layout generation. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [7] Zhaoyun Jiang, Shizhao Sun, Jihua Zhu, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. Coarse-to-fine generative modeling for graphic layouts. In *AAAI*, 2022.
- [8] Zhaoyun Jiang, Jiaqi Guo, Shizhao Sun, Huayu Deng, Zhongkai Wu, Vuksan Mijovic, Zijiang James Yang, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. LayoutFormer++: Conditional graphic layout generation via constraint serialization and decoding space restriction. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [9] Akash Abdu Jyothi, Thibaut Durand, Jiawei He, Leonid Sigal, and Greg Mori. LayoutVAE: Stochastic Scene Layout Generation from a Label Set. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- [10] Kotaro Kikuchi, Edgar Simo-Serra, Mayu Otani, and Kota Yamaguchi. Constrained graphic layout generation via latent optimization. In *ACM MM*, 2021.
- [11] Xiang Kong, Lu Jiang, Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Yuan Hao, Haifeng Gong, and Irfan Essa. BLT: Bidirectional layout transformer for controllable layout generation. In *ECCV*, 2022.
- [12] 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 *ECCV*, 2020.
- [13] Elad Levi, Eli Brosh, Mykola Mykhailych, and Meir Perez. DLT: Conditioned Layout Generation with Joint Discrete-Continuous Diffusion Layout Transformer. In *ICCV*, 2023.
- [14] Jianan Li, Jimei Yang, Aaron Hertzmann, Jianming Zhang, and Tingfa Xu. LayoutGAN: Synthesizing graphic layouts with vector-wireframe adversarial networks. *IEEE TPAMI*, 43(7), 2021.
- [15] Jiawei Lin, Jiaqi Guo, Shizhao Sun, Zijiang Yang, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. Layoutprompter: Awaken the design ability of large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [16] David D Nguyen, Surya Nepal, and Salil S Kanhere. Diverse multimedia layout generation with multi choice learning. In *ACM MM*, 2021.
- [17] Huiting Yang, Danqing Huang, Chin-Yew Lin, and Shengfeng He. Layout generation as intermediate action sequence prediction. In *AAAI*, 2023.
- [18] Junyi Zhang, Jiaqi Guo, Shizhao Sun, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. LayoutDiffusion: Improving Graphic Layout Generation by Discrete Diffusion Probabilistic Models. In *ICCV*, 2023.