

AI Tailoring: Evaluating Influence of Image Features on Fashion Product Popularity

Xiaomin Li*

John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University

xiaominli@g.harvard.edu

Junyi Sha*

Center for Computational Science & Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

jsha@mit.edu

Abstract

Identifying key product features that influence consumer preferences is essential in the fashion industry. In this study, we introduce a robust methodology to ascertain the most impactful features in fashion product images, utilizing past market sales data. First, we propose the metric called “influence score” to quantitatively assess the importance of product features. Then we develop a forecasting model, the Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP), which integrates Transformer-based models and Random Forest to predict market popularity based on product images. We employ image-editing diffusion models to modify these images and perform an ablation study, which validates the impact of the highest and lowest-scoring features on the model’s popularity predictions. Additionally, we further validate these results through surveys that gather human rankings of preferences, confirming the accuracy of the FDP model’s predictions and the efficacy of our method in identifying influential features. Notably, products enhanced with “good” features show marked improvements in predicted popularity over their modified counterparts. Our approach develops a fully automated and systematic framework for fashion image analysis that provides valuable guidance for downstream tasks such as fashion product design and marketing strategy development.

1. Introduction

In the domain of image feature analysis, contemporary approaches increasingly rely on deep learning techniques to extract and interpret complex patterns within image data. Pioneering models such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [28], Vision Transformers (ViT) [14], and Diffusion Models [56, 57] have demonstrated efficacy across di-

verse applications, including medical imaging, retail, and e-commerce [9, 19, 35, 40, 58, 70]. These models can be applied as tools for image editing tasks, significantly enhancing image customization for specific needs. For instance, DALL-E [47] and DALL-E 2 [48] generate imaginative images from textual descriptions, while StyleGAN enables realistic facial feature manipulations [26], and StyleCLIP merges StyleGAN’s capabilities with text-driven controls for detailed edits [43].

Particularly, for fashion product images, identifying features that influence consumer preferences is crucial. Nonetheless, current methodologies often rely heavily on human input, requiring designers to provide text instructions [44, 65] or detailed sketches [11, 66], which introduces subjectivity and potential biases. This highlights the importance of developing objective, automated systems that can accurately identify and modify key features, enhancing both the precision and reliability of fashion design processes.

In this paper, we introduce a novel method aimed at identifying and evaluating the most influential features in fashion product images, thus guiding the enhancement of design decisions based on their impact on product popularity. We first introduce the “influence score”, aggregated from the popularity data of related products, to quantify the importance of each design feature. This score is adjusted according to the frequency of features observed across a collection of images. Then we train a forecasting model which we call the *Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP)* using real sales data to forecast product popularity, as an increase in consumer ratings has been demonstrated to correspond with higher sales[41]. To validate our model, we conduct various experiments using real data adapted from a European fast fashion company. First, we assess the effectiveness of the FDP using a held-out test dataset and using human preference data collected through a survey. Secondly, we perform ablation studies to validate our feature influence measure, comparing

*Equal contribution.

pairs of original and AI-modified (using *InstructPix2pix-Distill*[45] and *Adobe Firefly Image 3* [2]) images to analyze the impact of specific features on product popularity, thereby ensuring consistency between model predictions and human assessments. Moreover, we use multi-modal large language models (*Llava-v1.5-7b* [36]) as our baseline for comparison. Our approach provides actionable insights for feature identification in fashion product images, essential for targeted image editing and fashion design tasks. The detailed pipeline of our methodology is illustrated in Figure 1.

In summary, our contributions are the following: (1) We developed a popularity forecasting model that predicts the popularity of fashion products based on their image and basic description. (2) We propose a quantitative measure to evaluate the influence and importance of distinct design features, where high scores indicate “good” features and low scores indicate “bad” features. (3) We provide comprehensive experiments and evaluation metrics to validate the performance of our forecasting model and the effectiveness of the feature influence score, employing ablation studies and human surveys for robust validation.

2. Related Work

Attribute/Feature Extraction Image feature extraction remains a fundamental task in computer vision, employing a spectrum of techniques from traditional algorithms, such as edge detection and texture analysis [62, 73], to more advanced neural network-based methods. Notably, deep learning models like CNNs [29], Transformers [63], and Vision Transformers (ViT) [15] have revolutionized this domain by automatically learning complex features. In the context of fashion images, both conventional approaches [3, 8, 67] and deep learning techniques [5, 31, 55, 69] have been extensively utilized for feature recognition and extraction. In particular, CNN is frequently applied in this field [12, 16, 24, 32, 39, 61, 64]. In our dataset, feature extraction is simplified by using a composite string of descriptors for each fashion product, thereby eliminating the need to design the concepts to describe the image features. Instead, we focus on analyzing and evaluating the importance of features. Our forecasting model leverages FashionCLIP [10], a transformer-based approach that converts image features into latent embeddings.

Fashion Image Generation and Editing Fashion image generation has been progressively studied with the advent of text-to-image synthesis, especially pertinent to fashion contexts [17, 21, 38, 68]. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) are prominently utilized for generating new designs from sketches [66] and for enabling the creation of similar designs through Attribute-GAN, which combines given designs with textual attributes [37]. The integration of ad-

vanced models such as transformers [43, 46–49, 53, 63, 71] and diffusion models [13, 22, 51, 52] has significantly enriched capabilities in image generation and editing. Specifically, [59] demonstrates a multi-modal transformer-based architecture that enhances fashion image editing through textual feedback, although it primarily functions within a search model context, contrary to initial interpretations. In our case, we utilize diffusion-based models, specifically *InstructPix2pix-Distill* and *Adobe Firefly Image 3*, which allow image editing based on region selection and text description inputs.

3. Methodology

3.1. Data

The dataset used in this study originates from a European fast fashion company and includes real product data. For each product, it provides a front-facing 2098×1500 pixel image captured under controlled lighting and a uniform white background (see pipeline Figure 1) for an example, and a caption which is a composite string of descriptors detailing product design elements, along with 22 categorical features, including product category, fabric, fashion degree, etc., and 13 numerical features, including product cost, product listed price, life cycle, etc. Further details about this dataset can be found in the Appendix. The dataset contains a total of 8,503 products that include the image and caption pair.

3.2. Caption Text Processing

Caption cleaning In our dataset, some captions are not formatted perfectly. For example, several captions include unusual non-English symbols, as well as superfluous commas and periods. To address these issues, in the pre-processing caption cleaning step, we first convert all captions to lowercase. Subsequently, we remove extraneous punctuation marks (such as commas and periods) and then divide the caption sentences into lists of short phrases, where each phrase describes one attribute/feature of the product.

Semantic-based Clustering using MinHashLSH Following the cleaning of captions, each caption is transformed into a list of features. We define the union of all these features as $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$. During our analysis, we identify multiple groups of features where the elements within each group are synonyms—indicating that they differ in expression but convey highly similar or identical meanings. Examples of such synonym groups include “cable knit” and “cable knit fabric”, as well as “hook and zip fastening” and “zip and hook fastening”. Consequently, our set of features, denoted $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$, is effectively composed of k synonym groups, represented




Figure 1. Pipeline of our methodology

mathematically as:

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{G}_i.$$

To eliminate this redundancy, we have opted to collapse each group \mathcal{G}_i into a singleton, with only one representative element. Specifically, we select a representative feature f_i from each \mathcal{G}_i to construct our refined feature set \mathcal{F} , expressed as:

$$\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k\} \quad (1)$$

This approach ensures a more streamlined and distinct set of features for subsequent analysis.

To achieve this, we implement the following procedure. First, we separate $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ into disjoint synonym groups. In this step, it is essential to assess the semantic similarity between features. Our approach entails grouping features whose similarity exceeds a predefined threshold τ_0 . Specifically, for any two features $f_i, f_j \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$, we define $H(\cdot)$ as our encoding function, which maps each text feature f_i into a d -dimensional vector in \mathbb{R}^d , where d is a fixed number. We then define $S(\cdot, \cdot)$ as our similarity metric for these vectors. Consequently, we enforce:

$$\text{if } f_i \in \mathcal{G} \text{ and } S(H(f_i), H(f_j)) > \tau_0, \text{ then } f_j \in \mathcal{G}.$$

This process ensures that features grouped together share a high degree of semantic similarity.

In particular, we employ MinHashLSH (MinHash Locality-Sensitive Hashing) algorithm [6, 18] to achieve efficient clustering. MinHashLSH is a probabilistic method designed to quickly identify approximate similarities between items. The principle underlying this technique is to hash similar items into the same ‘‘bucket’’ with a high probability, thereby simplifying the task of identifying similar

pairs. This is achieved by using multiple MinHash functions that generate compact signatures for sets. These signatures are then stored in a specialized data structure designed to increase the likelihood of collisions (or placement in the same bucket) among similar signatures. This structure makes the clustering and searching for approximate nearest neighbors highly efficient. It is widely used in applications such as document deduplication and clustering of large datasets [4, 20, 60].

Representative Feature Selection with LLMs For the final stage of our caption processing, it is necessary to select the most representative feature f_i within each synonym group \mathcal{G}_i . For this task, we utilize large language models, specifically GPT-4 [1], to identify the representative terms. Through this process, we successfully converted more than 40 synonym groups \mathcal{G}_i which contain more than one feature, into singletons with only a single representative feature. Ultimately, we derived a refined set of 1147 distinct features, denoted as $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{1147}\}$.

In summary, our caption processing procedure is described as follows:

1. Clean the captions and aggregate the features into a unified set $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$.
2. Utilize MinHash to map feature phrases into fixed-length encoding vectors (we choose $d = 128$).
3. Apply the Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH) algorithm to efficiently cluster similar encodings, which correspond to caption phrases with analogous semantic meanings. We set the similarity threshold be $\tau_0 = 0.8$. This effectively partitions $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ into k semantic groups $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_k$.
4. Query GPT-4 to identify the best representative feature f_i in each group \mathcal{G}_i . Following this, we construct the final feature set $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k\}$.

3.3. Feature Influence Score

At this stage, the features within \mathcal{F} are well-defined. To determine which features significantly impact fashion design sales and demand, we introduce the “influence score” $Influence(f_i)$ for each feature $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$. This score is used as a metric to assess the impact of each designed feature on sales. Specifically, we establish a direct correlation between the influence score of each feature and the sales of corresponding fashion products. Initially, we normalize the sales data of all considered fashion products to a range of $[0, 1]$ using min-max normalization. Formally, given a set S , for each $s \in S$, we define the min-max normalization transformation as

$$N_S(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{s - \min(S)}{\max(S) - \min(S)} \in [0, 1].$$

Now let S denote the set of all sales values in our dataset. Then $N_S(s)$ denotes the normalized sales in the range between 0 and 1. For a given feature f_i , define S_i as the sales for all the products containing this feature in their captions. For the influence score, we naturally average all the sales of the associated products for feature f_i , representing the general impact of this feature on the sales:

$$\frac{1}{|S_i|} \sum_{s \in S_i} N_S(s) \in [0, 1]$$

This average is the primary component in our definition of influence score later.

However, the frequency with which features appear varies significantly. For instance, certain uncommon features may only appear in a single product. In such cases, the influence score is heavily influenced by the sales value of that single product, which introduces a bias due to varying feature frequencies. To mitigate this bias, we incorporate a frequency regularization term into our influence score calculation. We count the frequency of each feature and apply min-max normalization again to these values. Let P be the set of frequencies of features, and use p_i to denote the frequency for feature f_i . Eventually, the influence score for each feature f_i , with associated product sales S_i and feature frequency p_i , is defined as

$$Influence(f_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{|S_i|} \sum_{s \in S_i} N_S(s) + \lambda \cdot N_P(p_i). \quad (2)$$

Here, λ is a regularization parameter used to balance the two components of the score. A positive λ effectively penalizes features with lower frequencies. Specifically, we set $\lambda = 0.15$ to balance the contributions of both terms within a similar range. Exploration of alternative λ values is proposed for future studies.

Now each feature f_i is assigned a score $Influence(f_i)$, which quantifies the quality or popularity of the feature. We

can rank the features in descending order based on their influence scores. This ranking allows designers to prioritize the inclusion of “good” features—those at the top of the list—in their fashion designs, while steering clear of “bad” features, which are positioned at the bottom. This strategic selection aims to enhance the appeal and marketability of the resulting fashion products.

3.4. Forecasting Model

To assess the potential market performance of fashion products, we need to develop a model capable of evaluating product popularity based on available data. In this study, we assume that a product’s sales is positively correlated with its popularity [41]. This assumption allows us to treat sales as a proxy for popularity, making it possible to assess the relative appeal of a product. In this section, we introduce our forecasting model, which we call *Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP)*, which can be used to classify products into different sales categories based on multi-modal inputs, including the image and some basic information (such as product names and types) of the products.

3.4.1. Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP)

Sales Classification Task Our Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP) is designed to assess the market viability of new fashion designs. Prior research[54] has explored the use of various machine learning algorithms to predict the sales of individual fashion items. Their studies underscore the difficulty of precisely forecasting exact sales figures for each product. However, for the purposes of our study, determining exact sales numbers is less critical than assessing relative popularity among products. To simplify this task, we convert the continuous sales data into categorical classes. This effectively transforms the challenging task of exact sales forecasting into a more manageable classification problem, simplifying the prediction process.

Sales Distribution Study To determine an appropriate sales class label for each product, we first study the total sales distribution for all the products. As shown in Figure 2, the distribution is heavily right-skewed with a long tail to the right-hand side, indicating very few products achieve extremely high sales. In this study, we are interested in the relative popularity of modified new products compared to the original design. This supports the use of the equal quantiles method to generate sales class labels, rather than using fixed sales value intervals. Specifically, we divide the distribution of sales into three regions of equal probability (see Figure 2), and assign the class labels 1, 2, and 3 respectively, where a higher label indicates higher sales. By using equal quantiles, each class contains the same number of products, ensuring balanced representation across classes. This is particularly beneficial for our classification model,

as class imbalance could introduce additional challenges to the learning process[25].




Figure 2. Density distribution of normalized fashion product sales. The sales are normalized between 0 and 1 using min-max scaling, showing a skewed distribution with a higher concentration of lower sales values. The red dashed lines indicate thresholds that divide the data into three equal quantiles.

Objective Function of FDP Different types of fashion product features are described in details found in the Appendix. As mentioned in the previous sections, in this work, we aim to solve the following objective. Given 36 categorical and numeric product data features denoted as X_i , a text caption denoted as t_i , an image embedding feature denoted as e_i , we want to predict the correct sales class label. The correct sales class label, denoted as y_i , is derived by dividing the continuous true sales data into k quantile-based classes. We can formulate the objective of our FDP as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{f}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(y_i \neq \hat{y}_i)}{n} \\ & \text{where} \quad \hat{y}_i = f(X_i, t_i, e_i) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The objective here is to identify the optimal classifier f to minimize the average classification error, or in other words, to improve the classification accuracy.

Data Preprocessing Some preprocessing techniques are used to ensure that: (1) the machine learning model can correctly handle unstructured data types such as text and images, and (2) the features have manageable dimensionality so that no single feature dominates. All the categorical features are one-hot encoded to maintain an equal-weighted representation for each distinct category. To handle the caption, we use the Sentence-BERT [50] to encode the string of descriptors into dense vector representations. For the images embeddings, we use FashionCLIP [10], an open-source pre-trained transformer model designed for fashion industry applications. Due to the high dimensionality of the

image embeddings, we implement dimensionality reduction using an autoencoder to preserve only the most essential features. The classification task using FDP is illustrated in Figure 3. The train and test sets were created using a random split with an 4:1 ratio, where 80% of the data was used for training and 20% for testing.

FDP Architecture and Accuracy We have tried several classification models, including Support Vector Machines (SVM), Random Forest, and XGBoost, among others. We opted for these lighter, simpler machine learning models because they are cost-effective and efficient. Among these classifiers, the Random Forest model has demonstrated the best performance. As an ensemble learning method, the Random Forest classifier constructs multiple decision trees and aggregates their predictions [42]. Its resilience to noisy data and capability to manage high-dimensional datasets—like ours, which contains over 768 features following data preprocessing—make it particularly effective for our classification task[42].

Note that instead of getting the final classification class, by taking out the logits, we are able to obtain a probability distribution over all possible classes after the softmax function. By analyzing these probabilities later, we can determine if one product is more popular than another, as a small shift in sales may not alter the predicted class, but the underlying probability distribution provides more nuanced insights. In Section 5.1, we discuss in detail how we transform the per-class probability into an overall score that can be used to compare relative product popularity.

In Table 1, the classification accuracy of the Random Forest FDP model is shown. Moreover, we demonstrated the accuracies under different numbers of sales classes (denoted as C). Intuitively, the higher the number of classes, the more challenging it is for FDP to achieve a satisfactory accuracy. When we take $C = 3$, the classification accuracy of Random Forest exceeds 80%. Thus, for the rest of this paper, we assign all products into three distinct sales classes, i.e., low-sales class, medium-sales class, and high-sales class.

Number of classes C	3	4	5
Classification accuracy	0.81	0.71	0.61

Table 1. Prediction accuracy of FDP on the test dataset across different choices of the number of classes.

4. New Product Design

After identifying the “good” and “bad” features, our next step is to generate new fashion designs and use ablation studies to assess how these features affect product quality. We experiment with several diffusion models for image editing to modify the original designs. Ultimately, two




Figure 3. A schematic overview of Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP): the model takes three types of input features: (1) descriptive text features processed by the Sentence-BERT’s encoder, (2) image features processed by the FashionCLIP’s encoder, and (3) one-hot encoded categorical and numeric features. The encoded descriptive and image features are further compressed by an autoencoder.

models emerge as particularly effective, providing relatively good results in editing. The first tool we apply is called *InstructPix2pix-Distill* [45], a distilled version of *Instruct-Pix2Pix*, which is a pre-trained text-guided image editing tool developed by [7], which allows for precise modifications based on natural language inputs. *InstructPix2pix-Distill* improves the efficiency by incorporating distillation techniques to speed up the performance. This algorithm modifies the image as a whole, without allowing us to specify particular regions for editing. While this limits control over localized changes, it also preserves the overall image integrity, ensuring that the edits do not disrupt the cohesion of the original design. One caveat of this model is that it is not fine-tuned for fashion products, which led to some difficulties in understanding certain fashion-specific terminologies. Another model we use is the *Adobe Firefly Image 3 Model* [2]. *Firefly* is a trained generative AI model developed by Adobe, offering advanced image generation and editing capabilities. Unlike *InstructPix2pix-Distill*, it allows for more precise control by enabling region-specific modifications, where users can specify areas of an image to edit, giving us the flexibility to focus on particular parts of the design. However, one drawback is that it can generate content that does not fit well with the rest of the product, leading to inconsistencies in style. Despite this, *Firefly* excels in producing highly detailed and photorealistic outputs. Its ability to allow region-specific edits made it a great complement to *InstructPix2pix-Distill* in our research.

5. Experiments

5.1. Experiment Setup and Evaluations

While models can readily provide forecast probabilities for a product’s likelihood of belonging to various sales classes, this task is highly challenging for humans to perform accurately. Our objective is not to predict exact product sales, but rather to compare the relative popularity of a product before and after modifications. To achieve this, we transform the model’s predicted class probabilities into an overall prediction score, s_j , for product j , using the following equation:

$$s_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(C_{ji}) \cdot i, \quad i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbb{P}(C_{ji})$ represents the probability of product j belonging to the i -th class. Using this approach, we design two experiments below to evaluate our model’s performance.

Experiment 1: Image Triplets Ranking The first experiment assesses how effectively the model ranks the popularity of products within the same category. The second experiment compares the original product images with modified versions generated by diffusion models, aiming to see if the predicted popularity aligns with our expectations for increased or decreased appeal. In the first experiment, we selected $m = 20$ triples T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m , where in each triple, ensuring that each triple contains three products of the same type, each with distinct sales class labels of 1, 2, and 3, respectively. We evaluate the reliability of our model, FDP, by calculating the Kendall Tau score [27] to see how well its internal ranking aligns with the ground truth, represented

by the sales class label for each product. We define the total Kendall Tau score as

$$\tau(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{P_i - Q_i}{\binom{n}{2}} \quad (5)$$

Here P_i represents the number of concordant pairs for the i -th triple, and Q_i represents the number of discordant pairs for the same triple, compared against the ground truth ranking (more details can be found in [27]). The term $\binom{n}{2}$ is the total number of possible pairs in a triple, where $n = 3$. The value τ is in the range of $[-1, 1]$, where a higher value indicates better alignment. For the baseline, we prompt *Llava-v1.5-7b* [36], one of the leading open-source multi-modal models available that support both image and text inputs, to rank the three images and calculate its Kendall Tau score similarly.

Moreover, instead of only using the ground truth class labels, we further validate the performance of our FDP by comparing it against the rankings of human raters. We recruited 100 female survey participants through *Prolific*, an online survey platform. Detailed demographic information for the participants is provided in the Appendix. We chose female participants specifically because our fashion products are designed and marketed for a female audience, ensuring that the feedback aligns with the target consumer demographic.

Experiment 2: Ablation Case Study In the second experiment, we select 9 “good” features and 9 “bad” features according to their influence score defined in 2. For each feature, we select one associated product and conduct an ablation by removing that feature from the original product. Then and evaluate how the modification affects the product’s popularity prediction of our FDP model, described in 4. Ideally, removing “good” features should result in a decrease in product popularity, while removing “bad” features is expected to increase it. To verify this assumption, we asked human raters to indicate their preferences between the original image and the AI-modified image.

During the feature selection process, we adhered to two criteria: (1) the features must be easily editable using the diffusion models described in Section 4, and (2) the features must be visually identifiable to human observers. For instance, features associated with specific parts of clothing, such as logo prints or pockets, are simpler to modify compared to features that describe the texture or fabric, which may pose greater challenges for visual editing.

5.2. Results

Results for Experiment 1 The results from our triplet product ranking task (Experiment 1) are summarized in Table 2.

As previously mentioned, for this experiment, we consider two types of “ground truth”: one derived from sales class

	Class Labels	Human Survey
FDP	0.93	0.43
Llava	-0.56	-0.30

(a) Kendall Tau Score

	Class Labels	Human Survey
FDP	18	8
Llava	1	1

(b) Triplet Correct Counts

Table 2. Comparison between FDP and Llava on Class Labels and Human Survey

labels and the other from relative rankings collected from the human survey. The sales class label provides an objective baseline based on actual product performance, capturing real-world purchasing trends. In contrast, the human survey ranking reflects subjective preferences based solely on the product’s image and its listed price, without access to additional product details or the ability to physically interact with the items, such as trying them on. We calculated the Kendall Tau score between these two ground truths and obtained a value of 0.53. This score confirms that, despite some discrepancies, the two ground truths are reasonably well-aligned and positively correlated.

Based on the results in Table 2, the performance of the Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP) model significantly surpasses that of the Llava model in both alignment with class labels and with human survey rankings. In Table 2a, the Kendall Tau scores indicate a high correlation between FDP predictions and the class labels, as well as a positive correlation with human survey rankings. These results suggest that FDP captures trends that are consistent with actual sales data and, to a lesser extent, with subjective human preferences. Conversely, the Llava model shows negative correlations with both class labels and human survey rankings, indicating that its predictions diverge significantly from both real-world performance and human preferences. In Table 2b, we further counted the number of triples where the two rankings match perfectly. The results further reinforces FDP’s superiority, showing that FDP achieves a high count of correct triplet rankings compared to class labels and human survey rankings. In contrast, Llava achieves only one correct triplet ranking against each baseline, suggesting that it fails to reliably rank products in a manner consistent with actual performance or consumer preferences. Overall, these results highlight FDP’s effectiveness in aligning with both objective sales data and human preferences.

Results for Experiment 2 In Table 3, we compare the FDP prediction scores for original and AI-modified designs after removing identified “good” and “bad” features. For “good” features, the original designs consistently receive higher popularity scores than the AI-modified versions. This drop in popularity for AI-modified designs after

Remove	Feature Name	Feature Score	Original	AI-Modified
Good	Folded Cuffs	0.258	2.636 ↑	2.440
	Three Zipped Pockets	0.210	2.566 ↑	2.448
	Short Raglan Sleeve	0.228	2.925 ↑	2.844
	Adjustable Inner Drawstring Waist (Green)	0.232	2.616 ↑	2.507
	Adjustable Inner Drawstring Waist (Yellow)	0.232	2.636 ↑	2.502
	Light Vintage Wash	0.307	2.593 ↑	2.434
	Palm Print (Tree)	0.160	2.521 ↑	2.459
	Palm Print (Leaf)	0.160	2.450 ↑	2.380
	Multicolour Print	0.171	2.761 ↑	2.693
	Bad	Contrasting Appliques	3.39E-04	1.157
Notched Lapel		6.40E-04	1.228	1.310 ↑
Zip Detail		2.14E-03	1.173	1.215 ↑
Contrasting Pocket		3.02E-03	1.223	1.282 ↑
Decorative Pleats		2.68E-03	1.162	1.202 ↑
Glass Beads		4.68E-03	1.387	1.418 ↑
Lapels with Press Studs		3.30E-03	1.310	1.417 ↑
Stripped Finish		2.95E-04	1.345 ↑	1.342
Leather Inner Lining	1.90E-03	1.419 ↑	1.397	

Table 3. Comparison of the FDP prediction scores between original and AI-modified designs after removing “good” and “bad” Features. ↑ indicates the design with a higher score.

the removal of these “good” features, aligns with our expectations, confirming that these features positively impact the appeal of the product. Conversely, for “bad” features, the AI-modified designs score higher than the original designs in 7 out of 9 cases, indicating that FDP supports our hypothesis that removing these features enhances product appeal.

The survey results, displayed in Table 4, provide an interesting comparison to the FDP model’s predictions. For designs with “good” features removed, the survey participants, like the FDP model, overwhelmingly preferred the original versions, reinforcing our hypothesis that removing these high-influence score features diminishes the product’s appeal. For the removal of “bad” features, the survey results show a slightly more varied response. Human participants favor the AI-modified designs in 5 out of 9 cases, prefer the original design in 3 cases, and show no clear preference

Remove	Feature Name	Original (%)	AI-Assisted (%)
Good	Folded Cuffs	53.6 ↑	46.4
Good	Three Zipped Pockets	92.9 ↑	7.1
Good	Short Raglan Sleeve	41.1	58.9 ↑
Good	Adjustable Inner Drawstring Waist (Yellow)	55.4 ↑	44.6
Good	Adjustable Inner Drawstring Waist (Green)	62.5 ↑	37.5
Good	Light Vintage Wash	42.9	57.1 ↑
Good	Palm Print (Tree)	70.5 ↑	29.5
Good	Palm Print (Leaf)	80.4 ↑	19.6
Good	Multicolour Print	52.7 ↑	47.3
Bad	Contrasting Appliqués	75.9 ↑	24.1
Bad	Notched Lapel	46.4	53.6 ↑
Bad	Zip Detail	46.4	53.6 ↑
Bad	Contrasting Pocket	74.1 ↑	25.9
Bad	Decorative Pleats	50	50
Bad	Glass Beads	44.6	55.4 ↑
Bad	Lapels with Press Studs	83 ↑	17
Bad	Stripped Finish	46.4	53.6 ↑
Bad	Leather Inner Lining	43.8	56.2 ↑

Table 4. Comparison of human survey preference scores between original and AI-modified designs after removing “good” and “bad” Features. ↑ indicates the design with a higher preference score.

in 1 case. Although the survey results are more diverse than the FDP model’s predictions, they still generally support the conclusion that removing “bad” features can enhance product appeal. This nuanced divergence indicates that, while the removal of low-influence features often improves the design, it does not universally lead to a more attractive product. These findings reflect the complexity of feature influence in fashion design.

6. Discussion

In this work, we introduce a comprehensive, end-to-end framework that identifies the most influential design features in fashion images and guides both design modifications and new product evaluations. Our methodology leverages the newly proposed influence score and the Fashion Demand Predictor (FDP) model, which aligns closely with human raters’ assessments of product popularity. There are some limitations to our current work, including the need to adjust the regularization parameter λ , the challenge of conducting surveys with larger populations due to high costs, and the limitation to only removing features rather than also adding or replacing features (mostly limited by the cur-

rent capabilities of AI models in image editing). Despite these challenges, our framework represents, to the best of our knowledge, the first fully automated and systematic approach to fashion image analysis that facilitates in-depth product reviews without the need for expert inspection.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 3
- [2] Adobe. Adobe introduces firefly image 3 foundation model to take creative exploration and ideation to new heights. <https://news.adobe.com/news/news-details/2024/adobe-introduces-firefly-image-3-foundation-model-to-take-creative-exploration-and-ideation-to-new-heights>, 2024. 2, 6
- [3] Batuhan AŞIROĞLU, Mehmet Ilkay Atalay, Alkan Balkaya, Erden TÜZÜNKAN, Mustafa Dağtekin, and Tolga ENSARİ. Smart clothing recommendation system with deep learning. In *2019 3rd International Symposium on Multidisciplinary Studies and Innovative Technologies (ISMSIT)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2019. 2
- [4] Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, Qiusi Du, Zhe Fu, et al. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*, 2024. 3
- [5] Christian Bracher, Sebastian Heinz, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion dna: merging content and sales data for recommendation and article mapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02489*, 2016. 2
- [6] Andrei Z Broder. On the resemblance and containment of documents. In *Proceedings. Compression and Complexity of SEQUENCES 1997 (Cat. No. 97TB100171)*, pages 21–29. IEEE, 1997. 3
- [7] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18392–18402, 2023. 6
- [8] Xiaofei Chao, Mark J Huiskes, Tommaso Gritti, and Calina Ciuhu. A framework for robust feature selection for real-time fashion style recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 1st international workshop on Interactive multimedia for consumer electronics*, pages 35–42, 2009. 2
- [9] Junyu Chen, Yufan He, Eric C Frey, Ye Li, and Yong Du. Vitv-net: Vision transformer for unsupervised volumetric medical image registration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.06468*, 2021. 1
- [10] Patrick John Chia, Giuseppe Attanasio, Federico Bianchi, Silvia Terragni, Ana Rita Magalhães, Diogo Goncalves, Ciro Greco, Jacopo Tagliabue, et al. Fashionclip: Connecting language and images for product representations. 2022. 2, 5
- [11] Yi Rui Cui, Qi Liu, Cheng Ying Gao, and Zhongbo Su. Fashiongan: Display your fashion design using conditional generative adversarial nets. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, pages 109–119. Wiley Online Library, 2018. 1
- [12] Qianqian Deng, Ruomei Wang, Zixiao Gong, Guifeng Zheng, and Zhuo Su. Research and implementation of personalized clothing recommendation algorithm. In *2018 7th International Conference on Digital Home (ICDH)*, pages 219–223. IEEE, 2018. 2
- [13] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:8780–8794, 2021. 2
- [14] Alexey Dosovitskiy. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. 1
- [15] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *CoRR*, abs/2010.11929, 2020. 2
- [16] SG Eshwar, AV Rishikesh, NA Charan, V Umadevi, et al. Apparel classification using convolutional neural networks. In *2016 international conference on ICT in business industry & government (ICTBIG)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2016. 2
- [17] Patrick Esser, Ekaterina Sutter, and Björn Ommer. A variational u-net for conditional appearance and shape generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8857–8866, 2018. 2
- [18] Aristides Gionis, Piotr Indyk, Rajeev Motwani, et al. Similarity search in high dimensions via hashing. In *Vldb*, pages 518–529, 1999. 3
- [19] Sonam Goenka, Zhaoheng Zheng, Ayush Jaiswal, Rakesh Chada, Yue Wu, Varsha Hedau, and Pradeep Natarajan. Fashionvlp: Vision language transformer for fashion retrieval with feedback. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14105–14115, 2022. 1
- [20] Aaron Gokaslan and Vanya Cohen. Openwebtext corpus. <http://Skyllion007.github.io/OpenWebTextCorpus>, 2019. 3
- [21] Xintong Han, Zuxuan Wu, Zhe Wu, Ruichi Yu, and Larry S Davis. Viton: An image-based virtual try-on network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7543–7552, 2018. 2
- [22] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 2
- [23] Hui Huang, Yingqi Qu, Jing Liu, Muyun Yang, and Tiejun Zhao. An empirical study of llm-as-a-judge for llm evaluation: Fine-tuned judge models are task-specific classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02839*, 2024. 13
- [24] Menglin Jia, Mengyun Shi, Mikhail Sirotenko, Yin Cui, Claire Cardie, Bharath Hariharan, Hartwig Adam, and Serge Belongie. Fashionpedia: Ontology, segmentation, and an attribute localization dataset. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–*

- 28, 2020, *Proceedings, Part I 16*, pages 316–332. Springer, 2020. 2
- [25] Justin M Johnson and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. Survey on deep learning with class imbalance. *Journal of big data*, 6(1):1–54, 2019. 5
- [26] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4401–4410, 2019. 1
- [27] Maurice G Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30(1-2):81–93, 1938. 6, 7
- [28] Yann LeCun, Bernhard Boser, John S Denker, Donnie Henderson, Richard E Howard, Wayne Hubbard, and Lawrence D Jackel. Backpropagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition. *Neural computation*, 1(4):541–551, 1989. 1
- [29] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015. 2
- [30] Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Thomas Mesnard, Johan Ferret, Kellie Ren Lu, Colton Bishop, Ethan Hall, Victor Carbune, Abhinav Rastogi, et al. Rlaif vs. rlhf: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*. 13
- [31] Hanbit Lee, Jinseok Seol, and Sang-goo Lee. Style2vec: Representation learning for fashion items from style sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.04014*, 2017. 2
- [32] Ruifan Li, Fangxiang Feng, Ibrar Ahmad, and Xiaojie Wang. Retrieving real world clothing images via multi-weight deep convolutional neural networks. *Cluster Computing*, 22(Suppl 3):7123–7134, 2019. 2
- [33] Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models, 2023. 13
- [34] Xiaomin Li, Mingye Gao, Zhiwei Zhang, Chang Yue, and Hong Hu. Rule-based data selection for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04715*, 2024. 13
- [35] Chengyi Liu, Wenqi Fan, Yunqing Liu, Jiatong Li, Hang Li, Hui Liu, Jiliang Tang, and Qing Li. Generative diffusion models on graphs: Methods and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02591*, 2023. 1
- [36] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 7
- [37] Linlin Liu, Haijun Zhang, Yuzhu Ji, and QM Jonathan Wu. Toward ai fashion design: An attribute-gan model for clothing match. *Neurocomputing*, 341:156–167, 2019. 2
- [38] Liqian Ma, Xu Jia, Qianru Sun, Bernt Schiele, Tinne Tuytelaars, and Luc Van Gool. Pose guided person image generation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 2
- [39] Yunshan Ma, Xun Yang, Lizi Liao, Yixin Cao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Who, where, and what to wear? extracting fashion knowledge from social media. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 257–265, 2019. 2
- [40] Leandro D Medus, Mohamed Saban, Jose V Francés-Víllora, Manuel Bataller-Mompeán, and Alfredo Rosado-Muñoz. Hyperspectral image classification using cnn: Application to industrial food packaging. *Food Control*, 125:107962, 2021. 1
- [41] Øystein Moen, Lars Jaako Havro, and Einar Bjerjing. Online consumers reviews: Examining the moderating effects of product type and product popularity on the review impact on sales. *Cogent Business & Management*, 4(1):1368114, 2017. 1, 4
- [42] Aakash Parmar, Rakesh Katariya, and Vatsal Patel. A review on random forest: An ensemble classifier. In *International conference on intelligent data communication technologies and internet of things (ICICI) 2018*, pages 758–763. Springer, 2019. 5
- [43] Or Patashnik, Zongze Wu, Eli Shechtman, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Dani Lischinski. Styleclip: Text-driven manipulation of stylegan imagery. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2085–2094, 2021. 1, 2
- [44] Martin Pernuš, Clinton Fookes, Vitomir Štruc, and Simon Dobrišek. Fice: Text-conditioned fashion-image editing with guided gan inversion. *Pattern Recognition*, 158:111022, 2025. 1
- [45] quickjkee. Instruct-pix2pix-distill: A distillation framework for pix2pix. <https://github.com/quickjkee/instruct-pix2pix-distill>, 2023. 2, 6
- [46] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 2
- [47] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8821–8831. Pmlr, 2021. 1
- [48] 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. 1
- [49] Mr D Murahari Reddy, Mr Sk Masthan Basha, Mr M Chinnaiahgari Hari, and Mr N Penchalaiah. Dall-e: Creating images from text. *UGC Care Group I Journal*, 8(14):71–75, 2021. 2
- [50] N Reimers. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*, 2019. 5
- [51] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 2
- [52] 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. 2
- [53] Othman Sbai, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Antoine Bordes, Y Lecun, and C Couprie. Design inspiration from generative networks. *Cornell University*, 2018. 2
- [54] Junyi Sha, Yuxiang Liu, Hanwei Li, David Simchi-Levi, and Michelle Xiao Wu. Imaged-based similarity for demand forecasting: a novel multimodal method to exploit images’ latent information. *Available at SSRN 4817547*, 2024. 4
- [55] Edgar Simo-Serra and Hiroshi Ishikawa. Fashion style in 128 floats: Joint ranking and classification using weak data for feature extraction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 298–307, 2016. 2
- [56] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2256–2265. PMLR, 2015. 1
- [57] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Improved techniques for training score-based generative models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:12438–12448, 2020. 1
- [58] Fareena Sultan, John U Farley, and Donald R Lehmann. A meta-analysis of applications of diffusion models. *Journal of marketing research*, 27(1):70–77, 1990. 1
- [59] Yuxin Tian, Shawn Newsam, and Kofi Boakye. Fashion image retrieval with text feedback by additive attention compositional learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1011–1021, 2023. 2
- [60] Kushal Tirumala, Daniel Simig, Armen Aghajanyan, and Ari Morcos. D4: Improving llm pretraining via document deduplication and diversification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:53983–53995, 2023. 3
- [61] Qingqing Tu and Le Dong. An intelligent personalized fashion recommendation system. In *2010 International Conference on Communications, Circuits and Systems (ICCCAS)*, pages 479–485. IEEE, 2010. 2
- [62] Mihran Tuceryan and Anil K Jain. Texture analysis. *Handbook of pattern recognition and computer vision*, pages 235–276, 1993. 2
- [63] A Vaswani. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017. 2
- [64] Sirion Vittayakorn, Takayuki Umeda, Kazuhiko Murasaki, Kyoko Sudo, Takayuki Okatani, and Kota Yamaguchi. Automatic attribute discovery with neural activations. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 252–268. Springer, 2016. 2
- [65] Tongxin Wang and Mang Ye. Textfit: Text-driven fashion image editing with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 10198–10206, 2024. 1
- [66] Han Yan, Haijun Zhang, Linlin Liu, Dongliang Zhou, Xiaofei Xu, Zhao Zhang, and Shuicheng Yan. Toward intelligent design: An ai-based fashion designer using generative adversarial networks aided by sketch and rendering generators. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 25:2323–2338, 2022. 1, 2
- [67] Ming Yang and Kai Yu. Real-time clothing recognition in surveillance videos. In *2011 18th IEEE international conference on image processing*, pages 2937–2940. IEEE, 2011. 2
- [68] Zhengrong Yi. Text-to-image synthesis for fashion design, 2019. 2
- [69] Heming Zhang, Siyang Li, Shanshan Cai, Haoyu Jiang, and C-C Jay Kuo. Representative fashion feature extraction by leveraging weakly annotated online resources. In *2018 25th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 2640–2644. IEEE, 2018. 2
- [70] Shunyuan Zhang, Dokyun Lee, Param Vir Singh, and Kannan Srinivasan. What makes a good image? airbnb demand analytics leveraging interpretable image features. *Management Science*, 68(8):5644–5666, 2022. 1
- [71] Zhu Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Rui Men, Zhikang Li, Ming Ding, Jie Tang, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. M6-ufc: Unifying multi-modal controls for conditional image synthesis via non-autoregressive generative transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14211*, 2021. 2
- [72] Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364*, 2023. 13
- [73] Djemel Ziou and Salvatore Tabbone. Edge detection techniques—an overview. *Pattern Recognition and Image Analysis: Advances in Mathematical Theory and Applications*, 8(4):537–559, 1998. 2

7. Appendix

7.1. Details of Data

This section provides additional context on the dataset and survey used in this study. Table 5 lists all relevant columns (13 numerical features and 22 categorical features) from the dataset, outlining the features that contributed to the analysis and modeling process. Tables 6 and 7 present the demographic distribution of survey participants, offering insights into the age range and diversity of respondents for the Image Triplet Ranking and Ablation Case Study tasks. The regional information is only available for the Image Triplet Ranking Task because the two surveys were designed using different tools, and only the tool (Qualtrics) used for the Triplet task recorded participants’ latitude and longitude data.

Numerical Features	Categorical Features
Listed Price	Product Family
Product Cost	Product Category
Lifecycle	Product Specific Type
Number of Sizes	Color Spectrum
Cosine Transformation of Dates	Color Family
Sine Transformation of Dates	Fabric
Same Family Product Count	Fashion Degree
Same Family, Same Color Product Count	Special Style Binary Indicator
Same Family, Same Price Product Count	Length Specification
Same Family, Same Price, Same Color Product Count	Neck Design
Family Price Minimum	Structure Type
Family Price Median	Knit Style
Family Price Maximum	Fit Style
	Pattern Inclusion
	Sleeve Length
	Release Month
	Release Year
	Season Code
	Special Style Category
	Store Type
	During Christmas Binary Indicator
	During Black Friday Binary Indicator

Table 5. List of Numerical and Categorical Features in Our Data

Age Group	Image Triplet Ranking	Ablation Case Study
18-25	39 (39.0%)	34 (30.4%)
26-35	36 (36.0%)	62 (55.4%)
35+	25 (25.0%)	16 (14.3%)
Total	100	112

Table 6. Age Distribution of Survey Takers for Image Triplet Ranking and Ablation Case Study Tasks

Country	Percentage (%)
South Africa	30.0
United Kingdom	17.0
Canada	8.0
Portugal	8.0
United States	8.0
Poland	6.0
Mexico	3.0
Hungary	3.0
Others	17.0

Table 7. Distribution of Regions of Survey Takers for Image Triplet Ranking Task by Percentage. Countries in "Others" include Spain, Greece, Italy, Czech Republic, Israel, Germany, Belgium, Brazil, Sweden, Morocco, India, Switzerland, and Kenya.

7.2. Examples of Images

In this section, we present three examples of our image modification process. Each pair of images compares the original design (left) with an AI-modified design (right), demonstrating the effect of removing specific features. These examples showcase how the removal of “good” or “bad” features influences the overall aesthetics and functionality of the designs. In Figure 4, the AI-modified design removes the cuff detail, a feature that contributes to the garment’s structured look. Figure 5 showcases the removal of the inner drawstring at the waist, which is a functional feature providing adjustability and customization. Finally, Figure 6 illustrates the elimination of the striped pattern, simplifying the design for a cleaner and more minimalistic aesthetic.



Figure 4. Comparison of Original (left) and AI-Modified (right) Designs. The AI-Modified design demonstrates the effect of removing a “Good” feature *Folded Cuffs*.




Figure 5. Comparison of Original (left) and AI-Modified (right) Designs. The AI-Modified design demonstrates the effect of removing a “Good” feature *Adjustable Inner Drawstring Waist*.



Figure 6. Comparison of Original (left) and AI-Modified (right) Designs. The AI-Modified design demonstrates the effect of removing a “Bad” feature *striped pattern*.

7.3. Prompt for Llava

In Section 5.2, we utilized Llava-1.5 for zero-shot inference to generate the ranking of product triplets, serving as our baseline. Specifically, we generated a single image containing three product images from each triplet and then queried Llava to produce popularity scores for these products (the ranking is generated later by comparing the scores). This approach was adopted because direct prompts to Llava for generating rankings resulted in highly biased and unstable outcomes; notably, the rankings often remained unchanged even when the order of the products was altered. This method is closely related to common applications of LLMs, particularly in settings of “LLM-as-a-judge”, where in our case the LLM judges the popularity as the quality [23, 30, 33, 34, 72]. The prompt template used for querying Llava, which includes the image along with basic product information such as price and category, is detailed in Table 7.

This image features three fashion design products, labeled from left to right as A, B, and C. Below are the details of the three products:

<BASIC_INFORMATION>

Considering both the design quality and their information, please estimate the popularity of each product and provide an estimated popularity score on a scale from 0 to 100 for each product. Make sure the three scores are different. Reply with three numbers.

Figure 7. Llava prompt for generating the popularity scores.

7.4. Fine-tuning Llava

We also experimented with fine-tuning Llava for a classification task involving images labeled by sales class, followed by its application in triplet ranking as discussed in Section 5.2. However, we observed that it is difficult for Llava to accurately learn the sales class; after fine-tuning, Llava’s predictions yielded highly unbalanced class labels compared to the original distribution of the sales classes, suggesting possible overfitting. Furthermore, it is important to note the significant computational costs associated with fine-tuning Llava. In contrast to our lightweight forecasting models using Random Forest, which only require 15 minutes on a CPU to train with a dataset of 8503 product images, fine-tuning Llava—even in its 8-bit quantized version—requires several GPU hours using an NVIDIA A100-80GB with a LoRA rank of 64. Indeed, even zero-shot inference using Llava is resource-intensive. Consequently, our method is not only more cost-effective but also demonstrates higher accuracy in our experiments.