Beyond Flat Text: Dual Self-inherited Guidance for Visual Text Generation

Minxing Luo^{[*](#page-0-0) 1}, Zixun Xia^{* 1}, Liaojun Chen¹, Zhenhang Li², Weichao Zeng², Jianye Wang¹,

Wentao Cheng¹, Yaxing Wang¹, Yu Zhou¹ and Jian Yang¹

 1 VCIP, CS, Nankai University, 2 Institute of Information Engineering, Chinese Academy of Sciences

Figure 1. STGen for visual text generation in challenging layout. *Using a pre-trained visual text generation model (e.g., AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0)), our method, STGen, guides the model to adjust the text region in latent space during image synthesis, producing images that more faithfully represent the input prompt with precise visual text.*

Abstract

*In real-world images, slanted or curved texts, especially those on cans, banners, or badges, appear as frequently, if not more so, than flat texts due to artistic design or layout constraints. While high-quality visual text generation has become available with the advanced generative capabilities of diffusion models, these models often produce distorted text and inharmonious text background when given slanted or curved text layouts due to training data limitation. In this paper, we introduce a new training-free framework, STGen, which accurately generates visual texts in challenging scenarios (*e.g*., slanted or curved text layouts) while harmonizing them with the text background. Our framework decomposes the visual text generation process into two branches: (i) Semantic Rectification Branch, which leverages the ability in generating flat but accurate visual texts of the model to guide the generation of challenging scenarios. The generated latent of flat text is abundant in accurate semantic information related both to the text itself and its background. By incorporating this, we rectify the semantic information of the texts and harmonize the integration of the text with its background in complex layouts. (ii) Structure Injection Branch, which reinforces the visual text structure during inference. We incorporate the latent information of the glyph image, rich in glyph structure, as a new condition to further strengthen the text structure. To enhance image*

harmony, we also apply an effective combination method to merge the priors, providing a solid foundation for generation. Extensive experiments across a variety of visual text layouts demonstrate that our framework achieves superior accuracy and outstanding quality.

1. Introduction

Visual text generation is an emerging yet challenging research area in image generation, because text is fine-grained and difficult to be balanced with image. There are two primary methodologies for visual text generation: local visual text blending and global visual text generation. Local visual text blending methods solely render visual text within given images, represented by early GAN-based methods [\[3,](#page-8-0) [12,](#page-8-1) [22,](#page-8-2) [31,](#page-9-1) [33\]](#page-9-2). Recent SceneVTG [\[38\]](#page-9-3) can render texts in small regions by utilizing diffusion-based models. In contrast, global visual text generation creates new images with integrated text, raising an inevitable challenge to achieve both accurate visual texts and harmonious image content. Recent studies [\[1,](#page-8-3) [5,](#page-8-4) [15,](#page-8-5) [16,](#page-8-6) [18,](#page-8-7) [28,](#page-9-4) [32,](#page-9-0) [34\]](#page-9-5) have attempted to address this challenge by leveraging the capabilities of diffusion models [\[4,](#page-8-8) [6,](#page-8-9) [9,](#page-8-10) [20,](#page-8-11) [25](#page-8-12)[–28,](#page-9-4) [30\]](#page-9-6). Among them, AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0) distinguishes itself by producing impressive images integrated with outstanding multilin-

^{*} Equal contribution.

Figure 2. Failure cases of AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0). *In the top row, we show examples of 2 failure scenarios: Textual distortion (left) and Background occlusion (right). In the bottom row, we show images obtained when using our method under the same seeds.*

gual text. It opens an era of universal visual text generation using large pretrained Visual Text Generation Model (VTGM). In this paper, we follow in the footsteps of Any-Text and focus on global visual text generation.

Although large pretrained VGTMs take a significant step towards universal visual text generation, they still do not possess the capability that is robust to handle variable user input, because of insufficient training data. Their performance is unsatisfactory in challenging cases, such as commonly seen slanted or curved texts in real-world images due to artistic design or layout constraints. Specifically, the subpar performance is reflected in text distortion and background occlusion as shown in Fig. [2.](#page-1-0)

One naive solution is to train VTGM on a more diversified dataset that covers various text configurations. But it is resource-intensive and time-consuming. To overcome this shortcoming, we propose to use VTGM which is welltrained on simple visual text (*e.g*. flat visual texts) to guide difficult visual text generation (*e.g*. slanted or curved visual texts). When plainly using the pretrained VTGM (*e.g*. Any-Text), it can generate a latent that contains clear and readable visual texts even at an early stage given a flat text mask. Nevertheless, in tilted situations, text in the latent becomes blurry and wrong, leading to incorrect results.

To address this issue, we propose a training-free method named Slanted Text Generation (STGen). STGen is a plugand-play method that corrects text regions in latent space during inference. Specifically, our approach employs a dual-branch framework. The first branch, the *Semantic Rectification Branch (SRB)*, utilizes a latent generated using the same prompt, but with a simplified shape, as a robust semantic prior. This branch simultaneously rectifies distorted text predictions and harmonizes the text with its background. For complex visual text generation, such as text layouts composed of multiple tilted or curved sections, we propose a *Divide and Conquer* strategy to efficiently reconfigure the text shape and obtain a reasonable semantic prior. The second branch, *Structure Injection Branch (SIB)*, extracts rich structural information from glyphs and injects it into the latent space as a structural prior, further enhancing the accuracy of the visual text. Rather than simply merging the two priors, we adopt a novel combination method for optimized integration. Together, the dualbranch framework offers effective guidance for the generation process. Our method addresses the shortcomings of the existing VTGM, ensuring the generated visual texts are both accurate and well-balanced with the overall image as shown in Fig. [1.](#page-0-0)

To the best of our knowledge, our method is the first specifically for generating visual texts in complex layouts and achieves the state-of-the-art results without additional training. We conduct thorough experiments to demonstrate the superiority of our method and the effectiveness of each component in generating complex visual texts while enhancing overall image quality and coherence. The main contributions of our work are summarized as follows:

- (i) We present a new challenge: generating visual text in complex layouts with diffusion models. To tackle this, we introduce STGen, a dual-branch, trainingfree framework that can be easily integrated with existing text generation models. This framework enables the model to generate text in complex layouts by incorporating both structural and semantic priors.
- (ii) We introduce an effective method to combine given priors within the latent space. This approach seamlessly merges priors and the latent, ensuring a consistent latent range and resulting in a balanced, highquality image.
- (iii) We propose a benchmark extending the AnyTextbenchmark to evaluate texts in complex layouts, enabling comprehensive assessment across varying text slant difficulties.

2. Related Works

Denoising diffusion probabilistic models (DDPMs) [\[4,](#page-8-8) [6,](#page-8-9) [9,](#page-8-10) [20,](#page-8-11) [25–](#page-8-12)[28,](#page-9-4) [30\]](#page-9-6) have made significant contribution to the field of text-to-image synthesis, enabling the generation of high-quality images. Despite advancements in text-toimage synthesis models, achieving precise control over image details remains challenging, particularly in visual text generation.

2.1. Local Visual Text Blending

Local Visual Text Blending focuses on producing localized images that contain a single line of text. Methods in this area often require a background or original image for text generation or editing. SynText [\[7\]](#page-8-13) detects the region in the image that can put texts on it and generate texts in the corresponding area. Following their work, SceneVTG [\[38\]](#page-9-3) introduces a model to predict the text generating area and

specifically designs a framework that takes line masks and word masks separately to help generate texts in different shapes. SceneVTG is less user-friendly because it requires an erased image and lacks support for multilingual text generation. AnyTrans [\[21\]](#page-8-14) provides an end-to-end method for local visual text blending, it identifies the texts in the image, erases them from the image, and generates the translated texts in the same area. The above methods require an input image to render or generate, which is good for editing, but cannot generate the whole image from scratch.

2.2. Global Visual Text Generation

Recent studies such as Imagen [\[28\]](#page-9-4) and e-Diff-I [\[1\]](#page-8-3) find that simply by replacing the text encoder from CLIP [\[23\]](#page-8-15) to more capable models like T5 [\[24\]](#page-8-16) can improve visual text generation. Liu *et al*. [\[15\]](#page-8-5) further replace the characterblind text encoder with a character-aware text encoder. Even though replacing text encoders seems to be a straightforward approach, it still struggles to generate complex characters such as Korean, Japanese, and Chinese. Glyph-ByT5 series [\[16,](#page-8-6) [17\]](#page-8-17) employ character-aware ByT5 encoder [\[14\]](#page-8-18) and a new cross attention mechanism to compute the text region and image region separately. GlyphDraw [\[18\]](#page-8-7) focuses on generating complex characters such as Chinese and proposes a sound baseline by introducing glyph condition for visual text generation. It uses the glyph image of the text and a location mask as conditions, allowing the model to control both the content and position of the generated text. However, it can generate only one line of text per image. TextDiffuser [\[5\]](#page-8-4) trains a dedicated layout generation module to specifically generate character-level mask as the condition for the diffusion model, improving performance for Latin texts. But it still cannot generate non-Latin texts. GlyphControl [\[34\]](#page-9-5) employs ControlNet [\[36\]](#page-9-7) for visual text generation and uses a rendered glyph image as a control condition, making it possible to enable models like Stable Diffusion to generate texts and maintain their textto-image capability at the same time. Nonetheless, Glyph-Control can only generate texts in straight lines and often produces unwanted texts outside the text region. Following the above works, AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0) proposes a robust and unified framework for visual text generation. It can generate high-quality multilingual texts in images, thanks to the text perceptual loss which takes the correctness of the generated text into account during training. However, AnyText performs poorly for generated text leaning more than 45 degrees. TextGen [\[35\]](#page-9-8) analyzes how the control information influences the generation in different timesteps. Diff-Text [\[37\]](#page-9-9) uses off-the-shelf diffusion model and canny controlnet to generate visual texts, where the canny controlnet utilizes the canny image of text glyph to control visual text generation. Nonetheless, Diff-Text binds text position to predefined objects like 'sign' or 'billboard' in the prompt.

It may fail if a prompt does not include predefined objects, leading to unnatural images.

3. Method

Given a prompt y describing the image and a challenging position mask l_p , our goal is to generate an image based on y that incorporates visual text at the specified positions dictated by l_p . Current visual text generation models struggle to generate visual texts in more challenging l_p settings, such as tilted or curved texts layouts.

Our method aims to solve the problem based on two key insights: First, when the position mask l_p is flat, current models can generate visual texts with high accuracy. We leverage this proficiency with flat visual texts to address challenging scenarios, providing a strong semantic prior for generation. Second, the glyph image contains little semantic information but is rich in glyph structural details. It can serve as a structure prior to further refine the structural information of the visual texts within the latent, thus enabling it to generate accurate slanted visual texts.

Our approach consists of two main branches: the *Semantic Rectification Branch* and the *Structure Injection Branch*. As shown in Fig. [3,](#page-3-0) the semantic rectification branch first takes the masks l_p reconfigured from l_p , prompt y , and random noise z_T to generate the latent representation z_0^f , which contains reconfigured and flat visual text as a semantic prior. The structure injection branch then takes the rendered glyph image l_q and z_t to generate a structural prior. These two priors are merged and fed into the VTGM, along with y, l_p , and l_q , for the denoising process. Further details of these branches are discussed in Sec. [3.1](#page-2-0) and Sec. [3.2.](#page-4-0)

3.1. Semantic Rectification Branch

In the initial stages of the DDIM denoising process in the VGTM, clear text is created when applying a flat position mask, while blurry and unclear text is generated when using a slanted mask. The reason for the distortion lies in the semantic drift in the text region when tilted. Motivated by this observation, we inherit the high quality flat text generation capabilities of the existing visual text model, adopting the latent of flat text as a constant reference to rectify the semantic information for challenging text generation.

Reference Branch for Semantic Rectification. Parallel to the generation branch, a separate branch is employed to generate flat visual texts using the same prompt y for additional semantic information, which we refer to as the semantic rectification branch. In this branch, the flat visual text latent is blended into the tilted one within the text region, while the rest of the latent remains unchanged.

As shown in Fig. [3,](#page-3-0) the flat position l_p and corresponding glyph image l_q are fed into the VTGM along with prompt

Figure 3. Pipeline of our method. Given user input on the leftmost side, which contains a prompt and a mask l_p specifying positions for *generating visual texts, we first split the* l^p *using Divide and Conquer Strategy and obtain glyph image* l^g *and flat position mask* ˜lp*. Then* ˜l^p *and* l^g *are input to Semantic Rectification Branch and Structure Injection Branch respectively. In Semantic Rectification Branch, based on* l_p , we render flat glyph l_q and use them along with prompt and random noise z_T to generate the latent with flat visual text. This latent *serves as a semantic prior, providing rich semantic information for both the generation of the text and its background.* lg*, on the other hand, is converted into the latent space as a structural prior for structural refinement of the text. Finally, the two prior combined together to guide the generation of the visual text in* l_p .

y and random noise z_T . After T denoising steps, we obtain the reference latent z_0^f . We rotate z_0^f to match the user-given position, and extract its text region z_f as a semantic guide for the branch below:

$$
\tilde{z}_t = z_f \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1 - l_p),\tag{1}
$$

where l_p is the position mask input by user. This operation effectively rectifies the visual text using the accurate text in the z_f . Thanks to the faithful background semantic information embedded in the z_f , we significantly reduce the erroneous non-textual semantic information in the text region while maintaining a coherent background, thereby avoiding background occlusion.

AdaIN Combination. AdaIN [\[10\]](#page-8-19) is originally developed for style transfer tasks. It substitutes mean and standard deviation of the source feature with those of the target feature. Masui *et al*. [\[19\]](#page-8-20) demonstrated that AdaIN can be applied directly to Diffusion models for style transfer without any additional training. In our method, we also incorporate AdaIN, but with the goal of preserving image integrity against disruptions in latent distribution caused by the replacement operation:

$$
\tilde{z}_t = \text{AdaIN}(z_f, z_t) \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1 - l_p)
$$

= $(\sigma(z_t)(\frac{x - \mu(z_f)}{\sigma(z_f)}) + \mu(z_t)) \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1 - l_p),$ (2)

where $\mu(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ denote the channel-wise mean and standard deviation. The aid of AdaIN ensures the latent for guidance has the same range as the original latent, minimizing the change in latent distribution. With a more consistent latent, the visual text semantic information is further enhanced while preserving the overall image coherence.

Divide and Conquer Strategy. In practice, complex position masks are often provided for generating realistic visual texts, which often consist of multiple straight or curved parts, bringing obstacles to the geometric alignment to flat position masks l_p in our method. To deal with the problem, we propose a divide-and-conquer strategy to effectively segment complex position masks into more manage-able straight sections as shown in Fig. [3.](#page-3-0) We use Bézier curves to define the upper and lower boundaries of l_p and establish a baseline for the texts by averaging these curves. We identify splitting points on the curve where the direction vectors at each point are parallel to the boundaries of the minimum bounding box of l_p , therefore creating N reconfigured masks:

$$
l_p = \left\{ l_p^0, l_p^1, \dots, l_p^{N-1} \right\}.
$$
 (3)

Subsequently, we rotate and regroup these reconfigured masks to obtain flat position masks l_p and render corresponding glyphs l_q :

Algorithm 1: STGen

- 1 Input: A text prompt y, an input position image l_p , a flat reference position image l_p and a set of iterations for refinement $\{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$ and a trained Visual Text Generation Model M .
- 2 Output: Denoised vector z_0 .
- 3 Render the glyph image l_q and compute its latent z_q ;
- 4 Compute the reference latent z_0^f ;
- 5 Rotate and crop z_0^f to get z_f according to the transformation from \tilde{l}_p to l_p ; 6 for $t = T, T - 1, \ldots, 1$ do 7 **if** $t \in \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$ then 8 $\Big| \quad \Big| \quad \tilde{z}_t \leftarrow \text{AdaIN}(z_f, z_t) \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1 - l_p);$ 9 \int $\hat{z}_t \leftarrow \rho \text{AdaIN}(z_g, z_t) + (1 - \rho)\tilde{z}_t;$ 10 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\n\hline\ni & \ddot{z}_t \leftarrow (\kappa_t \lambda \hat{z}_t + (1-\kappa_t)z_t) \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1-l_p); \\\hline\n\end{array}$ 11 | Set $z_t \leftarrow \ddot{z}_t;$ 12 end 13 Set $z_{t-1} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(z_t, y, t, l_p, l_q);$ 14 end 15 Return z_0

$$
\tilde{l}_p = \left\{ \tilde{l}_p^0, \tilde{l}_p^1, \dots, \tilde{l}_p^{N-1} \right\}, \tilde{l}_g = \left\{ \tilde{l}_g^0, \tilde{l}_g^1, \dots, \tilde{l}_g^{N-1} \right\}. \tag{4}
$$

With the assistance of this branch, we can generate highly accurate texts and create harmonious, diverse images by leveraging rich semantic information in both the visual texts and background.

3.2. Structure Injection Branch

Despite semantic guidance, the predictions may still deviate due to limited information in structure, causing cumulative errors and structural inconsistencies that require enriched structural guidance for clarity. To resolve this, we introduce a glyph structure prior directly into the latent space. Unlike early methods [\[18\]](#page-8-7) that use glyph images directly as auxiliary information, we consider text glyphs as essential parts of the image, which should be comprehended by the visual text generation model in the latent space. As shown in Fig. [3,](#page-3-0) the structure injection branch feeds the rendered glyph image l_q to Variational Autoencoder (VAE) [\[11\]](#page-8-21) encoder to obtain the latent z_q . As an extension of semantic prior, we incorporate the z_q as a structure prior into the latent z_t , using the same AdaIN operation above to regulate the range, which is represented as:

$$
\hat{z}_t = \text{AdaIN}(z_g, z_t) \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1 - l_p). \tag{5}
$$

This operation provides the model with a structural foundation that serves as a strong starting point in the generation

Language	λ	ρ	Sen.Acc ⁺	NED [†]	CLIP Score↑
	-0.5	0.5	44.88	64.11	0.3005
	0.5	0.5	45.43	65.10	0.3027
	0.5	0.25	45.12	63.85	0.3036
English	0.5	0.75	45.10	65.65	0.3006
	0.5	1.50	45.01	65.34	0.3009
	0.5	2.00	44.53	65.17	0.3009
	-0.5	0.5	49.28	87.29	0.3067
	0.5	0.5	49.96	88.08	0.3071
Chinese	0.5	0.25	50.70	87.86	0.3076
	0.5	0.75	49.05	87.89	0.3058
	0.5	1.50	47.40	87.64	0.3061
	0.5	2.00	47.88	87.63	0.3059

Table 1. Sensitivity analysis for $[\lambda, \rho]$.

process, further enhancing the overall structure of the visual texts.

Combining the two branches, the merged prior is represented by:

$$
\hat{z}_t = \rho \text{AdaIN}(z_g, z_t) + (1 - \rho)\tilde{z}_t,\tag{6}
$$

where ρ is a hyper-parameter that adjusts the balance between semantic and structural information. The modified latent is represented as follows:

$$
\ddot{z}_t = (\kappa_t \lambda \hat{z}_t + (1 - \kappa_t) z_t) \odot l_p + z_t \odot (1 - l_p), \quad (7)
$$

where λ is a hyper-parameter and the κ_t is a temporal factor that decays over time with each timestep. Together, they control the injection strength of the merged prior. The complete algorithm is represented as Algorithm [1.](#page-4-1)

4. Experiments

4.1. Implementation Details

Our framework is based on the pretrained AnyText model. During inference, we utilize a single RTX 3090 GPU for images in size of (512, 512). The framework achieves optimal performance when λ is within the range [$-0.5, 0.5$] and ρ is within (0, 2]. We set $\kappa_t = 10^{t-T}$ for effective guidance and harmonious text region boundary. Specifically, when λ is in [−0.5, 0), the diversity of generated visual texts increases, while λ in (0, 0.5] increases the variety of the image background. As shown in Tab. [1,](#page-4-2) our method demonstrates robustness with respect to hyper-parameter sensitivity. In subsequent experiments, we set λ to 0.5 and ρ to 0.5 which has a balanced performance on both Chinese and English for evaluation.

4.2. Evaluation Setup

Since there are currently no openly available datasets that focus on challenging visual texts generation, we establish a new benchmark for evaluation based on the AnyTextbenchmark [\[32\]](#page-9-0). For each text position mask, we randomly rotate the masks from the original benchmark and resolve

Language	Methods	Train	Sen.Acc ⁺				NED ⁺			CLIP Score ^t	
			easy	medium	hard	total	easy	medium	hard	total	
English	TextDiffuser [5] GlyphControl [34] SD1.5+SceneVTG [38] Anytext [32]	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	49.88 19.00 13.62 62.77	20.10 1.63 4.97 29.12	0.262 0.22 1.12 2.02	29.06 9.47 8.06 38.04	70.86 41.74 24.14 83.64	41.25 9.17 13.40 56.99	4.47 2.98 3.00 14.23	45.78 22.95 15.80 58.59	0.3091 0.3206 0.3112 0.3007
	Diff-Text [37] GlyphControl+Ours AnyText+Ours	Х Х Х	40.13 39.19 71.25	26.42 2.63 37.25	8.85 1.05 6.60	28.38 19.48 45.43	61.44 55.57 87.54	45.37 11.83 64.42	17.94 6.74 24.56	45.91 31.17 65.10	0.2962 0.3175 0.3027
Chinese	TextDiffuser [5] GlyphControl [34] SD1.5+SceneVTG [38] Anytext $[32]$	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	5.41 2.33 1.60 66.00	4.07 0.24 0.81 26.38	0.09 0.0 0.18 2.02	4.07 1.41 1.14 44.78	56.81 50.98 7.33 94.48	49.37 15.58 4.62 81.37	43.01 35.94 4.61 59.38	52.47 40.24 6.20 84.74	0.3066 0.3192 0.3025 0.3064
	Diff-Text $[37]$ GlyphControl+Ours AnyText+Ours	Х Х Х	23.46 6.27 69.22	17.26 0.57 35.58	7.35 0.74 8.55	18.95 3.93 49.96	68.27 62.50 95.37	62.71 18.08 85.85	48.65 45.58 68.77	63.21 49.40 88.08	0.2950 0.3168 0.3071

Table 2. Quantitative Comparison between STGen and other competitors on both English and Chinese sets. *All competitors are evaluated based on their officially released models. Numbers in bold indicate the best performance, and underscored numbers indicate the second best.*

Baseline	Baseline Preference	Our Method Preference
TextDiffuser	23.07%	76.93%
GlyphControl	21.96%	78.04%
SD1.5+SceneVTG	18.99%	81.01%
AnyText	25.31%	74.69%
Diff-Text	17.00%	83.00%

Table 3. User study results. *The participants were asked to select the best results based on image quality, the accuracy of the generated visual texts, and the similarity between the prompt and the generated images.*

any intersections, resulting in 984 prompts for LAIONword (English evaluation) and 919 prompts for Wukongword (Chinese evaluation), each with corresponding position masks. Each prompt includes at least one visual text line and up to five visual text lines. During evaluation, we categorize the masks into three levels based on their angles: 'easy' (0°–30°), 'medium' (30°–60°), and 'hard' (60°–90°), facilitating multi-level assessments.

Textual accuracy and background-text coherence are two main factors that determine the quality of slanted text generation, which we quantitatively evaluate through OCR accuracy. Following AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0), we select the following two metrics for comparing OCR accuracy at word-level and character-level, respectively: (1) Sentence Accuracy (Sen.Acc); (2) Normalized Edit Distance (NED).

We evaluated existing competing methods, including TextDiffuser [\[5\]](#page-8-4), GlyphControl [\[34\]](#page-9-5), SceneVTG [\[38\]](#page-9-3), AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0) and Diff-Text [\[37\]](#page-9-9) using the benchmark and metrics mentioned above. It is worth noticing that the SceneVTG [\[38\]](#page-9-3) cannot generate image from scratch. Therefore, we use the images generated by Stable Diffusion [\[27\]](#page-9-10) with the same prompt as background image. For all the methods in the evaluation, we use the preprocessed mask using the *Divide and Conquer* strategy mentioned above to generate images to ensure fairness.

4.3. Qualitative Comparisons

As presented in Fig. [4,](#page-6-0) TextDiffuser tends to generate lowquality images, specifically in the second and the fifth columns. GlyphControl often produces texts outside the given text position, as can be seen in the fourth column. Scene VTG [\[38\]](#page-9-3) exhibits severe text distortion, particularly in the first and third columns where the texts are extremely distorted and unrecognizable. Typical background occlusion is also observed in the second, third, and fourth columns, where the texts "Burning", "Mamba" and "Twinkle" are obscured by non-textual elements such as lava, a human figure, and stars, respectively. This indicates that SceneVTG can only render texts against simple and clear backgrounds and does not integrate well with other text-toimage models. For Diff-text [\[37\]](#page-9-9), there is a noticeable lack of coherence in the images due to insufficient consideration for harmony between the visual texts and the background, as particularly evidenced in the last 2 columns where the texts are rendered outside the bow and the watch. In Any-Text [\[32\]](#page-9-0), the generated visual texts tend to be distorted, this was caused by the loss of semantic and structure information during the inference. Moreover, in the first column, the text "Track" occludes with the train head, affecting both the text and the train. For our method, we can generate images with superior quality with accurate English and Chinese visual texts integrated even in complex scenarios like in the fourth and fifth columns. It's worth noting that except for resolving text distortion, our method also improves the background occlusion between visual text and non-textual elements. For instance, in the third column of Fig. [4,](#page-6-0) the text "Mamba" is originally disrupted by the human head us-

Figure 4. Qualitative comparison of our method and state of the art models in both English and Chinese text generation.

ing AnyText [\[32\]](#page-9-0), while our method pushes the human head aside to generate a clear text and reasonable non-textual element.

4.4. Quantitative Analysis

OCR Accuracy. As shown in Tab. [2,](#page-5-0) our method shows substantial improvements over the competitive methods in both English and Chinese across all levels. Notably, our method doesn't require additional training and enhances the performance of GlyphControl and AnyText at the easy level. At the hard level, AnyText with our method yields results closest to the ground truth in the NED metric, with an improvement of approximately 10%. over the baseline AnyText in both languages.

Text-Image Similarities. In the absence of ground-truth images, we use the CLIP score [\[8\]](#page-8-22) to assess the consistency between the prompt and the generated image. We compute the average cosine similarity between the prompt and the generated image, excluding the influence of the visual texts. As shown in Tab. [2,](#page-5-0) our method increases the accuracy of visual text generation without compromising the baseline performance. Additionally, our method improves the textimage similarity slightly, due to our design that minimizes conflicts between the image composition and the visual text.

Figure 5. Ablation Study Visualization. *The first column shows accuracy improvement with SRB. The second column demonstrates that while SIB enhances accuracy, it compromises coherence. The third column highlights that combining both branches yields accurate, coherent visual texts. Finally, AdaIN combination in the fourth column further refines image quality.*

This leads to a more coherent layout for both the image and the text.

User Study. Following [\[2\]](#page-8-23), we conduct user study to comprehensively compare the generation results in Tab. [3.](#page-5-1) We create 27 input sets with varying levels of difficulty in visual text generation. For each input set, we provide the respondents with our input prompt and position mask and two image alternatives: our result and a baseline (in random order). We ask them to select which image has the best quality and has the most accurate visual text. The final score is calculated based on the times the respondent choose the approach averaged on the total prompts. We collect 126 user judgments from a diverse group composed of both experts in the field and individuals with no specific background and report the percentage of votes. As shown in Tab. [3,](#page-5-1) our method is the most favored among all the circumstances.

5. Ablation Study

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our components through an ablation study on the medium level. We use OCR accuracy (Sen.Acc and NED) and CLIP score as the main metrics, given their importance in evaluating visual text generation. All parameters are kept consistent with those outlined in Sec. [4.1.](#page-4-3) The analysis of each component will be presented in the following parts of this section.

SRB without AdaIN. As shown in the first two rows of Tab. [4,](#page-7-0) the addition of *Semantic Rectification Branch* improves the visual text accuracy. Similarly, as demonstrated by the first column of Fig. [5,](#page-7-1) the generated visual text has a

SRB	SIB	AdaIN	Sen. Acc	NED	CLIP Score
х	х		29.12	56.99	0.3007
J	х		36.22	61.17	0.3003
✓			36.93	64.35	0.3006
✓		✓	37.25	64.42	0.3027

Table 4. Ablation study. *The results validate the effectiveness of each component.*

clear structure. However, this also negatively impacts textimage consistency, as indicated by the slight drop in the CLIP score. This occurs because the operation of replacing partial latent disrupts the latent distribution and affects the representation of other parts of the image. Thanks to the rich semantic information in the latent, the drop is minor.

SIB without AdaIN. As illustrated in the second and third rows of Tab. [4,](#page-7-0) *Structure Injection Branch* further improves the accuracy. As similarly shown in the third column of Fig. [5,](#page-7-1) this branch can structurally improve the text structure, resulting in impressive improvement. However, when applied alone, it may disrupt image coherence, as shown in the second column and third row of Fig. [5,](#page-7-1) where the word 'Fun' occludes the eye. This issue arises from the lack of semantic information in the structural prior.

AdaIN Combination. As revealed by the third and fourth column of Fig. [5,](#page-7-1) AdaIN improves the accuracy and the harmony of the text and its background, lifting the CLIP score to a new level in the Tab. [4.](#page-7-0)

6. Conclusion

In this work, we push the boundary of visual text generation by tackling the challenge of creating complex visual texts. We present a dual-branch method STGen, which decomposes the visual text generation into 2 branches: Semantic and Structure. In *Semantic Rectification Branch*, our method leverages the rich semantic information composed in the latent when generating accurate visual texts in simple scenarios to guide the generation in complex scenarios. In the *Structure Injection Branch*, we polish the visual text structure using the structural information extracted from glyphs at the same time. For challenging scenarios, we break them down into simpler steps to manage effectively. This approach can be integrated seamlessly with the existing visual text generation model using a dedicated ControlNet for generation. To exhibit its superior performance, we conduct extensive experiments on our proposed benchmark, demonstrating its excellence. Our approach offers a straightforward yet effective way to enhance the capabilities of existing visual text generation models. We believe STGen sets the stage for real-world applications, enabling more accurate and sophisticated visual text generation.

References

- [1] Yogesh Balaji, Seungjun Nah, Xun Huang, Arash Vahdat, Jiaming Song, Karsten Kreis, Miika Aittala, Timo Aila, Samuli Laine, Bryan Catanzaro, Tero Karras, and Ming-Yu Liu. ediff-i: Text-to-image diffusion models with ensemble of expert denoisers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01324*, 2022. [1,](#page-0-1) [3](#page-2-1)
- [2] Omer Bar-Tal, Dolev Ofri-Amar, Rafail Fridman, Yoni Kasten, and Tali Dekel. Text2live: Text-driven layered image and video editing. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 707–723. Springer, 2022. [8](#page-7-2)
- [3] Mehdi Boroumand, Mo Chen, and Jessica Fridrich. Deep residual network for steganalysis of digital images. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 14(5): 1181–1193, 2019. [1](#page-0-1)
- [4] Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Jarred Barber, Aaron Maschinot, Jose Lezama, Lu Jiang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, ´ Kevin Patrick Murphy, William T. Freeman, Michael Rubinstein, Yuanzhen Li, and Dilip Krishnan. Muse: Text-toimage generation via masked generative transformers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, pages 4055–4075. PMLR, 2023. [1,](#page-0-1) [2](#page-1-1)
- [5] Jingye Chen, Yupan Huang, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Qifeng Chen, and Furu Wei. Textdiffuser: Diffusion models as text painters. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. [1,](#page-0-1) [3,](#page-2-1) [6](#page-5-2)
- [6] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:8780–8794, 2021. [1,](#page-0-1) [2](#page-1-1)
- [7] Ankush Gupta, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Synthetic data for text localisation in natural images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2315–2324, 2016. [2](#page-1-1)
- [8] Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. Clipscore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7514–7528, 2021. [7](#page-6-1)
- [9] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6840–6851, 2020. [1,](#page-0-1) [2](#page-1-1)
- [10] Xun Huang and Serge Belongie. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1501–1510, 2017. [4,](#page-3-1) [1](#page-0-1)
- [11] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14- 16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2014. [5](#page-4-4)
- [12] Praveen Krishnan, Rama Kovvuri, Guan Pang, Boris Vassilev, and Tal Hassner. Textstylebrush: transfer of text aesthetics from a single example. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(7):9122–9134, 2023. [1](#page-0-1)
- [13] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012. [1](#page-0-1)
- [14] Rosanne Liu, Dan Garrette, Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Adam Roberts, Sharan Narang, Irina Blok, RJ Mical, Mohammad Norouzi, and Noah Constant. Character-aware models improve visual text rendering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10562*, 2022. [3](#page-2-1)
- [15] Rosanne Liu, Dan Garrette, Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Adam Roberts, Sharan Narang, Irina Blok, Rj Mical, Mohammad Norouzi, and Noah Constant. Character-aware models improve visual text rendering. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 16270–16297, 2023. [1,](#page-0-1) [3](#page-2-1)
- [16] Zeyu Liu, Weicong Liang, Zhanhao Liang, Chong Luo, Ji Li, Gao Huang, and Yuhui Yuan. Glyph-byt5: A customized text encoder for accurate visual text rendering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09622*, 2024. [1,](#page-0-1) [3](#page-2-1)
- [17] Zeyu Liu, Weicong Liang, Yiming Zhao, Bohan Chen, Ji Li, and Yuhui Yuan. Glyph-byt5-v2: A strong aesthetic baseline for accurate multilingual visual text rendering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10208*, 2024. [3](#page-2-1)
- [18] Jian Ma, Mingjun Zhao, Chen Chen, Ruichen Wang, Di Niu, Haonan Lu, and Xiaodong Lin. Glyphdraw: Seamlessly rendering text with intricate spatial structures in text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17870*, 2023. [1,](#page-0-1) [3,](#page-2-1) [5](#page-4-4)
- [19] Kento Masui, Mayu Otani, Masahiro Nomura, and Hideki Nakayama. Harnessing the latent diffusion model for training-free image style transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01366*, 2024. [4,](#page-3-1) [1](#page-0-1)
- [20] Alexander Quinn Nichol and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8162–8171. PMLR, 2021. [1,](#page-0-1) [2](#page-1-1)
- [21] Zhipeng Qian, Pei Zhang, Baosong Yang, Kai Fan, Yiwei Ma, Derek F Wong, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Anytrans: Translate anytext in the image with large scale models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11432*, 2024. [3](#page-2-1)
- [22] Yadong Qu, Qingfeng Tan, Hongtao Xie, Jianjun Xu, Yuxin Wang, and Yongdong Zhang. Exploring stroke-level modifications for scene text editing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2119– 2127, 2023. [1](#page-0-1)
- [23] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. [3](#page-2-1)
- [24] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020. [3](#page-2-1)
- [25] 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,](#page-0-1) [2](#page-1-1)

- [26] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- [27] 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. [6](#page-5-2)
- [28] 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. [1,](#page-0-1) [2,](#page-1-1) [3](#page-2-1)
- [29] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. *arXiv:2010.02502*, 2020. [1](#page-0-1)
- [30] Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. [1,](#page-0-1) [2](#page-1-1)
- [31] Jeyasri Subramanian, Varnith Chordia, Eugene Bart, Shaobo Fang, Kelly Guan, Raja Bala, et al. Strive: Scene text replacement in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 14549– 14558, 2021. [1](#page-0-1)
- [32] Yuxiang Tuo, Wangmeng Xiang, Jun-Yan He, Yifeng Geng, and Xuansong Xie. Anytext: Multilingual visual text generation and editing. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. [1,](#page-0-1) [2,](#page-1-1) [3,](#page-2-1) [5,](#page-4-4) [6,](#page-5-2) [7](#page-6-1)
- [33] Qiangpeng Yang, Jun Huang, and Wei Lin. Swaptext: Image based texts transfer in scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14700–14709, 2020. [1](#page-0-1)
- [34] Yukang Yang, Dongnan Gui, Yuhui Yuan, Weicong Liang, Haisong Ding, Han Hu, and Kai Chen. Glyphcontrol: Glyph conditional control for visual text generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. [1,](#page-0-1) [3,](#page-2-1) [6](#page-5-2)
- [35] Boqiang Zhang, Zuan Gao, Yadong Qu, and Hongtao Xie. How control information influences multilingual text image generation and editing? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11502*, 2024. [3](#page-2-1)
- [36] Lymin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models, 2023. [3](#page-2-1)
- [37] Lingjun Zhang, Xinyuan Chen, Yaohui Wang, Yue Lu, and Yu Qiao. Brush your text: Synthesize any scene text on images via diffusion model. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 7215–7223, 2024. [3,](#page-2-1) [6](#page-5-2)
- [38] Yuanzhi Zhu, Jiawei Liu, Feiyu Gao, Wenyu Liu, Xinggang Wang, Peng Wang, Fei Huang, Cong Yao, and Zhibo

Yang. Visual text generation in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14138*, 2024. [1,](#page-0-1) [2,](#page-1-1) [6](#page-5-2)

Beyond Flat Text: Dual Self-inherited Guidance for Visual Text Generation

Supplementary Material

Figure 6. Comparison of predicted x_0 under different inference steps in various masks. *The first column is the AnyText intermediate results under a flat mask, AnyText can predict the structure of the texts at the very early stage of inference. The rest of the columns show intermediates in a slanted mask using AnyText and other operations using different methods. Our method can revise the originally wrong texts and harmonize the background.*

7. Additional Background

Latent Diffusion Models. The Latent Diffusion Models (LDM) denoise a noisy vector z_t to z_0 that is mapped to an image x_0 through an autoencoder, based on a text prompt y . To sequentially remove the noise ε , a network ε_{θ} is trained to minimize the loss:

$$
\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{z_0, y, \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), t} ||\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t, c(y))||_2^2, \qquad (8)
$$

where the $c(y)$ is the conditioning embedding of the prompt y, z_t is a noisy vector obtained by adding noise to z_0 according to the timestep t . During inference, provided a random noise vector z_T , the trained network iteratively removes the predicted noise to produce a latent z_0 for T steps. Namely, we employ popular DDIM sampling [\[29\]](#page-9-11) for inference:

$$
z_{t-1} = \sqrt{\alpha_{t-1}} \underbrace{\left(\frac{z_t - \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t)}}{\sqrt{\alpha_t}}\right)}_{\text{predicted } z_0} + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_{t-1} - \sigma_t^2 \cdot \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t)}.
$$
\n(9)

The DDIM Sampling in general combines the predicted z_0 and z_t to obtain the z_{t-1} . We mainly analyze the predicted x_0 that is decoded from predicted z_0 in the rest of the section.

Adaptive Instance Normalization. The Adaptive Instance Normalization (AdaIN) [\[10\]](#page-8-19) is previously adopted

Figure 7. Results under different lambda. *When* λ *is -0.5, we obtain colorful and styled visual texts in the first column. When* λ *is 0.5, we produce images with rich background. When* λ *is 0, the method degrades to vanilla AnyText.*

in the task of style transfer. It substitutes mean and standard deviation of the activations from each CNN [\[13\]](#page-8-24) filter of the original image with those of the style image as follows:

$$
\text{AdaIN}(x, y) = \sigma(y) \left(\frac{x - \mu(x)}{\sigma(x)}\right) + \mu(y), \qquad (10)
$$

where x and y stand for the activation of a CNN filter from the content image and style image, $\mu(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ are channel-wise mean and standard deviation. Masui *et al*. [\[19\]](#page-8-20) further prove that the AdaIN can be directly applied to the LDM without any additional training for style transfer.

8. Analysis of Predicted x_0

As shown in Fig. [6,](#page-10-0) AnyText can produce clear and intact visual texts in structure even in the first inference step. However, once tilted, the prediction becomes blurry and wrong as in the second column. The following columns show the effectiveness of our method. SRB can improve the structure. The SIB further improves the structure but produces visual texts that are not coherent with the background.

9. Additional Results

Here we provide additional results of our method. Our code will be released upon acceptance.

9.1. Additional Quantitative Results

Hyper-parameters Sensitivity As shown in the Tab. [5,](#page-11-0) our method shows robustness in hyper-parameters change. The best performance is obtained when ρ is 0.75 at the hard level. But the method achieves the best performance in the

Table 5. Detailed sensitivity analysis for $[\lambda, \rho]$.

easy level of Chinese and English set when ρ is 0.25. To ensure fairness, we choose the performance when ρ is 0.5 which has a balanced performance for comparison.

9.2. Additional Qualitative Results

Choice of λ We can observe in Fig. [7](#page-10-1) that when λ is in the range of $(0, 0.5]$ we can achieve background with more diversity and in the range of $[-0.5, 0)$ the diversity of texts is increased consistent with what we mentioned in Sec. [4.1.](#page-4-3)

Coherence with Background As shown in Fig. [8,](#page-12-0) thanks to the rich semantic information contained in the latent with flat visual texts, we can generate visual texts that are perfectly blended in with the background. The text 'Harvest' in the bottom right is more harmonious with the background and is closest to the description "interwoven".

Visual Text Diversity As shown in the first row of Fig. [10,](#page-14-0) with proper control, our method can generate texts in various styles and colors. The second row shows that the generated visual texts remain to be accurate under 2 different image styles. The third row demonstrates the robustness of our method under different challenging masks. The fourth row shows our ability to generate various visual texts using the same prompt.

Additional Comparison with baseline. We present more qualitative comparisons on simple slanted or curved situations in Fig. [11](#page-15-0) and Fig. [12,](#page-16-0) and complex scenarios in Fig. [13.](#page-17-0) Our method can generate high-quality images with accurate visual texts in all the scenarios.

10. Details of User Study

An illustration of our user study is provided in Fig. [9.](#page-13-0) Since the caption in the English (LAION) set are often hard for users to understand (*e.g*. "carousel of carousel of carousel"). To produce meaningful prompts that can help the user understand, we employ LLMs to generate image prompts for user study. Here we provide a simplified template of our instructions and examples:

1.Task instruction

I am working on a text-to-image generation task. Each Prompt should include a scene description and contain one or two sets of words that need to be present in the image, enclosed in double quotes. 2. Examples

• A raccoon stands in front of the blackboard with the words "Deep Learning" written on it

```
\bullet ......
```
3.Trigger CoT reasoning ability of LLMs Reasoning: Let's think step by step......

11. Limitations

Our method still inherits the problems of the baseline Any-Text, such as the unsatisfactory ability to generate texts on a small scale or to generate texts in a specific font. Restricted by the latent size, our method may not acquire accurate texts when the text region is too small.

A serene beach at sunrise, where the word "<u>CVPR</u>" is written in the sand with gentle waves approaching

An aerial view of a forest in autumn colors, with text "Harvest" interwoven in the leaves.

Figure 8. Examples of texts blend perfectly with background. *Visual text generated by AnyText in the first row is often blurry and wrong. While our method can not only generate accurate visual text but the visual text is also blended with the background perfectly.*

Survey On Image Generation Quality

This survey evaluates the quality of images generated by various models. It consists of 27 questions, each offering two options. Please choose the image you believe best meets the following criteria:

1. The text in the image is accurate, clear, and aesthetically pleasing, with no additional characters or garbled text except as required by the prompt.

2. The image is coordinated, aesthetically pleasing, and high-quality. Reminder:

The prompt is provided for understanding the context of the image. You may directly assess the images to make your selection.

* 01 Prompt[B]:On Halloween night, a spooky landscape is adorned with eerie trees and glowing pumpkin lanterns, while the bright and shining text "Trick" "Or" "Treat!" is boldly displayed in the center, creating a festive atmosphere.

Figure 9. User study print screen.

Prompt: A vibrant street art mural in a lively city square, showcasing "CVPR" in artistic graffiti surrounded bright splashes of color

Prompt: ... with a unicorn frolicking among trees and the words "Mystic Realm" floating in the air.

Prompt: A detailed hand-drawn map of a fantasy island, forests and rivers labeled, and the words "Adventure" "Awaits" written along a winding path

Figure 10. Diversity demonstration.*The first row demonstrates various fonts and colors a single prompt can generate. The second row shows same texts with different prompts can still generate coherent and reasonable images. We use different masks in the third row. The fourth row illustrates the ability to simply change the language of the generated texts.*

Figure 11. Additional slanted results for our method.

Figure 12. Additional curved results for our method.

Figure 13. Additional complex results for our method.