



EmoAgent: Multi-Agent Collaboration of Plan, Edit, and Critic, for Affective Image Manipulation

Qi Mao^{1,✉}

Haobo Hu¹

Yujie He¹

Difei Gao²

Haokun Chen¹

Libiao Jin¹

¹MIPG, Communication University of China

²Show Lab, National University of Singapore



Figure 1. **Affective image manipulation using EmoAgent.** Given an image and a target emotion specified by the user, EmoAgent can perform affective image manipulation, transforming the original emotion conveyed by the image into the target emotion.

Abstract

*Affective Image Manipulation (AIM) aims to alter an image’s emotional impact by adjusting multiple visual elements to evoke specific feelings. Effective AIM is inherently complex, necessitating a collaborative approach that involves identifying semantic cues within source images, manipulating these elements to elicit desired emotional responses, and verifying that the combined adjustments successfully evoke the target emotion. To address these challenges, we introduce **EmoAgent**, the first multi-agent collaboration framework for AIM. By emulating the cognitive behaviors of a human painter, **EmoAgent** incorporates three specialized agents responsible for planning, editing, and critical evaluation. Furthermore, we develop an emotion-factor knowledge retriever, a decision-making tree space, and a tool library to enhance **EmoAgent**’s effectiveness in handling AIM. Experiments demonstrate that the proposed multi-agent framework outperforms existing methods, offering more reasonable and effective emotional expression.*

1. Introduction

“Image manipulation is not just art; it’s a dialogue where each pixel whispers an emotion.”

—Anonymous

In our everyday lives, images serve as powerful conveyors of emotion—a family photo that captures the warmth of a reunion, a travel snapshot that brings back the excitement of adventure, or an advertisement designed to evoke

desire or happiness. Manipulating these images to enhance or alter their emotional impact is not just about filters and adjustments; it’s about harnessing visual elements to deepen emotional impact and create a meaningful connection with viewers. For instance, a marketer might want to adjust an image to make a product appear more appealing, or a social media user might edit a photo to better reflect the mood of a memorable moment. This brings us to the concept of affective image manipulation (AIM), which involves altering images to elicit specific emotional responses in viewers.

Unlike semantic image manipulation (SIM), which modifies specific objects or features based on their inherent semantic meanings, AIM aims to alter the emotional impact of an image by adjusting *multiple visual elements* to evoke specific feelings. As illustrated in Fig. 2, SIM involves replacing the cat with a Corgi, ensuring that the dog in the edited image is specifically a Corgi rather than a Samoyed. In contrast, AIM modifies the overall emotional tone of the image through adjustments in color, lighting, and background, creating a darker atmosphere. Furthermore, AIM changes the cat’s expression to one where its mouth is open, displaying its teeth, thereby conveying anger. The key difference is that *SIM centers on changing the image’s content and semantic meaning regardless of emotional impact, whereas AIM’s modifications—whether low-level visual adjustments or higher-level semantic changes—are driven by the goal of affecting the viewer’s emotions.*

Effective AIM presents significant challenges, necessitating a collaborative approach that: 1) identifies semantic cues in source images, 2) adjusts these elements using appropriate manipulation methods to elicit the desired emotional response, and 3) verifies that the combined visual

✉ Corresponding Author




Figure 2. **Task definition.** Unlike SIM, which alters the semantic content of an image (right), AIM focuses on adjusting multiple visual elements to evoke a specific emotion (left).

adjustments successfully evoke the target emotion. Previous studies in AIM either focus on low-level adjustments such as color and style [29] or directly embed emotion as an encoding feature [14], thus oversimplifying complex emotional expressions. While EmoEdit [34] converts the AIM task into a SIM task using a visual-language model (VLM) and InstructPix2Pix (IP2P) [5], it fails to provide an accurate reasoning process to manage the complex interplay between target emotion factors and semantic elements.

To address these AIM challenges, we introduce **EmoAgent**, the first *multi-agent collaboration* framework specifically designed to efficiently coordinate the aforementioned steps, thereby enhancing the interpretability and reliability of the manipulated results. By emulating the cognitive behaviors of a human painter, we incorporate three specialized agents responsible for planning, editing, and critical evaluation. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the Planning Agent serves as the “brain”. It decomposes the intricate AIM task into concrete SIM instructions by utilizing a structured three-layer decision-making tree and emotional factor knowledge retrieval, thereby systematically constructing a reasoning process based on source image semantics, target emotions, and corresponding manipulation methods. The Editing Agent, functioning as the “hands”, employs various editing tools to execute each instruction, incorporating step-by-step validation to ensure precision and effectiveness. However, the reliability of AIM is not fully assured by these two agents alone. The Critic Agent, performing as the “eyes”, assesses and iteratively refines the edits to accurately reflect the intended emotions, enhancing the framework’s effectiveness in conveying the target emotions as demonstrated in Fig. 1.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose EmoAgent, a multi-agent collaboration framework, which deconstructs the complex AIM challenge into logically connected, manageable phases of planning, editing, and critic evaluation. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first multi-agent approach within this domain.
- We enhance EmoAgent by incorporating an emotion-

factor knowledge retriever, a decision-making tree space, and a tool library, collectively improving the interpretability and effectiveness of AIM.

- Extensive quantitative and qualitative experiments demonstrate that our proposed method outperforms existing approaches in addressing AIM, excelling particularly in terms of emotion expression and semantic plausibility.

2. Related Work

Semantic Image Manipulation. Past years have seen significant advances in diffusion models [6, 11, 20] for text-based SIM. Methods like Prompt2Prompt (P2P) [10] use cross-attention mechanisms to facilitate editing adjustments to specific areas based on an overarching target description. Additionally, instruction-based methods like IP2P [5] enable users to perform image editing guided by instructions alone. Mask-based methods [3, 4] enable users to edit specific regions with masked areas and local descriptions.

Affective Image Manipulation. With the increasing popularity of AIGC, affective generation has emerged as a new focal point in affective computing [17]. EmoGen [33] innovates in this space by generating emotion-driven content that is both semantically accurate and emotionally aligned, utilizing mappings between emotional and CLIP spaces for precise emotion interpretation. For AIM, the Affective Image Filter (AIF) model [29] utilizes a multi-modal transformer architecture to convert abstract emotional cues from text into concrete style-based visuals. Make Me Happier [14] adopts the IP2P [5] structure, embedding emotion as a simplistic encoding feature, which tends to oversimplify complex emotional expressions and struggles with maintaining structural fidelity. While EmoEdit [34] integrates semantic cue identification and emotional element adjustment using a visual-language model (VLM) and InstructPix2Pix (IP2P) [5], it lacks the flexibility to manage the intricate interplay among diverse semantic and emotional factors and various manipulation methods. Additionally, the simplistic ranking technique employed cannot provide further optimization, failing to ensure robust emotional alignment. In contrast, our introduction of a multi-agent collaboration framework systematically breaks down the complex problem of AIM into reliable, manageable sub-steps, thereby enhancing both the precision and interpretability of the results.

LLM-As-Agent. LLM-based agents have garnered significant attention in both industry and academia for their strong reasoning abilities. These agents have been proven to be highly effective, acting as the central “brains” in decision-making and planning tasks [22, 23, 28, 36, 38]. Techniques like Chain of Thought (CoT) [28] and ReAct [36], enhanced by prompt engineering, have further refined their capabilities in specific scenarios. Additionally, advancements in LLM-based agents have also shown potential in visual




Figure 3. **Overview of EmoAgent.** The multi-agent collaborative framework comprises three agents, which are responsible for planning, editing, and critic.

tasks [8, 21, 30, 35]. In the field of SIM, GenArtist [27] introduces a unified system that coordinates image generation and editing. Here, the VLM agent systematically handles the generation, editing, and self-correction processes to address complex tasks. Building on this foundation, we present the first attempt to introduce a multi-agent collaboration framework specifically designed for AIM. Due to the difference between SIM and AIM, GenArtist [27] only requires the decomposition of complex text prompts into sub-tasks. In contrast, the Planning Agent in our framework introduces a three-layer decision-making tree to transform the complex AIM task into a collection of SIM instructions.

3. Multi-Agent Collaboration Framework for Affective Image Manipulation

In this work, we aim to manipulate the user-provided image I_o into the target image I_t that can evoke desired emotion category E_t . Unlike SIM, which alters concrete and objective elements, AIM presents a greater challenge due to its focus on adjustments to elicit specific emotional responses. Consequently, we design a multi-agent collaborative framework, **EmoAgent**, as illustrated in Fig. 3, which comprises three key agents—planning, editing, and critic—each respectively tasked with determining how to convert emotional cues into SIM instructions, iteratively editing with suitable tools, and assessing whether the output effectively evokes the intended emotions. We first explain the collaborative interactions among these agents in Section 3.1. Then, we provide detailed descriptions of the workflow employed by each agent in Section 3.2, Section 3.3, and Section 3.4.

3.1. Two-Stage Collaboration of EmoAgent

The framework operates through a multi-agent collaboration framework designed to mimic the painter’s brain, hands, and eyes. This division of labor ensures that com-

plex AIM tasks are managed efficiently and effectively. The overall workflow of this collaboration (detailed in Fig. 4) is organized into two main stages:

1) **Pre-Creation Stage.** After receiving the original image I_o and the target emotion E_t , the Planning Agent designs an initial draft of the editing plan P_0 . The Critic Agent then evaluates this draft and iteratively refines it into the final editing plan P_f , which is passed on to the Editing Agent. After the Editing Agent processes all the editing instructions according to the final plan P_f , the Critic Agent evaluates the emotion of the resulting image I_t^0 . If the editing result accurately expresses the target emotion E_t , the task is considered complete, and our EmoAgent returns the editing result I_t to the user. If it does not meet the criteria, the task progresses to the optimization phase.

2) **Optimization Stage.** The optimization stage involves collaboration solely between the Critic Agent and the Editing Agent. The Critic Agent evaluates the editing results I_t^i and communicates with the Editing Agent on how to adjust the manipulations. This process is repeated until the Critic Agent is satisfied with the emotional expression of the final result I_t , at which point the process is terminated.

3.2. Planning Agent

The Planning Agent serves as the core component of our EmoAgent, designed to transform subjective emotional cues into concrete SIM instructions, effectively acting as the brain of the painter. The input and output of this agent function as follows:


- **Input:** the input image I_o and the target emotion category E_t .
- **Output:** the initial editing plan P_0 that consists of multiple candidate editing instructions $\{\text{Ins}_1, \text{Ins}_2, \text{Ins}_3, \dots, \text{Ins}_n\}$.

Emulating human cognitive processes such as analysis, referencing, and conceptualization, the Planning Agent is integrated with three carefully designed modules: visual emotion analysis, emotion-factor knowledge retriever, and iterative editing plan generation, detailed as follows.

Visual Emotion Analysis. To enhance the alignment between E_t and the semantics of I_o , the editing plan is specifically designed based on the semantic cues of the source emotion E_o . In particular, the Planning Agent leverages the ability of VLM, i.e., GPT-4o [1] to first analyze the original image I_o . It extracts the inherent emotion E_o and the semantic cues S_o that evoke E_o , facilitating subsequent operations of the emotion-factor knowledge retriever.

Emotion-Factor Knowledge Retriever. We design an external knowledge retriever called Emotion-Factor Knowledge Retriever by introducing Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [13] to mimic the human behavior of seeking creative inspiration through searching and referencing, thereby enhancing its capability to generate more effective editing plans. Specifically, we construct an emotion-factor

Pre-Creation Stage



Optimization Stage




Figure 4. An AIM example workflow using EmoAgent. In the pre-creation stage, the Planning Agent drafts the initial editing plan. This draft is then assessed by the Critic Agent, after which the Editing Agent executes all the editing instructions iteratively, producing the preliminary editing result. During the optimization stage, the Critic Agent evaluates whether these results effectively convey the target emotion. If the initial attempts do not meet the desired emotion, the Critic Agent refines the editing plan. This optimized plan is implemented in collaboration with the Editing Agent in iterative cycles, continuing until the target emotion is accurately expressed.

knowledge (EFK) database using EmoSet [32], a comprehensive visual emotion dataset with rich attributes. In the EFK database, each data entry contains a descriptive text detailing a specific editing element, labeled with its corresponding emotion and element type. To design an editing plan based on S_o and ensure alignment between the target emotion E_t and the original image I_o , which helps avoid unreasonable editing elements, the agent uses emotion and element type as filters to narrow the search, selecting text data that matches these labels. By calculating the textual similarity between the filtered data and S_o , the agent identifies the editing element that best aligns with I_o .

Editing Plan Generation. To transform the subjective emotion space into objective SIM instructions, we define a decision-making space for the Planning Agent using a three-layer tree structure, as illustrated in Fig. 5.

- **Root node:** the emotion types E_* , which initiate the editing plan and encompass eight emotional labels

from EmoSet [32]: amusement, awe, contentment, excitement, anger, disgust, fear, and sadness.

- **Branch node:** the editing elements e_i , including various components such as object semantics, attributes, facial expressions, backgrounds, and global hue.
- **Leaf node:** the editing methods m_i , consisting of manipulation operations such as object replacement, addition, removal, expression changes, filter changes, background changes, and attribute changes.

Leveraging the three-layer decision-making tree, the Planning Agent initiates the editing process by utilizing the target emotion E_t to conceptualize the editing elements e_i that can convey this emotion within S_o , while concurrently retrieving relevant elements from the EFK database. Subsequently, the agent selects the appropriate editing methods m_i for each editing element e_i . This approach enables the Planning Agent to suppress the original emotion E_o and enhance E_t by filtering suitable editing elements and methods




Figure 5. **Three-layer decision-making tree.** The agent designates the target emotion as the root node, identifies appropriate editing elements as branch nodes, and assigns corresponding editing methods as leaf nodes.

from the high-dimensional emotion space based on S_o . Ultimately, the task of AIM is transformed into a collection of semantic edits $(e_1, m_1), (e_2, m_2), \dots, (e_i, m_i)$. Furthermore, the initial editing plan P_0 is developed by iteratively generating editing instruction Ins_i as,

$$\text{Ins}_i = f(e_i, m_i), \quad (1)$$

where f represents the function that combines the editing element e_i with the editing method m_i .

3.3. Editing Agent

The Editing Agent is the executor in EmoAgent, acting as hands of painter, which can call different editing tools as brushes to complete each step of editing correctly. The input and output of this agent function as follows:

- **Input:** the final editing plan P_f and the input image I_o .
- **Output:** the edited image I_t that evokes target emotion E_t .

Tool Library. To achieve editing results that closely align with the provided instructions during iterative editing, we introduce a tool library for the Editing Agent, as detailed in Table 1. These tools are specifically designed based on the manipulation operations defined within the Planning Agent’s decision-making space, as described in Section 3.2, ensuring coherence between semantic elements and editing algorithms. The Editing Agent selects the most appropriate tool according to each tool’s capabilities. Additionally, we integrate auxiliary tools, including localization models such as object detection [15] and segmentation [12] models, to facilitate object-level editing tasks.

Action Space. For the editing plan P_i , the Editing Agent decomposes the execution into a series of sequential actions. Each action space Act^i executes the corresponding editing instruction through three distinct steps, as illustrated in Fig. 6: 1) **Pre-processing** ($\text{Act}_{\text{pre}}^i$): executes pre-processing actions, such as object detection, to ensure the successful execution of subsequent editing operations




Figure 6. **Trajectory of actions selected in the action space.** If an action fails to execute successfully, a new action is generated and re-executed to ensure the desired outcome.

Editing Methods	Editing Tools
Objects Addition	Magicbrush [37]
Objects Replacement	SDXL-Inpainting [18] / P2P [10]
Objects Removal	Lama [24]
Background Editing	Plug-and-Play [26] / SDXL-Inpainting [18]
Object Attribute Editing	MAG-Edit [16]
Expression Editing	Guide [25]
Filter Editing	Ip2p [5]
Auxiliary Function	Auxiliary Tools
Detection	Grounding Dino [15]
Segmentation	Segment Anything [12]
Refine	SDXL-Refiner [18]
Self-Critic	GPT-4o [1]

Table 1. **Tool library in the Editing Agent.**

that require positional information. 2) **Editing** ($\text{Act}_{\text{edit}}^i$): carries out the editing action by invoking the appropriate editing tool associated with the current editing instruction. 3) **Validation** ($\text{Act}_{\text{val}}^i$): performs self-critic validation actions, serving as a corrective mechanism to ensure the effectiveness and accuracy of the editing performed. By utilizing GPT-4o [1], we assess the editing results to determine whether the editing instructions have been successfully executed. If verification indicates a failure, the editing process is re-executed to achieve the desired outcome.

3.4. Critic Agent

To accurate conveyance of emotional intent, the critic agent mimics human behaviors of observation, review, and reflection to achieve optimization goals, acting as the eyes of the painter. The critic agent plays distinctive roles across two stages, comprising two main modules: the Editing Plan Critic and the Editing Results Critic. These modules collaborate with the Planner Agent and the Editing Agent, respectively, delivering more reliable manipulation results.

Editing Plan Critic. We employ the CoT [28] method to evaluate the first draft of the editing plan:

- **Input:** the triplet of $\{S_o, E_t, P_0\}$.
- **Output:** the final editing plan P_f .

The VLM integrates the editing elements and methods in the initial editing plan P_0 with source semantics S_o , generating new image semantics to assess whether the target






Figure 7. **Qualitative comparisons with existing state-of-the-art SIM and AIM methods.** Our EmoAgent demonstrates superior ability in expressing target emotion while preserving the integrity of image structure.

emotion E_t is effectively conveyed. If E_t is not adequately expressed, the agent then evaluates each editing instruction Ins_i in P_0 to determine whether it enhances emotional ex-

pression within S_o . Instructions that fail to enhance the target emotion are iteratively optimized by modifying the editing elements e_i to \hat{e}_i while retaining the editing method m_i .



(a) Editing Self-Critic



(b) Editing Results Critic

Figure 8. **Ablation of critic modules.** (a) self-critic in the Editing Agent prevents image-destructive outcomes. (b) editing results critic in the Critic Agent effectively enhance the expression of the target emotion.

Methods/Metrics		Emotion Matching (\uparrow)	Emotion Transformation (\uparrow)	Semantic Plausibility (\uparrow)
Compare to State-of-the-art SIM Methods				
EmoAgent v.s.	IP2P [5]	93% v.s. 7%	91% v.s. 9%	95% v.s. 5%
	MagicBrush [37]	95% v.s. 5%	89% v.s. 11%	94% v.s. 6%
	PnP [26]	86% v.s. 14%	94% v.s. 6%	89% v.s. 11%
	InsDiff [9]	89% v.s. 11%	86% v.s. 14%	89% v.s. 11%
Compare to Previous AIM Methods				
EmoAgent v.s.	CLVA [7]	95% v.s. 5%	94% v.s. 6%	90% v.s. 10%
	AIF [29]	84.8% v.s. 15.2%	77.6% v.s. 22.8%	76.8% v.s. 23.2%
	EmoEdit* [34]	84% v.s. 16%	85.6% v.s. 14.4%	80% v.s. 20%

Table 2. Human Evaluation on AIM Results.

Editing Results Critic. The Editing Agent submits the initial editing result image I_t^0 to the Critic Agent for assessment. The Critic Agent first evaluates whether I_t^0 effectively conveys the target emotion E_t . If it does, the editing process is considered complete, and I_t^0 is finalized as the editing result I_t . If the target emotion is not effectively expressed, the Critic Agent undertakes a two-step evaluation for each editing instruction Ins_i : 1) **Emotion conveyance**: the Critic Agent assesses whether the instruction conveys E_t . If it does not, the agent optimizes Ins_i to Ins_i^* . 2) **Execution accuracy**: if the instruction expresses E_t , the agent then evaluates whether it is executed correctly. If execution errors are found, both the non-optimized instructions and those incorrectly executed are sent back to the Editing Agent for re-editing, resulting in an updated image I_t^i . This iterative process continues until the edited image I_t accurately reflects the desired emotion E_t .

4. Experiments

4.1. Implementation Details

We employ GPT-4o [1] as the default VLM. In the EFK Retriever, text-embedding-ada-002 is used for text encoding. All experiments are conducted, and editing and auxiliary tools are deployed on a machine equipped with two NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPUs. All tools in the tool library are implemented using the official codes provided. Additionally, we ensure that all input and output images maintain a resolution of 512×512 pixels. For more implementation details, please refer to Section B and Section C of the *supplementary material (SM)*.

4.2. Comparisons with Baselines

Dataset. To ensure comprehensiveness and diversity in our AIM experiments, we select eight distinct emotions from the EmoSet [32] dataset, covering a variety of image types including animals, humans, objects, and scenes. A total of 100 images are chosen as our test set.

Baselines. We compare our EmoAgent with several state-of-the-art techniques in SIM and AIM as follows.

- **State-of-the-art SIM methods:** IP2P [5], MagicBrush [37], InsDiff [9], and PnP [26].
- **Style-based AIM methods:** CLVA [7], and AIF [29].
- **VLM-driven AIM method:** Since EmoEdit [34], the method most closely related to our work, is not open-sourced, we replicate it using GPT-4o [1] as VLM and IP2P [5] for editing, denoted as EmoEdit*. Specifically, we re-implement EmoEdit* following the guidelines in [34], with a focus on designing editing instructions that target content and color adjustments.

Qualitative Results. We present the qualitative results in Fig. 7. It is apparent that all SIM techniques are unable to effectively grasp semantic instructions at the emotional level, confirming the gap between SIM and AIM. For instance, when directly utilizing IP2P [5], the editing results exhibit minimal emotional transformation compared to the original image. Specifically, when attempting to convey the emotion of “fear”, IP2P [5] produces an image as a “fear girl” regardless of the original content. Furthermore, the structural integrity of edited images produced by Insdiff [9] is significantly compromised. Style-based AIM methods, such as CLVA [7] and AIF [29], also struggle to effectively convey target emotions through style transfer alone. In most experiments with CLVA [7], the style transfer process undermines the visual integrity of the original image, resulting in noticeable distortions. Although EmoEdit* can convert AIM into a set of SIM instructions using the VLM, it cannot ensure the reliability of the SIM instruction reasoning. This deficiency often results in instructions that fail to convey the intended emotions effectively. For instance, in the cases of “fear” and “sadness”, the editing results produced by EmoEdit* are inadequately expressed. In contrast, the




Figure 9. **Ablation of the EFK retriever.** The EFK retriever enhances EmoAgent’s ability to identify elements that align with both the image semantics and the target emotion.

collaboration of three specialized agents enables EmoAgent to achieve richer and more accurate emotional expressions with more semantically plausible results, without sacrificing the original content. **Quantitative Results.** To quantitatively compare EmoAgent with the state-of-the-art SIM and previous AIM methods, we conduct both automatic and human evaluation experiments. Detailed automatic experimental procedures and content are provided in Section C of the SM. Given the subjective nature of AIM, we conduct human preference evaluations using Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), focusing on three critical aspects: *emotion matching*, *emotion transformation*, and *semantic plausibility*. The results of Table 2 fully demonstrate that EmoAgent exhibits superior performance and distinct advantages in AIM tasks, which is the most preferred method among all the methods involved in the questionnaire. More details can also be found in the Section B of SM.

4.3. Ablation Study

Critic Modules. We ablate self-critic in the Editing Agent and editing results critic in the Critic Agent. Fig. 8(a) demonstrates that self-critic can effectively prevent unsuccessful executions. For example, if EmoAgent determines that the “tomato” in the edited result has not rotted as expected, it will re-edit the image using a different editing tool to ensure the desired outcome is achieved. On the other hand, the editing results critic module enables EmoAgent to iteratively refine the editing outcomes to achieve the desired emotion, as illustrated in Fig. 8 (b), the emotional expression of “amusement” is significantly enhanced by adjusting



Figure 10. **Ablation of editing tool library.** Tool library can enable the agent to select appropriate editing tools, thereby enhancing the emotional expression ability of images.

the background and color tone in the “strawberry” example through this module.

Emotion-Factor Knowledge Retriever. The EFK Retriever provides external affective domain knowledge, enabling the Planning Agent to identify more effective semantic elements for specific emotions. As shown in Fig. 9, elements are associated with the emotion “awe”, while “cockroach” are linked to “disgust”. In contrast, without the EFK Retriever, EmoAgent struggles to identify relevant semantic elements, hindering effective manipulation.

Editing Tools. To assess the efficiency of editing tools in the tool library, we develop a variant that exclusively utilizes IP2P [5] as the editing tool. Fig. 10 illustrates that IP2P struggles with local-level editing, leading to undesirable outcomes, such as the distortion of the “girl’s body” in the “Amusement” scenario. By fully leveraging the capabilities of all editing tools, EmoAgent selects the most appropriate tools for each task, thereby significantly enhancing the quality of the manipulated results.

5. Conclusions

In this work, we introduce EmoAgent, a pioneering multi-agent collaboration framework that efficiently coordinates planning, editing, and critic evaluation to tackle complex AIM challenges. We have developed key components such as an emotion-factor knowledge retriever, decision-making tree space, and a comprehensive tool library, all of which enhance the effectiveness of AIM. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our method significantly outperforms existing approaches, providing more accurate and effective emotional expressions.

References

- [1] Gpt-4o. Accessed May 13, 2024 [Online] <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>. 3, 5, 7, 1, 4
- [2] Amazon. Amazon mechanical turk. <https://requester.mturk.com.2>
- [3] Omri Avrahami, Dani Lischinski, and Ohad Fried. Blended diffusion for text-driven editing of natural images. In *CVPR*, 2022. 2
- [4] Omri Avrahami, Ohad Fried, and Dani Lischinski. Blended latent diffusion. In *TOG*, 2023. 2
- [5] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2, 5, 7, 8, 1, 4
- [6] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. In *NIPS*, 2021. 2
- [7] Tsu-Jui Fu, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. Language-driven artistic style transfer. In *ECCV*, 2022. 7, 1, 2
- [8] Difei Gao, Lei Ji, Zechen Bai, Mingyu Ouyang, Peiran Li, Dongxing Mao, Qinchun Wu, Weichen Zhang, Peiyi Wang, Xiangwu Guo, et al. Assistgui: Task-oriented pc graphical user interface automation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [9] Zigang Geng, Binxin Yang, Tiankai Hang, Chen Li, Shuyang Gu, Ting Zhang, Jianmin Bao, Zheng Zhang, Houqiang Li, Han Hu, et al. Instructdiffusion: A generalist modeling interface for vision tasks. In *CVPR*, 2024. 7, 1, 2, 4
- [10] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross attention control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01626*, 2022. 2, 5
- [11] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *NIPS*, 2020. 2
- [12] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *ICCV*, 2023. 5, 1
- [13] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *NIPS*, 2020. 3
- [14] Qing Lin, Jingfeng Zhang, Yew Soon Ong, and Mengmi Zhang. Make me happier: Evoking emotions through image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08255*, 2024. 2, 4
- [15] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Qing Jiang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. In *ECCV*, 2023. 5, 1
- [16] Qi Mao, Lan Chen, Yuchao Gu, Zhen Fang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Mag-edit: Localized image editing in complex scenarios via mask-based attention-adjusted guidance. In *ACMMM*, 2024. 5, 1
- [17] Rosalind W Picard. Affective computing mit press. *Cambridge, Massachussets*, 1997. 2
- [18] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2023. 5, 1
- [19] 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 *ICML*, 2021. 1, 2, 4
- [20] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022. 2
- [21] Raphael Schumann, Wanrong Zhu, Weixi Feng, Tsu-Jui Fu, Stefan Riezler, and William Yang Wang. Velma: Verbalization embodiment of llm agents for vision and language navigation in street view. In *AAAI*, 2024. 3
- [22] Ishika Singh, Valts Blukis, Arsalan Mousavian, Ankit Goyal, Danfei Xu, Jonathan Tremblay, Dieter Fox, Jesse Thomason, and Animesh Garg. Progprompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models. In *ICRA*, 2023. 2
- [23] Chan Hee Song, Jiaman Wu, Clayton Washington, Brian M Sadler, Wei-Lun Chao, and Yu Su. Llm-planner: Few-shot grounded planning for embodied agents with large language models. In *NIPS*, 2023. 2
- [24] Roman Suvorov, Elizaveta Logacheva, Anton Mashikhin, Anastasia Remizova, Arsenii Ashukha, Aleksei Silvestrov, Naejin Kong, Harshith Goka, Kiwoong Park, and Victor Lempitsky. Resolution-robust large mask inpainting with fourier convolutions. In *WACV*, 2022. 5, 1
- [25] Vadim Titov, Madina Khalmatova, Alexandra Ivanova, Dmitry Vetrov, and Aibek Alanov. Guide-and-rescale: Self-guidance mechanism for effective tuning-free real image editing. In *ECCV*, 2024. 5, 1
- [26] Narek Tumanyan, Michal Geyer, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. Plug-and-play diffusion features for text-driven image-to-image translation. In *CVPR*, 2023. 5, 7, 1, 2
- [27] Zhenyu Wang, Aoxue Li, Zhenguo Li, and Xihui Liu. Genartist: Multimodal llm as an agent for unified image generation and editing. In *NIPS*, 2024. 3
- [28] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *NIPS*, 2022. 2, 5
- [29] Shuchen Weng, Peixuan Zhang, Zheng Chang, Xinlong Wang, Si Li, and Boxin Shi. Affective image filter: Reflecting emotions from text to images. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 7, 1, 4
- [30] Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*, 2023. 3
- [31] Hongxia Xie, Chu-Jun Peng, Yu-Wen Tseng, Hung-Jen Chen, Chan-Feng Hsu, Hong-Han Shuai, and Wen-Huang Cheng. Emovit: Revolutionizing emotion insights with visual instruction tuning. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2
- [32] Jingyuan Yang, Qirui Huang, Tingting Ding, Dani Lischinski, Danny Cohen-Or, and Hui Huang. Emoset: A large-scale

- visual emotion dataset with rich attributes. In *ICCV*, 2023. [4](#), [7](#), [1](#)
- [33] Jingyuan Yang, Jiawei Feng, and Hui Huang. Emogen: Emotional image content generation with text-to-image diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024. [2](#), [4](#)
 - [34] Jingyuan Yang, Jiawei Feng, Weibin Luo, Dani Lischinski, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Hui Huang. Emoedit: Evoking emotions through image manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12661*, 2024. [2](#), [7](#), [1](#), [4](#)
 - [35] Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Ehsan Azarnasab, Faisal Ahmed, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, Michael Zeng, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-react: Prompting chatgpt for multimodal reasoning and action. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11381*, 2023. [3](#)
 - [36] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *ICLR*, 2022. [2](#), [5](#)
 - [37] Kai Zhang, Lingbo Mo, Wenhui Chen, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. Magicbrush: A manually annotated dataset for instruction-guided image editing. In *NIPS*, 2024. [5](#), [7](#), [1](#), [2](#), [4](#)
 - [38] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. In *ICLR*, 2022. [2](#)



EmoAgent: Multi-Agent Collaboration of Plan, Edit, and Critic, for Affective Image Manipulation

Supplementary Material

A. Summary

In this supplementary material, we present more implementation details of EmoAgent in Section B. Furthermore, Section C illustrates more implementation details on the benchmark dataset, baselines, automatic evaluation metrics, and human evaluation. We demonstrate additional quantitative results and qualitative results with EmoEdit to complement the paper in Section D. Additionally, we conduct a study on multiple emotion directions to further demonstrate the performance of EmoAgent. We also include visualizations of the EmoAgent workflow to illustrate how the framework operates and adapts to different emotional contexts.

B. Implementation Details

In this section, we detail the implementation of EmoAgent, covering the construction of the emotion-factor tree, creation of the emotion-factor knowledge database, and deployment of editing tools.

Details of Emotion-Factor Tree. To link subject emotions with specific visual semantic elements, we adopt the strategy of constructing the emotion-factor tree [34]. The construction process begins by embedding EmoSet [32] images into a semantic space using the CLIP [19] model, capturing key visual and semantic features for clustering analysis. Semantically similar images are grouped together through an iterative clustering approach to identify visual cues associated with distinct emotional categories. Initially, each image is treated as an independent cluster. The two most similar clusters are merged in each iteration until the similarity between all clusters drops below a predefined threshold (e.g., 0.89). To enhance the relevance and generalizability of emotional expressions, we implement a multi-step post-processing procedure that includes: 1) removing clusters with fewer than five images for statistical reliability, 2) excluding clusters with excessive pixel-level similarity to avoid redundancy, and 3) eliminating clusters that do not evoke specific emotions to maintain emotional relevance. The refined clusters, depicted in Fig. 11, are then organized into a hierarchical structure based on dimensions such as objects, scenes, actions, and facial expressions. Using the GPT-4o [1] model, we generate natural language descriptions for each cluster, extracting and summarizing consistent key information across dimensions like “objects”, “scenes”, “facial expressions”, “actions”, and “color tones” to form the hierarchical emotion-factor tree. The tree’s root

nodes represent emotional categories, such as “sadness”, while leaf nodes detail specific visual elements. The extracted semantic information—covering objects, scenes, actions, facial expressions, and colors—is stored in independent JSON files.

Details of Emotion-Factor Knowledge Database. The EFK Database performs retrieval by leveraging the node information provided by the emotion-factor tree. In this database, each emotional factor is transformed into a TextNode, with sub-tags for emotion and element type to refine the search process. The text description of each emotional factor serves as the content of these nodes. To identify the editing element that best aligns with the original image’s semantics, we directly compute the L_2 similarity between the node content E_n and the image’s semantic text extraction embedding E_s .

$$d = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (E_n - E_s)^2}. \quad (2)$$

This approach allows for precise matching and enhances the accuracy of emotional expression in image editing.

Details for Editing Tools. We use the official codes released by the authors for implementing IP2P [5], MagicBrush [37], PnP [26], MAG-Edit [16], Guide [25], SDXL [18], Lama [24], Grounding Dino [15], Segmentation Segment Anything [12] as editing tools and auxiliary tools. Specifically, for SDXL, we select the official stable-diffusion-xl-1.0-inpainting-0.1 model as the editing tool, SDXL-Inpainting, for object replacement and background editing. Additionally, we employ the official Refiner model, SDXL-Refiner, as an auxiliary tool to optimize the fine-grained details of images.

C. Details of Comparisons with Baselines

C.1. Implementation Details of Baselines

We employ the official codes released by the authors for implementing IP2P [5], MagicBrush [37], InsDiff [9], PnP [26], CLVA [7], AIF [29]. Specifically, we re-implemented EmoEdit* according to the guidelines provided in EmoEdit [34], focusing on designing editing instructions that target content and color adjustments. We utilize the visual-language model (VLM), specifically GPT-4o [1], to analyze images and generate appropriate editing instructions. Additionally, we employ IP2P [5] as the editing tool to execute these operations. Each algorithm uses



Figure 11. **Cluster examples.** (a) An example of cluster results for the "sadness" emotion, showing that the main features of this class are people with somber expressions and gray tones. (b) An example of cluster results for the emotion of "excitement", where the main features of this class are humans with colorful hair and wearing colorful clothes on the street.

information from two modalities as input: the original image and the associated text containing the target emotion. All algorithms are deployed on the same NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU for consistent performance evaluation.

C.2. Evaluation Details of Automatic Experiments

We evaluate the efficiency of our method in terms of semantic consistency and emotion expression using the following automatic evaluation metrics: 1) **Semantic consistency:** We utilize the CLIP image score (CLIP-I [19]), which assesses the semantic similarity between the original and edited images, ensuring that the edits maintain semantic consistency with the source images. 2) **Emotion expression:** We adopt the expression accuracy similar to [33], denoted as Emo-A, using EmoVIT [31] to assess the alignment between edited images and the target emotions. We also employ the Emotional Shift Ratio (ESR) metric [14], which uses the Kullback-Leibler Divergence (KLD) to calculate the emotional probability distributions of manipulated images relative to source images. This metric is designed to measure the impact of editing on the emotional transition from the source to the target emotion.

C.3. Details of Human Evaluation

We conduct a user study on the Amazon MTurk platform [2]. We design three types of questionnaires to evaluate images from the perspectives of *Emotional Matching*,

Method/Metrics	Semantic consistency	Emotion expression	
	CLIP-I (↑)	Emo-A (↑)	ESR (↑)
IP2P [5]	0.917	12%	65%
MagicBrush [37]	0.928	11%	60%
InsDiff [9]	0.746	10%	63%
PnP [26]	0.792	20%	85%
CLVA [7]	0.767	15%	68%
AIF [29]	0.759	10%	70%
EmoEdit*	0.798	24%	87%
Ours	0.763	61%	95%

Table 3. **Quantitative comparisons.** Blue and green indicate the best and second best value, respectively.

Emotional Transformation, and *Semantic Plausibility*, as depicted in Fig. 12. In the first task, we present participants with two edited images alongside a target emotion: one image is generated by our proposed method, and the other by a randomly selected baseline method. The presentation order of the images is shuffled to prevent order bias. In the second and third tasks, building upon the foundation of the first task, we additionally present participants with the source image to offer a reference point for evaluating the edits. For each of the three tasks, raters are asked to answer bellowing questions, respectively:

- **Emotion Matching:** Which of the above two pictures do you think better evokes the target emotion?
- **Emotion Transformation:** Compared to the source image, which edited image do you think achieves the target emotion transformation more effectively?
- **Semantic Plausibility:** Between the two edited images, which one has a more reasonable and natural semantic transformation towards the target emotion?

The user study comprises over 150 tasks, each evaluated by five human evaluators. A total of responses are received from 750 distinct human evaluators. To ensure the credibility and reliability of our user study, we only involve Amazon MTurk workers with "Master" status and a Human Intelligence Task (HIT) Approval Rate exceeding 90% across all Requesters' HITs.

D. Additional Experimental Results

Automatic Experiment Results. As illustrated in Table 3, EmoAgent demonstrates superior performance across various metrics of Emotion expression, particularly excelling in emotion accuracy, when compared to other methods. Advanced SIM algorithms such as IP2P [5] and Magicbrush [37] have an Emo-A [33] index of only 12% or 11%, whereas algorithms with AIM capabilities like AIF [29] and CLVA [7] exhibit an even lower index of just 10% to 15%. These figures highlight the limitations of existing approaches in accurately capturing and expressing emotion and struggle to effectively control images based on the desired emotion level.

Moreover, due to the limited capability of understanding

Instructions

In each trial, you will be presented with 2 images. Your task is to choose the image that **better evokes the target emotion**.
Please click on your choice to continue

Your task is to choose the image that **better evokes the target emotion**

Target emotion: **excitement**



Option 1



Option 2

1. Which of the above two pictures do you think **better evokes the target emotion**?


☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2

Instructions


In each trial, you will be presented with 2 images. Your task is to choose the image that **better evokes the target emotion**.
Please click on your choice to continue

Your task is to choose the image that **better evokes the target emotion**

Target emotion: **anger**



Option 1



Option 2

1. Which of the above two pictures do you think **better evokes the target emotion**?

☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2

Instructions

In each trial, you will be presented with 2 images. Your task is to choose the image that **better evokes the target emotion**.
Please click on your choice to continue

Your task is to choose the image that **better evokes the target emotion**

Target emotion: **contentment**



Option 1



Option 2

1. Which of the above two pictures do you think **better evokes the target emotion**?

☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2

(a) Emotion Matching

Instructions

In each trial, You will be presented with three images: the first one is the **source image**, and the other two are the images that have been **edited by AI algorithms**. Additionally, a **target emotion** will be provided.


Please read the following question and click on your choice to continue

Compared to the source image, which edited image do you think **has achieved the target emotion transformation more effectively**?
Please select the image that shows a greater emotional contrast from the original while aligning well with the target emotion.

Target emotion: **disgust**



source image



Option 1



Option 2

☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2


Instructions

In each trial, You will be presented with three images: the first one is the **source image**, and the other two are the images that have been **edited by AI algorithms**. Additionally, a **target emotion** will be provided.


Please read the following question and click on your choice to continue

Compared to the source image, which edited image do you think **has achieved the target emotion transformation more effectively**?
Please select the image that shows a greater emotional contrast from the original while aligning well with the target emotion.

Target emotion: **sadness**



source image



Option 1



Option 2

☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2

(b) Emotion Transformation

Instructions

In each trial, You will be presented with three images: the first one is the **source image**, and the other two are the images that have been **edited by AI algorithms**. Additionally, a **target emotion** will be provided.

Please read the following question and click on your choice to continue

Between the two edited images, which one has a **more reasonable and natural semantic transformation towards the target emotion**? Please select that image.
(If there are any unreasonable situations such as **the distortion of human faces or the unreasonable positions of objects, or if it is completely irrelevant to the source image**, it means that the editing result is unreasonable.)

Target emotion: **disgust**



source image



Option 1



Option 2

☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2


Instructions

In each trial, You will be presented with three images: the first one is the **source image**, and the other two are the images that have been **edited by AI algorithms**. Additionally, a **target emotion** will be provided.

Please read the following question and click on your choice to continue

Between the two edited images, which one has a **more reasonable and natural semantic transformation towards the target emotion**? Please select that image.
(If there are any unreasonable situations such as **the distortion of human faces or the unreasonable positions of objects, or if it is completely irrelevant to the source image**, it means that the editing result is unreasonable.)

Target emotion: **contentment**



source image



Option 1



Option 2

☐ Option 1 ☐ Option 2

(c) Semantic Plausibility

Figure 12. Examples of three tasks for 5 human raters on Amazon MTurk to complete. (a) Exhibition of emotion matching questionnaire interface. (b) Exhibition of emotion transformation questionnaire interface. (c) Exhibition of semantic plausibility questionnaire interface.




Figure 13. **Qualitative comparisons with EmoEdit.** EmoEdit and our method both have good image structure preservation capabilities. In terms of editing methods and editing elements, our EmoAgent has richer and more accurate emotional expression capabilities.




Figure 14. **Multiple emotion directions results.** Our EmoAgent can achieve effective image manipulation through different editing elements in eight categories of emotions.

affective descriptions, SIM methods such as IP2P [5] and Magicbrush [37] often produce manipulated images that remain largely unchanged. This preservation of the original image semantics is a primary reason why these algorithms achieve high scores on the CLIP-I [19] metric. Using the capabilities of VLMs, EmoEdit* performs well in AIM tasks compared to relying solely on IP2P. However, without an accurate reasoning process, domain knowledge, critic-process, its Emo-A [33] value is significantly lower than ours. In contrast, our algorithm achieves the highest scores in both the Emo-A [33] and ESR [14] indices, with Emo-A notably outperforming other algorithms. Although the manipulation of more semantic elements results in a lower CLIP-I metric, our method still surpasses others like AIF [29] and InsDiff [9]. This demonstrates our method’s superior capability to achieve accurate emotional expression without compromising the integrity of image semantics.

Comparisons with EmoEdit. Since EmoEdit [34] is not open-sourced, we recreate EmoEdit* using GPT-4o [1] and IP2P [5] in the main manuscript to facilitate comparative experiments. To ensure a fair comparison with EmoEdit [34], we additionally conduct a qualitative comparison using the example images provided in the publication, as shown in

Fig. 13. Both EmoEdit [34] and our method effectively preserve the structural integrity of images. However, our EmoAgent excels by utilizing editing elements that align more closely with the semantics of the original image. For example, when conveying the emotion of “awe” in images featuring “pebbles”, EmoEdit primarily modifies the global color tone. In contrast, our method not only adjusts the color tone but also introduces additional elements such as “clouds” and “sky”. These additions emphasize the vastness and grandeur associated with “awe” providing a more nuanced and layered emotional expression. Consequently, EmoAgent delivers richer and more accurate emotional expressions, enhancing the overall emotional impact and relevance of the edited images.

Manipulation Results in Multiple Emotion Directions. Our EmoAgent is capable of modifying a given image across eight distinct emotional directions, incorporating various semantic factors specific to each emotion category, as illustrated in Fig. 14. For instance, as shown in the second row, when presented with an image of a “dilapidated house”, EmoAgent incorporates elements such as “posters” and “phonograph”, replaces the existing floor material with wooden flooring, and applies color filters to accentuate the




Figure 15. **More subjective experimental results of different emotions.** The effectiveness of our EmoAgent in the AIM task can be demonstrated significantly.

emotion of “amusement”. Additionally, by altering the “decor of the house”—such as adding “chandeliers” and “murals” and incorporating “golden lighting”—EmoAgent effectively conveys a sense of “awe”.

Additional Qualitative Results. We present further qualitative comparisons with existing approaches, as illustrated in Fig. 16. Additional examples of affective image manipulation are illustrated in Fig. 15. These extensive experimental results underscore the superior performance of our method in the AIM task, demonstrating its effectiveness in accurately conveying intended emotions through targeted image modifications.

Workflow Visualization of EmoAgent. We provide the visualization examples to demonstrate the concrete editing process of our EmoAgent. A key advantage of our EmoAgent over other approaches is *its high degree of interpretability at every step of the workflow*. This level of transparency enables users to clearly understand and trace the decision-making and emotion processing throughout the system. In Fig. 17, we present a prime example of all processes being executed correctly. EmoAgent adheres to the workflow, efficiently executing each step in sequence. In Fig. 18, we present a case where the initial editing actions are incorrect, yet are subsequently corrected by the Self-Critic mechanism. This process continues until all steps are completed correctly, demonstrating our method’s capability for precise image manipulation. As shown in Fig. 17 and Fig. 18, all three agents operate with the working logic of ReAct [36] agent, where each action strictly adheres to the workflow of thinking, discovering, and executing.




Figure 16. **More qualitative comparisons with existing state-of-the-art SIM and AIM methods.** Our EmoAgent demonstrates superior ability in expressing target emotion while preserving the integrity of image structure.



Figure 17. **The first workflow example of EmoAgent.** An ideal workflow without any editing or emotional errors. The blue, green, and yellow process boxes represent the workflows of the Planning Agent, the Critic Agent, and the Editing Agent, respectively.

