

On Geometrical Properties of Text Token Embeddings for Strong Semantic Binding in Text-to-Image Generation

Hoigi Seo^{1*}Junseo Bang^{1*}Haechang Lee^{1*}Joohoon Lee²Byung Hyun Lee¹Se Young Chun^{1,2,3†}¹Dept. of ECE, ²IPAI & ³INMC, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

{seohoiki3215, qkdwnstj10, harrylee, joohoon1, ldlqudgus756, sychun}@snu.ac.kr



Figure 1. Images generated by each method from prompts containing multiple objects with respective attributes. (Left) Existing methods, including SDXL [34], SynGen [39], ToMe [15], and Magnet [53], often omit objects or incorrectly assign attributes (e.g., generating a “red furry dog”), indicating weak semantic binding. **TeeMo** (Ours) accurately preserves object-attribute relationships. (Right) Even in complex object-attribute scenes, while other methods struggle to accurately depict the prompt, TeeMo’s generation aligns closely with the prompt.

Abstract

Text-to-Image (T2I) models often suffer from text-image misalignment in complex scenes involving multiple objects and attributes. Semantic binding aims to mitigate this issue by accurately associating the generated attributes and objects with their corresponding noun phrases (NPs). Existing methods rely on text or latent optimizations, yet the factors influencing semantic binding remain underexplored. Here we investigate the geometrical properties of text token embeddings and their cross-attention (CA) maps. We empirically and theoretically analyze that the geometrical properties of token embeddings, specifically both angular distances and norms, play a crucial role in CA map differentiation. Then, we propose **TeeMo**, a training-free text embedding-aware T2I framework with strong semantic binding. TeeMo consists of Causality-Aware Projection-Out (CAPO) for distinct inter-NP CA maps and Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM) with our loss to enhance inter-NP separation while maintaining intra-NP cohesion in CA maps. Extensive experiments confirm TeeMo consistently outperforms prior arts across diverse baselines and datasets.

* Authors contributed equally. † Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

Text-to-Image (T2I) synthesis has made significant strides in generating high-fidelity images from text prompts, driven by diffusion models [3, 4, 7, 34, 40, 54]. However, ensuring precise adherence to prompts in image generation remains challenging, as issues such as i) missing and ii) misbinding of objects and attributes disrupt compositional generation [8, 39]. These issues are more pronounced as the number of objects (i.e., multi-object) and attributes (i.e., multi-attribute) increases within a prompt [1, 34, 38], ultimately degrading text-image alignments.

To address this challenge, the *semantic binding* task has emerged, aiming to generate objects that correspond to each noun phrase (NP) in the text prompt. An important observation in this context is that, for effective semantic binding, cross-attention (CA) maps corresponding to tokens from different NPs (inter-NP) should be separated, whereas CA maps for tokens within the same NP (intra-NP) should remain clustered together [29, 39]. Leveraging this insight, various approaches have been proposed, including latent vectors optimization [1, 6, 15, 19, 25, 39, 44], text embeddings optimization [15], or text embeddings modification [2, 8, 53] to enhance semantic binding performance.

However, these approaches often rely on spatial priors, requiring additional user input [6] or reducing compositional diversity of generated images [15]. Moreover, the text embedding optimization approach [15] requires an extra optimization to preserve the original semantics of tokens, leading to inefficiency and suboptimal performance.

Here we investigate the influence of token embeddings, specifically their geometric properties such as *norm* and *similarity*, on semantic binding, which has not been thoroughly explored. We observe that when similar token embeddings appear across distinct NPs, significant overlap in CA maps occurs, causing poor semantic binding. Increasing the embedding norm of either attribute or object tokens alleviates semantic neglect, a phenomenon where the semantics of certain tokens are omitted in the generated image, thereby enhancing semantic binding. A larger embedding norm increases distances between token embeddings, consequently reducing undesirable CA overlaps. Interestingly, our analysis reveals that prior methods implicitly leverage this norm-based effect. Our findings are supported by comprehensive empirical and theoretical analyses.

Building upon these findings, we propose **TeeMo**, a training-free approach to enhance semantic binding in T2I diffusion models. TeeMo consists of several key components. First, to mitigate issues in semantic binding arising from angular distance across tokens, we introduce Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO) to enforce orthogonalization. Given the intrinsic asymmetry in causal text encoders where earlier tokens have no access to latter ones, we adopt asymmetric Schmidt orthogonalization [22], projecting out preceding token embeddings from later ones. In contrast, for non-causal text encoders, we employ Löwdin orthogonalization [30] to symmetrically project token embedding pairs. Next, we introduce Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM), inspired by our findings of the relationship between token norm and CA map, as well as the token merging strategy using semantic additivity suggested by ToMe [15], to optimize token norms with the mixing matrix within NPs, effectively improving semantic binding. Our loss design, based on entropy [42] and Bhattacharyya distance [41], ensures intra-NP compactness and inter-NP distinction in CA maps by optimizing the mixing matrix.

To evaluate TeeMo’s semantic binding performance, we conducted extensive experiments comparing it with various state-of-the-art training-free semantic binding methods. The evaluation employed multiple metrics, including BLIP-VQA [17], GenEval [10], CIC [2], VQAScore [26], and VIEScore [21], across multiple T2I benchmarks. The results demonstrate that TeeMo outperforms existing methods across most metrics on various datasets and baselines, establishing a new benchmark in the semantic binding task. Our key contributions are summarized as follows:

- We *empirically* and *theoretically* analyze the geometri-

cal properties of token embeddings influencing semantic binding, leading to two necessary conditions and enabling to reinterpret existing works in a new perspective.

- Building on these findings, we propose TeeMo, a training-free method designed to effectively tackle the T2I semantic binding task. TeeMo comprises novel components: CAPO, ATM, and a loss formulation for condensed intra-NP and separated inter-NP.
- We extensively evaluate TeeMo across various baselines, datasets, and metrics, demonstrating that it achieves a new state-of-the-art performance in semantic binding.

2. Related Works

Semantic leakage and neglect in T2I generation. T2I diffusion models [3, 4, 34, 40] generate high-quality images aligned with input text by leveraging attention mechanisms between latent vectors and text embeddings. However, they often struggle to accurately reflect input prompts, particularly in complex scenarios involving multiple objects and attributes. This leads to two major issues [1, 34, 38]: semantic neglect, where certain objects or attributes in the prompt are ignored, and semantic leakage, where attributes of one object mistakenly appear on another. Addressing these issues has led to the emergence of the semantic binding task.

Attend-and-Excite (A&E) [1] optimizes latent vectors to ensure all subject tokens activate their corresponding image patches in CA maps, mitigating both semantic neglect and leakage. SynGen [39] optimizes latents to ensure that intra-NP tokens (within the same NP) have similar CA maps, while inter-NP tokens (across different NPs) maintain distinct CA maps. Additionally, Marioriyad *et al.* [29] quantifies overlap in CA maps using the variance and center-of-mass distance, targeting semantic neglect. Since textual input alone provides weak conditioning [43, 45], some methods incorporate spatial guidance via annotations such as bounding boxes [5, 6, 27, 28, 33, 48, 49] and masks [20, 31]. Additionally, some studies [11, 33, 52] introduce multi-modal frameworks that leverage large language models’ (LLMs) capabilities. While these methods are effective, they lack a direct study on the role of text embeddings. Additionally, spatial prior-based methods require extra user input or limit compositional flexibility.

Token-driven approaches for semantic alignment. Recent efforts have explored the role of text token embeddings in T2I synthesis, aiming to enhance semantic binding. StructureDiffusion [8] enhances semantic binding by using embeddings from hierarchical phrase structures rather than a single textual sequence. ToMe [15] merges token embeddings within an NP based on fixed coefficients creating a single embedding for each NP and optimizes both text embeddings and latents to cluster CA maps into fixed positions. Magnet [53] manipulates token embeddings to bind




Figure 2. **Relationship between token embedding mean squared error (MSE) and semantic binding.** Upper numbers indicate the MSE between noun tokens within each NP. Stacked images show attention maps aligned with tokens below. Lower MSE leads to object neglect (e.g., “grapefruit”) due to substantial attention overlap, while higher MSE enhances text-image alignment.

objects and attributes with a positive and negative dataset. Despite advances in semantic binding, these approaches have limitations: performance gains are marginal [8], flexibility is restricted by predefined positional information and coefficients [15], mitigation of semantic neglect is limited to objects only [2], and reliance on datasets introduces performance variability depending on the dataset [53].

3. Analysis

3.1. Cross-Attention in Diffusion Models

T2I diffusion frameworks [3, 4, 34, 40] typically condition the denoising network using text embeddings obtained from a text encoder. This conditioning is achieved through the cross-attention (CA) module within the denoising network. Let the text embeddings be represented as $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d_1}$ where L is the number of tokens and d_1 is the text embedding dimension. We also denote $H \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_2}$ as the latent tokens where N is the number of latent tokens and d_2 is their dimension. Each vector is then projected into the query Q , key K , and value V via learned linear transformations:

$$Q = HW_Q, \quad K = TW_K, \quad V = TW_V, \quad (1)$$

where $W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d}$ and $W_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d}$. The Q , K , and V are then used in the CA operation as follows:

$$\text{CrossAttention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d}}\right)V, \quad (2)$$

where the softmax operation ensures that the sum of probabilities for each text token across all latent tokens equals 1. The result of the softmax(\cdot) operation is referred to as the CA maps $P \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times L}$ for overall tokens. Additionally, for an arbitrary i -th text token, we define A_i as the sum-1 normalized distribution of the CA map for $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

3.2. Embedding Distance and Semantic Binding

Previous studies [15, 29, 39, 51] have shown that semantic binding deteriorates when token attention maps excessively

overlap or become too dispersed. However, the influence of token embedding characteristics on these overlaps and dispersions remains unexplored. To investigate this, we experiment with structurally identical multi-attribute multi-object prompts differing only by a single word, with a fixed seed. In Fig. 2, we replaced “grapefruit” with “pencil” in the prompt “a green apple and a red grapefruit,” and measured token embedding distance via mean squared error (MSE) between embeddings within different noun phrases (NPs). Lower embedding MSE between distinct NPs demonstrates semantic neglect, while higher MSE shows better semantic binding. Analysis reveals that lower embedding MSE induces greater overlap in CA maps, weakening semantic binding, whereas higher MSE yields distinct CA maps, enhancing semantic binding. Based on this finding, we propose the following proposition.

Proposition 1 (KL Divergence Monotonicity in Distance). *Let $Q = [q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N]$ and suppose that q_a are i.i.d. samples from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. For sufficiently large N , increasing the distance between token embeddings $\|t_i - t_j\|_2^2$ monotonically increases the Kullback-Leibler divergences $D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j)$ and $D_{KL}(A_j \| A_i)$.*

Proof is provided in the supplementary Sec. S1.1. Proposition 1 states that as the distance between two token embeddings increases, their corresponding CA maps become more distinct. Our empirical and theoretical analysis suggests that increasing token embedding distance across different NPs is crucial for preventing CA overlap, thereby mitigating object neglect and preserving semantics.

Notably, to increase the distance of token embeddings, one can either i) increase the *angular distance* between the embeddings or ii) enlarge their *magnitudes*. A remedy for increasing the angle is introduced in Sec. 4.1, while enlarging the magnitudes requires additional considerations.

3.3. Embedding Norm and Semantic Binding

Relationship between the token embeddings norm and semantic binding. Existing semantic binding approaches [12, 15, 53] adjust text embeddings to control CAs but do not explicitly link token embedding norm scaling to attribute and object activations within the CA maps.

As illustrated in Fig. 3, scaling the norm of text embeddings in T2I synthesis models [3, 34, 40] improves the visibility of underrepresented semantics across various text encoders [36, 37]. Optimal scaling factor depends on prompt and seed, remaining consistent for different attributes and objects. The proposition below explains how increased embedding norms enhance semantic binding.

Proposition 2. *Let two token embeddings $t_i, t_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ follow the assumptions 1) and 2) in supplementary materials S1.3. With scalar values $\lambda_i, \lambda_j > 1$, the following holds.*

$$\|t_i - t_j\|_2^2 < \|\lambda_i t_i - \lambda_j t_j\|_2^2. \quad (3)$$




Figure 3. **Relationship between the token embeddings norm and semantic binding.** The first row shows images from various models, while the second row presents results after scaling up the norm of ignored tokens’ embeddings. This simple operation improves semantic binding, highlighting the importance of embedding norms across various text encoders (*i.e.* CLIP [36] and T5 [37]) and denoising architectures (*i.e.* UNet [40] and DiT [32]).

Proof, assumptions, and verification of assumptions are provided in the supplementary Sec. S1.2 and S2.1. Proposition 2 suggests that, under certain conditions, scaling the norm of token embeddings increases the distance between two vectors. This leads to a more distinct CA map, as supported by Proposition 1. A remedy for effectively increasing the norm of token embeddings is provided in Sec. 4.2.

Reinterpreting existing token-driven methods based on norm scaling. Recent T2I diffusion models rely on text embeddings to condition the image synthesis. These embeddings, extracted from a text encoder, play a crucial role in guiding the generative process. Assuming that token embedding vectors exhibit Gaussian properties [35, 47], their behavior can be analyzed as following.

Remark 1 (Norm of token embedding add & sub). Suppose that two token embeddings $t_i, t_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ follow $t_i, t_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_d, \Sigma_d)$ and they satisfy $\|\mu_d\|_2 \ll \|t_i\|_2, \|t_j\|_2$. Then:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2], \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2]. \quad (4)$$

Proof and assumptions are in the supplementary (Sec. S1.3, S2.1). Remark 1 implies adding or subtracting two token embeddings increases the norm of the resulting embedding.

Based on this observation, we reinterpret Prompt-to-Prompt [12] as scaling attention maps through adjustments in text embedding norms, thereby modulating semantic influence. Similarly, Magnet [53] strengthens or weakens prompts by adding or subtracting their embeddings, respectively, which, according to Remark 1, increases the embedding norm. ToMe [15] also increases embedding norms by linearly summing attribute and object embeddings within an NP. The approach we use also leverages this phenomenon, which is further elaborated in Sec. 4.2. More detailed analysis can be found in supplementary Sec. S2.3.

4. Method

Sec. 3 highlights the importance of token embedding distances, particularly *angular distance* and *norm*, in semantic binding. We propose Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO) to increase inter-NP angular distances by orthogonalizing embeddings. Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM) then enables intra-NP norm scaling without semantic information loss. Optimized with entropy and Bhattacharyya losses, ATM condenses intra-NP and separates inter-NP CA maps.

4.1. Causality-Aware Projection Out

Drawing from insights in Proposition 1, we apply orthogonalization to increase angular distances between token embeddings from distinct noun phrases (NPs), thus reducing dependency. Considering text encoder causality, we note that causal encoders employ attention masks, restricting tokens to attend only to preceding positions, whereas non-causal encoders allow unrestricted mutual attention. Therefore, we propose *Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO)*, aiming to preserve maximal token information while increasing inter-NP distances. Defining preceding NP tokens as $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$ and succeeding NP tokens as $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$, CAPO uses Schmidt orthogonalization [22] in causal encoders, projecting each $w_i \in \mathcal{W}$ orthogonally against tokens $u_j \in \mathcal{U}$, yielding w'_i as follows:

$$w'_i = w_i - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\langle w_i, u_j \rangle}{\langle u_j, u_j \rangle} u_j, \quad (5)$$

where $\langle u_i, w_j \rangle$ represents the inner product between u_i and w_j . This transformation ensures that embeddings in \mathcal{W} , embeddings in the latter NP, remain orthogonal to all embeddings in \mathcal{U} , eliminating redundant dependencies while preserving the semantic integrity of reference embeddings in the former NP. For a non-causal text encoder with bidirectional dependencies, we apply a symmetric approach using Löwdin orthogonalization [30], ensuring equitable decorrelation of token embeddings across NPs. Given a token embedding matrix $X = [u_i, w_j]$ spanning different NPs, we compute the orthogonalized pair $X' = [u'_i, w'_j]$ as follows:

$$X' = X(X^\top X)^{-1/2}. \quad (6)$$

The overall process of CAPO is illustrated in Fig. 4a. Leveraging CAPO allows for attributes and objects across NPs to stay separate, which improves semantic binding and maintains compositional consistency during the T2I generation process that involves multiple objects and attributes.

4.2. Adaptive Token Mixing

Building on the insights from Proposition 2, we propose *Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM)*, which adaptively enhances the distinctiveness of CA maps for each NP. Instead of




Figure 4. **The overview illustration of the TeeMo.** TeeMo consists of two main components: Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO) and Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM). **(a)** CAPO extracts token embeddings from each noun phrase (NP) and performs orthogonalization on token pairs based on the causality of the text encoder. For the causal text encoder, an asymmetric orthogonalization method, Schmidt orthogonalization (Schmidt ortho.), is applied. If the encoder is non-causal, a symmetric method, Löwdin orthogonalization (Löwdin ortho.), is used. **(b)** ATM introduces a learnable transformation matrix \mathbf{M} to appropriately mix tokens within each NP, enhancing semantic binding. The \mathbf{M} and latent vectors (Z_t) are optimized with the loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}}$ obtained from the cross-attention (CA) map.

solely controlling token norms, ATM employs a learnable mixing matrix to blend token embedding semantics. This approach not only adjusts token norms but also keeps their intended semantics in NP, thereby improving semantic binding performance, which is illustrated in Fig. 4b.

For a given token embedding set of an NP, $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, we define the matrix $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, where each token embedding vector is stacked along the row dimension and d denotes the embedding dimension. We then initialize a learnable *mixing matrix* $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. The mixing operation is performed as Eq. (7) to generate a new representation $\mathbf{V}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, which is subsequently utilized in both the optimization step and the image synthesis process:

$$\mathbf{V}^* = \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{V}. \quad (7)$$

For example, given an NP with one object with two attributes, such as “red furry cat”, we can construct a token embedding set $\mathcal{V} = \{v_{\text{red}}, v_{\text{furry}}, v_{\text{cat}}\}$, build a token matrix $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times d}$ with \mathcal{V} , and initialize $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{V}} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} v_{\text{red}} \\ v_{\text{furry}} \\ v_{\text{cat}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where the updated token embeddings are computed as:

$$\mathbf{V}^* = \begin{bmatrix} v_{\text{red}}^* \\ v_{\text{furry}}^* \\ v_{\text{cat}}^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}v_{\text{red}} + a_{12}v_{\text{furry}} + a_{13}v_{\text{cat}} \\ a_{21}v_{\text{red}} + a_{22}v_{\text{furry}} + a_{23}v_{\text{cat}} \\ a_{31}v_{\text{red}} + a_{32}v_{\text{furry}} + a_{33}v_{\text{cat}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Our approach adaptively adjusts token norms to capture semantics in NP while enhancing individual token representation. By mixing tokens within an NP, it strengthens entailment relationships, fostering cohesive meaning integration




Figure 5. **Illustration of the effects of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}}$ on two probability distributions, A_1 and A_2 .** (a) As $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}}$ decreases, each distribution, A_1 and A_2 , becomes more condensed. (b) As $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}}$ decreases, the overlap between A_1 and A_2 is reduced.

and reinforcing semantic consistency for more effective semantic binding. In contrast, ToMe [15] merges objects and attributes within a phrase via linear summation, setting attribute token norms to zero and fixing object token norms to predefined values (e.g., 1.1 or 1.2 in their implementation), imposing rigid constraints. Our ATM approach dynamically optimizes the coefficients for mixing and scaling, offering flexibility and significantly improving semantic binding.

4.3. Loss-Guided Condensation and Separation

Recall that effective semantic binding requires condensed and distinct CA maps. We previously introduced necessary conditions and the *ATM*, which leverage the conditions. This structure is optimized via an objective explicitly designed to achieve condensed and distinct CA maps.

For the condensed CA maps, we employ a Shannon entropy [42] loss that encourages attention condensation by minimizing entropy. Given the probability p_i over an A_k of k -th token, the entropy loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}}$ is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}} = - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{p_i \in A_k} p_i \log p_i, \quad (10)$$

Method	BLIP-VQA [17] ↑			GenEval [10] ↑ Color attribute	CIC [2] ↑ ‘2 Obj. exist’	VQAScore [26] ↑	VIEScore [21] ↑
	Color	Texture	Shape				
SDXL [34]	0.6121	0.5568	0.4982	0.2050	0.518	0.7327	7.380
ToMe [15]	0.5404	0.5324	0.2918	0.0175	0.389	0.6451	6.132
StructureDiff _{XL} [8]	0.5092	0.4996	0.4416	0.1375	0.436	0.6924	7.148
A&E _{XL} [1]	0.6309	0.5550	0.5075	0.2325	0.536	0.7333	7.560
SynGen _{XL} [39]	0.6549	0.5734	0.5092	0.1550	0.533	0.7502	7.804
Magnet [53]	0.6839	0.5686	0.5056	0.2875	0.555	0.7870	7.996
TeeMo (Ours)	0.7610	0.6581	0.5472	0.4525	0.639	0.8219	8.328

Table 1. **Quantitative results of semantic binding performance evaluation for T2I generation.** We measure the BLIP-VQA score across three attribute subsets (Color, Texture, Shape) in the T2I-CompBench dataset. Additionally, we evaluate the entity occurrence ratio by measuring the ‘2 objects exist’ case from Chen *et al.* [2] (CIC) on 1,000 generated samples. VQAScore and VIEScore are computed on 250 generated samples, all from the T2I-CompBench. The GenEval score evaluates color alignment on the GenEval dataset. TeeMo demonstrates superior performance without requiring additional training, achieving a **120.7%** improvement over the SDXL in GenEval.

where \mathcal{K} denotes the set of token indices corresponding to objects. As shown in Fig. 5a, this objective facilitates the formation of localized CA maps, ultimately preserving the object-attribute relationships effectively.

To make inter-NP CA map distinct, we introduce Bhattacharyya distance [41] loss, which measures the overlaps between two probability distributions, ensuring distinct attention distributions across phrases. It is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}} = \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{p_i \in A_m, q_i \in A_n} \sqrt{p_i q_i} \right) \right), \quad (11)$$

where \mathcal{S} is the set of object token index pairs in different NPs. As shown in Fig. 5b, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}}$ encourages the formation of mutually exclusive CA maps by reducing the overlap between two CA maps, contributing to semantic binding.

By combining the two previously introduced objectives, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}}$, we formulate the final loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$ as follows, serving as the optimization objective:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{Ent.}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{Bhat.}}, \quad (12)$$

where λ is a coefficient that balances intra-NP condensation and inter-NP separation. With $\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$, we optimized latent vectors and mixing matrix parameter set θ via backpropagation with step size η as $\theta' = \theta - \eta \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$.

Note that other works do not explicitly use overlap as an objective [1, 39] or often rely on pre-defined spatial priors [6, 15] for non-overlap constraints between CA maps. In contrast, our formulation does not incorporate any spatial priors. Instead, it is solely built upon the two key insights we proposed: CA map condensation and separation. We empirically validate the effectiveness of this approach.

5. Experiments

5.1. Experimental Setups

Baselines. To assess TeeMo’s performance, we compare it against multiple baselines: ToMe [15], StructureDiffusion [8] (StructureDiff), Attend-and-Excite [1] (A&E), Syn-

Gen [39], and Magnet [53]. Quantitative comparisons employ SDXL [34], while qualitative analyses additionally use PlayGround-v2 (PlayG-v2) [23] and PixArt- Σ [3]. Notably, SDXL and PlayG-v2 use CLIP [36] as a causal text encoder, whereas PixArt- Σ utilizes T5 [37], a non-causal text encoder. None of the baselines require additional training for the semantic binding task. For automatic NP extraction, we utilize SpaCy [14] to syntactically parse prompts. To ensure fairness, we use official implementations for each approach. For baselines with unsupported base models, we have adapted the implementations as needed (*e.g.*, StructureDiff, A&E, and SynGen). The implementation details of the models are provided in the supplementary (Sec. S4).

Datasets. For quantitative evaluation, we employed T2I-CompBench [17], GenEval [10] color subset, and our 3×3 dataset. T2I-CompBench consists of three subsets—color, texture, and shape—each with 300 prompts. GenEval’s color attribute subset contains 100 prompts describing objects with distinct colors. To further examine TeeMo’s robustness under *multiple attribute scenarios*, we constructed the 3×3 dataset, consisting of structured prompts with two objects, each assigned two attributes, following the template: “a/an {adj.} {adj.} {noun} and a/an {adj.} {adj.} {noun}.” Attributes and nouns from T2I-CompBench were used to generate 200 prompts via an LLM, resulting in 1,200 evaluation prompts. Dataset details are in Sec. S5.

Metrics. We evaluate semantic binding performance using five metrics: BLIP-VQA [17], GenEval [10], CIC [2], VQAScore [26], and VIEScore [21]. BLIP-VQA follows established protocols [9, 15, 16, 18] on the T2I-CompBench dataset [17]. GenEval assesses object-color relationships. CIC utilizes an LLM to quantify information loss, specifically measuring the ‘two objects exist’ scenario in Chen *et al.* [2]. VQAScore employs the clip-flanT5-xxl model for evaluation. In VIEScore, we measured semantic consistency and followed the protocol in the original paper. Evaluations are conducted with five images per prompt, generating a total of 6,000 images per method. Evaluation




Figure 6. **Qualitative comparison of TeeMo against training-free semantic binding baselines across various models.** Unlike baselines which struggle with semantic binding as prompt complexity and attribute counts per object rise, TeeMo consistently produces images accurately aligned with textual descriptions, underscoring its robustness across both simple and intricate prompts.



Figure 7. **Qualitative results of TeeMo with Pixart- Σ as a base model.** As shown in the first row, Pixart- Σ exhibits difficulties in semantic binding despite its use of a large text encoder (T5-XXL) and advanced denoising architecture (DiT). The second row illustrates that TeeMo markedly enhances semantic binding, effectively resolving previously problematic prompts. Importantly, TeeMo remains robust for challenging prompts involving multiple attributes per object, such as the 3x3 scenario, highlighting the efficacy of our approach.

Method	CIC [2] \uparrow '2 Obj. exist'	VQAScore [26] \uparrow	VIEScore [21] \uparrow
SDXL [34]	0.260	0.6886	6.120
ToMe [15]	0.130	0.5357	4.312
StructureDiff _{XL} [8]	0.204	0.6240	5.792
A&E _{XL} [1]	0.275	0.6805	6.248
SynGen _{XL} [39]	0.280	0.6997	6.408
Magnet [53]	0.304	0.6907	6.240
TeeMo (Ours)	0.376	0.7422	7.020

Table 2. **Quantitative results for semantic binding assessment in the challenging 3×3 prompts.** While other semantic binding methods either underperform compared to naïve SDXL or achieve only marginal improvements in the 3 × 3 setting, TeeMo outperforms them by a large margin, achieving gains of up to **44.6%**.

metric details Sec. S6 and other implementation considerations Sec. S4 are provided in the supplementary.

5.2. Comparison

Quantitative comparison. We conduct a comprehensive quantitative comparison of various semantic binding methods using SDXL [34] as the base model. Tab. 1 presents the results obtained from images generated by each method with various metrics. As shown, TeeMo exhibits superior performance across all datasets and metrics, indicating a **120.7%** improvement in the GenEval score compared to the SDXL, clearly validating its enhanced capability. We also evaluate the methods under a more challenging 3×3 prompts, with results in Tab. 2. The results confirm that TeeMo continues to exhibit strong performance even with complex attribute compositions, highlighting its robustness in managing intricate multi-attribute prompts. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that TeeMo demonstrates its competitiveness against existing training-based methods [9, 16, 18, 50], showcasing comparable and, on average, superior BLIP-VQA [17] scores (Sec. S9.1). Additional experiments, including computational cost (Sec. S3) and alternative base model evaluations (Sec. S9.1), are in the supplementary.

Qualitative comparison. We conduct qualitative comparisons between TeeMo and existing semantic binding methods across multiple T2I synthesis models, including SDXL and PlayG-v2, as shown in Fig. 6. The results clearly demonstrate that TeeMo achieves superior semantic binding performance not only in scenarios involving two objects each associated with a single attribute, but also in the more challenging 3×3 scenarios where each object has two attributes, as well as in complex prompt conditions. Furthermore, we extend our experiments to PixArt-Σ, a model that integrates the non-causal text encoder T5 and DiT architecture, with results provided in Fig. 7. These additional results further confirm the generalizability and robustness of TeeMo across diverse model architectures. In addition, we provide various qualitative results, including *uncurated samples*, in the supplementary material Sec. S9.2-S9.3.

Conf.	CAPO	ATM		BLIP-VQA [17] \uparrow			
		$\mathcal{L}_{Ent.}$	$\mathcal{L}_{Bhat.}$	Color	Texture	Shape	Avg.
A	✗	✗	✗	0.5616	0.6446	0.5712	0.5925
B	✓	✗	✗	0.5900	0.6954	0.5910	0.6255
C	✗	✓	✗	0.7346	0.7796	0.6323	0.7155
D	✗	✓	✓	0.7689	0.7798	0.6472	0.7320
E	✓	✓	✗	0.7641	0.8000	0.6415	0.7352
F	✓	✓	✓	0.7576	0.8041	0.6866	0.7494

Table 3. **Ablation study on the T2I-CompBench benchmark.** Ablation studies on CAPO and ATM confirm their significant individual contributions to semantic binding performance. Note that the latent vectors are optimized only when ATM is applied.

5.3. Ablation Study

To validate each component’s effectiveness, we conduct an ablation study on 100 sampled images (20 prompts, 5 images each) from T2I-CompBench using SDXL. Additional ablation studies, including qualitative results for each configuration in Tab. 3, are in the supplementary Sec. S7.

Effectiveness of CAPO. To validate CAPO’s effectiveness, we compare semantic binding performance with and without CAPO, as summarized in Tab. 3. The significant improvement from Conf. A (baseline) to Conf. B (with CAPO only) confirms CAPO’s capability to reduce entanglements and strengthen semantic binding. Further enhancements observed between Conf. D (without CAPO) and Conf. F (Ours) reinforce CAPO’s efficacy.

Effectiveness of ATM with our loss design. In Tab. 3, comparing Conf. A (baseline) and Conf. C ($\mathcal{L}_{Ent.}$ only) shows that entropy loss significantly improves semantic binding performance. Adding the Bhattacharyya distance loss, which forms our total loss design, in Conf. D further enhances the results, validating its synergy with $\mathcal{L}_{Ent.}$. Optimizing the token mixing matrix and latent space with our loss after applying CAPO (in Conf. F), representing TeeMo, achieves the best performance, validating its efficacy.

6. Conclusion

We have proposed TeeMo, a training-free, text embedding-aware attention control method for Text-to-image (T2I) generation of scenes with multiple objects and attributes. Our empirical and theoretical analyses reveal that the geometric properties of text token embeddings such as norms and similarities are crucial for semantic binding. TeeMo integrates Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO) and Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM) with a unique loss design to effectively regularize the attention map, leading to condensing intra-NP and separating inter-NP. Comprehensive experiments across various baselines demonstrate that TeeMo outperforms existing methods across diverse datasets and metrics, highlighting its effectiveness and scalability for strong semantic binding in T2I synthesis.

S1. Proofs

S1.1. Proof of Proposition 1

Proposition 1 (KL Divergence Monotonicity in Distance). *Let $Q = [q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N]$ and suppose that q_a are i.i.d. samples from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. For sufficiently large N , increasing the distance between token embeddings $\|t_i - t_j\|^2$ monotonically increases the Kullback-Leibler divergences $D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j)$ and $D_{KL}(A_j \| A_i)$.*

Proof. We define the attention logit Ω_{ai} and its attention value P_{ai} for a -th latent query token q_a and i -th text token t_i as:

$$\Omega_{ai} = q_a W_K^\top t_i^\top, \quad P_{ai} = \frac{\exp(\Omega_{ai})}{\sum_{i=1}^L \exp(\Omega_{ai})}. \quad (\text{S1})$$

The normalized attention map A_i is defined as:

$$A_i = \frac{P_i}{\|P_i\|_1}, \quad A_{ai} = \frac{P_{ai}}{\sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi}}. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Define the denominator of P_{ai} and P_{aj} as:

$$Z_a = \sum_{m=1}^L \exp(\Omega_{am}). \quad (\text{S3})$$

Then, we can rewrite the normalized attention value as:

$$A_{ai} = \frac{\frac{\exp(q_a W_K^\top t_i^\top)}{Z_a}}{\sum_{b=1}^N \frac{\exp(q_b W_K^\top t_i^\top)}{Z_b}}, \quad A_{aj} = \frac{\frac{\exp(q_a W_K^\top t_j^\top)}{Z_a}}{\sum_{b=1}^N \frac{\exp(q_b W_K^\top t_j^\top)}{Z_b}}. \quad (\text{S4})$$

The Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence D_{KL} of A_i and A_j is defined as:

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) = \sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} \log \frac{A_{ai}}{A_{aj}}. \quad (\text{S5})$$

With Eq. (S4), the term with log in Eq. (S5) can be expressed as:

$$\log \frac{A_{ai}}{A_{aj}} = q_a W_K^\top (t_i - t_j)^\top + \log \left(\frac{\sum_{b=1}^N \frac{\exp(q_b W_K^\top t_j^\top)}{Z_b}}{\sum_{b=1}^N \frac{\exp(q_b W_K^\top t_i^\top)}{Z_b}} \right). \quad (\text{S6})$$

Then, we can simplify Eq. (S6):

$$\log \frac{A_{ai}}{A_{aj}} = q_a W_K^\top (t_i - t_j)^\top + \log \frac{S_j}{S_i}, \quad (\text{S7})$$

where S_i and S_j are defined as:

$$S_i = \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi} = \sum_{b=1}^N \frac{\exp(q_b W_K^\top t_i^\top)}{Z_b}, \quad S_j = \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bj} = \sum_{b=1}^N \frac{\exp(q_b W_K^\top t_j^\top)}{Z_b}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Thus, the KL divergence of A_i and A_j in Eq. (S5) can be represented:

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) = \sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} \left[q_a W_K^\top (t_i - t_j)^\top + \log \frac{S_j}{S_i} \right] \quad (\text{S9})$$

$$= \left(\sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} q_a \right) W_K^\top (t_i - t_j)^\top + \log \frac{S_j}{S_i}. \quad (\text{S10})$$

Since q_a are sampled from i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, and N is large enough to apply the law of large numbers, we can define without loss of generality:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi} = \frac{S_i}{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{q_1}[P_{1i}], \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bj} = \frac{S_j}{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{q_1}[P_{1j}]. \quad (\text{S11})$$

It allows us to simply represent Eq. (S8) and attention A_{ai} as:

$$S_i \approx N\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}], \quad S_j \approx N\mathbb{E}[P_{1j}], \quad A_{ai} \approx \frac{P_{ai}}{N\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]}. \quad (\text{S12})$$

Defining $\bar{q}_{A_i} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} q_a$, we can represent the KL divergence in Eq. (S10) between A_i and A_j with Eq. (S12):

$$\bar{q}_{A_i} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^N \frac{P_{ai}}{N\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]} q_a \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{P_{ai}}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]} q_1 \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i} q_1]}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) &= N \bar{q}_{A_i} W_K^\top (t_i - t_j)^\top + \log \frac{S_j}{S_i} \\ &\approx N \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i} q_1]}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]} \right) W_K^\top (t_i - t_j)^\top + \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1j}]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S14})$$

Due to the complexity results from the softmax, consider a perturbation approach when $t_i \approx t_j$. Let $t_j = t_i + \delta t$, and examine how D_{KL} changes with $\|\delta t\|^2$. With small δt , we can represent Ω_{aj} and P_{aj} as:

$$\Omega_{aj} = q_a W_K^\top (t_i + \delta t)^\top = \Omega_{ai} + q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top, \quad (\text{S15})$$

$$P_{aj} \approx P_{ai} \exp(q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top) / Z'_a, \quad (\text{S16})$$

since Z_a changes by δt . Using a first-order approximation, we can represent:

$$P_{aj} - P_{ai} \approx P_{ai} (q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top), \quad (\text{S17})$$

$$S_j \approx S_i + \sum_{a=1}^N P_{ai} (q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top), \quad (\text{S18})$$

$$A_{aj} \approx \frac{P_{ai} (1 + q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top)}{S_i (1 + \frac{1}{S_i} \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi} q_b W_K^\top \delta t^\top)}, \quad (\text{S19})$$

$$\log \frac{A_{ai}}{A_{aj}} \approx -q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top + \frac{1}{S_i} \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi} q_b W_K^\top \delta t^\top. \quad (\text{S20})$$

Therefore, the KL divergence reduces to:

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) \approx \sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} (-q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top + \frac{1}{S_i} \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi} q_b W_K^\top \delta t^\top) \quad (\text{S21})$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{S_i} \sum_{b=1}^N P_{bi} q_b - \sum_{a=1}^N P_{ai} q_a \right) W_K^\top \delta t^\top. \quad (\text{S22})$$

Since $A_{ai} = P_{ai}/S_i$,

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) \approx N \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^N P_{ai} q_a - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^N P_{ai} q_a \right) W_K^\top \delta t^\top, \quad (\text{S23})$$

indicating a need for higher-order terms. Compute the second-order term:

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) \approx \sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} \left(\frac{1}{2} (q_a W_K^\top \delta t^\top)^2 \right) \quad (\text{S24})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \delta t W_K \left(\sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} q_a^\top q_a \right) W_K^\top \delta t^\top. \quad (\text{S25})$$

For large N , without loss of generality:

$$\sum_{a=1}^N A_{ai} q_a^\top q_a \approx N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{P_{1i} q_a^\top q_a}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]} \right], \quad (\text{S26})$$

which is positive definite, and:

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) \approx \frac{N}{2} \delta t W_K \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{P_{1i} q_a^\top q_a}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]} \right] W_K^\top \delta t^\top. \quad (\text{S27})$$

Let express distance with δt ,

$$\|t_i - t_j\|_2^2 = \delta t \delta t^\top. \quad (\text{S28})$$

We have shown:

$$D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j) \propto \delta t W_K \Sigma' W_K^\top \delta t^\top, \quad (\text{S29})$$

where $\Sigma' = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{P_{1i} q_a^\top q_a}{\mathbb{E}[P_{1i}]} \right]$. Since $W_K \Sigma' W_K^\top$ is positive definite, $D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j)$ increases as $\|t_i - t_j\|_2^2$ increases. Beyond small perturbations, $D_{KL}(A_i \| A_j)$ remains convex in A_j and continues to increase as A_j deviates further from A_i , driven primarily by the growth in $\|t_i - t_j\|_2^2$, aligning with the quadratic approximation. A similar proof holds for $D_{KL}(A_j \| A_i)$. \square

S1.2. Proof of Proposition 2

Proposition 2. Let two token embeddings $t_i, t_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ follow the assumptions 1) $\|t_i\| \approx \|t_j\| = r$ and 2) $\cos \theta_{ij} < 0.5$ where $\cos \theta_{ij} = (t_i t_j^\top / (\|t_i\| \|t_j\|))$. With scalar values $\lambda_i, \lambda_j > 1$, the following holds.

$$\|t_i - t_j\|_2^2 < \|\lambda_i t_i - \lambda_j t_j\|_2^2.$$

Proof. Then with the assumption 1),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\lambda_i t_i - \lambda_j t_j\|_2^2 - \|t_i - t_j\|_2^2 \\ &= r^2 (\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_j^2 + 2(1 - \lambda_i \lambda_j) \cos \theta_{ij} - 2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S30})$$

Since $\lambda_i, \lambda_j > 1$ and with the assumption 2),

$$\begin{aligned} & r^2 (\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_j^2 + 2(1 - \lambda_i \lambda_j) \cos \theta_{ij} - 2) \\ & > r^2 (\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_j^2 - \lambda_i \lambda_j - 1) \\ & > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S31})$$

Therefore, we have proven the following inequality.

$$\|\lambda_i t_i - \lambda_j t_j\|_2^2 - \|t_i - t_j\|_2^2 > 0. \quad (\text{S32})$$

\square

S1.3. Proof of Remark 1

Remark 1 (Norm of token embedding add & sub). Suppose that two token embeddings $t_i, t_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ follow $t_i, t_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_d, \Sigma_d)$ and they satisfy $\|\mu_d\|_2 \ll \|t_i\|_2, \|t_j\|_2$. Then:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2], \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2].$$

Proof. Expanding the squared norm,

$$\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2^2 = \|t_i\|_2^2 + \|t_j\|_2^2 \pm 2t_i \cdot t_j. \quad (\text{S33})$$

Taking expectations and using linearity,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2^2] \pm 2\mathbb{E}[t_i \cdot t_j]. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Since t_i and t_j follow $\mathcal{N}(\mu_d, \Sigma_d)$, their inner product satisfies $\mathbb{E}[t_i \cdot t_j] = \|\mu_d\|_2^2$ and $\|\mu_d\|_2^2 \ll \|t_i\|_2^2, \|t_j\|_2^2$, simplifying to:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2^2] \pm 2\|\mu_d\|_2^2 \quad (\text{S35})$$

$$\approx \mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2^2]. \quad (\text{S36})$$

Applying Jensen's inequality to the square root function,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2] \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2^2]}. \quad (\text{S37})$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2^2]}$ by Jensen's inequality, it follows that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|t_i\|_2], \mathbb{E}[\|t_j\|_2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|t_i \pm t_j\|_2]. \quad (\text{S38})$$

Equality holds when either $t_i = 0$ or $t_j = 0$. □

S2. Additional Analysis

S2.1. Verification of Assumptions

Assumption of norm difference in Proposition 2. In Proposition 2, we assumed that the norms of two token embeddings, t_i and t_j , are approximately similar. To empirically validate this assumption, we conducted experiments on 600 prompts sampled from the T2I Compbench dataset used in BLIP-VQA. Specifically, we quantified the relative norm difference by computing the ratio $2\|t_i\|_2 - \|t_j\|_2 / (\|t_i\|_2 + \|t_j\|_2)$ for each object token embedding pair present in these prompts. The results are depicted in Fig. S1a. As shown in the figure, most computed ratios are close to zero, indicating that the differences in norm between embedding pairs are minimal relative to their magnitudes. These results strongly support the validity of our assumption regarding the similarity of the embedding norms.

Assumption of cosine similarity in Proposition 2. In Proposition 2, we assumed that $\cos \theta_{ij} = \frac{t_i t_j^\top}{\|t_i\| \|t_j\|} < 0.5$. In this section, we present experimental results validating the feasibility of this assumption. Fig. S1b illustrates a histogram of $\cos \theta_{ij}$ values computed between object token embeddings t_i and t_j , corresponding to different NPs across 600 prompts from the BLIP-VQA dataset. As seen in the figure, the majority of token embedding pairs satisfy the stated condition. The few prompts that violate this condition typically correspond to cases where both tokens represent the same object category (e.g., “a plastic chair and a wooden chair”). Since such cases are rare, these results demonstrate the validity of our assumption.

Assumption of norm in Remark 1 Text encoders utilized in TeeMo enforce a Gaussian distribution through a layer normalization module before producing final embeddings. In the case of the T5 encoder [37], due to the absence of bias terms in layer norm, two token embeddings t_i and t_j naturally satisfy $\mathbb{E}[t_i \cdot t_j] = 0$, making the remark hold, without requiring specific constraints on μ_d . However, the CLIP text encoder [36] incorporates bias terms during the layer normalization step, causing μ_d to deviate from the zero vector. Hence, we analyze whether the embeddings extracted from the CLIP text encoder satisfy the assumption stated in Remark 1, namely, $\|\mu_d\|_2 \ll \|t_i\|^2, \|t_j\|^2$. The results of this analysis in 600 prompts from the T2I Compbench dataset are presented in Fig. S1c. As shown in the figure, the norm $\|\mu_d\|_2$ is approximately 12.5, significantly smaller compared to the norms of individual embeddings. This result supports the compatibility of the CLIP text encoder embeddings with our assumption.

S2.2. Token Embedding Scaling in Baselines

Prompt-to-prompt. Prompt-to-prompt [12] (P2P) performs image editing by controlling the degree of attribute expression in the generated image through cross-attention re-weighting. This can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AttentionRe-weight} &= \alpha_i \cdot \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V \\ &\approx \text{softmax}\left(\frac{Q(\alpha_i \cdot K)^\top}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)(\alpha_i \cdot V), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S39})$$

where α_i is a vector whose elements are set to a user-specified scalar value at the token index i intended for re-weighting, with all other elements set to 1. This approach is equivalent to scaling the value matrix V . Since the vectors used as inputs for key and value projections remain identical as text embeddings, and the projections for keys and values are linear, this operation can ultimately be interpreted as scaling the original text embeddings.

Magnet. Magnet [53] obtains an embedding vector \hat{e}_i , used for Text-to-Image (T2I) synthesis, by linearly combining the original embedding e_i with positive (v_i^{pos}) and negative embedding vectors (v_i^{neg}) derived from a pre-defined dataset. This procedure can be formulated as follows:

$$\hat{e}_i = e_i + \alpha_i \cdot v_i^{\text{pos}} - \beta_i \cdot v_i^{\text{neg}}. \quad (\text{S40})$$

According to Remark 1, this approach yields results exactly equivalent to scaling the embedding of the i -th token, thereby improving semantic binding performance.

ToMe. One of the key approaches of ToMe [15] is leveraging semantic additivity to create a single token embedding representing a noun phrase (NP) by linearly combining tokens corresponding to attributes and objects within that NP. Given an NP token vector set $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$, where u_1 denotes the object token embedding, ToMe computes the merged token embedding u_{mer} , as follows:

$$u_{\text{mer}} = \alpha \cdot u_1 + \beta \cdot \sum_{i=2}^n u_i, \quad (\text{S41})$$

where α and β are scalar values greater than 1, fixed as $\alpha = 1.1$ and $\beta = 1.2$ in their implementation. According to Remark 1, this also results in an effect of increasing the magnitude of the token embedding.

S2.3. Additional Analysis Results

Effect of MSE in semantic binding. In the main paper, we theoretically and empirically demonstrated the impact of the distance between tokens belonging to distinct noun phrases (NPs) on semantic binding. In this section,




Figure S1. **(a)** Histogram of the norm differences and norm ratios. Most values are concentrated around 0, and the largest value is below 0.02, indicating that norm differences between token embedding pairs are extremely small. **(b)** Histogram of cosine similarity between object token embeddings located in different noun phrases (NPs) within the text prompt set for BLIP-VQA. It can be observed that most token embedding pairs have similarities lower than 0.5. **(c)** Comparison between the histogram of norms of token embeddings and $\|\mu_d\|_2$. While $\|\mu_d\|_2$ is relatively small (12.5), most token embeddings exhibit norms greater than 400, confirming that the assumption $\|\mu_d\|_2 \ll \|t_i\|_2, \|t_j\|_2$ holds true for the CLIP text encoder.




Figure S2. **Additional qualitative results illustrating the impact of Mean-Squared Error (MSE) on semantic binding performance.** Consistent with the main manuscript, it can be observed that smaller MSE between token embeddings correlate with increased difficulty in achieving proper semantic binding.

we extend these experiments to investigate whether similar trends and outcomes hold true for a broader set of prompts. As illustrated in Fig. S2, a higher mean squared error (MSE)—which can be viewed as equivalent to distance due to the fixed dimensionality—between two tokens clearly correlates with more distinct cross-attention maps and improved semantic binding. These results align well with Proposition 1 introduced in the main text, further substantiating the motivation behind Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO) and Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM).

Norm scaling. We have empirically and theoretically demonstrated that scaling the token norm improves under-

represented semantics and enhances semantic binding in the main manuscript. In this section, we provide further empirical evidence supporting this finding. As illustrated in the Fig. S3, this phenomenon consistently occurs irrespective of the architectures of the text encoder and denoising network. This observation, reinforced by our theoretical analysis, confirms once again that the phenomenon inherently arises from the fundamental properties of the cross-attention mechanism.

Cross-attention maps of TeeMo. We developed our method aiming to ensure that tokens belonging to different noun phrases (NPs) possess distinct cross-attention (CA) maps during the denoising process. In this section, we qualitatively demonstrate whether tokens corresponding to each object in images generated by TeeMo indeed exhibit distinct attention maps. As shown in Fig. S4, despite the presence of multiple objects and diverse attributes describing each object, tokens representing individual objects display mutually exclusive and clear attention maps. These results confirm the effectiveness of our objectives and methods.

S3. Efficiency

To evaluate the efficiency of TeeMo, we measured the inference time and peak memory usage of each method and present the results in Tab. S1. The evaluation was conducted on an Nvidia A100 GPU using the average of 10 prompts. We used the same guidance scale and sampling steps as in the main paper. In terms of inference time, TeeMo achieved an inference time of 22.3 seconds, which is the fastest among optimization-based approaches (A&E, SynGen, and ToMe). For peak memory usage, it recorded 14.1 GB, ranking third with a minimal difference from SDXL (10.7 GB), while maintaining the best performance in semantic binding. These results demonstrate that our method not only outperforms existing approaches but also efficiently handles




Figure S3. **Additional qualitative results further illustrate the effectiveness of norm scaling on semantic binding.** Beyond the examples presented in the main manuscript, we observe consistent effects across various models, including Stable Diffusion 1.5, SDXL, and PixArt- Σ , and across diverse prompts. Notably, even in cases of semantic leakage (e.g., “a blue bench,” “a green suitcase”) norm scaling effectively mitigates the leakage, reinforcing its role in improving semantic binding.



Figure S4. **Visualization of images generated by TeeMo with various input prompts, along with their corresponding cross-attention (CA) maps for object tokens within each prompt.** Consistent with our discussion, CA maps for images generated by TeeMo show minimal overlap and distinct separation, confirming that TeeMo effectively achieves clear semantic binding.

the semantic binding task.

S4. Implementation Details

Background of Diffusion Models. Latent Diffusion Models (LDMs) perform denoising in the latent space, significantly reducing computational cost while preserving im-

Method	Sampling Steps	Time ↓ (sec.)	Peak Memory ↓ (GB)
SDXL [34]	50	6.00	10.7
ToMe [15]	50	30.6	20.4
StructureDiff _{XL} [8]	50	6.14	11.1
A&E _{XL} [1]	50	37.0	29.3
SynGen _{XL} [39]	50	23.6	20.3
Magnet [53]	50	5.67	11.1
TeeMo (Ours)	50	22.3	14.1

Table S1. **Computation costs of TeeMo compared to baseline methods.** Sampling time was measured exclusively during the inference steps following the parsing stage, and peak memory usage was measured using `torch.cuda.max_memory_allocated()` to assess the precise memory usage.

age quality. A pre-trained encoder ϕ maps an image x to its latent representation $z = \phi(x)$, and a decoder ψ reconstructs it, ensuring $\psi(z) \approx x$. The forward diffusion process gradually adds Gaussian noise to z , producing noisy latents z_t over timesteps $t = 1, \dots, T$. A denoising network ϵ_θ learns to remove this noise by minimizing $\|\epsilon_\theta(z_t, t) - \epsilon_t\|^2$, where $z_t = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}z_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t}\epsilon$, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where $\bar{\alpha}_t$ is the cumulative product of α from 0 to t as defined in DDPM [13]. During inference, $z_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is progressively denoised into z_0 and decoded back into an image.

TeeMo operates within the framework of Text-to-Image (T2I) generation and builds upon LDMs, leveraging a pre-trained CLIP text encoder \mathcal{E} to process input prompts. Given a prompt \mathcal{P} , the encoder maps it to an embedding $c = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$, which conditions the diffusion process through cross-attention layers. The loss function $\|\epsilon_\theta(z_t, t, c) - \epsilon_t\|^2$ ensures semantic alignment between text and image while maintaining structural integrity in the latent space.

Base models. SDXL [34], PlayGround-v2 (PlayG-v2) [23], and PixArt- Σ [3] are state-of-the-art AI models

designed for high-quality image generation. SDXL (Stable Diffusion XL) is an enhanced version of Stable Diffusion [40], leveraging a Latent Diffusion Model (LDM) architecture with an improved Text-to-Image synthesis capability, enabling higher resolution outputs and more detailed visual representations. PlayGround-v2 also utilizes an LDM-based approach and incorporates a CLIP text encoder, which allows for effective conditioning on textual prompts. Both models inherit causality properties, meaning that later tokens retain the semantic information of preceding tokens [36]. In contrast, PixArt- Σ is based on a Diffusion Transformer (DiT) [32] architecture and employs a T5-XXL [37] text encoder, which differs from CLIP in that it follows a non-causal structure. This design choice allows PixArt- Σ to generate high-resolution, photorealistic images with improved efficiency and semantic coherence. These models represent significant advancements in AI-driven image synthesis, catering to both artistic and functional applications.

Comparison methods. To assess the effectiveness of our method, we compare it against state-of-the-art approaches in semantic binding tasks for T2I generation. The comparison is categorized into two groups: (i) Latent optimization-based methods, including Attend & Excite (A&E) [1] and SynGen [39]; (ii) Token-based methods, including ToMe [15], StructureDiffusion (StructureDiff) [8], and Magnet [53].

Among these, StructureDiff and A&E were originally designed for Stable Diffusion (SD) 1.4, SynGen was developed for SD 1.5, and ToMe, and Magnet were implemented based on SDXL. To ensure a fair comparison, we adapted each method’s implementation to be compatible with SDXL and PlayG-v2. A&E was applied using subject token indices within the prompt, while ToMe incorporated subject token indices along with their corresponding adjective tokens and prompt anchors. For consistency across all models, we applied SpaCy’s dependency parser to refine and align inputs with our framework while preserving each method’s original design. These adaptations ensured a fair benchmarking process and a reliable evaluation of semantic binding performance. For ToMe ¹ and Magnet ², we utilized their official PyTorch implementations. For A&E ³, we re-implemented the SDXL version based on the Huggingface implementation. Similarly, for StructureDiff ⁴ and SynGen ⁵, we implemented the SDXL version based on

¹<https://github.com/hutaihang/ToMe>

²<https://github.com/I2-Multimedia-Lab/Magnet>

³https://huggingface.co/docs/diffusers/api/pipelines/attend_and_excite

⁴<https://github.com/weixi-feng/Structured-Diffusion-Guidance?tab=readme-ov-file>

⁵<https://github.com/RoyiRa/Linguistic-Binding-in-Diffusion-Models>

their official implementations. Noticeably, there is a significant discrepancy between the performance of ToMe reported in the original paper and the performance we measured. Through meticulous verification, we confirmed that there were no differences between their implementation and the methodology described in the paper. Additionally, we found multiple reports on the official GitHub repository indicating issues with reproducing the claimed performance. Therefore, to facilitate a comprehensive comparison across various metrics not reported by ToMe, we conducted experiments based on the official implementation.

Other implementation considerations. To prevent excessive growth in token embedding norms within Adaptive Token Mixing (ATM), we applied appropriate clamping to the mixing matrix M during optimization. Additionally, we empirically observed that jointly optimizing the end token (EOT) and padding tokens (PAD), which encapsulate global semantic and contextual information respectively [15, 46], leads to better control of the cross-attention maps for word tokens within a prompt. So, we applied this optimization, whereas it was not used in PlayG-v2 or PixArt- Σ . For our total loss design, the lambda coefficient was set to 0.01 for SDXL and PlayG-v2, and 0.05 for PixArt- Σ . Regarding sampling hyperparameters, we used 50 steps with a guidance scale of 7.5 for SDXL, 50 steps with a guidance scale of 2.0 for PlayG-v2, and 20 steps with a guidance scale of 4.0 for PixArt- Σ . All experiments were conducted on an Nvidia A100 GPU.

S5. Dataset

In our experiments, we use three datasets: 1) T2I-CompBench, 2) GenEval, and 3) the 3×3 prompts dataset. The sample prompts are provided in Fig. S5.

T2I-CompBench. T2I-CompBench is a benchmark designed to evaluate compositional understanding in text-to-image (T2I) generation models. It consists of structured prompts that assess a model’s ability to accurately bind attributes to objects, ensuring proper semantic alignment in multi-object, multi-attribute scenarios. The dataset is categorized into three subsets—color, texture, and shape—each containing 300 prompts, including 240 relatively simple prompts and 60 longer, more complex ones. By providing diverse and challenging text prompts, T2I-CompBench serves as a rigorous testbed for measuring semantic binding and mitigating semantic neglect and attribute misassignment issues commonly observed in T2I models.

For evaluation, each prompt is tested with five random seeds, generating a total of 300×3 subsets \times 5 seeds = 4500 images. The BLIP-VQA score is computed across the full prompts of the three attribute subsets in T2I-CompBench.

The CIC metric is evaluated on 200 randomly selected prompts (totaling 1000 generated images with five seeds), while VQAScore and VIEScore are computed using 50 sampled prompts (totaling 250 generated images with five seeds), all from T2I-CompBench.

GenEval dataset. The GenEval dataset comprises 100 prompts (totaling 500 generated images with five seeds) designed for color alignment evaluation and is used to compute the GenEval metric proposed in the original study.

3×3 prompts. For the 3×3 prompts dataset, we construct 200 prompts using words from T2I-CompBench, following the template “a/an {adj.} {adj.} {noun} and a/an {adj.} {adj.} {noun}.” These prompts are generated using an GPT-4o as a LLM. Each prompt is evaluated with five seeds, resulting in a total of 1000 generated images for assessment.

S6. Evaluation Metric Details

BLIP-VQA. The BLIP-VQA metric in T2I-CompBench [17] uses BLIP [24]’s visual question answering module to assess whether a generated image accurately reflects the intended prompt. It queries the BLIP model with predefined questions about objects, attributes, and relationships, and measures alignment based on answer correctness. Compared to simpler metrics like CLIP-Score, BLIP-VQA offers finer insight into whether specific objects or attributes are missing or misrepresented, thus providing a more precise measure of compositional alignment. In our work, we also employ BLIP-VQA on T2I-CompBench subsets, following prior approaches [9, 15, 16, 18].

GenEval. GenEval is a comprehensive evaluation metric designed to assess how effectively a Text-to-Image (T2I) generative model aligns its generated images with corresponding textual prompts. In this study, GenEval was utilized to evaluate whether image synthesis outputs produced by the compressed text encoder accurately reflect their intended textual descriptions. The GenEval metric consists of six distinct sub-metrics: Single Object Generation, assessing the model’s capability to generate images from prompts containing a single object (e.g., ‘a photo of a giraffe’); Two Objects Generation, evaluating image generation from prompts involving two distinct objects (e.g., ‘a photo of a knife and a stop sign’); Counting, measuring accuracy in representing the specified quantity of objects (e.g., ‘a photo of three apples’); Colors, verifying the accurate depiction of colors specified in the prompts (e.g., ‘a photo of a pink car’); Position, testing the model’s comprehension of spatial relationships described within prompts (e.g., ‘a photo of a sofa under a cup’); and Color Attribution, assessing the correct assignment of specified colors to multiple objects

(e.g., ‘a photo of a black car and a green parking meter’). In our evaluation, we specifically employed the “Color Attribution” metric to measure semantic binding performance in image generation, with random seeds.

CIC. The evaluation metric proposed by Chen *et al.* [2], referred to as CIC (named after the paper title “A Cat Is A Cat”), quantifies information loss and object mixture issues in Text-to-Image (T2I) diffusion models more accurately than existing methods, such as CLIP-based similarity scores. Unlike the CLIP score, CLIP-BLIP score, and bounding box overlap-based measures, which struggle to precisely assess object presence and mixture, CIC leverages OWL-ViT, an open-vocabulary object detection model, for more robust evaluation. It classifies generated images based on whether objects are fully present, mixed, or missing. In this paper, we specifically apply CIC to assess TeeMo’s object neglect issue, restricting our evaluation to the ‘2 objects exist’ case as a hard metric and reporting the results in Tab. 1, Tab. 2, and Tab. S2.

VQAScore. VQAScore [26] is a metric for evaluating Text-to-Visual generation by leveraging visual-question-answering (VQA) models to assess image-text alignment. Unlike CLIPScore, which struggles with complex compositional prompts, VQAScore computes alignment by estimating the probability of a “Yes” response to a structured question like “Does this figure show text?”. This approach, implemented with open-source VQA models, achieves state-of-the-art performance across multiple benchmarks, surpassing proprietary models like GPT-4o. Additionally, the study introduces GenAI-Bench, a benchmark with 1,600 compositional prompts and 15,000+ human ratings, further validating VQAScore’s reliability.

VIEScore. VIEScore [21] proposes a framework called Visual Instruction-guided Explainable Score for evaluating conditional image synthesis. It introduces a general assessment methodology and compares its alignment with existing metrics and human judgments across tasks like Text-to-Image generation, image editing, and subject-driven image generation. Leveraging the reasoning capabilities of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs), VIEScore enables training-free evaluation. TeeMo’s VIEScore metric employs the “Text-Guided Image Generation” prompt template from the Semantic Consistency (SC) Rating Prompt Template using GPT-4o, sourced from the original VIEScore paper’s supplementary materials.

S7. Additional Ablation Studies

Additional qualitative results. In addition to the quantitative results presented in the main text, we also report

T2I-CompBench (Color subset)
<p>a green bench and a blue cake. a brown horse and a blue vase. a blue cake and a red suitcase. a brown bowl and a blue elephant. A red carpet in a bathroom with white fixtures. A blue scooter is parked near a curb in front of a green vintage car. A dining area features a wood table and chairs, a silver refrigerator and light brown cabinets. ...</p>
T2I-CompBench (Texture subset)
<p>a plastic toy and a glass bottle. rubber sole shoes and fluffy clouds. a metallic desk lamp and a fluffy sweater. a rubber band and a wooden floor. The fluffy towel and metallic hook hang on the wooden hook by the glass shower. The glass ornament and wooden hook decorate the metallic Christmas tree on the fabric skirt. The metallic pen and fluffy notebook jot down ideas on the wooden desk. ...</p>
T2I-CompBench (Shape subset)
<p>a cubic ice cube and a spherical ice bucket. an oblong eggplant and a teardrop melon. a cubic block and a cylindrical bottle. a triangular slice of cheese and a rectangular cheese board. The pentagonal prism and the pyramidal tetrahedron were the shapes of the crystals in the museum exhibit. A triangular plane and a circular hot air balloon floated in the sky. The long river and the short stream flowed through the picturesque valley. ...</p>
GenEval Dataset
<p>a photo of a purple wine glass and a black apple. a photo of a green bus and a purple microwave. a photo of a yellow computer keyboard and a black sink. a photo of a pink oven and a green motorcycle. a photo of a purple parking meter and a red laptop. a photo of a yellow skateboard and an orange computer mouse. a photo of a black bus and a brown cell phone. ...</p>
3×3 Prompts Dataset (challenging dataset)
<p>a green fluffy dog and a blue metallic cat. a red wooden car and a yellow plastic boat. a silver soft boat and a brown metallic dog. a red wooden apple and a black plastic giraffe. a yellow fluffy banana and a white metallic clock. a gold leather chair and a purple glass cat. a brown wooden dog and a yellow plastic banana. ...</p>

Figure S5. **Example prompts used in our experiments.** We utilize T2I-CompBench for BLIP-VQA, VQAScore, and VIEScore evaluations, the GenEval color-attribute dataset for GenEval score assessment, and 3×3 prompts—generated from the adjectives and nouns in T2I-CompBench—to evaluate TeeMo’s performance in challenging scenarios.



Figure S6. **Qualitative results demonstrating the limitations of TeeMo.** The four generated images on the left illustrate cases where TeeMo struggles when multiple attributes describe a single object. The four synthesized images on the right highlight failure cases inherited from the base diffusion model, specifically in handling counting and spatial relationships.

qualitative results for each configuration. We provide qualitative results for color, texture, and shape from the T2I-CompBench, as illustrated in the Fig. S9, Fig. S10, and Fig. S11. As shown in the results, each component of TeeMo contributes to the performance of semantic binding.

Ablation study on a causality awareness. Through Causality-Aware Projection Out (CAPO), we increased the angular distance by employing asymmetric orthogonalization via Schmidt orthogonalization for causal text encoders, thus accounting for the unidirectional nature of information flow within these encoders. Conversely, for non-causal text encoders, we increased the angular distance by applying symmetric orthogonalization through Löwdin orthogonalization, effectively considering the bidirectional exchange of information. To verify the effectiveness of these causality-aware orthogonalization methods, we applied Löwdin orthogonalization to SDXL [34], which employs a causal text encoder (CLIP [36]), and Schmidt orthogonalization to PixArt- Σ [4], which uses a non-causal text encoder (T5-XXL [37]). The corresponding results are presented in the Fig. S7 for SDXL, and Fig. S8 for PixArt- Σ , confirming the validity of our orthogonalization strategies based on text encoder causality. In these experiments, all other components of TeeMo were kept unchanged, except for the orthogonalization methods.

S8. Limitations

While TeeMo provides an efficient and effective solution to the attribute binding problem, it has inherent limitations. Fig. S6 presents failure cases that illustrate key challenges. Although our method effectively controls attention, generated images may still exhibit missing attributes or objects and attribute leakage for prompts with a large number of attributes (columns 1-4). This is likely due to the increased complexity of the loss landscape as the number of cross-attention maps to be controlled increases, making optimization more challenging. Another limitation is TeeMo’s occasional misalignment of positional or numerical relationships (columns 5-8), where the generated concepts are semantically correct but incorrectly positioned or

counted. This limitation stems from the inherent difficulty of the pretrained diffusion models in precisely capturing spatial and numerical relationships within complex scenes. As our focus lies primarily on the semantic binding problem, these inherent limitations of diffusion models persist in our approach. These limitations, while varying in severity, are well-documented challenges in the semantic binding domain [39, 53]. We leave these challenges as future work.

S9. Additional Results

S9.1. Additional Quantitative Results

Other base model. In the main manuscript, we measured the semantic binding performance of various methods across multiple metrics, using SDXL as the base model. In this section, we examine quantitative results obtained by applying TeeMo and previous works to the Playground-v2 (PlayG-v2) model. The experimental outcomes are presented in the Tab. S2, demonstrating that TeeMo maintains superior performance across different base models.

Comparison with training requiring methods. TeeMo performs semantic binding through an optimization process at inference time without requiring any training. While prior approaches have aimed to enhance semantic binding performance through extensive training [9, 16, 18, 50], we validate the effectiveness of TeeMo by comparing it against these training-requiring methods. The results, presented in Tab. S3, include training-based methods implemented using SDXL [34] as the base model. Since all models are closed-source, we directly report numerical results from the respective papers. Notably, while WiCLIP [50] does not provide SDXL experimental results in the main paper, such results were disclosed during the review process⁶, and we include them in our report. Despite being entirely training-free, TeeMo achieves performance on par with or even surpassing training-dependent methods. In particular, TeeMo establishes a new state-of-the-art in the average performance across three subsets of BLIP-VQA, further demonstrating its effectiveness.

⁶<https://openreview.net/forum?id=QVBeBpsmy0>

Method	Base Model	BLIP-VQA [17] \uparrow			CIC [2] \uparrow '2 Obj. exist'	VQAScore [26] \uparrow
		Color	Texture	Shape		
PlayG-v2 [23]	-	0.5743	0.5832	0.4849	0.463	0.7964
ToMe _{PGv2} [18]	PlayG-v2	0.1951	0.2511	0.1705	0.065	0.3527
StructureDiff _{PGv2} [8]		0.4820	0.5146	0.4234	0.376	0.6762
A&E _{PGv2} [1]		0.5637	0.5859	0.4886	0.471	0.7971
SynGen _{PGv2} [39]		0.5792	0.5625	0.4661	0.438	0.7924
Magnet _{PGv2} [53]		0.6630	0.5864	0.4849	0.488	0.7911
TeeMo (Ours)		0.6464	0.6152	0.5181	0.499	0.8078

Table S2. Additional quantitative results of semantic binding assessment are presented across diverse benchmarks for Text-to-Image (T2I) generation, using PlayG-v2 [23] as the base model. Since the comparison methods did not include PlayG-v2 as a baseline in their experiments, we implemented PlayG-v2 for each method ourselves ($\{each\ method\}_{PGv2}$). The best scores are in *red*, second-best in *orange*, and third-best in *yellow*. TeeMo, built on PlayG-v2 as the base model, achieves superior performance across most metrics without the need for additional training.

Method	Training free	BLIP-VQA [17] \uparrow			
		Color	Texture	Shape	Avg.
SDXL [34]	✓	0.6121	0.5568	0.4983	0.5557
Ranni* [9]	✗	0.6893	0.6325	0.4934	0.6051
WiCLIP* [50]	✗	0.7801	0.6557	0.5166	0.6058
ELLA* [16]	✗	0.7260	0.6686	0.5634	0.6527
CoMat* [18]	✗	0.7872	0.6468	0.5329	0.6541
TeeMo (Ours)	✓	0.7610	0.6581	0.5472	0.6555

Table S3. **Performance comparison between TeeMo and methods requiring training.** The results reported for these training-based methods were obtained directly from their respective papers (indicated as *), as their implementations are closed-source. Notably, the results for WiCLIP using SDXL as the base model were not provided in their main paper but were instead obtained from the reviews. Despite being fully training-free, TeeMo achieves performance on par with or surpassing methods that require extensive training resources.

S9.2. Additional Qualitative Results

We provide additional qualitative comparisons on both the T2I CompBench dataset and our proposed 3×3 dataset. These experiments were conducted under the same settings as in the main manuscript for SDXL and PlayG-v2, with results illustrated in the Fig. S12, Fig. S13, Fig. S14, Fig. S15, and Fig. S16. The presented outcomes demonstrate that TeeMo achieves superior performance compared to various alternative methods. Additionally, we provide further qualitative results for PixArt- Σ with a broader set of prompts, as shown in the Fig. S17. These results clearly indicate that TeeMo robustly operates across diverse denoising model architectures (U-Net vs. DiT) and varying types of text encoder causality. Additionally, we conducted experiments using prompts containing four objects, each with their own attributes, and these results are presented in Fig. S18. Note that ours is the first work to report results for four objects

without spatial guidance. While existing methods typically experience decreased semantic binding performance as the number of objects increases, TeeMo demonstrates excellent semantic binding capability even under these challenging conditions.

S9.3. Uncurated Samples

In T2I synthesis, the random seed significantly affects not only the quality of generated images but also several critical aspects of semantic binding performance. Although we have quantitatively verified the robustness of TeeMo through evaluations involving thousands of images, we further provide qualitative evidence of TeeMo’s robustness by presenting uncurated samples. Specifically, for each of the 11 prompts, we performed 50 purely random image generations without selecting any manual seed sets, and the resulting images are presented in the Fig. S19, Fig. S20, Fig. S21, Fig. S22, Fig. S23, Fig. S24, Fig. S25, Fig. S26, Fig. S27, Fig. S28, and Fig. S29. These results clearly demonstrate that TeeMo achieves robust semantic binding across diverse input prompts.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by Institute of Information & communications Technology Planning & Evaluation (IITP) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) [NO. RS-2021-II211343, Artificial Intelligence Graduate School Program (Seoul National University)] and National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. NRF-2022M3C1A309202211). Also, the authors acknowledged the financial support from the BK21 FOUR program of the Education and Research Program for Future ICT Pioneers, Seoul National University.




Figure S7. **Qualitative results illustrating the effectiveness of causality awareness in CAPO using the SDXL model.** As SDXL utilizes a causal text encoder (CLIP text encoder), CAPO applies Schmidt orthogonalization. The results presented here show outcomes when Löwdin orthogonalization, which is causality-unaware, is applied within TeeMo. As demonstrated, the absence of causality awareness frequently leads to object neglect or worse semantic binding performance.




Figure S8. **Qualitative results illustrating the effectiveness of causality awareness in CAPO using the PixArt- Σ model.** Since PixArt- Σ employs a non-causal text encoder (T5 text encoder), CAPO utilizes Löwdin orthogonalization. The presented results show cases where Schmidt orthogonalization—which assumes causality—is incorrectly applied within TeeMo. As shown, neglecting causality-awareness leads to object neglect or inadequate semantic binding.



Figure S9. **Qualitative results of the ablation study for each configuration on the “Color” subset of T2I-CompBench.** With CAPO, the frequency of generating irrelevant or missing objects decreases significantly. Furthermore, as each component is incrementally added, images become increasingly aligned with the text prompt, demonstrating improved attribute binding. Ultimately, configuration F exhibits the best overall performance.



Figure S10. **Qualitative results of the ablation study for each configuration on the “Texture” subset of T2I-CompBench.** With CAPO, the frequency of generating irrelevant or missing objects decreases significantly. Furthermore, as each component is incrementally added, images become increasingly aligned with the text prompt, demonstrating improved attribute binding. Ultimately, configuration F exhibits the best overall performance.



Figure S11. **Qualitative results of the ablation study for each configuration on the “Shape” subset of T2I-CompBench.** With CAPO, the frequency of generating irrelevant or missing objects decreases significantly. Furthermore, as each component is incrementally added, images become increasingly aligned with the text prompt, demonstrating improved attribute binding. Ultimately, configuration F exhibits the best overall performance.




Figure S12. **Qualitative comparison of TeeMo against other baseline methods using the SDXL as a base model on the T2I-CompBench dataset.** The prompts used in this comparison consist of relatively simple cases, each containing two objects with a single descriptive attribute per object, covering diverse examples across color, texture, and shape. This comparison confirms that TeeMo achieves superior semantic binding performance, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively.




Figure S13. **Qualitative comparison of TeeMo against other baseline methods using the SDXL as a base model on our 3×3 dataset.** The prompts used in this comparison consist of relatively simple cases, each containing two objects with a single descriptive attribute per object, covering diverse examples across color, texture, and shape. This comparison confirms that TeeMo achieves superior semantic binding performance, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively.




Figure S14. **Qualitative comparison of TeeMo against other baseline methods using the PlayGround-v2 as a base model on the T2I-CompBench dataset.** The prompts used in this comparison consist of relatively simple cases, each containing two objects with a single descriptive attribute per object, covering diverse examples across color, texture, and shape. This comparison confirms that TeeMo achieves superior semantic binding performance, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively.




Figure S15. **Qualitative comparison of TeeMo against other baseline methods using the PlayGround-v2 as a base model on our 3×3 dataset.** The prompts used in this comparison consist of relatively simple cases, each containing two objects with a single descriptive attribute per object, covering diverse examples across color, texture, and shape. This comparison confirms that TeeMo achieves superior semantic binding performance, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively.




Figure S16. **Qualitative comparison of TeeMo against other baseline methods using the SDXL and PlayGround-v2 as a base models on the T2I-CompBench dataset.** The prompts used in this comparison consist of relatively complex cases, containing multiple objects, attributes and environment, covering diverse examples across color, texture, and shape. This comparison confirms that TeeMo achieves superior semantic binding performance, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively.




Figure S17. **Qualitative results of applying TeeMo using PixArt- Σ as the base model.** TeeMo demonstrates strong performance not only on simple prompts but also on challenging prompts such as the 3×3 configuration. These results show that TeeMo performs effectively even with PixArt- Σ , which employs a non-causal text encoder and the DiT architecture.



Figure S18. **Qualitative comparisons on highly complex prompts involving four distinct objects, each described by individual attributes.** Despite the complexity arising from multiple objects and diverse attributes, TeeMo consistently achieves excellent semantic binding performance, accurately reflecting each object and its associated attributes in the generated images.



Figure S19. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt “a photo of a blue backpack and a brown cow”. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.



Figure S20. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a blue bench and a green cake"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.



Figure S21. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a pink bear and a yellow book"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.



Figure S22. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a red cake and a blue suitcase"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.

“a photo of a round muffin and a square napkin”



Figure S23. **50 random, uncensored images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt “a photo of a round muffin and a square napkin”. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.



Figure S24. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a big bear and a small squirrel"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.




Figure S25. **50 random, uncensored images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a cubic block and a cylindrical bottle"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.



Figure S26. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a fabric bag and a glass vase"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.

"a photo of a wooden pencils and a leather sofa"




Figure S27. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of wooden pencils and a leather sofa"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.




Figure S28. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a wooden spoon and a fabric rug"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.




Figure S29. **50 random, uncurated images generated by TeeMo.** The images were generated from the input prompt *"a photo of a plastic cup and a leather hat"*. Note that we generated 50 images regardless of their quality and directly report the results. These results demonstrate that TeeMo robustly performs semantic binding across diverse generations.

References

- [1] Hila Chefer, Yuval Alaluf, Yael Vinker, Lior Wolf, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Attend-and-excite: Attention-based semantic guidance for text-to-image diffusion models. *ACM TOG*, 2023. 1, 2, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20
- [2] Chieh-Yun Chen, Chiang Tseng, Li-Wu Tsao, and Hong-Han Shuai. A cat is a cat (not a dog!): Unraveling information mix-ups in text-to-image encoders through causal analysis and embedding optimization. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 17, 20
- [3] Junsong Chen, Chongjian Ge, Enze Xie, Yue Wu, Lewei Yao, Xiaozhe Ren, Zhongdao Wang, Ping Luo, Huchuan Lu, and Zhenguo Li. Pixart- σ : Weak-to-strong training of diffusion transformer for 4k text-to-image generation. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 6, 15
- [4] Junsong Chen, Jincheng Yu, Chongjian Ge, Lewei Yao, Enze Xie, Zhongdao Wang, James T Kwok, Ping Luo, Huchuan Lu, and Zhenguo Li. Pixart- α : Fast training of diffusion transformer for photorealistic text-to-image synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 19
- [5] Minghao Chen, Iro Laina, and Andrea Vedaldi. Training-free layout control with cross-attention guidance. In *WACV*, 2024. 2
- [6] Omer Dahary, Or Patashnik, Kfir Aberman, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Be yourself: Bounded attention for multi-subject text-to-image generation. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1, 2, 6
- [7] Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, et al. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2024. 1
- [8] Weixi Feng, Xuehai He, Tsu-Jui Fu, Varun Jampani, Arjun Akula, Pradyumna Narayana, Sugato Basu, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. Training-free structured diffusion guidance for compositional text-to-image synthesis. *ICLR*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20
- [9] Yutong Feng, Biao Gong, Di Chen, Yujun Shen, Yu Liu, and Jingren Zhou. Ranni: Taming text-to-image diffusion for accurate instruction following. In *CVPR*, 2024. 6, 8, 17, 19, 20
- [10] Dhruva Ghosh, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Geneval: An object-focused framework for evaluating text-to-image alignment. *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2, 6
- [11] Yaru Hao, Zewen Chi, Li Dong, and Furu Wei. Optimizing prompts for text-to-image generation. *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2
- [12] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross-attention control. In *ICLR*, 2023. 3, 4, 13
- [13] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *NeurIPS*, 2020. 15
- [14] Matthew Honnibal. spacy 2: Natural language understanding with bloom embeddings, convolutional neural networks and incremental parsing. 2017. 6
- [15] Taihang Hu, Linxuan Li, Joost van de Weijer, Hongcheng Gao, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, Jian Yang, Ming-Ming Cheng, Kai Wang, and Yaxing Wang. Token merging for training-free semantic binding in text-to-image synthesis. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17
- [16] Xiwei Hu, Rui Wang, Yixiao Fang, Bin Fu, Pei Cheng, and Gang Yu. Ella: Equip diffusion models with llm for enhanced semantic alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05135*, 2024. 6, 8, 17, 19, 20
- [17] Kaiyi Huang, Kaiyue Sun, Enze Xie, Zhenguo Li, and Xihui Liu. T2i-compbench: A comprehensive benchmark for open-world compositional text-to-image generation. *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2, 6, 8, 17, 20
- [18] Dongzhi Jiang, Guanglu Song, Xiaoshi Wu, Renrui Zhang, Dazhong Shen, Zhuofan Zong, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. Comat: Aligning text-to-image diffusion model with image-to-text concept matching. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 6, 8, 17, 19, 20
- [19] Jeeyung Kim, Erfan Esmaeili, and Qiang Qiu. Text embedding is not all you need: Attention control for text-to-image semantic alignment with text self-attention maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15236*, 2024. 1
- [20] Yunji Kim, Jiyoung Lee, Jin-Hwa Kim, Jung-Woo Ha, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Dense text-to-image generation with attention modulation. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [21] Max Ku, Dongfu Jiang, Cong Wei, Xiang Yue, and Wenhua Chen. Viescore: Towards explainable metrics for conditional image synthesis evaluation. In *ACL*, 2024. 2, 6, 8, 17
- [22] Steven J Leon, Åke Björck, and Walter Gander. Gram-schmidt orthogonalization: 100 years and more. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 2013. 2, 4
- [23] Daiqing Li, Aleks Kamko, Ali Sabet, Ehsan Akhgari, Linmiao Xu, and Suhail Doshi. Playground v2. 6, 15, 20
- [24] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *ICML*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. 17
- [25] Yumeng Li, Margret Keuper, Dan Zhang, and Anna Khoreva. Divide & bind your attention for improved generative semantic nursing. In *BMVC*, 2023. 1
- [26] Zhiqiu Lin, Deepak Pathak, Baiqi Li, Jiayao Li, Xide Xia, Graham Neubig, Pengchuan Zhang, and Deva Ramanan. Evaluating text-to-visual generation with image-to-text generation. In *ECCV*, 2024. 2, 6, 8, 17, 20
- [27] Wan-Duo Kurt Ma, Avisek Lahiri, John P Lewis, Thomas Leung, and W Bastiaan Kleijn. Directed diffusion: Direct control of object placement through attention guidance. In *AAAI*, 2024. 2
- [28] Jiafeng Mao and Xueting Wang. Training-free location-aware text-to-image synthesis. In *ICIP*, 2023. 2
- [29] Arash Mafarizadeh, Mohammadali Banayeeanzade, Reza Abbasi, Mohammad Hossein Rohban, and Mahdieh Soleymani Baghshah. Attention overlap is responsible for the entity missing problem in text-to-image diffusion models! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20972*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [30] István Mayer. On löwdin’s method of symmetric orthogonalization. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 2002. 2, 4
- [31] Dong Huk Park, Grace Luo, Clayton Toste, Samaneh Azadi, Xihui Liu, Maka Karalashvili, Anna Rohrbach, and Trevor Darrell. Shape-guided diffusion with inside-outside attention. In *WACV*, 2024. 2

- [32] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *ICCV*, 2023. 4, 16
- [33] Quynh Phung, Songwei Ge, and Jia-Bin Huang. Grounded text-to-image synthesis with attention refocusing. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2
- [34] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 15, 19, 20
- [35] Chen Qian, Fuli Feng, Lijie Wen, and Tat-Seng Chua. Conceptualized and contextualized gaussian embedding. In *AAAI*, 2021. 4
- [36] 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. 3, 4, 6, 13, 16, 19
- [37] 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. *JMLR*, 2020. 3, 4, 6, 13, 16, 19
- [38] Royi Rassin, Shauli Ravfogel, and Yoav Goldberg. Dalle-2 is seeing double: Flaws in word-to-concept mapping in text2image models. In *EMNLPW*, 2022. 1, 2
- [39] Royi Rassin, Eran Hirsch, Daniel Glickman, Shauli Ravfogel, Yoav Goldberg, and Gal Chechik. Linguistic binding in diffusion models: Enhancing attribute correspondence through attention map alignment. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 19, 20
- [40] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 4, 16
- [41] Pranab Kumar Sen. Anil kumar bhattacharyya (1915-1996): A reverent remembrance. *Calcutta Statistical Association Bulletin*, 1996. 2, 6
- [42] Claude E Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal*, 1948. 2, 5
- [43] David Stap, Maurits Bleeker, Sarah Ibrahimi, and Maartje Ter Hoeve. Conditional image generation and manipulation for user-specified content. *CVPRW*, 2020. 2
- [44] Kota Sueyoshi and Takashi Matsubara. Predicated diffusion: Predicate logic-based attention guidance for text-to-image diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 1
- [45] Yoad Tewel, Omri Kaduri, Rinon Gal, Yoni Kasten, Lior Wolf, Gal Chechik, and Yuval Atzmon. Training-free consistent text-to-image generation. *ACM TOG*, 2024. 2
- [46] Michael Toker, Ido Galil, Hadas Orgad, Rinon Gal, Yoad Tewel, Gal Chechik, and Yonatan Belinkov. Padding tone: A mechanistic analysis of padding tokens in t2i models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06751*, 2025. 16
- [47] Luke Vilnis and Andrew McCallum. Word representations via gaussian embedding. *ICLR*, 2015. 4
- [48] Ruichen Wang, Zekang Chen, Chen Chen, Jian Ma, Haonan Lu, and Xiaodong Lin. Compositional text-to-image synthesis with attention map control of diffusion models. In *AAAI*, 2024. 2
- [49] Jinheng Xie, Yuexiang Li, Yawen Huang, Haozhe Liu, Wentian Zhang, Yefeng Zheng, and Mike Zheng Shou. Boxdiff: Text-to-image synthesis with training-free box-constrained diffusion. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [50] Arman Zarei, Keivan Rezaei, Samyadeep Basu, Mehrdad Saberi, Mazda Moayeri, Priyatham Kattakinda, and Soheil Feizi. Understanding and mitigating compositional issues in text-to-image generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07844*, 2024. 8, 19, 20
- [51] Yanbing Zhang, Mengping Yang, Qin Zhou, and Zhe Wang. Attention calibration for disentangled text-to-image personalization. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [52] Shanshan Zhong, Zhongzhan Huang, Weushao Wen, Jinghui Qin, and Liang Lin. Sur-adapter: Enhancing text-to-image pre-trained diffusion models with large language models. In *ACM-MM*, 2023. 2
- [53] Chenyi Zhuang, Ying Hu, and Pan Gao. Magnet: We never know how text-to-image diffusion models work, until we learn how vision-language models function. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20
- [54] Le Zhuo, Ruoyi Du, Han Xiao, Yangguang Li, Dongyang Liu, Rongjie Huang, Wenzhe Liu, Lirui Zhao, Fu-Yun Wang, Zhanyu Ma, et al. Lumina-next: Making lumina-t2x stronger and faster with next-dit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18583*, 2024. 1