Attention Distillation: A Unified Approach to Visual Characteristics Transfer

Yang Zhou Xu Gao Zichong Chen Hui Huang* Visual Computing Research Center, CSSE, Shenzhen University



Figure 1. Given a reference image, our approach can faithfully reproduce its visual characteristics in synthesis, providing a unified framework for a wide range of example-based image synthesis applications, such as artistic style transfer, appearance transfer, style-specific text-to-image generation, and various texture synthesis tasks.

Abstract

Recent advances in generative diffusion models have shown a notable inherent understanding of image style and semantics. In this paper, we leverage the self-attention features from pretrained diffusion networks to transfer the visual characteristics from a reference to generated images. Unlike previous work that uses these features as plug-andplay attributes, we propose a novel attention distillation loss calculated between the ideal and current stylization results, based on which we optimize the synthesized image via backpropagation in latent space. Next, we propose an improved Classifier Guidance that integrates attention distillation loss into the denoising sampling process, further accelerating the synthesis and enabling a broad range of image generation applications. Extensive experiments have demonstrated the extraordinary performance of our approach in transferring the examples' style, appearance, and texture to new images in synthesis. Code is available at https://github.com/xugao97/

AttentionDistillation.

1. Introduction

Synthesizing new images with visual elements, such as the style or texture, of an example image, is a long-standing yet challenging problem in computer graphics and vision. The key challenge lies in properly representing images' texture or style features. Traditional methods [6, 11, 15, 34, 37, 38, 42, 67] usually define textures as repeated local patterns and synthesize new textures by copying local patches from the source image. When it comes to style, an extensive yet more abstract visual characteristic than texture, new representations are required.

Thanks to the deep learning revolution, neural representations of visual features have emerged. One group of approaches performs texture or style-specific synthesis by matching the global distribution of deep features between the reference and the output. For example, the seminal work Gram loss [21, 22] regards the feature maps' statistics as the texture/style representation. Some other work optimizes

^{*}Corresponding author.

deep features by minimizing Wassertein distance [24] or adversarial discrimination loss [51, 52, 68]. However, matching global distributions lacks local perception, usually leading to conspicuous detail artifacts. Another group retakes the local patch strategy, optimizing output's deep features through nearest-neighbor matching [40, 43, 69]. As local patches are unaware of global structure, these methods always require additional structural guidance.

Beyond the above progress, recent breakthroughs in large-scale diffusion models have sparked new representations for visual features, reaching a good balance between global and local consistency in synthesis [2, 7, 10, 25, 29, 70]. A key consensus of these techniques is that the *keys* (K) and values (V) from the self-attention module of pre-trained diffusion models characterize the appearance of the exemplar. Re-aggregating these features according to target queries (Q) by self-attention mechanism during new image generation can reproduce the visual characteristics of the reference. Although impressive results were achieved due to the robust performance of diffusion models, these methods still often suffer issues like insufficient stylization. We hypothesize three reasons for their limitations:

1) Domain gap. When two images differ significantly, the similarity between the target Q (queries of the synthesized image) and the source KV (keys and values of the exemplar) will become low and unreliable, leading to erroneous aggregation results. Techniques like AdaIN [27] and attention scale can partially mitigate this issue [2, 25].

2) Error accumulation. While the iterative sampling process in diffusion models can ameliorate large discrepancies between the target Q and the source KV, errors may also accumulate. As demonstrated in [56], features from different layers of diffusion models focus on distinct information, such as semantics and geometry. Incorrect matches will propagate errors to subsequent layers along the Markov chain and degrade the final image quality.

3) Architectural limit. The self-attention mechanism is implemented within the residual branch of the denoising network. Injecting self-attention features from the source may have a bounded influence on the target latent code, potentially diminishing their efficacy in the synthesis.

In this work, we still follow the assumption that the selfattention features in the denoising networks capture an image's visual appearance. To address the above-mentioned limitations, we introduce a novel *Attention Distillation* (AD) loss, based on which we directly update the synthesized image through backpropagation. Specifically, we consider the output obtained by computing the attention between the target Q and the source KV as the *ideal* stylized result, and the original attention output represents the current stylization. We define attention distillation loss as the L1 distance between these two outputs and optimize the synthesized image through backpropagation in latent space. We simultaneously calculate the differences across various layers to avoid error accumulation. Such an optimization process gradually reduces the disparity between the target Q and the source KV, enhancing the accuracy of similarity calculations and thus improving the final stylization.

Whereas our approach differs greatly from previous works that use self-attention features as plug-and-play attributes, the new attention distillation loss can also be integrated into the sampling process of diffusion models, functioning as an *improved Classifier Guidance*. Combined with the normal Classifier-Free Guidance, it further enables textbased controlled generation, and is also compatible with other conditioning technologies such as ControlNet, leading to broad image synthesis applications; see, *e.g.*, Fig. 1. Extensive experiments and comparisons with state-of-theart methods have demonstrated our advantages.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- We analyze the limitations of previous plug-and-play attention features methods and propose a novel attention distillation loss for reproducing the visual characteristics of a reference image, achieving notably superior results.
- We develop attention distillation guided sampling, an improved Classifier Guidance that integrates attention distillation loss into the denoising process, which significantly accelerates synthesis speed and enables a wide range of visual characteristics transfer and synthesis applications.

2. Related work

Our primary contribution lies in proposing a novel loss function that effectively transfers the visual characteristics of one image to another. This loss function has broad applications across various image synthesis tasks, including texture synthesis, style transfer, appearance transfer, and customized image generation based on text-to-image models. We review related work in these domains.

Texture synthesis focuses on generating images that resemble the original texture without repetition and artifacts. Traditional methods rely on parametric texture models [23, 32, 53] or sampling pixels/patches [14, 15, 37, 38, 62] to create new images. These methods excel with simple textures but often struggle with complex or highresolution textures. Deep learning-based methods, utilizing convolution neural networks (CNNs), extract multilevel features that capture textures at varying scales. Gatys et al. [21] introduced Gram matrix, a second-order statistic of feature map to represent stationary textures. Histogram loss [47] and Sliced Wasserstein loss [16, 24] offer improved modeling of texture distributions, leading to more realistic results but failing to capture large-scale structure, especially for non-stationary textures. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) are also widely adopted in texture synthesis [51, 52, 68]; for instance, Zhou et al. [68] used a self-supervised approach to expand a single texture by learning the internal patch distribution, achieving impressive detail and structure expansion. Recently, Self-Rectification [70] leverages pre-trained diffusion networks and the self-attention mechanism to gradually refine a lazyediting input, addressing the intricate challenge of synthesizing non-stationary textures.

Neural style transfer applies the artistic style of a source image to a new content image. Gatys et al. [22] pioneered this field by using Gram loss as style representation and proposed a neural style transfer algorithm that combines content and style loss in the optimization. While Gram loss and its variants [27, 30, 39] are the most widely used style losses, they primarily assess global distribution differences and cannot account for local semantic correspondences. Approaches like CNNMRF [40] and Contextual Loss^[43] address this by computing semantic similarity in high-dimensional feature spaces to enable semantically coherent style transfer. Later works incorporated transformers with self-attention to capture stronger relationships between style and content. Deng et al. [12] introduced a fully transformer-based architecture, StyTR², achieving state-of-the-art results at the time. Recent advances in diffusion models enable interpretable and controllable contentstyle separation. InST [66] proposed inversion-based learning of artistic style from a single painting. StyleDiffusion [60] introduced a CLIP-based style disentanglement loss. StyleID [10], a training-free method, manipulates the self-attention features of a pre-trained diffusion model by substituting the keys and values of the content with those of the style image in cross-attention mechanisms.

Appearance transfer, a specialized semantic style transfer, aims at transferring the appearance of semantically corresponding regions. Early works [28, 45, 71] use paired or unpaired datasets to train GANs for domain-specific appearance transfer. Tumanyan *et al.* [57] extract structure and appearance features using a pre-trained DINO-ViT [8], and trains a generator for each image pair. Recently, cross-image attention [2] with pre-trained diffusion models real-izes zero-shot appearance transfer by implicitly establishing semantic correspondences across images.

Customized/Personalized image generation based on text-to-image (T2I) diffusion models has attracted particular attention recently, which aims to learn the style from one or more reference images to generate new content. Fine-tuning approaches [1, 18–20, 31, 36, 50, 54] enable models to learn novel style concepts from a few images. However, these methods are prone to overfitting, potentially resulting in degraded image quality or content leakage. To alleviate this issue, B-LoRA [19] leverages LoRA [26] (Low-Rank Adaptation) to implicitly separate the style and content components of a single image. Pair Customization [31] learns stylistic differences from a single image pair and then applies the acquired style to the generation process.

Encoder-based methods [9, 33, 59, 61, 63, 64] utilize visual encoders to capture image information and establish mappings between image prompts and models through huge dataset training. While currently favored as state-of-theart, these techniques are constrained by the capabilities of visual encoders, often extracting only abstract style information and struggling with fine-grained textures of the reference. Several works have proposed plug-and-play solutions for training-free style customization. For example, StyleAligned [25] and Visual Style Prompt [29] maintain style consistency by preserving the queries from the original features while sharing or swapping the keys and values with those from reference features in the late self-attention layers. RB-Modulation [49] modulates the drift field of reverse diffusion dynamics by incorporating desired attributes (e.g., style or content) through a terminal cost.

3. Method

3.1. Preliminaries

Latent diffusion models (LDM), exemplified by Stable Diffusion [46, 48], have achieved state-of-the-art performance in image generation due to the robust ability to model complex data distributions. In LDM, an image x is first compressed into a learned latent space using a pretrained VAE $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$. A UNet-based denoising network $\epsilon_{\theta}(\cdot)$ is subsequently trained to predict the noise during the diffusion process by minimizing the mean squared error between the predicted noise and the actually added noise ϵ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LDM}} = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{E}(x), y, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), t} \Big[\|\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t, y) - \epsilon\|_2^2 \Big], \quad (1)$$

where y denotes the condition and t represents the timestep. The denoising UNet typically consists of a bunch of convolution blocks and self-/cross-attention modules, all integrated within the predictive branch of *residual* architecture.

KV-injection is widely employed in image editing [2, 7, 58], style transfer [10, 25, 29], and texture synthesis [70]. It is built upon the self-attention mechanism and uses the self-attention features in diffusion models as plug-and-play attributes. The self-attention mechanism is formulated as:

Self-Attn
$$(Q, K, V)$$
 = softmax $(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d}})V$. (2)

At the core of the attention mechanism lies the calculation of a weight matrix based on the similarity between the queries (Q) and keys (K), which is used to perform a weighted aggregation of the values (V). KV-injection extends this mechanism by copying or sharing the KV features across different synthesis branches. Its key assumption is that KV features represent the visual appearance of an image. During sampling, replacing the KV features in



Figure 2. **Overview of attention distillation.** Based on the self-attention mechanism in diffusion models, we compute the difference between the ideal and the current stylization, formulating a novel Attention Distillation (AD) loss (a). The new loss acts like a style loss. When combined with a content loss (also derived from the self-attention mechanism), we can realize high-quality content-preserving synthesis, such as style transfer or appearance transfer (b). Our attention distillation loss can be incorporated into the normal diffusion sampling process as an improved Classifier Guidance (c), which enables a broad scope of example-based image generation applications.



Figure 3. **Differences between KV-injection and attention distillation.** We start with the same latent for sampling and optimization, both running 100 steps, using empty prompts. The information flow (red arrows) differs only from the identity connection. However, the results of our attention distillation optimization (b)

are clearly superior to sampling with KV-injection (a). the synthesized branch with those KV from the corresponding timestep of the exemplar can realize appearance transfer

3.2. Attention Distillation Loss

from the source image to the synthesized target.

Although KV-injection has achieved noticeable results, it falls short in preserving the style or texture details of the reference due to the residual mechanism; see Fig. 3 (a) for example. KV-injection only operates on the residual, which means the information flow (red arrows) is subsequently influenced by the identity connection, leading to an incomplete transfer of information. As a result, the sampling outputs cannot fully reproduce the desired visual details.

In this work, we propose a novel loss function to distill visual elements by reaggregating features within the selfattention mechanism; therefore, we refer to it as Attention Distillation (AD) loss. We leverage the UNet of the pretrained T2I diffusion model, Stable Diffusion [48], to extract image features from self-attention modules. As illustrated in Fig. 2 (a), we first reaggregate the visual information of the KV features (K_s and V_s) from the reference branch according to Q from the target branch, which is the same as KV-injection. We regard this attention output as the *ideal* stylization. Then, we calculate the attention output of the target branch and compute the L1 loss w.r.t. the ideal attention output, which defines the AD loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{AD} = \|\text{Self-Attn}(Q, K, V) - \text{Self-Attn}(Q, K_s, V_s)\|_1.$$
(3)

We can use the proposed AD loss to optimize a random latent noise via gradient descent, resulting in vivid texture or style reproduction in the output; see Fig. 3 (b) for example. This can be attributed to the backpropagation in optimization, which allows information to flow not only across the (*residual*) self-attention modules but also through the identity connection. With continuous optimization, the gap between Q and K_s gradually narrows, making attention more and more accurate, and eventually, features are correctly aggregated to produce the desired visual details.

Following recent experimental analysis [7, 29, 58], we empirically select the last 6 self-attention layers of the UNet to compute AD loss. Additionally, during optimization, we simulate the sampling process of diffusion models by linearly decreasing the timestep t input to the UNet from T to 0. We begin with different random latent noises and optimize them over 100 steps. Note that during the whole optimization, the predicted noise from U-Net is totally discarded, and we continuously update the same latent.

To better understand our AD loss, we present the optimization results across multiple runs, as shown in Fig. 4. These results demonstrate that: i) AD loss effectively distills high-quality visual characteristics in style and texture; ii) AD loss is self-adapted to different spatial structures, showcasing diversity across multiple runs.



Figure 4. **Optimizing attention distillation loss across multiple runs.** The coherence in texture and style, and the variations in structure across multiple runs of the same reference, demonstrates the ability of our AD loss in style alignment and spatial adaption.

3.3. Content-preserving Optimization

With the texture and style distilled by AD loss, we can further align the synthesized content to another reference image using a content loss. Such optimization allows the synthesis of images that transform the visual elements of one image while preserving the target content, achieving tasks such as style transfer, appearance transfer, and more.

As illustrated in Fig. 2 (b), we define the content loss similarly to AD loss, which is also based on the self-attention mechanism, fully drawing the advantage of the deep understanding of images in diffusion models. In particular, the L1 loss computed between the target queries Q and the reference queries Q_c , formulates the content loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{content}} = \|Q - Q_c\|_1. \tag{4}$$

In implementation, we also select the last 6 self-attention layers to compute the content loss, consistent with AD loss. The objective of content-preserving optimization is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{AD}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{content}}.$$
 (5)

After optimization, the optimized latent code is decoded into image space using the pretrained VAE. We have summarized the content-preserving optimization in Algorithm 1 of the supplementary material.

3.4. Attention Distillation Guided Sampling

The syntheses above are using backpropagation optimization. In this section, we introduce how we incorporate attention distillation loss into the sampling process of diffusion models in an improved Classifier Guidance manner.

According to [13], Classifier Guidance alters the denoising direction during the denoising process, thereby generating samples from $p(z_t|c)$, which can be formulated as:

$$\hat{\epsilon}_{\theta} = \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t, y) - \alpha \sigma_t \nabla_{z_t} \log p(c|z_t), \tag{6}$$

where t is the timestep, y denotes the prompts, and ϵ_{θ} and z_t refer to the denoising network and the latent in LDM,

respectively. α controls the guidance strength. Inspired by [17], we guide the diffusion sampling process using an energy function based on attention distillation loss.

Specifically, during DDIM sampling [55], the latent z_t at timestep t are translated to z_{t-1} according to the update direction ϵ_{θ} estimated from the denoising network:

$$z_{t-1} = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}}\hat{z}_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1}}\epsilon_\theta,\tag{7}$$

where $\hat{z}_0 = \frac{z_t - \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \epsilon_{\theta}}{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}}$. Replace ϵ_{θ} with $\hat{\epsilon}_{\theta}$ from Eq. (6):

$$z_{t-1} = \underbrace{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}}\hat{z}_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1}}\epsilon_\theta}_{\text{DDIM Sampling}} + \alpha C \cdot \nabla_{z_t} \log p(c|z_t),$$
(8)

where C is a constant related to t. We define the energy function using our AD loss by substituting $\nabla_{z_t} \log p(c|z_t)$ with $\nabla_{z_t} \mathcal{L}_{AD}$. However, we found configuring the guidance strength is tricky; see Sec. 4 for detailed experimental analysis. To address this issue, we introduce an Adam optimizer [35] to automatically manage the strength and compute gradients. For simplification, we approximate the term $\nabla_{z_t} \mathcal{L}_{AD}$ by $\nabla_{z_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_{AD}$, enabling an initial DDIM sampling for z_{t-1} , followed by a straightforward optimization update. The AD loss takes as inputs the latent z_{t-1} and the noise-disturbed reference latent z_{t-1}^{ref} , as illustrated in Fig. 2 (c). We update z_{t-1} via AD loss optimization as:

$$z_{t-1} := z_{t-1} - \alpha C \cdot \nabla_{z_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_{AD}(z_{t-1}, z_{t-1}^{ref}).$$
(9)

With the guidance from AD loss, we can compute the losses on the latents with timestep conditioning, rather than converting the latent to image space and calculating image-level losses, as done in recent works [4, 41, 49]. Using the Adam optimizer also enables us to establish a universal learning rate, alleviating the challenge of setting the guidance strength. The attention distillation guided sampling is detailed in Algorithm 2 of the supplementary. Note that the content loss proposed in Eq. (4) can also be added into the sampling process working with AD loss, further to preserve the structure of a content reference image.

3.5. Improved VAE Decoding

Experimental evidence [3, 72] suggests that the VAE employed in latent diffusion models is perceptually lossy. For tasks that require high-frequency local details, such as texture synthesis, we can *optionally* fine-tune the weights θ of the VAE decoder $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ on the example image x to enhance its reconstruction quality using L1 loss, following [3]:

$$\theta^* = \arg\min_{\theta} \|\mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\mathcal{E}(x)) - x\|_1, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ denotes the VAE encoder. Fig. 5 presents some results of the reconstruction and sampling, showing improved perceptual quality with the fine-tuned VAE.



Figure 5. **Improved VAE decoding.** The pretrained VAE is lossy in high-frequency details. Fine-tuning the VAE with the reference image over several steps (denoted as VAE*) can enhance the reconstruction quality and the decoding for novel image synthesis.

4. Experiments

4.1. Applications and Comparisons

In the following, we apply our attention distillation loss to various visual characteristic transfer tasks and compare the results to state-of-the-art methods in each application. See the supplementary materials for detailed parameter configurations, running time, and additional results.

Style and Appearance Transfer. Following the spirit of the prominent work of Gatys et al. [22], we achieve style and appearance transfer through the optimization method described in Sec. 3.3. We compare our method to CSGO [63], StyleShot [33], StyleID [10], StyTR² [12] and NST [22] for style transfer, as well as Cross-Image Attention [2] and SpliceViT [57] for appearance transfer. Fig. 6 presents the qualitative comparison results. In style transfer, our method effectively captures high-quality, coherent style characteristics while simultaneously preserving the semantic structures of the content image. This is particularly evident in the sketch styles in the 3rd and 4th rows. In contrast, baseline methods exhibit notable style discrepancies, despite retaining the original structure. In appearance transfer, our method also shows superiority, avoiding the oversaturation of color seen in Cross-image Attention.

Style-specific Text-to-Image Generation. As described in Sec. 3.4, we can apply our AD loss within the diffusion sampling, thereby realizing style-specific text-to-image generation. We set the reference as the desired style image. Fig. 7 showcases some generated results, along with a comparison to alternative methods, including Visual Style Prompting [29], InstantStyle [59], and RB-Modulation [49]. The results in Fig. 7 demonstrate that our method aligns textual semantics comparably to existing methods while achieving notably better style coherence with the reference.

In addition to the above approach, we further incorporate ControlNet [65] to enable style-specific text-to-image generation with additional conditioning on various modalities, *e.g.* depth and canny edges. Fig. 8 presents some generated examples. More results can be seen in the supplementary. **Controlled Texture Synthesis.** Our method can be applied to texture optimization as demonstrated in Sec. 3.2. Inspired by [7], we further incorporate mask guidance when calculating attention distillation loss, thereby constraining the values queried by Q, resulting in controlled texture synthesis. Specifically, given a source texture $x_s \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times 3}$, its corresponding source segmentation map $S^s \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times 1}$, and the target segmentation map $S^t \in \mathbb{R}^{h' \times w' \times 1}$, we first flatten S^s and S^t and downsample them to match the resolution of attention features, resulting in \overline{S}^s and \overline{S}^t . Then, we compute the guiding mask M; with this mask, we restrict the visual information aggregated by Q in attention computation to focus solely on the corresponding regions:

$$M_{i,j} := \begin{cases} \text{True} & \text{if } \bar{S}_i^s = \bar{S}_j^t \\ \text{False} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(11)

 $\mathcal{L}_{MAD} = ||Self-Attn(Q, K, V) - Self-Attn(Q, K_s, V_s; M)||_1$ (12)

To further ensure the alignment with the target mask, we fill the target mask as initialization with pixels randomly drawn from corresponding labeled regions of the source image. Then, we regard this init as the content reference and add a content loss as Sec. 3.3 based on the query features. Figs. 1 and 9 present our controlled texture synthesis results. Compared to GCD [69], a patch-based neural texture optimization method, our results exhibit comparable texture details with smoother object edges. In contrast, GCD suffers from artifacts of color aliasing; see the 2nd row of Fig. 9.

Recently, Self-Rectification [70] introduced a "lazyediting" control for generating non-stationary textures. Aiming at the same goal, we utilize SDEdit [44] to preserve the structure of the layout image edited by the user. Then, we incorporate our proposed AD loss and content loss into the sampling (as Sec. 3.4). As compared in Fig. 9, Self-Rectification outputs smoother texture transitions, while our results better adhere to the original texture examples.

Texture Expansion. It is very difficult to synthesize ultrahigh resolution textures using traditional methods, given the limited patch sources. Here, we apply our attention distillation guided sampling to the MultiDiffusion [5] model, enabling texture expansion to arbitrary resolution. Although SD-1.5 [48] is trained on images of size 512×512 , surprisingly, it demonstrates robust capabilities in large-size texture synthesis when incorporating attention distillation. Fig. 10 presents comparisons of texture expansion to size 512×1536 with GCD [69] and GPDM [16]. Our approach shows significant advantages in such a challenging task.

4.2. Ablation Studies

In this section, we present ablation study results on two aspects of our approach: i) the impact of content loss weight



Figure 6. **Comparisons of style and appearance transfer.** Our comparisons primarily focus on recent diffusion-based methods of style and appearance transfer, including CSGO [63], StyleShot [33], StyleID [10], and Cross-Image Attention [2]. Additionally, we include traditional methods such as NST [22] and transformer-based methods such as StyTR2 [12] and SpliceViT [57] for comparison.



Figure 7. **Comparisons of style-specific text-to-image generation.** We compare our approach to InstantStyle [59], Visual Style Prompting [29], and RB-Modulation [49] using three style references as examples. For each style, we utilize the same text prompts: "*A deer*" (left), "*A rocket*" (top right), and "*A piano*" (bottom right).



Figure 8. By combining attention distillation guided sampling with ControlNet [65] into the text-to-image pipeline, we can produce high-quality results that align the structure with the condition image while maintaining style coherence with the style reference.

in content-preserving optimization (Sec. 3.3), and ii) the optimizer for managing guidance strength in attention distillation guided sampling (Sec. 3.4).



Figure 9. **Comparisons of controlled texture synthesis.** Left: annotation control; Right: layout control.

Content loss weight. As shown in Fig. 11, varying the content loss weight λ brings intriguing effects on the transfer results. In style transfer, for instance, the abstract style



Figure 10. Comparisons of texture expansion. Taking a 512×512 texture image as the input example, we expand it with automatic semantic understanding and synthesize results at the resolution 512×1536 . We compare our approach with GCD [69] and GPDM [16].



Figure 11. Ablation of content loss weights. Varying the content loss weights λ on two examples, one each for style transfer (left) and appearance transfer (right). The results demonstrate how the content loss helps preserve the source image content during the transfer. When the weights are within an appropriate range, the results exhibit varying levels of abstraction and appearance transition.



Figure 12. Impact of the optimizer for managing guidance strength. Both cases–with and without the Adam optimizer [35]–were conducted with 50 diffusion sampling steps. All results are generated using Stable Diffusion v1.5 [48], with empty text prompts. The learning rate of the Adam optimizer is set to 0.02.

example shown on the left illustrates how the adjustment of λ results in different levels of abstraction, offering flexibility for artistic creation. In appearance transfer, thanks to the precise semantic understanding from diffusion networks, the facial image transfer shown on the right exhibits a smooth identity transition along with the λ varies.

Optimizer. Fig. 12 demonstrates the importance of the optimizer in managing guidance strength. We experimentally test a naive strategy of manually setting the guidance strength to control the scale of gradient updates to the latents. However, varying this strength manually often fails to yield reasonable results: textures or appearance features in the examples are typically lost, as shown in the last three columns of Fig. 12. In contrast, introducing an Adam optimizer to manage latent optimization produces results that closely match the visual characteristics of the input examples (columns $2\sim4$ in Fig. 12). Furthermore, increasing the number of optimization iterations within each timestep dur-



Figure 13. User preference score. We report the overall preference score comparing our method to selected alternatives across three transfer tasks. Each comparison is conducted individually, directly evaluating user preference between our results and those of each competing method. Note CIA stands for Cross-Image Attention [2] and VSP as [29]. See supplementary for more details.

ing sampling generally enhances the quality of generated results, although it also brings extra computation time. In practice, we set the iteration number to 2 to achieve an efficient balance, delivering high-quality results effectively.

4.3. User Preference Study

To validate the qualitative analysis, we conduct a user study with 30 questions (5 questions for each of 6 selected competitors) on three transfer tasks. In each question, we showcase two results: one from our method and one from a competitor. The user was asked to choose the better one based on the provided instructions and criteria. We have collected 1500 responses from 50 participants, and the overall preference score is summarized in Fig. 13. Our method consistently outperforms the alternatives by significant margins. Please refer to the supplementary for more details.

5. Conclusion

We have presented a unified approach for various visual characteristics transfer tasks, including style/appearance transfer, style-specific image generation, and texture synthesis. The key to the proposed method is a novel attention distillation loss, which calculates the difference between the ideal and current stylization, and gradually modifies the synthesis. Our method overcomes the limitations of previous works, and experiments have validated its superiority.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in parts by NSFC (U21B2023), ICFCRT (W2441020), Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (2023B1515120026), Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (KQTD20 210811090044003, RCJC20200714114435012, KJZD20 240903100022028), and Scientific Development Funds from Shenzhen University.

References

- [1] Namhyuk Ahn, Junsoo Lee, Chunggi Lee, Kunhee Kim, Daesik Kim, Seung-Hun Nam, and Kibeom Hong. Dreamstyler: Paint by style inversion with text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proc. AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 674–681, 2024. 3
- [2] Yuval Alaluf, Daniel Garibi, Or Patashnik, Hadar Averbuch-Elor, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Cross-image attention for zeroshot appearance transfer. In *Proc. of SIGGRAPH*, pages 1– 12, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 15
- [3] Omri Avrahami, Ohad Fried, and Dani Lischinski. Blended latent diffusion. ACM Trans. on Graphics (Proc. of SIG-GRAPH), 42(4), 2023. 5
- [4] Arpit Bansal, Hong-Min Chu, Avi Schwarzschild, Soumyadip Sengupta, Micah Goldblum, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. Universal guidance for diffusion models. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations*, 2024. 5
- [5] Omer Bar-Tal, Lior Yariv, Yaron Lipman, and Tali Dekel. Multidiffusion: Fusing diffusion paths for controlled image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08113, 2023. 6, 12
- [6] Connelly Barnes, Eli Shechtman, Adam Finkelstein, and Dan B Goldman. Patchmatch: A randomized correspondence algorithm for structural image editing. ACM Trans. on Graphics (Proc. of SIGGRAPH), 28(3), 2009. 1
- [7] Mingdeng Cao, Xintao Wang, Zhongang Qi, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Yinqiang Zheng. MasaCtrl: tuning-free mutual self-attention control for consistent image synthesis and editing. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 22560–22570, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 6, 12
- [8] Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Herve Jegou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*, 2021. 3

- [9] Jingwen Chen, Yingwei Pan, Ting Yao, and Tao Mei. Controlstyle: Text-driven stylized image generation using diffusion priors. In ACM International Conference on Multimedia, page 7540–7548, 2023. 3
- [10] Jiwoo Chung, Sangeek Hyun, and Jae-Pil Heo. Style injection in diffusion: A training-free approach for adapting largescale diffusion models for style transfer. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, pages 8795–8805, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 7, 15
- [11] Soheil Darabi, Eli Shechtman, Connelly Barnes, Dan B. Goldman, and Pradeep Sen. Image melding: Combining inconsistent images using patch-based synthesis. ACM Trans. on Graphics (Proc. of SIGGRAPH), 31(4), 2012. 1
- [12] Yingying Deng, Fan Tang, Weiming Dong, Chongyang Ma, Xingjia Pan, Lei Wang, and Changsheng Xu. Stytr2: Image style transfer with transformers. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, 2022. 3, 6, 7, 15
- [13] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Quinn Nichol. Diffusion models beat GANs on image synthesis. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2021. 5
- [14] A.A. Efros and T.K. Leung. Texture synthesis by nonparametric sampling. In *Proceedings of the Seventh IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 1999. 2
- [15] Alexei A. Efros and William T. Freeman. Image quilting for texture synthesis and transfer. In *Proc. of SIGGRAPH*, pages 341–346, 2001. 1, 2
- [16] Ariel Elnekave and Yair Weiss. Generating natural images with direct patch distributions matching. In *Proc. of Euro. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 544–560. Springer, 2022. 2, 6, 8, 16
- [17] Dave Epstein, Allan Jabri, Ben Poole, Alexei A Efros, and Aleksander Holynski. Diffusion self-guidance for controllable image generation. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023. 5
- [18] Martin Nicolas Everaert, Marco Bocchio, Sami Arpa, Sabine Süsstrunk, and Radhakrishna Achanta. Diffusion in style. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 2251–2261, 2023. 3
- [19] Yarden Frenkel, Yael Vinker, Ariel Shamir, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Implicit style-content separation using b-lora. arXiv preprint arxiv:2403.14572, 2024. 3
- [20] Rinon Gal, Yuval Alaluf, Yuval Atzmon, Or Patashnik, Amit Haim Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations*, 2022. 3
- [21] Leon A. Gatys, Alexander S. Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. Texture synthesis using convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2414–2423, 2015. 1, 2
- [22] Leon A. Gatys, Alexander S. Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, pages 2414–2423, 2016. 1, 3, 6, 7
- [23] David J. Heeger and James R. Bergen. Pyramid-based texture analysis/synthesis. In Proc. of the 22nd Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques, page 229–238, 1995. 2

- [24] Eric Heitz, Kenneth Vanhoey, Thomas Chambon, and Laurent Belcour. A sliced wasserstein loss for neural texture synthesis. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, pages 9412–9420, 2021. 2, 16
- [25] Amir Hertz, Andrey Voynov, Shlomi Fruchter, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Style aligned image generation via shared attention. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, pages 4775–4785, 2024. 2, 3
- [26] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations*, 2022. 3
- [27] Xun Huang and Serge Belongie. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 1510–1519, 2017. 2, 3, 12
- [28] Phillip Isola, Jun-Yan Zhu, Tinghui Zhou, and Alexei A. Efros. Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision* & *Pattern Recognition*, 2017. 3
- [29] Jaeseok Jeong, Junho Kim, Yunjey Choi, Gayoung Lee, and Youngjung Uh. Visual style prompting with swapping selfattention. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12974, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15
- [30] Justin Johnson, Alexandre Alahi, and Li Fei-Fei. Perceptual losses for real-time style transfer and super-resolution. In *Proc. of Euro. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 694–711, 2016. 3
- [31] Maxwell Jones, Sheng-Yu Wang, Nupur Kumari, David Bau, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Customizing text-to-image models with a single image pair. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01536, 2024. 3
- [32] B. Julesz. Visual pattern discrimination. *IEEE Transactions* on Information Theory, 8(2):84–92, 1962. 2
- [33] Gao Junyao, Liu Yanchen, Sun Yanan, Tang Yinhao, Zeng Yanhong, Chen Kai, and Zhao Cairong. Styleshot: A snapshot on any style. *arXiv preprint arxiv:2407.01414*, 2024. 3, 6, 7
- [34] Alexandre Kaspar, Boris Neubert, Dani Lischinski, Mark Pauly, and Johannes Kopf. Self tuning texture optimization. *Computer Graphics Forum (Proc. of Eurographics)*, 34(2): 349–359, 2015. 1
- [35] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations*, 2015. 5, 8
- [36] Nupur Kumari, Bingliang Zhang, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Multi-concept customization of text-to-image diffusion. In Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, 2023. 3
- [37] Vivek Kwatra, Arno Schödl, Irfan Essa, Greg Turk, and Aaron Bobick. Graphcut textures: Image and video synthesis using graph cuts. ACM Trans. on Graphics (Proc. of SIGGRAPH), 22(3):277–286, 2003. 1, 2
- [38] Vivek Kwatra, Irfan Essa, Aaron Bobick, and Nipun Kwatra. Texture optimization for example-based synthesis. *ACM Trans. on Graphics (Proc. of SIGGRAPH)*, 2005. 1, 2
- [39] Yanghao Li, Naiyan Wang, Jiaying Liu, and Xiaodi Hou. Demystifying neural style transfer. arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.01036, 2017. 3

- [40] Michael Li, Chuan and Wand. Combining Markov Random Fields and Convolutional Neural Networks for Image Synthesis. In Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, pages 2479–2486, 2016. 2, 3
- [41] Xihui Liu, Dong Huk Park, Samaneh Azadi, Gong Zhang, Arman Chopikyan, Yuxiao Hu, Humphrey Shi, Anna Rohrbach, and Trevor Darrell. More control for free! image synthesis with semantic diffusion guidance. In Proc. of Winter Conf. on Applications of Computer Vision, 2023. 5
- [42] M. Lukáč, J. Fišer, P. Asente, J. Lu, E. Shechtman, and D. Sýkora. Brushables: Example-based edge-aware directional texture painting. *Computer Graphics Forum (Proc. of Pacific Conf. on Computer Graphics & Applications)*, 34(7): 257–267, 2015. 1
- [43] Roey Mechrez, Itamar Talmi, and Lihi Zelnik-Manor. The contextual loss for image transformation with non-aligned data. In *Proc. of Euro. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 768–783, 2018. 2, 3
- [44] Chenlin Meng, Yutong He, Yang Song, Jiaming Song, Jiajun Wu, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Stefano Ermon. SDEdit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations. In Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations, 2022. 6
- [45] Taesung Park, Jun-Yan Zhu, Oliver Wang, Jingwan Lu, Eli Shechtman, AlexeiA. Efros, and Richard Zhang. Swapping autoencoder for deep image manipulation. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2020. 3
- [46] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. SDXL: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. In Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations, 2024. 3, 12
- [47] Eric Risser, Pierre Wilmot, and Connelly Barnes. Stable and controllable neural texture synthesis and style transfer using histogram losses. arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08893, 2017. 2
- [48] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf.* on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, pages 10684– 10695, 2022. 3, 4, 6, 8, 12
- [49] L Rout, Y Chen, N Ruiz, A Kumar, C Caramanis, S Shakkottai, and W Chu. Rb-modulation: Training-free personalization of diffusion models using stochastic optimal control. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17401, 2024. 3, 5, 6, 7
- [50] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. DreamBooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, pages 22500–22510, 2023. 3
- [51] Tamar Rott Shaham, Tali Dekel, and Tomer Michaeli. Singan: Learning a generative model from a single natural image. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 4570– 4580, 2019. 2
- [52] Assaf Shocher, Shai Bagon, Phillip Isola, and Michal Irani. Ingan: Capturing and retargeting the "dna" of a natural image. In Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision, 2019. 2
- [53] E.P. Simoncelli and W.T. Freeman. The steerable pyramid: a flexible architecture for multi-scale derivative computation.

In Proceedings, International Conference on Image Processing, 2002. 2

- [54] Kihyuk Sohn, Lu Jiang, Jarred Barber, Kimin Lee, Nataniel Ruiz, Dilip Krishnan, Huiwen Chang, Yuanzhen Li, Irfan Essa, Michael Rubinstein, Yuan Hao, Glenn Entis, Irina Blok, and Daniel Castro Chin. Styledrop: Text-to-image synthesis of any style. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pages 66860–66889. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. 3
- [55] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. In Proc. of Int. Conf. on Learning Representations, 2021. 5
- [56] Luming Tang, Menglin Jia, Qianqian Wang, Cheng Perng Phoo, and Bharath Hariharan. Emergent correspondence from image diffusion. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023. 2
- [57] Narek Tumanyan, Omer Bar-Tal, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. Splicing vit features for semantic appearance transfer. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, 2022. 3, 6, 7, 15
- [58] Narek Tumanyan, Michal Geyer, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. Plug-and-play diffusion features for text-driven image-to-image translation. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, pages 1921–1930, 2023. 3, 4
- [59] Haofan Wang, Qixun Wang, Xu Bai, Zekui Qin, and Anthony Chen. Instantstyle: Free lunch towards stylepreserving in text-to-image generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02733, 2024. 3, 6, 7, 15
- [60] Zhizhong Wang, Lei Zhao, and Wei Xing. Stylediffusion: Controllable disentangled style transfer via diffusion models. In *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*, pages 7677–7689, 2023. 3
- [61] Zhouxia Wang, Xintao Wang, Liangbin Xie, Zhongang Qi, Ying Shan, Wenping Wang, and Ping Luo. Styleadapter: A unified stylized image generation model without test-time fine-tuning. arXiv pretrint arxiv:2309.01770, 2024. 3
- [62] Li-Yi Wei and Marc Levoy. Fast texture synthesis using tree-structured vector quantization. In Proceedings of the 27th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques - SIGGRAPH '00, 2000. 2
- [63] Peng Xing, Haofan Wang, Yanpeng Sun, Qixun Wang, Xu Bai, Hao Ai, Renyuan Huang, and Zechao Li. Csgo: Content-style composition in text-to-image generation. arXiv preprint arxiv:2408.16766, 2024. 3, 6, 7
- [64] Hu Ye, Jun Zhang, Sibo Liu, Xiao Han, and Wei Yang. Ipadapter: Text compatible image prompt adapter for text-toimage diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arxiv:2308.06721*, 2023. 3
- [65] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*, pages 3836–3847, 2023. 6, 7
- [66] Yuxin Zhang, Nisha Huang, Fan Tang, Haibin Huang, Chongyang Ma, Weiming Dong, and Changsheng Xu. Inversion-based style transfer with diffusion models. In Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, pages 10146–10156, 2023. 3

- [67] Yang Zhou, Huajie Shi, Dani Lischinski, Minglun Gong, Johannes Kopf, and Hui Huang. Analysis and controlled synthesis of inhomogeneous textures. *Computer Graphics Forum (Proc. of Eurographics)*, 36(2):199–212, 2017. 1
- [68] Yang Zhou, Zhen Zhu, Xiang Bai, Dani Lischinski, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Hui Huang. Non-stationary texture synthesis by adversarial expansion. ACM Trans. on Graphics (Proc. of SIGGRAPH), 37(4):49:1–49:13, 2018. 2
- [69] Yang Zhou, Kaijian Chen, Rongjun Xiao, and Hui Huang. Neural texture synthesis with guided correspondence. In Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, pages 18095–18104, 2023. 2, 6, 8, 12, 16
- [70] Yang Zhou, Rongjun Xiao, Dani Lischinski, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Hui Huang. Generating non-stationary textures using self-rectification. In *Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision* & *Pattern Recognition*, pages 7767–7776, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 12, 16
- [71] Jun-Yan Zhu, Taesung Park, Phillip Isola, Alexei Efros, Summer Winter, Van Gogh, Cezanne Monet, and Ukiyo-E Photos. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycleconsistent adversarial networks. In Proc. of IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition, 2017. 3
- [72] Zixin Zhu, Xuelu Feng, Dongdong Chen, Jianmin Bao, Le Wang, Yinpeng Chen, Lu Yuan, and Gang Hua. Designing a better asymmetric vqgan for stablediffusion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04632, 2023. 5

A. Algorithm

We build our method on the pretrained Stable Diffusion models. Algorithm 1, using style transfer as an example, outlines our content-preserving optimization approach with attention distillation loss. For attention distillation guided sampling, we take style-specific text-to-image generation as an example and describe our approach in Algorithm 2. We denote the encoder and decoder of VAE as $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$, respectively, and use $\epsilon_{\theta}(\cdot)$ to represent the denoising network. In Algorithm 2, Sampling(\cdot) refers to a diffusion sampling step from z_t to z_{t-1} , and AdaIN(\cdot, \cdot) [27] refers to modulate the variance and mean of the features to boost stylization.

B. Implementation Details

We implemented our approach using the PyTorch framework, applying mixed precision to save time and memory costs. For style-specific text-to-image generation, we use SDXL [46]; for other tasks, we employ Stable Diffusion v1.5 [48]. Following recent works [7, 29, 70], we extract attention features from the last six self-attention layers of U-Net to compute attention distillation loss. For comparison, we use the publicly available implementations of all baseline methods and adhere to their suggested configurations. All experiments are conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX 6000 Ada GPU. We use a fixed learning rate (0.05) for the Adam optimizer, except for style-specific text-to-image generation (0.015). In the following, we specify the detailed configurations for each task.

Style/Appearance Transfer. We initialize the target latent using the content/structure image. The content loss is computed with the Q features from the last 6 self-attention layers. The content loss weight, λ , is set to 0.25 for style transfer and 0.2 for appearance transfer, respectively. By default, We optimize the target latent over 200 iterations. All experiments are conducted to generate images at a resolution of 512x512. The time to synthesize an image takes about 30 seconds, with our optimization in latent space.

Style-Specific Text-to-Image Generation. We generate images at a resolution of 1024x1024 using SDXL. The sampling is conducted over 50 steps using DDIM sampling, with a scale set to 7 for classifier-free guidance. At each sampling step, We perform 2 iterations of latent optimization utilizing attention distillation loss. The whole process takes no more than 30 seconds. The learning rate of the Adam optimizer is set to 0.015 by default.

Controlled Texture Synthesis. For the mask-controlled texture synthesis, images are resized to resolution 512×512,

and synthesized in the optimization manner. The optimization performs 200 iterations by default. We adopted the same initialization strategy as GCD [69], where we fill the target segmentation map with random pixels drawn from the semantically corresponding region of the source texture. However, the low spatial resolution of features from U-Net makes the Masked AD loss inadequate for precise spatial control, as shown in Fig. 15. To address this, we utilize the Q features from the initialization image to compute the content loss with a content weight λ of 0.15. Introducing content loss leads to precise spatial alignment without compromising texture quality. For the layout control task as Self-Rectification [70], we directly use the color layout as the content image to compute content loss.

Texture Expansion. In this task, the example textures are resized to 512×512 . The results are generated using attention distillation guided sampling for efficiency. We use MultiDiffusion [5] to synthesize ultra-high resolution textures, achieving remarkable results; see an example of size 4096×4096 in Fig. 26. The sampling is conducted over 50 steps using DDIM sampling without classifier-free guidance. At each sampling step, We perform 3 iterations of latent optimization utilizing our attention distillation loss.

C. Additional Experiments

Time Efficiency. For texture synthesis, either optimization or sampling can be utilized. We record the time consumed by different methods (excluding the time for model loading, compilation, and image encoding/decoding). Specifically, the sampling method employs the DDIM sampler with 50 steps without classifier-free guidance. The Adam optimizer is set with a fixed learning rate of 0.05 for both methods. Typically, non-stationary textures require more iterations to produce a reasonable spatial structure. The detailed results are presented in Table 1 and Fig. 14.

Table 1. Time efficiency of our optimization-based and samplingbased approaches using Stable Diffusion v1.5. The sample-based approach performed a total of 50 sampling steps.

	Optimization-based			Sampling-based		
Iterations	100	200	300	1	2	3
Run Time	10 s	21 s	32 s	7 s	10 s	13 s
GPU Memory	4 GB					

A DEEP COMPARISON between optimization and sampling with attention distillation. The primary distinction between our optimization-based and samplingbased approaches with attention distillation lies in the nature of the extracted features. As illustrated in Algorithms 1 and 2, sampling-based methods extract features from Algorithm 1 Content-preserving Optimization (For Style and Appearance Transfer)

1: **Input:** Style image I^s , content image I^c , learning rate η , content loss weight λ . 2: **Output:** Optimized image *I*. 3: $z^s, z^c \leftarrow \mathcal{E}(I^s), \mathcal{E}(I^c)$ ▷ Convert the input images to latent space 4: Initialize $z \leftarrow z^c$ ▷ Start with the content latents 5: for t = T, T - 1, ..., 1 do $\{Q_c, K_c, V_c\} \leftarrow \epsilon_{\theta}(z^c, t, \emptyset)$ > Extract self-attention features from the UNet 6: $\{Q_s, K_s, V_s\} \leftarrow \epsilon_{\theta}(z^s, t, \emptyset)$ 7: $\{Q, K, V\} \leftarrow \epsilon_{\theta}(z, t, \emptyset)$ 8: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{content}} = \|Q - Q_c\|_1$ ▷ Calculate the content loss 9: $\mathcal{L}_{AD} = \|\text{Self-Attn}(Q, K, V) - \text{Self-Attn}(Q, K_s, V_s)\|_1$ 10: \triangleright Calculate the style loss $\mathcal{L}_{total} = \mathcal{L}_{AD} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{content}$ ⊳ Total loss 11: $z \leftarrow z - \eta \nabla_z \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$ ▷ Gradient descent step 12: 13: end for 14: $I \leftarrow \mathcal{D}(z)$ ▷ Decode the latents to image space 15: **Return:** *I*.

Algorithm 2 Attention Distillation Guided Sampling (For Style-specific Text-to-Image Generation)

1: Input: Style image I^s , text prompt y, learning rate η , optimization steps M. 2: **Output:** Generated image *I*. 3: $z^s \leftarrow \mathcal{E}(I^s)$ ▷ Convert the input images to latent space 4: Initialize $z_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ ▷ Start with random noise 5: for t = T, t - 1, ..., 1 do $z_{t-1} \leftarrow \text{Sampling}(z_t, t, \epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t, y))$ ▷ Diffusion Sampling 6: $z_{t-1}^{s} \leftarrow \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} z^{s} + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} \epsilon, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ $\{Q, K_{s}, V_{s}\} \leftarrow \epsilon_{\theta}(z_{t-1}^{s}, t-1, \emptyset)$ 7: ▷ Add noise to the style image latents ▷ Extract self-attention features from the UNet 8: $z_{t-1} = \text{AdaIN}(z_{t-1}, z_{t-1}^s)$ ▷ Modulate the variance and mean 9: for m = 1, ..., M do 10: $\{Q, K, V\} \leftarrow \epsilon_{\theta}(z_{t-1}, t-1, \emptyset)$ $\mathcal{L}_{AD} = \|\text{Self-Attn}(Q, K, V) - \text{Self-Attn}(Q, K_s, V_s)\|_1$ 11: ▷ Calculate the style loss 12: $z_{t-1} \leftarrow z_{t-1} - \eta \nabla_{z_{t-1}} \mathcal{L}_{AD}$ 13: ▷ Gradient descent step end for 14: 15: end for 16: $I \leftarrow \mathcal{D}(z_0)$ ▷ Decode the latents to image space 17: Return: I



Figure 14. Comparison between optimization-based and sampling-based approaches with attention distillation.



Figure 15. Ablation of losses used for controlled texture synthesis.



Figure 16. Digging deeper into the difference between our optimization and sampling-based methods. Top: optimization using differently fixed timesteps (fixed during optimization). Bottom: optimization with clean latents (Case 1), optimization with noised latents (Case 2), and sampling with noised latents (Case 3). For a fair comparison, we add the iteration number at each timestep for the optimization-based method (Case 1 & 2). See text for details.

stochastically inverted images, where scheduled noise relating to timesteps is added, which prevents the latents from being optimized outside the data distribution. In contrast, our optimization-based method extracts features from clean images (*i.e.*, z_0 encoded by VAE encoder). Experimental results reveal that by adjusting the timestep t, it is possible to extract features at varying levels of granularity, ranging from coarse to fine. As shown in Fig. 16 top, features



Figure 17. Impact of different learning rates and optimization iterations in style-specific text-to-image generation.

extracted from different timesteps were used to compute the AD loss to optimize the same Gaussian noise. Using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.05 and 200 iterations, the results indicate that features corresponding to larger timesteps focus on coarse structures, whereas those from small timesteps focus on fine details, demonstrating the necessity of linearly decreasing the timestep in our optimization-based method, as described in Sec.3.2 of our main paper.

To further investigate the differences between these two approaches, we designed three experimental cases for texture synthesis. Case 1 involves using features extracted from clean image latents to compute the AD loss for opti-



Figure 18. User study interface.

mization. Case 2 uses features extracted from noisy latents for the same purpose. Case 3 also employs features from noisy latents but optimizes the latent after denoising with the UNet for each timestep, *i.e.*, our AD-guided sampling method. In these experiments, the same Gaussian noise was used as the initial latent, the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.05 was employed, and the number of steps was set to 50. As shown in the bottom of Figure 16, the comparison between Cases 1 and 2 reveals that Case 2 produces noisier results and converges much more slowly. More importantly, the comparison between Cases 2 and 3 demonstrates that our guided sampling (or, equivalently, optimizing the denoising UNet-sampled results with AD loss) significantly improves the quality and speed of texture synthesis.

Impact of hyperparameters on Style-Specific T2I Gener-

ation. We study the impact of two hyperparameters, optimization iteration number in sampling, and learning rate on style-specific T2I generation. As shown in Fig. 17, a lower learning rate or fewer optimization iterations results in in-



Figure 19. Limitations of our method.

sufficient stylization, while increasing the learning rate or the number of optimization iterations can lead to a loss of semantic structure derived from text prompts. According to this study, we set the number of optimization iterations to 2 and the learning rate to 0.015 as default values, balancing image quality, text alignment, and time.

D. Details of User Study

We conduct a user study on three transfer tasks, selecting two competitors for each. Specifically, we compare StyleID [10] and StyTR² [12] for style transfer, Crossimage Attention [2] and SpliceViT [57] for appearance transfer, and InstantStyle [59] and Visual Style Prompting [29] for style-specific text-to-image generation. For each task, the user interface, shown in Fig. 18, randomly presents a set of results from our pool, displaying our method's generated results alongside those of one competitor in the center of the screen side-by-side. Reference images or prompts are provided on the left, with a summary of the evaluation criteria at the top of the screen. Users are asked to pick the better one. The criteria for each task are summarized as follows:

Style transfer: i) structural similarity to the content image, and ii) stylistic similarity to the style image.

Appearance transfer: i) structural similarity to the structure image, and ii) appearance similarity to the appearance image.

Style-specific text-to-image generation: i) semantic alignment with the text prompt, and ii) stylistic similarity to the style reference.

E. Limitation and Discussion

While we have demonstrated the effectiveness of our attention distillation loss across a wide range of visual characteristic transfer tasks—such as artistic style and appearance transfer, style-specific text-to-image generation, and texture synthesis—several limitations should be noted. First, we observed that the results of texture expansion occasionally exhibit oversaturated colors. This issue arises because the AD loss does not explicitly constrain the consistency of the data distribution. Instead, it relies on the model's understanding of the reference image to reassemble visual elements. When the resolution of the generated image exceeds the model's training scope, the aggregation process may produce suboptimal results. Second, in style and appearance transfer tasks, the AD loss depends on the model's ability to establish semantic correspondences based on its understanding of images. When the content of two images differs significantly, the model's limitations may lead to incorrect semantic matches, negatively impacting the final output. See Fig. 19 for two examples.

F. Additional Results

Finally, in the below figures, we provide additional results:

- (1) In Figs. 20 and 21, we display additional results of creative, text-guided generation with style-specific guidance.
- (2) In Fig. 22, we show more style transfer outcomes on diverse content and style examples.
- (3) In Fig. 23, we present the comparison on unconditioned texture synthesis to showcase the texture understanding capabilities of our attention distillation loss. We apply both optimization-based and sampling-based approaches with our method and compare them against state-of-the-art methods, including Self-Rectification [70], GCD [69], GPDM [16], and SWD [24].
- (4) In Figs. 24 and 25, we present the additional results of stationary and non-stationary texture synthesis and expansion, all achieved through our guided-sampling approach.
- (5) Finally, in Fig. 26, we demonstrate an extreme texture expansion by generating a high-resolution image in size 4096×4096 using a 512×512 example.



Figure 20. Additional results of our approach on style-specific text-to-image generation.



Figure 21. Additional results of our approach on style-specific text-to-image generation.



































Content









Figure 22. Additional results of our approach on artistic style transfer.



Figure 23. Comparison on unconditioned texture synthesis. Note that Self-Rectification needs a rough layout, but here, we only give it a random initialization as the target. In our results presented in the 4th and 6th rows, a fine-tuned VAE decoder is employed.



Figure 24. Additional results of our approach on stationary texture synthesis and expansion.



Figure 25. Additional results of our approach on non-stationary texture synthesis and expansion.



Figure 26. Texture synthesis with arbitrary resolution, where the above-generated image is in size of 4096×4096 pixels, synthesized from an example (bottom left) in size 512×512 .