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Figure 1: Stochastic Differential Editing (SDEdit) is a unified image synthesis and editing framework based on stochastic differential equations. SDEdit allows stroke painting to image, image compositing, and stroke-based editing without task-specific model training and loss functions.

Abstract

We introduce a new image editing and synthesis framework, Stochastic Differential Editing (SDEdit), based on a recent generative model using stochastic differential equations (SDEs). Given an input image with user edits (e.g., hand-drawn color strokes), we first add noise to the input according to an SDE, and subsequently denoise it by simulating the reverse SDE to gradually increase its likelihood under the prior. Our method does not require task-specific loss function designs, which are critical components for recent image editing methods based on GAN inversion. Compared to conditional GANs, we do not need to collect new datasets of original and edited images for new applications. Therefore, our method can quickly adapt to various editing tasks at test time without re-training models. Our approach achieves strong performance on a wide range of applications, including image synthesis and editing guided by stroke paintings and image compositing.

1. Introduction

Denoising diffusion probabilistic models \cite{song2020denoising, song2021score} and score-based generative models \cite{song2019generative, song2020score} are a new class of generative models that have found great success in image generation \cite{song2020denoising, song2019generative, song2020score, song2020score2, song2019score, song2021score, song2020score2, song2020score3, song2020score4}, audio synthesis \cite{song2020score5} and graph generation \cite{song2020score6}. One of the latest development in this direction, generative modeling with stochastic differential equations (SDEs \cite{song2020score6}), has demonstrated comparable or better sample quality than generative adversarial networks (GANs) \cite{goodfellow2014generative}, with more stable training and better mode coverage. Specifically, Song et al. \cite{song2020score6} proposed to perturb a data distribution according to the trajectory of an SDE by injecting Gaussian noise, which smoothly transforms any data distribution (e.g., images) to a tractable Gaussian prior distribution. To perform sampling, a neural network is trained to estimate the gradient of the data distribution, and subsequently uses it to solve the reverse stochastic process—a process that converts any Gaussian noise vector back to a data sample. Despite recent progress on uncondi-
Figure 2: Synthesizing images from strokes with SDEdit. The blue dot illustrates the editing process of our method. The green and blue contour plots represent the distributions of images and stroke paintings, respectively. Given a stroke painting, we first perturb it by adding noise according to an SDE and progressively remove the noise by simulating the reverse SDE. This process gradually projects an unrealistic stroke painting to the manifold of natural images.

Stochastic Differential Editing (SDEdit) is a unified approach to image editing and synthesis inspired by generative modeling with stochastic differential equations (SDEs) [55]. The key intuition of SDEdit is to “hijack” the reverse stochastic process of SDE-based generative models, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Given an input image with user edits, such as a stroke painting or an image with strokes, we can add a suitable amount of noise to smooth out undesirable artifacts and distortions (e.g., unnatural details at stroke pixels), while still preserving the overall structure of the input. We then initialize the reverse SDE with this noisy input, and simulate the reverse process to obtain a denoised result of high quality. Since both share the same noisy image, this denoised result and the user-edited input also share the overall image structure (see Fig. 2).

Existing methods for image editing are typically based on GANs, and can be roughly grouped into two categories. The first category leverages conditional GANs [26, 72] to learn a direct mapping from original images to edited ones. However, conditional models have to be trained on both original and edited images, thus requiring data collection and model re-training for new editing tasks. Unlike conditional GANs, SDEdit only requires training on the original image. As such, it can be directly applied to various editing tasks at test time (as illustrated in Figure 1).

The second category is GAN inversion [71, 9], where a pre-trained GAN is used to invert a given image to a latent representation, which is subsequently modified to generate the edited image. This procedure involves manually designing loss functions and optimization procedures for different image editing tasks. However, designing a proper loss function can be hard, and for tasks such as stroke-based image synthesis (Figure 1), no such loss exists in the literature. Moreover, many datasets are still hard to invert [32, 24] due to the limited model capacity and optimization difficulty.

Unlike GAN inversion, SDEdit does not solve an optimization problem, and is thus free of task-specific loss functions and optimization procedures. This makes our method especially advantageous when the loss function is hard to design (e.g., stroke-based image synthesis in Figure 2).

We show that our unified framework enables several image synthesis and editing applications, including image compositing, stroke-based image synthesis, and stroke-based editing. Our empirical results confirm that SDEdit significantly outperforms GAN baselines on stroke-based image synthesis, with comparable performance on other tasks. We provide code and more details on our website.

2. Related Work

Conditional GANs [26, 72] for image editing learn to directly generate an image based on a user input, and have demonstrated success on a variety of tasks including image synthesis and editing [42, 11, 12, 59, 39, 73], sketch2photo [47], inpainting [40, 25, 65, 35], photo colorization [67, 34, 68, 22], semantic image texture and geometry synthesis [69, 20, 61]. However, applying such methods to on-the-fly image manipulation is still challenging since a new model needs to be trained for each new application.

GANs Inversion and Editing. Another mainstream approach to image editing involves GAN inversion [71, 9], where the input is first projected into the latent space of an unconditional GAN before synthesizing a new image from the modified latent code. Several methods have been proposed in this direction, including fine-tuning network weights for each image [7, 38, 46], choosing better or multiple layers to project and edit [1, 2, 19, 60], designing better encoders [45, 57], modeling image corruption and transformations [5, 24], and discovering meaningful latent directions [49, 16, 27, 21]. However, these methods need to define different loss functions for different tasks. They
also require GAN inversion, which can be hard for certain datasets [24, 32, 8, 64].

Score-based Generative Models. Recent advances in training non-normalized probabilistic models, such as score-based generative models [52, 53, 55, 23, 51, 28] and energy-based models [3, 15, 14, 62, 63, 54], have achieved comparable image sample quality as GANs. However, most of the prior works in this direction have focused on unconditional image generation and density estimation, and state-of-the-art techniques for image editing and synthesis are still dominated by GAN-based methods. In this work, we focus on the recently emerged generative modeling with stochastic differential equations (SDE), and study its application to controllable image editing and synthesis tasks.

3. Background

Below we introduce the basic concepts of stochastic differential equations, and how to approximately reverse them by training neural networks.

3.1. Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs)

Stochastic differential equations (SDEs) generalize ordinary differential equations (ODEs) by injecting random noise into the dynamics. The solution of an SDE is a time-varying random variable (i.e., stochastic process), which we denote as \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \), where \( t \in [0, 1] \) indexes time. The probability density function of \( x(t) \) is denoted as \( p_t \).

We consider two special SDEs in this work: the Variance Exploding (VE) and Variance Preserving (VP) SDEs [55]. VE SDE gives a process with exploding variance, as used in [52, 53], while VP SDE yields a process with fixed variance of one under certain conditions, as used in [50, 23]. Though possessing slightly different forms and performing differently depending on the image domain, they share the same mathematical intuition. Since methods can be directly transferred from one to the other (and to other linear SDEs as well), we therefore only discuss the mathematical formulation of VE SDEs in the interest of space, and defer detailed information on VP SDEs to the appendix.

The VE SDE is given by

\[
\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = \sigma(t) w(t),
\]

where \( \sigma(t) \in \mathbb{R} \) is a pre-specified function that starts at \( \sigma(0) = 0 \) and grows exponentially fast. Here \( dx(t) \) represents the instantaneous increment of \( x(t) \), \( dt \) represents an infinitesimal time step, \( w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \) denotes a Brownian motion process, and \( dw(t) \) stands for an infinitesimal difference of \( w(t) \) which can be intuitively understood as infinitesimal Gaussian noise.

For VE SDEs, \( x(t) \) is always distributed according to a Gaussian centered at \( x(0) \). Specifically,

\[
p(x(t) | x(0)) = \mathcal{N}(x(t) | x(0), \sigma^2(t)I).
\]

Intuitively, the stochastic process perturbs \( x(0) \) with increasing Gaussian noise as time moves forward, which makes obtaining \( x(t) \) from \( x(0) \) particularly easy. Under the condition that \( \sigma(1) \) is sufficiently large, \( x(1) \) will be approximately distributed according to \( \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(1)I) \) regardless of the value of \( x(0) \), i.e., \( p_1 \approx \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(1)I) \).

3.2. Reversing SDEs

As time elapses, the SDE progressively adds Gaussian noise to \( x(0) \). By reversing this process, we can gradually denoise \( x(t) \) to recover \( x(0) \). [4] shows that any SDE has a corresponding reverse SDE that depends on \( \nabla_x \log p_t(x) \), a quantity commonly known as the (Stein) score function [56, 36, 18] of \( p_t(x) \). In particular, the reverse VE SDE is

\[
\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = \frac{d[\sigma^2(t)]}{dt} \nabla_x \log p_t(x(t))dt + \sqrt{\frac{d[\sigma^2(t)]}{dt}} dw(t),
\]

where \( dt \) here is an infinitesimal negative time step, \( p_t \) denotes the distribution of \( x(t) \), and \( w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is a Brownian motion running backwards in time. Both forward and reverse SDEs induce the same stochastic process \( \{x(t)\}_{t \in [0,1]} \), except that time progresses in the reverse direction for the reverse SDE.

To obtain the reverse SDE, it is necessary to know the score function \( \nabla_x \log p_t(x(t)) \) for all \( t \in [0,1] \). Suppose the initial distribution of the SDE, \( p_0 \), is chosen to be the underlying data distribution of a dataset. We can estimate these score functions by training a time-dependent neural network \( s_\theta(x, t) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \), called a time-dependent score model, on this dataset such that \( s_\theta(x, t) \approx \nabla_x \log p_t(x) \).

The training objective for \( s_\theta(x, t) \) is a mixture of denoising score matching losses [58, 44, 43] over randomly sampled time steps. For VE SDEs, it takes the form of

\[
\min_\theta \mathbb{E}_{t \sim U(0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{x(0) \sim p_0} \mathbb{E}_{x(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(x(0), \sigma^2(t)I)} \left[ \left\| \frac{\sigma(t) s_\theta(x(t), t) + x(t) - x(0)}{\sigma(t)} \right\|_2^2 \right].
\]

Here all expectations can be estimated with empirical means over samples. Intuitively, the objective pushes \( s_\theta(x(t), t) \) to recover the Gaussian noise that perturbed \( x(0) \) to \( x(t) \), and the resulting score model can be interpreted as a denoiser for \( x(t) \). We can minimize the objective with standard Stochastic Gradient Descent, with no need for adversarial training.

With the learned time-dependent score model in hand, we can plug it into the reverse SDE. This allows us to
gradually transform a Gaussian noise vector $x(1) \sim p_1 \approx \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(1)I)$ to a data sample $x(0) \sim p_0$. Following previous work [55], we solve the reverse VE and VP SDEs by discretizing the time interval, where $[0, 1]$ is uniformly partitioned to $N$ equal sub-intervals, with end points $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N = 1$ and $\Delta t = \frac{1}{N}$. In particular, we solve the reverse VE SDE by iterating

$$x_{n-1} = x_n + (\sigma^2(t_n) - \sigma^2(t_n - \Delta t))s_\theta(x_n, t_n) + \sqrt{\sigma^2(t_n) - \sigma^2(t_n - \Delta t)}z_n, \quad (4)$$

where $n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, $x_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(1)I)$ and $z_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. When $\Delta t \approx 0$, we have $\sigma^2(t) - \sigma^2(t - \Delta t) \approx \frac{d\sigma^2(t)}{dt}\Delta t$, making Eq. (4) close to Eq. (2). As a result, the sequence of random variables $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^N$ obtained from Eq. (4) becomes an approximation of the stochastic process $\{x(t)\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ (i.e., $x_n \approx x(t_n) \sim p_n$ for each $n$). Note that Eq. (4) is only one numerical integration scheme, and other numerical SDE solvers [48] also work. Reversing VP SDEs can be similarly achieved with a uniform discretization and the time-dependent score model, which we defer to the appendix.

4. Image Synthesis and Editing with SDEs

Leveraging SDEs and their reverse, we propose a unified approach for multiple tasks in image synthesis and editing, including stroke-based image synthesis, stroke-based image editing and image compositing as shown in Fig. 1. For each image domain, we only need to train a single time-dependent score model to build a prior for performing all these tasks. We call our method Stochastic Differential Editing (SDEdit). As we shall see later, SDEdit does not require task-specific model training or loss function designs, and is advantageous when the loss function for GAN-based methods is hard to design (e.g., stroke-based image synthesis in Figure 2). Moreover, SDEdit does not require training on paired or unpaired edited images, and is directly applicable to various image editing and synthesis tasks.

4.1. Training the Score Model

Before performing various editing tasks, we need a dataset of images that captures the prior of a particular image domain. For example, we need a dataset of diverse human faces for performing face editing, and a dataset of high quality bedrooms for synthesizing bedroom images.

Suppose the dataset contains $M$ images, denoted as $\{x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \ldots, x^{(M)}\}$, which are i.i.d. sampled from an underlying data distribution $p_{\text{data}}$. As a first step of our method, we perturb the training data with an SDE by setting $p_0 = p_{\text{data}}$, and train a time-dependent score model $s_\theta(x(t), t)$ to denoise perturbed samples by optimizing Eq. (3).

4.2. Synthesizing Images from Strokes

With the learned time-dependent score model $s_\theta(x(t), t)$ at our disposal, we can synthesize and edit images in the same domain without re-training models. We first introduce a simplified version of our algorithm before discussing the general case. Let us consider the task of stroke-based image synthesis, where we aim to generate photo-realistic images guided by strokes from a user (see Fig. 2). The stroke painting describes the rough content in a target image with color blocks, and we aim to infer high quality images from our prior while preserving semantics of the stroke painting. Compared to Scriber [47], our stroke paintings only require rough color strokes and do not rely on detailed sketches, which are hard for novice users to create.

Generating images from strokes is challenging for GAN inversion methods due to the difficulty of designing a suitable loss to measure the difference between strokes and images, as the loss should assess semantic similarity instead of pixel-wise distances. Solving this task with SDEs, however, is rather straightforward as we observe that the distributions of strokes and images can be smoothly bridged together by adding large Gaussian noise. As illustrated in Fig. 2, we can first perturb an input stroke according to the SDE until it loses details but not general structure. Subsequently, we denoise the noisy stroke to progressively move it to the distribution of valid images captured by the time-dependent score model.

This intuition can be implemented with the reverse SDE and a pre-trained time-dependent score model. We first start with a stroke painting $x(0)$ and run the forward SDE until $t = t_0$ to obtain $x(t_0)$, where $0 < t_0 < 1$ is a hyper-parameter tuned such that $x(t_0)$ blurs the unrealistic details in $x(0)$ without significantly altering its global semantics and structure. We then reverse the stochastic process with the time-dependent score model using the numerical procedure given in Eq. (4). Because the forward and reverse processes are stochastic, we do not recover the original stroke painting, but instead obtain a modified image steered towards the prior distribution of valid images, on which our score-based models have been trained. We can repeat the above perturbing and denoising procedure for this modified image, in order to move it closer to the data distribution for improved fidelity. The pseudo-code is given in Algorithm 1 for the VE SDE, where $N$ denotes the number of denoising steps, and $K$ is the number of total repeats.

4.3. SDEdit: General Algorithm

Algorithm 1 converts a stroke painting to a photo-realistic image, which typically modifies all pixels of the input. However, in cases such as image compositing and stroke-based editing, certain regions of the input are already photo-realistic and therefore we hope to leave these regions intact. To represent a specific region, we use a binary mask.
Algorithm 1 Stroke-based image synthesis with SDEdit

Require: \( x \) (stroke painting), \( t_0 \) (SDE hyper-parameter), \( N \) (total denoising steps), \( K \) (total repeats)

\[ \Delta t \leftarrow \frac{t_0}{N} \]

for \( k \leftarrow 1 \) to \( K \)

for \( n \leftarrow N \) to 1 do

\[ z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \]

\[ \epsilon \leftarrow \sqrt{\sigma^2(t) - \sigma^2(t - \Delta t)} \]

\[ x \leftarrow x + \epsilon s_\theta(x, t) + \epsilon z \]

end for

end for

Return \( x \)

\( \Omega \in \{0, 1\}^{C \times H \times W} \) that evaluates to 1 for editable pixels and 0 otherwise. We can generalize Algorithm 1 to restrict editing in the region defined by \( \Omega \).

For editable regions, we perturb the input image with the forward SDE and generate edits by reversing the SDE, using the same procedure in Algorithm 1. For uneditable regions, we perturb it as usual but design the reverse procedure carefully so that it is guaranteed to recover the input. Specifically, suppose \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H \times W} \) is an input image of height \( H \), width \( W \), and with \( C \) channels. Our algorithm first perturbs \( x(0) = x \) with an SDE running from \( t = 0 \) till \( t = t_0 \) to obtain \( x(t_0) \), where \( 0 < t_0 \leq 1 \) is a hyper-parameter tuned in the same way as Section 4.2. Afterwards, we denoise \( x(t_0) \) with separate methods for \( \Omega \circ x(t) \) and \( (1 - \Omega) \circ x(t) \), where \( \circ \) denotes the element-wise product and 0 \( \leq t \leq t_0 \). For \( \Omega \circ x(t) \), we simulate the reverse SDE in Eq. (2) and project the results by element-wise multiplication with \( \Omega \). For \( (1 - \Omega) \circ x(t) \), we set it to \( (1 - \Omega) \circ (x + \sigma(t)z) \), where \( z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \). Here we gradually reduce the noise magnitude according to \( \sigma(t) \) to make sure \( \Omega \circ x(t) \) and \( (1 - \Omega) \circ x(t) \) have comparable amount of noise. Moreover, since \( \sigma(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to 0 \), this ensures that \( (1 - \Omega) \circ x(t) \) converges to \( (1 - \Omega) \circ x \), keeping the uneditable part of \( x \) intact. The complete SDEdit method (for VE SDEs) is given in Algorithm 2, and we provide additional pseudo-code for VP SDEs in the supplementary material.

With different inputs to Algorithm 2, we can perform multiple image synthesis and editing tasks with a single unified approach, including but not limited to the following:

- **Stroke-based image synthesis**: We can recover Algorithm 1 discussed in Section 4.2 by setting all entries in \( \Omega \) to 1.

- **Stroke-based image editing**: Suppose \( x \) is an image marked by strokes, and \( \Omega \) masks the part of stroke painting. We can reconcile the two parts of \( x \) with

Algorithm 2 Stochastic Differential Editing (VE SDE)

Require: \( x \) (raw image), \( \Omega \) (mask for edited regions), \( t_0 \) (SDE hyper-parameter), \( N \) (total denoising steps), \( K \) (total repeats)

\[ \Delta t \leftarrow \frac{t_0}{K} \]

\[ x_0 \leftarrow x \]

for \( k \leftarrow 1 \) to \( K \)

for \( n \leftarrow N \) to 1 do

\[ z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \]

\[ x \leftarrow (1 - \Omega) \odot x_0 + \Omega \odot x + \sigma(t_0)z \]

end for

end for

Return \( x \)

\[ \% \text{ more faithful than SDEdit (VE)}(1) \]

\[ \% \text{ more realistic than SDEdit (VE)}(1) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>in-domain GAN-1 [70]</th>
<th>in-domain GAN-2 [70]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDEdit (VE) (1) (ours)</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDEdit (VE) (3) (ours)</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
<td>8.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StyleGAN2-ADA [30]</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Evaluation of stroke-based generation on LSUN bedroom dataset. The parenthesis after SDEdit (VP/VE) indicates the number of repetitions \( k \). Numbers are the percentage of MTurk workers that prefers a method over our SDEdit (VE) (1).

Algorithm 2 to obtain a photo-realistic image.

- **Image compositing**: Suppose \( x \) is an image superimposed by elements from two images, and \( \Omega \) masks the region belonging to the same image. We can perform image compositing with Algorithm 2.

5. Experiments

We show that SDEdit is able to outperform state-of-the-art GAN models on stroke-based image synthesis, and achieves competitive performance on stroke-based image editing, and image compositing. Both the baselines and our SDEdit use pre-trained models that are publicly available.

5.1. Stroke-Based Image Synthesis

Given an input stroke painting, our goal is to generate a realistic image that shares the same structure as the input _when no paired data is available_. We present the results of SDEdit using both VE and VP SDEs in Figure 3. We consider \( K = 1 \) and \( K = 3 \) to compare and contrast the per-
Figure 3: Generated images based on stroke paintings on LSUN bedroom dataset. We generated 400 images for each method. We compare our results with StyleGAN2-ADA and in-domain GAN. In the figure, the parenthesis after SDEdit (VP/VE) stands for the number of iterations used.

As Figure 3 demonstrates, both baselines struggle to generate realistic images based on stroke painting inputs whereas our method successfully generates realistic images that preserve semantics of the input stroke painting. In addition, as shown in Figure 4, our SDEdit can synthesize diverse images for the same input.

We leverage Amazon Mechanical Turk to quantify the advantage of our SDEdit over baselines. Specifically, we synthesize a total of 400 bedroom images from stroke paintings for each method. To quantify sample quality, we ask the workers to perform 1500 pairwise comparisons (against SDEdit (VE) \(k = 1\)) to determine which image sample looks more realistic. To quantify faithfulness (i.e., whether synthesized samples preserve semantics of the stroke painting), we ask a different set of workers to perform another 3000 pairwise comparisons (against SDEdit (VE) \(k = 1\)).
Figure 5: Stroke-based image editing with SDEdit (VP) on LSUN bedroom, CelebA-HQ, and LSUN church datasets. For comparison, we also show the results of GAN baselines with the same inputs, where results for LSUN bedroom and CelebA-HQ are obtained by in-domain GAN (the first 4 panels), and results for LSUN church are from StyleGAN2-ADA (the rightmost 3 panels). We observe that our method is able to generate images that are more faithful and realistic compared to the baselines.

All quantitative results for this task are given in Table 1. We observe that all the SDEdit methods are able to beat the GAN baselines on both faithfulness and sample quality, with SDEdit (VP) \((k = 3)\) achieving the best performance.

5.2. Flexible Image Editing

With the same pre-trained time-dependent score models, we can perform a variety of different image editing tasks with Algorithm 2. We focus on LSUN (bedroom, church) and CelebA-HQ datasets, and provide more details on the experimental setup in the appendix.

5.2.1 Stroke-based image editing

We ask users to add stroke edits to real images, and then specify the masks to describe the locations of the strokes. Similar to our previous experiments, we use StyleGAN-ADA and in-domain GAN as our baselines. We feed the same scribbled images to all the models. As shown in Figure 5, results generated by GAN baselines tend to introduce undesired modifications, occasionally making the image outside the stroke region blurry. In contrast, our method is able to generate image edits that are both realistic and faithful (to the user edit), while avoid making undesired modifications.

5.2.2 Image compositing

We focus on compositing images from the CelebA-HQ [29] dataset. Given an image randomly sampled from the dataset, we ask the users to specify how they want the edited image to look like using pixel patches copied from other reference images (examples in Figure 6 where “original” stands for a dataset image, and “input” for an input designed by users). We ask users to specify the pixels they want to perform modifications, which will be used as the mask in Algorithm 2. We compare our method to traditional blending algorithms and the same GAN baselines considered previously. We present the results in Figure 6 where we use the same input for all the methods. To quantitatively evaluate our results, we generate 936 images based on the user inputs. To quantify sample quality, we ask MTurk workers to perform 1500 pairwise comparisons (against SDEdit (VE) pre-trained on FFHQ [31]) to determine which image sample looks more realistic. To quantify faithfulness (i.e. whether the generated images follows the user’s edit), we ask different workers to perform another 1500 pairwise comparisons (against SDEdit (VE) pre-trained on FFHQ) to decide which generated image matches the content of the inputs more faithfully. To quantify undesired changes, we follow [6] to compute masked LPIPS [66]. As evidenced in Table 2, we observe that SDEdit is able to generate both faithful and realistic images with much lower LPIPS scores compared to GAN baselines. We present more experiment
Figure 6: Image editing on CelebA with models trained on FFHQ. Given an input image, we use the same mask for all methods. Quantitative results are reported in Table 2.

Table 2: Image editing on CelebA-HQ images. All the GAN baselines are trained on FFHQ [31]. For SDEdit, we denote in the parenthesis which dataset it is pre-trained on. Numbers indicate the percentage of MTurk workers that prefer the corresponding method over SDEdit (VE) (FFHQ). We report the masked LPIPS distance between edited and unchanged images to quantify undesired changes outside the masks.

6. Conclusion

We propose Stochastic Differential Editing (SDEdit), an image editing and synthesis method via generative modeling of images with stochastic differential equations (SDEs). Unlike image editing techniques via GAN inversion, our method does not require task-specific optimization algorithms for reconstructing inputs, and is particularly suitable for datasets or tasks where GAN inversion losses are hard to design or optimize. We demonstrate that SDEdit outperforms existing GAN-based methods on stroke-based image generation, and also achieves competitive performance on stroke-based image editing and image compositing with no or minor modifications.
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Below, we add additional implementation details for each application. Our code and models will be publicly available upon publication.

Stroke-based image synthesis. In this experiment, we use $N = 500$, $t_0 = 0.5$, for SDEdit (VP); and $N = 1000$, $t_0 = 0.45$ for SDEdit (VE). We find that $K = 1$ to 3 work reasonably well, with larger $K$ generating more realistic images but at a higher computational cost.

For both StyleGAN2-ADA and in-domain GAN, we use the official implementation with default parameters to project each input image into the latent space, and subsequently use the obtained latent code to produce stroke-based image samples.

We provide intermediate images samples.

A. Implementation Details

Below, we add additional implementation details for each application. Our code and models will be publicly available upon publication.

Stroke-based image synthesis. In this experiment, we use $N = 500$, $t_0 = 0.5$, for SDEdit (VP); and $N = 1000$, $t_0 = 0.45$ for SDEdit (VE). We find that $K = 1$ to 3 work reasonably well, with larger $K$ generating more realistic images but at a higher computational cost.

For both StyleGAN2-ADA and in-domain GAN, we use the official implementation with default parameters to project each input image into the latent space, and subsequently use the obtained latent code to produce stroke-based image samples.

Image compositing. We use CelebA-HQ (256×256) [29] for image compositing experiments. More specifically, given an image from CelebA-HQ, the user will copy pixel patches from other reference images, and also specify the pixels they want to perform modifications. In general, the masks are simply the pixels the users have copied pixel patches to. We focus on editing hairstyles and adding glasses. We use an SDEdit model pretrained on FFHQ [31] or CelebA-HQ [29]. We use $t_0 = 0.3$, $N = 300$, $K = 3$ for SDEdit (VP), and $t_0 = 0.35$, $N = 700$, $K = 3$ for SDEdit (VE). We present more results in Appendix B.2.

B. Extra experimental results

B.1. Extra results on LSUN datasets

Stroke-based image generation. We present more SDEdit (VP) results on LSUN bedroom in Figure 7. We use $t_0 = 0.5$, $N = 500$, and $K = 2$. We observe that, SDEdit is able to generate realistic images that share the same structure as the input paintings when no paired data is provided.

Stroke-based image editing. We present more SDEdit (VP) results on LSUN bedroom in Figure 8. SDEdit generates image edits that are both realistic and faithful to the user edit, while avoids making undesired modifications on pixels not specified by users. See Appendix A for experimental settings.

B.2. Extra results on CelebA-HQ datasets

Stroke-based image editing. We provide intermediate step visualizations for SDEdit (VP) in Figure 9. We present extra SDEdit (VP) results on CelebA-HQ in Figure 10. We also presents results on CelebA-HQ (1024×1024) in Fig. 15. SDEdit generates images that are both realistic and faithful (to the user edit), while avoids introducing undesired modifications on pixels not specified by users. We provide experiment settings in Appendix A.

Image compositing. We focus on editing hair styles and adding glasses. We present more SDEdit (VP) results on CelebA-HQ (256×256) in Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13. We also presents results on CelebA-HQ (1024×1024) in Figure 14. We observe that SDEdit can generate both faithful and realistic edited images. See Appendix A for experiment settings.

C. Details on the VE and VP SDEs

We follow the definitions of VE and VP SDEs in [55], and adopt the same settings therein. In particular, for the VE SDE, we choose

$$
\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} 
0, & t = 0 \\
\sigma_{\min}(\frac{x_{\max}}{\sigma_{\min}})^t, & t > 0
\end{cases}
$$

where $\sigma_{\min} = 0.01$ and $\sigma_{\max} = 380, 378, 348, 1348$ for LSUN churches, bedroom, FFHQ/CelebA-HQ 256 × 256, and FFHQ 1024 × 1024 datasets respectively.

For the VP SDE, it takes the form of

$$
\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{2} \beta(t)x(t)dt + \sqrt{\beta(t)}dw(t),
$$

where $\beta(t)$ is a positive function. In experiments, we follow [55, 23] and set

$$
\beta(t) = \beta_{\min} + t(\beta_{\max} - \beta_{\min}),
$$

where $\beta_{\min} = 0.1$ and $\beta_{\max} = 20$ across all datasets. We always have $p_1(x) \approx N(0, I)$ under these settings.

Solving the reverse VP SDE is similar to solving the reverse VE SDE. Specifically, we follow the iteration rule below:

$$
x_{n-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \beta(t_n)\Delta t}}[x_n + \beta(t_n)\Delta ts_\theta(x(t_n), t_n)] + \sqrt{\beta(t_n)\Delta t}z_n,
$$

where $x_N \sim N(0, I)$, $z_n \sim N(0, I)$ and $n = N, N - 1, \cdots, 1$.

D. Details on Stochastic Differential Editing

In this section, we present the algorithm for SDEdit (VP) on stroke-based image synthesis in Algorithm 3. We present
the algorithm for the general flexible image editing method in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 3 Stroke-based image synthesis with SDEdit (VP SDE)

Require: $x$ (stroke painting), $t_0$ (SDE hyper-parameter), $N$ (total denoising steps), $K$ (total repeats)

$\Delta t \leftarrow \frac{t_0}{N}$

$\alpha(t_0) \leftarrow \prod_{n=1}^{N}(1 - \beta(\frac{nt_0}{N}) \Delta t)$

for $k \leftarrow 1$ to $K$ do

$z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$

$x \leftarrow \sqrt{\alpha(t_0)} x + \sqrt{1 - \alpha(t_0)} z$

for $n \leftarrow N$ to 1 do

$t \leftarrow t_0 \frac{n}{N}$

$z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$

$x \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \beta(t) \Delta t}} (x + \beta(t) \Delta t s_\theta(x, t)) + \sqrt{\beta(t) \Delta t} z$

end for

end for

Return $x$

Algorithm 4 Stochastic Differential Editing (VP SDE)

Require: $x$ (source image), $\Omega$ (mask for edited regions), $t_0$ (SDE hyper-parameter), $N$ (total denoising steps), $K$ (total repeats)

$\Delta t \leftarrow \frac{t_0}{N}$

$x_0 \leftarrow x$

$\alpha(t_0) \leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^{N}(1 - \beta(\frac{it_0}{N}) \Delta t)$

for $k \leftarrow 1$ to $K$ do

$z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$

$x \leftarrow [(1 - \Omega) \odot \sqrt{\alpha(t_0)} x_0 + \Omega \odot \sqrt{1 - \alpha(t_0)} z]$

for $n \leftarrow N$ to 1 do

$t \leftarrow t_0 \frac{n}{N}$

$z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$

$\alpha(t) \leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^{N}(1 - \beta(\frac{it_0}{N}) \Delta t)$

$x \leftarrow \{ (1 - \Omega) \odot (\sqrt{\alpha(t)} x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \alpha(t)} z) + \Omega \odot \sqrt{1 - \beta(t) \Delta t} (x + \beta(t) \Delta t s_\theta(x, t)) + \sqrt{\beta(t) \Delta t} z \}$

end for

end for

Return $x$
Figure 7: Stroke-based image generation on bedroom images with SDEdit (VP) pretrained on LSUN bedroom.
Figure 8: Stroke-based image editing on bedroom images with SDEdit (VP) pretrained on LSUN bedroom. SDEdit generates image edits that are both realistic and faithful (to the user edit), while avoids making undesired modifications on pixels not specified by users.

Figure 9: Stroke-based image editing. Given an image, users will first modify the image using stroke, and provide a mask which describes the pixels covered by stroke (see Figure (a)) . The edited image will then be fed into SDEdit. SDEdit will first perturb the image with an SDE (see Figure (b)), and then simulate the reverse SDE (see Algorithm 4). We provide visualization of the intermediate steps of reversing SDE used in SDEdit (see Figure (c)).
Figure 10: Stroke-based image editing on CelebA-HQ images with SDEdit (VP). SDEdit generates image edits that are both realistic and faithful (to the user edit), while avoids making undesired modifications on pixels not specified by users.

Figure 11: Image compositing on CelebA-HQ images with SDEdit (VP). We edit the images to have brown hair. The model is pretrained on FFHQ.
Figure 12: Image compositing on CelebA-HQ images with SDEdit (VP). We edit the images to wear glasses. The model is pretrained on FFHQ.

Figure 13: Image compositing on CelebA-HQ images with SDEdit (VP). We edit the images to have blond hair. The model is pretrained on FFHQ.
Figure 14: Image compositing results with SDEdit (VE) on CelebA-HQ (resolution 1024×1024). The SDE model is pre-trained on FFHQ.

Figure 15: Stroke-based image editing results with SDEdit (VE) on CelebA-HQ (resolution 1024×1024). The SDE model is pre-trained on FFHQ.