Generating Synthetic Data via Augmentations for Improved Facial Resemblance in DreamBooth and InstantID

Supplementary Material

1. FaceDistance of InstantID generations

Our experiments with InstantID reveal that using a single reference image produces high variance in output quality with inconsistent facial similarity. (Figure 1) When using multiple reference images, results significantly improve facial representation consistency (Figure 2). Analysis of the *Vacation-Anna* dataset demonstrates that while the visual improvement between using 1 and 2 reference images is substantial, the differences between using 2, 4, or 8 images are subtle and difficult to distinguish without direct side-by-side comparison. The FaceDistance metric confirms this, showing that as more reference images are used, the distribution of distances shifts leftward, indicating better overall similarity.



Figure 1. Distribution of facial similarity metrics for 8 different input subjects using single reference images, with the y-axis sorted by FaceDistance (Img 3 showing lowest inter-image distance, Img 5 showing highest).



Figure 2. Comparison of facial similarity performance when using k reference images, demonstrating the leftward shift in FaceDistance distribution as k increases from 1 to 8 images.

2. Motivation to Seek Alternatives to InstantID

Although InstantID produces visually appealing images, its output variability for identical configurations is limited (see Figure 4). Our survey reveals that users are seeking greater diversity in images while maintaining a natural appearance, free from a photoshopped aesthetic. In contrast, utilizing Dreambooth for image generation circumvents this issue, making it the more favorable option (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Dreambooth generated images with more variability (Vacation-Anna)

3. Comparative Survey Analysis of Portrait Generation Methods

Our analysis reveals that generated portraits perform similarly across individual aspects, likely due to the SD model employed (Figure 5). Good subject datasets for Dreambooth yield more natural results, though user preferences trend toward Photoshop-edited appearances. Further investigation shows that "good" datasets correlate with higher employee agreement on preferred methods, with approximately 4% more participants favoring standardized InstantID portraits for their professional, photoshopped aesthetic (Figure 6). When assessing facial similarity between real and generated images, Dreambooth consistently outperformed InstantID regardless of dataset quality, with fewer participants identifying Dreambooth generations as different individuals (Figure 7).

White-collar workers demonstrated limited ability to distinguish AI-generated images, often searching for wellknown AI flaws absent from our high-quality generations.



Figure 4. InstantID generated images with better facial similarity but with less variability (*Party-Ryan*)

Among the subset of participants (n = 77) who reported noticing AI-generated images in daily life, our generations integrated seamlessly with non-generated studio images, with only the "Real (Daniel)" image—featuring strong contrast and sharp features—dividing opinion nearly equally (Figure 8).



Figure 5. Mean Scores by Category for Each Method. Users were asked to rate samples from each method on 5 Categories, 5 being the highest value.

4. Survey Questionare

Here is the full questionnaire for the survey. The answer options are in *italic*. Titles and other guiding instructions are in **bold**. We included descriptions to the images.

Title: Survey on Studio Portraits Short introduction

1. Rate the skill level of the photographer. (This is re-



Figure 6. Percentage of Participant Choices.



Figure 7. Percentage of Similarity Ratings per Method.



Figure 8. Percentage of No/Yes Answers per Picture. (n = 77)

peated for all four subjects.) Each subject has four generated images arranged in a grid. A short description of their professional background is included (e.g., marketer, researcher, nurse).

- (a) How would you rate the overall quality? *[Really Bad] 1 5 [Really Good]*
- (b) Are the facial details clear and well-defined? [No] 1 - 5 [Yes]
- (c) How identical is the person in these pictures? [Completely Different] 1 - 5 [Exactly The Same]
- (d) How much editing, if any, is present in this photo? [No Editing] 1 - 5 [Heavily Edited]
- (e) Rate the quality of the background in the headshot. [Poor] 1 5 [Excelent]
- (f) Would you expect to see these photos in a professional context, such as on LinkedIn or company websites? [Yes/No]
- (g) Is there anything you don't like about these pictures? [Text Answer]
- (h) Is there anything you particularly like about these pictures? [Text Answer]
- 2. Which photographers were good? If you've liked at least 1 image, click the square near it. [Four image grids from above]
- 3. Similarity of Real-Life Pictures and Portraits. In this section, you are asked to compare how similar the person in the everyday pictures on the left is to

the person in the portraits on the right.

How would you rate the similarity of the person? [Not the same] 1-3 [The Same]

4. Detection of the use of AI. In this chapter, we might have used artificial intelligence (AI) in a way. Don't go back to previous chapters and change your answers. This is important for our research.

Please select photos, if any, that you think AI was used. *[Four pictures of the subjects]*

- 5. What affected your choice? [Text Answer]
- 6. Your familiarity with photography How often do you take photos of yourself or others in your daily life? [Daily or Weekly, Monthly, Every few Months, Yearly or Never]
- 7. Do you use any software to edit your photos? [Yes/No]
- 8. Do you spot AI (artificial intelligence) generated pictures in your daily life? [Yes/No]
- 9. Have you ever used AI to create pictures? [Yes/No]