

Figure 1: Panorama in a out of training-distribution setting.

# A APPENDIX

# A.1 OUT-OF-DISTRIBUTION EXAMPLES



Figure 2: Out-of-distribution examples generated by Cubediff. On the right are artistic generations, on the left fantasy sceneries like Alice in Wonderland.





• A cozy, modern living room with large windows allowing natural light to flood in. The room is furnished with a soft, gray sofa facing the windows and a wooden coffee table in



 

 



A concrete stairwell with orange railings leads up to a yellow door with a number 2 on it.

A bedroom with a window overlooking a snowy forest, a bed, a desk, and a dresser.

### A.3 PERSPECTIVE IMAGES FOR EVALUATION

 Please note that all perceptual/text alignment metrics require another network to be computed. However, as these networks are trained with perspective images alone, the metrics would not give meaningful results when computed on panoramas. To circumvent this problem, we instead we render 10 random perspective images with a FOV of 90° for each panorama and use those for metric computation. Notice that we do not sample with an elevation of less than -45° or more then 45° as other works such as MVDiffusion do not generate full 360° panoramas.

### A.4 USER STUDY

<span id="page-3-0"></span>As described in the main paper we perform a two-alternative forced choice (2AFC) considering all competitors and variants of our method. In Figure [3,](#page-3-0) we show the percentage of wins against all 1258 draws and corresponding confidence intervals. This indicates ours methods performs significantly better in the user study.



Figure 3: Results of User study. In this figure, we show the percentage of wins against all draws including the confidence interval

### A.5 MORE QUALITATIVE RESULTS



<span id="page-5-0"></span>

Figure 4: Generated panoramas with multiple text prompts and image condition

<span id="page-6-0"></span>

Figure 5: Generated panoramas with multiple text prompts and image condition



# A.6 MORE RESULTS OF UNSYNCHRONIZED GROUPNORM



Figure 6: Additional results of predictions with unsynchronized Group Norm.



A.7 MORE RESULTS OF NON-OVERLAPPING PREDICTIONS

Figure 7: Additional results of non-overlapping predictions.

### A.8 INDIVIDUAL FACE OVERLAPS FROM QUALITATIVE COMPARISON

Here, we depict the individual faces generated by our three CubeDiff methods used in the equirectangular panoramas in Figure 4 in the main paper. We show both uncropped and cropped faces as requested by reviewers. Additionally, we show the ground truth panoramas, the individual textual face descriptions. The corresponding input conditioning image is always the first (front) image of the individual faces (and thus equal for all models).

# Oursimg



Figure 8: Our generated faces with input conditioning image only. Top row shows the uncropped faces, bottom row shows the cropped faces.



Figure 9: Our generated faces with input conditioning image. Top row shows the uncropped faces, bottom row shows the cropped faces.

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

# Oursimg+txt

• A concrete stairwell with orange railings leads up to a yellow door with a number 2 on it.



Figure 10: Our generated faces with single caption input. Top row shows the uncropped faces, bottom row shows the cropped faces.

## • A bedroom with a window overlooking a snowy forest, a bed, a desk, and a dresser.



Figure 11: Our generated faces with single caption input. Top row shows the uncropped faces, bottom row shows the cropped faces.

# Oursimg+multitxt

**594 595**

**645 646 647**



Figure 12: Our generated faces with multi caption input. Top row shows the uncropped faces, bottom row shows the cropped faces.



Figure 13: Our generated faces with multi caption input. Top row shows the uncropped faces, bottom row shows the cropped faces.

# Ground truth



Figure 14: Ground truth panoramas from the Laval Indoor dataset.

### A.9 VAE RECONSTRUCTIONS

Below, we present pairs of images: the ground truth perspective images with a 95° field of view (FoV) and their corresponding reconstructed images. The reconstructed images are produced by passing the ground truth images through the encoder of our VAE and then decoding the resulting latent representations using the decoder of the same VAE.



Figure 15: Examples of ground truth and encoded-decoded perspective images with a FoV of 95° using our VAE. The VAE is capable of reconstructing perspective images with out loss of quality.

 

- 
- 
- 

### **702 703** A.10 DETAILED ARCHITECTURE

**754 755**

**704 705 706 707 708 709** We illustrate our latent diffusion model in Figure [16.](#page-13-0) The model's input is a concatenation of encoded latents, positional encodings, and an input mask indicating the conditioning image. To generate the initial latents, the input image is encoded with a VAE, while Gaussian noise is sampled for the other five faces. The VAE architecture is identical to that of Stable Diffusion's VAE, with one modification: all GroupNorm layers are replaced with synchronized GroupNorms, where normalization is computed across both the spatial and frame dimensions.

**710 711 712 713 714** The combined input is downsampled three times to a resolution of  $B \times 6 \times 32 \times 32$ . The first and last blocks of the model exclude attention layers and operate independently on each face. Once the final layer is computed, the output is processed through the synchronized decoder. Notably, except for the GroupNorm layers, all computations are performed per face, with no awareness of the overall panorama structure.

<span id="page-13-0"></span>**715** Despite this simplicity, our approach outperforms existing methods, as demonstrated by our results.



### A.11 ABLATIONS ON PANORAMIC DATA

 To evaluate the impact of dataset size on the performance of our method, we conducted an ablation study by training CubeDiff on three subsets of panoramic data: a tiny dataset containing approximately 700 panoramas from the Polyhaven dataset, a medium dataset of about 20,000 panoramas from the Structured3D dataset (the same dataset PanoDiffusion used and comparable in size to MVDiffusion), and a full dataset with over 40,000 panoramas. The results demonstrate that Cube-Diff performs robustly across all settings. Even the tiny model, trained on only 700 panoramas, achieves competitive results, while the medium model closely matches the performance of the full model and significantly outperforms baseline methods in most metrics. Qualitative results further confirm the ability of the tiny and medium models to generate visually consistent and high-quality panoramas, demonstrating CubeDiff's robustness even with constrained data. These findings indicate that the superior performance of CubeDiff stems not only from data volume but also from the strength of the cubemap representation and its compatibility with pretrained latent diffusion models.

	<b>LAVAL</b> Indoor			<b>SUN360</b>		
	$FID \downarrow$	KID $(\times 10^2)$	Clip-FID $\downarrow$		FID $\downarrow$ KID $(\times 10^2)$	$Clip-FID\downarrow$
Text2Light	28.3	1.45	11.5	60.1	4.31	31.3
PanFusion	41.7	2.85	19.8	30.0	1.42.	7.8
<b>OmniDreamer</b>	71.0	5.17	23.9	92.3	8.89	51.7
PanoDiffusion	58.6	4.08	26.6	52.9	3.51	28.9
Diffusion360	33.1	2.07	16.9	45.4	3.73	18.5
<b>MVDiffusion</b>	25.7	1.11	13.5	50.9	3.71	15.4
Ours <sub>tiny</sub>	27.3	1.05	8.8	41.7	2.99	14.7
<b>Our</b> S <sub>medium</sub>	13.8	0.66	8.5	23.9	1.28	10.7
$Ours_{full}$	10.0	0.35	4.1	24.1	1.33	7.0

Table 1: Quantitative Ablation on the Laval Indoor and SUN360 dataset. We train a model (Ours $_{\text{tiny}}$ ) on a tiny dataset and another model (Ours $_{\text{medium}}$ ) on a medium dataset



Figure 17: Qualitative results of the ablated models. Both the tiny and the medium model are able to generate consistent panoramas.



Figure 18: Example of an OOD generation of our tiny (top row) model, medium model (second row) and MVDiffusion (last row).