000 001 002 003 GROUP DIFFUSION TRANSFORMERS ARE UNSUPERVISED MULTITASK LEARNERS

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

While large language models (LLMs) have revolutionized natural language processing with their task-agnostic capabilities, visual generation tasks such as image translation, style transfer, and character customization still rely heavily on supervised, task-specific datasets. In this work, we introduce Group Diffusion Transformers (GDTs), a novel framework that unifies diverse visual generation tasks by redefining them as a group generation problem. In this approach, a set of related images is generated simultaneously, optionally conditioned on a subset of the group. GDTs build upon diffusion transformers with minimal architectural modifications by concatenating self-attention tokens across images. This allows the model to implicitly capture cross-image relationships (*e.g.*, identities, styles, layouts, surroundings, textures, and color schemes) through caption-based correlations. Our design enables scalable, unsupervised, and task-agnostic pretraining using extensive collections of image groups sourced from multimodal internet articles, image galleries, and video frames. We evaluate GDTs on a comprehensive benchmark featuring over 200 instructions across 30 distinct visual generation tasks, including picture book creation, font design, style transfer, sketching, colorization, drawing sequence generation, and character customization. Our models achieve competitive zero-shot performance without any additional fine-tuning or gradient updates. Furthermore, ablation studies confirm the effectiveness of key components such as data scaling, group size, and model design. These results demonstrate the potential of GDTs as scalable, general-purpose visual generation systems. We will release the code and models to support further research.

031 032 033

034

1 INTRODUCTION

035 036 037 038 039 040 041 042 043 044 045 046 047 048 The advent of large language models (LLMs) has brought a paradigm shift in natural language processing (NLP) [Radford et al.](#page-13-0) [\(2019\)](#page-13-0); [Raffel et al.](#page-13-1) [\(2020\)](#page-13-1); [Brown](#page-10-0) [\(2020\)](#page-10-0); [Ouyang et al.](#page-12-0) [\(2022\)](#page-12-0); [Zhang et al.](#page-15-0) [\(2022\)](#page-15-0); [Touvron et al.](#page-14-0) [\(2023a;](#page-14-0)[b\)](#page-14-1); [Dubey et al.](#page-10-1) [\(2024\)](#page-10-1), enabling a wide range of tasks to be approached in a task-agnostic manner. These models, trained on vast corpora, can generate coherent and contextually relevant content across various domains without the need for task-specific fine-tuning, setting a new standard for what is achievable in NLP. However, this level of task generalization has yet to be fully realized in the field of visual generation. Unlike NLP, visual generation tasks – such as pose transfer [Shen et al.](#page-13-2) [\(2023\)](#page-13-2); [Lu et al.](#page-12-1) [\(2024\)](#page-12-1), image translation [Ho et al.](#page-11-0) [\(2024\)](#page-11-0); [Rodatz et al.](#page-13-3) [\(2024\)](#page-13-3), customization [Jones et al.](#page-11-1) [\(2024\)](#page-11-1); [Wei et al.](#page-14-2) [\(2023\)](#page-14-2), stylization [Huang et al.](#page-11-2) [\(2024\)](#page-11-2); [Yang et al.](#page-14-3) [\(2023\)](#page-14-3), and font creation [Wang et al.](#page-14-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-14-4); [Yang et al.](#page-14-5) [\(2024\)](#page-14-5) – remain largely siloed, relying heavily on supervised learning paradigms. These tasks often demand extensive taskspecific datasets and additional modules, such as LoRAs [Jones et al.](#page-11-1) [\(2024\)](#page-11-1); [Smith et al.](#page-13-4) [\(2023\)](#page-13-4); [Luo](#page-12-2) [et al.](#page-12-2) [\(2023\)](#page-12-2), adapters [Ye et al.](#page-14-6) [\(2023a\)](#page-14-6); [Mou et al.](#page-12-3) [\(2024\)](#page-12-3), visual encoders [Giannone et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2022\)](#page-11-3); [Kumar et al.](#page-11-4) [\(2024\)](#page-11-4); [Xu et al.](#page-14-7) [\(2024\)](#page-14-7), and ControlNets [Zhang et al.](#page-15-1) [\(2023\)](#page-15-1); [Zhao et al.](#page-15-2) [\(2024\)](#page-15-2), to achieve satisfactory performance.

049 050 051 052 053 This reliance on specialized data and architectures presents significant challenges for scalability and generalization. First, it limits scalability by failing to leverage the vast amount of weakly supervised data available on the Internet; creating and curating task-specific datasets is human-laboring. Second, it restricts models' adaptability to unseen tasks. Third, cross-task adaptation is lacking, particularly in compositional control, where multiple tasks are implicitly managed. For example, consider creating a picture book [Jin & Song](#page-11-5) [\(2023\)](#page-11-5); [Wang et al.](#page-14-8) [\(2023b\)](#page-14-8), characters, environments,

Figure 1: Group Diffusion Transformers perform a vast array of visual generation tasks in a unified framework termed group generation. Note that NO task-specific dataset and NO additional gradient update is applied. The model is automatically generalized to these tasks after unsupervised training on image groups. For simplicity, textual descriptions of images are omitted here, which can be found in Appendix.

 and attire must be dynamically adjusted, requiring decisions on which elements to keep consistent and which to vary. Finally, we hypothesize that training on single-task, shallow-domain datasets leads to the lack of generalization in real-world applications. To truly unlock the potential of visual generation, it is crucial to develop models capable of performing a wide range of tasks in a task-agnostic manner. This demands a shift in how we conceptualize and approach these tasks.

 Our key insight is that most, *if not all*, visual generation tasks can be reformulated within a unified framework that we term the group generation problem. In this framework, the objective is

Figure 2: When conditioned on a subset of the group data, Group Diffusion Transformers could perform conditional group generation in the inpainting fashion. Note that the model is automatically generalized to these tasks after unsupervised training on image groups. Textual descriptions of images are omitted here (can be found in Appendix), and we summarize them into brief task descriptions.

135 136 137

141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 to generate a set of correlated data, or a *group*, optionally conditioned on a subset of this group. For instance, tasks such as generating picture books [Jin & Song](#page-11-5) [\(2023\)](#page-11-5); [Wang et al.](#page-14-8) [\(2023b\)](#page-14-8), font images [Wang et al.](#page-14-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-14-4); [Yang et al.](#page-14-5) [\(2024\)](#page-14-5), or emoticons [Mittal et al.](#page-12-4) [\(2020\)](#page-12-4) involve producing multiple images with distinct yet related descriptions simultaneously. The inherent correlations are implicitly captured through the relationships among these descriptions. Conversely, tasks like sketching [Voynov et al.](#page-14-9) [\(2023\)](#page-14-9); [Wang et al.](#page-14-10) [\(2023c\)](#page-14-10), colorization [Zabari et al.](#page-15-3) [\(2023\)](#page-15-3); [Carrillo et al.](#page-10-2) [\(2023\)](#page-10-2); [Liang et al.](#page-12-5) [\(2024\)](#page-12-5), character-specific image generation [Zdenek & Nakayama](#page-15-4) [\(2023\)](#page-15-4); [Kou](#page-11-6) [et al.](#page-11-6) [\(2023\)](#page-11-6), and multiview image generation from a single image [Liu et al.](#page-12-6) [\(2023b\)](#page-12-6); [Shi et al.](#page-13-5) [\(2023\)](#page-13-5) can be framed as conditional group generation problems, where a subset of the group data is provided as a reference. Figure [1](#page-1-0) and [2](#page-2-0) provide examples of group generation and conditional group generation. By reframing these tasks as group generation problems, we leverage the power of unsupervised learning to address a broad spectrum of tasks without the need for task-specific supervision, simplifying the learning process and broadening applicability.

153 154 155 156 157 158 159 One of the most compelling advantages of the **group generation** framework is its natural alignment with the vast amount of data available on the Internet. Multimodal articles, image galleries, and multi-shot videos are just a few examples of readily accessible sources of group data. Each of these sources inherently captures the relationships between different data elements, offering a form of free supervision that is both scalable and diverse. The availability of such abundant group data not only reduces the need for labor-intensive data annotation but also enables the training of models on a wide array of tasks simultaneously, further enhancing generalizability.

160 161 To address the group generation problem, we introduce a minimalistic modification to diffusion transformers [Peebles & Xie](#page-12-7) [\(2023\)](#page-12-7); [Esser et al.](#page-10-3) [\(2024a\)](#page-10-3); [Chen et al.](#page-10-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-10-4), termed Group Diffusion Transformers (GDTs). The core idea is to concatenate self-attention tokens across a group **162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170** of inputs, allowing the model to learn the correlations and variations within the group. This modification is straightforward, requiring minimal changes to the underlying architecture of diffusion transformers (DiTs), yet it significantly enhances the model's ability to capture relationships among multiple generated data. To address reference-based generation problems, such as style transfer [Huang et al.](#page-11-2) [\(2024\)](#page-11-2); [Yang et al.](#page-14-3) [\(2023\)](#page-14-3) and image translation [Ho et al.](#page-11-0) [\(2024\)](#page-11-0); [Rodatz et al.](#page-13-3) [\(2024\)](#page-13-3), we incorporate techniques like SDEdit [Meng et al.](#page-12-8) [\(2021\)](#page-12-8) and inpainting [Xie et al.](#page-14-11) [\(2023\)](#page-14-11); [Xu et al.](#page-14-7) [\(2024\)](#page-14-7). These methods enable the model to generate the remaining elements of a group when conditioned on a subset of inputs. Figure [3](#page-4-0) provides a detailed architectural overview of GDTs. The straightforward design of GDTs makes it easy to implement and shows promise for efficient scaling.

171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 To evaluate the capabilities of our model, we first introduce a user interface that can automatically convert user instructions into textual descriptions of the target image group to support group generation. Then, we construct a comprehensive benchmark that covers a wide range of visual generation tasks, both with and without reference images. All tasks are performed in a zero-shot setting, without any parameter or architectural modifications. Despite the absence of task-specific supervision during training, our model demonstrates promising performance across most tasks. Finally, we conduct ablation studies to examine the impact of key components in our framework, such as data scale, group size, model design and quality tuning, on overall performance.

179 180

181

2 APPROACH

182 183 184 185 The core of our approach is to reformulate visual generation tasks into a *group generation* problem and solve it using minimally modified diffusion transformers. We begin by detailing how these tasks are reformulated, followed by a comprehensive introduction to our model, its architecture, the data employed, the training procedure, and the inference stage.

186 187

213

2.1 PROBLEM FORMULATION

188 189 190 191 192 193 194 We propose that a vast array of visual generation tasks can be unified under a single framework we term the **group generation** problem. In this framework, the objective is to generate a group of n elements $\mathbf{x} = {\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{x}_n}$, where each element is conditioned on its respective context (*e.g.*, *image descriptions*) $c = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$. The relationships among these elements are implicitly defined by the interdependencies within their contextual conditions. Optionally, a subset of $0 \le m <$ n elements of x can be provided as reference data, with the task being to generate the remaining $(n - m)$ elements. This formulation naturally encapsulates a variety of tasks:

- Text-to-Image: A special case where the group size $n = 1$ and the reference subset size $m = 0$. The task is to generate a single image from a textual description.
- Font Generation: Here, the group size $n > 1$ corresponds to the number of characters to generate, with $m = 0$.
- Picture Book Generation: Similar to font generation, the group size $n > 1$ corresponds to the number of picture book pages, with $m = 0$. The descriptions capture the connections and variations across the pages.
	- Identity Preservation: Here, the group size $n > 1$ corresponds to the number of photos with the same identities to generate, with $m = 0$. Identity-specific information is reflected in the descriptions, such as names or other identifiers.
	- Local Editing: In this task, the group size is $n = 2$ with a reference subset size $m = 1$. One reference image is provided, and the model generates the edited image based on the differences captured in their descriptions.
	- Image Translation: Similarly, the group size is $n = 2$ with a reference subset size $m = 1$. A reference image from one domain is converted to another domain according to their descriptions.
- **212 214** • Subject Customization: The task involves generating $(n - m) \ge 1$ images, where $1 \le$ $m < n$ character images are used as references.
- **215** • Style Adaptation: In this task, $(n - m) \ge 1$ corresponds to the number of stylized images to be generated, with $m = 1$ being the reference image guiding the target style.

233 234 235 236 Figure 3: The overview of Group Diffusion Transformer, which takes minimal adaptations for the encoder-decoder and encoder-only visual generation architectures. We make a straightforward modification on self-attention blocks by concatenating image tokens across group inputs, allowing to learn inter-image correlations.

238 239 240 241 242 These examples illustrate just a few of the many tasks that can be naturally expressed within the *group generation* framework. Across these tasks, the task hints are naturally embedded within the group element descriptions, much like how a human might communicate with a designer. This unified framework simplifies the approach to diverse visual generation tasks and paves the way for scalable, generalized solutions.

2.2 MODEL AND ARCHITECTURES

237

243 244

245 246 247 248 249 To tackle the group generation problem, it is crucial to establish connections between multiple group elements during the generation process, allowing the model to perceive and utilize the correlations among these elements. Our approach involves a straightforward modification: concatenating tokens across group inputs within the self-attention blocks of diffusion transformers. This enables tokens from different data elements to interact with one another throughout the model's layers.

250 251 252 For different text-conditioned visual generation architectures, we make minimal adaptations to accommodate our approach:

- Encoder-Decoder: In architectures like PixArt [Chen et al.](#page-10-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-10-4), each transformer block includes a self-attention operation for the image, cross-attention for interaction between image and text, and a feed-forward network. We choose to concatenate all the image tokens in self-attention blocks, which allows every token attends to all the image tokens within the group. After self-attention operation, concatenated image tokens are split back correspondingly. Then, in cross-attention blocks, each image token attends only to the text embeddings associated with its respective description. This setup is illustrated in Figure [3](#page-4-0) (b).
- Encoder-Only: Examples like Stable Diffusion 3 [Esser et al.](#page-10-3) [\(2024a\)](#page-10-3) and FLUX [Labs](#page-11-7) [\(2024\)](#page-11-7) feature transformer blocks with self-attention blocks and feed-forward networks. We modify the self-attention operation into a masked version, which is depicted in Fig-ure [3](#page-4-0) (c). Specifically, image tokens x_i as well as text tokens c_i are first concatenated with each other all over the group. Then, we calculate the masked self-attention, where the mask is designed for allowing every image token attends to all tokens across the group while allowing context tokens only attend to image tokens as well as themselves. Concretely, let $M(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_k)$ indicate the attention mask for tokens in \mathbf{a}_i and \mathbf{b}_k , where $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}\}, 0 \leq j, k \leq n$. Then, $M(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_k)$ is decided by

$$
M(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (j = k) \text{ or } (\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{x} \text{ and } \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{x}) \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \tag{1}
$$

270 271 2.3 TRAINING DATASET

272 273 274 275 276 We focus on image-related tasks in this work, which requires a high-quality, large-scale, and diverse image group dataset. While existing multimodal datasets like MINT-1T [Awadalla et al.](#page-10-5) [\(2024\)](#page-10-5) are large, they fall short of our pretraining needs due to low image quality and biased group type distribution relative to real-world visual generation applications. Thus, we construct our own dataset by sourcing image groups from multimodal Internet articles.

277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 Our dataset creation process involve several key steps: (1) We collect a substantial amount of multimodal data, extracting images while preserving their original order to maintain group integrity. (2) A small subset of these image groups is manually annotated as either positive (suitable for retention) or negative (to be discarded). (3) Using these annotations, we train a binary classifier to score and filter the collected image groups. (4) We perform deduplication across and within groups to eliminate redundant groups and images. After preprocessing, we compile a dataset of approximately 500,000 image groups, with the distribution of group size illustrated in Figure [4.](#page-5-0)

Figure 4: Distribution of group size in our training dataset.

289 290 291 292 293 The next crucial step is to generate descriptions that accurately capture the correlations among the images within each group. To achieve this, we utilize our internal multimodal large language models (MLLMs), iteratively testing and refining prompts to ensure the generated descriptions are stable and applicable across different group types. In Figure [5,](#page-5-1) we show the prompt we used, as well as the resulting group image descriptions.

While pretraining on our large-scale dataset provides a solid foundation for learning correlations with Group Diffusion Transformers (GDTs), it is common practice in visual generation tasks to conduct a supervised fine-tuning stage to enhance generation details and aesthetics. To this end, we curate a smaller, high-quality subset of approximately 10,000 image groups. These groups were selected for their strong correlations, high image quality, aesthetic appeal, and diversity. Fine-tuning our pretrained models on this curated dataset significantly improves both the image quality and content consistency in group generation, where the comparison can be found in Section [4.2.5.](#page-8-0)

Figure 5: Example of our training dataset, where the group images are captioned through prompting our internal MLLMs.

2.4 TRAINING PROCESS

316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 We initialize the Group Diffusion Transformers (GDTs) with weights from pre-trained text-toimage models, such as PixArt-α [Chen et al.](#page-10-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-10-4) and Stable Diffusion 3 [Peebles & Xie](#page-12-7) [\(2023\)](#page-12-7). Since GDTs introduce no additional parameter to the existing diffusion transformers, the pretrained weights are fully compatible. During both pretraining and supervised fine-tuning, we uniformly sample group sizes ranging from 1 to 4, dynamically adjusting the batch size to maintain consistent GPU memory usage. This approach ensures balanced performance across different group sizes. The model undergoes pretraining for approximately 100,000 steps, followed by fine-tuning on a curated dataset for around 5,000 steps. All training is conducted on A100 GPUs. We adopt the same hyperparameter settings as the official models in PixArt- α and Stable Diffusion 3.

Figure 7: We build a user interface that automatically converts the user instruction into group prompts using MLLMs, which is useful in the inference stage of GDTs.

2.5 USER INTERFACE

Considering it is tedious to write a group of prompts in the inference stage, we build a user interface to provide a convenient interaction with the GDTs. As illustrated in Figure [7,](#page-6-0) we follow the pipeline of [**Instruction**] → [**Group Prompts**] → [**Generated Images**] for group generation, and [**IMGs**] + [**Instruction**] → [**Group Prompts**] → [**Generated Images**] for conditional group generation. Specifically, we leverage MLLMs to convert the user instruction into group prompts, where the MLLM could analyze the number of group prompts and the corresponding tasks. For example, if the instruction is "Draw a line sketch of a female character and the corresponding colored photo", the MLLM can deduce that this instruction should be transformed into two prompts, categorizing the task as sketch coloring.

3 BENCHMARK

374 375 Given the diverse nature of visual generation tasks, evaluating the performance of our Group Diffusion Transformers (GDTs) presents unique challenges. Therefore, we design a benchmark that spans a wide array of tasks as shown in Figure [6.](#page-6-1) Specifically, our benchmark consists of over 200 instructions, each corresponding to one of 30 distinct types of visual generation tasks. This diversity enables a thorough assessment of the generalization capabilities of GDTs across various scenarios.

This evaluation suit encompasses tasks such as identity preservation, local editing, subject customization, font generation, and stylized group generation. Among these coarse-grained categories, fur-

376 377 ther fine-grained tasks are expanded. For example, step-by-step generation contains subtasks like story telling [Zhou et al.](#page-15-5) [\(2024\)](#page-15-5), painting process [Song et al.](#page-13-6) [\(2024\)](#page-13-6), and growth process. Besides, all the textual descriptions in this benchmark are created through our user interface.

Figure 8: Generated results of GDTs on our benchmark, including group generation and conditional group generation.

4 RESULTS

4.1 USER STUDY

401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 We first qualitatively evaluate the generated results of GDTs on our proposed benchmark as shown in Figure [8.](#page-7-0) GDTs could perform both group generation and conditional group generation according to the user instructions. Note that the task scope of this benchmark is effectively limited by our imagination, but thanks to our unsupervised and task-agnostic pretraining, GDTs can theoretically be generalized to *arbitrary* visual generation tasks.

412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 In our user study, we mainly adopt human ratings to assess the performance of GDTs on the benchmark. Three questions are included to measure the prompt following ability, content consistency within the image group, and the overall instruction following ability, namely: **Q1: Prompt follow**ing on each image within the group: Q2: Content consistency among generated group images, regardless of prompts, Q3: Instruction following on the generated group images. Evaluators are asked to rate on three questions in the scale from 1 to 5, where 5 signifies perfection and 1 denotes the lowest quality. The final evaluation score is derived from the average ratings across all tasks, which serves as a robust indicator of the overall performance and its potential for real-world applications. The human-rated results are illustrated in Table [1,](#page-7-1) where GDTs achieve overall satisfaction (higher than 3) on all of the three questions.

422 423

4.2 ABLATION ANALYSIS

424 4.2.1 METRICS

425 426 427 428 429 430 431 While our benchmark with over 200 instructions could well evaluate model's capabilities on a fivepoint scale, we would like to compare these ablated models in a more nuanced and quantitative manner in our ablation experiments. Therefore, we mainly present the objective metrics like FID and CLIP score. To be specific, we measure image fidelity by calculating FID on the validation set using 50k images. We assess content consistency and prompt adherence within each group by averaging CLIP similarities across every image-image and image-text pairs, respectively. In terms of reference-based generation, we adopt the same metrics but exclude pairs that involve the reference images themselves, as well as pairs between reference images and their corresponding texts.

Table 2: Performance evaluation on key components of GDTs. We investigate the impacts of data scale, group size, model design, and quality tuning on encoder-decoder and encoder-only models.

4.2.2 DATA SCALING

432

453 454 455 456 457 458 459 Without the demand of task-specific supervision, it is quite easy to acquire a large abundance of group data from the Internet. We scale the training data to 5k, 50k, and 500k groups, to explore the impact of data scale in GDTs. As illustrated in Table [2,](#page-8-1) with the increase of the amount of training data, GDTs behave increasingly better in content consistency and prompt adherence. Interestingly, we find that FID would become lower when training on less data, which may be that it is easier to overfit to small datasets. We plan to further scale up our data to the level of hundreds of millions of groups in the future, in order to fully leverage the potential of GDTs.

460 461 4.2.3 GROUP SIZE

462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 We gradually increase the upper limit of group size to 2, 4, and 8, and perform inference based on that limit. Note that doubling the group size will, in turn, double the sequence length in selfattention, leading to a corresponding increase in computational complexity, so we cap the maximum group size at 8 in our ablation. From the ablated results in Table [2,](#page-8-1) we find that larger group sizes lead to a more pronounced performance decline in image quality, content consistency, and prompt adherence. The reason may be that it is more difficult to learn the complex relationships across a large group of images. Besides, the scarcity of data of large group sizes prevents the model from being adequately trained. In the future, we would greatly scale our training data.

470 4.2.4 SDEDIT OR INPAINTING

471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 When conditioned on a subset of the group data, using methods like SDEdit [Meng et al.](#page-12-8) [\(2021\)](#page-12-8) or trainable inpainting [Xie et al.](#page-14-11) [\(2023\)](#page-14-11); [Xu et al.](#page-14-7) [\(2024\)](#page-14-7), GDTs can be instructed to generate the remaining data of the group. Specifically, SDEdit is a training-free technique which provides the reference images that are added with the same noise step as the generated images during the denoising stage. In contrast, trainable inpainting concatenates the reference image to the noised one in channel dimension, allowing the model to "copy" the reference images and generate the remaining ones. In our ablation study, as illustrated in Table [2,](#page-8-1) it is observed that trainable inpainting performs better in image quality and content consistency, while the training-free SDEdit is good at prompt adherence. We adopt the model design of trainable inpainting in our GDTs.

480 481 4.2.5 QUALITY TUNING

482 483 484 485 While quality tuning is a common practice in visual generation models to enhance aesthetic appeal, we investigate its impact under the paradigm of group generation. As illustrated in Table [2,](#page-8-1) after the supervised fine-tuning on a small subset of high-quality image groups, GDTs exhibit significantly better image quality. We also find that quality tuning helps generating image groups with higher content consistency, while barely compromising the adherence to textual descriptions.

486 487 5 RELATED WORK

5.1 TEXT-TO-IMAGE GENERATION

490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 The emergence of DDPM [Ho et al.](#page-11-8) [\(2020\)](#page-11-8) has catalyzed rapid advancements in text-to-image (T2I) generation. Earlier frameworks focused on T2I generation in pixel space, exemplified by GLIDE [Nichol et al.](#page-12-9) [\(2022\)](#page-12-9) and Imagen [Saharia et al.](#page-13-7) [\(2022\)](#page-13-7). In contrast, Stable Diffusion [Rom](#page-13-8)[bach et al.](#page-13-8) [\(2022\)](#page-13-8) introduced latent space for T2I generation, while DALLE-2 (unCLIP[\)Ramesh](#page-13-9) [et al.](#page-13-9) [\(2022a\)](#page-13-9) expanded this to a multimodal latent space. EM[UDai et al.](#page-10-6) [\(2023\)](#page-10-6) demonstrated that supervised fine-tuning on a small set of appealing images can significantly enhance generation quality. Unlike U-Net architectures, several approaches, including DiT [Peebles & Xie](#page-12-7) [\(2023\)](#page-12-7), Pixart [Chen et al.](#page-10-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-10-4), HunyuanDiT [Li et al.](#page-12-10) [\(2024b\)](#page-12-10), and SD3 [Esser et al.](#page-10-7) [\(2024b\)](#page-10-7), adopt transformers as their backbone.

498 499 500

488 489

5.2 CONTROLLABLE TEXT-TO-IMAGE GENERATION

501 502 503 504 505 506 507 Personalization. Personalization in T2I generation [Cui et al.](#page-10-8) [\(2024\)](#page-10-8); [Salehi et al.](#page-13-10) [\(2024\)](#page-13-10); [Ham et al.](#page-11-9) [\(2024\)](#page-11-9); [Wang et al.](#page-14-12) [\(2024\)](#page-14-12) aims to capture concepts like subject [Li et al.](#page-11-10) [\(2023a\)](#page-11-10); [Kumari et al.](#page-11-11) [\(2023\)](#page-11-11), person [Xiao et al.](#page-14-13) [\(2023\)](#page-14-13); [Li et al.](#page-11-12) [\(2024a\)](#page-11-12); [Chen et al.](#page-10-9) [\(2024b;](#page-10-9) [2023b\)](#page-10-10), style [Liu et al.](#page-12-11) [\(2023a\)](#page-12-11); [Sohn et al.](#page-13-11) [\(2023\)](#page-13-11), and image [Ye et al.](#page-14-14) [\(2023b\)](#page-14-14); [Xu et al.](#page-14-15) [\(2023\)](#page-14-15); [Ramesh et al.](#page-13-12) [\(2022b\)](#page-13-12). Techniques like Textual Inversion [Gal et al.](#page-11-13) [\(2022\)](#page-11-13) and DreamBooth [Ruiz et al.](#page-13-13) [\(2022\)](#page-13-13) facilitate concept embedding. Subject-driven methods [Valevski et al.](#page-14-16) [\(2023\)](#page-14-16); [Chen et al.](#page-10-9) [\(2024b\)](#page-10-9) use face recognition models for personalization.

508 509 510 Spatial Control. Spatial control in T2I generation [Li et al.](#page-11-14) [\(2023b\)](#page-11-14) is crucial for representing image structure. ControlNet [Zhang et al.](#page-15-1) [\(2023\)](#page-15-1) and UniControl [Qin et al.](#page-13-14) [\(2023\)](#page-13-14) are examples of models that incorporate positional signals for spatial control.

511 512 513 514 Advanced Controllable Text-to-Image Generation. New directions in controllable T2I generation include Attend-and-Excite [Chefer et al.](#page-10-11) [\(2023\)](#page-10-11), Composer [Huang et al.](#page-11-15) [\(2023\)](#page-11-15), Cocktail [Hu et al.](#page-11-16) [\(2023\)](#page-11-16), Cones [Liu et al.](#page-12-12) [\(2023c\)](#page-12-12), Universal Guidance [Bansal et al.](#page-10-12) [\(2023\)](#page-10-12), EMU2 [Sun et al.](#page-13-15) [\(2024\)](#page-13-15), and FreeDom [Yu et al.](#page-14-17) [\(2023\)](#page-14-17), which aim to enhance text alignment and achieve universal control.

515 516 517

5.3 GENERALIZATION ABILITY OF GENERATIVE MODELS

518 519 520 521 522 Beyond fundamental generative capabilities, recent approaches are investigating the generalization and versatility of models. ControlNeXt [Peng et al.](#page-13-16) [\(2024\)](#page-13-16) is designed to support both images and videos while incorporating diverse forms of control information. EMU2 [Sun et al.](#page-13-15) [\(2024\)](#page-13-15) demonstrates task-agnostic in-context learning capabilities. MT-Diffusion [Chen et al.](#page-10-13) [\(2024a\)](#page-10-13) achieves multi-modality diffusion through multi-task learning.

523 524 525 526 In contrast to the aforementioned methods, Group Diffusion Transformers aim to provide a generalpurpose visual generation framework with the following capabilities: 1) no need for task-specific pretraining or finetuning; 2) generating multiple images in parallel; 3) conditioning on text or images; and 4) enabling zero-shot task generalization.

527 528

6 CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

529

530 531 532 533 534 We reformulate most visual generation tasks into a **group generation** problem, thereby introducing a unified framework named **Group Diffusion Transformers** (GDTs). We present that with scalable, unsupervised, and task-agnostic pretraining on group data, GDTs could achieve competitive zeroshot performance on a vast array of visual generation tasks. Our results demonstrate the potential of GDTs as scalable, general-purpose visual generation systems.

535 536 537 538 539 Moreoever, we point out that there is still a discrepancy in image quality between GDTs and the state-of-the-art text-to-image models. The amount of group data for pretraining is also not sufficient yet, which has not fully unleashed the model's capabilities. We are optimistic that with an enlarged group dataset, we can further optimize the model's performance and reduce the discrepancy. In the future, we also plan to extend the time dimension of GDTs to enable multi-shot video generation, which can be naturally expressed under our group generation framework.

540 541 REFERENCES

647 tomaker: Customizing realistic human photos via stacked id embedding. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024a.

691

- Zhexin Liang, Zhaochen Li, Shangchen Zhou, Chongyi Li, and Chen Change Loy. Control color: Multimodal diffusion-based interactive image colorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10855*, 2024.
- **660 661 662** Gongye Liu, Menghan Xia, Yong Zhang, Haoxin Chen, Jinbo Xing, Xintao Wang, Yujiu Yang, and Ying Shan. Stylecrafter: Enhancing stylized text-to-video generation with style adapter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00330*, 2023a.
- **663 664 665 666** Yuan Liu, Cheng Lin, Zijiao Zeng, Xiaoxiao Long, Lingjie Liu, Taku Komura, and Wenping Wang. Syncdreamer: Generating multiview-consistent images from a single-view image. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03453*, 2023b.
- **667 668 669 670** Zhiheng Liu, Ruili Feng, Kai Zhu, Yifei Zhang, Kecheng Zheng, Yu Liu, Deli Zhao, Jingren Zhou, and Yang Cao. Cones: Concept neurons in diffusion models for customized generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023c. URL [https://api.](https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257427549) [semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257427549](https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257427549).
	- Yanzuo Lu, Manlin Zhang, Andy J Ma, Xiaohua Xie, and Jianhuang Lai. Coarse-to-fine latent diffusion for pose-guided person image synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 6420–6429, 2024.
- **675 676 677** Simian Luo, Yiqin Tan, Suraj Patil, Daniel Gu, Patrick von Platen, Apolinario Passos, Longbo ´ Huang, Jian Li, and Hang Zhao. Lcm-lora: A universal stable-diffusion acceleration module. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05556*, 2023.
- **678 679 680 681 682** 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 *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL [https://api.semanticscholar.](https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:245704504) [org/CorpusID:245704504](https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:245704504).
- **683 684 685 686** Paritosh Mittal, Kunal Aggarwal, Pragya Paramita Sahu, Vishal Vatsalya, Soumyajit Mitra, Vikrant Singh, Viswanath Veera, and Shankar M Venkatesan. Photo-realistic emoticon generation using multi-modal input. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pp. 254–258, 2020.
- **687 688 689 690** Chong Mou, Xintao Wang, Liangbin Xie, Yanze Wu, Jian Zhang, Zhongang Qi, and Ying Shan. T2i-adapter: Learning adapters to dig out more controllable ability for text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 4296– 4304, 2024.
- **692 693 694** Alex Nichol, Prafulla Dhariwal, Aditya Ramesh, Pranav Shyam, Pamela Mishkin, Bob McGrew, Ilya Sutskever, and Mark Chen. Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models, 2022.
- **695 696 697 698** Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- **700 701** William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 4195–4205, October 2023.

- Nir Zabari, Aharon Azulay, Alexey Gorkor, Tavi Halperin, and Ohad Fried. Diffusing colors: Image colorization with text guided diffusion. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2023 Conference Papers*, pp. 1–11, 2023.
- Jan Zdenek and Hideki Nakayama. Handwritten text generation with character-specific encoding for style imitation. In *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, pp. 313–329. Springer, 2023.
- Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models, 2023.
	- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
	- Shihao Zhao, Dongdong Chen, Yen-Chun Chen, Jianmin Bao, Shaozhe Hao, Lu Yuan, and Kwan-Yee K Wong. Uni-controlnet: All-in-one control to text-to-image diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
		- Yupeng Zhou, Daquan Zhou, Ming-Ming Cheng, Jiashi Feng, and Qibin Hou. Storydiffusion: Consistent self-attention for long-range image and video generation. 2024.

A APPENDIX

A young woman
floats in the water, floats in the water,
her head slightly
lifted and her gaze
directed upwards.
Her dark hair
spreads around her,
contrating sharply
with her fair skin
with her fair skin
lipstick. The water
surrounds her face
and hair, creat atmosphere. dreamlike
atmosphere.

A young woman \sim A young woman leans A young woman
floats in the water on a chest, gazing stands by the wind
with her eyes \sim consider the constant of the constant of the scheet is closed. Her dark half She has fair s neckline slightly open, revealing the graceful lines of her neck.

stands by the window,
her head tilted slightly her head titled slightly
upwards as if feeling
the caress of a gentle
breeze. She has fair
skin, her brown hair
falls naturally, and he
date yes are filled
with hope for the
tuture. She wears a
light-colored shirt
with loo and dark pants,
creating a simple and
elegant look.

A fashion photography A fashion photography
piece showcasing a
fermale model in a pink
pinted maxi dress
alwerd over with a long
whice furry coat. The
maximum model has long brown
markeup; she stands
against a light-colored
backrop in an elegan has a V-neck design, is
lightweight in texture, and features a soft print. The coat is fluffy and soft, with a high-
end feel. The model is wearing gold strapped heels.

Fashion photography
showcasing a female
model in a

model in a
champagne-colored
strapless A-line
strapless A-line
smooth in texture,
with a strong drape,
and an A-line skirt,
cinched at the waist
cinched at the waist
with a golden belt.
The model's hairstyle
and makeup are previous image, and
the background is
similarly simple and light-colored. The model's pose is elegant, with her
gaze directed
forward. She wears gold heels that complement the dress.

A fashion
photography image
photography image
model in a burgundy
velvet maxi dress.
The dress is a halter
neck style, with a defined wist, and an
a symmetric hemine,
thilling on one side
while revealing the
miling on one The dress is thick in texture, with a rich color, and the skirt flows slightly. The model's hairstyle and makeup remain consistent, against a simple light-colored background. The
model's posture is
elegant, and she
wears gold highheeled shoe

A fashion photography A fashion photography
piece featuring a
female model in a
purplish-red velvet slip
dress. The dress is
simply cut and form-
intiting, accented with a
thin sliver belt at the
maintains the wousit. The model
consistent hairs images, against a light-
colored background. The model poses elegantly, with a
confident smile. Her makeup is refined, with
simple earrings. The model wears light gold heeled shoes.

- Figure 1: Detailed results of Group Diffusion Transformers.
- **916 917**

-
-

-
-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-