

# Modern Text-to-Image Generation (2020–2025): Diffusion Transformers, Token Models, and Controllable Synthesis

Author Name(s) TBD

Affiliation(s) TBD

Email(s) TBD

**Index Terms**—generative image models, text-to-image, diffusion models, diffusion transformers, autoregressive models, controllable synthesis, image editing

**Abstract**—Generative image modeling has progressed from specialized unconditional synthesis to broadly capable text-conditioned generation and editing systems. This review surveys state-of-the-art methods from 2020–2025, with an emphasis on the two dominant families of modern systems: diffusion/score/flow-based generators and token-based transformer models. We present a unifying taxonomy organized around objectives, representations (pixel, continuous latent, and discrete tokens), and inference choices (samplers/solvers, guidance, and distillation/consistency accelerations). We then synthesize architectural trends, including the transition from U-Net backbones to diffusion transformers and scaling recipes that enable high-resolution, photorealistic outputs. Beyond base model quality, we review mechanisms for controllability and image editing, covering structured conditioning (e.g., geometry/layout signals), modular adapters, personalization via finetuning or embeddings, and instruction-driven edits. We discuss evaluation protocols for conditional generation, contrasting fidelity/diversity metrics with text–image alignment scores and highlighting failure modes that are under-captured by standard benchmarks. Finally, we survey emerging evidence on privacy risks (memorization and training data extraction) and provenance techniques such as watermarking, and we outline open research problems and reporting practices needed for reproducible and responsible progress.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

Generative image modeling has rapidly shifted from narrow, style-specific synthesis to broadly capable text-conditioned generation and editing systems that can be steered by prompts and auxiliary controls. The current state of the art (SOTA) is driven by large-scale training on image–text corpora and advances in diffusion-style objectives, guidance, and scalable backbones [1]–[4].

This review focuses on modern text-to-image generation and image editing/inpainting, with an emphasis on the 2020–2025 period and a cutoff date of **2025-12-27**. We treat SOTA as a multi-objective frontier that balances fidelity, diversity, prompt adherence, controllability, and inference cost, rather than a single metric leaderboard [5], [6]. We also highlight that “frontier” systems often differ in what they disclose (data, compute, training details), which directly affects reproducibility and scientific interpretability [3], [7].

Our angle is pragmatic: we organize the space around (i) *model families* (diffusion/score/flow, token-based autoregressive or masked modeling, and high-fidelity GANs), (ii) *conditioning and control* mechanisms for steerable synthesis and editing, and (iii) *evaluation and failure modes* that matter in real deployments [8]–[10]. Throughout, we prioritize primary sources for each method and explicitly separate evidence-backed claims from common but weakly supported folklore.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section II introduces core objectives, representations, and inference choices; Sections III–V cover diffusion models, token-based generators, and controllable/editable generation; Section VI surveys frontier systems and practical tradeoffs; Sections VII–VIII discuss evaluation, safety, provenance, and open problems [11]–[13].

## II. FOUNDATIONS AND BUILDING BLOCKS

### A. Objectives and Formulations (Minimal Math)

Modern generative image models can be grouped by their training objective and sampling procedure. Diffusion models learn to reverse a forward noising process and typically sample by iterative denoising [1], [11]. Score-based formulations connect diffusion to stochastic differential equations, which clarifies sampler design and continuous-time perspectives [14]. In practice, a key unifying axis is *conditioning*: most SOTA systems are conditional generators where text, images, and/or structured controls define the output distribution [3], [4].

Token-based approaches instead reduce image generation to sequence modeling over discrete codes, using either autoregressive factorization or masked token prediction [8], [15], [16]. While GANs remain competitive for specific domains and high-fidelity unconditional synthesis, recent SOTA for text-to-image is dominated by diffusion and token-based families [17], [18].

Figure 1 provides a high-level taxonomy of these families that we use throughout the review.

### B. Conditioning, Guidance, and Encoders

Text conditioning is typically implemented by encoding prompts into embeddings that modulate a generative backbone via cross-attention or related mechanisms [3], [19]. Beyond conditioning, *guidance* methods modify the sampling trajectory to trade off sample quality and prompt adherence.




Fig. 1. Taxonomy of modern generative image model families (diffusion/score/flow; token-based AR/masked; and GANs), grounded in representative works such as DDPMs [1], DiTs [9], masked token generators [8], and StyleGAN-style GANs [17].

Classifier-free guidance (CFG) has become a default choice because it avoids training an external classifier while providing a strong quality–alignment knob [2]. These mechanisms interact with model class: diffusion samplers and token decoders expose different control surfaces and failure modes, motivating careful comparisons across families [11], [20].

### C. Backbones and Representations

Representation choices strongly shape compute and controllability. Latent diffusion models generate in a learned latent space rather than pixel space, enabling high-resolution synthesis at reduced cost while keeping a diffusion-style training objective [3]. In parallel, diffusion transformers (DiTs) replace U-Net backbones with transformer architectures that scale well and unify image generation with broader transformer design patterns [9], [21].

Token-based generators rely on discrete tokenizers (e.g., VQ-style codebooks) that compress images into sequences of codes, so generation becomes token prediction [15], [16]. This design can support fast decoding and scaling regimes closer to language modeling, but also introduces tokenization artifacts and additional reconstruction loss that can limit fine detail [8], [22].

### D. Sampling, Solvers, and Efficiency

Inference cost is often dominated by the number of sampling steps and backbone evaluations. For diffusion, deterministic or ODE-inspired samplers reduce the number of steps required for high-quality outputs [11], [12]. The design space of noise schedules and parameterizations further impacts sampling efficiency and robustness [23]. Distillation and consistency-style training aims to compress long denoising chains into few-step generators, enabling real-time or interactive use cases [24]–[26].

## III. DIFFUSION MODELS: FROM DDPMs TO DIFFUSION TRANSFORMERS

### A. Training Objectives and Noise/SDE/Flow Views

Diffusion probabilistic models define a forward noising process that gradually perturbs data  $x_0$  into  $x_t$ , and learn a reverse-time model to denoise from noise back to samples

[1]. A common parameterization trains a network to predict the injected noise  $\epsilon$  under a mean-squared error objective:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{simple}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t, x_0, \epsilon} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(x_t, t, c)\|_2^2], \quad (1)$$

$$x_t = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \epsilon.$$

where  $c$  denotes conditioning (e.g., text embeddings) [1], [3].

Score-based generative modeling frames the reverse process via the score function  $\nabla_{x_t} \log p_t(x_t)$  and connects diffusion to SDEs, which provides a principled way to derive samplers and understand continuous-time limits [14]. Recent “flow” and “rectified flow” perspectives further blur the boundary between diffusion-like training and ODE-style generation, and have been combined with transformer backbones for high-resolution synthesis [27].

### B. Guidance and Conditioning

Most modern diffusion systems are conditional, and conditioning is typically injected via cross-attention, feature-wise modulation, or related mechanisms [3], [4]. Classifier-free guidance builds a guided score by interpolating conditional and unconditional predictions, improving prompt adherence at the cost of reduced diversity and potential artifacts when guidance is pushed too high [2]. In practice, guidance interacts with the sampler/solver choice and the backbone, so comparing models without controlling these factors can be misleading [12], [23].

### C. Samplers/Solvers and Fast Sampling

Sampling speed is a central practical bottleneck. DDIM showed that deterministic, non-Markovian sampling can produce high-quality images with fewer steps than ancestral DDPM sampling [11]. Subsequent solver-based methods use ODE approximations to achieve further reductions in function evaluations, often with strong empirical performance [12]. EDM highlighted that parameterization and noise schedule choices materially affect sampling efficiency and stability across compute budgets [23].

Beyond better solvers, distillation and consistency training compress multi-step denoising into few-step generators. Progressive distillation iteratively halves the number of steps while preserving a teacher’s distributional behavior [24]. Consistency models aim to learn a mapping that is consistent across noise levels, enabling sampling with very few steps, and latent consistency models adapt this idea to latent diffusion backbones for efficient high-resolution synthesis [25], [26].

Figure 2 summarizes a typical conditional diffusion sampling pipeline and highlights where guidance and solver choices enter.

### D. Architectural Evolution: Latent Diffusion, DiT, PixArt, Rectified Flow

Architecturally, latent diffusion models popularized training diffusion in an autoencoder latent space, making high-resolution text-to-image feasible on commodity hardware while retaining controllability via conditioning [3]. Diffusion transformers (DiT) demonstrated that transformer backbones




Fig. 2. Schematic diffusion sampling pipeline: start from noise and iteratively denoise with conditioning and guidance, using samplers/solvers and accelerations [1], [2], [11], [12], [26].

can scale diffusion models effectively, aligning image generation with the broader trend toward transformer scalability and modularity [9]. More recent DiT-style systems emphasize data curation, training efficiency, and scaling recipes for photorealistic synthesis at higher resolutions [21], [28].

Rectified-flow transformers can be viewed as part of the same trajectory toward transformer backbones and ODE-like generation mechanisms, aiming to improve both quality and sampling efficiency at high resolutions [27].

#### IV. AUTOREGRESSIVE AND TOKEN-BASED IMAGE GENERATORS

##### A. Discrete Tokenizers and Latent Codes

Token-based generators factor image synthesis into two stages: (i) a tokenizer that maps images into discrete code sequences, and (ii) a sequence model that generates those codes. Vector-quantized autoencoders introduced this paradigm by learning a discrete codebook and an encoder/decoder pair, enabling compression into a grid of tokens while maintaining visual fidelity [15]. VQGAN improved perceptual quality by combining discrete latents with adversarial and perceptual losses, making token reconstruction sharper and better aligned with human perception [16].

The benefit is that generation becomes token prediction, which can exploit transformer scaling and potentially reduce sampling steps relative to diffusion-style denoising [22], [29]. The cost is that tokenizer design imposes a rate-distortion tradeoff: aggressive compression can destroy fine detail, while high token rates increase sequence length and compute [15], [16].

##### B. Autoregressive vs Masked Modeling

Autoregressive (AR) models generate tokens sequentially, which provides a straightforward likelihood factorization but can be latency-limited for large images [22], [29]. Masked modeling instead predicts subsets of tokens in parallel, iteratively refining a partially masked canvas. MaskGIT showed that masked generative transformers can dramatically reduce generation time via parallel decoding while retaining strong

sample quality [8]. Muse extended the masked-token approach to high-quality text-to-image generation with large-scale training and guidance-like mechanisms in token space [20].

##### C. Tradeoffs vs Diffusion

Diffusion models and token-based models differ in how compute is spent. Diffusion typically requires tens of denoising steps, but each step can be heavily optimized with solvers and distillation [12], [25], [26]. Token models can amortize work into a tokenizer and benefit from parallel decoding, but may be sensitive to tokenization artifacts and can struggle to preserve high-frequency detail without long sequences or improved tokenizers [8], [16].

In practice, SOTA systems increasingly hybridize ideas: diffusion uses transformer backbones and latent representations [3], [9], while token models adopt guidance-like mechanisms and large-scale conditioning [20], [29]. As a result, comparisons should report not only output quality but also throughput, latency, and controllability under realistic constraints [5], [6].

#### V. CONDITIONING, CONTROL, PERSONALIZATION, AND EDITING

##### A. Conditional Inputs (Layout, Depth, Pose, Edges, Reference Images)

Beyond text prompts, modern systems accept structured signals to constrain composition and geometry. Common conditioning modalities include edge maps, depth, pose, segmentation, and reference images, which allow users to specify layout while delegating texture and style to the generator [10]. These controls are particularly important in applications where spatial accuracy matters (product design, storytelling, scientific illustration), and they expose a key gap between prompt-based benchmarks and real-world workflows [13].

##### B. Adapters and Control Networks

Control is often implemented via lightweight modules that modulate a frozen base model. ControlNet adds a conditional branch that injects control features into a diffusion backbone while retaining the base model’s generative capability [10]. This adapter-style pattern aligns with broader trends in parameter-efficient finetuning, enabling multiple controls (e.g., pose, depth) to share a common foundation model without retraining from scratch [3], [30].

Figure 3 summarizes how control, personalization, and editing modules relate to a shared base generator.

##### C. Personalization and Finetuning

Personalization methods adapt a text-to-image model to a specific subject or style using a small number of reference images. DreamBooth finetunes a diffusion model to bind a unique token to a subject, enabling consistent generation of that subject in novel contexts [31]. Textual inversion instead optimizes a new embedding vector in the text encoder space, which can be cheaper and more modular but may be less expressive than full finetuning [32]. LoRA-style low-rank updates provide a parameter-efficient alternative that is widely




Fig. 3. Control and editing landscape for modern text-to-image systems: structural controls via ControlNet-style adapters [10], personalization via finetuning/embeddings [30]–[32], and editing methods [13], [33], [34].

used to distribute lightweight adapters for styles, characters, and domains [30].

These methods introduce practical risks: identity drift (loss of subject fidelity), overfitting, and potential memorization of training images if finetuning is performed without safeguards [31], [32]. Reliable evaluation therefore needs both qualitative inspection and quantitative probes for memorization and leakage [5], [35].

#### D. Instruction Editing

Editing tasks aim to modify an input image while preserving irrelevant content. SDEdit framed editing as partially noising an input and denoising under a conditional model, enabling a range of edits without explicit supervision [33]. Prompt-to-Prompt showed that manipulating cross-attention maps during diffusion sampling can yield fine-grained, localized edits while maintaining structure [34]. InstructPix2Pix learns to follow natural-language editing instructions by combining image inputs, text instructions, and diffusion-style generation [13].

More broadly, early text-guided diffusion systems demonstrated practical image editing and inpainting capabilities that helped establish editing as a first-class use case for conditional generators [36], [37].

Across editing methods, common failure modes include unintended global changes (“collateral edits”), poor disentanglement between content and style, and prompt sensitivity that reduces reproducibility [13], [34].

## VI. FRONTIER SYSTEMS AND PRACTICAL TRADEOFFS (2023–2025)

### A. What Counts as “Frontier”

We define “frontier” systems as those that push the Pareto boundary along at least one axis of practical capability: photorealism, prompt adherence, controllability/editing, inference efficiency, or resolution. Importantly, frontier status is also constrained by *disclosure*: systems differ in how much they reveal about training data, compute, and implementation, which affects how strongly we can attribute observed behavior to specific design choices [3], [7].

### B. Representative Systems (Open vs Closed)

Open and reproducible research systems often publish architectures and training recipes, enabling meaningful ablation

and follow-up work. Representative examples include latent diffusion models and their descendants [3], diffusion transformers and scaled training pipelines [9], [28], and rectified-flow transformer variants that target high-resolution synthesis [27]. Token-based systems such as Parti and Muse illustrate how large-scale token modeling can compete in text-to-image settings, albeit with different tradeoffs and disclosure patterns [20], [29].

Closed or partially closed systems may publish high-level technical reports without releasing weights or data, which limits reproducibility but can still contribute valuable ideas (e.g., data curation, evaluation protocols). When discussing such systems, we treat claims as conditional on the published evidence and avoid extrapolating beyond what is documented [4], [37].

### C. Efficiency and Deployment Constraints

Deployment imposes constraints that are often invisible in academic benchmarks: latency targets, memory ceilings, and content safety requirements. On the modeling side, fast sampling is enabled by improved solvers, distillation, and consistency-style training [12], [24], [26]. On the product side, systems frequently layer safety filters, prompt classifiers, and post-generation moderation, which can change observed behavior relative to the underlying generator [37].

Table I provides an illustrative comparison of representative systems and the disclosure patterns that affect reproducibility.

Figure 4 provides an annotated timeline of representative research milestones that motivated key shifts in backbones, conditioning/control, and efficiency/provenance practices across modern text-to-image systems.

## VII. EVALUATION, BENCHMARKS, AND FAILURE MODES

### A. Metrics and Protocols

Evaluating generative image models requires measuring multiple axes: sample fidelity, diversity, and alignment to conditioning signals (e.g., text). For unconditional image synthesis, Inception Score (IS) and Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) are widely used to quantify realism and distributional match, but they depend on feature extractors and can fail to reflect prompt faithfulness in conditional generation [5], [44]. Precision–recall-style metrics attempt to separate fidelity and coverage, making tradeoffs more explicit [35].




Fig. 4. Annotated timeline of representative research milestones in modern text-to-image generation (2020–2025). Entries are selected for illustrative coverage rather than completeness.

TABLE I  
FRONTIER MODEL COMPARISON (ILLUSTRATIVE; CITE PRIMARY SOURCES PER ROW). REPRESENTATIVE DIFFUSION AND TOKEN-BASED SYSTEMS INCLUDE LDM [3], IMAGEN [4], DALL·E 2 [37], DiT [9], PIXART- $\Sigma$  [28], AND MUSE [20].

System	Backbone	Resolution	Openness
LDM / Stable Diffusion [3]	U-Net (latent diffusion)	High (latent)	Open weights (varies)
Imagen [4]	U-Net diffusion	High	Closed weights/data
DALL·E 2 [37]	Diffusion + CLIP latents	High	Closed weights/data
DiT [9]	Transformer diffusion	High	Research code/paper
PixArt- $\Sigma$ [28]	Diffusion transformer	4K	Research code/paper
Muse [20]	Masked token transformer	High	Closed weights/data

For text-to-image, embedding-based alignment metrics such as CLIPScore approximate prompt adherence by measuring similarity in a joint image–text embedding space [6], [19]. However, purely embedding-based metrics may miss composition errors, hallucinated text, or safety violations, motivating mixed protocols that combine automatic scores with human preferences and targeted test suites [4], [29], [37].

Table II summarizes common metrics and their limitations in conditional generation settings.

### B. Failure Modes

Common failure modes include prompt sensitivity (small prompt edits change outputs disproportionately), compositional errors (incorrect attribute binding), and mode collapse or lack of diversity under strong guidance [2], [6]. Editing and control introduce additional failure cases such as “collateral edits” and poor spatial adherence when the control signal conflicts with the learned prior [10], [13], [34].

Because these failures often depend on the prompt distribution and the chosen guidance/sampler settings, reproducible evaluation should document prompts, sampling parameters (steps, guidance scale), and any post-generation filtering [12], [23], [37].

TABLE II  
COMMON EVALUATION METRICS AND WHAT THEY CAPTURE/MISS IN TEXT-TO-IMAGE SETTINGS. FID AND IS QUANTIFY REALISM AND DISTRIBUTIONAL MATCH [5], [44], PRECISION/RECALL DECOMPOSES FIDELITY VS COVERAGE [35], AND CLIPSCORE APPROXIMATES PROMPT ADHERENCE [6], [19].

Metric	Captures	Misses
IS [44]	Classifier-based proxy for realism/diversity	Domain mismatch; weak for text alignment and composition
FID [5]	Feature-space distance to real images	Prompt adherence; semantic errors; feature/domain sensitivity
Precision/Recall [35]	Separates fidelity vs coverage/diversity	Depends on feature space/thresholds; conditional alignment
CLIPScore [6], [19]	Text–image embedding similarity	Image realism; spatial correctness; safety violations

## VIII. SAFETY, PROVENANCE, AND OPEN PROBLEMS

### A. Safety, Misuse, and Governance

Modern generative image systems raise safety issues spanning misuse (e.g., deception), privacy, and intellectual property. From a data perspective, large-scale web datasets enable

capability but also import biases and copyrighted or private content into the training distribution, complicating downstream governance [7], [45]. Many deployed systems add layered mitigations (prompt and image filters, refusal policies, post-generation moderation), which can reduce harmful outputs but also makes evaluation less transparent [37].

Privacy risks have been studied through memorization and membership inference: attackers may test whether a training image or concept was included in a model’s training set, or attempt to recover training examples. Empirical work finds diffusion models can be vulnerable to membership inference and that realistic threat models matter for measured risk [46], [47]. Relatedly, multiple lines of work examine memorization behavior in diffusion models and propose measurements and mitigations [42], [43].

Data extraction results further show that, under some conditions, training images can be recovered from diffusion models, highlighting a tension between scale, fidelity, and privacy [39], [41]. These findings motivate cautious claims about “generalization” and suggest that SOTA reviews should treat privacy, data curation, and filtering as first-class design choices rather than afterthoughts.

### B. Provenance and Watermarking

Provenance mechanisms aim to help platforms and users identify AI-generated images or attribute outputs to a specific model. One family of approaches embeds *watermarks* by modifying the generation process so that outputs contain a detectable signal while remaining visually indistinguishable. Tree-ring watermarks propose robust, invisible fingerprints tailored to diffusion sampling [38]. Other methods watermark either the diffusion process itself or the latent space of latent diffusion models, trading off robustness, detectability, and impact on image quality [40], [48], [49].

Watermarking is not a silver bullet: threat models include benign transformations (cropping, compression) and adaptive attackers who attempt to remove or spoof watermarks. As a result, provenance systems are best viewed as components in a broader pipeline (metadata standards, platform policies, and audit trails), with careful reporting of false-positive and false-negative rates under realistic transformations [38], [40].

### C. Open Problems and Recommendations

We close with open problems that cut across model families: (i) *Evaluation*: develop prompt suites and metrics that better capture compositional correctness, text rendering, and controllability, rather than optimizing toward a narrow set of proxy scores [5], [6]. (ii) *Efficiency*: push few-step generation without sacrificing diversity or introducing new artifacts, building on solver and consistency ideas [12], [25]. (iii) *Control*: improve reliable spatial and semantic control without brittle prompt engineering, integrating adapters and editing methods into coherent workflows [10], [13]. (iv) *Safety and provenance*: quantify privacy risk and watermark robustness under realistic attackers, and standardize disclosure practices for training data and filtering [38], [39], [47].

For reproducible science, we recommend that papers report (a) prompt sets and sampling parameters, (b) the training data mixture at a high level (or a data statement when full disclosure is impossible), and (c) evaluations that include both automatic metrics and human or task-based protocols [4], [37].

## IX. CONCLUSION

Modern generative image modeling is increasingly defined by scalable conditional generation: diffusion objectives and their solver/distillation variants dominate many text-to-image settings, while token-based transformers remain competitive and offer distinct efficiency tradeoffs [1], [12], [20]. The emergence of transformer backbones for diffusion, alongside improved data and training recipes, has enabled rapid progress in photorealism and resolution [9], [27], [28].

At the same time, practical deployment depends on controllability, editing, and trustworthy evaluation. Adapter-based controls and instruction editing provide powerful interfaces but expose new failure modes, and evaluation remains challenged by the multi-objective nature of “quality” and the limitations of automatic metrics [6], [10], [13]. Finally, safety and provenance are not optional: evidence on memorization, extraction, and watermark robustness shows that responsible SOTA systems require end-to-end design that spans data, models, and governance [38], [39], [46].



## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11239*, 2020.
- [2] J. Ho and T. Salimans, “Classifier-free diffusion guidance,” 2022.
- [3] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” 2022.
- [4] C. Saharia, W. Chan, S. Saxena, L. Li, J. Whang, E. Denton, S. K. S. Ghasemipour, B. K. Ayan, S. S. Mahdavi, R. G. Lopes, T. Salimans, J. Ho, D. J. Fleet, and M. Norouzi, “Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding,” 2022.
- [5] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, and S. Hochreiter, “Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium,” 2018.
- [6] J. Hessel, A. Holtzman, M. Forbes, R. L. Bras, and Y. Choi, “Clipscore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning,” 2022.
- [7] C. Schuhmann, R. Beaumont, R. Vencu, C. Gordon, R. Wightman, M. Cherti, T. Coombes, A. Katta, C. Mullis, M. Wortsman, P. Schramowski, S. Kundurthy, K. Crowson, L. Schmidt, R. Kaczmarczyk, and J. Jitsev, “Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models,” 2022.
- [8] H. Chang, H. Zhang, L. Jiang, C. Liu, and W. T. Freeman, “Maskgit: Masked generative image transformer,” 2022.
- [9] W. Peebles and S. Xie, “Scalable diffusion models with transformers,” 2023.
- [10] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, “Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models,” 2023.
- [11] J. Song, C. Meng, and S. Ermon, “Denoising diffusion implicit models,” 2022.
- [12] C. Lu, Y. Zhou, F. Bao, J. Chen, C. Li, and J. Zhu, “Dpm-solver: A fast ode solver for diffusion probabilistic model sampling in around 10 steps,” 2022.
- [13] T. Brooks, A. Holynski, and A. A. Efros, “Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions,” 2023.
- [14] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, “Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations,” 2021.
- [15] A. van den Oord, O. Vinyals, and K. Kavukcuoglu, “Neural discrete representation learning,” 2018.
- [16] P. Esser, R. Rombach, and B. Ommer, “Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis,” 2021.
- [17] T. Karras, S. Laine, M. Aittala, J. Hellsten, J. Lehtinen, and T. Aila, “Analyzing and improving the image quality of stylegan,” 2020.
- [18] M. Kang, J.-Y. Zhu, R. Zhang, J. Park, E. Shechtman, S. Paris, and T. Park, “Scaling up gans for text-to-image synthesis,” 2023.
- [19] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” 2021.
- [20] H. Chang, H. Zhang, J. Barber, A. Maschinot, J. Lezama, L. Jiang, M.-H. Yang, K. Murphy, W. T. Freeman, M. Rubinstein, Y. Li, and D. Krishnan, “Muse: Text-to-image generation via masked generative transformers,” 2023.
- [21] J. Chen, J. Yu, C. Ge, L. Yao, E. Xie, Y. Wu, Z. Wang, J. Kwok, P. Luo, H. Lu, and Z. Li, “Pixart- $\alpha$ : Fast training of diffusion transformer for photorealistic text-to-image synthesis,” 2023.
- [22] G. A. Aye and G. E. Kaiser, “Sequence model design for code completion in the modern ide,” 2020.
- [23] T. Karras, M. Aittala, T. Aila, and S. Laine, “Elucidating the design space of diffusion-based generative models,” 2022.
- [24] T. Salimans and J. Ho, “Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models,” 2022.
- [25] Y. Song, P. Dhariwal, M. Chen, and I. Sutskever, “Consistency models,” 2023.
- [26] S. Luo, Y. Tan, L. Huang, J. Li, and H. Zhao, “Latent consistency models: Synthesizing high-resolution images with few-step inference,” 2023.
- [27] P. Esser, S. Kulal, A. Blattmann, R. Entezari, J. Müller, H. Saini, Y. Levi, D. Lorenz, A. Sauer, F. Boesel, D. Podell, T. Dockhorn, Z. English, K. Lacey, A. Goodwin, Y. Marek, and R. Rombach, “Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis,” 2024.
- [28] J. Chen, C. Ge, E. Xie, Y. Wu, L. Yao, X. Ren, Z. Wang, P. Luo, H. Lu, and Z. Li, “PixArt- $\Sigma$ : Weak-to-Strong Training of Diffusion Transformer for 4K Text-to-Image Generation,” 2024.
- [29] J. Yu, Y. Xu, J. Y. Koh, T. Luong, G. Baid, Z. Wang, V. Vasudevan, A. Ku, Y. Yang, B. K. Ayan, B. Hutchinson, W. Han, Z. Parekh, X. Li, H. Zhang, J. Baldridge, and Y. Wu, “Scaling autoregressive models for content-rich text-to-image generation,” 2022.
- [30] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” 2021.
- [31] N. Ruiz, Y. Li, V. Jampani, Y. Pritch, M. Rubinstein, and K. Aberman, “Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation,” 2023.
- [32] R. Gal, Y. Alaluf, Y. Atzmon, O. Patashnik, A. H. Bermano, G. Chechik, and D. Cohen-Or, “An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion,” 2022.
- [33] C. Meng, Y. He, Y. Song, J. Song, J. Wu, J.-Y. Zhu, and S. Ermon, “Sdedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations,” 2022.
- [34] A. Hertz, R. Mokady, J. Tenenbaum, K. Aberman, Y. Pritch, and D. Cohen-Or, “Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross attention control,” 2022.
- [35] T. Kynkäänniemi, T. Karras, S. Laine, J. Lehtinen, and T. Aila, “Improved precision and recall metric for assessing generative models,” 2019.
- [36] A. Nichol, P. Dhariwal, A. Ramesh, P. Shyam, P. Mishkin, B. McGrew, I. Sutskever, and M. Chen, “Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models,” 2022.
- [37] A. Ramesh, P. Dhariwal, A. Nichol, C. Chu, and M. Chen, “Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents,” 2022.
- [38] Y. Wen, J. Kirchenbauer, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, “Tree-ring watermarks: Fingerprints for diffusion images that are invisible and robust,” 2023.
- [39] R. Webster, “A reproducible extraction of training images from diffusion models,” 2023.
- [40] Z. Meng, B. Peng, and J. Dong, “Latent watermark: Inject and detect watermarks in latent diffusion space,” 2024.
- [41] Y. Chen, X. Ma, D. Zou, and Y.-G. Jiang, “Extracting training data from unconditional diffusion models,” 2024.
- [42] X. Gu, C. Du, T. Pang, C. Li, M. Lin, and Y. Wang, “On memorization in diffusion models,” 2025.
- [43] Z. Ma, Q. Li, X. Zhang, T. Du, R. Lin, Z. Wang, S. Ji, and W. Chen, “An inversion-based measure of memorization for diffusion models,” 2025.
- [44] T. Salimans, I. Goodfellow, W. Zaremba, V. Cheung, A. Radford, and X. Chen, “Improved techniques for training gans,” 2016.
- [45] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, L. Bourdev, R. Girshick, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, C. L. Zitnick, and P. Dollár, “Microsoft coco: Common objects in context,” 2015.
- [46] J. Duan, F. Kong, S. Wang, X. Shi, and K. Xu, “Are diffusion models vulnerable to membership inference attacks?,” 2023.
- [47] J. Dubiński, A. Kowalczyk, S. Pawlak, P. Rokita, T. Trzcinski, and P. Morawiecki, “Towards more realistic membership inference attacks on large diffusion models,” 2023.
- [48] Y. Liu, Z. Li, M. Backes, Y. Shen, and Y. Zhang, “Watermarking diffusion model,” 2023.
- [49] S. Peng, Y. Chen, C. Wang, and X. Jia, “Intellectual property protection of diffusion models via the watermark diffusion process,” 2023.