

Replication in Visual Diffusion Models: A Survey and Outlook

Wenhao Wang, Yifan Sun, Zongxin Yang, Zhengdong Hu, Zhentao Tan, Yi Yang*, Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract—Visual diffusion models have revolutionized the field of creative AI, producing high-quality and diverse content. However, they inevitably memorize training images or videos, subsequently *replicating* their concepts, content, or styles during inference. This phenomenon raises significant concerns about privacy, security, and copyright within generated outputs. In this survey, we provide the first comprehensive review of replication in visual diffusion models, marking a novel contribution to the field by systematically categorizing the existing studies into unveiling, understanding, and mitigating this phenomenon. Specifically, *unveiling* mainly refers to the methods used to detect replication instances. *Understanding* involves analyzing the underlying mechanisms and factors that contribute to this phenomenon. *Mitigation* focuses on developing strategies to reduce or eliminate replication. Beyond these aspects, we also review papers focusing on its real-world influence. For instance, in the context of healthcare, replication is critically worrying due to privacy concerns related to patient data. Finally, the paper concludes with a discussion of the ongoing challenges, such as the difficulty in detecting and benchmarking replication, and outlines future directions including the development of more robust mitigation techniques. By synthesizing insights from diverse studies, this paper aims to equip researchers and practitioners with a deeper understanding at the intersection between AI technology and social good. We release this project at <https://github.com/WangWenhao0716/Awesome-Diffusion-Replication>.

Index Terms—Replication, Visual Diffusion Models, AI for Social Good, AI Security

1 INTRODUCTION

VISUAL diffusion models represent a significant advancement in the field of generative modeling, particularly for image synthesis tasks. These models leverage the concept of diffusion, a process inspired by statistical physics, to generate images from random noise [1], [2]. Compared to traditional Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) [3] and Variational Autoencoders (VAE) [4], visual diffusion models excel in producing high-quality, diverse, and stable images. Famous visual diffusion models include OpenAI’s DALL-E [5]–[7], Stability AI’s Stable Diffusion [8]–[10], Google’s Imagen [11], and Baidu’s ERNIE-ViLG [12], [13], drawing widespread attention from researchers, practitioners, and enthusiasts.

Visual diffusion models have a broad range of real-world applications across various industries. In the entertainment sector, these models are utilized for creating highly realistic visual effects [14], animations [15], and virtual environments in movies and video games [16], significantly reducing production costs and time. In the field of design and fashion, they aid in generating new styles, patterns, and prototypes, fostering innovation and creativity [17]–[19]. Marketing and advertising benefit from these models through the creation of visually appealing and customized content that enhances consumer engagement [20]. Additionally, in healthcare, visual




Fig. 1. During training, visual diffusion models memorize the training images and *replicate* their concepts, content, or styles during the inference stage. For instance, they can replicate (a) a biased concept of “nurses are female”, (b) copyrighted content from Getty Images, private content from patient X-ray films, and facial portrait from Elon Musk, and (c) unique stylistic elements from a contemporary artist, Hollie Mengert.

diffusion models assist in medical imaging by enhancing the quality of diagnostic images [21], [22] and creating synthetic data for research and training purposes [23], [24]. The image-generating AI market is estimated to be valued at around 349.6 million in 2023 and is expected to grow to approximately 1,081.2 million by 2030 [25].

To achieve such outstanding performance and broad applications, visual diffusion models highly rely on extensive web data, such as LAION-5B [26], for training. However, this data encompasses several significant issues: First, at the *concept* level, the training data often contains biased gender [27] and culture [28], racial representations [29], and Not Safe For Work (NSFW) materials [30]. Second, at the *content*

- Wenhao Wang and Zhengdong Hu are with the Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. e-mail: wangwenhao0716@gmail.com and luzhengdongcs@gmail.com
- Yifan Sun and Zhentao Tan are with Baidu Inc., Beijing, China. e-mail: sunyf15@tsinghua.org.cn and tanzhentao@stu.pku.edu.cn
- Zongxin Yang and Yi Yang are with the College of Computer Science and Technology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China. e-mail: zongxinyang1996@gmail.com and yangyics@zju.edu.cn

* Yi Yang is the corresponding author.

level, web data includes a substantial amount of copyrighted images [31], medical images containing patient information [32], and photos of politicians or celebrities [33]. Third, at the *style* level, data may include works characterized by unique stylistic elements from contemporary artists [34], [35]. These issues lead to some generated images exhibiting unfair outcomes, inappropriate content, ethical risks, and copyright infringement [36], thereby negatively impacting the widespread applications of visual diffusion models.

Fundamentally, as shown in Fig. 1, this problem comes from an inevitable and important phenomenon in current visual diffusion models, *i.e.*, during training, these models memorize the training images and *replicate* their concepts, content, or styles during the inference stage. Currently, an increasing amount of research is being conducted to discuss this *replication* phenomenon. However, there is a lack of surveys that specifically focus on replication in visual diffusion models. In this survey, we provide the first comprehensive review of replication in visual diffusion models, which not only systematically investigates this research topic but also potentially benefits the improvement of model safety and ethical standards in the real world.

Our survey systematically introduces the concept of replication in visual diffusion models from three perspectives: *unveiling*, *understanding*, and *mitigation*. *Unveiling* involves identifying and exposing replication through techniques such as similarity retrieval [34], [37], membership inference [38], [39], and prompting [40], [41]. *Understanding* explores the mechanisms behind replication, including factors like data duplication [31], [42] and inappropriate training methods [43], [44]. *Mitigation* discusses strategies to minimize replication, such as differential privacy [45], [46], data deduplication [47], [48], and machine unlearning [49], [50]. Lastly, we explore the influence of replication in the real world, including regulation [51], [52], art [53], [54], society [29], [55], and healthcare [56], [57]. An overview of this survey is available at Fig. 1.

This survey makes the following contributions:

- 1) This is the first survey that systematically reviews the concept of replication in visual diffusion models. We innovatively discuss this phenomenon from the perspectives of unveiling, understanding, mitigation, and its influence in the real-world.
- 2) We provide a brief overview of visual diffusion models, including their categorization, theoretical foundations, and functionalities. We then formally introduce the term replication within this context, providing a concise definition and understanding of its meaning.
- 3) By pointing out the inadequacies of current methods and the challenges existing in replication, we provide a roadmap for future research, such as developing more accurate and efficient unveiling methods and creating more robust mitigation strategies.

The remainder of this survey is organized as follows: In Section 2, we highlight the differences between our survey and existing ones. In Section 3, we briefly introduce visual diffusion models and define the phenomenon of replication. Subsequently, we summarize unveiling, understanding, and mitigation in Sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively. Additionally, in Section 7, we review papers that focus on the influence of replication in the real world. Finally, we present the current

challenges and future directions in Section 8 and conclude the survey in Section 9.

2 RELATED WORKS

Diffusion models in vision. Existing surveys on diffusion models, such as [198]–[201], provide comprehensive overviews of various diffusion modeling techniques and their applications in computer vision. These surveys categorize diffusion models, discuss their theoretical foundations, and highlight their performance in tasks like image synthesis and data augmentation. In contrast, our survey uniquely focuses on the critical issue of replication within diffusion models. We systematically explore this phenomenon through the lenses of unveiling, understanding, and mitigation, thereby filling a gap between general diffusion model overviews and the specific challenge of replication.

Safety of diffusion models. Existing surveys on the safety of diffusion models often address issues such as bias, misinformation, privacy concerns, and copyright protection. For instance, [202] emphasizes the critical need to identify AI-generated content to prevent its misuse and potential societal disruptions. [36] explores privacy risks associated with generative AI and highlights the importance of robust detection and authentication. Additionally, [203] and [204] investigate the broader ethical implications and technical challenges of ensuring the integrity and trustworthiness of AI-generated content, including the use of privacy-preserving techniques and blockchain for content verification. Furthermore, [205] addresses the legal and technical challenges of protecting intellectual property rights in the context of AI-generated works, emphasizing the need to identify and verify copyrighted content.

In contrast, while our survey also falls under the safety of diffusion models, we specifically target the replication phenomenon within visual diffusion models. This focus is unique compared to existing surveys: while these surveys emphasize detection and mitigation of AI-generated content to prevent misuse and ensure ethical deployment, our survey goes deeper into the intrinsic properties of diffusion models related to replication. This distinction not only complements existing studies but also provides a more granular understanding of the safety concerns associated with visual diffusion models.

Replication in large language models. The replication phenomenon in large language models (LLMs) have been extensively studied in recent literature. Works such as [206] explore the implications of memorization for privacy, security, and copyright. Similarly, the survey [207] provides a comprehensive overview of methods for extracting training data from LLMs and discusses the inherent challenges in mitigating these risks. Our survey differentiates itself by focusing specifically on visual diffusion models, filling this gap in the current literature.

3 BACKGROUND

In this section, we provide an overview of visual diffusion models and formally define the replication phenomenon.




Fig. 2. Categorization of the literature on replication in visual diffusion models: unveiling, understanding, mitigation, and its influence.

3.1 Visual Diffusion Models

Categorization and theoretical foundations. Diffusion models are typically categorized into three main types: denoising diffusion probabilistic models (DDPMs) [2], noise-conditioned score networks (NCSNs) [208], and stochastic differential equations (SDEs) [209].

Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs): DDPMs add Gaussian noise to the data in a forward process and learn to reverse this process to denoise the data. The forward process is defined as:

$$q(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{x}_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t; \sqrt{\alpha_t}\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, (1 - \alpha_t)\mathbf{I}), \quad (1)$$

where α_t is a noise schedule parameter. The reverse process is:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}|\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}; \mu_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t), \sigma_t^2\mathbf{I}), \quad (2)$$

with μ_θ being predicted by a neural network.

Noise-Conditioned Score Networks (NCSNs): NCSNs estimate the score function, the gradient of the log density of the data, to denoise the data. The forward process introduces noise, and the model learns to predict the score:

$$\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t) \approx \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_t} \log p(\mathbf{x}_t). \quad (3)$$

The reverse process uses Langevin dynamics to generate new samples:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t) + \epsilon\mathbf{z}, \quad \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}), \quad (4)$$

where ϵ is a step size parameter.

Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs): SDEs generalize the diffusion process using continuous-time dynamics. The forward process can be described by an SDE:

$$d\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_t, t)dt + g(t)d\mathbf{w}_t, \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{w}_t is a standard Wiener process. The reverse-time SDE is used to generate samples:

$$d\mathbf{x}_t = [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) - g(t)^2\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_t} \log p_t(\mathbf{x}_t)]dt + g(t)d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t, \quad (6)$$

where $d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$ is the reverse-time Wiener process.

Functionalities. Visual diffusion models exhibit a broad range of functionalities, including storytelling [210]–[212], virtual try-on [213]–[215], drag edit [216]–[218], diffusion inversion [94], [219], [220], text-guided editing [221]–[223], T2I augmentation [224]–[226], spatial control [227]–[229], image translation [230]–[232], inpainting [233]–[235], layout generation [236], [237], super resolution [238], [239], video generation [240], [241], and video editing [242], [243], showing their versatility and applicability across diverse domains. However, at the same time, visual diffusion models also pose potential threats to this wide range of functionalities through the replication of their training data. This underscores the necessity of our survey, which provides a comprehensive review of this phenomenon, aiming to enhance model safety and ethical standards.

3.2 Replication

Definition. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ denote a training set of n samples. A diffusion model trained on this set is denoted as $f_{\mathcal{T}}$. During the inference phase, the model generates a set of m data points denoted as $\mathcal{G} = \{\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_m\}$. We say that a trained diffusion model $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ replicates its training set if and only if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist points $x_i \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\hat{x}_j \in \mathcal{G}$, and a distance metric d , such that $d(x_i, \hat{x}_j) < \epsilon$. The distance metric d is a function defined on set $M: M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, satisfying the following axioms for all points $x, y, z \in M$:

- The distance from a point to itself is zero: $d(x, x) = 0$;
- The distance between two distinct points is always positive: if $x \neq y$, then $d(x, y) > 0$;
- The distance from x to y is always the same as the distance from y to x : $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$.

Understanding. This definition is highly compatible with the various *functionalities* and *modalities* of visual diffusion models, and it comprehensively includes different *levels* of replication:

- 1) *Functionalities.* The proposed definition is highly compatible with different functionalities exhibited by visual diffusion models because these applications fundamentally involve generative tasks, where the output is either an image or a video. Our definition specifies the replication by only comparing training data and generated outputs using a distance metric. This definition is agnostic to the type of generative task – whether it is text-to-image, image translation, inpainting, or video generation.
- 2) *Modalities.* The proposed definition is also compatible with different modalities of data, such as images, videos, and even text, due to its reliance on a general concept of data points and a distance metric for comparison. Regardless of whether the data point is an image, a video, or text, there are established methods for feature extraction and distance calculation specific to each modality.
- 3) *Levels.* The proposed definition includes different replication levels, *i.e.*, concept, content, and style, because it allows for various feature extractors tailored to each specific level. When focusing on the concept level, which is akin to common multi-class classification tasks, models like CLIP [244], DINO [245], [246], or those [247], [248] pre-trained on datasets like ImageNet [249] can serve as effective feature extractors to evaluate conceptual similarities between training and generated data. For the content level, there are image copy detection algorithms [250]–[253] designed to ensure precise detection of replicated content in the generated outputs. At the style level, researchers have developed specialized style descriptors [34], [35] to assess stylistic similarities. Moreover, in mathematics, various distance metrics, such as Euclidean and Manhattan distances, measure the distance between two points.

4 UNVEILING

In this section, we focus on the first aspect of our survey on replication in visual diffusion models, which is *unveiling*. Unveiling [254]–[257] refers to the process of uncovering the phenomenon of replication, either manually or through the use of specially-designed machine learning models. As




Fig. 3. Illustrations of different methods for unveiling replication in visual diffusion models.

shown in Fig. 1, we organize the unveiling of replication into 6 categories, *i.e.*, prompting, membership inference, similarity retrieval, proactive replication, watermarking, and novel perspectives. The illustration of these categories is provided in Fig. 3.

4.1 Prompting

These articles investigate how prompting can reveal replication in visual diffusion models. As shown in Fig. 3 (a): by using *specific* prompts, researchers can generate images that closely resemble the model’s training data; beyond that, some papers show visual diffusion models may replicate learned copyrighted images *implicitly*.

Specific. Specific prompts are carefully chosen phrases or descriptions from researchers to test whether visual diffusion models can replicate. For instance, [37], [58]–[60] employ specific prompts that are known to correspond to particular training images to see if the generated images closely resemble these originals. By injecting maliciously crafted data into the training set, researchers [61] can use specific prompts to trigger the model to produce near-identical copies of copyrighted images. The articles [62]–[64] demonstrate that by using prompts that are likely to invoke sensitive or controversial topics, the diffusion model can be coaxed into generating unsafe or offensive images. By using prompts that include the names of famous artists [40] or refer to different social stereotypes [65], the researchers show that the model can produce images that closely mimic the unique features of their styles or reflect biased society representations.

Implicit. replication can also occur when user prompts are related to certain concepts or topics implicitly or unintentionally. For instance, these studies [60], [66], [67] highlight how diffusion models can replicate copyrighted content with such prompts. They further utilize techniques such as keyword extraction and gradient-based prompt optimization to analyze the attention mechanisms within these models.

4.2 Membership Inference

Membership inference attacks (MIAs) aim to determine whether specific data samples are part of the model’s training set. These attacks exploit patterns in the model’s behavior, such as how it processes and reconstructs data, to infer the presence of training data. If visual diffusion models have not been trained on a data sample, they will never replicate it. Therefore, MIAs have a strong relationship with replication, and we review MIAs in the context of visual diffusion models in this section. Based on the level of access attackers have, MIAs can be categorized into *white-box* and *black-box* attacks, as shown in Fig. 3 (b).

White-box. White-box membership inference attacks diffusion models by leveraging their internal parameters and gradients. Key methods include loss-based attacks [68], [69], likelihood-based attacks [68], [69], gradient-based attacks [70], quantile regression [71], proximal initialization [39]. These methods highlight significant privacy risks for diffusion models when accessing their internal weights, especially handling sensitive data.

Black-box. Black-box MIAs focus on exploiting the generated images rather than visual diffusion models’ internal param-

ters. Key studies have shown that these attacks can effectively differentiate members based on image quality and semantic fidelity [69], [72]. Existing techniques include leveraging probabilistic fluctuation [73], using data watermarking [74], and analyzing statistical properties of generated distributions [75]. Some methods also highlight significant privacy risks in fine-tuned [76] and large-scale [77] diffusion models.

4.3 Similarity Retrieval

Similarity retrieval is a method that closely aligns with human common sense for uncovering replication. This approach involves searching for and identifying items in a dataset that are similar to a given query item. In the context of diffusion models, similarity retrieval allows for comparing generated outputs against the training data. When a generated image/video closely matches an image/video from the training set, it raises concerns about the model replicating specific data points rather than generalizing from the training data. As shown in Fig. 3 (c), the primary retrieval methods for unveiling replication are through *content similarity*, while *style similarity* is also used to help identify artworks mimicry.

Content similarity. Content similarity focuses on comparing the actual content or subject matter of the generated images or videos to the training data. The first step of comparison involves feature extraction with pre-trained vision(-language) models [244]–[248] or specialized image copy detection methods [250]–[253]. After that, these extracted features are used to compute similarity scores between generated content and training samples through various metrics such as cosine similarity, Euclidean distance, or more complex learned metrics [37], [78]–[82].

Style similarity. Style similarity involves comparing the artistic style or aesthetic elements of generated images or videos to those in the training data. This approach is crucial for identifying instances where a diffusion model replicates the distinctive style of contemporary artworks or artists. For instance, [83] explores how well diffusion models can replicate the styles of human artists. Additionally, [34] discusses a framework for understanding and extracting style descriptors from images generated by diffusion models. Furthermore, [35] generalizes the pattern retrieval algorithm for image copy detection to measure style similarity.

4.4 Watermarking

By embedding imperceptible *watermarks* into the data, one can detect the presence of these watermarks in the generated images if a visual diffusion model uses the data during training or fine-tuning processes. In this way, unveiling possible replication is simplified to detecting and verifying the occurrence of watermarks, as shown in Fig. 3 (d). Unlike comparing similarities, which aligns with common sense but is difficult to use as legal evidence, watermarking techniques provide concrete evidence of copyright infringement and protect the intellectual property of rights holders. Several methods have been proposed to embed such watermarks into images. For instance, DIAGNOSIS [84] detects unauthorized data usage in text-to-image diffusion models by injecting unique behaviors into models via modified datasets; DiffusionShield [85] embeds invisible watermarks containing

copyright information into images; and FT-SHIELD [86] uses imperceptible watermarks embedded in data to verify if it has been misused in the training or fine-tuning of text-to-image diffusion models. Beyond watermarking general images, [87] embeds robust, invisible watermarks into artworks to trace art theft.

4.5 Proactive Replication

Recently, some personalized visual diffusion models [88]–[97] have been successfully designed to fine-tune on specific subjects or styles using minimal input data. Remarkably, some models [98], [99] can even learn from this minimal input data in a training-free manner. This enables users to generate images that highly preserve the original visual characteristics and essence of the subjects or styles at a very low cost, as shown in Fig. 3 (e).

We refer to this as *proactive replication*, unlike the aforementioned reviewed methods, which inevitably and unintentionally replicate. Proactive replication in visual diffusion models represents a double-edged sword: while it offers opportunities for the creative industry with enhanced personalized content [88], it also poses significant ethical and practical challenges [258]. One of the most pressing concerns is the potential for these models to replicate and commercialize the artistic styles of living artists without consent [133]. This capability to reproduce artists’ styles at low cost undermines the years of effort artists invest in their unique visual signatures.

4.6 Novel Perspectives

In addition to these categorizations of unveiling replication, several novel perspectives have emerged that offer unique insights and techniques. As shown in Fig. 3 (f), these perspectives [100]–[106] leverage different aspects of model behavior and training data characteristics to uncover replication in visual diffusion models:

- 1) *Magnitude of noise.* This research [100] presents a method for detecting replication by examining the magnitude of text-conditional noise predictions. By analyzing these magnitudes, the study unveils how specific text tokens contribute to replication, allowing users to adjust their prompts.
- 2) *Training data attribution.* The papers [101], [102] emphasize the role of training data in guiding diffusion models by tracing back generated outputs to their original training data. This approach aids in identifying instances where the model excessively relies on specific training samples.
- 3) *Cross attention.* This work [103] investigates the role of cross attention mechanisms in text-to-image diffusion models. Examining cross-attention mechanisms helps identify a model’s replication because models tend to focus on certain text-image pairs.
- 4) *Fine-tune to leak.* This research [104] highlights the risks associated with fine-tuning diffusion models, which can amplify replication issues. To determine if a visual diffusion model has serious replication issues, it is feasible to check whether the model has undergone fine-tuning.
- 5) *Overfitted Masked Autoencoder (MAE).* The paper [105] proposes using overfitted MAEs to detect generative parroting in diffusion models. By identifying overfitting




Fig. 4. Illustrations of different perspectives for understanding replication in visual diffusion models.

patterns, the study spots when a model is replicating training data instead of generating novel content.

- 6) *Property inference*. This work [106] explores how property existence inference can be used to detect replication in generative models. By inferring whether certain properties exist in the training data, the method helps in identifying instances of replication and implementing measures to reduce such occurrences.

5 UNDERSTANDING

After unveiling the phenomenon of replication in visual diffusion models, *understanding* its mechanism is crucial for developing effective mitigation strategies and improving the safety and ethical standards of these models. As outlined in Fig. 1, this section explores the underlying mechanisms that contribute to replication from three different perspectives: data, methods, and theory. The demonstration of these aspects is shown in Fig. 4.

5.1 Data

Data plays a crucial role in the replication phenomenon observed in visual diffusion models. The quality, duplication, and bias present in the training data directly impact the model’s behavior and performance. As shown in Fig. 4 (a), in this section, we explore how *insufficient training data*, *image*

duplication, *misleading captions*, and *data types* contribute to replication.

Insufficient training data. When the training dataset is too small, the model is not exposed to enough variety and tends to overfit the limited examples it has seen. This overfitting means that the model memorizes specific details of the training data, which it then replicates during the generation phase. The concept of Effective Model Memorization (EMM) [107] is introduced to represent the maximum size of a training dataset where the model approximates the theoretical optimum in terms of memorization. Empirically, researchers [107] also show that as the size of the training dataset increases, the replication ratio decreases.

Image duplication. When training data contains multiple copies or near-duplicates of the same images, the model is more likely to replicate these images during inference [108]. This issue is particularly prevalent in large-scale datasets scraped from the web, where duplicates are common due to the lack of rigorous data cleaning processes. Experiments by [37] and [31] on datasets such as Oxford Flowers [259], Celeb-A [260], ImageNet [249], and LAION [26] demonstrate that the degree of content replication varies with the image duplication rates in these datasets.

Misleading captions. When captions are duplicated, specific, or inaccurate, they can misguide the model during the training phase, leading to the replication of specific image-caption pairs. For instance, while it is commonly believed

that image duplication alone causes replication, research [31], [42], [108], [109] indicates that the similarity of captions in the training data can also influence replication behavior. Additionally, experiments [42] reveal that specific keywords, such as “Van Gogh”, in the training data can lead to clusters of nearly identical images. Surprisingly, [107] discovers that the replication issue in diffusion models can be significantly exacerbated when training data is conditioned on inaccurate captions. This may be because such captions do not provide meaningful guidance for the model during training, leading to overfitting on specific training examples.

Data types. Beyond these common understandings in data, [110] finds that inliers (data points that are representative of the general distribution of the training data) are memorized earlier in the training process, while outliers (data points that are atypical or rare within the training set) tend to be memorized later. This indicates that the visual diffusion model focuses on learning the core characteristics of the dataset before handling more unusual data.

5.2 Methods

To complement insights from a data perspective, this section demonstrates how training methods can influence replication in visual diffusion models. It specifically examines the roles of a *deterministic sampler* and *model capacity*. To deepen the analysis of model behavior, we additionally review *new metrics* developed specifically for assessing replication. The illustrations of these are shown in Fig. 4 (b).

Deterministic sampler. Deterministic samplers are mechanisms used in visual diffusion models to generate data in a repeatable and predictable manner. The researchers [43] find that deterministic samplers lead to generated samples that are highly correlated with the training set. This high correlation indicates that the model is replicating patterns seen during training rather than generating truly novel data. Further, [44] demonstrates that while deterministic samplers can lead to replication, they can also support generalization under appropriate training conditions.

Model capacity. Model capacity refers to a machine learning model’s ability to fit a wide variety of functions, which is determined by the model’s complexity. Complexity factors include the number of parameters, the depth of the model, and the model’s structure. In visual diffusion models, replacing the commonly-used U-Net backbone [261] with a transformer [262] – referred to as Diffusion Transformers (DiTs) [263] – results in a higher model capacity. Although models with greater capacity often achieve lower Frechet Inception Distance (FID) and better visual fidelity, they are also more prone to replicating training data. For instance, [31] demonstrates that large models with substantial capacity can retain detailed information from the training data, which may lead them to replicate these details during inference. Furthermore, [108] finds that high-capacity models, due to their complexity, are more likely to replicate training data, particularly under conditions of insufficient data diversity or small dataset size.

New metrics. Beyond understanding replication from the perspective of *training* methods, [111]–[113] underscore the importance of developing more comprehensive *evaluation* frameworks. Traditional evaluation metrics, like FID for

visual diffusion models, are useful but insufficient for addressing issues such as overfitting and generalization beyond the training set. Therefore, new metrics, such as Feature Likelihood Divergence (FLD), have been proposed to specifically account for:

- ensuring that generated samples differ from the training samples;
- assessing the quality of the generated samples;
- promoting a wide variety of generated samples.

Empirical evaluations show that FLD effectively reveals overfitting cases where other metrics fail across various datasets and model classes.

5.3 Theory

Beyond the straightforward understanding of the replication phenomenon from the data and methods perspectives, some researchers [43], [114]–[118] offer formal and theoretical explanations using various mathematical theories, such as probability and information theory. In this section, we illustrate these theories in Fig. 4 (c) and provide a brief review as detailed below:

- 1) *Near access-freeness.* The authors [114] introduce the concept of “near access-freeness” (NAF) and provide bounds on the probability that a model will generate protected content.
- 2) *Dichotomy.* This study [115] examines the generalization capabilities of diffusion probabilistic models, introducing the “memorization-generalization dichotomy”. The key finding is that these models generalize well when they fail to memorize their training data.
- 3) *Geometry-adaptive.* This paper [116] explores how the generalization properties of diffusion models can be attributed to their use of geometry-adaptive harmonic representations and argue that these representations allow the models to adapt to the underlying geometric structures of the data.
- 4) *Data-(in)dependent.* The authors [117] introduce a framework to estimate the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the learned and target distributions, providing both data-independent and data-dependent bounds.
- 5) *Mutual information.* This paper [43] defines generalization in terms of mutual information between the generated data and the training set, suggesting that models generating data with less correlation to the training set exhibit better generalization.
- 6) *Creativity.* Theoretically, the authors [118] discuss various dimensions of creativity, including originality, flexibility, and elaboration, and analyze how current AI technologies perform in these areas.

6 MITIGATION

After we unveil and understand the replication phenomenon in visual diffusion models, the final and most crucial step is to design strategies to *mitigate* these issues. Mitigation means avoiding the (un)intentional leakage of training data through model outputs. To effectively finish that, it is essential to employ a multifaceted approach that encompasses both data management techniques and algorithmic innovations. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 1, in this section, we explore




Fig. 5. Illustrations of different approaches for mitigating replication in visual diffusion models.

mitigation strategies through training data optimization, machine unlearning, and prompt disturbing. Beyond that, we also review some novel perspectives towards addressing this issue. The illustration of these aspects is shown in Fig. 5.

6.1 Training Data Optimization

Since data is the direct cause of replicating biased concepts, copyrighted and private content, and artwork styles, optimizing training datasets becomes crucial for mitigating replication in visual diffusion models. As shown in Fig. 5 (a), based on current key interests, we innovatively categorize training data optimization methods into four main areas: *deduplication*, *protection*, *purification*, *corruption*.

Deduplication. Deduplication involves identifying and removing duplicate or near-duplicate data entries within training datasets. This process is essential to ensure a diverse training dataset and prevent models from overfitting to repetitive patterns. Techniques such as hashing, semantic analysis, and clustering are typically used to detect duplicates based on exact matches or semantic similarities. For visual diffusion models, deduplication can be particularly challenging due to the scale and complexity of training data. Approaches like [47], [48], [119] leverage embeddings from pre-trained models like CLIP [244] to perform semantic deduplication, which not only identifies exact duplicates but also uncovers semantically similar image entries, thereby

refining the dataset more effectively. Furthermore, [31], [108] focus on the deduplication of captions, highlighting how unique texts can influence the diversity of generated images. Beyond these, the paper [120] proposes a novel dual fusion enhancement method to simultaneously deal with image and captions. Initially, it introduces a generality score to measure caption generality and employs a large language model to generalize training captions. The method then leverages these generalized captions along with a new dataset to enhance image and text diversity and randomness, effectively reducing potential duplication in the fine-tuning dataset.

Protection. This involves protective measures for images or videos to prevent misuse or unauthorized imitation by visual diffusion models. A typical protection involves adversarial examples, which ensures that visual diffusion models cannot accurately learn or reproduce training data. For instance, the authors [121] discuss advanced strategies for generating adversarial attacks that disrupt the latent diffusion model’s ability to generate accurate outputs. The concept of unlearnable examples [122] is also proposed to add specially crafted noise to data to make it unlearnable by diffusion models. [123] is proposed to use score distillation sampling in conjunction with projected gradient descent to perturb images, thereby protecting them from unauthorized use. By embedding watermarks and crafting adversarial perturbations, this study [124] not only prevents unauthorized replication but also ensures that any reproduced images visibly indicate their protected status.

Although these adversarial example techniques are useful for general protection purposes, they are not specifically designed for personalized or customized visual diffusion models, which may bring suboptimal protection performance in this area. With the increasing prevalence of these models, such as DreamBooth [88], and the ethnic concerns they bring, there is a growing number of papers focusing on developing adversarial techniques to combat unauthorized customization of visual diffusion models. These adversarial methods are crucial for ensuring that personal and copyrighted images are not replicated by these powerful AI frameworks. The utilized techniques include:

- subtle imaging perturbations [125]–[129], which involve making minor adjustments to an image that are imperceptible to the human eye but disrupt the AI’s ability to learn from these images effectively;
- adversarial watermarking [130], [131], which embed specific patterns into images that can degrade output quality when the watermarked images are used to train a model.

One of the most controversial applications of personalization technology is its ability to mimic artworks created by contemporary artists. This unethical practice undermines the significant time and effort that artists invest in developing their unique styles. Consequently, several measures have been proposed specifically to prevent the mimicking of artworks. For instance, researchers have developed methods like PAG [132], Glaze [133], MAMC [134], and soft restriction strategy [264], which apply nearly imperceptible distortions to images before they are shared online, misleading AI models that attempt to mimic the artist’s style. Additionally, the study [135] introduces adversarial examples as a way to protect paintings. By generating adversarial examples that

are visually similar to the original paintings but are designed to mislead diffusion models, this method effectively prevents visual diffusion models from replicating the artwork’s style.

Beyond these protective methods, differential privacy [265] also helps reduce the risk of visual diffusion models replicating training data. Differential privacy is a technique to enhance the privacy of a dataset by adding noise to the data, which prevents the exact inference of individual information from released data. [45] and [46] were among the first to introduce the concept of differential privacy into visual diffusion models. Recently, Normalizing Flows [136] are used to model and analyze data while implementing differential privacy to enhance data protection; MPCPA [137] explores a multi-center privacy computing framework; and DP-RDM [138] adapts diffusion Models to private domains without fine-tuning.

Although these protective measures show effectiveness in their respective settings, they have limitations. Research [139] indicates that while adversarial perturbations can protect data, advanced methods like destruction-restoration can remove these perturbations, allowing the diffusion models to function normally with protected data. Similarly, [140] reveals that although protective perturbations can safeguard images, their effectiveness can be compromised by advanced diffusion models which can adapt and mitigate these protections. The study [141] exposes the vulnerabilities in probabilistic copyright protection, demonstrating how repeated interactions can significantly amplify the probability of generating infringing content. Furthermore, [142] highlights that existing methods like GLAZE [133], which introduce imperceptible perturbations, can be detected and neutralized by sophisticated AI models, rendering these protections ineffective over time. Therefore, future efforts should focus on creating more adaptive, robust, and multi-layered protection mechanisms that can withstand the increasing capabilities of modern AI tools.

Purification. Purification involves the removal of undesirable samples from training datasets, particularly those containing copyrighted or privacy-sensitive content. This process is essential to ensure that even if visual diffusion models replicate data, they do not pose security or legal risks. While this method effectively addresses the issue from its roots, its adoption remains limited due to the complexity and time-consuming nature of the process. The CommonCanvas [143] initiative tackles this challenge by assembling a dataset of Creative Commons (CC)-licensed images along with corresponding high-quality synthetic captions. The models trained on the CommonCanvas dataset achieve performance comparable to Stable Diffusion 2 [8] in human evaluations while avoiding the typical copyright issues. In the artistic creation area, the article [144] introduces innovative methods for creating new artistic styles using models trained solely on natural images, thereby avoiding any claims of copying existing human art styles.

Corruption. Corruption refers to data samples that have been altered, typically due to noise or other forms of distortion, making them different from their true, clean distribution. Leveraging visual diffusion models to learn from corrupted data can be beneficial for reducing data replication and enhancing privacy. This is because these models are able to learn general data patterns in the absence of specific

individual samples. To learn from these corrupted data, the methodologies involve introducing additional distortions [145] or using sophisticated statistical formulas [146].

6.2 Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning [266] is a process designed to remove specific data or concepts from a machine learning model, effectively making the model “forget” particular information without needing to retrain from scratch. As shown in Fig. 5 (b), in the context of visual diffusion models, machine unlearning plays a vital role in mitigating the issues of replication of specific concept, content, and style [50], [147], [148]. Specifically, the studies [49], [103], [149]–[152] emphasizes the significance of choosing cross-attention-related parameters to fine-tune for effective erasure. Focusing on gradient, SalUn [153] utilizes gradient-based weight saliency to improve the limitations of traditional machine unlearning methods, aiming to enhance accuracy, stability, and cross-domain applicability of the unlearning process. Utilizing continual learning, Selective Amnesia [154] explores how to selectively forget concepts in deep generative models.

There are also some works focusing on specialized aspects or applications. The paper [155] discusses the application of machine unlearning techniques in image-to-image generative models. Regarding defending against unexpected user inputs: Espresso [156] is the first method to robustly remove unacceptable concepts; Task Vectors [157] have been shown to be more robust compared to input-dependent erasure methods; and [158] proposes the use of pruning techniques to enhance the model’s robustness. [159] and [160] are specifically designed to use machine unlearning to mitigate unsafe content generation and enhance copyright protection, respectively.

Beyond traditional machine unlearning methods that focus on erasing single concept at a time, recent advancements move towards more comprehensive approaches that aim to modify, erase, or refine multiple concepts simultaneously within diffusion models. For instance, UCE [161] can handle multiple concept editing tasks simultaneously, such as debiasing, style erasure, and content moderation. SDD [162] effectively reduces the proportion of harmful content generated by aligning the conditional noise estimate with an unconditional one and allows for the removal of multiple concepts simultaneously. SepME [163] flexibly erases or recovers multiple concepts while preserving overall model performance. MACE [164] and EMCID [165] scale up to handle the erasure of 100 and 1,000 concepts, respectively, while maintaining the integrity of other non-edited concepts.

Although these unlearning methods are effective to some degree, some evaluations question their reliability and indicate that they are susceptible to jailbreaking. For instance, UnlearnCanvas [166] includes high-resolution, stylized images that allow researchers to effectively test and quantify the unlearning of artistic painting styles and associated image objects. The paper highlights shortcomings in existing machine unlearning evaluation methods, such as a lack of diverse unlearning targets, lack of evaluation precision, and a lack of systematic study on retainability. Additionally, the study [167] shows that special learned word embeddings can retrieve supposedly erased concepts from sanitized models

without needing to alter the models’ weights. Furthermore, some prompts are also designed for testing the reliability of deployed safety mechanisms:

- UnlearnDiff [168] leverages the inherent classification capabilities of visual diffusion models to simplify the generation of adversarial prompts;
- Ring-A-Bell [169] first performs concept extraction to gain comprehensive representations of sensitive and inappropriate concepts, then uses these concepts to automatically select problematic prompts;
- Researchers in [170] combine multiple prompts to reconstruct the vector responsible for target concept generation, even when direct computation of this vector is infeasible.

6.3 Prompt Disturbing

As illustrated in Fig. 5 (c), the term “prompt disturbing” refers to the intentional modification of user inputs to prevent the model from merely replicating memorized patterns or details from its training data. These modifications include direct change to the original user prompts. For instance, [100] alters specific terms or removing elements from prompts to decrease direct ties to memorized data and promote a broader range of creative outputs. Negative prompts [30] are introduced to guide a visual diffusion model to avoid producing certain elements, thereby encouraging more original creations that are not simply replication of its training data.

Beyond that, some methods further disturb prompt-related components in the visual diffusion models to avoid replication. For instance, ProtoRe [171] incorporates language-contrastive knowledge to identify prototypes of negative concepts, which are then used to extract and eliminate undesirable features from outputs. Degeneration Tuning [172] is proposed to disrupt the correlation between undesired textual concepts and their corresponding image domains. [173] works by optimizing text embeddings during inference time to better control the image content generated from textual descriptions.

6.4 Novel Perspectives

Beyond these common mitigation methods for the replication phenomenon, some novel perspectives can be explored to further reduce these issues within visual diffusion models. As shown in Fig. 5 (d), these novel perspectives [108], [174]–[176] aim to tackle the underlying causes of replication by diversifying the training approaches and incorporating principles from other domains of machine learning and data security:

- 1) *Composition*. This research [174] allows different diffusion models to be trained on separate data sources and arbitrarily composed at inference time. Each model only contains information about the subset of the data it was exposed to during training, which effectively prevents the leakage of training data.
- 2) *Model immunizing*. The article [175] discusses how to mitigate replication by improving learning algorithms to reduce the risk of malicious adaptation. Malicious adaptation refers to the behavior of fine-tuning visual diffusion models to produce harmful or unauthorized




Fig. 6. Illustrations of different influences of replication in visual diffusion models.

content. The article proposes an approach called IMMA, which mainly modifies the parameters of the pre-trained model using a bi-level optimization strategy.

- 3) *Low-rank adaptation*. This paper [176] discusses how to apply Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) in diffusion models while reducing the risk of Membership Inference Attacks (MIA). These attacks can identify whether specific data belongs to the training dataset, leading to severe privacy leaks. To address this challenge, researchers introduced a new method called PrivateLoRA, which uses a min-max optimization strategy to balance the model’s adaptation loss and the MIA gain of a proxy attack model.
- 4) *Despecification guidance*. This approach [108] attempts to diminish the specificity of text prompts in guiding the inference process, thus decreasing the model’s dependency on specific inputs and preventing overly similar outputs to training data. Specifically, the method starts with a noised image or latent-space representation and predicts noise at a given time to infer the original image. It then calculates the similarity between the inferred image and the closest neighbor in the training set. This similarity is used to adjust the scaling of epsilon predictions to reduce alignment with the prompt-conditioned prediction.

7 INFLUENCE

After sequentially discussing the unveiling, understanding, and mitigation of replication in visual diffusion models, as outlined in Fig. 1, this section focuses on its *influence* in the real world. Specifically, as illustrated in Fig. 6, we focus on regulation, art, society, and healthcare. This involves opinions from legal scholars, artists, sociologists, and doctors.

7.1 Regulation

As shown in Fig. 6 (a), training and generating processes in some visual diffusion models raise significant law issues due to the replication of copyrighted materials. As these models become more powerful and prevalent, an increasing number of legal scholars are focusing on this area. They primarily investigate how these models manage and utilize copyrighted materials during the creation process, along with the challenges and implications for the existing copyright law framework. For instance, they [51], [52], [177]–[182] question whether using copyrighted works as training data for AI constitutes copyright infringement, whether AI-generated outputs are derivative works infringing on the original copyrights, and who owns the copyright for AI-generated works. Furthermore, [182], [183] discuss the intricate infringement challenges that arise when generative AI models, particularly visual diffusion models, are trained using copyrighted materials without proper authorization. Additionally, [184] aims to define and clarify what constitutes replication from the perspective of copyright infringement; [185] thoroughly explores the intersection of copyright law and economic principles in the context of rapid technological advancements; and the core idea of [186] is to evaluate whether privacy protection measures can align with and support copyright law.

Beyond the copyright issues, there are also privacy concerns and corresponding data protection regulations [267], [268]. The replication of data by visual diffusion models can pose significant privacy risks, especially when the models inadvertently replicate sensitive or personal data. This contravenes data protection regulations such as

the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [269] in Europe, which mandates the protection of personal data with appropriate technical measures. Regulatory frameworks ensure that AI systems, particularly those trained on vast amounts of potentially sensitive data, comply with privacy regulations and do not retain or reproduce personal data without consent.

The replication of biases in training data by AI models is another regulatory concern [267], [270], [271]. Ensuring that diffusion models do not perpetuate or amplify biases present in the data they are trained on is crucial. Regulations enforce fairness, accountability, and transparency in AI systems to mitigate these issues. This could involve mandatory bias audits, transparency in data usage, and clear documentation of the data and methodologies used in training AI models.

7.2 Art

The influence of generative AI in art worlds presents both opportunities and challenges. These models have transformed the art market, personalizing the buying experience and enhancing the efficiency of curators in identifying trends and managing collections [187]. Despite these advances, as shown in Fig. 6 (b), many artists fear that AI may threaten their jobs and dilute the authenticity of art by replicating styles and producing art without human involvement [53], [188]. This fuels the ongoing debate about whether art can exist without an artist [189], [190]. Additionally, some researchers [191] are investigating artistic copyright infringements, underscoring the complex challenges in protecting intellectual property because artistic style itself is not copyrightable [54].

7.3 Society

From a societal perspective, as shown in Fig. 6 (c), the phenomenon of replication in visual diffusion models manifests in the duplication of human values, ideals, and even biases within generated images or videos. Much of the research in this area focuses on the issue of biases because this can result in the reinforcement and amplification of societal inequalities and discrimination. Different from the biases discussed in the Regulation subsection, we review some papers from a societal perspective here. For instance, the study [29] introduces a novel method for assessing social biases by analyzing how varying input prompts related to gender, ethnicity, and professions influence the diversity of generated images. The researchers [55] highlight how these visual diffusion models can exacerbate the biases present in their training data, particularly depending on the dataset size. The papers [192], [193] specifically explore how gender is represented in text-to-image models and emphasizes the need to understand how they reinforce gender stereotypes.

7.4 Healthcare

Visual diffusion models have significantly impacted the field of healthcare by enhancing the generation and analysis of medical images, which are critical tools in diagnosis, treatment planning, and research.

A primary way diffusion models assist in medical imaging is through the generation of synthetic images [272]–[274]. These models can create realistic medical images,

such as MRI scans or X-rays, from a dataset of existing images. This capability is particularly useful for training medical professionals, as it allows for the creation of diverse scenarios and conditions that might not be readily available in educational settings due to rarity or ethical concerns. Additionally, synthetic images can augment datasets used to train other machine learning models, improving their ability to recognize and diagnose conditions from real patient data.

Furthermore, diffusion models can enhance image quality and detail [21], [275], [276], which is vital in medical diagnostics where the clarity of an image can influence the accuracy of assessments made by radiologists. For example, diffusion models can refine images, improving resolution and contrast, or even reconstruct incomplete scans. This enhances the interpretability of medical images and assists in more accurate diagnosis and patient monitoring.

Moreover, visual diffusion models support the development of automated diagnostic tools [277]–[279]. By generating high-quality, detailed images, these models aid in training algorithms that can detect anomalies such as tumors, fractures, or degenerative conditions. This speeds up the diagnostic process and helps in reducing human error by providing a consistent, objective analysis that can be used as a second opinion or to verify human-made diagnoses.

As shown in Fig. 6 (d), while visual diffusion models offer significant benefits in medical imaging, such as enhancing image quality and generating scarce datasets, these models also pose substantial risks due to their potential for replication. The replication phenomenon could lead to generated images being overly similar to real patient data, thus risking personal health information disclosure. In the following, we review papers that unveil, understand, and mitigate the replication phenomenon in the context of medical imaging. **Unveiling.** Several studies have served as “whistleblowers” in highlighting these issues. For instance, the research [56] reveals that 3D latent diffusion models are more prone to replicate original training images, affecting the model’s generalizability. Another study [195] compares diffusion models and GANs in synthesizing medical images, finding that diffusion models, compared to GANs, are more likely to replicate training images when generating 2D slices from 3D volumes, increasing the risk of patient re-identification. Further research in [196] confirms the tendency of latent diffusion models to replicate data in an unconditional generation setting, suggesting that diffusion models might fail to prevent the disclosure of training data details even when not targeted for specific tasks.

Understanding. The occurrence of replication in medical imaging, can be attributed mainly to two factors: the size of the original dataset and the number of training epochs. Firstly, when diffusion models are trained on small datasets, there is a higher risk of replication, as the model has fewer examples from which to learn and generalize. Studies such as [56] and [197] have highlighted that models trained on small datasets, such as those containing detailed scans for brain tumors, tend to produce synthetic images that too closely replicate the training images, reducing their utility and increasing privacy risks. Secondly, [194] reveals that over-training a model – running too many epochs – can lead to a situation where the diffusion models begin to precisely replicate the training patient data rather than

generating diverse synthetic images. This occurs because excessive training on the same dataset reinforces the model’s exposure to and retention of specific data characteristics, thereby increasing the likelihood of producing identical or nearly identical images to those seen during training.

Mitigation. There are effective solutions that can mitigate these risks and thus enhance the privacy and utility of synthetic data. Firstly, the approach of *privacy distillation*, as discussed in [57] offers a robust method for safeguarding patient information. This technique involves training a diffusion model on real data to generate a synthetic dataset, which is then filtered to remove any potentially identifiable information. A second model is then trained exclusively on this sanitized dataset. Secondly, *data augmentation* is another approach that can enhance the diversity of training datasets and reduce overfitting. By artificially expanding the dataset through transformations and variations of the original patient images, models are less likely to replicate [56], [194].

8 CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

After reviewing the replication issues in visual diffusion models, including unveiling, understanding, mitigation, and its influence in the real world, this section will discuss the current challenges and future directions in this field.

8.1 Specialized Visual Copy Detection

Currently, many research efforts [37], [78]–[82] focus on the analysis of *replicated content* because this level of replication aligns well with human perceptions of similarity. However, these methods predominantly rely on existing feature extraction models, such as SSCD [250] and CLIP [244], which are not specifically designed for diffusion-based replication. SSCD [250], for instance, only learns invariance against image transformations, while CLIP [244] is developed primarily for natural images. Consequently, these models often fail to detect some forms of replicated content generated by diffusion models. As a result, the analysis of replicated content by visual diffusion models tends to be both inaccurate and biased.

Future efforts could focus on creating a new dataset that includes images and videos featuring various types of replicated content generated by visual diffusion models. This dataset would then be used to train specialized visual copy detection models. By employing these models, subsequent analysis is expected to become both more accurate and fairer.

8.2 In-context Similarity Retrieval

Replication in visual diffusion models manifest across various dimensions, including gender [27], culture [28], racial aspects [29], NSFW content [30], copyrighted images [31], patient information [32], photos of politicians or celebrities [33], and artistic styles [35]. Current approaches to unveiling this phenomenon typically utilize a spectrum of feature extraction models or purpose-specific models. Although these methods can be effective, they come with significant disadvantages: (1) Selecting suitable models for practical deployment is time-consuming; (2) labeling new datasets and training specialized models are costly; and (3) the models,

once trained, often lack generalizability to other contexts, thereby increasing the overall costs of practical applications.

In light of these challenges, introducing in-context learning to this area presents a promising direction for future development. In-context learning, a paradigm where a single foundational model adapts to a variety of tasks based on the context provided during inference, eliminates the need for multiple specialized models. Specifically, for in-context similarity retrieval, this approach could enable the foundational model to dynamically adjust the feature extraction process based on specific concerns – such as gender biases, racial characteristics, or copyrighted content. This is achieved by simply presenting relevant contextual examples to the model, which allows it to adjust without the need for retraining. This methodology eliminates the need for selecting/training specialized models and significantly increases generalizability.

8.3 Robust Mitigation

The current mitigation methods often fail to successfully solve the replication problems. For instance,

- Even after deduplicating images and captions in the dataset, visual diffusion models can still generate samples similar to data points from the training set;
- Malicious researchers can easily develop AI methods to bypass training data protection strategies;
- Visual diffusion models equipped with machine unlearning methods can still generate concepts that have already been erased;
- Prompt perturbation methods cannot always generate images that align well with the prompt while simultaneously avoiding the creation of copyrighted content.

Therefore, in the future, researchers can (1) focus on enabling visual diffusion models to learn only the semantic content from any training sample, rather than its specific details; (2) develop irremovable protection mechanisms for images and videos; and (3) enhance prompt engineering techniques to ensure that the generated content not only avoids legal pitfalls but also more accurately reflects users’ intent.

8.4 Unified Benchmarks

In the context of computer vision, benchmarks serve as crucial tools for measuring and comparing the performance of various algorithms across standardized tasks and datasets. Although research on replication is flourishing, researchers often work in isolation, leading to inconsistencies in evaluation. Future research may focus on building unified benchmarks for comparing algorithms in unveiling, understanding, and mitigating replication.

Unveiling. The benchmarks for unveiling may evaluate the accuracy of current methods. For instance, many membership inference methods claim that they can nearly judge with 100% accuracy whether a visual diffusion model was trained on one specific image or video. However, this may not be the case in the real world setting. Therefore, building a benchmark to compare which membership inference attack is most effective is essential.

Understanding. Currently, all the understanding of replication phenomenon seems to be reasonable and correct. However, each understanding on replication may only captures a

part of the entire complexity. Building a unified benchmark for understanding is challenging, yet it provides a valuable measure of the applicability of different interpretations.

Mitigation. The benchmark for mitigation may include assessing how successful the data optimization strategies and unlearning methods are. Specifically, researchers may evaluate what proportion of the training data is replicated using different protection or unlearning strategies.

8.5 New Regularization

As AI’s capability to mimic human characteristics in creative outputs grows, there is an increasing need for transparency in AI’s role in content creation. This transparency is crucial for addressing copyright claims and enhancing public understanding. Current initiatives focus primarily on the necessity of disclosing AI involvement in registered works. Furthermore, the development and training of AI systems often involve using large volumes of data, some of which includes copyrighted material. This practice has sparked concerns over potential copyright infringement, an issue that remains legally ambiguous. Consequently, there is a pressing need for updated regulations or clarifications on existing copyright exceptions to accommodate the complexities introduced by AI. Jurisdictions worldwide are beginning to consider such amendments, but the global landscape is still uneven and undergoing transition.

9 CONCLUSION

This paper presents a comprehensive and methodical examination of the replication phenomenon within visual diffusion models. We begin by concisely defining replication, establishing a clear understanding of the concept. Subsequently, we innovatively review papers focusing on this phenomenon from the perspectives of *unveiling* (methods to detect and reveal occurrences), *understanding* (analyzing the underlying causes), and *mitigation* (strategies to address and resolve issues). Furthermore, we discuss the influences of replication in the real world, such as a privacy-sensitive area, healthcare. We conclude by highlighting persistent challenges in this domain and proposing potential directions for future investigation. We view this survey as an initial step towards advancing academic research on replication in visual diffusion models and enhancing AI security efforts.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Sohl-Dickstein, E. Weiss, N. Maheswaranathan, and S. Ganguli, “Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics,” *ICML*, 2015.
- [2] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models,” *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [3] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, “Generative adversarial nets,” *NeurIPS*, 2014.
- [4] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, “Auto-encoding variational bayes,” *arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [5] A. Ramesh, M. Pavlov, G. Goh, S. Gray, C. Voss, A. Radford, M. Chen, and I. Sutskever, “Zero-shot text-to-image generation,” *ICML*, 2021.
- [6] A. Ramesh, P. Dhariwal, A. Nichol, C. Chu, and M. Chen, “Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents,” *arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- [7] J. Betker, G. Goh, L. Jing, T. Brooks, J. Wang, L. Li, L. Ouyang, J. Zhuang, J. Lee, Y. Guo *et al.*, “Improving image generation with better captions,” *OpenAI*, 2023.
- [8] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” *CVPR*, 2022.
- [9] D. Podell, Z. English, K. Lacey, A. Blattmann, T. Dockhorn, J. Müller, J. Penna, and R. Rombach, “Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis,” *ICLR*, 2023.
- [10] P. Esser, S. Kulal, A. Blattmann, R. Entezari, J. Müller, H. Saini, Y. Levi, D. Lorenz, A. Sauer, F. Boesel *et al.*, “Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis,” *arXiv:2403.03206*, 2024.
- [11] C. Saharia, W. Chan, S. Saxena, L. Li, J. Whang, E. L. Denton, K. Ghasemipour, R. Gontijo Lopes, B. Karagol Ayan, T. Salimans *et al.*, “Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding,” *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [12] H. Zhang, W. Yin, Y. Fang, L. Li, B. Duan, Z. Wu, Y. Sun, H. Tian, W. Yin, and H. Wang, “Ernie-vilg: Unified generative pre-training for bidirectional vision-language generation,” *arXiv:2112.15283*, 2021.
- [13] Z. Feng, Z. Zhang, X. Yu, Y. Fang, L. Li, X. Chen, Y. Lu, J. Liu, W. Yin, S. Feng *et al.*, “Ernie-vilg 2.0: Improving text-to-image diffusion model with knowledge-enhanced mixture-of-denoising-experts,” *CVPR*, 2023.
- [14] R. Po, W. Yifan, V. Golyanik, K. Aberman, J. T. Barron, A. H. Bermanto, E. R. Chan, T. Dekel, A. Holyński, A. Kanazawa *et al.*, “State of the art on diffusion models for visual computing,” *arXiv:2310.07204*, 2023.
- [15] Y. Guo, C. Yang, A. Rao, Z. Liang, Y. Wang, Y. Qiao, M. Agrawala, D. Lin, and B. Dai, “Animatediff: Animate your personalized text-to-image diffusion models without specific tuning,” *ICLR*, 2024.
- [16] Y. Shen, M. Xu, and W. Liang, “Context-aware head-and-eye motion generation with diffusion model,” *VR*, 2024.
- [17] S. Cao, W. Chai, S. Hao, Y. Zhang, H. Chen, and G. Wang, “Diffashion: Reference-based fashion design with structure-aware transfer by diffusion models,” *TMM*, 2023.
- [18] A. Baldrati, D. Morelli, G. Cartella, M. Cornia, M. Bertini, and R. Cucchiara, “Multimodal garment designer: Human-centric latent diffusion models for fashion image editing,” *ICCV*, 2023.
- [19] Z. Sun, Y. Zhou, H. He, and P. Mok, “Sgdiff: A style guided diffusion model for fashion synthesis,” *ACM MM*, 2023.
- [20] C. V. Lim, Y.-P. Zhu, M. Omar, and H.-W. Park, “Decoding the relationship of artificial intelligence, advertising, and generative models,” *Digital*, 2024.
- [21] H. Asgariandehkordi, S. Goudarzi, A. Basarab, and H. Rivaz, “Deep ultrasound denoising using diffusion probabilistic models,” *IUS*, 2023.
- [22] Y. Wang, S. Yoon, P. Jin, M. Tivnan, Z. Chen, R. Hu, L. Zhang, Z. Chen, Q. Li, and D. Wu, “Implicit image-to-image schrodinger bridge for ct super-resolution and denoising,” *arXiv:2403.06069*, 2024.
- [23] H. Ali, S. Murad, and Z. Shah, “Spot the fake lungs: Generating synthetic medical images using neural diffusion models,” *AICS*, 2022.
- [24] W. H. Pinaya, P.-D. Tudosiu, J. Dafflon, P. F. Da Costa, V. Fernandez, P. Nachev, S. Ourselin, and M. J. Cardoso, “Brain imaging generation with latent diffusion models,” *MICCAIW*, 2022.
- [25] G. V. Research, “Artificial intelligence (ai) image generator market report,” *MAR*, 2024.
- [26] C. Schuhmann, R. Beaumont, R. Vencu, C. Gordon, R. Wightman, M. Cherti, T. Coombes, A. Katta, C. Mullis, M. Wortsman *et al.*, “Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models,” *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [27] T. Anand, A. Chauhan, T. Jauhari, A. Shah, R. Singh, B. Liang, and R. Dutta, “Identifying race and gender bias in latent diffusion ai image generation,” *SSRN 4602033*, 2023.
- [28] L. Struppek, D. Hintersdorf, F. Friedrich, M. Brack, P. Schramowski, and K. Kersting, “Exploiting cultural biases via homoglyphs in text-to-image synthesis,” *JAIR*, 2023.
- [29] S. Luccioni, C. Akiki, M. Mitchell, and Y. Jernite, “Stable bias: Evaluating societal representations in diffusion models,” *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [30] P. Schramowski, M. Brack, B. Deiseroth, and K. Kersting, “Safe latent diffusion: Mitigating inappropriate degeneration in diffusion models,” *CVPR*, 2023.

- [31] G. Somepalli, V. Singla, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Understanding and mitigating copying in diffusion models," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [32] A. Kazerouni, E. K. Aghdam, M. Heidari, R. Azad, M. Fayyaz, I. Hacihaliloglu, and D. Merhof, "Diffusion models in medical imaging: A comprehensive survey," *MIA*, 2023.
- [33] Y. Chen, N. A. H. Haldar, N. Akhtar, and A. Mian, "Text-image guided diffusion model for generating deepfake celebrity interactions," *DICTA*, 2023.
- [34] G. Somepalli, A. Gupta, K. Gupta, S. Palta, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, A. Shrivastava, and T. Goldstein, "Measuring style similarity in diffusion models," *arXiv:2404.01292*, 2024.
- [35] W. Wang, Y. Sun, Z. Tan, and Y. Yang, "Anypattern: Towards in-context image copy detection," *arXiv:2404.13788*, 2024.
- [36] T. Wang, Y. Zhang, S. Qi, R. Zhao, Z. Xia, and J. Weng, "Security and privacy on generative data in aigc: A survey," *arXiv:2309.09435*, 2023.
- [37] G. Somepalli, V. Singla, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Diffusion art or digital forgery? investigating data replication in diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [38] J. Duan, F. Kong, S. Wang, X. Shi, and K. Xu, "Are diffusion models vulnerable to membership inference attacks?" *ICML*, 2023.
- [39] F. Kong, J. Duan, R. Ma, H. T. Shen, X. Zhu, X. Shi, and K. Xu, "An efficient membership inference attack for the diffusion model by proximal initialization," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [40] R. Leotta, O. Giudice, L. Guarnera, and S. Battiato, "Not with my name! inferring artists' names of input strings employed by diffusion models," *ICIAP*, 2023.
- [41] Y. Wen, N. Jain, J. Kirchenbauer, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [42] A. Naseh, J. Roh, and A. Houmansadr, "Memory triggers: Unveiling memorization in text-to-image generative models through word-level duplication," *arXiv:2312.03692*, 2023.
- [43] M. Yi, J. Sun, and Z. Li, "On the generalization of diffusion model," *arXiv:2305.14712*, 2023.
- [44] H. Zhang, J. Zhou, Y. Lu, M. Guo, L. Shen, and Q. Qu, "The emergence of reproducibility and consistency in diffusion models," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [45] T. Dockhorn, T. Cao, A. Vahdat, and K. Kreis, "Differentially private diffusion models," *TMLR*, 2023.
- [46] S. Lyu, M. F. Liu, M. Vinaroz, and M. Park, "Differentially private latent diffusion models," *arXiv:2305.15759*, 2023.
- [47] R. Webster, J. Rabin, L. Simon, and F. Jurie, "On the de-duplication of laion-2b," *arXiv:2303.12733*, 2023.
- [48] A. K. M. Abbas, K. Tirumala, D. Simig, S. Ganguli, and A. S. Morcos, "Semdedup: Data-efficient learning at web-scale through semantic deduplication," *ICLRW*, 2023.
- [49] R. Gandikota, J. Materzynska, J. Fiotto-Kaufman, and D. Bau, "Erasing concepts from diffusion models," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [50] N. Kumari, B. Zhang, S.-Y. Wang, E. Shechtman, R. Zhang, and J.-Y. Zhu, "Ablating concepts in text-to-image diffusion models," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [51] C. T. Zirpoli, "Generative artificial intelligence and copyright law," 2023.
- [52] K. Lee, A. F. Cooper, J. Grimmelmann, and D. Ippolito, "Ai and law: The next generation," *SSRN*, 2023.
- [53] Z. Epstein, A. Hertzmann, the Investigators of Human Creativity, M. Akten, H. Farid, J. Feld, M. R. Frank, M. Groh, L. Herman, N. Leach, R. Mahari, A. S. Pentland, O. Russakovsky, H. Schroeder, and A. Smith, "Art and the science of generative ai," *Science*, 2023.
- [54] T. Crawford and M. Bogatin, "Legal guide for the visual artist," *SS*, 2022.
- [55] M. V. Perera and V. M. Patel, "Analyzing bias in diffusion-based face generation models," *IJCB*, 2023.
- [56] S. U. H. Dar, A. Ghanaat, J. Kahmann, I. Ayx, T. Papavassiliu, S. O. Schoenberg, and S. Engelhardt, "Investigating data memorization in 3d latent diffusion models for medical image synthesis," *MICCAI*, 2023.
- [57] V. Fernandez, P. Sanchez, W. H. L. Pinaya, G. Jacenków, S. A. Tsafaris, and M. J. Cardoso, "Privacy distillation: Reducing re-identification risk of diffusion models," *MICCAI*, 2023.
- [58] N. Carlini, J. Hayes, M. Nasr, M. Jagielski, V. Schwag, F. Tramèr, B. Balle, D. Ippolito, and E. Wallace, "Extracting training data from diffusion models," *USENIX*, 2023.
- [59] R. Webster, "A reproducible extraction of training images from diffusion models," *arXiv:2305.08694*, 2023.
- [60] A. Naseh, J. Roh, and A. Houmansadr, "Understanding (un)intended memorization in text-to-image generative models," *arXiv:2312.07550*, 2023.
- [61] H. Wang, Q. Shen, Y. Tong, Y. Zhang, and K. Kawaguchi, "The stronger the diffusion model, the easier the backdoor: Data poisoning to induce copyright breaches without adjusting finetuning pipeline," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [62] Y. Qu, X. Shen, X. He, M. Backes, S. Zannettou, and Y. Zhang, "Unsafe diffusion: On the generation of unsafe images and hateful memes from text-to-image models," *SIGSAC*, 2023.
- [63] M. Brack, P. Schramowski, and K. Kersting, "Distilling adversarial prompts from safety benchmarks: Report for the adversarial nibbler challenge," *AACL*, 2023.
- [64] Y. Wu, N. Yu, M. Backes, Y. Shen, and Y. Zhang, "On the proactive generation of unsafe images from text-to-image models using benign prompts," *arXiv:2310.16613*, 2023.
- [65] R. Naik and B. Nushi, "Social biases through the text-to-image generation lens," *AIES*, pp. 786–808, 2023.
- [66] Y. Zhang, T. T. Tzun, L. W. Hern, H. Wang, and K. Kawaguchi, "On copyright risks of text-to-image diffusion models," *arXiv:2311.12803*, 2024.
- [67] Y. Wen, N. Jain, J. Kirchenbauer, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [68] H. Hu and J. Pang, "Loss and likelihood based membership inference of diffusion models," *ISC*, 2023.
- [69] T. Matsumoto, T. Miura, and N. Yanai, "Membership inference attacks against diffusion models," *SPW*, 2023.
- [70] Y. Pang, T. Wang, X. Kang, M. Huai, and Y. Zhang, "White-box membership inference attacks against diffusion models," *arXiv:2308.06405*, 2023.
- [71] S. Tang, Z. S. Wu, S. Aydore, M. Kearns, and A. Roth, "Membership inference attacks on diffusion models via quantile regression," *arXiv:2312.05140*, 2023.
- [72] Y. Wu, N. Yu, Z. Li, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, "Membership inference attacks against text-to-image generation models," *arXiv:2210.00968*, 2022.
- [73] W. Fu, H. Wang, C. Gao, G. Liu, Y. Li, and T. Jiang, "A probabilistic fluctuation based membership inference attack for diffusion models," *arXiv:2308.12143*, 2024.
- [74] M. Laszkiewicz, D. Lukovnikov, J. Lederer, and A. Fischer, "Set-membership inference attacks using data watermarking," *arXiv:2307.15067*, 2023.
- [75] M. Zhang, N. Yu, R. Wen, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, "Generated distributions are all you need for membership inference attacks against generative models," *WACV*, 2024.
- [76] Y. Pang and T. Wang, "Black-box membership inference attacks against fine-tuned diffusion models," *arXiv:2312.08207*, 2023.
- [77] J. Dubiński, A. Kowalczyk, S. Pawlak, P. Rokita, T. Trzcirski, and P. Morawiecki, "Towards more realistic membership inference attacks on large diffusion models," *WACV*, 2024.
- [78] D. Bralios, G. Wichern, F. G. Germain, Z. Pan, S. Khurana, C. Hori, and J. Le Roux, "Generation or replication: Auscultating audio latent diffusion models," *ICASSP*, 2024.
- [79] A. Rahman, M. V. Perera, and V. M. Patel, "Frame by familiar frame: Understanding replication in video diffusion models," *arXiv:2403.19593*, 2024.
- [80] J. Zhou, J. Gao, Z. Wang, and X. Wei, "Copyscope: Model-level copyright infringement quantification in the diffusion workflow," *arXiv:2311.12847*, 2023.
- [81] H. Aboutaleb, D. Mao, C. Xu, and A. Wong, "Deepfakeart challenge: A benchmark dataset for generative ai art forgery and data poisoning detection," *arXiv:2306.01272*, 2023.
- [82] X. Wu, Y. Hua, C. Liang, J. Zhang, H. Wang, T. Song, and H. Guan, "Cgi-dm: Digital copyright authentication for diffusion models via contrasting gradient inversion," *arXiv:2403.11162*, 2024.
- [83] S. Casper, Z. Guo, S. Mogulothu, Z. Marinov, C. Deshpande, R.-J. Yew, Z. Dai, and D. Hadfield-Menell, "Measuring the success of diffusion models at imitating human artists," *arXiv:2307.04028*, 2023.
- [84] Z. Wang, C. Chen, L. Lyu, D. N. Metaxas, and S. Ma, "Diagnosis: Detecting unauthorized data usages in text-to-image diffusion models," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [85] Y. Cui, J. Ren, H. Xu, P. He, H. Liu, L. Sun, and J. Tang, "Diffusionshield: A watermark for copyright protection against generative diffusion models," *arXiv:2306.04642*, 2023.

- [86] Y. Cui, J. Ren, Y. Lin, H. Xu, P. He, Y. Xing, W. Fan, H. Liu, and J. Tang, "Ft-shield: A watermark against unauthorized fine-tuning in text-to-image diffusion models," *arXiv:2310.02401*, 2023.
- [87] G. Luo, J. Huang, M. Zhang, Z. Qian, S. Li, and X. Zhang, "Steal my artworks for fine-tuning? a watermarking framework for detecting art theft mimicry in text-to-image models," *arXiv:2311.13619*, 2023.
- [88] 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," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [89] 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," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [90] Y. Alaluf, E. Richardson, G. Metzger, and D. Cohen-Or, "A neural space-time representation for text-to-image personalization," *TOG*, 2023.
- [91] M. Arar, R. Gal, Y. Atzmon, G. Chechik, D. Cohen-Or, A. Shamir, and A. H. Bermano, "Domain-agnostic tuning-encoder for fast personalization of text-to-image models," *SIGGRAPH Asia*, 2023.
- [92] V. Shah, N. Ruiz, F. Cole, E. Lu, S. Lazebnik, Y. Li, and V. Jampani, "Ziplora: Any subject in any style by effectively merging loras," *arXiv:2311.13600*, 2023.
- [93] W. Chen, H. Hu, Y. Li, N. Ruiz, X. Jia, M.-W. Chang, and W. W. Cohen, "Subject-driven text-to-image generation via apprenticeship learning," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [94] Y. Zhang, N. Huang, F. Tang, H. Huang, C. Ma, W. Dong, and C. Xu, "Inversion-based style transfer with diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [95] M. Jones, S.-Y. Wang, N. Kumari, D. Bau, and J.-Y. Zhu, "Customizing text-to-image models with a single image pair," *arXiv:2405.01536*, 2024.
- [96] N. Kumari, B. Zhang, R. Zhang, E. Shechtman, and J.-Y. Zhu, "Multi-concept customization of text-to-image diffusion," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [97] R. Gal, M. Arar, Y. Atzmon, A. H. Bermano, G. Chechik, and D. Cohen-Or, "Encoder-based domain tuning for fast personalization of text-to-image models," *TOG*, 2023.
- [98] J. Ma, J. Liang, C. Chen, and H. Lu, "Subject-diffusion: Open domain personalized text-to-image generation without test-time fine-tuning," *arXiv:2307.11410*, 2023.
- [99] J. Shi, W. Xiong, Z. Lin, and H. J. Jung, "Instantbooth: Personalized text-to-image generation without test-time finetuning," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [100] Y. Wen, Y. Liu, C. Chen, and L. Lyu, "Detecting, explaining, and mitigating memorization in diffusion models," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [101] S.-Y. Wang, A. A. Efros, J.-Y. Zhu, and R. Zhang, "Evaluating data attribution for text-to-image models," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [102] K. Georgiev, J. Vendrow, H. Salman, S. M. Park, and A. Madry, "The journey, not the destination: How data guides diffusion models," *arXiv:2312.06205*, 2023.
- [103] J. Ren, Y. Li, S. Zen, H. Xu, L. Lyu, Y. Xing, and J. Tang, "Unveiling and mitigating memorization in text-to-image diffusion models through cross attention," *arXiv:2403.11052*, 2024.
- [104] Z. Li, J. Hong, B. Li, and Z. Wang, "Shake to leak: Fine-tuning diffusion models can amplify the generative privacy risk," *SaTML*, 2024.
- [105] S. A. Taghanaki and J. Lambourne, "Detecting generative parroting through overfitting masked autoencoders," *arXiv:2403.19050*, 2024.
- [106] L. Wang *et al.*, "Property existence inference against generative models," *USENIX*, 2024.
- [107] X. Gu, C. Du, T. Pang, C. Li, M. Lin, and Y. Wang, "On memorization in diffusion models," *arXiv:2310.02664*, 2023.
- [108] C. Chen, D. Liu, and C. Xu, "Towards memorization-free diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [109] G. Somepalli, V. Singla, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Understanding data replication in diffusion models," *ICMLW*, 2023.
- [110] A. Janolkar, "Outliers memorized last: Trends in memorization of diffusion models based on training distribution and epoch," *OpenReview*, 2023.
- [111] M. Jiralerspong, J. Bose, I. Gemp, C. Qin, Y. Bachrach, and G. Gidel, "Feature likelihood score: Evaluating the generalization of generative models using samples," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [112] M. Jagielski, O. Thakkar, F. Tramèr, D. Ippolito, K. Lee, N. Carlini, E. Wallace, S. Song, A. G. Thakurta, N. Papernot *et al.*, "Measuring forgetting of memorized training examples," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [113] S. Li, S. Chen, and Q. Li, "A good score does not lead to a good generative model," *arXiv:2401.04856*, 2024.
- [114] N. Vyas, S. M. Kakade, and B. Barak, "On provable copyright protection for generative models," *ICML*, 2023.
- [115] T. Yoon, J. Y. Choi, S. Kwon, and E. K. Ryu, "Diffusion probabilistic models generalize when they fail to memorize," *ICMLW*, 2023.
- [116] Z. Kadkhodaei, F. Guth, E. P. Simoncelli, and S. Mallat, "Generalization in diffusion models arises from geometry-adaptive harmonic representation," *ICLR*, 2024.
- [117] P. Li, Z. Li, H. Zhang, and J. Bian, "On the generalization properties of diffusion models," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [118] H. Wang, J. Zou, M. Mozer, L. Zhang, A. Goyal, A. Lamb, Z. Deng, M. Q. Xie, H. Brown, and K. Kawaguchi, "Can ai be as creative as humans?" *arXiv:2401.01623*, 2024.
- [119] Y. Liao, "Dataset deduplication with datamodels," Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, 2022.
- [120] C. Li, D. Chen, Y. Zhang, and P. A. Beeler, "Mitigate replication and copying in diffusion models with generalized caption and dual fusion enhancement," *ICASSP*, 2024.
- [121] B. Zheng, C. Liang, X. Wu, and Y. Liu, "Understanding and improving adversarial attacks on latent diffusion model," *arXiv:2310.04687*, 2023.
- [122] Z. Zhao, J. Duan, X. Hu, K. Xu, C. Wang, R. Zhang, Z. Du, Q. Guo, and Y. Chen, "Unlearnable examples for diffusion models: Protect data from unauthorized exploitation," *arXiv:2306.01902*, 2023.
- [123] H. Xue, C. Liang, X. Wu, and Y. Chen, "Toward effective protection against diffusion-based mimicry through score distillation," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [124] P. Zhu, T. Takahashi, and H. Kataoka, "Watermark-embedded adversarial examples for copyright protection against diffusion models," *arXiv:2404.09401*, 2024.
- [125] C. Liang and X. Wu, "Mist: Towards improved adversarial examples for diffusion models," *arXiv:2305.12683*, 2023.
- [126] T. Van Le, H. Phung, T. H. Nguyen, Q. Dao, N. N. Tran, and A. Tran, "Anti-dreambooth: Protecting users from personalized text-to-image synthesis," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [127] Y. Liu, C. Fan, Y. Dai, X. Chen, P. Zhou, and L. Sun, "Toward robust imperceptible perturbation against unauthorized text-to-image diffusion-based synthesis," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [128] F. Wang, Z. Tan, T. Wei, Y. Wu, and Q. Huang, "Simac: A simple anti-customization method against text-to-image synthesis of diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [129] J. Xu, Y. Lu, Y. Li, S. Lu, D. Wang, and X. Wei, "Perturbing attention gives you more bang for the buck: Subtle imaging perturbations that efficiently fool customized diffusion models," *arXiv:2404.15081*, 2024.
- [130] X. Ye, H. Huang, J. An, and Y. Wang, "Duaw: Data-free universal adversarial watermark against stable diffusion customization," *ICLRW*, 2024.
- [131] Y. Ma, Z. Zhao, X. He, Z. Li, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, "Generative watermarking against unauthorized subject-driven image synthesis," *arXiv:2306.07754*, 2023.
- [132] Z. Tan, S. Wang, X. Yang, and K. Huang, "Pag: Protecting artworks from personalizing image generative models," *ICONIP*, 2023.
- [133] S. Shan, J. Cryan, E. Wenger, H. Zheng, R. Hanocka, and B. Y. Zhao, "Glaze: Protecting artists from style mimicry by text-to-image models," *USENIX*, 2023.
- [134] A. Rhodes, R. Bhagat, U. A. Ciftci, and I. Demir, "My art my choice: Adversarial protection against unruly ai," *arXiv:2309.03198*, 2023.
- [135] C. Liang, X. Wu, Y. Hua, J. Zhang, Y. Xue, T. Song, Z. Xue, R. Ma, and H. Guan, "Adversarial example does good: Preventing painting imitation from diffusion models via adversarial examples," *ICML*, 2023.
- [136] S. Amiri, E. Nalisnick, A. Belloum, S. Klous, and L. Gommans, "Differential privacy vs detecting copyright infringement: A case study with normalizing flows," *ICMLW*, 2023.
- [137] G. Luo, H. Zhang, X. Wang, M. Chen, and Y. Zhu, "Mpcpa: Multi-center privacy computing with predictions aggregation based on denoising diffusion probabilistic model," *arXiv:2403.07838*, 2024.
- [138] J. Lebensold, M. Sanjabi, P. Astolfi, A. Romero-Soriano, K. Chaudhuri, M. Rabbat, and C. Guo, "Dp-rdm: Adapting diffusion models to private domains without fine-tuning," *arXiv:2403.14421*, 2024.
- [139] T. Qin, X. Gao, J. Zhao, and K. Ye, "Destruction-restoration suppresses data protection perturbations against diffusion models," *ICTAI*, 2023.

- [140] Z. Zhao, J. Duan, K. Xu, C. Wang, R. Z. Z. D. Q. Guo, and X. Hu, "Can protective perturbation safeguard personal data from being exploited by stable diffusion?" *arXiv:2312.00084*, 2023.
- [141] X. Li, Q. Shen, and K. Kawaguchi, "Va3: Virtually assured amplification attack on probabilistic copyright protection for text-to-image generative models," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [142] B. Cao, C. Li, T. Wang, J. Jia, B. Li, and J. Chen, "Impress: Evaluating the resilience of imperceptible perturbations against unauthorized data usage in diffusion-based generative ai," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [143] A. Gokaslan, A. F. Cooper, J. Collins, L. Seguin, A. Jacobson, M. Patel, J. Frankle, C. Stephenson, and V. Kuleshov, "Commoncanvas: An open diffusion model trained with creative-commons images," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [144] N. Abrahamsen and J. Yao, "Inventing art styles with no artistic training data," *arXiv:2305.12015*, 2023.
- [145] G. Daras, K. Shah, Y. Dagan, A. Gollakota, A. Dimakis, and A. Klivans, "Ambient diffusion: Learning clean distributions from corrupted data," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [146] G. Daras, A. G. Dimakis, and C. Daskalakis, "Consistent diffusion meets tweedie: Training exact ambient diffusion models with noisy data," *arXiv:2404.10177*, 2024.
- [147] E. Zhang, K. Wang, X. Xu, Z. Wang, and H. Shi, "Forget-me-not: Learning to forget in text-to-image diffusion models," *arXiv:2303.17591*, 2023.
- [148] J. Wu, T. Le, M. Hayat, and M. Harandi, "Erasediff: Erasing data influence in diffusion models," *arXiv:2401.05779*, 2024.
- [149] S. Hong, J. Lee, and S. S. Woo, "All but one: Surgical concept erasing with model preservation in text-to-image diffusion models," *AAAI*, 2024.
- [150] A. Bui, K. Doan, T. Le, P. Montague, T. Abraham, and D. Phung, "Removing undesirable concepts in text-to-image generative models with learnable prompts," *arXiv:2403.12326*, 2024.
- [151] Z. Liu, K. Chen, Y. Zhang, J. Han, L. Hong, H. Xu, Z. Li, D.-Y. Yeung, and J. Kwok, "Implicit concept removal of diffusion models," *arXiv:2310.05873*, 2024.
- [152] C.-P. Huang, K.-P. Chang, C.-T. Tsai, Y.-H. Lai, and Y.-C. F. Wang, "Receler: Reliable concept erasing of text-to-image diffusion models via lightweight erasers," *arXiv:2311.17717*, 2023.
- [153] C. Fan, J. Liu, Y. Zhang, E. Wong, D. Wei, and S. Liu, "Salun: Empowering machine unlearning via gradient-based weight saliency in both image classification and generation," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [154] A. Heng and H. Soh, "Selective amnesia: A continual learning approach to forgetting in deep generative models," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [155] G. Li, H. Hsu, R. Marculescu *et al.*, "Machine unlearning for image-to-image generative models," *arXiv:2402.00351*, 2024.
- [156] A. Das, V. Duddu, R. Zhang, and N. Asokan, "Espresso: Robust concept filtering in text-to-image models," *arXiv:2404.19227*, 2024.
- [157] M. Pham, K. O. Marshall, C. Hegde, and N. Cohen, "Robust concept erasure using task vectors," *arXiv:2404.03631*, 2024.
- [158] T. Yang, J. Cao, and C. Xu, "Pruning for robust concept erasing in diffusion models," *arXiv:2405.16534*, 2024.
- [159] X. Li, Y. Yang, J. Deng, C. Yan, Y. Chen, X. Ji, and W. Xu, "Safegen: Mitigating unsafe content generation in text-to-image models," *arXiv:2404.06666*, 2024.
- [160] C. Zhou, H. Zhang, J. Bian, W. Zhang, and N. Yu, "© plug-in authorization for human content copyright protection in text-to-image model," *ICLRW*, 2024.
- [161] R. Gandikota, H. Orgad, Y. Belinkov, J. Materzyska, and D. Bau, "Unified concept editing in diffusion models," *WACV*, 2024.
- [162] S. Kim, S. Jung, B. Kim, M. Choi, J. Shin, and J. Lee, "Towards safe self-distillation of internet-scale text-to-image diffusion models," *arXiv:2307.05977*, 2023.
- [163] M. Zhao, L. Zhang, T. Zheng, Y. Kong, and B. Yin, "Separable multi-concept erasure from diffusion models," *arXiv:2402.05947*, 2024.
- [164] S. Lu, Z. Wang, L. Li, Y. Liu, and A. W.-K. Kong, "Mace: Mass concept erasure in diffusion models," *arXiv:2403.06135*, 2024.
- [165] T. Xiong, Y. Wu, E. Xie, Z. Li, and X. Liu, "Editing massive concepts in text-to-image diffusion models," *arXiv:2403.13807*, 2024.
- [166] Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Y. Yao, J. Jia, J. Liu, X. Liu, and S. Liu, "Unlearncanvas: A stylized image dataset to benchmark machine unlearning for diffusion models," *arXiv:2402.11846*, 2024.
- [167] M. Pham, K. O. Marshall, N. Cohen, G. Mittal, and C. Hegde, "Circumventing concept erasure methods for text-to-image generative models," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [168] Y. Zhang, J. Jia, X. Chen, A. Chen, Y. Zhang, J. Liu, K. Ding, and S. Liu, "To generate or not? safety-driven unlearned diffusion models are still easy to generate unsafe images... for now," *arXiv:2310.11868*, 2023.
- [169] Y.-L. Tsai, C.-Y. Hsu, C. Xie, C.-H. Lin, J. Y. Chen, B. Li, P.-Y. Chen, C.-M. Yu, and C.-Y. Huang, "Ring-a-bell! how reliable are concept removal methods for diffusion models?" *ICLR*, 2023.
- [170] V. Petsiuk and K. Saenko, "Concept arithmetics for circumventing concept inhibition in diffusion models," *arXiv:2404.13706*, 2024.
- [171] P. Dong, S. Guo, J. Wang, B. Wang, J. Zhang, and Z. Liu, "Towards test-time refusals via concept negation," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [172] Z. Ni, L. Wei, J. Li, S. Tang, Y. Zhuang, and Q. Tian, "Degeneration-tuning: Using scrambled grid shield unwanted concepts from stable diffusion," *ACM MM*, 2023.
- [173] S. Li, J. van de Weijer, F. Khan, Q. Hou, Y. Wang *et al.*, "Get what you want, not what you don't: Image content suppression for text-to-image diffusion models," *ICLR*, 2024.
- [174] A. Golatkar, A. Achille, A. Swaminathan, and S. Soatto, "Training data protection with compositional diffusion models," *arXiv:2308.01937*, 2023.
- [175] Y. Zheng and R. A. Yeh, "Imma: Immunizing text-to-image models against malicious adaptation," *arXiv:2311.18815*, 2023.
- [176] Z. Luo, X. Xu, F. Liu, Y. S. Koh, D. Wang, and J. Zhang, "Privacy-preserving low-rank adaptation for latent diffusion models," *arXiv:2402.11989*, 2024.
- [177] P. Henderson, X. Li, D. Jurafsky, T. Hashimoto, M. A. Lemley, and P. Liang, "Foundation models and fair use," *arXiv:2303.15715*, 2023.
- [178] P. Samuelson, "Generative ai meets copyright," *Science*, 2023.
- [179] K. Lee, A. F. Cooper, and J. Grimmelmann, "Talkin'bout ai generation: Copyright and the generative-ai supply chain," *CSLAW*, 2024.
- [180] M. D. Murray, "Generative ai art: Copyright infringement and fair use," *SMU*, 2023.
- [181] M. Sag, "Copyright safety for generative ai," *HLR*, 2023.
- [182] M. A. Lemley, "How generative ai turns copyright law on its head," *SSRN 4517702*, 2023.
- [183] S. Wang *et al.*, "Analyzing copyright infringement by artificial intelligence: The case of the diffusion model," *JHSS*, 2023.
- [184] A. F. Cooper and J. Grimmelmann, "The files are in the computer: Copyright, memorization, and generative ai," *arXiv:2404.12590*, 2024.
- [185] C. Peukert and M. Windisch, "The economics of copyright in the digital age," *JES*, 2024.
- [186] N. Elkin-Koren, U. Hacoheh, R. Livni, and S. Moran, "Can copyright be reduced to privacy," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [187] I. Rudolf, "Understanding the influence of artificial intelligence art on transaction in the art world," *Theses*, 2024.
- [188] H. H. Jiang, L. Brown, J. Cheng, M. Khan, A. Gupta, D. Workman, A. Hanna, J. Flowers, and T. Gebru, "Ai art and its impact on artists," *AIES*, 2023.
- [189] A. Ghosh and G. Fossas, "Can there be art without an artist?" *arXiv:2209.07667*, 2022.
- [190] E. Gabrys, "Ai art: Artists' best friend or mortal enemy?" 2023.
- [191] M. Moayeri, S. Basu, S. Balasubramanian, P. Kattakinda, A. Chengini, R. Brauneis, and S. Feizi, "Rethinking artistic copyright infringements in the era of text-to-image generative models," *arXiv:2404.08030*, 2024.
- [192] Y. Zhang, L. Jiang, G. Turk, and D. Yang, "Auditing gender presentation differences in text-to-image models," *arXiv:2302.03675*, 2023.
- [193] Y. Wu, Y. Nakashima, and N. Garcia, "Stable diffusion exposed: Gender bias from prompt to image," *arXiv:2312.03027*, 2023.
- [194] S. U. H. Dar, I. Ayx, M. Kapusta, T. Papavassiliu, S. O. Schoenberg, and S. Engelhardt, "Effect of training epoch number on patient data memorization in unconditional latent diffusion models," *BVMW*, 2024.
- [195] M. U. Akbar, W. Wang, and A. Eklund, "Beware of diffusion models for synthesizing medical images-a comparison with gans in terms of memorizing brain mri and chest x-ray images," *SSRN 4611613*, 2023.
- [196] S. U. H. Dar, M. Seyfarth, J. Kahmann, I. Ayx, T. Papavassiliu, S. O. Schoenberg, and S. Engelhardt, "Unconditional latent diffusion models memorize patient imaging data," *arXiv:2402.01054*, 2024.
- [197] M. Usman Akbar, M. Larsson, I. Blystad, and A. Eklund, "Brain tumor segmentation using synthetic mr images-a comparison of gans and diffusion models," *Nature*, 2024.

- [198] F.-A. Croitoru, V. Hondru, R. T. Ionescu, and M. Shah, "Diffusion models in vision: A survey," *TPAMI*, 2023.
- [199] C. Zhang, C. Zhang, M. Zhang, and I. S. Kweon, "Text-to-image diffusion model in generative ai: A survey," *arXiv:2303.07909*, 2023.
- [200] L. Yang, Z. Zhang, Y. Song, S. Hong, R. Xu, Y. Zhao, W. Zhang, B. Cui, and M.-H. Yang, "Diffusion models: A comprehensive survey of methods and applications," *ACM COMPUT SURV*, 2023.
- [201] H. Cao, C. Tan, Z. Gao, Y. Xu, G. Chen, P.-A. Heng, and S. Z. Li, "A survey on generative diffusion models," *TKDE*, 2024.
- [202] L. Lin, N. Gupta, Y. Zhang, H. Ren, C.-H. Liu, F. Ding, X. Wang, X. Li, L. Verdoliva, and S. Hu, "Detecting multimedia generated by large ai models: A survey," *arXiv:2402.00045*, 2024.
- [203] M. Fan, C. Chen, C. Wang, and J. Huang, "On the trustworthiness landscape of state-of-the-art generative models: A comprehensive survey," *arXiv:2307.16680*, 2023.
- [204] C. Chen, Z. Wu, Y. Lai, W. Ou, T. Liao, and Z. Zheng, "Challenges and remedies to privacy and security in aigc: Exploring the potential of privacy computing, blockchain, and beyond," *arXiv:2306.00419*, 2023.
- [205] J. Ren, H. Xu, P. He, Y. Cui, S. Zeng, J. Zhang, H. Wen, J. Ding, H. Liu, Y. Chang *et al.*, "Copyright protection in generative ai: A technical perspective," *arXiv:2402.02333*, 2024.
- [206] V. Hartmann, A. Suri, V. Bindschaedler, D. Evans, S. Tople, and R. West, "Sok: Memorization in general-purpose large language models," *arXiv:2310.18362*, 2023.
- [207] S. Ishihara, "Training data extraction from pre-trained language models: A survey," *arXiv:2305.16157*, 2023.
- [208] Y. Song and S. Ermon, "Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution," *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [209] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, "Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations," *ICLR*, 2020.
- [210] T. Rahman, H.-Y. Lee, J. Ren, S. Tulyakov, S. Mahajan, and L. Sigal, "Make-a-story: Visual memory conditioned consistent story generation," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [211] Y. Z. X. Z. Y. W. W. X. Chang Liu, Haoning Wu, "Intelligent grimm – open-ended visual storytelling via latent diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [212] T. Song, J. Cao, K. Wang, B. Liu, and X. Zhang, "Causal-story: Local causal attention utilizing parameter-efficient tuning for visual story synthesis," *ICASSP*, 2024.
- [213] D. Morelli, A. Baldrati, G. Cartella, M. Cornia, M. Bertini, and R. Cucchiara, "Ladi-vton: latent diffusion textual-inversion enhanced virtual try-on," *ACM MM*, 2023.
- [214] J. Gou, S. Sun, J. Zhang, J. Si, C. Qian, and L. Zhang, "Taming the power of diffusion models for high-quality virtual try-on with appearance flow," *ACM MM*, 2023.
- [215] J. Kim, G. Gu, M. Park, S. Park, and J. Choo, "Stableviton: Learning semantic correspondence with latent diffusion model for virtual try-on," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [216] C. Mou, X. Wang, J. Song, Y. Shan, and J. Zhang, "Dragdiffusion: Enabling drag-style manipulation on diffusion models," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [217] P. Ling, L. Chen, P. Zhang, H. Chen, and Y. Jin, "Freedrag: Point tracking is not you need for interactive point-based image editing," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [218] Y. Shi, C. Xue, J. Pan, W. Zhang, V. Y. Tan, and S. Bai, "Dragdiffusion: Harnessing diffusion models for interactive point-based image editing," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [219] R. Mokady, A. Hertz, K. Aberman, Y. Pritch, and D. Cohen-Or, "Null-text inversion for editing real images using guided diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [220] X. Ju, A. Zeng, Y. Bian, S. Liu, and Q. Xu, "Direct inversion: Boosting diffusion-based editing with 3 lines of code," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [221] A. Hertz, R. Mokady, J. Tenenbaum, K. Aberman, Y. Pritch, and D. Cohen-Or, "Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross-attention control," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [222] G. Parmar, K. Kumar Singh, R. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Lu, and J.-Y. Zhu, "Zero-shot image-to-image translation," *SIGGRAPH*, 2023.
- [223] T. Brooks, A. Holynski, and A. A. Efros, "Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [224] H. Chefer, Y. Alaluf, Y. Vinker, L. Wolf, and D. Cohen-Or, "Attend-and-excite: Attention-based semantic guidance for text-to-image diffusion models," *TOG*, 2023.
- [225] S. Hong, G. Lee, W. Jang, and S. Kim, "Improving sample quality of diffusion models using self-attention guidance," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [226] S. Ge, T. Park, J.-Y. Zhu, and J.-B. Huang, "Expressive text-to-image generation with rich text," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [227] Y. Zeng, Z. Lin, J. Zhang, Q. Liu, J. Collomosse, J. Kuen, and V. M. Patel, "Scenecomposer: Any-level semantic image synthesis," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [228] Y. Li, H. Liu, Q. Wu, F. Mu, J. Yang, J. Gao, C. Li, and Y. J. Lee, "Gligen: Open-set grounded text-to-image generation," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [229] W. Feng, X. He, T.-J. Fu, V. Jampani, A. R. Akula, P. Narayana, S. Basu, X. E. Wang, and W. Y. Wang, "Training-free structured diffusion guidance for compositional text-to-image synthesis," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [230] 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," *ICLR*, 2021.
- [231] S. Xu, Z. Ma, Y. Huang, H. Lee, and J. Chai, "Cyclenet: Rethinking cycle consistency in text-guided diffusion for image manipulation," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [232] T. Qi, S. Fang, Y. Wu, H. Xie, J. Liu, L. Chen, Q. He, and Y. Zhang, "Deadiff: An efficient stylization diffusion model with disentangled representations," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [233] B. Yang, S. Gu, B. Zhang, T. Zhang, X. Chen, X. Sun, D. Chen, and F. Wen, "Paint by example: Exemplar-based image editing with diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [234] O. Avrahami, D. Lischinski, and O. Fried, "Blended diffusion for text-driven editing of natural images," *CVPR*, 2022.
- [235] O. Avrahami, O. Fried, and D. Lischinski, "Blended latent diffusion," *TOG*, 2023.
- [236] N. Inoue, K. Kikuchi, E. Simo-Serra, M. Otani, and K. Yamaguchi, "Layoutdm: Discrete diffusion model for controllable layout generation," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [237] H. Weng, D. Huang, Y. Qiao, Z. Hu, C.-Y. Lin, T. Zhang, and C. Chen, "Desigen: A pipeline for controllable design template generation," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [238] Z. Yue, J. Wang, and C. C. Loy, "Reshift: Efficient diffusion model for image super-resolution by residual shifting," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [239] C. Saharia, J. Ho, W. Chan, T. Salimans, D. J. Fleet, and M. Norouzi, "Image super-resolution via iterative refinement," *TPAMI*, 2022.
- [240] L. Khachatryan, A. Movsisyan, V. Tadevosyan, R. Henschel, Z. Wang, S. Navasardyan, and H. Shi, "Text2video-zero: Text-to-image diffusion models are zero-shot video generators," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [241] Y. Nikankin, N. Haim, and M. Irani, "Sinfusion: Training diffusion models on a single image or video," *ICML*, 2023.
- [242] C. Qi, X. Cun, Y. Zhang, C. Lei, X. Wang, Y. Shan, and Q. Chen, "Fatezero: Fusing attentions for zero-shot text-based video editing," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [243] O. Bar-Tal, D. Ofri-Amar, R. Fridman, Y. Kasten, and T. Dekel, "Text2live: Text-driven layered image and video editing," *ECCV*, 2022.
- [244] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," *ICML*, 2021.
- [245] M. Caron, H. Touvron, I. Misra, H. Jégou, J. Mairal, P. Bojanowski, and A. Joulin, "Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers," *ICCV*, 2021.
- [246] M. Oquab, T. Darcet, T. Moutakanni, H. V. Vo, M. Szafraniec, V. Khalidov, P. Fernandez, D. HAZIZA, F. Massa, A. El-Nouby *et al.*, "Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision," *TMLR*, 2023.
- [247] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," *CVPR*, 2016.
- [248] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *ICLR*, 2020.
- [249] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," *CVPR*, 2009.
- [250] E. Pizzi, S. D. Roy, S. N. Ravindra, P. Goyal, and M. Douze, "A self-supervised descriptor for image copy detection," *CVPR*, 2022.
- [251] W. Wang, W. Zhang, Y. Sun, and Y. Yang, "Bag of tricks and a strong baseline for image copy detection," *arXiv:2111.08004*, 2021.

- [252] W. Wang, Y. Sun, W. Zhang, and Y. Yang, "D2 Iv: A data-driven and local-verification approach for image copy detection," *arXiv:2111.07090*, 2021.
- [253] S. Yokoo, "Contrastive learning with large memory bank and negative embedding subtraction for accurate copy detection," *arXiv:2112.04323*, 2021.
- [254] S. K. Amer, "Ai imagery and the overton window," *arXiv:2306.00080*, 2023.
- [255] C. Stokel-Walker and R. V. Noorden, "What ChatGPT and generative AI mean for science," *Nature*, 2023.
- [256] L. Manduchi, K. Pandey, R. Bamler, R. Cotterell, S. Däubener, S. Fellenz, A. Fischer, T. Gärtner, M. Kirchler, M. Kloft, Y. Li, C. Lippert, G. de Melo, E. Nalisnick, B. Ommer, R. Ranganath, M. Rudolph, K. Ullrich, G. V. den Broeck, J. E. Vogt, Y. Wang, F. Wenzel, F. Wood, S. Mandt, and V. Fortuin, "On the challenges and opportunities in generative ai," *arXiv:2403.00025*.
- [257] J. Rando, D. Paleka, D. Lindner, L. Heim, and F. Tramèr, "Red-teaming the stable diffusion safety filter," *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [258] Y. Liu, C. Fan, Y. Dai, X. Chen, P. Zhou, and L. Sun, "Toward robust imperceptible perturbation against unauthorized text-to-image diffusion-based synthesis," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [259] M.-E. Nilsback and A. Zisserman, "Automated flower classification over a large number of classes," *ICVGIP*, 2008.
- [260] Z. Liu, P. Luo, X. Wang, and X. Tang, "Deep learning face attributes in the wild," *ICCV*, 2015.
- [261] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," *MICCAI*, 2015.
- [262] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [263] W. Peebles and S. Xie, "Scalable diffusion models with transformers," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [264] N. Ahn, W. Ahn, K. Yoo, D. Kim, and S.-H. Nam, "Imperceptible protection against style imitation from diffusion models," *arXiv:2403.19254*, 2024.
- [265] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," *ICALP*, 2006.
- [266] L. Bourtole, V. Chandrasekaran, C. A. Choquette-Choo, H. Jia, A. Travers, B. Zhang, D. Lie, and N. Papernot, "Machine unlearning," *SP*, 2021.
- [267] L. Lyu, C. Chen, and J. Fu, "A pathway towards responsible ai generated content," *JCAI*, 2023.
- [268] A. F. Cooper, K. Lee, J. Grimmelmann, D. Ippolito, C. Callison-Burch, C. A. Choquette-Choo, N. Mireshghallah, M. Brundage, D. Mimno, M. Z. Choksi *et al.*, "Report of the 1st workshop on generative ai and law," *arXiv:2311.06477*, 2023.
- [269] P. Voigt and A. Von dem Bussche, "The eu general data protection regulation," *CHAM*, 2017.
- [270] A. Ghosh and D. Lakshmi, "Dual governance: The intersection of centralized regulation and crowdsourced safety mechanisms for generative ai," *arXiv:2308.04448*, 2023.
- [271] K. A. Bartlett and J. D. Camba, "Generative artificial intelligence in product design education: Navigating concerns of originality and ethics," *IJIMAI*, 2024.
- [272] S. Pan, T. Wang, R. L. Qiu, M. Axente, C.-W. Chang, J. Peng, A. B. Patel, J. Shelton, S. A. Patel, J. Roper *et al.*, "2d medical image synthesis using transformer-based denoising diffusion probabilistic model," *PMB*, 2023.
- [273] D. Eschweiler, R. Yilmaz, M. Baumann, I. Laube, R. Roy, A. Jose, D. Brückner, and J. Stegmaier, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models for generation of realistic fully-annotated microscopy image datasets," *PLOS*, 2024.
- [274] W. Peng, E. Adeli, T. Bosschieter, S. H. Park, Q. Zhao, and K. M. Pohl, "Generating realistic brain mris via a conditional diffusion probabilistic model," *MICCAI*, 2023.
- [275] T. Xiang, M. Yurt, A. B. Syed, K. Setsompop, and A. Chaudhari, "Ddm2: Self-supervised diffusion mri denoising with generative diffusion models," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [276] D. Hu, Y. K. Tao, and I. Oguz, "Unsupervised denoising of retinal oct with diffusion probabilistic model," *SPIE*, 2022.
- [277] A. Kascenas, P. Sanchez, P. Schrempf, C. Wang, W. Clackett, S. S. Mikhael, J. P. Voisey, K. Goatman, A. Weir, N. Pugeault *et al.*, "The role of noise in denoising models for anomaly detection in medical images," *MIA*, 2023.
- [278] J. Wolleb, F. Bieder, R. Sandkuhler, and P. C. Cattin, "Diffusion models for medical anomaly detection," *MICCAI*, 2022.

- [279] Z. Liang, H. Anthony, F. Wagner, and K. Kamnitsas, "Modality cycles with masked conditional diffusion for unsupervised anomaly segmentation in mri," *MICCAI*, 2023.



Wenhao Wang is a Ph.D. student at the Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute, University of Technology Sydney. He earned his bachelor's degree from Beihang University in 2021, receiving the Shenyuan Medal (Top 10 Undergraduate). His research has been focusing on image copy/replication since 2021, with publications in top-tier conferences and journals like NeurIPS, AAAI, IJCV, and TIP. His algorithms have won several top academic competitions about visual copy detection, with \$100,000 prize totally.



Dr. Yifan Sun is currently a Senior Expert at Baidu Inc. His research interests focus on deep representation learning, data problem (e.g., long-tailed data, cross-domain scenario, few-shot learning) in deep visual recognition and large visual transformers. He has publications on many top-tier conferences/journals such as CVPR, ICCV, ICLR, NeurIPS and TPAMI. His papers have received over 7000 citations and some of his researches have been applied into realistic AI business.



Dr. Zongxin Yang is currently a post-doctoral researcher with Zhejiang University, China. His research interests focus on vision generation, 3D vision, and video understanding. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Science and Technology of China, in 2018, and the PhD degree in computer science from the University of Technology Sydney, Australia, in 2021. He has publications on many top-tier conferences/journals such as TPAMI, ICLR, NeurIPS, ICML, CVPR, ECCV, and ICCV. His research also won the best paper award of ACM MM in 2023.



Zhengdong Hu is a Ph.D. student at the Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute, University of Technology Sydney. He earned his master's degree from Zhejiang University in 2022. Since then, he has been conducting research at Baidu Inc. His research interests include diffusion models, multimodal large language models, and large visual transformers, with publications in top-tier conferences like NeurIPS, ICLR and AAAI.



Zhentao Tan is currently conducting research at Baidu Inc. He will join Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute, University of Technology Sydney as a Ph.D. student in the near future. He earned his bachelor's degree from Beihang University in 2021 and his master's degree from Peking University in 2024. His research interests include diffusion models, image copy detection, and optimization, with publications in top-tier conferences like ICML and ICCV.



Dr. Yi Yang (Senior Member, IEEE) is a distinguished Professor with the college of computer science and technology, Zhejiang University. He has authored over 200 papers in top-tier journals and conferences. His papers have received over 70,000 citations, with an H-index of 128. He has received more than 10 international awards in the field of AI, such as the Zhejiang Provincial Science Award First Prize, the Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Research Award, the Australian Computer Society Gold Digital Disruptor Award, and the Google Faculty Research Award.