

PaintFlow: A Unified Framework for Interactive Oil Paintings Editing and Generation

Zhangli Hu, Ye Chen, Jiajun Yao, Bingbing Ni*

School of Information Science and Electronic Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China
tension-2019@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Oil painting, as a high-level medium that blends human abstract thinking with artistic expression, poses substantial challenges for digital generation and editing due to its intricate brushstroke dynamics and stylized characteristics. Existing generation and editing techniques are often constrained by the distribution of training data and primarily focus on modifying real photographs. In this work, we introduce a unified multimodal framework for oil painting generation and editing. The proposed system allows users to incorporate reference images for precise semantic control, hand-drawn sketches for spatial structure alignment, and natural language prompts for high-level semantic guidance, while consistently maintaining a unified painting style across all outputs. Our method achieves interactive oil painting creation through three crucial technical advancements. First, we enhance the training stage with spatial alignment and semantic enhancement conditioning strategy, which map masks and sketches into spatial constraints, and encode contextual embedding from reference images and text into feature constraints, enabling object-level semantic alignment. Second, to overcome data scarcity, we propose a self-supervised style transfer pipeline based on Stroke-Based Rendering (SBR), which simulates the inpainting dynamics of oil painting restoration, converting real images into stylized oil paintings with preserved brushstroke textures to construct a large-scale paired training dataset. Finally, during inference, we integrate features using the AdaIN operator to ensure stylistic consistency. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our interactive system enables fine-grained editing while preserving the artistic qualities of oil paintings, achieving an unprecedented level of imagination realization in stylized oil paintings generation and editing.

Introduction

Oil painting, as a vital carrier of traditional culture, holds irreplaceable historical and artistic value. However, its high level of professional expertise presents a barrier to the widespread adoption of traditional creation methods, limiting the people’s involvement in the creative process. In response to this issue, interactive painting technology has emerged, aiming to build a creative space that aligns with




Figure 1: PaintFlow is an interactive oil painting editing and generation system. It enables users to flexibly combine text, reference images, and sketches for fine-grained control. Please zoom in to capture more details.

human cognitive needs and expands the dimensions of artistic expression (Chen et al. 2015; Singh et al. 2022; Liu et al. 2024b). As a result, it has attracted wide attention across interdisciplinary fields such as design and education.

However, despite the rapid development of AIGC (Rombach et al. 2022; Zhang, Rao, and Agrawala 2023; Podell et al. 2023) and graphics technologies (Chen et al. 2015; Wang et al. 2024b), interactive generation of oil painting styles still faces critical challenges: (1) The unique visual representation of oil painting emphasizes layered brushstroke textures rather than the precision of visual structure; (2) Creating a realistic oil painting requires the artist to dynamically adjust the content of the canvas through multimodal interactions such as sketches, text, and reference images, while maintaining the consistent collaboration of style across the entire canvas. Current research focuses on two major paradigms: reconstruction and generation. The reconstruction paradigm (Huang, Heng, and Zhou 2019; Tong et al. 2022; Hu et al. 2023, 2024) relies on predefined brushstroke libraries to convert natural images into an oil painting style. While high-resolution works can be generated, they are limited to the visual reconstruction of existing content, do not support interactive user creation, and are constrained by fixed brushstroke libraries that cannot cover diverse artistic styles. The generation paradigm (Rombach

*Corresponding author.

et al. 2022; Zhang, Rao, and Agrawala 2023; Ye et al. 2023; Yang et al. 2023; Liu et al. 2024b; Hertz et al. 2024; Liu et al. 2024a), based on models like Stable Diffusion (Rombach et al. 2022), utilizes conditional injection for stylized output. While these methods support custom image editing, they are limited by the data distribution preferences of base models: they struggle to consistently generate structure-precise oil painting style images and lack high-quality multimodal annotated data, making it difficult to support core interactive methods such as sketch guidance and text descriptions.

To address these limitations, this paper proposes a novel unified interactive oil painting style image editing and generation framework. We select the Stable Diffusion model as the base model. Mimicking the creative process of human artists in oil painting, we have customized three interactive mechanisms for this model: text channel carries the thematic semantics of the creation, sketch channel locates the spatial topology structure, and reference image channel anchors the visual content entities. To support these three interactive mechanisms while ensuring that the generated content fully aligns with the user’s multimodal instructions and maintains a consistent oil painting style across the entire canvas, we have developed an oil painting style image diffusion model. The model design adheres to the principle of content-style decoupling. During the training phase, conditional alignment techniques map the mask/sketch to the channel dimension of the U-Net, while the reference image is encoded as contextual embedding through a cross-attention module, complemented by a semantic enhancement strategy to improve fine-grained feature fidelity. In the inference phase, a style alignment system is applied, aligning source domain style features through the AdaIN (Huang and Belongie 2017) module, then merging the stylized context with the semantic vector output by the pretrained text encoder for cross-modal fusion. This solution systematically addresses the three challenges of multimodal coordination, style controllability, and structural consistency.

Comprehensive experiments demonstrate that PaintFlow shows significant advantages in both multimodal instruction alignment and painting style preservation, with performance metrics surpassing current mainstream methods. A ground-breaking aspect of our framework is its ability to achieve full-process interactive creation from a blank canvas, enabling continuous user participation in the artistic generation process. It maintains precise and controllable content generation through multiple iterations and ensures consistent style stability throughout the oil painting creation process.

Related Works

Stroke Based Rendering with Oil Painting

Stroke-Based Rendering (SBR) is a graphics technique that enables style transfer while preserving semantic content by placing discrete elements (e.g., brushstrokes) rather than manipulating pixels. This approach visualizes the artistic process and supports diverse styles such as pencil sketches (Fu et al. 2011), watercolors (Kang, Chui, and Chakraborty 2006), and oil paintings (Hu et al. 2023, 2024; Huang, Heng, and Zhou 2019; Liu et al. 2021; Tong et al.

2022). Early SBR methods (Hertzmann 1998, 2001) often ignore spatial-temporal coherence, producing unnatural stroke sequences. Recent advances using reinforcement learning (Huang, Heng, and Zhou 2019; Hu et al. 2023) or Transformer (Liu et al. 2021) improve quality but still lack alignment with authentic human painting workflows. Works such as (Hu et al. 2024; Tong et al. 2022) introduced key principles, e.g., edge-following strokes, coarse-to-fine progression, and semantic region rendering, enhancing realism and supporting style preservation under arbitrary cropping. Our work builds on this by leveraging state-of-the-art SBR methods to synthesize large-scale oil painting datasets from natural images, addressing the data scarcity problem in oil painting style editing tasks.

Personalized Image Generation and Editing

Personalized image generation and editing involves tailoring content to user-specific needs. While early GAN-based methods (Goodfellow et al. 2020) enabled controllable synthesis, they suffered from limited generalization. Diffusion models have since shown superior quality and flexibility. Recent approaches incorporate various conditional inputs—text (Brooks, Holynski, and Efros 2023; Sheynin et al. 2024), masks (Huang et al. 2024; Singh et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2023), layouts (Epstein et al. 2023), and sketches (Voynov, Aberman, and Cohen-Or 2023; Liu et al. 2024b)—focusing on text-image alignment (Podell et al. 2023), identity preservation (Ye et al. 2023; Wu et al. 2024), or style consistency (Wang et al. 2023; Hertz et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2024a; Liu et al. 2024a). IP-Adapter (Ye et al. 2023) preserves portrait identity under text guidance but lacks support for fine-grained editing. MagicQuill (Liu et al. 2024b) enables multimodal control (text, color, sketch) with spatial flexibility but lacks reference image input for object-level control. Existing methods often rely on coarse, single-modal controls and struggle with conflicts between modalities, hindering joint alignment of semantics, content, and style. To address this, we introduce a multimodal framework with distributed input design and attention control to enable coherent, fine-grained alignment across modalities.

Interactive Support for Image Editing

Interactive support substantially enhances generative models via human-in-the-loop collaboration (Ko et al. 2023). While existing systems, such as Promptify (Brade et al. 2023), PromptMagician (Feng et al. 2023) and Design-Prompt (Peng, Koch, and Mackay 2024), pioneer the use of image clustering and attention visualization techniques to concretize human creativity through prompt engineering, their capability remains confined to coarse-grained inpainting. Although MagicQuill (Liu et al. 2024b) achieves pixel-level object generation by integrating brushstrokes with a multimodal large language model (MLLM), its reliance on ambiguous textual semantics inherently limits fine-grained intra-element control. The problem faced by recent work is that image editing still essentially relies only on textual modality, and the ambiguous semantics of text leads to biased generation. To resolve this fundamental constraint, our




Figure 2: Overview of our framework. During training, we follow a condition alignment paradigm by feeding the mask and sketch as additional channels into the denoising process. A semantic enhancement strategy is applied to extract fine-grained features as context embedding via cross-attention process from the reference image and frozen pretrained text embedding, ensuring detailed semantic fidelity. During inference, we use a training-free AdaIN operator to align source style. Prompt features from the frozen CLIP text encoder are fused with a learnable hyperparameter λ , enabling visually satisfactory editing.

system incorporates reference images and a decoupled training paradigm to harmonize multimodal controls, thereby enabling cross-image fine-grained semantic migration for precision-guided creative expression.

Method

Problem Definition

To realize a highly available oil painting generation agent, which facilitates a flexible and interactive creative process for oil painting generation and refinement, it is essential to develop a novel, unified framework for oil painting-style image generation and editing. This framework is characterized by two key features: (1) It supports multimodal inputs from users, including reference images, hand-drawn sketches, and text instructions; (2) It enables interactive generation and editing according to user instructions at any stage of the oil painting process (*e.g.* initial blank phase, partially completed stages, or fully finished artwork), and within any specified region of the painting. Thus, we propose to train a diffusion model that generates oil painting style images with the following inputs: a) An initial painting canvas $\mathbf{x}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$; b) A binary mask $\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1\}^{H \times W}$, which indicates targeted

editing regions; c) A reference image $\mathbf{x}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{H' \times W' \times 3}$ and a regioned sketch $\mathbf{x}_{\text{sketch}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H' \times W'}$ which are responsible for providing structural information of the painted content, where H' and W' represent the height and width of smallest rectangle to enclose 1 region in mask \mathbf{m} ; d) A prompt \mathbf{P} describing the text to draw. After receiving the input above, the model fills the masked regions by incorporating the textual content from the reference image while following the sketch-guided structure and source oil style.

Self-supervised Oil Painting Data Preparation

In order to train the aforementioned generative model, the first step is to construct a multimodal-annotated dataset in the oil painting style. This dataset should include various types of annotations corresponding to the multimodal conditions, which serves as the foundational resource for enabling the model to understand and generate oil paintings based on different forms of user input.

Specifically, we use DiffusionDB (Wang et al. 2022) as our data source and adopt a self-supervised data annotation approach with balanced input conditions to transfer source images to oil painting style images with multimodal anno-

tations. Concretely, given a real image \mathbf{x}_s , we obtain its oil painting stylization \mathbf{x}_{oil} through SBR algorithm and its sketch x_{sketch} using edge detection. For a segmented image with foreground object contours, we treat the foreground contours as a binary mask \mathbf{m} , and consider the region within the binary mask as the reference image $\mathbf{x}_r = \mathbf{m} \odot \mathbf{x}_{oil}$, along with its corresponding sketch $\mathbf{x}_{sketch} = \mathbf{m} \odot \mathbf{x}_{edge}$. The generated result should naturally exhibit the stylized region within the bounded area. Therefore, our training data consists of pairs $\{(\bar{\mathbf{m}} \odot \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_{sketch}, \mathbf{m}, prompt), \mathbf{x}_{oil}\}$, where $\bar{\mathbf{m}} = 1 - \mathbf{m}$ represents the complement of \mathbf{m} , and 1 denotes an all-ones matrix with same shape.

Due to limitations in real oil painting datasets, including insufficient quantity and lack of corresponding text descriptions, we adopt the approach proposed by (Hu et al. 2024; Tong et al. 2022), utilizing SBR algorithm to stylized real images into oil paintings. A language analysis agent (DeepSeek 2024) is employed to extract subjects among prompts, which are then used as text inputs for Grounded-SAM (Ren et al. 2024) to segment the main objects as mask regions. For sketch images, we employ edge detection model (Su et al. 2021) to extract the primary structures and subsequently binarized these edge structures. To capture richer details, particularly in background regions, we lower the edge detection threshold to reveal finer structural details.

Building upon the accurate foreground object contours obtained through our data preparation pipeline, we apply morphological operations at the foreground object contour edges, expanding outward by 3-6 pixels to form irregularly shaped masks. This random distortions D_r on mask m break the inductive bias and narrow the gap between training and testing scenarios, which indicates $\bar{m} = 1 - D_r(m)$. Previous research (Yang et al. 2023) has shown that rectangular masks often fail to accurately represent masked regions in practical applications. By incorporating these irregular masks into our training process, our model can generate superior results given masks of various shapes.

We select image-text pairs from DiffusionDB (Wang et al. 2022) and annotate input images and stylize them. To ensure the model possesses comprehensive semantic understanding, we adopt a hierarchical data construction strategy: for images with text identifying foreground objects, we construct training data for foreground object completion. For images in which the main subject cannot be extracted from text or the foreground cannot be segmented, we perform random cropping with a cropping ratio of 50% to construct background completion training data. After filtering, we have formed balanced training data consisting of 40,000 foreground samples and 10,000 background samples.

Oil Painting Style Diffusion Model Training

Semantic Preservation and Condition Alignment Paradigm. To decouple the influence of multimodal conditions (mask, sketch, prompt and reference image) on the generated image, our method separates regional inpainting from semantic preservation conditions at the training stage. Compared to other conditions, sketches excel in guiding geometric structures for pixel-level generation control, offering users more refined image editing capabilities.

Specifically, in our model architecture, we incorporate masks m and sketches x_{sketch} as input images' new dimensions into the U-Net's denoising process through channel concatenation. It can be expressed as:

$$z'_t = \text{Concat}(z_t, \text{Resize}(mask), \text{Resize}(x_{sketch})) \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Concat}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$, Resize denote the concatenation and image resize function respectively.

For reference images x_{ref} , we propose a novel semantic enhancement strategy: inject encoded image embeddings as context through cross-attention mechanisms while deactivating text cross-attention modules in U-Net in the training stage. This design enables both accurate capture of semantic texture information from reference images and precise control of outline structures through sketches.

Throughout the training phase, we optimize the parameters of the semantic extraction and fine-tune the pre-trained diffusion model. The optimized loss is very similar to the original diffusion loss formulation, with the only difference being the shift from textual conditions to identity conditions that are input as reference image embeddings c_{ref} .

$$L_{\text{diffusion}} = \mathbb{E}_{z'_t, t, c_{ref}, \epsilon \in N(0, I)} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(z'_t, t, c_{ref})\|_2^2] \quad (2)$$

Injecting sketch conditions into the U-Net via channel-wise concatenation demonstrates distinct advantages: it preserves precise spatial structure intact, allows all convolutional layers to directly leverage geometric constraints, and avoids the high computational overhead of attention matrices in cross-attention mechanisms. This conditioning strategy is particularly suitable for our tasks that require strict spatial alignment, such as edge-guided synthesis or layout-controlled generation. In contrast, cross-attention mechanisms are more appropriate for handling semantic features from reference images, as they capture multiscale texture patterns through long-range dependency modeling while maintaining flexibility in spatial semantic relationship.

Semantic Enhancement Training Strategy. In the feature extraction and fusion stage, we propose a hierarchical feature processing paradigm. Initially, we employ a feature freezing strategy by fixing the parameters of the CLIP image encoder, which extracts patch-level feature representations to form an embedding sequence. Previous research (Ye et al. 2023) has demonstrated that features extracted by the CLIP image encoder effectively preserve texture details and structural information from reference images. Subsequently, we introduce a multi-head attention mechanism based on learnable query vectors, which adaptively captures correlations between image patch features at different spatial positions.

Specifically, by designing global query vectors as attention queries, this simple processor can dynamically assign importance weights to different image patches, achieving feature aggregation from local to global perspectives. This attention-based aggregation approach demonstrates significant advantages over direct MLP projection: (1) preservation of spatial relationships between image patches; (2) adaptive adjustment of feature fusion strategies based on input content. Following attention aggregation, we employ a simple MLP network for feature transformation, leveraging non-linear mapping to further enhance feature expressiveness.

Finally, the image embeddings are projected into the same dimensionality as text features in the pretrained diffusion.

In summary, the semantic feature embedding c_{ref} extracted by reference image x_{ref} can be expressed as:

$$c_{ref} = M_{clip}(E_{atten}(E_{clip}(x_{ref}))) \quad (3)$$

where $M_{clip}(\cdot)$, $E_{atten}(\cdot)$, $E_{clip}(\cdot)$ denote the CLIP MLP mapper, multi-head attention extractor, CLIP image encoder.

Modality Fusion. For text injection in the original Stable Diffusion, we process through the standard text encoder and use learnable coefficient λ to control the mixing ratio between text conditions and image information. Fusion results are passed to subsequent SD blocks.

$$Attn(Q, K, V) = Attn(Q, \hat{K}_{ref}, \hat{V}_{ref}) + \lambda Attn(Q, K_t, V_t) \quad (4)$$

where $K_t = \tilde{W}_k^t c_t$, $V_t = \tilde{W}_v^t c_t$. c_t is the text embedding processed by pre-trained CLIP text encoder. \tilde{W}_k^t , \tilde{W}_v^t correspond to the replication weights of the SD base version.

The attention is computed by the scaled dot-product as:

$$Attn(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V \quad (5)$$

where d_k is the dimension of query and key vector.

Style Retention Mechanism

At inference stage, we maintain the training phase methodology: utilizing the trained semantic feature extraction module to capture key semantic and texture information from reference images, while using randomly cropped original images as style conditions. Inspired by (Hertz et al. 2024; Wu et al. 2024), we employ an AdaIN operation (Huang and Belongie 2017) to further align the style of the synthetic images with the original input images. Specifically, we align the key and value features of the reference image in the cross-attention layer with the key and value features of the input image:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K}_{ref} &= \text{AdaIN}(K_{ref}, K_{style}) \\ \hat{V}_{ref} &= \text{AdaIN}(V_{ref}, V_{style}) \\ K_{ref} &= W_k^{ref} c_{ref}, \quad K_{style} = W_k^{ref} c_{style} \\ V_{ref} &= W_v^{ref} c_{ref}, \quad V_{style} = W_v^{ref} c_{style} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where c_{ref} and c_{style} are the corresponding context embeddings of the reference image and style image. The parameters W_k^{ref} , W_v^{ref} are the weights of the corresponding fully connected layers. And the AdaIN operation is defined as:

$$\text{AdaIN}(x, y) = \sigma(y) \left(\frac{x - \mu(x)}{\sigma(x)} \right) + \mu(y) \quad (7)$$

Experiment

Experiment Settings

Training settings. The model is initialized by pre-trained models (Rombach et al. 2022), providing a strong prior guidance at the early stages of training. Input images and reference images are uniformly resized to 512×512 and

224×224 respectively, and we adopt PiDiNet (Su et al. 2021) as the edge detection model. For the semantic extraction module, we use OpenCLIP ViT-H/14 (Zhai et al. 2019), incorporating a trainable global query vector in the attention layer and an 8-head attention mechanism, followed by a CLIP mapper with 768-dimensional output. Training is conducted on 8 NVIDIA 4090 GPUs for 50 epochs. At inference stage, we employ DDIM Sampler (Song, Meng, and Ermon 2020) with 50 steps and guidance scale is 3.0.

Evaluation. Our goal is to seamlessly merge the reference image into the source image, ensuring the editing regions are both semantically aligned with the input text and image and blend with the source style. To evaluate these aspects, we use four metrics: (1) CLIP-T (Radford et al. 2021) and CLIP-I (Gal et al. 2022) scores measure the similarity between the editing regions and the reference image; (2) Gram (Gatys, Ecker, and Bethge 2016) score assesses feature map style similarity via the Gram matrix; (3) FID (Heusel et al. 2017) score, a standard metric for evaluating image quality, using the oil painting dataset from (DataScienceProject 2025); (4) Aesthetic (Yi et al. 2023) score, which evaluates the aesthetic quality of the generated images. Methods without corresponding modal omit the scores.

Comparasion with State-of-the-Art Methods

We select four representative state-of-the-art diffusion-based image generation and editing methods as baselines, including Paint-by-Example (Yang et al. 2023), MagicQuill (Liu et al. 2024b) and two IP-Adapter (Ye et al. 2023)+ControlNet (Zhang, Rao, and Agrawala 2023)-based composite multimodal condition models. To guarantee the fairness of the comparison: (1) the original hyper-parameter configurations are strictly maintained; (2) only use official input modalities of each model.

Figure 3 provides a qualitative comparison for editing oil painting images. Existing approaches exhibit conflicts or deficiencies in modality conditions, leading to misalignment with input conditions, inconsistent artistic style preservation, and inadequate handling of complex user requirements. Specifically, IP-Adapter+ControlNet+SD-Scribble introduces visible artifacts at mask boundaries (e.g., "Man") and texture discontinuities (e.g., "Tree"). While SD-Inpaint effectively aligns style and semantics with reference images, it fails to achieve spatial pose control via sketches. Paint-by-Example (Yang et al. 2023), lacking multi-modal input capability, is confined to coarse-grained adjustments and often directly transplants objects from reference images (e.g., "Sunflower" and "Goose"), resulting in artistic incoherence. MagicQuill (Liu et al. 2024b) enables flexible sketch-based editing and employs MLLM for style alignment but relies on simplistic text prompts that prove insufficient for complex demands. This limitation is evident in the "Sunflower" case, where the method fails to produce meaningful results when confronted with intricate sketch.

In contrast, our approach leverages multimodal conditions to enable flexible and precise editing in the image. By establishing a three-level intent translation mechanism—"Region Definition(mask)-Layout Planning(sketch)-Precise Semantic Control(reference+text)" — we effectively decouple

































	Input Condition		Result Comparison					Original Image
Sunflower								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	
Goose								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	
Man								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	
Tree								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	

Figure 3: Qualitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods. We showcase the inpainting results of previous methods and ours. As shown, the results of existing methods are plagued with artifacts, irregular edges, and realistic style inconsistencies. Our method achieves significantly better oil paintings than other methods. Please zoom in to capture more details.




Figure 4: Flow Painting Process. We demonstrate how our system generates a high-fidelity oil painting in four steps.

Table 1: Quantitative comparison. Our method features the most comprehensive multimodal input, enabling simultaneous alignment of text, image semantics and style. The performance metrics underscore the superiority of our method. Additionally, the quantitative comparisons of ablation study have been shown in the bottom part.

Method	Target Alignment			CLIP-T \uparrow	CLIP-I \uparrow	Gram \uparrow	FID \downarrow	Aesthetic \uparrow
	Text	Semantics	Style					
IP-Adapter+SD-ControlNet-Inpaint	✓	×	✓	0.862	-	0.568	268.16	5.098
IP-AdapterSD-ControlNet-Scribble	✓	✓	×	0.834	0.792	0.431	287.50	4.873
Paint-by-Example(Yang et al. 2023)	×	✓	×	-	0.809	0.417	281.71	4.894
MagicQuill(Liu et al. 2024b)	✓	×	✓	0.802	-	0.585	258.35	5.147
Ours	✓	✓	✓	0.947	0.909	0.619	234.27	5.322
Ours w/o text	×	✓	✓	-	0.827	0.605	260.91	5.109
Ours w/o semantic	✓	×	✓	0.920	-	0.611	249.63	5.184
Ours w/o style	✓	✓	×	0.929	0.867	0.420	279.80	5.002

and leverage multi-modal information to capture the user’s intent with precision. Unlike LoRA (Hu et al. 2022), which fine-tunes SD model with a limited set of images to align a specific style, our approach emphasizes interactive painting through regional and controllable edits with various styles.

Figure 4 illustrates our flow painting process, which allows users to easily and effortlessly realize their creative ideas. In the background painting stage, the system generates a semantically appropriate background composition based on text and reference images. When the canvas is blank, the text allows specification of various painting styles. In the foreground painting stage, users can accurately bring their ideas to life on the canvas by combining textual prompts, reference images, and simple sketch, all while maintaining a consistent oil painting style for about 5s inference time. Each step typically takes 2 minutes, while generating a complete image from scratch takes about 8 minutes.

Table 1 presents a quantitative analysis, highlighting the superiority of our method in generating oil paintings. Our method is the first to successfully fuse three modalities of information. It significantly outperforms other model architectures in terms of instruction alignment, style retention and image aesthetic quality. For more qualitative results, please refer to supplementary material.

Ablation Study

The results of the ablation study, shown in Figure 5, provide deep insights into the essential roles of each component in our proposed framework for generating high-quality oil painting images. When the semantic extraction module is removed, the generated image will rely solely on the text to provide texture and color information. This leads to a loss of fine-grained control over the image’s regions, particularly in areas where precise details are crucial, and results in a more generic and less structured output. Without the style operator, the generated images adopt a more realistic style, moving away from the intended oil painting aesthetic. Without text input, the critical function of providing high-level semantic guidance will be absent. The text ensures robust output generation when spatial and visual information conflict, by bridging deep connections between the image (reference) and layout (sketch). In the absence of text modality,




Figure 5: Ablation Study. Our method is equipped with a dedicated module for each condition, and the absence of any modality will compromise the generated image fidelity.

most generated images lack fine-grained texture details, as shown in the third row. The fourth row presents failure case: ambiguous input sketches cause high ambiguity, leading to modal conflict with the reference images and resulting in image generation failure. This highlights the importance of text. The qualitative comparison shown in Table 1 demonstrates the effectiveness of our modules.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we have presented a novel framework for interactive oil painting generation and editing that leverages multimodal conditions. By customizing text, sketch, and reference image conditions, we provide users with fine-grained control over the creation and modification of oil paintings. Our framework integrates a condition alignment paradigm during training, along with a semantic enhancement strategy, to preserve the intricate details of the reference image. The style retention mechanism during inference ensures the generated content aligns with the desired oil painting style and user instructions. We introduce a self-supervised pipeline for

generating an unlimited oil painting dataset from the real dataset. Extensive experiments validate the effectiveness of our approach, demonstrating its ability to generate oil paintings with high fidelity, accurate instruction alignment, and robust style preservation. Ultimately, our method offers a comprehensive solution for interactive oil painting generation, enabling users to create artwork from scratch or edit existing paintings with precision and artistic control.

References

- Brade, S.; Wang, B.; Sousa, M.; Oore, S.; and Grossman, T. 2023. Promptify: Text-to-image generation through interactive prompt exploration with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 1–14.
- Brooks, T.; Holynski, A.; and Efros, A. A. 2023. Instruct-pix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 18392–18402.
- Chen, Z.; Kim, B.; Ito, D.; and Wang, H. 2015. Wetbrush: GPU-based 3D painting simulation at the bristle level. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 34(6): 1–11.
- DataScienceProject. 2025. Art Images AI And Real. https://huggingface.co/datasets/DataScienceProject/Art_Images_AI_And_Real.
- DeepSeek. 2024. <https://chat.deepseek.com/>.
- Epstein, D.; Jabri, A.; Poole, B.; Efros, A.; and Holynski, A. 2023. Diffusion self-guidance for controllable image generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 16222–16239.
- Feng, Y.; Wang, X.; Wong, K. K.; Wang, S.; Lu, Y.; Zhu, M.; Wang, B.; and Chen, W. 2023. Promptmagician: Interactive prompt engineering for text-to-image creation. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 30(1): 295–305.
- Fu, H.; Zhou, S.; Liu, L.; and Mitra, N. J. 2011. Animated construction of line drawings. In *Proceedings of the 2011 SIGGRAPH Asia Conference*, 1–10.
- Gal, R.; Alaluf, Y.; Atzmon, Y.; Patashnik, O.; Bermano, A. H.; Chechik, G.; and Cohen-Or, D. 2022. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01618*.
- Gatys, L. A.; Ecker, A. S.; and Bethge, M. 2016. Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2414–2423.
- Goodfellow, I.; Pouget-Abadie, J.; Mirza, M.; Xu, B.; Warde-Farley, D.; Ozair, S.; Courville, A.; and Bengio, Y. 2020. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11): 139–144.
- Hertz, A.; Voynov, A.; Fruchter, S.; and Cohen-Or, D. 2024. Style aligned image generation via shared attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 4775–4785.
- Hertzmann, A. 1998. Painterly rendering with curved brush strokes of multiple sizes. In *Proceedings of the 25th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, 453–460.
- Hertzmann, A. 2001. Paint by relaxation. In *Proceedings. Computer Graphics International 2001*, 47–54. IEEE.
- Heusel, M.; Ramsauer, H.; Unterthiner, T.; Nessler, B.; and Hochreiter, S. 2017. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Hu, E. J.; Shen, Y.; Wallis, P.; Allen-Zhu, Z.; Li, Y.; Wang, S.; Wang, L.; Chen, W.; et al. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2): 3.
- Hu, T.; Yi, R.; Zhu, H.; Liu, L.; Peng, J.; Wang, Y.; Wang, C.; and Ma, L. 2023. Stroke-based neural painting and stylization with dynamically predicted painting region. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 7470–7480.
- Hu, Z.; Chen, Y.; Zhao, Z.; Liu, J.; Ke, B.; and Ni, B. 2024. Towards Artist-Like Painting Agents with Multi-Granularity Semantic Alignment. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 10191–10199.
- Huang, X.; and Belongie, S. 2017. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 1501–1510.
- Huang, Y.; Xie, L.; Wang, X.; Yuan, Z.; Cun, X.; Ge, Y.; Zhou, J.; Dong, C.; Huang, R.; Zhang, R.; et al. 2024. Smartedit: Exploring complex instruction-based image editing with multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 8362–8371.
- Huang, Z.; Heng, W.; and Zhou, S. 2019. Learning to paint with model-based deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 8709–8718.
- Kang, H. W.; Chui, C. K.; and Chakraborty, U. K. 2006. A unified scheme for adaptive stroke-based rendering. *The Visual Computer*, 22: 814–824.
- Ko, H.-K.; Park, G.; Jeon, H.; Jo, J.; Kim, J.; and Seo, J. 2023. Large-scale text-to-image generation models for visual artists’ creative works. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on intelligent user interfaces*, 919–933.
- Liu, G.; Xia, M.; Zhang, Y.; Chen, H.; Xing, J.; Wang, Y.; Wang, X.; Shan, Y.; and Yang, Y. 2024a. Style-Crafter: Taming Stylized Video Diffusion with Reference-Augmented Adapter Learning. *ACM TRANSACTIONS ON GRAPHICS*, 43(6).
- Liu, S.; Lin, T.; He, D.; Li, F.; Deng, R.; Li, X.; Ding, E.; and Wang, H. 2021. Paint transformer: Feed forward neural painting with stroke prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 6598–6607.
- Liu, Z.; Yu, Y.; Ouyang, H.; Wang, Q.; Cheng, K. L.; Wang, W.; Liu, Z.; Chen, Q.; and Shen, Y. 2024b. MagicQuill: An Intelligent Interactive Image Editing System.

- Peng, X.; Koch, J.; and Mackay, W. E. 2024. Designprompt: Using multimodal interaction for design exploration with generative ai. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, 804–818.
- Podell, D.; English, Z.; Lacey, K.; Blattmann, A.; Dockhorn, T.; Müller, J.; Penna, J.; and Rombach, R. 2023. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*.
- Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Hallacy, C.; Ramesh, A.; Goh, G.; Agarwal, S.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Mishkin, P.; Clark, J.; et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, 8748–8763. PmLR.
- Ren, T.; Liu, S.; Zeng, A.; Lin, J.; Li, K.; Cao, H.; Chen, J.; Huang, X.; Chen, Y.; Yan, F.; et al. 2024. Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14159*.
- Rombach, R.; Blattmann, A.; Lorenz, D.; Esser, P.; and Ommer, B. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 10684–10695.
- Sheynin, S.; Polyak, A.; Singer, U.; Kirstain, Y.; Zohar, A.; Ashual, O.; Parikh, D.; and Taigman, Y. 2024. Emu edit: Precise image editing via recognition and generation tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 8871–8879.
- Singh, J.; Smith, C.; Echevarria, J.; and Zheng, L. 2022. Intelli-Paint: Towards developing more human-intelligible painting agents. In *European conference on computer vision*, 685–701. Springer.
- Singh, J.; Zhang, J.; Liu, Q.; Smith, C.; Lin, Z.; and Zheng, L. 2024. SmartMask: context aware high-fidelity mask generation for fine-grained object insertion and layout control. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 6497–6506.
- Song, J.; Meng, C.; and Ermon, S. 2020. Denoising diffusion implicit models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02502*.
- Su, Z.; Liu, W.; Yu, Z.; Hu, D.; Liao, Q.; Tian, Q.; Pietikäinen, M.; and Liu, L. 2021. Pixel difference networks for efficient edge detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 5117–5127.
- Tong, Z.; Wang, X.; Yuan, S.; Chen, X.; Wang, J.; and Fang, X. 2022. Im2oil: Stroke-based oil painting rendering with linearly controllable fineness via adaptive sampling. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on multimedia*, 1035–1046.
- Voynov, A.; Aberman, K.; and Cohen-Or, D. 2023. Sketch-guided text-to-image diffusion models. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2023 conference proceedings*, 1–11.
- Wang, H.; Spinelli, M.; Wang, Q.; Bai, X.; Qin, Z.; and Chen, A. 2024a. Instantstyle: Free lunch towards style-preserving in text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02733*.
- Wang, X.; Xu, Y.; Liu, S.; Ren, B.; Kosinka, J.; Telea, A. C.; Wang, J.; Song, C.; Chang, J.; Li, C.; et al. 2024b. Physics-based fluid simulation in computer graphics: Survey, research trends, and challenges. *Computational Visual Media*, 10(5): 803–858.
- Wang, Z.; Wang, X.; Xie, L.; Qi, Z.; Shan, Y.; Wang, W.; and Luo, P. 2023. StyleAdapter: A Unified Stylized Image Generation Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01770*.
- Wang, Z. J.; Montoya, E.; Munechika, D.; Yang, H.; Hoover, B.; and Chau, D. H. 2022. DiffusionDB: A Large-Scale Prompt Gallery Dataset for Text-to-Image Generative Models. *arXiv:2210.14896 [cs]*.
- Wu, Y.; Li, Z.; Zheng, H.; Wang, C.; and Li, B. 2024. Infinite-ID: Identity-preserved Personalization via ID-semantics Decoupling Paradigm. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 279–296. Springer.
- Yang, B.; Gu, S.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, T.; Chen, X.; Sun, X.; Chen, D.; and Wen, F. 2023. Paint by example: Exemplar-based image editing with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 18381–18391.
- Ye, H.; Zhang, J.; Liu, S.; Han, X.; and Yang, W. 2023. Ip-adapter: Text compatible image prompt adapter for text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06721*.
- Yi, R.; Tian, H.; Gu, Z.; Lai, Y.-K.; and Rosin, P. L. 2023. Towards artistic image aesthetics assessment: a large-scale dataset and a new method. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 22388–22397.
- Zhai, X.; Puigcerver, J.; Kolesnikov, A.; Ruysen, P.; Riquelme, C.; Lucic, M.; Djolonga, J.; Pinto, A. S.; Neumann, M.; Dosovitskiy, A.; et al. 2019. A large-scale study of representation learning with the visual task adaptation benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04867*.
- Zhang, L.; Rao, A.; and Agrawala, M. 2023. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 3836–3847.

Supplementary Material

Preliminaries

Latent Diffusion Model. Latent Diffusion Models (LDM) first employs an autoencoder consisting of an encoder \mathcal{E} and a decoder \mathcal{D} to compress images into lower-dimensional latent representations before training a diffusion model, dramatically reducing computational requirements while maintaining high-quality generation capabilities. Then a denoising U-Net architecture is trained to denoise a noise ϵ following normal distribution into realistic latent representation $z = \mathcal{E}(x)$ through t timesteps.

From a variational perspective, the LDM objective function can be simplified as:

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_t, c, \epsilon, t} (\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, c, t)\|_2^2) \quad (8)$$

where ϵ_θ means the function of the denoising U-Net and c denotes the embeddings of conditional information.

In conditional diffusion models, classifier guidance is a technique based on the gradients of pre-trained classifiers that effectively balances fidelity and diversity in generated images. To simplify this process, researchers proposed classifier-free guidance, which jointly trains conditional and unconditional diffusion models by randomly dropping condition c during training. During the sampling stage, the model combines predictions from both the conditional model $\epsilon_\theta(x_t, c, t)$ and the unconditional model $\epsilon_\theta(x_t, t)$ to calculate the final noise prediction:

$$\hat{\epsilon}_\theta(x_t, c, t) = w\epsilon_\theta(x_t, c, t) + (1 - w)\epsilon_\theta(x_t, t) \quad (9)$$

The scalar parameter w (commonly known as guidance scale or guidance weight) is used to adjust how closely the generated results match condition c , it further enhances conditional generation control, ensuring generated results better conform to user-specified conditions while maintaining reasonable diversity.

CLIP Vision Model. The vision model in CLIP is widely used for extracting features from visual data in Text-to-Image (T2I) models. To process a image, such as our reference image $I_r \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C}$, where H , W , and C denote the height, width, and channels, respectively, the model first flattens the image into a sequence of patches $I_p \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (P^2 \times C)}$. In this case, P refers to the patch size, and N , which equals HW/P^2 , represents the sequence length. The model then feeds the sequence of patches into a vision embedding module, which computes embeddings using a linear projection matrix $E \in \mathbb{R}^{P^2 \times C \times D}$. Additionally, the model appends a class embedding $E_{cls} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times D}$ to the vision embeddings before combining them with a position embedding $E_{pos} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1) \times D}$. The embedding process can be expressed as:

$$E_{I_r} = [E_{cls}, I_r^0 E, I_r^1 E, \dots, I_r^{N-1} E] + E_{pos}. \quad (10)$$

In the Semantic Enhancement Training Strategy, we propose a hierarchical feature processing paradigm. Specifically, we first extract patch-level feature representations from the penultimate layer of the CLIP vision encoder, which retain rich local semantic information. To further capture the relationships among patches across different spatial

locations, we use a multi-head attention mechanism based on learnable query vectors. In particular, a global query vector is designed to serve as the attention query, allowing the model to dynamically assign importance weights to different patches and thereby aggregate features from local to global.

Compared to simple average pooling, this attention-based aggregation approach offers significant advantages: it not only preserves the spatial relationships between patches, but also adaptively adjusts the feature fusion strategy based on the input content. Following attention aggregation, we apply a two-layer MLP network as CLIP Mapper for feature transformation, enhancing the expressiveness of the features through nonlinear mapping and normalization operations. This design remains end-to-end trainable and effectively mitigates the information loss commonly seen in traditional average pooling methods, providing more discriminative feature representations for downstream tasks.

Model Architecture Details

Dataset Preparation. DiffusionDB (Wang et al. 2022) is a large-scale text-to-image prompt dataset, containing 14 million images generated by Stable Diffusion based on prompts and hyperparameters specified by real users. Its strength lies in the massive scale of text-image pairs, which allows for accurate identification of key painting areas in generated images by extracting relevant keywords from the text. However, a drawback of DiffusionDB is that these generated images lack the texture and distinctive features typical of oil paintings. Therefore, an SBR algorithm (Tong et al. 2022) is required to perform style transfer on regular images while preserving all semantic content. The algorithm used for annotation is presented in Alg 1.

Algorithm 1: Oil Painting Dataset Preparation

Input: DiffusionDB (Input Dataset)

Output: Oil painting style train dataset \mathcal{D}

- 1: Initialize dataset: $\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$
 - 2: **for** $i = 1$ **to** N **do**
 - 3: Get image and text from dataset: $x_s, prompt = \text{DiffusionDB}[i]$
 - 4: Stylize input image: $x_{oil} = \text{Style}(x_s)$
 - 5: Edge detection: $x_{sketch} = \text{Edge}(x_s)$
 - 6: Extract subjects: $P_{obj} = \text{LLM}(prompt)$
 - 7: Segment input image with object prompt: $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\} = \text{GSAM}(x_s, P_{obj})$
 - 8: **for** each object segment m_j from m_1 to m_n **do**
 - 9: Apply morphological operation: $m = D_r(m^j)$
 - 10: Compute the complement: $\bar{m} = 1 - m^j$
 - 11: Update sketch: $x_{sketch} = m \odot x_{sketch}$
 - 12: $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup \{(\bar{m} \odot x_s, x_{sketch}, m, prompt), x_{oil}\}$
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **return** Oil painting style train dataset \mathcal{D}
-

Details in Interactive Editing. We built an interactive painting editing and generation interface based on Streamlit to implement Flow Painting, as shown in Fig 6. When editing an existing image, users initiate the process by uploading




Figure 6: Interactive Painting Editing/Generation Interface.

both the source and reference images. They then switch to Canvas mode to separately define masks and sketches. Following this, a prompt is entered in the sidebar, and clicking "Generate" produces the edited result below. For creation from scratch, the source image upload is omitted while all subsequent operations—switching to Canvas mode, defining masks and sketches, entering prompts, and generating the image—remain consistent. To achieve stylistic diversity, users may incorporate relevant style descriptors into their prompts during the first generation stage. The interactive editing algorithm process is illustrated in Alg 2. To finalize, a concise semantic prompt is entered in the command input field to configure generation logic, enabling iterative creative outputs within approximately 2 minutes.

Experiment Results

Experiment Settings. Training is conducted on a system equipped with an Intel Xeon Gold 6150 @ 2.70GHz CPU, running Ubuntu 24.04.2 LTS, and 8 NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPUs. During training, each GPU uses approximately 24.3 GB of memory. We selected 50,000 training images and 3,000 test images from DiffusionDB, maintaining the dataset in paired format as $\{(\bar{\mathbf{m}} \odot \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_{\text{sketch}}, \mathbf{m}, \text{prompt}), \mathbf{x}_{\text{oil}}\}$.

For testing, we introduce an interactive evaluation mechanism that provides qualitative insights through comparative analysis of the completion of the user creative intent. Specifically, for oil painting images in diverse artistic styles, users perform semantic editing on arbitrary image regions by supplying sketches, reference images, and text prompts.

Among the four baseline models we compare, Paint-by-Example (Yang et al. 2023) and MagicQuill (Liu et al. 2024b) are evaluated using their official recommended settings. The other two models are integrated versions of IP-Adapter (Ye et al. 2023) and ControlNet (Zhang, Rao,

Algorithm 2: Interactive Image Editing System

Input: Canvas C , Mask M , Sketch S , Reference R , Prompt P

Output: Final canvas C_{curr}

```

1: Initialize previous canvas:  $C_{\text{prev}} = \text{InitCanvas}()$ 
2: Initialize current canvas:  $C_{\text{curr}} = C_{\text{prev}}$ 
3: while True do
4:   Get user input:  $I_{\text{user}} = \text{GetUserInput}()$ 
5:   if  $I_{\text{user}} == \text{"break"}$  then
6:     break
7:   end if
8:   Extract current mask:  $M_{\text{cur}} = I_{\text{user}}[\text{mask}]$ 
9:   Extract current sketch:  $S_{\text{cur}} = I_{\text{user}}[\text{sketch}]$ 
10:  Extract current reference:  $R_{\text{cur}} = I_{\text{user}}[\text{ref}]$ 
11:  Extract current prompt:  $P_{\text{cur}} = I_{\text{user}}[\text{prompt}]$ 
12:   $C_{\text{temp}} = \text{Inference}(M_{\text{cur}}, S_{\text{cur}}, R_{\text{cur}}, P_{\text{cur}})$ 
13:  Display result to user:  $\text{Display}(C_{\text{temp}})$ 
14:  Get user confirmation:  $\text{conf} = \text{GetConfirm}()$ 
15:  if  $\text{conf} == \text{True}$  then
16:    Update previous canvas:  $C_{\text{prev}} = C_{\text{curr}}$ 
17:    Update current canvas:  $C_{\text{curr}} = C_{\text{temp}}$ 
18:  else
19:    Revert to current canvas:  $C_{\text{temp}} = C_{\text{curr}}$ 
20:  end if
21: end while
22: return Final canvas  $C_{\text{curr}}$ 

```

and Agrawala 2023), with the primary difference lying in the type of condition input used by ControlNet. Specifically, ControlNet-Inpaint and ControlNet-Scribble are both based on Stable Diffusion 1.5, as determined by the pretrained weights provided by their official sources.

User Study. To further demonstrate the superiority of our method, we randomly select 50 generated samples and recruit 35 volunteers to rank the editing and generation quality of both state-of-the-art methods and ours across three aspects: text alignment, style consistency, and visual quality. As shown in Table 2, the edited oil paintings produced by PaintFlow are consistently preferred in all three aspects.

Table 2: User study results summarized from rankings of 35 volunteers. Our model ranks first in all three metric.

Methods	Semantic↓	Style↓	Quality↓
IPA.+SDC.-Inpaint	2.77	2.80	2.86
IPA.+SDC.-Scribble	4.03	3.61	3.79
Paint-by-Example	2.63	4.51	4.26
MagicQuill	4.01	2.43	2.54
Ours	1.57	1.66	1.54

More Qualitative Comparison Results. We provide extensive qualitative comparisons with state-of-the-art methods in Fig 7 and Fig 8, alongside further ablation study results in Fig 9. Finally, we demonstrate high-resolution paintings generated by our method in Fig 10.

































	Input Condition		Result Comparison					Original Image
Rose								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	
River								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	
Mountain								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	
Woman								
	Mask+Sketch	Reference	IP.C.SD-Inpaint	IP.C.SD-Scribble	P-E	MagicQuill	Ours	

Figure 7: More qualitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods.




Figure 8: More Oil Flow Painting Process.




Figure 9: Ablation study results.




Figure 10: Oil paintings editing through our method.