

EmoEdit: Evoking Emotions through Image Manipulation

Jingyuan Yang¹, Jiawei Feng¹, Weibin Luo¹, Dani Lischinski², Daniel Cohen-Or³, Hui Huang^{1*}
¹Shenzhen University ²The Hebrew University of Jerusalem ³Tel Aviv University
 {jingyuanyang.jyy, fengjiawei0909, waibunlok, danix3d, cohenor, hhzhiyan}@gmail.com




Figure 1. Affective Image Manipulation with EmoEdit, which seeks to modify a user-provided image to evoke specific emotional responses from viewers.

Abstract

Affective Image Manipulation (AIM) seeks to modify user-provided images to evoke specific emotional responses. This task is inherently complex due to its twofold objective: significantly evoking the intended emotion, while preserving the original image composition. Existing AIM methods primarily adjust color and style, often failing to elicit precise and profound emotional shifts. Drawing on psychological insights, we extend AIM by incorporating content modifications to enhance emotional impact. We introduce EmoEdit, a novel two-stage framework comprising emotion attribution and image editing. In the emotion attribution stage, we leverage a Vision-Language Model (VLM) to create hierarchies of semantic factors that represent abstract emotions. In the image editing stage, the VLM identifies the most relevant factors for the provided image, and guides a generative editing model to perform affective modifications. A ranking technique that we developed selects the best edit, balancing between emotion fidelity and structure integrity. To validate EmoEdit, we assembled a dataset of 416 images, categorized into positive, negative, and neutral

classes. Our method is evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively, demonstrating superior performance compared to existing state-of-the-art techniques. Additionally, we showcase EmoEdit’s potential in various manipulation tasks, including emotion-oriented and semantics-oriented editing.

1. Introduction

“The emotion expressed by wordless simplicity is the most abundant.”

–William Shakespeare

Emotions weave through our daily lives, deeply intertwined with our perception of the world. Among myriad factors, visual stimuli stand out as particularly influential in shaping our emotional state. The emerging field of Visual Emotion Analysis (VEA) [24, 38, 40] explores the intricate connections between visuals and human emotions, with applications ranging from advertising to robotics. In the arts, profound emotional responses have long been elicited via manipulation of various visual elements. This prompts an intriguing question: whether and how can we deliberately alter an image to steer the viewer’s emotional experience?

*Corresponding author




Figure 2. While DALL-E 3 conveys emotions well, IP2P remains faithful to original structure, neither approach satisfies both aspects. EmoEdit fills this gap by creating images with both emotion fidelity and structure preservation.

This paper addresses the task of Affective Image Manipulation (AIM), which involves modifying a user-provided input image to evoke specific emotional responses in viewers, as depicted in Fig. 1. This task poses considerable challenges, requiring the automatic selection of appropriate visual elements suited for the image at hand, and integrating them in an emotionally resonant manner, while striving to maintain the original composition of the image.

Current state-of-the-art generative models, while proficient in various image editing tasks, often fail to adequately balance AIM’s contradictory objectives. For instance, DALL-E 3 [1] effectively conveys target emotions but commonly disrupts the original image structure, as shown in Fig. 2. Conversely, InstructPix2Pix (IP2P) [3] remains faithful to the structure but lacks in emotional expressiveness.

Previous approaches in AIM focused primarily on adjusting color and style [7, 15, 31, 33], but these methods struggle to evoke precise and significant emotion shifts, and some are limited to binary emotion categories (positive and negative). In contrast, our approach, inspired by psychological studies [4], extends beyond color and style adjustments to perform substantive modifications of relevant content. Furthermore, we use the eight emotion categories introduced by Mikels *et al.* [18], to achieve more precise control over the emotions conveyed.

Specifically, we introduce EmoEdit, a novel two-stage framework comprising *emotion attribution* and *image editing*. In the emotion attribution stage, we cluster and fil-

ter the affective images in the recently introduced EmoSet dataset [38] and task a Vision-Language Model (VLM) to compile summaries of semantic content and color characteristics for each cluster. This process results in the creation of eight hierarchies of semantic emotion evoking stimuli, which we refer to as *emotion factor trees*, one for each emotion category. These factor trees enable the mapping of abstract emotion categories to concrete semantic descriptions.

In the subsequent image editing stage, given an input image, we again employ a VLM to identify the most relevant factor tree summaries and generate tailored instructions for modifying the image at hand via a generative editing model, specifically IP2P. To refine the editing process and produce more convincing results, we have developed a ranking technique that selects the most effective edit in terms of balancing emotion fidelity with structure preservation.

In summary, given one of the eight emotion categories as a target, EmoEdit generates an emotion-evoking, contextually fitting, and structurally faithful variant of a user-provided input image. To validate our method, we assembled a dataset of 416 images, categorized into neutral, positive, and negative emotion classes, from various online sources. We use this dataset to compare our method quantitatively and qualitatively with several state-of-the-art editing methods including: global, local, and emotion-related. Our evaluation metrics assess three aspects: pixel-wise similarity, semantic similarity and faithfulness to the target emotion. Finally, we demonstrate EmoEdit’s potential using a few applications of semantic-oriented and emotion-oriented editing tasks.

2. Related Work

2.1. Visual Emotion Analysis

Over the past two decades, researchers in VEA have focused on a pivotal inquiry: What evokes visual emotions? Responses have varied, ranging from low-level features like color and texture [13, 16, 25, 44] to high-level content and style [2, 25, 37, 39, 44]. Lee *et al.* [13] propose an approach to evaluate visual emotions by constructing prototypical color images for each emotion. Drawing inspiration from psychology and art theory, Machajdik *et al.* [16] extract and combine color and texture features for emotion classification. A significant milestone in this field was achieved by Borth *et al.* [2], who constructed a comprehensive visual sentiment ontology named SentiBank, where each concept is represented by an Adjective-Noun Pair (ANP). This work marked a pivotal advancement in considering high-level semantic features in VEA. The advent of deep learning has substantially improved classification accuracy in VEA. Rao *et al.* [25] introduced MldrNet, a model that predicts emotions by combining pixel-level, aesthetic, and semantic features. To develop a comprehensive representation for emo-




Figure 3. Affective Image Manipulation with EmoEdit. Given an input image and the target emotion (*contentment* in this example), a set of instruction prompts are generated, a VLM refers to the emotion factor tree to select the most relevant factors for the image, and generates several alternative editing instructions. Each instruction is fed to IP2P to yield a different edit candidate, and a ranking technique selects the best one among them.

tion recognition, Zhang *et al.* [44] integrated content and style information. Yang *et al.* explored networks based on different visual stimuli, including color, objects, and facial expressions [39], and further investigated the correlations between objects and scenes [37]. Previous studies have demonstrated the correlation between emotion and various visual elements. However, to establish a stronger causal relationship, image manipulation is necessary. By introducing specific visual elements to the input image and observing how the emotion varies, we can gain deeper insights into understanding emotions.

2.2. Text-driven Image Manipulation

Recent years have witnessed a meteoric rise in generative models, ranging from GANs [9], VAEs [12], normalizing flows [26], and diffusion models [6, 11, 27]. Image manipulation encompasses various tasks, including, *e.g.*, image colorization [42], object addition/removal [10, 34], background replacement [30], action change [19] and style transfer [29]. Methods in text-driven image manipulation can be grouped into global [17, 29, 34] and local [3, 8, 19, 21, 30]. A pioneering work, SDEdit [17] leverages stochastic differential equations for guided image synthesis. CycleDiff [34] unifying cycle consistency and diffusion models for effective image translation. PnP [29] is further introduced to enable semantic editing through condition-controlled guidance. To modify images in a more fine-grained manner, researchers have also explored local editing. EDICT [30] edits images using explicit dual diffusion processes while NTI [19] enables fine-grained local image editing through inversion of diffusion models. Pix2Pix-Zero [21] allows for zero-shot editing of images without training on paired data. InsDiff [8] and InstructPix2Pix (IP2P) [3] allow users to edit specific regions of images by

giving instructions. Further, BlipDiffusion [14] integrates VLM with diffusion models for precise visual region modification. Existing editing methods can effectively manipulate concrete concepts but face challenges when dealing with more abstract emotions. Translating emotions into tangible prompts remains a challenging problem. In EmoEdit, we extract statistical data from EmoSet and create emotion factor trees, aiming at bridging the *affective gap*.

2.3. Affective Image Manipulation

Most of the previous works in AIM can be grouped into color-based [5, 15, 22, 31, 35, 45] and style-based [7, 28, 33]. Yang *et al.* [35] pioneered the application of color transfer in image emotion manipulation, dividing the color spectrum into 24 distinct moods. Given an emotion word, Wang *et al.* [31] automatically adjusts image color to meet a desired emotion and Liu *et al.* [15] further exploit deep learning technique to build an end-to-end network. Peng *et al.* [22] propose a method to transfer the color and texture of the target image to the source image, to make modify emotions. Recent methods, such as CLVA [7] and AIF [33] reflect emotions derived from textual input by adjusting both the color and style of the original image. Most previous studies have focused on adjusting color and style to elicit specific emotions. However, psychologists have demonstrated that image content is a critical emotional stimuli [4]. In light of this, we introduce a novel method, EmoEdit, which seeks to evoke visual emotions by manipulating both content and color.

3. Method

As shown in Fig. 3, given a user-provided image and a desired emotion category, EmoEdit generates an output with emotion fidelity, contextual fit and structure integrity. The




Figure 4. Overview of Emotion attribution. Given *contentment* images, EmoEdit constructs an emotion factor tree with diverse content-color summaries. For clarity, we only present the content summary as leaf nodes.

process involves two stages: emotion attribution and image editing. We first construct emotion factor trees to map abstract emotions to tangible visual elements, depicted in Fig. 4. We then perform effective image editing with the assistance of the IP2P and GPT-4V.

3.1. Emotion Attribution

Unlike general image manipulation tasks, AIM poses significant challenges due to the highly abstract nature of emotions and the lack of paired data. For instance, it is much easier to add a *dog* on the grass than to modify an image to elicit *excitement* in viewers. This raises an important question: how can emotions be mapped to descriptive textual prompts?

Semantic Clustering EmoSet is a recently introduced large-scale visual emotion dataset [38] featuring rich attributes. However, attribute labels in EmoSet are limited. While some important emotion elements are not comprehensively labeled (e.g., firework, ghost), the single-word labels may restrict the expressiveness of emotions. For example, while a blooming “flower” might evoke excitement, a wilted “flower” might evoke sadness. Consequently, we conduct clustering on EmoSet to identify the common visual cues for each emotion. Given the significant correlation between emotions and semantics [4], we experimented with semantic embeddings generated by CLIP [23] and DINOv2 [20]. We observed that, for our purposes, CLIP captures visual semantics more effectively and eventually chose it for clustering. As shown in Algorithm 1, we first initialize each cluster with an image, followed by iteratively merging two clusters with the highest similarities until all inter-cluster similarities are below 0.89.

Emotion Filtering However, due to its unsupervised nature, the clustering results are not consistently perfect. Consequently, we implement several post-processing steps to eliminate emotion-agnostic clusters, as depicted in Fig. 4. Clusters containing fewer than five images are deemed unimportant for the associated emotion category. Additionally, clusters with images exhibiting excessive similarity at the pixel level are considered inadequate as generalized semantic factors. To enhance the efficacy of emotion editing, we exclude clusters that fail to evoke emotion. Detailed steps of the filtering process are outlined in Algorithm 1.

Emotion Factor Tree Following the clustering and filtering procedures, N clusters remain, designated as emotion factors for each category. Recognizing the significance of both content and color in visual emotion, we employ GPT-4V to assign a content-color summary to each factor and categorize them into different types: object, scene, action, and facial expression. For instance, referring to factor 1 as depicted in Fig. 4, its content is characterized as “Reading books,” its color described as “Daylight, cold,” and it is classified under the “Action” category. In Fig. 4, the emotion factor tree is structured hierarchically, where a variety of visual elements at the leaf nodes can evoke specific emotions at the root node. EmoSet comprises eight distinct emotions [18], for each of which a specific factor tree is constructed. These emotions include *amusement*, *awe*, *contentment*, *excitement*, *anger*, *disgust*, *fear*, and *sadness*. For more details, please refer to the supplementary material.

3.2. Image Editing

The emotion factor tree establishes connections between abstract emotional states and concrete semantic and visual elements. The next challenge is to modify a specific image so as to evoke the target emotion, while accounting for the

ALGORITHM 1: Emotion Attribution Algorithm

Input: M images: $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$
Output: K clusters: $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_K\}$; N factors :
 $C' = \{C'_1, \dots, C'_N\}$

Step 1: Semantic Clustering
Extract CLIP feature for each image:
 $f_m = CLIP_{visual}(x_m)$;
Initialize M clusters each with an image: $C_m = \{f_m\}$;
Calculate similarity matrix $S(i, j) = sim(C_i, C_j)$;
while $\max(S(i, j)) \geq 0.89$ **do**
 Merge clusters in $a, b = arg \max(S(i, j))$ as a new cluster c ;
 Calculate the centroid of cluster c ;
 Update similarity matrix S ;
end
return K clusters: $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_K\}$

Step 2: Emotion Filtering
Initialize emotion factor index: $n = 0$;
for $k = 1$ to K **do**
 if $|C_k| \geq 5$ **then**
 Calculate averaged similarity:
 $s_k = \frac{1}{|C_k|} \sum_{i,j=1}^{|C_k|} (sim(f_k^i, f_k^j))$;
 if $s_k \leq 0.89$ **then**
 Calculate averaged emotion score:
 $e_k = \frac{1}{|C_k|} \sum_{i=1}^{|C_k|} (F_{emo}(f_k^i))$;
 F_{emo} is a pre-trained emotion classifier;
 if $e_k \geq 0.3$ **then**
 cluster k survives the filtering process:
 $C'_n = C_k$;
 end
 end
 end
end
return N factors: $C' = \{C'_1, \dots, C'_N\}$

image content, and retaining the existing image structure, as much as possible. We first leverage GPT-4V again, to select the emotion factors that fit best the content of the user-provided image, and to generate editing instructions for incorporating these factors into the image. Next, IP2P is employed to execute the necessary image manipulations. Finally, a ranking technique is applied to select the best edit, considering both emotion fidelity and structure integrity.

Factor Selection In most editing tasks, specific directives are often provided, such as “replace the cat with a tiger”. In contrast, our task involves editing user-provided images with unknown and variable content. Furthermore, the multitude of potential emotion factors complicates the selection process. Matching the proper emotion factor to the given image content is essential for producing meaningful edits. For instance, while “surfing on the sea” can evoke *excitement*, this factor most likely would not fit well to an input image depicting a living room. We thus leverage the power

of a VLM (GPT-4V) to identify the most contextually suitable emotion factor for each image. Specifically, given an input image and a target emotion, we instruct GPT-4V to identify the top-5 related emotion factors and to generate, for each factor, two tailored edit instructions concerning content and color (see Fig. 3). For example, if the given image shows a living room and the desired emotion is *contentment*, GPT-4V might choose the factor “cozy sofa” and generate the instruction: “Place a cozy sofa on the floor with some pillows”. For color, it might recommend: “Adjust the color scheme to warmer tones”.

Instruction-based Editing As EmoEdit is a training-free method, we leverage an existing state-of-the-art method, namely IP2P [3], to carry out the two editing instructions (content and color) one after the other. By addressing content and color separately, we enhance the precision of each modification and enable nuanced adjustments to the color based on content variations. Our ablation studies, detailed in Section 4, underscore the critical roles of both content and color in this process. Notably, the instructions for content and color are paired, derived from the summaries from the corresponding emotion factor tree. For instance, “colorful flowers” typically evoke *contentment*, whereas “colorful swam” might be perceived as unusual, highlighting the significance of the paired instruction format. Following this instruction-based editing method, we generate five distinct edits for a single input, which then compete as candidates for the final selection.

Ranking As an emotion-oriented task, EmoEdit is designed to elicit specific emotional responses from viewers. Concurrently, as an image editing task, EmoEdit aims to maintain the overall structure of the input image. Consequently, we use emotion fidelity and structure integrity as criteria to find the best edit. Recognizing the layered nature of emotions, we first construct a hierarchical emotion filter comprising two classifiers: one with eight categories and another based on two polarities. Images accurately categorized by the 8-category classifier are given the highest priority in output. In instances where images fail the 8-category classification yet succeed in the 2-polarity assessment, they are designated as secondary priority. Should images not meet criteria under either classifier, they are then output with third priority. Subsequently, these filtered images are evaluated by an SSIM score regressor to determine their rank, yielding the finest edit. Through this process, EmoEdit reliably produces images that are emotionally resonant, contextually appropriate, and structurally intact.

Table 1. Comparisons with the state-of-the-art methods on global editing, local editing and style-based AIM methods. Six metrics are used, encompassing pixel-level, semantic-level, and emotion-level evaluations.

Method	PSNR \uparrow	SSIM \uparrow	LPIPS \downarrow	CLIP-I \uparrow	Emo-A \uparrow	Emo-S \uparrow
SDEdit [17]	15.41	0.415	0.460	0.639	38.07%	0.220
PnP [29]	14.39	0.435	<u>0.381</u>	0.850	23.83%	0.095
InsDiff [8]	10.74	0.319	0.506	0.796	19.10%	0.059
P2P-zero [21]	13.75	0.451	0.545	0.685	20.24%	0.066
ControlNet [41]	12.04	0.296	0.600	0.687	36.33%	0.215
BlipDiff [14]	8.99	0.249	0.654	0.811	18.07%	0.045
CLVA [7]	12.62	0.398	0.479	0.758	14.22%	0.018
AIF [33]	14.08	<u>0.539</u>	0.492	0.828	12.74%	0.003
EmoEdit	16.01	0.561	0.300	<u>0.832</u>	64.16%	0.363

4. Results

4.1. Dataset and Evaluation

Dataset There are no publicly available datasets designed specifically for the AIM task. We collected 416 real images as a test set for EmoEdit, sourced from user and artist uploads on the Internet*. To ensure greater diversity in AIM, our data comprises positive, negative and neutral images, categorized by a pre-trained emotion classifier on EmoSet [38]. Our method is adaptable to any user-provided images without requiring additional training.

Evaluation Metrics Given the multiple objectives of AIM, we assess our method based on three aspects: pixel-level (PSNR, SSIM), semantic-level (LPIPS, CLIP-I) and emotion-level (Emo-A, Emo-S). PSNR measures the reconstruction quality by comparing the pixel-by-pixel similarity between the original and edited images, indicating the level of noise and distortion introduced during the manipulation process. SSIM [32] evaluates the perceptual quality of images by comparing low-level structural information, luminance, and contrast. LPIPS [43] leverages deep learning models to assess the perceptual similarity between images. CLIP image score (CLIP-I) [23] measures the semantic similarity between the original and edited images, ensuring the edits align with human perception and maintain contextual relevance. Emotion accuracy (Emo-A) [36] assesses how well the edited image matches the targeted emotion, utilizing a pre-trained emotion classifier. AIM is a more challenging task than emotion generation because it requires both preserving structure and evoking emotions. Therefore, we also introduce a new metric to evaluate the increase in predicted scores for the desired emotion type, called the Emotion Incremental Score (Emo-S). For more details, please refer to the supplementary material.

*<https://www.pexels.com/>



Figure 5. Ablation study on methodology. Content and color modification, along with ranking technique, are demonstrated to be vital.

4.2. Comparisons

Since EmoEdit is the first attempt at content editing in AIM, we compare our method with relevant state-of-the-art techniques. These include global editing methods: SDEdit [17], PnP [29], local editing methods: InsDiff [8], P2P-zero [21], ControlNet [41], BlipDiff [14] and style-based AIM methods: CLVA [7], AIF [33].

Qualitative Comparisons We present the qualitative results in Fig. 8. EmoEdit excels in both preserving structures and evoking emotions compared to other methods. Most compared methods lack sufficient emotion knowledge, resulting in image distortion and severe artifacts. Methods like SDEdit and InsDiff possess a certain level of emotional understanding, attempting to show people with amusement or excitement. However, they struggle to choose contextually appropriate content for the given image and are limited to a single emotion factor. Both CLVA and AIF are emotion style transfer methods that transform realistic images into various artistic styles reflecting different emotions, but they are less flexible in altering the emotional content of the images.

Quantitative Comparisons In Table 1, EmoEdit outperforms other methods across various metrics. Due to a lack of emotion knowledge, most methods perform poorly on emotion-level metrics, with only 38.07% versus 64.16% in Emo-A, and 0.220 versus 0.363 in Emo-S. One of the biggest challenges in AIM is balancing emotion fidelity with structure integrity. However, aside from emotion-level metrics, EmoEdit also achieves the best results in pixel-level metrics like PSNR and SSIM. For CLIP-I, EmoEdit



Figure 6. Ablation study on image guidance scale. EmoEdit can progressively edit an input image to different emotion polarities, both positive and negative.

ranks second, slightly behind PnP, likely because content changes can decrease semantic similarity. Among all compared methods, global editing techniques SDEdit and PnP perform relatively well, possibly because emotion effects are more global rather than local. CLVA and AIF aim to evoke emotions through various artistic styles, effectively preserving image structure but are limited to realistic emotion expression.

User Study We conducted a user study to assess whether humans prefer our method. We invited 54 participants of various ages, with each session lasting about 15 minutes. The study included 40 sets of images, each featuring an original image alongside four edited versions from different methods: SDEdit, P2P-zero, BlipDiffusion, and EmoEdit. Participants were shown a set of images and asked three questions: 1) Which image best preserves the structure? 2) Which image most strongly evokes the targeted emotion? 3) Which image achieves the best balance between structure and emotion? Participants could choose one out of the four options and we calculate the vote percentage for each question. Results in Table 2 show that EmoEdit is the most preferred choice in all questions. Despite the challenge of maintaining structure while conveying emotions, EmoEdit received the highest votes for both aspects. In terms of balance, EmoEdit shows a clear advantage with 87.15% support, confirming that our method aligns with human perceptions.

4.3. Ablation study

Methodology In Fig. 5, we evaluate the effectiveness of several key network designs in EmoEdit, including content instruction, color instruction and ranking technique. It can be observed that both content and color are crucial visual elements to evoke emotions, with content serving as the

Table 2. User preference study. The numbers indicate the percentage of participants who vote for the result.

Method	Structure integrity \uparrow	Emotion fidelity \uparrow	Balance \uparrow
SDEdit [17]	10.56 \pm 8.05%	19.17 \pm 8.87%	5.28 \pm 12.07%
P2P-zero [21]	2.64 \pm 2.43%	8.52 \pm 7.66%	1.58 \pm 3.01%
BlipDiff [14]	18.06 \pm 19.68%	10.46 \pm 6.84%	6.00 \pm 12.02%
EmoEdit	68.75\pm23.86%	61.85\pm16.84%	87.15\pm19.89%

foundation and color providing further adjustments. Additionally, ranking technique is essential for selecting the best edit by maintaining structure and evoking emotions. For example, in the case of *fear*, content instruction replaces flowers with creepy doll heads, and color instruction gives the entire image a gloomy atmosphere. While pumpkins heads are scary, creepy dolls evoke a greater sense of fear.

Guidance scale We show EmoEdit’s editing results with variations in image guidance scale in Fig. 6. The middle image represents the input, while the left and right images illustrate different guidance scales for two emotion polarities: positive and negative. Taking the first image as an example, a race car may evoke *excitement*, while dead branches and dark lighting can create a sense of *fear*. We observe that as the image guidance scale decreases, emotion intensity increases while structure preservation diminishes. Although evoking emotion and preserving structure are often contradictory, our method effectively balances them, as demonstrated in Table 1 and Table 2. Users can customize the level of manipulation by adjusting guidance scale to suit their needs and preferences.

4.4. Applications

Multiple emotion directions Given an input image, EmoEdit can manipulate it to evoke different emotions by




Figure 7. EmoEdit can modify a given image across eight different emotional directions, with various factors represented within each specific emotion category.

selecting appropriate emotion factors. As illustrated in Fig. 7, taking the window as an example, squirrels may evoke *amusement*, the aurora elicits *awe*, fire incites *anger* and ghost evokes *fear*. Furthermore, each emotional direction is illustrated with various visual elements, showcasing the diversity of emotion factor trees. For example, emotion factors like surfing on the sea, floating balloons, and beautiful fireworks may evoke *excitement*, while tombstones, ruined architecture, and shabby houses elicit *sadness*.

Diverse editing results In Fig. 9, we present diverse editing results of EmoSet. From an editing perspective, the results can be categorized into low-level (light, color, texture), mid-level (object, scene), and high-level (action and facial expression) changes. From an emotional perspective, the results can be summarized as emotion-generation, emotion-variation, and emotion-enhancement editing. For example, in mid-level editing, adding flowers to the doorway can evoke *contentment*, turning peaceful dog to fierce tiger can induce *anger*, and replacing the night sky with majestic canyon can evoke *awe*. In emotion-enhancement editing, adding balloons can increase *amusement*, while transforming a grassland under a blue sky into a sea view at sunset brings more *awe*.

5. Conclusions

We have introduced EmoEdit, a method for evoking emotions by modifying the content and color of images. EmoEdit constructs an emotion factor tree comprising various visual elements. For a given input image, we use VLM and IP2P to generate edit candidates and employ a ranking technique to select the best edits. Our method is evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively, demonstrating a strong balance between structure preservation and emo-

tion faithfulness. A user study confirms the effectiveness of EmoEdit, and various applications highlight its significant potential.

In the real world, there are many emotion factors beyond those included in our constructed emotion factor tree. Our method relies heavily on EmoSet, so the limited data can introduce some bias and constraints. Exploring a wider range of emotion factors would enhance the richness and effectiveness of the editing results. Additionally, the fixed filter and score ranker in EmoEdit’s ranking technique can limit its effectiveness. Since AIM is a highly human-involved task, incorporating human interaction in future work would provide users with greater flexibility, enabling them to tailor the editing process to their personal tastes and preferences.

References

- [1] James Betker, Gabriel Goh, Li Jing, Tim Brooks, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Long Ouyang, Juntang Zhuang, Joyce Lee, Yufei Guo, Wesam Manassra, Prafulla Dhariwal, Casey Chu, Yunxin Jiao, and Aditya Ramesh. 2023. *Improving image generation with better captions*. Technical Report. OpenAI. 2
- [2] Damian Borth, Rongrong Ji, Tao Chen, Thomas Breuel, and Shih-Fu Chang. 2013. Large-scale visual sentiment ontology and detectors using adjective noun pairs. In *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. on Multimedia*. 223–232. 2
- [3] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. 2023. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 18392–18402. 2, 3, 5
- [4] Tobias Brosch, Gilles Pourtois, and David Sander. 2010. The perception and categorisation of emotional stimuli: A review. *Cognition and Emotion* 24, 3 (2010), 377–400. 2, 3, 4
- [5] Tianlang Chen, Wei Xiong, Haitian Zheng, and Jiebo Luo.

2020. Image sentiment transfer. In *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. on Multimedia*. 4407–4415. [3](#)
- [6] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. 2021. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. *Proc. Conf. on Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 8780–8794. [3](#)
- [7] Tsu-Jui Fu, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2022. Language-driven artistic style transfer. In *Proc. Euro. Conf. on Computer Vision*. 717–734. [2, 3, 6](#)
- [8] Zigang Geng, Binxin Yang, Tiankai Hang, Chen Li, Shuyang Gu, Ting Zhang, Jianmin Bao, Zheng Zhang, Han Hu, Dong Chen, and Baining Guo. 2023. Instructdiffusion: A generalist modeling interface for vision tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03895* (2023). [3, 6](#)
- [9] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Generative adversarial nets. *Proc. Conf. on Neural Information Processing Systems* 27 (2014). [3](#)
- [10] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. 2022. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross attention control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01626* (2022). [3](#)
- [11] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. 2020. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Proc. Conf. on Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 6840–6851. [3](#)
- [12] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. 2013. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114* (2013). [3](#)
- [13] Joonwhoan Lee and EunJong Park. 2011. Fuzzy similarity-based emotional classification of color images. *IEEE Trans. on Multimedia* 13, 5 (2011), 1031–1039. [2](#)
- [14] Dongxu Li, Junnan Li, and Steven Hoi. 2024. Blip-diffusion: Pre-trained subject representation for controllable text-to-image generation and editing. *Proc. Conf. on Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024). [3, 6, 7](#)
- [15] Da Liu, Yaxi Jiang, Min Pei, and Shiguang Liu. 2018. Emotional image color transfer via deep learning. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 110 (2018), 16–22. [2, 3](#)
- [16] Jana Machajdik and Allan Hanbury. 2010. Affective image classification using features inspired by psychology and art theory. In *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. on Multimedia*. 83–92. [2](#)
- [17] Chenlin Meng, Yutong He, Yang Song, Jiaming Song, Jiajun Wu, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Stefano Ermon. 2021. Sdedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01073* (2021). [3, 6, 7](#)
- [18] Joseph A Mikels, Barbara L Fredrickson, Gregory R Larkin, Casey M Lindberg, Sam J Maglio, and Patricia A Reuter-Lorenz. 2005. Emotional category data on images from the International Affective Picture System. *Behavior research methods* 37, 4 (2005), 626–630. [2, 4](#)
- [19] Ron Mokady, Amir Hertz, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. 2023. Null-text inversion for editing real images using guided diffusion models. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 6038–6047. [3](#)
- [20] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Mahmoud Assran, Nicolas Ballas, Wojciech Galuba, Russell Howes, Po-Yao Huang, Shang-Wen Li, Ishan Misra, Michael Rabbat, Vasu Sharma, Gabriel Synnaeve, Hu Xu, Hervé Jegou, Julien Mairal, Patrick Labatut, Armand Joulin, and Piotr Bojanowski. 2023. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193* (2023). [4](#)
- [21] Gaurav Parmar, Krishna Kumar Singh, Richard Zhang, Yijun Li, Jingwan Lu, and Jun-Yan Zhu. 2023. Zero-shot image-to-image translation. In *Proc. SIGGRAPH*. 1–11. [3, 6, 7](#)
- [22] Kuan-Chuan Peng, Tsuhan Chen, Amir Sadovnik, and Andrew C Gallagher. 2015. A mixed bag of emotions: Model, predict, and transfer emotion distributions. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 860–868. [3](#)
- [23] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning*. 8748–8763. [4, 6](#)
- [24] Tianrong Rao, Xiaoxu Li, and Min Xu. 2016. Learning multi-level deep representations for image emotion classification. *Neural Processing Letters* (2016), 1–19. [1](#)
- [25] Tianrong Rao, Xiaoxu Li, and Min Xu. 2020. Learning multi-level deep representations for image emotion classification. *Neural Processing Letters* 51 (2020), 2043–2061. [2](#)
- [26] Danilo Rezende and Shakir Mohamed. 2015. Variational inference with normalizing flows. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning*. 1530–1538. [3](#)
- [27] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 10684–10695. [3](#)
- [28] Shikun Sun, Jia Jia, Haozhe Wu, Zijie Ye, and Junliang Xing. 2023. MSNet: A Deep Architecture Using Multi-Sentiment Semantics for Sentiment-Aware Image Style Transfer. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech & Signal Processing*. 1–5. [3](#)
- [29] Narek Tumanyan, Michal Geyer, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. 2023. Plug-and-play diffusion features for text-driven image-to-image translation. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 1921–1930. [3, 6](#)
- [30] Bram Wallace, Akash Gokul, and Nikhil Naik. 2023. Edict: Exact diffusion inversion via coupled transformations. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 22532–22541. [3](#)
- [31] Xiaohui Wang, Jia Jia, and Lianhong Cai. 2013. Affective image adjustment with a single word. *The Visual Computer* 29 (2013), 1121–1133. [2, 3](#)
- [32] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. 2004. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing* 13, 4 (2004), 600–612. [6](#)

- [33] Shuchen Weng, Peixuan Zhang, Zheng Chang, Xinlong Wang, Si Li, and Boxin Shi. 2023. Affective Image Filter: Reflecting Emotions from Text to Images. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*. 10810–10819. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [34] Chen Henry Wu and Fernando De la Torre. 2022. Unifying Diffusion Models’ Latent Space, with Applications to CycleDiffusion and Guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05559* (2022). [3](#)
- [35] Chuan-Kai Yang and Li-Kai Peng. 2008. Automatic mood-transferring between color images. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 28, 2 (2008), 52–61. [3](#)
- [36] Jingyuan Yang, Jiawei Feng, and Hui Huang. 2024. EmoGen: Emotional Image Content Generation with Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04608* (2024). [6](#)
- [37] Jingyuan Yang, Xinbo Gao, Leida Li, Xiumei Wang, and Jinshan Ding. 2021. SOLVER: Scene-Object Interrelated Visual Emotion Reasoning Network. *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing* 30 (2021), 8686–8701. [2](#), [3](#)
- [38] Jingyuan Yang, Qirui Huang, Tingting Ding, Dani Lischinski, Danny Cohen-Or, and Hui Huang. 2023. EmoSet: A Large-scale Visual Emotion Dataset with Rich Attributes. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*. 20383–20394. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [39] Jingyuan Yang, Jie Li, Xiumei Wang, Yuxuan Ding, and Xinbo Gao. 2021. Stimuli-aware visual emotion analysis. *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing* 30 (2021), 7432–7445. [2](#), [3](#)
- [40] Jufeng Yang, Dongyu She, Yu-Kun Lai, Paul L Rosin, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. 2018. Weakly supervised coupled networks for visual sentiment analysis. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 7584–7592. [1](#)
- [41] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. 2023. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computer Vision*. 3836–3847. [6](#)
- [42] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, and Alexei A Efros. 2016. Colorful image colorization. In *Proc. Euro. Conf. on Computer Vision*. 649–666. [3](#)
- [43] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. 2018. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition*. 586–595. [6](#)
- [44] Wei Zhang, Xuanyu He, and Weizhi Lu. 2019. Exploring discriminative representations for image emotion recognition with CNNs. *IEEE Trans. on Multimedia* 22, 2 (2019), 515–523. [2](#), [3](#)
- [45] Siqi Zhu, Chunmei Qing, Canqiang Chen, and Xiangmin Xu. 2023. Emotional generative adversarial network for image emotion transfer. *Expert Systems with Applications* 216 (2023), 119485. [3](#)




Figure 8. Comparison with the state-of-the-art methods on eight emotion categories, where EmoEdit surpasses others on emotion fidelity and structure integrity.




Figure 9. EmoEdit offers diverse editing results, including low-level, mid-level, and high-level editing, as well as emotion-generation, emotion-variation, and emotion-enhancement editing.