
COMBINING GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) AND THE INTERNET: HEADING TOWARDS EVOLUTION OR DEGRADATION?

Gonzalo Martínez

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
28911 Madrid, Spain
gonzmart@pa.uc3m.es

Lauren Watson

School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh
lauren.watson@ed.ac.uk

Pedro Reviriego

Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
28040 Madrid, Spain
pedro.reviriego@upm.es

José Alberto Hernández

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
28911 Madrid, Spain
jahgutie@it.uc3m.es

Marc Juarez

School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh
mjuarez@inf.ed.ac.uk

Rik Sarkar

School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh
rsarkar@inf.ed.ac.uk

March 3, 2023

ABSTRACT

In the span of a few months, generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools that can generate realistic images or text have taken the Internet by storm, making them one of the technologies with fastest adoption ever. Some of these generative AI tools such as DALL-E, MidJourney, or ChatGPT have gained wide public notoriety. Interestingly, these tools are possible because of the massive amount of data (text and images) scraped from Internet sites. Now, these generative AI tools are creating massive amounts of new data that are being fed into the Internet. Therefore, future versions of generative AI tools will be trained with Internet data that is a mix of original and AI-generated data. As time goes on, increasing volumes of data generated by different versions of AI will populate the Internet.

This raises a few intriguing questions: how will future versions of generative AI tools behave when trained on a mixture of real and AI generated data? Will they evolve and improve with the new data sets or degenerate? Will evolution introduce biases in subsequent generations of generative AI tools? In this document, we explore these questions and report some initial simulation results using a simple image-generation AI tool. These results suggest that the quality of the generated images degrades as more AI-generated data is used for training thus suggesting that generative AI may degenerate. Although these results are preliminary and cannot be generalised without further study, they serve to illustrate the potential issues of the interaction between generative AI and the Internet.

1 Introduction

Traditional applications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) have focused on the detection or classification of objects, for example detecting pedestrians in the images captured by in-vehicle cameras [1] or classifying the results of a medical

test from x-ray images [2]. More recently, AI models that can generate images, text, or even videos and 3D objects have been developed and made publicly available [3]. These models have been widely adopted and some of them have now millions of users, like for example ChatGPT for text or DALL-E for image generation.

In the case of image generation, AI models such as DALL-E, MidJourney, and Stable Diffusion [4] are now widely used to generate many different types of images with applications in fields as diverse as art [5], architecture [6] or cultural heritage [7] among other. These AI tools are also used to generate illustrations and content for websites and magazines and also by end-users that upload the images to social networks and other applications. These generative AI models such as DALL-E [8] or CogView [9] are trained on large data sets of images that in most cases are obtained from the Internet by scraping websites [10, 11].

As AI-generated content populates the Internet, AI-generated images will be scrapped and may end up in future training data sets. This poses the following question: *what is the effect of this feedback loop on AI tools that use AI-generated images?* [12] An initial study has shown that current AI-generated images tend to degrade the performance of AI image tools [12]. In this paper, we study the long-term effects that AI image generation tools can have. For example, we investigate whether repeatedly feeding AI generative models with AI-generated data over time leads to *degeneration*, so newer models producing lower quality results as they are trained with more and more AI-generated samples. Our initial experiments on a simple diffusion model show that degeneration is indeed possible. We also discuss other potential issues as generative AI and the Internet feed each other over time and propose future work and experiments to better understand the impact of this closed loop interaction between generative AI and the Internet¹.

2 Initial Evaluation of Generative AI evolution

To study the evolution of generative AI, we consider the simulation model in Figure 1 in which the original data set is augmented with AI-generated images and then trained to generate a new version of the AI-generation model. Then, the new model generates images that are added to the data set to train yet another model, the third-generation model. This process may continue for n generations. This simple model tries to capture what could happen on the Internet as AI-generated images are incorporated to the training datasets of new models.




Figure 1: Simulation model for the evolution of generative AI

¹In fact, this paper is a first work in progress version and we are currently conducting additional experiments to produce a second more complete version.



Figure 2: Examples of real flowers, Original dataset

Figure 3: Examples of synthetic flowers, V_1 generated set

To test the model in Figure 1 for generative AI, we use a Denoising Diffusion Implicit Model (DDIM)². For training the model, we use the Oxford Flowers dataset, consisting of 1023 images of flowers classified into 102 categories³. We train a Generative AI model with the Oxford Flowers dataset and 40 epochs. Figure 2 shows a few examples of the original images used for training and Figure 3 shows the images generated by the diffusion model. These synthetic flowers comprise the first V_1 generated dataset, as shown in Figure 1.

In the next experiments, we mix both real data and AI generated data (V_1) to re-train the diffusion model and create a second generation of synthetic flowers (V_2). Let α denote the relative number of synthetic data elements generated with the latest AI version (flowers in this case) included during the training process compared to the size of the existing training set to obtain the next offspring. Thus, α controls the amount of AI generated elements introduced for the next generation. For example, when $\alpha = 1$, at each iteration, the number of elements added to the training set generated with the latest version of the AI tool equals the total number of elements used to train the previous generation.

²See A. Beres: "Denoising Diffusion Implicit Models", available at <https://keras.io/examples/generative/ddim/>, last access February 2023.

³See M.-E. Nilsback, A. Zisserman, "102 Category Flower Dataset", available at <https://www.robots.ox.ac.uk/~vgg/data/flowers/102/>, last access February 2023.



Figure 4: **Examples of images generated by the second V_2 (top), third V_3 (middle), and fourth V_4 (bottom) diffusion models trained with the original images and subsequent synthetic versions ($\alpha = 1$)**

Figure 4 shows examples of second, third, and fourth-generation synthetic flowers for $\alpha = 1$, that is, at each generation V_n , the diffusion model is trained with as many synthetic flowers V_{n-1} as original flowers and flowers generated with previous AI models. It can be observed that the quality of the images quickly degrades at each new iteration and the fourth AI model is unable to generate any flower with sufficient quality.

To see how the number of AI-generated elements impacts the quality of the diffusion models, in a second experiment we run the simulations with $\alpha = 0.5$ (so training with 2/3 real or previously generated flowers and 1/3 generated with



Figure 5: Examples of images generated by the second V_2 (top), third V_3 (middle), and fourth V_4 (bottom) diffusion models trained with the original images and subsequent synthetic versions ($\alpha = 0.5$)

the latest AI model on each iteration) and with $\alpha = 2$ (so adding double AI generated images to the training set on each iteration). The results are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. When $\alpha = 0.5$, the overall degradation is significantly lower but the images generated on the fourth iteration still have a much lower quality than those in the first iteration, as expected. Instead when $\alpha = 2$, the degradation is higher. This seems to indicate that the more AI-generated content added to the training data set, the lower the quality of subsequent generation of images.



Figure 6: Examples of images generated by the second V_2 (top), third V_3 (middle), and fourth V_4 (bottom) diffusion models trained with the original images and subsequent synthetic versions ($\alpha = 2$)

Finally, we run the first experiment with $\alpha = 1$ and try to mitigate the degradation by doubling the number of epochs used for training, that is, 80 epochs. The results are shown in Figure 7. We observe that even when increasing the training effort, degeneration is still present and the model starts generating noise after a few iterations.

3 Limitations of the experiments and future work

The experiments in the previous section have several limitations. For example, the initial data set is small and the diffusion model is simple. Therefore, it would be interesting to run the same experiments on larger and more varied data sets to understand if degeneration occurs regardless of data set size and the nature of the images. In addition, to pinpoint the role that model complexity plays in the degeneration, it would be useful to experiment with more complex generative models.

Another interesting experiment would be to use several generative AI models to add elements to the training data set at each iteration to see if having several AI models reduces or eliminates degeneration. Additionally, each of those models could be trained on all the data set, or on different parts of it—for example, by applying mechanisms that filter which data points should be included in the next iterations, based on metrics that measure data quality or diversity.

The main challenge is that running some of those experiments requires a large amount of computing resources that is beyond the capabilities of most university research groups.

It is also of interest to explore the evolution when AI generated content is concentrated on a type or class of images as it may happen on the Internet. Would this introduce or augment biases in newer AI generation tools? This can be explored by generating images of only one or a few classes and add them for training in the next generation. This may lead to more subtle effects than the degradation that we have observed in our simple experiments, that may have serious consequences for the fairness of these models.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we have considered the evolution of generative AI models when newer versions are trained with a mixture of real and AI-generated data. The experimental results on a simple image diffusion generative AI-model show that in each new version, the quality of the images is worse, leading to a degeneration of the AI-model’s performance with each new version. Although the model and data set that we considered are simple, the results show that generative AI can suffer degradation. This suggests that more subtle effects may appear when using more complex generative models trained on larger datasets.

References

- [1] Danut Ovidiu Pop, Alexandrina Rogozan, Fawzi Nashashibi, and Abdelaziz Bensrhair. Pedestrian recognition using cross-modality learning in convolutional neural networks. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, 13(1):210–224, 2021.
- [2] Guoming Chen, Yongchang Chen, Zeduo Yuan, Xuming Lu, Xiongyong Zhu, and Wanyi Li. Breast cancer image classification based on CNN and bit-plane slicing. In *2019 International Conference on Medical Imaging Physics and Engineering (ICMIPE)*, pages 1–4, 2019.
- [3] Roberto Gozalo-Brizuela and Eduardo C. Garrido-Merchan. ChatGPT is not all you need. a state of the art review of large generative AI models. *arXiv*, 2023.
- [4] Ali Borji. Generated faces in the wild: Quantitative comparison of stable diffusion, Midjourney and DALL-E 2. *arXiv*, 2022.



Figure 7: Examples of images generated by the second V_2 (top), third V_3 (middle), and fourth V_4 (bottom) diffusion models trained with the original images and subsequent synthetic versions ($\alpha = 1$), but doubling the number of epochs

- [5] Alexis Newton and Kaustubh Dhole. Is AI art another industrial revolution in the making? *arXiv*, 2023.
- [6] Joern Ploennigs and Markus Berger. AI art in architecture. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [7] Fernando Moral-Andrés, Elena Merino-Gómez, Pedro Reviriego, and Fabrizio Lombardi. Can artificial intelligence reconstruct ancient mosaics? *arXiv*, 2022.
- [8] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with CLIP latents. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [9] Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Wenyi Hong, Wendi Zheng, Chang Zhou, Da Yin, Junyang Lin, Xu Zou, Zhou Shao, Hongxia Yang, and Jie Tang. CogView: Mastering text-to-image generation via transformers. *arXiv*, 2021.
- [10] Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. LAION-400M: Open dataset of CLIP-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. *arXiv*, 2021.
- [11] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. LAION-5B: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [12] Ryuichiro Hataya, Han Bao, and Hiromi Arai. Will large-scale generative models corrupt future datasets? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08095*, 2022.