
Plasticine3D: 3D Non-Rigid Editing with Text Guidance by Multi-View Embedding Optimization

Yige Chen

Shanghai Jiaotong University
foxie_arctic@sjtu.edu.cn

Teng Hu

Shanghai Jiaotong University

Yizhe Tang

Shanghai Jiaotong University

Siyuan Chen

Shanghai Jiaotong University

Ang Chen

Shanghai Jiaotong University

Ran Yi

Shanghai Jiaotong University

Abstract

With the help of Score Distillation Sampling (SDS) and the rapid development of neural 3D representations, some methods have been proposed to perform 3D editing such as adding additional geometries, or overwriting textures. However, generalized 3D non-rigid editing task, which requires changing both the structure (posture or composition) and appearance (texture) of the original object, remains to be challenging in 3D editing field. In this paper, we propose **Plasticine3D**, a novel text-guided fine-grained controlled 3D editing pipeline that can perform 3D non-rigid editing with large structure deformations. Our work divides the editing process into a geometry editing stage and a texture editing stage to achieve separate control of structure and appearance. In order to maintain the details of the original object from different viewpoints, we propose a **Multi-View-Embedding (MVE) Optimization** strategy to ensure that the guidance model learns the features of the original object from various viewpoints. For the purpose of fine-grained control, we propose **Embedding-Fusion (EF)** to blend the original characteristics with the editing objectives in the embedding space, and control the extent of editing by adjusting the fusion rate. Furthermore, in order to address the issue of gradual loss of details during the generation process under high editing intensity, as well as the problem of insignificant editing effects in some scenarios, we propose **Score Projection Sampling (SPS)** as a replacement of score distillation sampling, which introduces additional optimization phases for editing target enhancement and original detail maintenance, leading to better editing quality. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method on 3D non-rigid editing tasks.

1 Introduction

Recent developments in text-to-3D generation, particularly those employing score distillation sampling (SDS) and leveraging both 2D priors from text-to-image diffusion models and the inductive bias of implicit 3D representation, have demonstrated promising capabilities in semantic-driven 3D object generation (Poole et al. [2022], Wang et al. [2023], Chen et al. [2023]). Besides generating 3D objects by text from scratch, there is also a great demand in generating new 3D models from existing 3D assets. Considering modeling professionals working in the gaming industry have already created a usable 3D model (such as a statue in a game), they often need to create another 3D model with



Figure 1: Our *Plasticine3D* achieves text-guided fine-grained controlled 3D editing and enables non-rigid editing with large deformations. For each case, the original object’s RGB and normal maps are displayed on the left side, with the target prompt below, highlighting the main editing objective in orange. The final edited result’s RGB and normal maps are on the right.

different poses or attire. Developing a 3D generation method capable of editing based on existing 3D models could substantially alleviate the workload for these professionals, allowing them to focus on carving the details. Given the success of SDS methods in generating 3D geometry, it immediately raises the question of whether a similar approach could be developed to edit 3D shapes.

Recent semantic-driven 3D editing techniques can be categorized into 3D rigid and 3D non-rigid editing methods. 1) **3D Rigid Editing methods** perform style transfer tasks on appearance of the object without changing the structure (Chiang et al. [2022], Fan et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2022], Zhang et al. [2022]), which limits their applications. 2) **3D Non-rigid Editing methods** additionally perform structure (posture or composition) changes to the original object besides changing its appearance. The existing methods for performing 3D non-rigid editing either rely on a self-generated/provided attention mask/grid to accurately locate a local editing region (Zhuang et al. [2023], Sella et al. [2023], Mikaeili et al. [2023], Li et al. [2023a]), or simply finetune a Text-to-Image generative model as the guidance for SDS (Raj et al. [2023]). However, these methods either fail to handle significant structural changes, or exhibit poor quality as well as poor identity maintenance during the process of structural change. We show the comparison between different methods in Table 1. In summary, the existing 3D editing methods cannot perform high-quality controllable 3D non-rigid editing tasks involving significant structural deformations.

To address the above issues, we propose *Plasticine3D*, a novel semantic-driven fine-grained controlled 3D editing pipeline that can perform 3D rigid and non-rigid editing with large structure deformations. For separately controlling the structure and appearance of the 3D object, we divide the editing into 2 stages for geometry and appearance editing respectively. In order to preserve original details of an object from different viewpoints, we propose a **Multi-View-Embedding (MVE) Optimization** strategy. In order to achieve fine-grained control of editing extent, we propose **Embedding-Fusion (EF)** to blend the original characteristics with the editing objectives in the embedding space. In order to strengthen either original details or editing target for achieving better editing quality, we propose **Score Projection Sampling (SPS)** as a replacement for score distillation sampling (SDS) in geometry editing stage. Furthermore, in order to further mitigate the impact of the Janus problem, we additionally employ a multi-view normal-depth diffusion model as guidance during the geometry editing stage. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our *Plasticine3D* in both 3D rigid and non-rigid editing tasks.

In summary, our key contributions can be summarized into the following three aspects: 1) We propose *Plasticine3D*, a novel semantic-driven fine-grained controlled 3D pipeline, which can achieve general 3D non-rigid editing with large structure deformations while keeping the the details of the original object. 2) We propose a *Multi-View Embedding (MVE) Optimization* strategy based on perspective-

Table 1: Comparison of different 3D editing methods. We categorize 3D editing into: 1) 3D Rigid Editing requiring no structural changes, 2) 3D Non-Rigid Editing (Composition) requiring simple addition of new objects, and 3) 3D Non-Rigid Editing (Posture) requiring large deformation on the original structure. \circ means the ability of this method on performing this task is uncertain.

Method	3D Rigid Editing	3D Non-Rigid Editing	
		Composition	Posture
VOX-E (Sella et al. [2023])	✓	×	\circ
Fantasia3D (Chen et al. [2023])	✓	×	×
FocalDreamer (Li et al. [2023a])	✓	✓	×
DreamBooth3D (Raj et al. [2023])	✓	✓	✓
Plasticine3D (Ours)	✓	✓	✓

appearance disentanglement, which can extract multi-view features with fine-grained details. **3)** We design a novel *Score Projection Sampling (SPS)*, which introduces additional optimization phases to focus on structure editing and original detail maintenance, largely improving the editing accuracy and original detail consistency during 3D object editing.

2 Related Works

Text-Guided Image Editing Methods. Significant advancements in Text-to-Image (T2I) synthesis using diffusion models have become increasingly conspicuous in recent years. Recently, they have been applied to various of image editing fields such as inpainting (Lugmayr et al. [2022], Avrahami et al. [2022]), 2D non-rigid editing (Kawar et al. [2023], Hertz et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2023]) and 2D rigid editing (Yang et al. [2023], Zhang et al. [2023]). The most relevant fields to our work are non-rigid and rigid editing. 2D rigid editing is a task which only requires changing the appearance of an image while preserving its structure. Conversely, 2D non-rigid editing involves modifying both the appearance and structure of an image. Among all, Imagic (Kawar et al. [2023]) is one of the most representative 2D non-rigid editing methods which introduces an embedding optimization and fine-tuning process to realize controllable 2D non-rigid editing, inspiring us to explore the realm of 3D non-rigid editing.

Semantic-Driven 3D Editing Methods. Recently, thanks to the rapid development of 2D lifted 3D generative methods that leverage score distillation sampling (SDS) technique, semantic-driven 3D editing has emerged as a promising avenue with significant potential. DreamEditor (Zhuang et al. [2023]) automatically creates an explicit 3D mask from the attention map with diffusion model to restrict the local edit area. Vox-E (Sella et al. [2023]) uses cross-attention volumetric grids to refine the editing region. SKED (Mikaeili et al. [2023]) performs local editing on 3D scenes by providing precise multi-view sketches. FocalDreamer (Li et al. [2023a]) possesses the capability of 3D local editing by restricting the target part in a focal region. However, these methods can only perform local editing in a restricted region provided. DreamBooth3D (Raj et al. [2023]) has the ability to perform 3D non-rigid editing while preserving the features from the original object leveraging the customization ability of DreamBooth (Ruiz et al. [2023a]). However, it suffers from low visual quality results and lacks precise control over editing extents. In summary, all the existing methods either achieve only local non-rigid editing or exhibit low editing quality. In contrast, our work performs high-resolution, fine-grained controlled, semantic-driven 3D non-rigid editing with great flexibility and accurate preservation of the original object details.

3 Preliminaries

Score Distillation Sampling (SDS) is a method proposed in DreamFusion (Poole et al. [2022]) for text-to-3D object generation task, that distills the hidden priors from text-to-image diffusion models to a differentiable 3D representation. Given a differentiable 3D representation $x = g(\theta, v)$, where θ represents the trainable parameters, we can obtain the rendered image x from a given view point v . Subsequently, a sampled noise ϵ is added to x to a random time step t to get a noisy image x_t . SDS then utilizes a noise predictor $\hat{\epsilon}_\phi(x_t; y, t)$ to get a score function from the noisy image x_t given the text embedding y and the noise step t . This score function guides the direction of the gradient for




Figure 2: Framework of *Plasticine3D*. We first optimize a set of trainable Multi-View Embeddings (MVE) using the rendered images of the original object from multiple views to capture the features of the object. We also finetune a Stable Diffusion model based on the renderings of the original object. Then we fuse the optimized MVE with the target text embedding to get fused embeddings as the semantic guidance in our editing. Finally, we edit the object with our novel three-phase Score Projection Sampling (SPS), which enhances both the editing target features and source details.

updating the parameters θ of the 3D representation as follows:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{SDS}(\phi, x) = \mathbb{E}_{t, \epsilon, v} \left[\omega(t) (\hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(x_t; y, t) - \epsilon) \frac{\partial x}{\partial \theta} \right], \quad (1)$$

where $\omega(t)$ is a weight factor related with the time step t . Specifically, $\hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(x_t; y, t)$ can be calculated using the classifier free guidance used in *Fantasia3D* (Chen et al. [2023]):

$$\hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(y) = \hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(e_{unc}) + w * (\hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(e_{cond}) - \hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(e_{unc})), \quad (2)$$

where e_{cond} refers to a target text embedding generated from the target prompt, while e_{unc} refers to an unconditional text embedding generated from an empty string. x_t and t are omitted in the above equation. For ease of notation, we designate the direction $\hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(e_{cond}) - \hat{\epsilon}_{\phi}(e_{unc})$ as \vec{e}_{cond} .

4 Plasticine3D: 3D Non-Rigid Editing Method

We define our 3D editing task as the following formulation: Given an original 3D object Ω_o (represented as a geometry mesh M_o and a texture T_o), along with a target prompt c_t that describes our editing objective, our goal is to generate an edited 3D object Ω_e (represented as a mesh-texture pair (M_e, T_e)) in a way that matches the semantics in the target prompt, while preserving a maximal amount of details of the original 3D object. The 3D editing task can be divided into two categories, 3D non-rigid editing and rigid editing, based on whether the structure is changed: 1) 3D rigid editing only requires changing the appearance (texture) of an object, while preserving its structure (posture or composition); while 2) 3D non-rigid editing requires changing both the structure (posture or composition) of an object and the appearance (texture).

Compared to rigid editing of 3D content, 3D non-rigid editing requires greater editing flexibility and larger overall deformations. Therefore, although the existing methods can successfully perform 3D rigid editing (Chiang et al. [2022], Fan et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2022], Zhang et al. [2022]), or 3D non-rigid editing that simply requires adding an object to the original structure (Zhuang et al. [2023], Li et al. [2023a]), they often cannot handle 3D non-rigid editing with large deformations. When performing non-rigid editing that requires large structure changes, these existing methods often lose part of the features of the original model. To address this issue, we aim to develop a method to perform high-quality 3D non-rigid editing, which enables flexible editing with large deformations.

We employ a 2-stage editing pipeline for non-rigid editing task, where geometry and texture editing is performed separately in each stage. This 2-stage pipeline also gives us enough flexibility when the texture T_o is not provided or when we need to separately adjust the edited geometry and texture.

In each stage, we design three steps to achieve the desired editing (Fig. 2): Multi-View-Embedding Optimization, Embedding Fusion, and Score Projection Sampling. 1) We first optimize a Multi-View Embedding (MVE) based on viewpoint-appearance decoupling, optimizing different embeddings for different views, which ensures that the guidance model learns the features of the object from various viewpoints. 2) Then, we fuse the optimized embeddings with the target embeddings to integrate information through Embedding Fusion (EF), which ensures the fine-grained control of editing extent through embedding fusion rate. 3) Finally, we propose Score Projection Sampling (SPS) to update an initial mesh for high-quality 3D non-rigid editing, which can enhance the quality of editing by using vector augmentation during the editing process.

4.1 Multi-View-Embedding (MVE) Optimization

An important aspect in 3D non-rigid editing task is to maintain the detail information of the original 3D object while performing large deformations. In order to capture the features of the original object, inspired by Imagic (Kawar et al. [2023]), a 2D image editing method, we propose a strategy that optimizes both the text embedding and the diffusion model to reconstruct the multi-view information of the original 3D object. Our key observation is that: Different from the 2D scenarios, a single trainable text embedding in each editing stage is not enough for keeping the detail information of the original object. This is because, unlike 2D images, each rendering angle of 3D objects corresponds to a different image, which means that renderings of a 3D object from different perspectives correspond to different embeddings in CLIP Space. Therefore, unlike 2D images, different trainable embeddings are needed for different perspectives of the same 3D object. Motivated by this observation, we propose Multi-View Embedding (MVE) Optimization, a novel strategy for preserving the details of the original 3D object by optimizing different embeddings for different views.

Multi-View Embedding. In this step, we aim to obtain an optimized text embedding e_o that best matches the original 3D object semantically. We first obtain a target text embedding e_t from the target text prompt c_t using the CLIP encoder, and initialize the trainable embedding e_{tr} of the original 3D object as a clone of e_t . Then we render the original 3D object from multiple viewpoints, and feed the renderings into a pretrained Stable Diffusion model. The trainable embedding e_{tr} is then optimized using the following reconstruction loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{recon} = \mathbb{E}_{v,t,\epsilon} [\|\epsilon_\phi(x_t^v; e_{tr}, t) - \epsilon\|_2^2], \quad (3)$$

where v is a randomly selected viewpoint, x^v is a rendered image from the selected viewpoint of the original 3D object Ω_o , and x_t^v is the noised version of x^v . $\epsilon_\phi(x_t^v; e_{tr}, t)$ is the noise prediction given by the UNet inside diffusion model, $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$, $t \sim Uniform(1, T)$.

However, as we stated above, since a 3D object has different appearances under different views, a single text embedding is not sufficient to represent the 3D object, *i.e.*, different trainable embeddings are needed for different perspectives of the same 3D object. A direct solution is to assign n_v independent trainable embeddings for n_v different perspectives, with each embedding covering $\frac{360}{n_v}$ degrees. But this solution will cost a significant amount of computation resources as n_v increases. In this paper, we propose an *interpolation-based* multi-view trainable embedding as our final solution. We first set four azimuth angles as the *base azimuth angles*: 0° , -90° , 90° , and 180° (equivalent to -180°). We then assign a trainable text embedding to each of the four azimuth angles. For any azimuth angle α in the range of $[-180^\circ, 180^\circ]$, its corresponding embedding is the interpolation of the trainable embeddings at its adjacent two base azimuth angles:

$$e_{tr}^\alpha = \frac{\alpha - \alpha_0}{90} * e_{tr}^{\alpha_0} + (1 - \frac{\alpha - \alpha_0}{90}) * e_{tr}^{\alpha_1}, \quad (4)$$

where e_{tr}^α is the corresponding embedding at azimuth angle α , and α_0, α_1 are two base azimuth angles adjacent to α . We use the interpolated view-dependent embedding e_{tr}^α in reconstruction loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{recon} = \mathbb{E}_{v,t,\epsilon} [\|\epsilon_\phi(x_t^v; e_{tr}^\alpha, t) - \epsilon\|_2^2], \quad (5)$$

where α is the corresponding azimuth angle of viewpoint v . Since the multi-view embeddings are calculated by linear interpolation, they are fully differentiable with respect to the base embeddings.

This ensures that they can be optimized through gradient propagation. After the trainable multi-view embeddings e_{tr}^* have been fully optimized, we take their final state as the optimized multi-view embeddings e_o^* , which correspond to the multi-view features of the original object in the text space.

UNet Finetuning. While the optimized multi-view embeddings e_o^* are the embeddings that best matches the original 3D object Ω_o , there is still a difference in details between Ω_o and the 3D representation captured by e_o^* . This discrepancy arises due to that text-space embeddings serve as relatively global feature representations, thereby struggling to encapsulate the intricate details of the original object. This limitation has been confirmed in some diffusion-based image customization methods (Ye et al. [2023], Li et al. [2023b]). Therefore, it arises the necessity to further finetune the UNet architecture in the pretrained Stable Diffusion and enhance the alignment between the optimized multi-view embeddings e_o^* and the detailed information of the original 3D object Ω_o . We employ the same reconstruction loss as in Eq.(5) for this finetuning process, but optimizes the UNet parameters instead of the trainable embeddings, *i.e.*, we keep the embeddings fixed as the optimized multi-view embeddings e_o^* .

4.2 Embedding Fusion (EF)

From MVE optimization, we obtain a set of multi-view optimized embeddings e_o^* , along with a fine-tuned diffusion model whose parameters are represented as ϕ . In order to achieve fine-grained editing with explicit control of editing extents, we blend the optimized multi-view embeddings e_o^* (corresponding to the original identity features) with the target embeddings e_t (corresponding to the editing objective) by linear interpolation:

$$e_f^* = r * e_t + (1 - r) * e_o^*, \quad (6)$$

where r represents the embedding fusion rate within $[0, 1]$. In this way, we edit towards the target prompt while preserve the features of the original object, and the balancing between these two aspects can be adjusted by the fusion rate. After we get the fused embeddings e_f^* , it will be used in our Score Projection Sampling as a conditional guidance to generate an edited 3D object. Experiments in Sec. A.6 show that the granularity of the editing results can be adjusted by the rate r .

4.3 Score Projection Sampling (SPS)

After obtaining the fused embedding e_f^* , which is a blended version of editing target and optimized multi-view embeddings, we aim to conduct 3D editing guided by e_f^* ¹. A naïve solution is to employ the Score Distillation Sampling (SDS) loss (Sec. 3) widely used in text-to-3D generation to optimize a 3D mesh, using e_f^* as the conditional guidance, with the original 3D object or a base ellipsoid as the initial shape. However, as observed in both 2D and 3D scenarios, embedding fusion-based methods have inherent drawbacks. One major issue is that as the embedding fusion rate r increases, since the embeddings of the original object are blended less to the fused embeddings, the features of the original object gradually diminish. Another issue is that when using the SDS loss to update from the original 3D object based on e_f^* , it is often difficult to achieve large deformation, since the diffusion model has been finetuned on the original 3D object.

To address these challenges, inspired by the Perp-Neg algorithm (Armandpour et al. [2023]), we propose *Score Projection Sampling (SPS)*, a modified version of SDS, to mitigate these issues. We mainly add two additional optimization phases on the basis of SDS editing based on fused embedding, with a target enhancement phase at the beginning, and a detail enhancement phase at the end. SPS is divided into three phases: Phase 1: *Target Enhancement* phase first strengthens the guidance of the editing target to generate features with the desired modifications in the object. Phase 2: *Editing based on fused embedding* aligns the optimization direction with the editing target described by the fused embedding. Note that the naïve solution only has this phase. Phase 3: *Detail Enhancement* phase: Once the editing target is sufficiently achieved, it then reinforces the guidance of the original details to maintain the original object’s features.

Target Enhancement. In this phase, our goal is to enhance the guidance of the editing target based on SDS to generate features with the desired transformations while not affecting the guidance direction \vec{c}_f derived from the fused embeddings.

¹Compared to editing by target embedding e_t directly, editing by e_f^* enables fine-grained control of editing extents, *i.e.*, users can control the granularity of editing by fusion rate r ($r = 1$ is the case of editing by e_t).

Given a target vector \vec{c}_t derived from the target embedding e_t by $\hat{e}_\phi(e_t) - \hat{e}_\phi(e_{unc})$, the most direct way is to add \vec{c}_t to the guiding vector \vec{c}_f . However, as mentioned in Perp-Neg, directly adding this vector may affect the strength of the fused guiding direction \vec{c}_f . Therefore, as shown in Fig. 2, we extract a component of the target vector \vec{c}_t perpendicular to the fused vector \vec{c}_f , denoted as \vec{c}_{t_e} , and add a weighted version of it to the fused vector to obtain the final target-enhancement direction \vec{c} :

$$\vec{c}_{t_e} = \vec{c}_t - \frac{\vec{c}_t \cdot \vec{c}_f}{\|\vec{c}_f\|^2} \vec{c}_f, \quad \vec{c} = \lambda_t \vec{c}_{t_e} + \vec{c}_f. \quad (7)$$

The perpendicular component \vec{c}_{t_e} reinforces guidance toward the target, while minimally altering the guidance direction obtained from the fused embeddings. We name it the *target-enhancement direction*. By weighting and incorporating this direction into the CFG noise prediction, SDS optimization can better reflect the editing objectives and help to achieve large deformations.

Editing Based on Fused Embedding. SPS is essentially an improvement based on SDS guided by a fused embedding e_f^* as the editing condition. During the initial and final steps of SDS optimization process, we add Target Enhancement and Detail Enhancement phases respectively, to achieve the large deformations in 3D non-rigid editing tasks and to maintain the details of the original object. However, apart from target and detail enhancement, the semantic goal of the editing corresponding to e_f^* still needs to be maintained. So between these two phases, we keep the direction of optimization aligning with the fused direction \vec{c}_f to ensure that the editing result meets the semantic goal. Therefore, after achieving significant deformations during the target enhancement phase, we use \vec{c}_f to perform the original SDS to maintain the semantic features of the editing target. Once the semantic goals are sufficiently maintained, we proceed to the next phase for performing detail optimization.

Detail Enhancement. In this phase, our goal is to strengthen the guidance of the original details after the editing target has been sufficiently achieved, in order to restore the original details of the object. During this process, we also aim to ensure that this enhancement does not affect the guidance direction \vec{c}_f derived from the fused embeddings.

We first obtain a vector \vec{c}_o for the optimized embedding e_o^* by $\hat{e}_\phi(e_o^*) - \hat{e}_\phi(e_{unc})$. Since e_o^* corresponds to the original object, we should steer the guiding direction \vec{c}_f towards \vec{c}_o to enhance the preservation of original details. Similar to the target enhancement term, we perform this enhancement by extracting a perpendicular vector from \vec{c}_f to \vec{c}_o , denoted as \vec{c}_{d_e} , and adding a weighted version of it to \vec{c}_f to obtain the final detail-enhancement direction \vec{c} :

$$\vec{c}_{d_e} = \vec{c}_o - \frac{\vec{c}_o \cdot \vec{c}_f}{\|\vec{c}_f\|^2} \vec{c}_f, \quad \vec{c} = \lambda_d \vec{c}_{d_e} + \vec{c}_f. \quad (8)$$

The perpendicular component \vec{c}_{d_e} reinforces the guidance towards the details of the original object, while minimally affecting the guidance direction derived from the fused embeddings. We name it the *detail-enhancement direction*. By weighting and incorporating this term into the CFG noise prediction, the SDS optimization can recover more details of the original object after the editing target is achieved.

4.4 Multi-View Normal-Depth Guidance

Although our multi-view embeddings and UNet finetuning enable the model to learn features and details of the original object from different perspectives, multi-view embeddings alone cannot ensure geometric consistency across different views in the subsequent generation process. Therefore, we further introduce a multi-view normal-depth diffusion model from RichDreamer Qiu et al. [2023], which is trained on large-scale 3D dataset, as a regularization guidance to ensure geometric consistency in the generation process and mitigate the impact of the Janus problem.

We utilize the multi-view normal-depth diffusion model in the geometry editing stage with three steps: Firstly, similar to MVE, we also optimize a trainable embedding to capture the features of the original object in the geometric space of the normal-depth diffusion model. Secondly, we fuse the optimized embedding with the target embedding obtained from the target prompt with the same embedding fusion rate as in EF, resulting in a fused embedding on the normal-depth diffusion model. Thirdly, we incorporate this fused embedding into the overall loss calculation by computing a SDS loss with the normal-depth diffusion model. The weight of this loss is $\frac{1}{8}$ of the weight of SPS loss.




Figure 3: Qualitative comparisons: Vox-E (global) and Vox-E (local) lack the ability in handling 3D non-rigid editing involving large structure deformations. DreamBooth3D has some ability in performing large structure deformations, but lacks stability and suffers from low quality. In contrast, our *Plasticine3D* achieves good performance in editing accuracy and large deformations.

5 Experiments

5.1 Implementation Details

We use threestudio (Guo et al. [2023]) as the codebase for implementing our pipeline. And we employ Stable Diffusion 2.1 as our guidance model for fine-tuning and SPS. We also use multiview normal-depth diffusion model from RichDreamer (Qiu et al. [2023]) as a multiview guidance for enhancing geometry consistency. For 3D representation, we use NeuS in geometry editing stage, and DMTeT in texture editing stage with nvdiffrast (Laine et al. [2020]) as the renderer. Our original 3D assets are sourced from Objaverse (Deitke et al. [2023]). Experiments are conducted on a single V100-32GB GPU with a batch size of 12 by gradient accumulation. More details are included in Appendix.

5.2 Comparison Experiments

Baselines. We compare *Plasticine3D* with three baselines: Vox-E (global) (Sella et al. [2023]), Vox-E (local), and DreamBooth3D (Raj et al. [2023]). More details are in Appendix A.5.

Qualitative Comparison. The qualitative comparison with 3D editing baselines is shown in Fig. 3: Vox-E (global) struggles to handle 3D non-rigid editing tasks involving large structural changes. Vox-E (local) can perform 3D non-rigid editing locally, but faces challenges in precisely defining target regions when the target prompt describes an overall status (shown in Fig. 3). DreamBooth3D can perform 3D non-rigid editing with relatively large structure changes, but suffers from instability, geometry inconsistency, and poor editing quality. In contrast, our method consistently achieves high-quality 3D non-rigid editing results that align closely with the editing objectives.

Quantitative Comparison. The quantitative comparison results are reported in Tab. 2. We use two evaluation metrics (details in Appendix A.4): 1) the CLIP similarity $CLIP_{sim}$ measures the alignment between the edited result and the target prompt; and 2) the CLIP directional similarity $CLIP_{dir}$ (Gal et al. [2022]) measures the alignment of CLIP-space direction between the text and rendering image pairs of the source and the edited 3D object. To ensure fairness across all viewpoints of a 3D object, we calculate the average $CLIP_{sim}$ and $CLIP_{dir}$ over 100 rendered images of an object from random viewpoints with the target editing prompt to get the final result. We achieve the best score across all the comparison methods on 3D non-rigid editing tasks.

Table 2: Quantitative comparison with the baselines. Our *Plasticine3D* achieves the best scores on two evaluation metrics.

Method	$CLIP_{sim} \uparrow$	$CLIP_{dir} \uparrow$
VOX-E (global)	0.285	0.0278
VOX-E (local)	0.286	0.0232
DreamBooth3D	0.250	0.0138
Plasticine3D (Ours)	0.295	0.0456




Figure 4: Ablation experiment for components in MVE optimization. Without multi-view embeddings, the editing results suffer from serious geometric inconsistency (three legs). Without UNet finetuning, the editing results are distorted and lose original details.




Figure 5: Ablation studies on Score Projection Sampling (SPS). Without target enhancement phase in SPS, the editing results show poor alignment with the editing target. Without detail enhancement phase in SPS, the editing results lose the details of the original object.

5.3 Ablation Studies

MVE Optimization. As stated in Sec. 4.1, the Multi-View Embedding Optimization strategy is crucial for ensuring the quality of the editing results. In Fig. 4, we conduct ablation studies on MVE optimization by disabling components in MVE respectively. Specifically, we compare the editing results of: 1) our full model (with MVE), 2) the ablated model without the multi-view trainable embedding component and replacing it with a single trainable embedding for editing, and 3) the ablated model without the UNet finetuning step. The results show that: without the multi-view trainable embeddings, the editing results not only fail to maintain correspondence between details, but also exhibit severe geometric inconsistencies (*e.g.*, three legs in Fig. 4); without the UNet finetuning step, the details of the edited object deviate significantly from those of the original object.

Score Projection Sampling (SPS). As stated in Sec. 4.3, our Score Projection Sampling (SPS) strategy is crucial to the quality of editing results. In Fig. 5, we conduct ablation studies on SPS by disabling enhancement phases in SPS respectively. Specifically, we compare the editing results of: 1) our full model (with SPS), 2) the ablated model without the target enhancement phase, and 3) the ablated model without the detail enhancement phase. The results show that: without the target enhancement phase, the editing results fail to perform large-scale deformation on the original object, with the edited structure similar to the original object; without the detail enhancement phase, the results fail to align with the details of the original object. The ablation study shows SPS is important for aligning the editing result with our editing target as well as the details of the original object.

6 Conclusions

We propose *Plasticine3D*, a novel text-guided, fine-grained controlled 3D editing pipeline that can perform 3D non-rigid editing with large structure deformations. Our method divides the editing process into a geometry editing stage and a texture editing stage to achieve separate control of structure and appearance. We propose a Multi-View-Embedding (MVE) Optimization strategy to preserve the details of the original object from different viewpoints, and Embedding-Fusion (EF) to achieve fine-grained control of the extent of editing by adjusting the embedding fusion rate. Furthermore,

in order to address the issue of gradual loss of details during the generation process under high editing intensity, as well as the problem of insignificant editing effects in some scenarios, we propose Score Projection Sampling (SPS) as a replacement of score distillation sampling, which introduces additional optimization phases for editing target enhancement and original detail maintenance, leading to better editing quality. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our pipeline can perform 3D non-rigid editing with large structure deformations, with fine-grained control and good editing quality.

References

- M. Armandpour, H. Zheng, A. Sadeghian, A. Sadeghian, and M. Zhou. Re-imagine the negative prompt algorithm: Transform 2d diffusion into 3d, alleviate janus problem and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04968*, 2023.
- O. Avrahami, D. Lischinski, and O. Fried. Blended diffusion for text-driven editing of natural images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 18208–18218, June 2022.
- R. Chen, Y. Chen, N. Jiao, and K. Jia. Fantasia3d: Disentangling geometry and appearance for high-quality text-to-3d content creation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13873*, 2023.
- P.-Z. Chiang, M.-S. Tsai, H.-Y. Tseng, W.-S. Lai, and W.-C. Chiu. Stylizing 3d scene via implicit representation and hypernetwork. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1475–1484, 2022.
- M. Deitke, D. Schwenk, J. Salvador, L. Weihs, O. Michel, E. VanderBilt, L. Schmidt, K. Ehsani, A. Kembhavi, and A. Farhadi. Objaverse: A universe of annotated 3d objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13142–13153, 2023.
- Z. Fan, Y. Jiang, P. Wang, X. Gong, D. Xu, and Z. Wang. Unified implicit neural stylization. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 636–654, 2022.
- R. Gal, O. Patashnik, H. Maron, A. H. Bermano, G. Chechik, and D. Cohen-Or. Stylegan-nada: Clip-guided domain adaptation of image generators. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 41(4):141:1–141:13, 2022.
- Y.-C. Guo, Y.-T. Liu, R. Shao, C. Laforte, V. Voleti, G. Luo, C.-H. Chen, Z.-X. Zou, C. Wang, Y.-P. Cao, and S.-H. Zhang. threestudio: A unified framework for 3d content generation. <https://github.com/threestudio-project/threestudio>, 2023.
- A. Hertz, R. Mokady, J. Tenenbaum, K. Aberman, Y. Pritch, and D. Cohen-or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross-attention control. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- J. Huang, Y. Liu, J. Qin, and S. Chen. Kv inversion: Kv embeddings learning for text-conditioned real image action editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16608*, 2023.
- Y.-H. Huang, Y. He, Y.-J. Yuan, Y.-K. Lai, and L. Gao. Stylizednerf: consistent 3d scene stylization as stylized nerf via 2d-3d mutual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18342–18352, 2022.
- B. Kawar, S. Zada, O. Lang, O. Tov, H. Chang, T. Dekel, I. Mosseri, and M. Irani. Imagic: Text-based real image editing with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6007–6017, 2023.
- S. Laine, J. Hellsten, T. Karras, Y. Seol, J. Lehtinen, and T. Aila. Modular primitives for high-performance differentiable rendering. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 39(6), 2020.
- Y. Li, Y. Dou, Y. Shi, Y. Lei, X. Chen, Y. Zhang, P. Zhou, and B. Ni. Focaldreamer: Text-driven 3d editing via focal-fusion assembly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10608*, 2023a.
- Z. Li, M. Cao, X. Wang, Z. Qi, M.-M. Cheng, and Y. Shan. Photomaker: Customizing realistic human photos via stacked id embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04461*, 2023b.
- A. Lugmayr, M. Danelljan, A. Romero, F. Yu, R. Timofte, and L. Van Gool. Repaint: Inpainting using denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11461–11471, 2022.
- A. Mikaeili, O. Perel, M. Safaei, D. Cohen-Or, and A. Mahdavi-Amiri. Sked: Sketch-guided text-based 3d editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 14607–14619, 2023.

- B. Poole, A. Jain, J. T. Barron, and B. Mildenhall. Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- L. Qiu, G. Chen, X. Gu, Q. Zuo, M. Xu, Y. Wu, W. Yuan, Z. Dong, L. Bo, and X. Han. Richdreamer: A generalizable normal-depth diffusion model for detail richness in text-to-3d. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16918*, 2023.
- A. Raj, S. Kaza, B. Poole, M. Niemeyer, N. Ruiz, B. Mildenhall, S. Zada, K. Aberman, M. Rubinstein, J. Barron, et al. Dreambooth3d: Subject-driven text-to-3d generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13508*, 2023.
- N. Ruiz, Y. Li, V. Jampani, Y. Pritch, M. Rubinstein, and K. Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 22500–22510, June 2023a.
- N. Ruiz, Y. Li, V. Jampani, Y. Pritch, M. Rubinstein, and K. Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22500–22510, 2023b.
- E. Sella, G. Fiebelman, P. Hedman, and H. Averbuch-Elor. Vox-e: Text-guided voxel editing of 3d objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 430–440, 2023.
- H. Wang, X. Du, J. Li, R. A. Yeh, and G. Shakhnarovich. Score jacobian chaining: Lifting pretrained 2d diffusion models for 3d generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12619–12629, 2023.
- S. Yang, H. Hwang, and J. C. Ye. Zero-shot contrastive loss for text-guided diffusion image style transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 22873–22882, 2023.
- H. Ye, J. Zhang, S. Liu, X. Han, and W. Yang. Ip-adapter: Text compatible image prompt adapter for text-to-image diffusion models. *CoRR*, abs/2308.06721, 2023.
- K. Zhang, N. Kolkin, S. Bi, F. Luan, Z. Xu, E. Shechtman, and N. Snavely. Arf: Artistic radiance fields. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 717–733, 2022.
- L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3836–3847, 2023.
- J. Zhuang, C. Wang, L. Liu, L. Lin, and G. Li. Dreameditor: Text-driven 3d scene editing with neural fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13455*, 2023.

A Appendix

A.1 Overview

In this appendix, more details about the proposed *Plasticine3D* method and more experimental results are provided, including:

- More implementation details (Section A.2);
- More details for the training details of the proposed MVE (Section A.3);
- Details of evaluation metrics (Section A.4);
- Details of comparison baselines (Section A.5);
- Controllable results with Embedding-Fusion (Section A.6);
- Details and hyperparameters of SPS (Section A.7);
- More experiment results (Section A.8);
- Limitations of our work (Section A.9);
- Potential societal impacts of our work (Section A.10).

A.2 More Implementation Details

As mentioned in the main paper, our method is a 2-stage pipeline. In each stage, our method independently edits the geometry or texture of the original object with MVE, EF and SPS. 1) During the geometry editing stage, we use NeuS as our 3D representation, which enhances flexibility in this stage. Multiview Normal-Depth Guidance are also incorporated in this stage for enhancing geometric consistency. Additionally, we follow the approach of the 3D generation method Fantasia3D by dividing the geometry optimization into coarse and fine optimization. We optimize NeuS for 3,000 steps in total. In the coarse optimization stage (first 2,000 steps), the rendered normal map and opacity are resized and directly input into the finetuned UNet to calculate the SPS loss. In the fine optimization stage (last 1,000 steps), the normal map is encoded by the VQ-VAE encoder before being sent to the UNet to calculate the SPS loss. Fantasia3D has demonstrated that this method significantly improves the quality of geometry generation. 2) During the texture editing stage, we use DMTeT as our 3D representation.

A.3 More Training Details of MVE

We use Stable Diffusion 2.1 as our T2I diffusion model. For Multi-View Embeddings, we employ the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of $2e - 3$ and a batch size of 4 for 1,000 steps of optimization. For UNet finetuning, we use the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of $5e - 7$ and a batch size of 4 for 1,500 steps of optimization. Due to limitations in our GPU memory capacity, we utilize gradient accumulation during the UNet finetuning process to save memory.

A.4 Details of Evaluation Metrics

We adopt two evaluation metrics in quantitative comparisons (Sec. 5.2). In this section, we provide details on the calculation formula for these evaluation metrics.

1) The CLIP similarity $CLIP_{sim}$ measures the alignment between the edited result and the target prompt, calculated by:

$$CLIP_{sim}(I, c) = \max(\cos(E_I, E_c), 0),$$

which corresponds to the cosine similarity between visual CLIP embedding E_I for an image I and textual CLIP embedding E_c for an caption c . In our case, I is a rendered image from the edited object and c is our target prompt c_t .

2) The CLIP directional similarity $CLIP_{dir}$ measures the alignment of CLIP-space direction between the text and rendering image pairs of the source and the edited 3D object, calculated by:

$$CLIP_{dir}(I_t, I_o, c_t, c_o) = \max(\cos(E_{I_t} - E_{I_o}, E_{c_t} - E_{c_o}), 0),$$




Figure 6: Controllable results of different embedding fusion rates. We show that our method can realize fine-grained control of editing extent through adjusting the embedding fusion rate r . As r increases, the editing results show deeper extent to the editing target.

where $I_{_o}$ and $I_{_t}$ are the rendered images from the original object and the edited object. $c_{_t}$ and $c_{_o}$ represent the editing target prompt, and the caption of the original object. $E_{I_{_o}}$ and $E_{I_{_t}}$ represent the visual CLIP embeddings of the original image $I_{_o}$ and the edited image $I_{_t}$, respectively. $E_{c_{_t}}$ and $E_{c_{_o}}$ represent the textual CLIP embeddings of the target prompt $c_{_t}$ the original image caption $c_{_o}$, respectively.

A.5 Details of Comparison Baselines

In the experiments (Sec. 5.2), we compare with three baseline methods. In this section, we provide more descriptions of these baselines: 1) Vox-E (global) (Sella et al. [2023]): a state-of-the-art (SOTA) method for 3D object editing leveraging 2D diffusion model, which enables global-scale 3D editing that aligns with a provided target prompt. 2) Vox-E (local): Vox-E also provide a local mode in its pipeline. Vox-E (local) leverages the attention grid to enable 3D non-rigid editing in local regions. 3) DreamBooth3D (Raj et al. [2023]): a 3D non-rigid editing method based on DreamBooth (Ruiz et al. [2023b]). For Vox-E (global) and Vox-E (local), we use their official codes.

A.6 Controllable Results with Embedding-Fusion (EF)

Besides achieving high quality in non-rigid editing tasks, our method is the first to enable fine-grained control over the granularity of edits in the semantic-driven 3D non-rigid editing task. In Fig. 6, we demonstrate that adjusting the embedding fusion rate r can control the intensity of editing, and can be used to control both the geometric and appearance granularity of the edits. In the example where the target prompt is "a lying dog", as r increases, the dog lies down lower. In the example where the target prompt is "a dog made of green glass", as r increases, the dog's fur is gradually replaced with a green glass material.

Although theoretically the embedding fusion rate r can be any number within the range of $[0, 1]$, for the quality of editing, we recommend keeping r within the range of $[0.35, 0.85]$.

A.7 Details and Hyperparameters of SPS

Our SPS introduces two additional enhancement phases: target enhancement phase, and detail enhancement phase. Phase 1 (Target Enhancement) of SPS takes the first 1,000 steps in geometry optimization, and does not take place in texture optimization. In this phase of SPS, we have Eq. (7) where $\vec{\epsilon}_{t_e}$ is weighted by λ_t and added to $\vec{\epsilon}_f$. In our experiment, λ_t 's value can be calculated using:

$$\lambda_t = \frac{\|\vec{\epsilon}_f\|}{\|\vec{\epsilon}_{t_e}\|} * 0.4.$$

Phase 3 (Detail Enhancement) of SPS takes the last 1,000 steps in optimization. In this phase of SPS, we have Eq. (8) where $\vec{\epsilon}_{d_e}$ is weighted by λ_d and added to $\vec{\epsilon}_f$. In our experiment, λ_d 's value can be calculated using:

$$\lambda_d = \frac{\|\vec{\epsilon}_f\|}{\|\vec{\epsilon}_{d_e}\|} * 0.2.$$



Figure 7: More experiment results of our *Plasticine3D*. For each case, the original object’s RGB map is displayed on the left side, with the target prompt below, highlighting the main editing objective in orange. The final edited result’s RGB map is on the right side.

A.8 More Experiment Results

In this section, we provide more results of our *Plasticine3D* on various 3D objects like animals, humans and cars in Fig. 7. It can be seen that for various original 3D objects and target prompts, our model can consistently achieve high-quality editing results, aligning with the target prompt well and keeping the details of the original 3D objects.

A.9 Limitations

In some scenarios, the scale of our edited results may slightly change after geometry editing stage, so the users may need to resize them after the editing process. The UNet fine-tuning step in our method requires a GPU device with sufficient VRAM. In order to conduct UNet fine-tuning on consumer-grade GPU devices, gradient accumulation can be used to save memory, which will lead to an increase in processing time. Our future work may focus on tuning-free generalized 3D editing and achieving more accurate controllable 3D editing with control points.

A.10 Societal Impact

Our *Plasticine3D* has both potential positive and negative societal impacts:

1) Positive Societal Impacts:

- **Advancement in 3D Editing Technology:** Plasticine3D introduces a novel approach to 3D non-rigid editing, which can have positive implications for various industries such as entertainment, design, and manufacturing. By enabling fine-grained control over both structure and appearance, it opens up possibilities for more creative and precise 3D modeling and editing tasks.
- **Enhanced Virtual Reality:** Plasticine3D offers a novel approach to 3D editing, allowing users to manipulate both the structure and appearance of virtual objects with fine-grained control. This could empower artists and designers to unleash their creativity in virtual environments, leading to the creation of innovative digital artworks, immersive experiences, and virtual worlds, which can facilitate the development of virtual reality.

2) Negative Societal Impacts:

- **Potential for Misuse:** As with any technology that enables manipulation of digital content, there is a risk of misuse for malicious purposes such as creating deceptive or misleading visual content. Plasticine3D's capabilities, especially in terms of fine-grained control over appearance, may potentially be exploited to generate fake images or 3D models.
- **Privacy Concerns:** The ability to manipulate 3D models with such precision raises concerns about privacy, particularly in scenarios where personal or sensitive information is represented in 3D form. Plasticine3D may inadvertently facilitate the creation of realistic but false representations of individuals or sensitive information, leading to concerns about privacy preservation.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have clearly explained the contributions and scope in the Abstract and Introduction Section. Please refer to Page 1 and Page 2.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have stated the limitations in the Appendix Sec. A.9.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper does not include theoretical results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The implementation details are provided in Sec. 5.1 and the Appendix Sec. A.2, Sec. A.3 and Sec. A.7.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [No]

Justification: We will open-source the code once our paper is accepted. The data comes from some open-source datasets, which are commonly used.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All the training and testing details can be found in Sec. 5.1 and the Appendix Sec. A.2, Sec. A.3 and Sec. A.7.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [No]

Justification: We have fixed the random seeds for the experiments, and the results can be reproduced at any time. Moreover, the existing works in 3D generation usually do not report the error bars.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).

- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have clearly explained the implementation details for the experiments, and reported the computation resources, which can be found in Sec. 5.1 and Appendix Sec. A.2.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have carefully read NeurIPS Code of Ethics and will comply with it.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have discussed both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts in Appendix Sec. A.10.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.

- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper has no such risks.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All the assets are properly cited and the licenses are properly respected.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.

- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset’s creators.

13. **New Assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper does not release new assets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper does not involve crowdsourcing experiments nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper does not involve crowdsourcing experiments nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.

- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.