

The Layout Generation Algorithm of Graphic Design Based on Transformer-CVAE

Mengxi Guo*

Peking University
School of Electronic and Computer
Engineering
Shenzhen, China
nicolasguo@pku.edu.cn

Danqing Huang
Microsoft Research Asia
Beijing, China
dahua@microsoft.com

Xiaodong Xie
Peking University
School of Electronic Engineering and
Computer Science
Beijing, China
donxie@pku.edu.cn

Abstract—Graphic design is ubiquitous in people's daily lives. For graphic design, the most time-consuming task is laying out various components in the interface. Repetitive manual layout design will waste a lot of time for professional graphic designers. Existing templates are usually rudimentary and not suitable for most designs, reducing efficiency and limiting creativity. This paper implemented the Transformer model and conditional variational autoencoder (CVAE) to the graphic design layout generation task. It proposed an end-to-end graphic design layout generation model named LayoutT-CVAE. We also proposed element disentanglement and feature-based disentanglement strategies and introduce new graphic design principles and similarity metrics into the model, which significantly increased the controllability and interpretability of the deep model. Compared with the existing state-of-art models, the layout generated by ours performs better on many metrics.

Keywords—Variational autoencoder (VAE), Graphic design, Layout generation, Transformer, Deep learning

I. INTRODUCTION

Graphic design is widely used in our daily life, such as artistic advertisements, graphics on websites, arranged spreads in magazines, etc. The layout is the basis of graphic design tasks. In order to attract users' visual attention and effectively convey information, the layout of graphic design often has many changes. The layout of graphic design is often designed by professional graphic designers nowadays, but this process often takes much time. So it would be very constructive to have algorithms automatically generate the layout of graphic design.

In recent years, deep learning algorithms have achieved remarkable performance in generation tasks. However, many generative models have made great breakthroughs in the generation of images, speech, text and other fields[1][2]. Their development and exploration in the generation of graphic design layouts are still limited. The layout of PowerPoint slides is shown in Fig.1.1. Components such as titles, text boxes, pictures, etc. are represented as bounding boxes with relative coordinates and length and width. The ultimate goal of the layout generation task is to output the bounding box of each component on the canvas under certain given conditions, such as the category. However, unlike generative tasks such as images or voices, the generation of graphic design layouts has its uniqueness, which requires that in the process of generating graphic design layouts, not only the diversity of typographic styles must be pursued, but also some basic design principles need to be met. Designers often introduce graphic design principles such as alignment, repetition, and contrast. The introduction of these principles can make the overall layout tidier and more in line with the aesthetic habits of the public. Traditional tasks such as image or voice generation do not consider the introduction of design rules for display.




Fig. 1.1. The generated layout of PowerPoint slides through our model

Most of the existing graphic design layout works [3-5] use an encoder-decoder structure, the decoder uses RNN [6] or LSTM [7] network, and the encoder generally uses a multi-layer perceptron (MLP). During training, layout templates designed by graphic designers are often used as label supervision. The input situation will differ in each job, but most of them will input the set of types of components, $O = \{o_0, o_1, \dots, o_n\}$ (where each $o_i \in \mathcal{C}$, \mathcal{C} is a set of component categories) and the relative position of the component $E_{loc} = \{l_0, \dots, l_{mi}\}$. The output is the position and size of each component to be laid out, that is, $\{bb_0, \dots, bb_n\}$, where $O = \{x_i, y_i, w_i, h_i\}$ represents the position and size of the component. There are some problems and challenges in this field: The existing methods use recursive generation methods to generate the bounding boxes of the components. However, it does not have any reference information when these methods generate the bounding box of the first component, which does not use the global arrangement information of other components. Moreover, the interpretability and controllability of these methods are not good enough so they are difficult to be applied in practical work. Last, these data-driven methods don't consider using many prior design principles, such as alignment, contrast, repeat, in the process of generating layout.

To solve these problems, we proposed an end-to-end non-autoregressive layout generation model based on the Transformer [8] and CVAE. We introduce a Transformer-based CVAE model called layout Transformer conditional variational autoencoder (LayoutT-CVAE) which includes a full-convolution encoder to extract features and map the input into a continuous latent space, and then a multi-head attention module generates the bounding boxes of the components. Specifically, the Transformer structure can generate each bounding box with all input information and output all the results at once instead of using a recursive way. To increase the interpretability and controllability of the model, we introduce two dismantlement strategies: the element dis-

*This work is done while the author was in internships in Microsoft Research Asia

entanglement and the feature disentanglement. For the element disentanglement, we sample the latent vector for each component, generate the bounding box independently and use attention to see the connection between them. For the feature disentanglement, we disentangle each latent vector into five latent vectors, and each vector represents the position dimension information of a bounding box independently. After the feature disentanglement, the prior design principle is introduced into the process to modify the latent position vector.

The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- In this paper, we proposed an end-to-end non-autoregressive model using Transformer-based CVAE to achieve the state-of-art performance. As far as we know, this is the first work to prove the Transformer structure has good potential in the layout generation task.
- This paper proposes two strategies: The element disentanglement and the feature disentanglement. For the element disentanglement, we treat each component independently and imply its bounding box as an independent latent vector. For the feature disentanglement, we further disentangle the latent vector into five vectors representing separate coordinates information. These two strategies significantly improve the controllability and interpretability of the model.
- This paper combines three common principles of graphic design: alignment into the model and designs a set of continuity metrics that focus on the global layout quality.

II. RELATED WORKS

Deep learning-based layout generation: Generative models based on deep learning have achieved remarkable results in many applications. In October 2014, Ian et al. [1] proposed a new framework, Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN), which estimates the generation model through adversarial training. This model is widely used in image generation and has achieved great success [2-4]. In the same year, Kingma et al. [9] proposed Variational Auto-encoders (VAE), which maps the data to the prior distribution during training, thereby generating targets from the prior distribution during the testing. Since graphic design is essentially an art form, it is often difficult for people to summarize why a design is so beautiful and elegant. Therefore, data-driven graphic design layout generation methods were born. Akash Abdu Jyothi et al.[3] proposed a random scene layout generation framework based on a variational autoencoder, LayoutVAE, which allows to generate a complete image layout under a given component label condition. Jianan Li et al. proposed a GAN-based layout generation model called LayoutGAN. LayoutGAN takes a randomly placed set of two-dimensional graphic elements as input and optimizes them using self-attentional modules to align labels and geometric parameters to produce a realistic layout. However, LayoutGAN generates outputs unconditionally, which means the generation from sampled noise vectors, so it is difficult to apply in practical life. Recently, Hsin-Ying Lee et al. [5] combined the component relations in graphic design with graph neural networks and proposed a layout generation method within the constraints formulated by users. Similarly, Akshay Gadi Patil

et al. [10] proposed a recursive autoencoder for document layout generation (READ) model, and it also introduces the relative locations of components in the document as constraints of users. However, both methods use recursive generation models like Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) [3-5][10], and they did not fully consider the global information.

Transformer-based models: In 2017, Ashish Vaswani and his team from Google used the self-attention module instead of the RNN model and proposed Transformer [8] to solve the seq2seq problem. Since Transformer came out, it has been widely used in many fields. In natural language processing, the BERT [11] model proposed by Google in 2018 refreshed the performance list of multiple natural language processing tasks. Based on BERT, Colin Raffel et al. [12] proposed a unified framework model based on Transformer, which converts all text-based language problems into a text-to-text format and uses it to explore the prospects of natural language processing transfer learning technology. In the field of generative tasks, Transformer also has outstanding performance. Danyang Liu et al. [13] proposed a Transformer-based VAE model in the dialog generation task. Junyan et al. [14] proposed a combination model of Transformer and Variational Autoencoder: Transformer-VAE based on their previous work. Recently, Yifan et al. [15] proposed TransGAN which includes a generator to gradually increase the feature resolution of the image to be generated while reducing the feature dimension. It achieves powerful performance without using any convolution operation. However, as far as we know, there is no work to apply the Transformer structure to the layout generation task, and our work demonstrates that Transformer structures still have great potential for this task.

III. LAYOUT TRANSFORMER-CVAE

Our goal is to generate design layouts given a set of design components with user-specified constraints. We set the input as categories of the components and their relative positions, the designers' constraints as the input, and bounding boxes of components as the output.

We introduce a graphic design layout generation model: Layout Transformer-CVAE(LayoutT-CVAE) based on Transformer[8] and conditional variational autoencoders[16]. The model can randomly sample on the prior distribution and combine with certain user constraints to generate a layout template close to manual design. Compared with the traditional multi-layer perceptron model, the Transformer-based decoder applies Multi-head Attention to strengthen the information interaction between components when the components are relatively independent in the graphic design, making the model more consider the global features. Based on the attention mechanism of Transformer, we propose the element disentanglement and the feature disentanglement strategies. The element disentanglement enables the characteristics of each component to be independently mapped to the posterior distribution, which strengthens the interpretability and controllability of the model. For the feature disentanglement strategy, we further disentangle the latent vectors for each component and then introduce graphic design rules to guide the model to learn more prior design principles and strictly enforce principles. It's worth mentioning that LayoutT-CVAE is a completely non-autoregressive model that completely abandons the traditional autoregressive (recursive) method and makes full use of all




Fig. 3.1. LayoutT-CVAE architecture that combines the disentanglement strategies and graphic design rule

components information. The experimental results show that the LayoutT-CVAE proposed in this paper can make good use of the input information, and combined with the powerful multi-head attention module, it can generate a specific graphic design layout.

A. LayoutT-CVAE model

We propose a Transformer-based conditional variational autoencoder model called LayoutT-CVAE for the task of graphic design layout regression. We model the generation process using a conditional VAE model. The model mainly consists of two parts: A simple full convolution encoder to transfer the input into a Gaussian distribution latent space and a Transformer based decoder to generate the layout from latent vectors sampled from latent space. This process can be modeled as:

$$z = h_{bb}^{enc}(bb, c) \quad (3.1)$$

$$\widehat{bb} = h_{bb}^{dec}(z, c) \quad (3.2)$$

where h_{bb}^{enc} and h_{bb}^{dec} represent the encoder and the decoder. bb is a sequence for bounding boxes of components and is the conditional metric which means the relative positions of the components in this work. It's important to emphasize that LayoutT-CVAE has a powerful multi-head attention module, which can well obtain the mutual information between components to return to generate the layout from the overall information. This structure has also become the key to the layout subsequent graphic design layout generation task model. The structure of LayoutT-CVAE is shown as Figure. 3.1. We'll go through each part of the model in detail.

The full convolution encoder: The encoder is a traditional VAE encoder. It serves as a feature extracting network that takes the components bounding boxes and the relative positions as the input. Before this information is entered into the encoder, a layer of embedding layer is required. The embedding layer is the process of mapping simple input data to a fixed dimension d_{hidden} . Overall, the input embedding layer is a learnable linear transformation layer. Different inputs will use different mapping methods for implicit processing: The continuous data is generally the bounding box information. The embedding method is:

$$BE(bbox) = L(\text{cat}(\sin(bbox), \cos(bbox))) \quad (3.3)$$

where L is the linear layer and the input dimension is 8. Whereas in the input data of the graphic design layout generation task, the discrete data mainly includes the component category and some user input constraint information, such as the relative position between the components. The embedded method of these data is same as work [11]. After the encoding process, the input is transferred into a latent vector z which is of a priori normal Gaussian distribution. This latent vector z will be token as the input of the mapping network and the decoder with a conditional vector.

The Transformer-based decoder: The structure of the Transformer-based decoder is shown in Figure. 3.1. It consists of several powerful multi-head attention module blocks, which can obtain mutual information between components to return to generate the layout from the latent vectors. The core computing unit in Transformer is the multi-head attention module, which consists of multiple self-attention modules (also called multi-scale dot-product attention). The multi-head attention module is essentially composed of multiple self-attention modules. In a multi-head attention module, the results of multiple self-attention modules are spliced together and then go through a linear layer. Finally, the result of $4d_{hidden}$ is transformed into a d_{hidden} vector through a linear layer. The multi-head attention module improves the integration of components information so that model can generate layouts based on global information. After the process of multi-head attention module, a linear layer transfers the d_{hidden} feature vector into the 4-dimensional bounding box.

B. The two disentanglement strategies

Different from the layout generation methods [3-5] which sample a single latent vector from the latent space to generate the layout, we introduce two disentanglement strategies to increase the controllability and interpretability of the model: Element disentanglement strategy and feature disentanglement strategy.

Element disentanglement strategy: The task's input is divided into two parts: one is the bounding box of each component, which is also called layout information; the other is the category information of each component, which is also

called condition information. In the training phase, the encoder encodes the input information of each component into the latent space, and then the decoder and decoder reconstruct the input information. It is important to emphasize that each component's information is encoded independently and then be entered into the decoder. The multi-attentional module will fuse these separate latent information at decoding phase.

Feature Disentanglement strategy: Figure 3.1 shows the primary method of feature disentanglement. First, for a component i , its input bounding box information is b_i , which is expressed as a latent vector z_i after being encoded. In this model, the latent vector z_i will first pass through a mapping network that decomposes the latent vector z_i into 5 parts: the vector z_{ix} representing the information of the abscissa x of the component bounding box, vector z_{iy} representing the information of the ordinate y of the bounding box, vector z_{iw} representing the width w information of the component bounding box and a vector z_{ih} representing the height information h . Finally, the vector z_{io} of other information. In order to fully decouple the latent vector z_i , the model proposed in this section uses 4 independent linear based reconstructors to reconstruct each disentangled vector.

C. Graphic design principle

Previous layout generation models [3-5][10] based on deep learning often ignore the importance of prior manual design principles. In order to introduce graphic design principles, we introduce a principle module which is essentially several binary classifiers composed of MLP. In this work, we take the alignment principle that has the greatest impact on the user's senses in graphic design as an example. For alignment, the principle-module is called the alignment relation module.

The alignment relation module: As Figure 3.1 shown, the disentangled latent vector is feed into the alignment relation module. The alignment relation module contains five binary classifiers which determine whether components are aligned with each other. We define the alignment principle as five types: left, center, right and top. For two components A and B in a layout, the bounding boxes information are b_a and b_b , the coordinate information will be modified based on the results of the binary classifier and the above process for these four alignments can be defined as:

Left alignment: $b_{a,x} = b_{b,x}$; Top alignment: $b_{a,y} = b_{b,y}$

Center alignment: $b_{a,x} + 0.5b_{a,w} = b_{b,x} + 0.5b_{b,w}$

Right alignment: $b_{a,x} + b_{a,w} = b_{b,x} + b_{b,w}$

Based on the alignment definition, we can obtain a two-dimensional diagonal metric by fully-trained binary classifiers. The union-find disjoint sets algorithm can find components that should be aligned. In this paper, there are two methods to introduce the principle: one is to directly modify the disentangled latent vector, replacing the part of the vector of the child node with the corresponding part of the root node; the other is post-processing to directly adjust the final bounding box according to the alignment definition.

D. Loss function

In this section, we will introduce the loss function we used.

Loss function: The objective of the LayoutT-CVAE is:

$$L_{\text{total}} = L_{CioU_g} + L_{CE_g} + L_S + L_{\text{Align}} + \beta L_{KL} \quad (3.4)$$

where L_{CioU} can be described as:

$$L_{CioU} = 1 - IoU + \frac{\rho^2(b, b^{gt})}{c^2} + \alpha v \quad (3.5)$$

where b represents the bounding box generated by reconstructor, and b^{gt} represents the template bounding box in the training data, which is also called the label bounding box. IoU represents the intersection ratio between the generated bounding box and the label bounding box. c represents the diagonal distance of the smallest outer rectangle of b and b^{gt} . And α is a trad-off parameter, which can be expressed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{v}{(1-IoU)+v} \quad (3.6)$$

v is a parameter used to measure the consistency of the aspect ratio. This factor considers the aspect ratio of the predicted frame to fit the target frame, and is defined as:

$$v = \frac{4}{\pi^2} \left(\arctan \frac{w^{gt}}{h^{gt}} - \arctan \frac{w}{h} \right)^2 \quad (3.7)$$

Compared with the traditional MSE loss, the $CioU$ loss treats the four coordinate points as a whole. It can optimize the situation where two boxes do not intersect.

$$L_{CE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i L_{CEi} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i - \sum_{c=1}^M y_{ic} \log(p_{ic}) \quad (3.8)$$

The L_{KL} can be described by the formula as:

$$L_{KL} = \log \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} + \frac{\sigma_1^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma_2^2} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (3.9)$$

σ_2 is the standard deviation of the posterior distribution, and μ_2 is the mean of the posterior distribution. In experiments, the posterior distribution is often a standard normal distribution, which means $\sigma_2 = 1, \mu_2 = 0$. Therefore L_{KL} can be written as:

$$L_{KL} = -\log \sigma_1 + \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \mu_1^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (3.10)$$

Finally, the β before L_{KL} is the single-cycle annealing weight. It can be expressed as:

$$\beta = \begin{cases} f(\tau), & \tau \leq R \\ 1, & \tau > R \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

Among them, τ represents the number of iterations of training, and R represents the number of iterations of a single annealing cycle, which is 2×10^5 in the experiment. And $f(\tau)$ is a linear annealing function, which can be expressed as:

$$f(\tau) = \frac{\min(\tau, R)}{R} \quad (3.12)$$

During the feature disentanglement, we use both supervised and unsupervised joint training to optimize parameters:

$$L_{S,k} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} (R_k(z_{i,k}) - b_{i,k})^2 \quad (3.13)$$

where n is the sample number, k represents the characteristic symbol of a certain dimension of bounding box, $k \in [x, y, w, h]$, b_i represents the bounding box of the label templet and R represents the linear reconstructors.

For the alignment relation module part, the feature vectors in pairs are subtracted as the input and we train binary classifiers to determine whether there is a potential alignment between components. This process can be expressed as the use of cross-entropy loss for supervision, and its loss function can be written as:

$$L_{\text{Align}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \sum_i \sum_j \text{BCE}_k(z_i, z_j, y_{ij}) \quad (3.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BCE}_k(z_i, z_j, y_{ij}) = & \quad (3.15) \\ & -y_{ij,k} \cdot \log \left(C_k(\|z_{i,k} - z_{j,k}\|) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where k is the alignment, $k \in [L, M, R, T]$ and L, M, R, T represents left, center, right and top alignment respectively.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND ANALYSIS

A. Datasets and evaluation metrics

We perform the evaluation on four datasets: Magazine [17], RICO [18], Image banner ads [19], PowerPoint Slides. PowerPoint Slides data set is a large layout data set proposed in this work. The dataset consists of 2,030 slide template files, with a total of 37,898 slide template pages. The data templates are diverse, including business, fashion, cartoon, nature, etc. For slide templates, our work focuses on the following component types: title, subtitle, text, footer, text, and graphics.

We evaluate the visual quality following Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [20] and Alignment [5]:

$$\text{FID}(g, r) = \|\mu_g - \mu_r\|_2^2 + \text{Tr} \left(\Sigma_g + \Sigma_r - 2(\Sigma_g \Sigma_r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \quad (4.1)$$

where g and r are generate samples and real samples separately, and μ_g and μ_r represent the mean value of the eigenvectors.

For Alignment metric, it can be explicitly measured as:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_d \sum_i \min \{ \min(l(c_i^d, c_j^d), m(c_i^d, c_j^d), r(c_i^d, c_j^d)) \} \quad (4.2)$$

where N is the number of generated layouts, c_k^d is the k_{th} component of the d_{th} layout. In addition, l , m , and r are alignment functions where the distances between the left, center, and right of components are measured, respectively

Based on three commonly used principles in graphic design: alignment, repetition, and comparison, we proposed three new three evaluation metrics for layout generation tasks. We use sparsity to make these metrics continuous. The sparsity can be expressed as:

$$\text{Sparseness}(x) = \frac{\sqrt{n} - (\sum |x_i|) / \sqrt{x_i^2}}{\sqrt{n} - 1} \quad (4.3)$$

The essence of sparsity reflects the proportion of zero elements in a sequence or metric. Accordingly, we use sparsity to define two evaluation metrics, alignment and repetition. The evaluation metric can be expressed as:

$$\text{Align} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_k 1 - \text{Sparseness}_k(X_k) \quad (4.4)$$

where the L, M, R, T represents left-justified, center-justified, right-justified and top-justified separately. X_k is the aligned two-dimensional metric. The repetitive metric is also a standard configuration in graphic design. Similar to the alignment metric, the repetition metric can be directly defined by sparsity as:

$$\text{Repeat} = \text{Sparseness}(X) \quad (4.5)$$

TABLE I. QUANTITATIVE COMPARISON BETWEEN LAYOUTT-CAVE AND OTHER ALGORITHMS

Ads [19]	Ground Truth	0.0012	0.0034	4.33	1.18	3.34
	sig2im [21]	12.82	0.63	5.28	1.15	4.14
	LayoutVAE [3]	14.98	1.21	5.48	1.08	5.35
	NDN [5]	13.16	0.93	5.35	1.35	8.32
	LayoutT-CVAE	13.05	0.74	5.04	1.33	8.19
	LayoutT-CVAE+	12.79	0.59	4.73	1.45	5.09
Magazine [17]	Ground Truth	0.0003	0.0126	4.13	1.09	5.18
	sig2im [21]	9.51	0.97	4.10	1.18	6.29
	LayoutVAE [3]	10.18	3.25	5.57	0.96	6.23
	NDN [5]	8.90	2.51	5.11	1.56	7.66
	LayoutT-CVAE	5.11	1.03	4.52	1.55	7.42
	LayoutT-CVAE+	5.02	0.98	4.34	1.68	7.29
RICO [18]	Ground Truth	0.001	0.0012	4.45	1.29	3.35
	sig2im [21]	13.61	0.14	4.27	1.20	4.22
	LayoutVAE [3]	20.58	1.19	6.24	1.17	4.69
	NDN [5]	15.92	0.91	5.42	1.53	6.95
	LayoutT-CVAE	13.41	0.32	4.71	1.53	5.72
	LayoutT-CVAE+	12.21	0.26	4.50	1.56	5.05
PowerPoint	Ground Truth	0.0004	0.1065	3.43	1.23	2.51
	sig2im [21]	5.04	0.1490	3.42	1.48	4.15
	LayoutVAE [3]	9.78	0.2366	4.00	0.78	4.48
	NDN [5]	4.11	0.1720	3.66	1.73	8.45
	LayoutT-CVAE	3.25	0.1517	3.43	1.64	7.91
	LayoutT-CVAE+	3.22	0.1478	3.39	1.75	4.85

where X is a repeated two-dimensional metric:

$$X_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b_{i,w} = b_{j,w} \text{ and } b_{i,h} = b_{j,h} \\ 0 & \text{if } b_{i,w} \neq b_{j,w} \text{ or } b_{i,h} \neq b_{j,h} \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

In addition, we also propose a contrast-based metric:

$$\text{Contrast} = \sum_i^N \frac{(s_i - \bar{s})^2}{N-1} \quad (4.7)$$

where s_i is the area of i_{th} component and \bar{s} is the average area of all components.

B. Quantitative Evaluation

We compare the proposed method with related work. As shown in Table I, LayoutT-CVAE is the basic model without any modification based on the design principle, and LayoutT-CVAE+ is the final model within all strategies we outlined above. It can be seen that from the various metrics, the performance of the LayoutT-CVAE+ model is further superior to the LayoutT-CVAE, and it is also better than other methods. In some metrics, our model is not completely superior to other methods because each method has slightly different attention on layout generation. For example, the sig2im method focuses more on alignment and repetition. However, our method still achieves state-of-art performance on the majority of metrics. Through the comparison of experimental results of LayoutT-CVAE and LayoutT-CVAE+, the introduction of prior design principles can improve the performance of the model significantly, which on the one hand reflects the effectiveness of the disentanglement strategy, and on the other hand, shows that the design principles are of great help to improve the performance of the deep learning-based model.

C. Qualitative Evaluation

We compare the proposed method with related work. As shown in Figure 4.1, the sg2im, NDN and the proposed model can generate reasonable layouts. However, our LayoutT-CVAE and LayoutT-CVAE+ can better tackle alignment and overlapping issues. Especially for LayoutT-CVAE+, it is superior to introducing the principle of alignment, and the layout generated by this model has a good performance in alignment and has a good improvement compared with LayoutT-CVAE. Compared with NDN and LayoutVAE, the




Fig. 4.1. Quantitative comparison between LayoutT-CAVE and other algorithms. The examples are from models trained on PowerPoint datasets. Yellow components represent title, black for text, green for images, and red for footnote.

generation by our model pays more attention to the whole space. It makes full use of canvas space, making the whole layout more substantial.

V. CONCLUSION

We proposed a Transformer-CVAE-based layout generation model called LayoutT-CVAE which can generate visually appealing layouts. We also introduce element disentanglement and feature-based disentanglement strategies into the model and implement new graphic design principles into our model. During the evaluation, we design three new similarity metrics to evaluate the performance of layout generation. Extensive quantitative and qualitative experiments demonstrate that the performance of the proposed model is better than the state-of-arts.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 27, 2014.
- [2] H. Zhang, T. Xu, H. Li, S. Zhang, X. Wang, X. Huang, and D. N. Metaxas, "Stackgan: Text to photo-realistic image synthesis with stacked generative adversarial networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2017, pp. 5907-5915.
- [3] A. A. Jyothi, T. Durand, J. He, L. Sigal, and G. Mori, "Layoutvae: Stochastic scene layout generation from a label set," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 9895-9904.
- [4] J. Li, J. Yang, A. Hertzmann, J. Zhang, and T. Xu, "Layoutgan: Generating graphic layouts with wireframe discriminators," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.06767*, 2019.
- [5] H.-Y. Lee, L. Jiang, I. Essa, P. B. Le, H. Gong, M.-H. Yang, and W. Yang, "Neural design network: Graphic layout generation with constraints," in *Computer Vision-ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III* 16. Springer, 2020, pp. 491-506.
- [6] A. Graves, "Generating sequences with recurrent neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.0850*, 2013.
- [7] S. Hochreiter and J. Schmidhuber, "Long short-term memory," *Neural computation*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1735
- [8] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2017, pp. 5998-6008.
- [9] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [10] A. G. Patil, O. Ben-Eliezer, O. Perel, and H. Averbuch-Elor, "Read: Recursive autoencoders for document layout generation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, 2020, pp. 544-545.
- [11] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [12] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, "Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10683*, 2019.
- [13] D. Liu and G. Liu, "A transformer-based variational autoencoder for sentence generation," in *2019 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1-7.
- [14] J. Jiang, G. G. Xia, D. B. Carlton, C. N. Anderson, and R. H. Miyakawa, "Transformer vae: A hierarchical model for structure-aware and inter-pretable music representation learning," in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 516-520.
- [15] Y. Jiang, S. Chang, and Z. Wang, "Transgan: Two transformers can make one strong gan," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07074*, 2021.
- [16] K. Sohn, H. Lee, and X. Yan, "Learning structured output representation using deep conditional generative models," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, pp. 3483-3491, 2015.
- [17] X. Zheng, X. Qiao, Y. Cao, and R. W. Lau, "Content-aware generative modeling of graphic design layouts," *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1-15, 2019.
- [18] B. Deka, Z. Huang, C. Franzen, J. Hibschan, D. Afegan, Y. Li, J. Nichols, and R. Kumar, "Rico: A mobile app dataset for building data-driven design applications," in *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 2017, pp. 845-854.
- [19] H.-Y. Lee, L. Jiang, I. Essa, P. B. Le, H. Gong, M.-H. Yang, and W. Yang, "Neural design network: Graphic layout generation with constraints," in *Computer Vision-ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III* 16. Springer, 2020, pp. 491-506.
- [20] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, and S. Hochreiter, "Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [21] J. Johnson, A. Gupta, and L. Fei-Fei, "Image generation from scenegraphs," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 1219-1228.