An Integrated Research Charter on Fractal-Hybrid Image Generation: Foundations, Core Architectures, and Future Trajectories

Abstract

This research artifact provides an exhaustive analysis of the burgeoning field of fractal-hybrid image generation, charting a course from foundational principles to future research frontiers. It systematically reviews the mathematical underpinnings of fractal geometry and the architectural tenets of deep generative models (GANs, VAEs, Diffusion Models). Core investigations dissect two primary paradigms: data-driven approaches, where generative models learn from fractal datasets, and architecturally-driven methods, epitomized by the novel Fractal Generative Models (FGMs) that embed recursive, self-similar principles directly into their structure. We conduct a rigorous analysis of the field's principal challenges, including the NP-hard nature of the fractal inverse problem, the inadequacy of current evaluation metrics for capturing geometric complexity, and the unresolved legal and ethical dilemmas surrounding AI-generated content. Finally, we synthesize these findings to propose a forward-looking research roadmap, emphasizing the pursuit of semantic-fractal correspondence, the design of more sophisticated hybrid architectures, and the integration of principles from cognitive science to create a new generation of controllable, efficient, and interpretable generative systems.

Part I: Foundational Reviews

This part establishes the necessary theoretical groundwork, providing a self-contained reference for the two pillars of this research area: the mathematics of fractal geometry and the computational architecture of deep generative models.

Section 1: The Mathematical Underpinnings of Fractal Geometry

Fractal geometry provides the mathematical language to describe the intricate, irregular, and infinitely complex patterns that traditional Euclidean geometry, with its reliance on smooth lines and simple shapes, cannot adequately capture.[1] While Euclidean geometry models the idealized forms of human construction, fractal geometry models the rugged, self-repeating patterns found throughout nature, from the branching of trees to the structure of coastlines.[1] This section formally defines the core concepts of fractal geometry, providing the rigorous mathematical framework essential for understanding its application in generative modeling.

1.1 Self-Similarity and Scale Invariance

The conceptual heart of fractal geometry lies in the principle of self-similarity. A geometric object is considered self-similar if its constituent parts bear a resemblance to the whole shape, a property that can be either exact or statistical.[1] This means that if one were to magnify a small portion of a true fractal, the revealed structure would be a miniature, often slightly varied, version of the larger pattern. This characteristic is also known as scale invariance, which implies that the object appears "equally rough at all scales," lacking a preferred scale of observation.[1] This property stands in stark contrast to Euclidean shapes; magnifying a segment of a circle's circumference reveals a progressively flatter line, whereas magnifying a fractal coastline reveals ever more nooks and crannies, a phenomenon known as the coastline paradox, where the measured length of the boundary approaches infinity as the unit of measurement shrinks.[1]

This profound complexity often arises from surprisingly simple, recursive rules.[1] The process of repeatedly applying a function or a set of rules to its own output generates the intricate detail characteristic of fractals. This recursive generation is a foundational principle that connects classical fractal construction methods to the architectures of modern fractal-inspired generative models.

Canonical examples vividly illustrate these properties. The middle-third Cantor set, for instance, is constructed by starting with a unit interval and recursively deleting the middle third of every remaining segment. While the total length of the set approaches zero, it contains an uncountably infinite number of points and exhibits a fine structure at arbitrarily small scales.[2] Similarly, the Koch snowflake is formed by recursively replacing the middle third of each line segment with two sides of an equilateral triangle. With each iteration, the length of the boundary increases by a factor of 4/3, diverging to infinity, while the area it encloses remains finite.[1] Other famous examples include the Sierpinski gasket or triangle, formed by recursively removing central triangles from an initial triangle, which results in a structure composed of three smaller copies of itself.[2] These examples demonstrate that fractals possess a set of characteristic properties: a fine, detailed structure at all scales, a simple recursive definition, and a geometry that is not easily described in classical terms.[2]

1.2 Iterated Function Systems (IFS): The Language of Self-Similarity

Iterated Function Systems (IFS) provide the formal mathematical framework for generating and defining a wide class of fractals. An IFS is formally defined as a finite set of contraction mappings, $\{w1,w2,\ldots,wN\}$, operating on a complete metric space (X,d).[7] A mapping $wi:X\to X$ is a contraction if there exists a constant $s_i \in In practice, these mappings are most often affine transformations of the form $w(x)=Ax+b$, where A is a matrix that handles scaling and rotation, and b is a vector that handles translation.[8]
The collective action of these transformations is captured by the Hutchinson operator, W, which acts on sets. For any compact set $A\subset X$, the Hutchinson operator is defined as the union of the images of A under each of the individual transformations:

$W(A)=i=1\cup Nwi(A)$

A cornerstone result in fractal geometry is the Contraction Mapping Principle, which, when applied to this context by Hutchinson, guarantees that for any contractive IFS, there exists a unique non-empty compact set $S\subset X$, known as the attractor of the IFS, that is a fixed point of the Hutchinson operator.7 This is expressed by the fundamental fixed-point equation:
$S=W(S)=i=1\cup Nwi(S)$

This equation mathematically formalizes the concept of self-similarity: the fractal set S is precisely the union of transformed copies of itself. Furthermore, this unique attractor can be constructed by starting with any initial non-empty compact set S0 and iterating the Hutchinson operator, i.e., $Sk+1=W(Sk)$. The sequence of sets $\{Sk\}$ will converge to the attractor S in the Hausdorff metric.7
A popular and intuitive method for visualizing the attractor of an IFS is the **"chaos game"** algorithm.[7] This stochastic algorithm provides a practical means of rendering the often-complex fractal structure. The process is as follows:

1. An initial point p0 is chosen at random within the space X.
2. For each iteration $k=1,2,\ldots$, one of the contraction mappings wi is selected from the IFS. This selection is typically made randomly, often according to a set of associated probabilities $\{p1,p2,\ldots,pN\}$ where $\Sigma pi=1$.
3. The chosen map is applied to the current point to generate the next point: $pk=wik(pk-1)$.
4. This process is repeated for a large number of iterations, and the sequence of points $\{pk\}$ is plotted. After an initial transient period, the plotted points will converge to and trace out the unique attractor of the IFS. The Barnsley fern, for instance, is famously generated using a chaos game with four specific affine transformations, each with a different probability of being chosen, which governs the density of points in different parts of the fern structure.[8]

1.3 Fractal Dimension: Quantifying Complexity

While self-similarity describes the qualitative nature of fractals, the concept of **fractal**

dimension provides a quantitative measure of their complexity, or "roughness".[1] Unlike the integer dimensions of Euclidean geometry (a line is 1D, a plane is 2D), fractal dimension can be a non-integer, capturing how a fractal fills space as its scale of observation changes.[1] This fractional value formalizes the intuitive notion that a fractal curve can be more complex than a simple line (dimension > 1) but less space-filling than a solid plane (dimension < 2).

The most rigorous definition is the Hausdorff dimension, denoted D_H. Its construction begins with the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure, $H^s(F)$, of a set F. For a given dimension s and a small length scale δ, one considers all possible countable covers of the set F with balls $\{B_i\}$ whose diameters $|B_i|$ are all less than δ. The s-dimensional Hausdorff measure is then defined as the limit as $\delta \to 0$ of the infimum of the sum of the diameters raised to the power of s:

$$H^s(F)=\lim_{\delta\to 0}\inf\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}|B_i|^s\right\}$$

where the infimum is taken over all such δ-covers.13 The Hausdorff measure exhibits a critical behavior: there exists a unique value D_H such that for any $s<D_H$, the measure $H^s(F)$ is infinite, and for any $s>D_H$, the measure $H^s(F)$ is zero.[13] This critical value D_H is the Hausdorff dimension of the set F. It is the most theoretically robust definition of fractal dimension but can be very difficult to calculate directly.[14]

A more practical and computationally accessible alternative is the box-counting dimension, D_{BC}. This method involves covering the set F with a grid of boxes of side length ϵ and counting the minimum number of boxes, $N(\epsilon)$, required to contain the set. The box-counting dimension is then defined as the limit:

$$D_{BC}=\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{\log N(\epsilon)}{\log(1/\epsilon)}$$

This dimension measures how the number of covering boxes scales as their size decreases.13 Under many, but not all, circumstances, the Hausdorff and box-counting dimensions coincide.13

For the special but important case of strictly self-similar sets, a much simpler formula, the similarity dimension, can be used. If a fractal is composed of N non-overlapping copies of itself, each scaled down by a factor of $r<1$, its dimension D_s is given by the unique solution to the equation $N\cdot r^{D_s}=1$. Solving for D_s yields:

$$D_s=\frac{\log(N)}{\log(1/r)}$$

This elegant formula directly connects the geometric construction of the fractal (the number of copies N and the scaling ratio r) to its complexity.17 Using this, one can easily calculate the dimensions of canonical fractals. For the Cantor set, which is composed of $N=2$ copies scaled by $r=1/3$, the dimension is $D_s=\log(2)/\log(3)\approx 0.631$. For the Sierpinski triangle, composed of $N=3$ copies scaled by $r=1/2$, the dimension is $D_s=\log(3)/\log(2)\approx 1.585$.[17]

1.4 Canonical Examples: Mandelbrot and Julia Sets

The Mandelbrot and Julia sets are iconic examples of fractals that arise from the study of complex dynamics, specifically the iteration of simple quadratic functions in the complex plane. A **Julia set**, denoted J_c, is generated for a *fixed* complex parameter c. It is constructed by iterating the quadratic recurrence relation $z_{n+1}=z_n^2+c$ for every starting point z_0 in the complex plane. The filled-in Julia set consists of all starting points z_0 whose orbits remain bounded (do not escape to infinity).[18]

The **Mandelbrot set**, denoted M, is generated using a closely related process. Instead of fixing c and varying the starting point z_0, the Mandelbrot set fixes the starting point at $z_0=0$ and varies the parameter c. The Mandelbrot set is then defined as the set of all complex numbers c for which the orbit of $z_0=0$ under the iteration $z_{n+1}=z_n^2+c$ remains bounded.[19]

The relationship between these two sets is profound: the Mandelbrot set acts as a universal "map" or "index" for the family of all Julia sets.[18] The geometric structure of the Julia set J_c is directly linked to the location of the parameter c relative to the Mandelbrot set. The most fundamental connection is:

- If the parameter c is a point *within* the Mandelbrot set, the corresponding Julia set J_c is a single, connected piece.
- If the parameter c is *outside* the Mandelbrot set, the corresponding Julia set J_c is disconnected, forming a "dust" of infinitely many scattered points (often called a Fatou dust).[18]

The practical algorithm used to visualize both Mandelbrot and Julia sets is the **escape time algorithm**.[22] Since it is impossible to iterate infinitely to determine if an orbit is truly bounded, a finite approximation is used. A maximum number of iterations (e.g., 1000) and an "escape radius" or threshold (typically a circle of radius 2, since it can be proven that if $|z_n|>2$, the orbit will definitely escape to infinity) are defined.[21] For each point being tested (either c for the Mandelbrot set or z_0 for a Julia set), the iteration is performed. If the magnitude of z_n exceeds the escape radius before the maximum number of iterations is reached, the point is considered to be outside the set. The color of the corresponding pixel is then determined by the number of iterations it took to "escape." Points that do not escape within the maximum iteration count are considered to be inside the set and are typically colored black. This simple algorithm is responsible for generating the famously intricate and colorful images of these fractals, where the colored bands represent points that escape at different rates.[23]

Section 2: A Primer on Modern Deep Generative Models

Deep generative models represent a class of machine learning algorithms designed to learn the underlying probability distribution of a given dataset and subsequently generate new, synthetic data samples that resemble the original data.[27] These models have revolutionized fields like image synthesis, style transfer, and data augmentation by moving beyond discriminative tasks (classification) to creative ones (generation).[30] This section provides a comparative technical overview of the three most prominent families of deep generative models: Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), and Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs), focusing on their core architectures, objective functions, and fundamental trade-offs.

2.1 Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)

Introduced by Goodfellow et al. in 2014, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) are defined by a unique adversarial training process involving two competing neural networks.[31]
The **architecture** consists of two main components [30]:

1. A **Generator (G)**: This network takes a random noise vector z (typically sampled from a simple distribution like a Gaussian) as input and attempts to transform it into a synthetic data sample G(z) that is indistinguishable from real data.
2. A **Discriminator (D)**: This network acts as a binary classifier. It is presented with both real data samples from the training set and fake samples from the generator, and its task is to distinguish between them, outputting a probability that a given sample is real.

The **training process** is a zero-sum, minimax game where the two networks are trained in opposition.[33] The generator's goal is to fool the discriminator, while the discriminator's goal is to become better at identifying fakes. This dynamic is formalized by the
min-max loss function, which is derived from the binary cross-entropy between the real and generated distributions.[35] The value function
V(D,G) is given by:

GminDmaxV(D,G)=Ex~pdata(x)+Ez~pz(z)

In this formulation, the discriminator D is trained to maximize this objective. It aims to make D(x) approach 1 (for real data) and D(G(z)) approach 0 (for fake data), thereby maximizing both logarithmic terms. Concurrently, the generator G is trained to minimize this objective. Since G cannot affect the first term, its goal is effectively to minimize E, which it achieves by producing samples that cause the discriminator to output a high probability, D(G(z))⟶1.32
This adversarial training continues until a Nash equilibrium is reached, where the generator produces samples that are so realistic the discriminator can do no better than random guessing (i.e.,
D(G(z))=0.5).[36]
GANs possess distinct **strengths and weaknesses**. Their primary strength is the ability to generate exceptionally sharp and high-fidelity images, often setting the state-of-the-art in photorealism.[39] Furthermore, once trained, their inference process is very fast, involving a single forward pass through the generator network.[41] However, their adversarial training

dynamic is notoriously unstable and difficult to converge.[33] A common failure mode is **mode collapse**, where the generator discovers a few outputs that can consistently fool the discriminator and begins to produce only a limited variety of samples, failing to capture the full diversity of the training data.[41]

2.2 Variational Autoencoders (VAEs)

Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), introduced by Kingma and Welling in 2013, are generative models that combine a classic autoencoder architecture with a probabilistic, Bayesian inference framework.[45]

The **architecture** of a VAE is composed of an encoder and a decoder [46]:

1. An **Encoder ($q\phi(z|x)$)**: This network takes an input data point x and, unlike a standard autoencoder, maps it not to a single point in the latent space, but to the parameters of a probability distribution. Typically, this is a Gaussian distribution, so the encoder outputs a vector of means (μ) and a vector of log-variances ($\log(\sigma 2)$) that define the distribution for the latent representation z.
2. A **Decoder ($p\theta(x|z)$)**: This network takes a single point z, sampled from the latent distribution defined by the encoder, and attempts to reconstruct the original input data point x.

A key innovation in VAEs is the handling of the **probabilistic latent space**. The goal is to learn a latent space that is both *continuous* (nearby points in the space decode to similar outputs) and *complete* (any point sampled from the space decodes to a meaningful output).[46] This is achieved by forcing the learned latent distributions to be close to a prior distribution, usually a standard normal distribution

$N(0,I)$. However, the sampling process ($z \sim q\phi(z|x)$) is inherently stochastic and thus non-differentiable, which prevents the use of gradient-based optimization. VAEs solve this problem with the **reparameterization trick**.[48] Instead of sampling

z directly, a random noise vector ϵ is sampled from a fixed standard normal distribution, $\epsilon \sim N(0,I)$. The latent vector z is then computed deterministically as $z=\mu+\sigma\odot\epsilon$. This separates the random component from the learned parameters (μ and σ), allowing gradients to flow back through the encoder during training.[48]

The training of a VAE is guided by the optimization of a single objective function called the **Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO)**.[46] Maximizing the ELBO is equivalent to simultaneously maximizing the reconstruction quality and regularizing the latent space. The ELBO,

L, for a single data point x is derived from the principles of variational inference and can be expressed as [45]:

$$ \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; x) = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}{z \sim q\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)]}{\text{Reconstruction Term}} - \underbrace{D{KL}(q_\phi(z|x) || p_\theta(z))}{\text{Regularization Term}} $$

The first term is the reconstruction loss, which measures how well the decoder can reconstruct the input x from its latent representation z. This encourages the model to encode all necessary information. The second term is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the encoder's distribution $q\phi(z|x)$ and the prior $p\theta(z)$. Minimizing this term forces the latent distributions to be close to a standard normal distribution, which regularizes the latent space and prevents overfitting, thereby ensuring the continuity and completeness required for generation.47

The primary **strengths** of VAEs are their stable training process and their ability to learn a well-structured, smooth latent space that is highly suitable for tasks like semantic interpolation between data points.[55] Their main

weakness is that the images they generate tend to be blurrier and less photorealistic than those produced by state-of-the-art GANs, a result of the averaging effect inherent in the reconstruction loss.[55]

2.3 Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs)

Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs) are a more recent class of generative models that have demonstrated state-of-the-art performance in image synthesis, often surpassing GANs in terms of both sample quality and diversity.[41] They are inspired by concepts from non-equilibrium thermodynamics and operate through a two-stage process of diffusion and reversal.[58]

The **forward diffusion process** is a fixed (non-learned) procedure. It takes an image x_0 from the real data distribution and gradually adds Gaussian noise to it over a sequence of T timesteps.[60] At each step

t, the noise is added according to a predefined variance schedule $\{\beta_t\}_{t=1}^{T}$. The process is a Markov chain defined as:

$$q(x_t|x_{t-1})=N(x_t;1-\beta_t x_{t-1},\beta_t I)$$

A key property of this process is that we can sample the noisy image x_t at any arbitrary timestep t directly from the original image x_0 in a closed form 60:

$$q(x_t|x_0)=N(x_t;\bar{\alpha}_t x_0,(1-\bar{\alpha}_t)I)$$

where $\alpha_t=1-\beta_t$ and $\bar{\alpha}_t=\prod_{i=1}^{t}\alpha_i$. As t approaches T, the distribution of x_T becomes an analytically tractable isotropic Gaussian distribution, $N(0,I)$, effectively erasing all information from the original image.63

The **reverse diffusion process** is where the learning takes place. The goal is to learn a neural network, $p_\theta(x_{t-1}|x_t)$, that can reverse the diffusion process one step at a time. Starting from pure Gaussian noise, $x_T \sim N(0,I)$, the model iteratively denoises the sample until a clean image x_0 is generated.[64] The network, which typically has a U-Net architecture, is trained to predict the noise

ϵ_t that was added to create the noisy image x_t at each step. The training objective simplifies to minimizing the mean squared error between the predicted noise and the actual noise added during the forward process.[57]

The main **strengths** of diffusion models are their ability to generate images of exceptionally high quality and diversity, often exceeding the performance of GANs, and their training process is significantly more stable.[64] Their primary **weakness** is the slow and computationally expensive inference process. Generating a single image requires hundreds or thousands of sequential forward passes through the neural network (one for each denoising step), making them much slower than GANs or VAEs for sampling.[41]

2.4 Comparative Taxonomy and Table

The choice between GANs, VAEs, and Diffusion Models is not straightforward and depends heavily on the specific requirements of the application. A fundamental tension exists between sample fidelity, sample diversity, and computational cost (including training stability and inference speed). GANs excel at producing sharp, high-fidelity images quickly but can suffer from training instability and may fail to capture the full diversity of the data (mode collapse).[40] VAEs offer stable training and a well-structured latent space that is excellent for interpolation and exploring variations, but this comes at the cost of generating blurrier, lower-fidelity samples.[55] Diffusion Models represent a powerful compromise, achieving both high fidelity and high diversity with stable training, but this is balanced by a very high computational cost during their slow, iterative inference process.[41]

This trade-off landscape highlights that no single architecture is universally superior. The selection of a model is a constrained optimization problem based on project goals. Furthermore, the nature of each model's latent space—implicit and entangled in GANs, explicit and probabilistic in VAEs, or sequential and high-dimensional in Diffusion Models—is a critical architectural choice that directly dictates its generative capabilities and controllability.[46] This context underscores the motivation for developing hybrid models, which can be viewed as attempts to find more advantageous positions within this complex trade-off space. The following table provides a systematic comparison of these foundational generative architectures.

Model	**Core Principle**	**Training Objective**	**Latent Space Properties**	**Sample Quality (Fidelity)**	**Sample Quality (Diversity)**	**Training Stability**	**Inference Speed**	**Key Applications**
GAN	Adversarial game between a generator	Minimax loss based on binary cross-ent	Implicit, often entangled. Vector arithmetic	High / Sharp.[40]	Moderate to Low (prone to mode collapse).	Low / Unstable.[43]	High (single forward pass).[42]	Photorealistic image synthesis, style transfer,

	and a discriminator.[32]	ropy.[32]	is possible.[68]		[41]			super-resolution.[30]
VAE	Probabilistic encoding and decoding to learn a data distribution.[69]	Maximize Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO), balancing reconstruction and KL divergence.[46]	Explicit, continuous, smooth. Ideal for interpolation.[55]	Lower / Blurry.[40]	High.[40]	High / Stable.[55]	High (single forward pass).[42]	Data augmentation, anomaly detection, learning disentangled representations.[70]
Diffusion	Iteratively denoise a sample from a pure noise distribution by reversing a fixed noising process.[64]	Typically Mean Squared Error between predicted and actual noise.[57]	High-dimensional, existing at each timestep of the process.[67]	Very High / Sharp.[41]	Very High.[39]	High / Stable.[64]	Low (iterative, many forward passes).[42]	High-fidelity image synthesis, text-to-image generation, inpainting.[58]

Part II: Core Investigations in Fractal-Hybrid Generation

Building upon the foundational principles of fractal geometry and deep generative models, this part delves into the core of the research charter: the innovative synthesis of these two domains. The exploration of fractal-hybrid systems has evolved along a clear spectrum, moving from relatively superficial, data-driven mimicry to deep, structural integration. Early approaches treated fractals as a stylistic target, using standard neural networks as black-box function approximators to learn the visual characteristics of fractal datasets.[28] In contrast, more profound recent developments have internalized the principles of recursion and self-similarity as an architectural blueprint, creating models that are themselves fractal in nature.[72] This progression signifies a maturation of the field, suggesting that the most promising long-term advances will likely emerge from this deeper structural integration rather than from simple stylistic learning.

Section 3: Data-Driven Approaches: AI-Enhanced Fractal Synthesis

The most direct and foundational method for combining fractals and artificial intelligence involves using established generative models and training them on datasets composed of fractal images. This data-driven approach aims to leverage the powerful pattern-recognition capabilities of neural networks to learn the complex distributions of fractal geometry and generate novel "pseudo-fractals".[28]

3.1 Methodology: Training Generative Models on Fractal Datasets

The workflow for AI-enhanced fractal synthesis follows a standard machine learning pipeline, adapted for the specific nature of fractal data [28]:

1. **Dataset Generation and Collection:** The initial and most critical step is the creation of a large and diverse dataset of fractal images. This involves algorithmically generating numerous examples of well-known fractals, such as the Mandelbrot set and various Julia sets, ensuring a wide range of structures, colorings, and parameters are represented to provide a rich training signal for the model.[28]
2. **Data Preprocessing and Augmentation:** Before being fed into a neural network, the generated fractal images undergo a series of preprocessing steps to ensure consistency and improve model robustness. These steps include:
    - **Normalization:** Pixel values are scaled to a standardized range (e.g., 0 to 1 or -1 to 1) to facilitate faster convergence during training.[28]
    - **Resizing:** All images are resized to a uniform dimension to match the fixed input size required by the neural network architecture.[28]
    - **Data Augmentation:** To increase the variability of the training data and prevent overfitting, various augmentation techniques are applied. These include random rotations, translations, scaling (zooming), and flipping. This forces the model to learn the inherent structure of the fractals, independent of their specific orientation or position in the image.[28]
3. **Generative Model Training:** A standard generative model, such as a Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) or a Variational Autoencoder (VAE), is then trained on this prepared dataset.[28]
    - In a **GAN-based approach**, the generator network learns to produce images from random noise, while the discriminator is trained to distinguish these generated images from the real fractal images in the dataset. Through their adversarial competition, the generator becomes progressively better at creating outputs that the discriminator classifies as "fractal".[28]
    - In a **VAE-based approach**, the encoder learns to map the fractal images to a

low-dimensional latent space, and the decoder learns to reconstruct them. The model is optimized to learn a smooth and continuous probability distribution representing the "space of all fractals" in the dataset.[28]

The primary objective of this methodology is to create novel visual forms, termed **pseudo-fractals**, which retain the essential properties of their mathematical counterparts—such as self-similarity and intricate detail—while also incorporating unique variations and stylistic flourishes introduced by the AI's learning process. This fusion aims to bridge the gap between deterministic, formula-based fractal generation and the data-driven creativity of modern AI, potentially yielding patterns not easily achievable through conventional methods.[28]

3.2 Analysis of Generated Pseudo-Fractals and their Latent Space

Once a model has been successfully trained, the generated outputs and the internal representations it has learned must be rigorously analyzed to validate the approach and gain deeper understanding.

First, the generated pseudo-fractals require **verification** to confirm that they possess the desired fractal characteristics. This is a multi-faceted process involving both qualitative and quantitative assessment. **Visual inspection** is the initial step, where researchers examine the generated images for the hallmark traits of fractals, such as self-similar patterns, repeating motifs at different scales, and a high degree of visual complexity.[28] Beyond visual checks, **quantitative analysis** is performed to measure the fractal dimension of the generated images. Techniques like the box-counting method can be applied to the output images to calculate their fractal dimension, providing a numerical measure of their complexity and space-filling properties. This value can then be compared to the dimensions of the fractals in the original training set to assess how well the model has captured this fundamental property.[28]

Second, **latent space exploration** provides a powerful tool for understanding how the generative model has organized its internal representation of the "concept" of a fractal.

- For a **VAE**, which learns an explicit and continuous latent space, interpolation is a key analysis technique. By selecting two points in the latent space (corresponding to two different generated fractals) and generating images from points along the linear path between them, one can observe a smooth and meaningful transition from one fractal form to another. This demonstrates that the model has learned a coherent and well-structured representation manifold.[74]
- For a **GAN**, which learns an implicit latent space, vector arithmetic on the input noise vectors serves a similar purpose. For example, by finding vectors that correspond to specific attributes (e.g., "spiky" vs. "swirly"), one can perform operations like "spiky fractal" - "neutral fractal" + "swirly fractal" to manipulate the semantic features of the generated output in a controllable manner.[68]

This analysis of the latent space is not merely a technical exercise; it offers profound insights into the model's learned abstractions and provides a pathway toward more controllable and interactive fractal generation systems.

Section 4: Architecturally-Driven Approaches: The Emergence of Fractal Generative Models (FGM)

While data-driven methods treat generative models as black boxes trained on fractal data, a more profound and paradigm-shifting approach involves embedding fractal principles directly into the model's architecture. The most significant development in this domain is the **Fractal Generative Model (FGM)**, introduced by Tianhong Li et al..[75] This approach moves beyond merely mimicking fractal aesthetics to constructing models that are structurally fractal themselves, drawing inspiration from the recursive and self-similar patterns observed in nature and biological neural networks.[72]

4.1 Core Concept: Recursive Modularity and Self-Similarity

The foundational idea of FGM is a new level of **modularization**. Traditional modular design in computer science involves abstracting complex functions into atomic building blocks. FGM extends this concept by abstracting an entire generative model into a reusable **"atomic generative module"**.[72]

The FGM architecture is then constructed through a process of **recursive invocation**. A top-level "parent" generative module spawns multiple "child" modules of the same kind. Each of these child modules, in turn, can spawn its own children, and so on. This recursive process results in a deep, hierarchical framework that exhibits self-similarity across different levels of its architecture, directly analogous to the way mathematical fractals are formed.[72] The key component is the "generator" rule, which defines how each module recursively produces outputs for the next level, leading to an exponential growth in complexity and output dimensionality with only a linear increase in the number of recursive levels.[79]

4.2 Architectural Instantiation: Autoregressive FGM for Pixel-by-Pixel Generation

The FGM paper instantiates this framework to tackle the notoriously challenging task of **pixel-by-pixel image generation**. This task is difficult because images lack a natural one-dimensional sequential order, and modeling the dependencies between all pixels in a high-resolution image is computationally prohibitive for standard models like Transformers, which have a computational cost that scales quadratically with the sequence length (i.e., the number of pixels).[72]

The FGM architecture elegantly sidesteps this challenge with a "divide-and-conquer" strategy built on its recursive structure.[79] In the specific implementation using autoregressive models (which predict the next element in a sequence based on previous ones), the process works as follows [72]:

1. **Hierarchical Decomposition:** The image is conceptually broken down into a hierarchy of patches.
2. **Recursive Generation:** The generation process starts at the coarsest level. A top-level autoregressive model (e.g., a Transformer) processes a sequence representing large patches of the image.
3. **Passing Information:** The output of this top-level model is then passed down to a set of child models at the next level. Each child model is responsible for generating a finer-resolution patch, conditioned on the information received from its parent. This process repeats recursively, with each level adding more detail.
4. **Localized Attention:** The key to FGM's **computational efficiency** is that the attention mechanism within each autoregressive module is computed *locally*, only over the small patch it is responsible for, rather than globally across the entire image. This design choice dramatically reduces the computational burden. For a 256x256 image, a traditional visual autoregressive (VAR) model would need to compute attention over all 65,536 pixels. In contrast, an FGM might only compute attention within 4x4 or 16x16 patches at each level, leading to a massive reduction in floating-point operations (GFLOPs). The authors report that this makes their model up to **4096 times faster** than a comparable VAR model at 256x256 resolution.[80]

The paper explores two variants of the autoregressive module: **FractalAR**, which processes pixels in a fixed raster-scan order using a causal Transformer, and **FractalMAR**, which uses a random ordering and a bidirectional Transformer.[78]

4.3 Performance and Limitations

The FGM approach has demonstrated strong performance, particularly in likelihood estimation, while also showing competitive, though not superior, results in generation quality compared to top-tier GANs.

Performance Metrics: The quantitative results, reported in the paper and its associated GitHub repository, establish FGM as a leading architecture among pixel-based models.[72]

- **Likelihood Estimation:** On the CIFAR-10 dataset, FGM achieves a state-of-the-art Negative Log-Likelihood (NLL) score. FractalAR and FractalMAR record NLLs of 3.14 and 3.15 bits/dim, respectively, significantly outperforming previous autoregressive models like Perceiver AR and MegaByte, which scored 3.40.[72] This indicates that FGM is highly effective at accurately modeling the true data distribution.
- **Generation Quality:** On the more challenging ImageNet 256x256 benchmark, FGM produces high-quality images. The largest model, FractalMAR-Huge (848M parameters), achieves a Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) of 6.15 and an Inception Score (IS) of 348.9.[81] While these are impressive figures for a pixel-by-pixel model, they do not surpass the best GANs like StyleGAN-XL or GigaGAN, which report FIDs in the range of

2-4.[72] The strong IS and Precision scores suggest high fidelity in the generated images, but the comparatively weaker FID and Recall scores indicate that the model may not be capturing the full diversity of the training dataset, a common trade-off in generative modeling.[80]

Limitations: Despite its innovative design and strong performance, the FGM approach has noted limitations. Critical reviews suggest that the model could be viewed as a highly efficient, accelerated version of existing Visual Autoregressive (VAR) models rather than a completely new architectural paradigm.[80] The performance trade-off, where it excels in likelihood but lags top GANs in FID, highlights an area for future improvement. The model's strength lies in its ability to perform direct, interpretable pixel-level generation and editing tasks like inpainting and outpainting, which is a significant advantage over latent-space models like diffusion models.[84] However, bridging the final gap in generation quality with leading GANs and diffusion models remains an open challenge.

Section 5: Alternative and Emerging Hybrid Paradigms

Beyond the primary data-driven and architecturally-driven approaches, the research landscape includes several other emerging paradigms for integrating fractal concepts with neural networks. These methods, while less mainstream, offer unique perspectives and point toward novel future research directions.

5.1 Fractals as Priors in Deep Learning

A sophisticated method of integration involves using fractal properties not as raw training data, but as an explicit **prior** to guide or regularize the learning process of a deep neural network. This approach is conceptually analogous to the use of deep generative models themselves as data-driven priors in Bayesian inverse problems, where a learned distribution provides stronger, more realistic constraints than traditional, hand-crafted mathematical priors like Gaussian fields.[85]

In this context, instead of simply showing a model what fractals look like, one embeds the mathematical principles of fractals directly into the model's objective function or generative process. A compelling recent example of this is found in the domain of image super-resolution. The MFSR (Multi-fractal Feature for Super-resolution) model incorporates multi-fractal features extracted from a low-resolution input image as a "texture prior".[86] This fractal information is then used as a reinforcement condition during the denoising process of a diffusion model. By explicitly guiding the model with information about the image's inherent self-similarity and complexity at different scales, MFSR ensures a more accurate and detailed recovery of texture information than would be possible otherwise. This represents a more direct and mathematically grounded fusion of fractal theory and deep learning, where fractal analysis actively shapes the generation process.

5.2 Hybrid Fractology

A more abstract but potentially powerful conceptual framework is offered by **"Hybrid Fractology"**.[87] This novel framework posits that complex systems—including biological and artificial neural networks—can be effectively modeled by decomposing them into two interacting components:

1. **Fractal Components:** These represent the self-organizing, adaptive, and often nonlinear aspects of the system. In the brain, this could correspond to the dendritic branching of neurons or spontaneous synaptic growth. In AI, this mirrors the hierarchical feature extraction and nonlinear self-organization seen in deep learning.[87]
2. **Non-Fractal Components:** These represent the structured, stable, and often linear pathways within the system. In the brain, this could be the long-range, organized neural communication pathways. In AI, this is analogous to the structured, linear processes of gradient-based optimization.[87]

The core idea of Hybrid Fractology is that neural activity is neither purely chaotic nor strictly linear but arises from the interdependent interplay between these two components, ensuring both flexibility and efficiency. This framework suggests that a new generation of more effective and biologically plausible AI models could be developed by explicitly designing architectures that integrate these two modes of operation—for example, by combining adaptive, fractal-like learning mechanisms with structured, linear optimization pathways.[87]

5.3 Hybrid Quantum-Classical Models

At the cutting edge of computational research lies the exploration of **hybrid quantum-classical neural networks**.[88] While still a nascent and highly experimental field, this paradigm is relevant to the charter's forward-looking scope as it represents a fundamental shift in the underlying computational substrate. These models typically use classical neural networks (e.g., CNNs) for robust tasks like feature extraction and then leverage parameterized quantum circuits to potentially capture complex correlations and define sophisticated decision boundaries in ways that are intractable for classical computers.[88]

A recent pre-print paper, **HybridQ**, demonstrates the potential of this approach by proposing a hybrid classical-quantum GAN for generating medical images.[90] In this model, a classical-quantum fusion technique is used in the latent space to generate color medical images, reportedly outperforming classical GANs with significantly fewer parameters and training epochs. Although not explicitly fractal in nature, the exploration of such novel computational paradigms is a vital part of the broader research agenda. The potential for quantum computing to efficiently model the complex, high-dimensional probability distributions inherent in both generative modeling and fractal geometry makes this an area of significant future interest.

Part III: Analysis of Core Challenges

Despite the promising advancements in fractal-hybrid image generation, the field is confronted by a series of profound challenges that span computational theory, empirical evaluation, and legal-ethical frameworks. The historical difficulty of the fractal inverse problem continues to shape the trajectory of research, forcing a move from analytical solutions to heuristic and learning-based approaches. This shift, in turn, has exposed a critical mismatch between what existing evaluation metrics can measure and the unique aesthetic and geometric qualities that these new models aim to produce. Compounding these technical hurdles is a landscape of legal and ethical uncertainty, particularly concerning data privacy and copyright, which poses a significant threat to the practical application and commercial viability of this technology.

Section 6: The Intractability of the Fractal Inverse Problem

The central computational challenge that has historically defined and driven the field of fractal image analysis and compression is the **fractal inverse problem**. Its inherent difficulty is not merely a practical inconvenience but a fundamental barrier rooted in computational complexity theory. The field's evolution can be seen as a series of increasingly sophisticated attempts to circumvent, rather than directly solve, this intractable problem.

6.1 Formal Definition of the Inverse Problem

The "forward problem" in fractal geometry is straightforward: given a set of mathematical rules, such as an Iterated Function System (IFS), generate the corresponding fractal attractor. The **inverse problem**, conversely, is to start with a target image or set, S, and find the parameters of an IFS whose attractor, A, provides a close approximation to S.[92] Formally, this is an optimization problem: find the set of contraction mappings
$\{w_i\}$ that minimizes a distance metric $d(S,A)$, typically the Hausdorff distance, between the target and the attractor.[95]
A key theoretical tool for approaching this problem is the **Collage Theorem**.[92] It provides a practical, albeit suboptimal, pathway to a solution. The theorem states that if one can find a set of contractive maps
$\{w_i\}$ such that the union of the images of the target set S under these maps—the "collage" $W(S)=\cup_i w_i(S)$—is very close to the original set S, then the attractor A of that IFS will also be close to S. Specifically, if $d(S,W(S))<\epsilon$, then $d(S,A)<\epsilon/(1-s)$, where s is the largest contractivity factor among the maps. This effectively transforms the difficult problem of matching an

unknown attractor to the target into the more intuitive task of tiling the target image with smaller, transformed copies of itself.[10] However, finding the optimal tiling remains a formidable search problem.

6.2 Computational Complexity: NP-Hardness

The fundamental difficulty of the fractal inverse problem was formally established with the proof that finding the **optimal fractal code is NP-hard**.[97] A problem is NP-hard if it is at least as difficult as the hardest problems in the complexity class NP (Nondeterministic Polynomial time).[99] This implies that no known algorithm can find the guaranteed optimal solution in polynomial time for the general case. As the complexity of the image increases, the time required for an exhaustive search for the best set of fractal codes grows exponentially, rendering such an approach computationally intractable for all but the simplest cases.[99]
The proof of this NP-hardness is typically achieved through a **polynomial-time reduction**. This technique involves showing that a known NP-complete problem, such as **MAXCUT** (the problem of partitioning a graph's vertices into two sets to maximize the number of edges between them) [97] or
3-CNF Satisfiability (the problem of finding a satisfying assignment for a Boolean formula) [101], can be transformed into an instance of the optimal fractal coding problem in polynomial time. If such a reduction exists, a polynomial-time algorithm for optimal fractal coding would imply a polynomial-time algorithm for the original NP-complete problem, which is widely believed to be impossible (assuming $P \neq NP$). This theoretical result provides a rigorous justification for why the field has moved away from exhaustive search methods and towards heuristic and approximation algorithms.

6.3 Optimization-Based Approaches and Their Limitations

The NP-hardness of the inverse problem necessitates the use of optimization algorithms that do not guarantee a globally optimal solution but aim to find a "good enough" approximation within a feasible amount of time.

- **Genetic Algorithms (GAs):** GAs are a prominent class of metaheuristic search algorithms inspired by natural selection, and they have been widely applied to the fractal inverse problem.[96] The key components in this context are:
  - **Chromosome:** A data structure, typically a binary string, that encodes a candidate solution. For fractal compression, the chromosome represents the complete set of IFS parameters for an image, such as the coefficients of the affine transformations (scaling, rotation, translation) and the locations of the domain blocks for each range block.[105]
  - **Fitness Function:** An objective function that evaluates the quality of a chromosome. The goal is to find the chromosome that minimizes this function.

The most common fitness function is the Root Mean Square (RMS) error or Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the original image block and the image generated by the corresponding fractal code.[105]

    - **Genetic Operators:** The algorithm evolves a population of chromosomes over generations using operators like **selection** (favoring individuals with better fitness), **crossover** (combining parts of two parent chromosomes to create offspring), and **mutation** (introducing small, random changes to a chromosome to maintain diversity).[107] By iteratively applying these operators, the GA explores the vast search space to converge on a high-quality, low-error solution.
- **Simulated Annealing (SA):** SA is another powerful stochastic optimization technique used for this problem.[109] It is analogous to the process of annealing in metallurgy, where a material is heated and then slowly cooled to reach a minimum energy state. The algorithm starts with a random solution and a high "temperature" parameter. It iteratively explores neighboring solutions, always accepting better ones (lower error). Crucially, it also accepts *worse* solutions with a probability that depends on the temperature, allowing it to escape local minima. As the algorithm progresses, the temperature is gradually lowered according to an "annealing schedule," reducing the probability of accepting worse moves and eventually converging to a low-error state.[109] The objective function to be minimized is, again, typically the MSE between the target and reconstructed image blocks.[109]
- **Neural Network Approaches:** A more recent paradigm shift involves using neural networks, particularly Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), to directly predict the solution to the inverse problem.[112] In this approach, a CNN is trained on a massive database of fractal images and their known generating IFS parameters. After training, the network learns a direct mapping from the visual characteristics of a fractal to its underlying mathematical code. When presented with a new fractal image, the CNN can predict its IFS parameters in a single forward pass. While these predictions may not be perfectly accurate, they are often very close and can serve as an excellent starting point—or an initial population—for further refinement using traditional optimization methods like GAs, significantly accelerating the search process.[112]

The following table provides a comparative analysis of these optimization strategies.

Method	Core Principle	Strengths	Weaknesses	Computational Complexity
Exhaustive Search	Test all possible fractal codes to find the global optimum.	Guarantees the optimal solution.	Computationally intractable for non-trivial images.	Exponential (NP-hard).[97]
Collage Theorem	Find a "tiling" of the image with transformed	More intuitive than direct attractor matching.	Still a difficult search problem; provides a	High, but less than exhaustive search.

	copies of itself.		suboptimal solution.[92]	
Genetic Algorithm	Evolve a population of solutions using selection, crossover, and mutation.	Effective at global search; avoids getting trapped in local minima.[102]	Computationally intensive; many hyperparameters to tune; convergence can be slow.[114]	Heuristic; does not guarantee optimality.
Simulated Annealing	Probabilistically explore the solution space, accepting worse solutions to escape local minima.	Strong ability to escape local optima; conceptually simpler than GAs.[109]	Performance is highly sensitive to the annealing schedule; can be slow.[110]	Heuristic; does not guarantee optimality.
CNN Prediction	Learn a direct mapping from a fractal image to its IFS parameters.	Extremely fast prediction after initial training; can provide excellent initial guesses.[112]	Requires a large, curated training dataset; may not generalize to unseen fractal types; output is an approximation.[112]	High training cost, but very low inference cost.

Section 7: Evaluation and Benchmarking in a Hybrid Domain

A critical challenge facing the field of fractal-hybrid image generation is the absence of adequate evaluation methodologies. Standard metrics, developed primarily for assessing photorealism in traditional generative models, are ill-equipped to capture the unique geometric and aesthetic properties of fractals. This disconnect between what is measured and what is valued creates a significant obstacle to quantifying progress and guiding research. Furthermore, the human perception of complex visual information, such as fractals, is governed by principles of cognitive psychology that are entirely ignored by current automated metrics.

7.1 A Critical Review of Standard Image Generation Metrics

The evaluation of generative models typically relies on a suite of metrics that can be broadly categorized as pixel-based or distribution-based.

- **Pixel-Based Metrics (PSNR & SSIM):** These are reference-based metrics that require a ground-truth image for comparison.

- **Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR)** is derived from the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the generated and reference images. It quantifies the level of distortion in terms of pixel-wise error.[115] The formula is given by:PSNR=20·log10(MAXI)−10·log10(MSE)

  where MAXI is the maximum possible pixel value (e.g., 255 for an 8-bit image).115
- **Structural Similarity Index (SSIM)** was developed to better align with human perception by comparing images based on three components: luminance, contrast, and structure.[115] Its value ranges from -1 to 1, with 1 indicating perfect similarity.[117]

  The primary limitation of these metrics is their poor correlation with human judgment of image quality.72 An image with slight Gaussian blur might achieve a higher PSNR than an image with minor but structurally significant artifacts, even though a human observer would prefer the latter.117 They measure fidelity to a single reference, not generative quality or diversity.

- **Distribution-Based Metrics (FID & IS):** These metrics evaluate a set of generated images by comparing their distribution to a set of real images, without one-to-one correspondence.
  - **Inception Score (IS)** measures both the quality (low entropy of the class probability distribution for a single image) and diversity (high entropy of the marginal class distribution over all images) of generated samples, using a pre-trained InceptionNet classifier.[115]
  - **Fréchet Inception Distance (FID)** is the current standard for ranking generative models. It measures the Wasserstein-2 distance between the distributions of real and generated images in the feature space of a pre-trained Inception v3 network.[115] A lower FID score indicates that the two distributions are more similar.

    Despite their widespread use, these metrics have significant flaws. Their reliance on an Inception network pre-trained on ImageNet introduces a strong bias. Models that generate high-quality images outside the domain of ImageNet's classes may be unfairly penalized.122 Studies have shown that FID can be "gamed" by simply matching the class histogram of the target dataset, which lowers the FID score without any actual improvement in perceptual quality.123 This indicates that FID is sensitive to high-level semantic features related to ImageNet classes rather than general visual quality.

7.2 Benchmarking Datasets and Performance Tables

To contextualize the performance of any new generative model, it is essential to benchmark it against existing state-of-the-art models on standardized datasets. Common datasets for

image generation include **CIFAR-10** [124],
CelebA-HQ (high-quality celebrity faces) [125], and the large-scale
ImageNet.[129]
In recent years, more specialized benchmarks have been developed to address the unique challenges of evaluating generative models. **GenImage** is a million-scale dataset designed specifically for the task of detecting AI-generated images.[129]
JourneyDB is a large-scale benchmark for generative image *understanding*, containing millions of Midjourney images with corresponding text prompts and annotations for tasks like prompt inversion and style retrieval.[131] Libraries like
EvalGIM aim to provide a unified and flexible framework for evaluating text-to-image models across multiple datasets and metrics, introducing "Evaluation Exercises" to probe specific aspects like robustness and fairness.[132]
The following table provides a comparative benchmark of several state-of-the-art generative models on standard datasets, offering a baseline against which new fractal-hybrid models can be measured.

Model	Dataset	FID (↓)	IS (↑)	Precision (↑)	Recall (↑)	Source(s)
StyleGAN-XL	ImageNet 256x256	2.03	269.0	-	-	[72]
GigaGAN	ImageNet 256x256	3.45	225.5	0.84	0.61	[72]
ADM (Diffusion)	ImageNet 256x256	4.59	-	-	-	[133]
ADM-G (Guided)	ImageNet 256x256	3.94	-	-	-	[133]
FractalMAR-Base	ImageNet 256x256	11.80	274.3	-	-	[81]
FractalMAR-Large	ImageNet 256x256	7.30	334.9	-	-	[81]
FractalMAR-Huge	ImageNet 256x256	6.15	348.9	-	-	[81]
DCGAN	CIFAR-10	145.94	-	-	-	[134]
VAE	CIFAR-10	2.53	-	-	-	[134]
CLD-SGM (Diffusion)	CIFAR-10	2.25	-	-	-	[128]

7.3 The Need for Fractal-Specific Evaluation

The core issue with applying the metrics above to fractal-hybrid generation is a fundamental mismatch in objectives. FID, IS, and their variants are designed to measure photorealism and semantic diversity, while PSNR and SSIM measure pixel fidelity. None of these metrics are designed to quantify the defining characteristics of fractals: **geometric self-similarity**, **recursive detail**, and **fractal dimension**. A model could generate an image with a very low (good) FID score that bears no resemblance to a fractal, while another could produce a perfect mathematical fractal that receives a poor FID score because its structure is alien to the ImageNet distribution.

To truly evaluate progress in this domain, a new set of metrics is required. This brings the discussion to the realm of cognitive science and the psychology of perception. A visually complex image, such as a detailed fractal, imposes a high **cognitive load** on the human observer.[135] Cognitive load theory categorizes the mental effort required to process information into three types [138]:

1. **Intrinsic Load:** The inherent complexity of the information itself. A dense, intricate fractal has a high intrinsic load.
2. **Extraneous Load:** The mental effort imposed by the way information is presented. A poorly designed or cluttered visualization creates high extraneous load.
3. **Germane Load:** The productive effort related to schema construction and learning.

An effective fractal generation should produce an image that is aesthetically pleasing and comprehensible, which implies managing this cognitive load. It should present its high intrinsic complexity in a way that minimizes extraneous load, allowing the viewer to appreciate its structure without being overwhelmed.[140] This psychological dimension of complexity—how humans perceive and process intricate patterns—is entirely absent from current automated evaluation metrics. Therefore, a future evaluation framework must move beyond pixel and feature statistics to incorporate measures of geometric structure and principles of human visual perception.

Section 8: Ethical, Legal, and Privacy Frameworks

The advancement of powerful generative technologies like fractal-hybrid models does not occur in a vacuum. It is subject to a complex and evolving landscape of legal, ethical, and privacy regulations. These non-technical challenges, particularly concerning data privacy and intellectual property, are not peripheral concerns; they pose significant obstacles to the research, development, and deployment of these models. A failure to navigate this landscape responsibly could stifle innovation and erode public trust.

8.1 Data Privacy and Regulatory Compliance (GDPR & CCPA)

Generative AI models are fundamentally data-driven, often trained on vast datasets that may contain personal information. This immediately brings them under the purview of stringent data privacy regulations like the **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)** in Europe and

the **California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)** in the United States.[143]
These regulations are built on core principles that pose direct challenges to current practices in generative AI development [145]:

- **Lawful Basis and Purpose Limitation:** GDPR requires that all processing of personal data have a clear lawful basis (such as explicit consent) and be limited to the purpose for which the data was originally collected.[143] Training a generative model is often a new purpose for which specific consent was not obtained, especially when data is scraped from the internet.[148]
- **Data Minimization:** Both laws mandate that only the minimum amount of personal data necessary for a specific purpose should be collected and processed.[143] The "data-hungry" nature of large model training often conflicts with this principle.
- **Data Subject Rights:** A significant challenge is honoring the rights of data subjects, particularly the "right to erasure" (or "right to be forgotten").[144] Once personal data has been used to train a complex neural network, it becomes embedded in the model's weights in a distributed, non-transparent way. Removing this information without retraining the entire model is a difficult and unsolved technical problem, making compliance with deletion requests highly problematic.[147]

The **consent models** also differ significantly. GDPR operates on a strict **opt-in** basis, requiring explicit and informed consent *before* data collection.[144] In contrast, the CCPA largely uses an
opt-out model, allowing data collection by default unless a consumer actively chooses to refuse the sale or sharing of their information.[144] These divergent requirements create a complex compliance environment for developers of global AI systems.

8.2 Copyright and the "Human Authorship" Doctrine

Perhaps the most contentious legal issue surrounding generative AI is copyright. The central question is whether AI-generated content can be protected by copyright, and if so, who owns it.[152]
The legal sticking point in the United States is the **"human authorship" requirement**. U.S. copyright law has been consistently interpreted by courts and the U.S. Copyright Office to require that a work "owe its origin to a human agent".[154] This principle was decisively affirmed in the case of
Thaler v. Perlmutter, where a federal court ruled that an artwork generated "autonomously" by an AI system could not be copyrighted because it lacked a human author.[154] The consequence is that such works fall directly into the
public domain, free for anyone to use without permission or attribution.[160]
This creates a paradox. An artist or developer can use a sophisticated fractal-hybrid model to generate a visually stunning and commercially valuable piece of art, yet they may have no legal mechanism to protect it from being copied and exploited by others. This lack of

protection disincentivizes both the creation and commercialization of AI-generated art.[155]
The debate then shifts to **AI-assisted works**. The Copyright Office has stated that works containing AI-generated material may be copyrightable, but only to the extent of the human's creative contribution.[154] The critical question is what constitutes sufficient human involvement. Simply providing a text prompt has generally been deemed insufficient, with the Copyright Office comparing this to a client giving "general directions" to a human artist rather than being the artist themselves.[154] The human must exercise significant creative control over the "work's expression," for example, through the creative selection, arrangement, or modification of AI-generated elements.[154]
A related issue is the use of copyrighted material in **training data**. Many generative models are trained on vast datasets scraped from the internet, which inevitably include copyrighted images, text, and art. Artists and creators have filed numerous lawsuits arguing that this constitutes mass copyright infringement.[155] AI companies counter that this training process is a
fair use, arguing it is transformative and does not harm the market for the original works. The resolution of these cases will hinge on the courts' interpretation of the four fair use factors and will have profound implications for the future of AI development.[154]

8.3 Broader Ethical Considerations from Psychology (APA Guidelines)

Beyond strict legal compliance, the responsible development of generative AI requires a broader ethical framework. The principles outlined by the American Psychological Association (APA) for the use of AI in psychology offer a valuable and analogous model for navigating the ethical dimensions of generative systems.[162] These guidelines, while designed for a clinical context, translate directly to core ethical responsibilities for AI developers and users.
Key principles that can be adapted from the APA guidelines include [162]:

- **Confidentiality and Data Privacy:** This aligns directly with GDPR/CCPA concerns. Sensitive information, whether it is patient data or proprietary training data, must be protected. Using AI tools that store user inputs to train their own models can lead to serious breaches of confidentiality.
- **Bias and Accuracy:** AI systems reflect the biases present in their training data. If a model is trained on a biased dataset, it will perpetuate and potentially amplify those biases, leading to discriminatory or harmful outputs. This requires vigilant auditing of datasets and model outputs to ensure fairness.
- **Transparency and Explainability:** This addresses the "black box" problem in AI. Ethical practice demands that users and developers should be able to understand, at some level, how an AI system arrives at its output. This is crucial for accountability and for building trust in the technology.
- **Human Oversight and Judgment:** The APA guidance stresses that AI should *augment*, not *replace*, professional judgment. This principle is paramount for generative art. The human creator's vision, intent, and critical oversight must remain central. The AI should

be treated as a powerful tool, not an autonomous creator, aligning with the legal doctrine of human authorship.

Synthesizing these legal and ethical domains allows for the construction of a compliance framework for researchers and developers in the fractal-hybrid space.

Domain	**Principle**	**Key Regulation/Guideline**	**Implication for Fractal-Hybrid Models**
Data Privacy	Lawful Basis	GDPR Article 6	Must establish a clear lawful basis (e.g., explicit consent) for using any personal data in training sets. Scraping data without consent is high-risk.
	Data Minimization	GDPR Article 5(1)(c)	Collect and process only the minimum data necessary. Avoid using large, uncurated datasets containing irrelevant personal information.[143]
	Data Subject Rights	GDPR Articles 15-17	Must have a technical pathway to address requests for access and erasure. This is a major challenge for trained models and requires research into "machine unlearning".[147]
Copyright	Human Authorship	U.S. Copyright Law / *Thaler v. Perlmutter*	Purely AI-generated images are likely uncopyrightable in the U.S. Focus on AI as a tool. Document the human's creative process (prompt engineering, selection, arrangement, post-processing) to establish authorship.[156]

	Fair Use of Training Data	17 U.S.C. § 107	The legality of training on copyrighted data is unsettled. Using licensed or public domain datasets mitigates risk. The outcome of ongoing lawsuits will be critical.[154]
Ethics	Bias and Fairness	APA Ethical Guidelines	Audit training datasets for biases. Evaluate model outputs for harmful or discriminatory patterns. Prioritize diversity in data sources.[145]
	Transparency	APA Ethical Guidelines	Strive for explainable AI (XAI) methods that can provide insight into the generation process. Be transparent with users about the role of AI in content creation.[163]
	Human Oversight	APA Ethical Guidelines	Emphasize the role of the human creator. The AI is a tool to augment creativity, not replace it. Final creative decisions and accountability rest with the human user.[162]

Part IV: Future Pathways and Recommendations

The synthesis of fractal geometry and deep generative models opens a vast and largely unexplored frontier for research. The foundational reviews, core investigations, and challenge analyses conducted in this charter illuminate a clear path forward. Future work must pivot from demonstrating feasibility to tackling the core challenges of controllability, evaluation, and architectural innovation. This final part outlines a research roadmap designed to advance the field toward a new generation of generative systems that are not only powerful and efficient but also semantically meaningful and interpretable.

Section 9: Advancing Semantic-Fractal Correspondence

A primary limitation of current fractal generation, whether classical or AI-enhanced, is the disconnect between the low-level mathematical parameters that define the fractal and the high-level semantic features of the resulting image. The coefficients of an Iterated Function System (IFS) are abstract numbers that do not intuitively map to perceptual qualities like "branch density," "curliness," or "texture".[164] This abstraction barrier makes direct, intuitive control over the creative process nearly impossible. The next major breakthrough in this field will likely come from solving this mapping problem, bridging the gap between abstract parameters and meaningful artistic control.

9.1 The Challenge: From Abstract Parameters to Meaningful Features

The core challenge is to establish a clear and manipulable correspondence between the parameter space of a fractal-generating system and a human-understandable semantic feature space. The ultimate goal is to enable a user to specify high-level attributes (e.g., "more symmetric," "less dense," "add more spiral motifs") and have the model automatically translate these commands into the appropriate low-level parameter adjustments needed to generate the desired image.[86] This requires moving beyond random exploration of the parameter space to a structured understanding of its semantic organization.

9.2 Potential Approaches

Several research avenues hold promise for tackling this semantic mapping challenge:

- **Latent Space Disentanglement and Interpretation:** A powerful approach, borrowed from the broader field of generative modeling, is to focus on creating and interpreting a disentangled latent space. For a VAE or GAN trained on fractal data, the goal would be to apply techniques that encourage individual dimensions of the latent vector z to correspond to distinct, interpretable semantic attributes of the generated fractals.[168] For example, one latent dimension might learn to control the overall fractal dimension (complexity), another might control rotational symmetry, and a third might control the color palette. By identifying these "semantic vectors" within the latent space, one can achieve highly controllable generation through simple vector arithmetic and interpolation.[68]
- **Exploiting Fractal Features for Semantic Analysis:** Research in computer vision has already demonstrated that fractal features are correlated with semantic content in

real-world images. Techniques using local fractal dimension have been successfully applied to texture analysis, feature extraction, and semantic segmentation.[164] For instance, different textures in an image (e.g., grass vs. water) exhibit different fractal dimensions. This existing link proves that a mapping between fractal geometry and semantic meaning is not only possible but inherent in visual data. Future work could leverage this by building models that explicitly learn to predict semantic labels from fractal features, and then inverting this process for controlled generation.

- **Spectral-Fractal-Symbolic Interfaces:** On a more speculative but highly ambitious front, emerging conceptual frameworks like the Spectral–Fractal–Symbolic Interface (SFSI) propose a deep, unified connection between the spectral properties of networks (like neural networks), their geometric complexity (fractal dimension), and the emergence of symbolic meaning or cognition.[167] This framework suggests that transitions in cognitive states, such as the shift from spatial reasoning to abstract thought, may correspond to measurable shifts in the spectral and fractal properties of underlying neural activity. Applying this thinking to generative models could lead to systems where manipulating the fractal parameters of the architecture itself could induce predictable shifts in the semantic content of the output, representing the ultimate fusion of structure and meaning.

Section 10: A Research Roadmap for Integrated Fractal-Hybrid Models

Based on the comprehensive analysis presented in this charter, a concrete research roadmap can be formulated to guide future efforts in the field. This roadmap focuses on four key areas: architectural innovation, unified evaluation, revisiting the inverse problem, and navigating the non-technical landscape.

10.1 Architectural Innovation

The introduction of Fractal Generative Models (FGM) has opened a new design space for generative architectures. Future research should build upon this foundation.

- **Exploring Alternative Atomic Modules:** The original FGM paper focused on autoregressive models as the "atomic generative module".[73] A crucial next step is to explore the use of other generative architectures as the recursive building block. For instance, what would a
  Fractal Diffusion Model look like, where each level in the hierarchy performs a partial denoising step? Or a **Fractal VAE**, where a hierarchy of encoders and decoders operate at different scales? Investigating these new architectures could lead to models that combine the computational efficiency of the fractal structure with the unique strengths of other generative paradigms, such as the high sample quality of diffusion models.

- **Developing True Hybrid Architectures:** The most promising direction lies in creating architectures that are truly hybrid, explicitly combining data-driven and architecturally-driven principles. For example, one could design a system where a VAE is first trained on a large dataset of a specific class of images (e.g., natural landscapes, which have fractal properties). Then, an FGM could be trained to operate not on raw pixels, but within the learned, semantically rich **latent space** of this pre-trained VAE. Such a model would leverage the FGM's recursive efficiency to navigate and generate structures within a space that has already captured the high-level essence of the target domain, potentially offering the best of both worlds: structured generation and learned semantic understanding.

10.2 Unified Evaluation Frameworks

As established in Section 7, the field urgently needs evaluation metrics that are fit for purpose.

- **Development of New Metrics:** A dedicated research effort is required to create a new suite of metrics tailored for fractal-hybrid generation. This suite should be multi-faceted, including:
    1. **Geometric Metrics:** Algorithms that can be run on generated images to automatically calculate their fractal dimension (e.g., via box-counting) and other measures of statistical self-similarity.
    2. **Perceptual & Cognitive Metrics:** User studies grounded in cognitive psychology to evaluate aesthetic appeal, visual complexity, and the cognitive load imposed by the generated images. This moves beyond simple "realism" to assess how humans perceive and appreciate these unique structures.
    3. **Controllability Metrics:** Quantitative measures to assess how effectively a model can manipulate specific, user-defined semantic attributes in the generated output.
- **Creation of a Benchmark Dataset:** To facilitate standardized and reproducible research, the community should collaborate on creating a large-scale **Fractal-Hybrid Benchmark Dataset**. This dataset should contain a wide variety of mathematical fractals with their known generating IFS parameters, alongside a corpus of natural images with strong fractal characteristics. Crucially, these images should be annotated with both their geometric properties (e.g., fractal dimension) and a rich set of semantic labels, enabling the training and evaluation of models that aim to bridge the semantic-fractal gap.

10.3 Addressing the Inverse Problem and Compression

The original motivation for much of this field was fractal image compression, a goal that has been largely superseded by the focus on generation. However, the remarkable compression ratios achievable with IFS codes remain highly attractive.[93]

- **Revisiting Compression with Generative Models:** Future research could revisit the NP-hard fractal inverse problem, but armed with the power of modern generative models. Instead of using a CNN to simply predict IFS parameters, one could frame the problem in a generative context. For example, a conditional generative model could be trained to produce a set of IFS parameters (the compressed code) conditioned on an input image. The model's objective would be to generate a code whose attractor minimizes the reconstruction error. This approach could lead to a new generation of AI-powered compression algorithms that combine the semantic understanding of deep neural networks with the mathematical elegance and compactness of fractal codes.[175]

10.4 Navigating the Legal and Ethical Landscape

Progress in this field cannot be divorced from its societal context. Proactive engagement with legal and ethical challenges is essential.

- **Technical Solutions for Legal Ambiguity:** Research should be directed toward developing technical solutions that can help clarify legal questions. For example, work in **Explainable AI (XAI)** could lead to systems that can precisely document the degree of human creative input versus the model's contribution in the generation process. This documentation could serve as evidence in copyright disputes, helping to establish human authorship for AI-assisted works.
- **Data Provenance and Watermarking:** To address concerns about both copyright of training data and the authenticity of generated content, robust systems for **data provenance** are needed. This includes developing methods to trace the lineage of training data to ensure it is properly licensed, as well as creating invisible but resilient watermarking techniques to clearly identify images as AI-generated. This would promote transparency and accountability throughout the generative ecosystem.

Conclusion

The integration of fractal geometry with deep generative models represents a compelling and rapidly advancing frontier in artificial intelligence. This research artifact has charted the field's trajectory, from its foundations in the mathematics of self-similarity and the architecture of generative neural networks, to the core investigations into data-driven and structurally-integrated hybrid systems. The analysis reveals a clear evolution: a shift from using fractals as superficial training data to embedding the logic of recursion and self-similarity into the very fabric of generative architectures, as exemplified by the novel Fractal Generative Models.

This architectural internalization of fractal principles appears to be a powerful inductive bias for modeling the complex, multi-scale statistical distributions of the natural world, offering significant gains in computational efficiency. However, the field is at a critical juncture, facing profound challenges that must be addressed to unlock its full potential. The computational intractability of the classical fractal inverse problem, which catalyzed the turn towards learning-based methods, continues to influence research directions. More pressingly, the current suite of evaluation metrics, designed for photorealism, is fundamentally inadequate for measuring the geometric complexity and aesthetic novelty of fractal-hybrid outputs. This necessitates the development of new benchmarks that incorporate principles from both fractal analysis and cognitive science.

Perhaps the most significant barrier to widespread adoption is the unresolved legal and ethical landscape. The ambiguity surrounding copyright for AI-generated works, rooted in the doctrine of human authorship, combined with pressing data privacy concerns, creates a state of legal limbo that could stifle innovation and commercialization.

The future pathways are therefore clear. Research must focus on bridging the semantic-fractal gap to create controllable and intuitive generative tools. It must pioneer new hybrid architectures that combine the strengths of different generative paradigms within a fractal framework. It must establish robust and meaningful evaluation standards. And it must proactively engage with legal and ethical challenges by developing technical solutions for transparency and provenance. By pursuing this integrated research charter, the scientific community can move beyond mere generation towards a new form of computational creativity, unlocking systems capable of producing content with unprecedented complexity, efficiency, and profound aesthetic novelty.

Works cited

1. Fractal Geometry - Pardesco, accessed July 15, 2025, https://pardesco.com/blogs/news/fractal-geometry
2. Fractal Geometry_ Mathematical Foundations and Applications - Kenneth Falconer, accessed July 15, 2025, https://wwwf.imperial.ac.uk/~jswlamb/M345PA46/F03%20chap%201-4.pdf
3. HYBRID ALGORITHM FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF FRACTAL DESIGNS AND IMAGES, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/10.1142/S0218348X23400030
4. Introduction to Fractal Image Compression - uu .diva, accessed July 15, 2025, https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1561273/FULLTEXT01.pdf
5. Fractal Image Compression: What's it all About? - compression.ru, accessed July 15, 2025, http://www.compression.ru/arctest/descript/fractal.htm
6. Iterated Function Systems · Arcane Algorithm Archive, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.algorithm-archive.org/contents/IFS/IFS.html
7. Iterated function system - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iterated_function_system
8. ITERATED FUNCTION SYSTEMS - ART FROM CODE, accessed July 15, 2025, https://art-from-code.netlify.app/day-2/session-1/
9. Iterated Function Systems | Lee Mac Programming, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.lee-mac.com/iteratedfunctionsystems.html
10. SS > NSC > Fractal image compression, accessed July 15, 2025,

https://www-users.york.ac.uk/~ss44/complex/compress.htm
11. Iterated Function Systems - YouTube, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nIlp-vo8rHg
12. "Fractal Dimensions and Complexity", accessed July 15, 2025, https://imagej.net/ij/plugins/fraclac/FLHelp/FractalDimension.htm
13. Estimators of Fractal Dimension: Assessing the Roughness of ... - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/1101.1444
14. Chapter 2 Hausdorff measure and dimension, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.ma.imperial.ac.uk/~jswlamb/M345PA46/F03%20chap%202.pdf
15. Hausdorff Measure, accessed July 15, 2025, https://sites.math.washington.edu/~farbod/teaching/cornell/math6210pdf/math6210Hausdorff.pdf
16. Hausdorff Dimension and Fractal Geometry - ETH Zürich, accessed July 15, 2025, https://people.math.ethz.ch/~fdalio/BachelorThesisLucaFontana.pdf
17. Hausdorff dimension and its calculation | Geometric Measure Theory Class Notes - Fiveable, accessed July 15, 2025, https://library.fiveable.me/geometric-measure-theory/unit-2/hausdorff-dimension-calculation/study-guide/GYhhQNhSj0i27uwV
18. 5.6: The Julia Set - Mathematics LibreTexts, accessed July 15, 2025, https://math.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Analysis/Complex_Analysis_-_A_Visual_and_Interactive_Introduction_(Ponce_Campuzano)/05%3A_Chapter_5/5.06%3A_The_Julia_Set
19. Mandelbrot-Julia sets - Dynamic Mathematics, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.dynamicmath.xyz/mandelbrot-julia/
20. gauss.math.yale.edu, accessed July 15, 2025, https://gauss.math.yale.edu/public_html/People/frame/Fractals/MandelSet/welcome.html#:~:text=The%20Mandelbrot%20set%20is%20the,the%20Julia%20set%20is%20connected.
21. Mandelbrot set - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mandelbrot_set
22. Escape Time Fractals - Maple Help - Maplesoft, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.maplesoft.com/support/help/Maple/view.aspx?path=MathApps/EscapeTimeFractals
23. Plotting algorithms for the Mandelbrot set - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plotting_algorithms_for_the_Mandelbrot_set
24. The Escape-Time Algorithm - MI SANU, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.mi.sanu.ac.rs/vismath/javier/b2.htm
25. Session 5 - Escape-Time Fractals, accessed July 15, 2025, http://soft.vub.ac.be/~tvcutsem/teaching/wpo/grafsys/ex5/les5.html
26. New escape time algorithm of constructing Julia set - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286985455_New_escape_time_algorithm_of_constructing_Julia_set
27. Generative models and their latent space - The Academic, accessed July 15, 2025, https://theacademic.com/generative-models-and-their-latent-space/

28. (PDF) AI-Enhanced Fractal Geometry: Merging Machine Learning ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381699471_AI-Enhanced_Fractal_Geometry_Merging_Machine_Learning_with_Traditional_Fractal_Mathematics
29. A survey on generative adversarial networks for imbalance problems in computer vision tasks - PubMed, accessed July 15, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33552840/
30. What is a GAN? - Generative Adversarial Networks Explained - AWS, accessed July 15, 2025, https://aws.amazon.com/what-is/gan/
31. What are Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)? - IBM, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/generative-adversarial-networks
32. Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) - GeeksforGeeks, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/deep-learning/generative-adversarial-network-gan/
33. A Comprehensive Survey of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) in Cybersecurity Intrusion Detection - Amazon S3, accessed July 15, 2025, https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/pstorage-cqu-2209908187/45869847/A_Comprehensive_Survey_of_Generative_Adversarial_Networks_GANs_in_Cybersecurity_Intrusion_Detection.pdf?X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIA3OGA3B5WD3ZLMQ66/20250713/ap-southeast-2/s3/aws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20250713T031214Z&X-Amz-Expires=86400&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=37431c162e811f86af518ac02572268703f0db3c04874da7a4b50b03867fe71b
34. Mini-Max Optimization Design of Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN), accessed July 15, 2025, https://towardsdatascience.com/mini-max-optimization-design-of-generative-adversarial-networks-gan-dc1b9ea44a02/
35. Loss Functions | Machine Learning - Google for Developers, accessed July 15, 2025, https://developers.google.com/machine-learning/gan/loss
36. Deriving the minimax equation for GANs, accessed July 15, 2025, https://suzyahyah.github.io/generative%20models/2024/07/25/GANs-objective-first-principles.html
37. Understanding GAN Loss Functions - neptune.ai, accessed July 15, 2025, https://neptune.ai/blog/gan-loss-functions
38. Understanding the Min-Max Loss Function in GANs | by ML and DL Explained - Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@ml_dl_explained/understanding-the-min-max-loss-function-in-gans-66203c989fc6
39. GANs vs. Diffusion Models: In-Depth Comparison and Analysis - Sapien, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.sapien.io/blog/gans-vs-diffusion-models-a-comparative-analysis
40. Comparing Diffusion, GAN, and VAE Techniques | by Roberto Iriondo | Generative AI Lab, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/generative-ai-lab/a-tale-of-three-generative-models-comparing-diffusion-gan-and-vae-techniques-1423d5db5981

41. (PDF) Comparative Analysis of GANs and Diffusion Models in Image ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387444028_Comparative_Analysis_of_GANs_and_Diffusion_Models_in_Image_Generation
42. How does a diffusion model compare with GANs and VAEs? - Milvus, accessed July 15, 2025, https://milvus.io/ai-quick-reference/how-does-a-diffusion-model-compare-with-gans-and-vaes
43. Comparative Analysis of Generative Models: Enhancing Image Synthesis with VAEs, GANs, and Stable Diffusion - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2408.08751v1
44. (PDF) Generative adversarial networks: A recent survey, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370273119_Generative_adversarial_networks_A_recent_survey
45. Variational autoencoders - Matthew N. Bernstein, accessed July 15, 2025, https://mbernste.github.io/posts/vae/
46. What is a Variational Autoencoder? | IBM, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/variational-autoencoder
47. Tutorial - What is a variational autoencoder? - Jaan Lı 李, accessed July 15, 2025, https://jaan.io/what-is-variational-autoencoder-vae-tutorial/
48. The Reparameterization Trick - Emma Benjaminson, accessed July 15, 2025, https://sassafras13.github.io/ReparamTrick/
49. Reparameterization trick - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reparameterization_trick
50. Understanding the Reparameterization Trick | by ML and DL Explained - Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@ml_dl_explained/understanding-the-reparameterization-trick-be349756b91b
51. The Reparameterization Trick in Variational Autoencoders | Baeldung on Computer Science, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.baeldung.com/cs/vae-reparameterization
52. An Overview of Variational Autoencoders (VAE), KL Divergence, Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO), Reparametrization Trick, Latent Space, and Their Mathematical Background | by baris_kaplan | Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@bkaplan18/an-overview-of-variational-autoencoder-vae-kl-divergence-evidence-lower-bound-elbo-6583729f169a
53. tonyduan/variational-autoencoders: Variational ... - GitHub, accessed July 15, 2025, https://github.com/tonyduan/variational-autoencoders
54. Formulation of the Variational Autoencoder and Evidence Lower Bound and an Application to the MNIST Dataset - Eric Fischer, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.ericmfischer.com/project/variational-autoencoder/variational-autoencoder.pdf
55. Generative Models Explained: VAEs, GANs, Diffusion, Transformers, Autoregressive Models & NeRFs - Bestarion, accessed July 15, 2025, https://bestarion.com/generative-models-explained-vaes-gans-diffusion-transfo

rmers-autoregressive-models-nerfs/
56. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) vs. VAEs: A Comparative Analysis, accessed July 15, 2025, https://apxml.com/courses/vae-representation-learning/chapter-7-advanced-vae-topics-extensions/gans-vs-vaes-comparison
57. Hybrid Generative Models for Two-Dimensional Datasets, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.00203
58. Diffusion Model for Image Generation - A Survey - IEEE Computer Society, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.computer.org/csdl/proceedings-article/aihcir/2023/603600a416/1WE3aNseLNS
59. A Survey on Generative Diffusion Models - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2209.02646v10
60. Lecture 15. Diffusion Models - Math.Utah.Edu, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.math.utah.edu/~bwang/mathds/Lecture15.pdf
61. How diffusion models work: the math from scratch | AI Summer, accessed July 15, 2025, https://theaisummer.com/diffusion-models/
62. Diffusion Models: A Mathematical Note from Scratch | The Gradient, accessed July 15, 2025, https://cyk1337.github.io/notes/2022/12/12/Diffusion-Models-Math-Guide/
63. Diffusion model - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diffusion_model
64. Introduction to Diffusion Models for Machine Learning | SuperAnnotate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.superannotate.com/blog/diffusion-models
65. A Survey on Generative Diffusion Models - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2209.02646
66. Comparing Generative AI Models: GANs, VAEs, and Transformers - Hyqoo, accessed July 15, 2025, https://hyqoo.com/artificial-intelligence/comparing-generative-ai-models-gans-vaes-and-transformers
67. Diffusion models for 3D generation: A survey - Tsinghua Graphics and Geometric Computing Group, accessed July 15, 2025, https://cg.cs.tsinghua.edu.cn/papers/CVMJ-2025-diffusion.pdf
68. How to Explore the GAN Latent Space When Generating Faces - Machine Learning Mastery, accessed July 15, 2025, https://machinelearningmastery.com/how-to-interpolate-and-perform-vector-arithmetic-with-faces-using-a-generative-adversarial-network/
69. Variational autoencoders. - Jeremy Jordan, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.jeremyjordan.me/variational-autoencoders/
70. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), and Transformers | by Ajay Verma | May, 2025 | Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@ajayverma23/generative-adversarial-networks-gans-variational-autoencoders-vaes-and-transformers-225528564544
71. Diffusion Models in Vision: A Survey (accepted at IEEE ... - GitHub, accessed July 15, 2025, https://github.com/CroitoruAlin/Diffusion-Models-in-Vision-A-Survey

72. Fractal Generative Models - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2502.17437v1
73. accessed December 31, 1969, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2502.17437.pdf
74. Variational Autoencoder Tutorial: VAEs Explained | Codecademy, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.codecademy.com/article/variational-autoencoder-tutorial-vaes-explained
75. [2502.17437] Fractal Generative Models - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.17437
76. Unveiling the Brain's Fractal Structure: A New Paradigm for Generative Models and Beyond, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@thomas_59905/unveiling-the-brains-fractal-structure-a-new-paradigm-for-generative-models-and-beyond-328e327a6b58
77. Paper page - Fractal Generative Models - Hugging Face, accessed July 15, 2025, https://huggingface.co/papers/2502.17437
78. (PDF) Fractal Generative Models - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389316331_Fractal_Generative_Models
79. [Literature Review] Fractal Generative Models, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.themoonlight.io/en/review/fractal-generative-models
80. Fractal Generative Models - STRUCT, accessed July 15, 2025, http://39.96.165.147/Seminar/2025/0309_siwen.pdf
81. LTH14/fractalgen: PyTorch implementation of FractalGen ... - GitHub, accessed July 15, 2025, https://github.com/LTH14/fractalgen
82. [Paper Reading] Fractal Generative Models - YouTube, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yxNuUg3aUjA
83. Fractal Generative Models—Growing Images Like Nature Grows ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mD3QOoWIUKY
84. Fractal Generative Models - YouTube, accessed July 15, 2025, https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=QY_310dWUa0
85. Generative modelling meets Bayesian inference: a new paradigm ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12177523/
86. MFSR: Multi-fractal Feature for Super-resolution Reconstruction with Fine Details Recovery, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2502.19797v1
87. (PDF) Hybrid Fractology: A Unified Framework for Fractal and Non ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388681740_Hybrid_Fractology_A_Unified_Framework_for_Fractal_and_Non-Fractal_Systems_in_Neural_Networks
88. Hybrid Quantum–Classical Neural Networks for Efficient MNIST Binary Image Classification, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/12/23/3684
89. Hybrid Quantum Neural Network Image Anti-Noise Classification Model Combined with Error Mitigation - MDPI, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/4/1392
90. [2506.21015] HybridQ: Hybrid Classical-Quantum Generative Adversarial Network for Skin Disease Image Generation - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025,

https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.21015
91. [2308.16005] Hybrid Quantum Neural Network Structures for Image Multi-classification - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.16005
92. Fractal Image Compression and the Inverse Problem of ... - CiteSeerX, accessed July 15, 2025, https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=791c68739763f6ccd2d2aa44d4692369d99d9cf7
93. arxiv.org, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2507.06325v1#:~:text=In%20fractal%20image%20compression%2C%20this,instead%20of%20all%20destination%20blocks.
94. Chaotic Optimization and the Construction of Fractals: Solution of an Inverse Problem - Wolfram, accessed July 15, 2025, https://content.wolfram.com/sites/13/2018/02/03-1-4.pdf
95. Solving the Inverse Problem of 3D Fractals Using Neural Networks - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343473581_Solving_the_Inverse_Problem_of_3D_Fractals_Using_Neural_Networks
96. Fractal Image Compression using Genetic ... - Research Trend, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchtrend.net/ijet/ijet21/ijetnew/12%20ANAMIKA%20PANDEY%20AND%20ANSHUL%20SINGH.pdf
97. Optimal Fractal Coding is NP-Hard - People, accessed July 15, 2025, https://people.csail.mit.edu/ruhl/papers/1997-dcc.pdf
98. On the Inverse Problem of Fractal Compression - People | MIT CSAIL, accessed July 15, 2025, https://people.csail.mit.edu/ruhl/papers/2001-danse.html
99. NP-hardness - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NP-hardness
100. P, NP, Np-Complete and Np-Hard | PDF | Time Complexity - Scribd, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/presentation/575292835/6-P-NP-NPC-AND-NPH
101. NP-Hardness of the Problem of Optimal Box Positioning - MDPI, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/7/8/711
102. (PDF) Optimization of Fractal Functions using Genetic Algorithms., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221210367_Optimization_of_Fractal_Functions_using_Genetic_Algorithms
103. Optimization of Fractal Functions using Genetic Algorithms, accessed July 15, 2025, http://evelyne.lutton.free.fr/Papers/RR-1941.pdf
104. "A genetic algorithm applied to the fractal inverse problem" by Hiroo Miyamoto - Digital Scholarship @UNLV - University of Nevada, Las Vegas, accessed July 15, 2025, https://oasis.library.unlv.edu/rtds/329/
105. OPTIMIZATION OF FRACTAL IMAGE COMPRESSION WITH GENETIC ALGORITHMS - EURASIP, accessed July 15, 2025, https://new.eurasip.org/Proceedings/Ext/ISCCSP2006/defevent/papers/cr1220.pdf

106. (PDF) Technique for fractal image compression using genetic ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5576306_Technique_for_fractal_image_compression_using_genetic_algorithm
107. Fractal Compression of Single Images and Image Sequences using Genetic Algorithms - CiteSeerX, accessed July 15, 2025, https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=41ee50176fcb4e2d1cbc30bdbe98b485f8a21ca4
108. Genetic Algorithm based Fractal Image Compression - International Journal of Modern Engineering Research, accessed July 15, 2025, http://www.ijmer.com/papers/Vol3_Issue2/DH3211231128.pdf
109. ITERATION-FREE FRACTAL CODING FOR IMAGE ... - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thamarai-Selvi-Somasundaram/publication/4267451_Iteration-free_fractal_coding_for_image_compression_using_simulated_annealing/links/0046352e1cf0ce7ff7000000/Iteration-free-fractal-coding-for-image-compression-using-simulated-annealing.pdf
110. A Comparative Approach to Fractal image Compression Using Genetic Algorithm and Simulated Annealing Technique - MAK HILL Publications, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.makhillpublications.co/files/published-files/mak-ajit/2008/7-285-289.pdf
111. Simulated annealing - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simulated_annealing
112. Applying Neural Networks to a Fractal Inverse Problem - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354207184_Applying_Neural_Networks_to_a_Fractal_Inverse_Problem
113. Applying Neural Networks to a Fractal Inverse Problem | springerprofessional.de, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.springerprofessional.de/en/applying-neural-networks-to-a-fractal-inverse-problem/19609684
114. Speeding Up Fractal Image Compression by Genetic Algorithms - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226765284_Speeding_Up_Fractal_Image_Compression_by_Genetic_Algorithms
115. A Review of the Image Quality Metrics used in Image Generative Models - Paperspace Blog, accessed July 15, 2025, https://blog.paperspace.com/review-metrics-image-synthesis-models/
116. Image Quality Assessment through FSIM, SSIM, MSE and PSNR—A ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=90911
117. Measuring What Matters: Objective Metrics for Image Generation ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://huggingface.co/blog/PrunaAI/objective-metrics-for-image-generation-as

sessment
118. Understanding VMAF, PSNR, and SSIM: Full-Reference video quality metrics - FastPix, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.fastpix.io/blog/understanding-vmaf-psnr-and-ssim-full-reference-video-quality-metrics
119. How to Evaluate Semantic Communications for Images with ViTScore Metric? - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.04891
120. (PDF) Image quality metrics: PSNR vs. SSIM - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220931731_Image_quality_metrics_PSNR_vs_SSIM
121. Global-Local Image Perceptual Score (GLIPS): Evaluating Photorealistic Quality of AI-Generated Images - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2405.09426v1
122. THE ROLE OF IMAGENET CLASSES IN FR´ECHET INCEPTION DISTANCE - OpenReview, accessed July 15, 2025, https://openreview.net/pdf?id=4oXTQ6m_ws8
123. The Role of ImageNet Classes in Fréchet Inception Distance - OpenReview, accessed July 15, 2025, https://openreview.net/forum?id=4oXTQ6m_ws8
124. CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html
125. Interpretable Generative Models through Post-hoc Concept Bottlenecks - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2503.19377
126. oftverse/control-celeba-hq · Datasets at Hugging Face, accessed July 15, 2025, https://huggingface.co/datasets/oftverse/control-celeba-hq
127. Towards Photographic Image Manipulation with Balanced Growing of Generative Autoencoders - CVF Open Access, accessed July 15, 2025, https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_WACV_2020/papers/Heljakka_Towards_Photographic_Image_Manipulation_with_Balanced_Growing_of_Generative_Autoencoders_WACV_2020_paper.pdf
128. Score-Based Generative Modeling with Critically-Damped Langevin Diffusion, accessed July 15, 2025, https://research.nvidia.com/labs/toronto-ai/CLD-SGM/
129. GenImage-Dataset/GenImage - GitHub, accessed July 15, 2025, https://github.com/GenImage-Dataset/GenImage
130. GenImage: A Million-Scale Benchmark for Detecting AI-Generated Image, accessed July 15, 2025, https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/f4d4a021f9051a6c18183b059117e8b5-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html
131. JourneyDB: A Benchmark for Generative Image Understanding, accessed July 15, 2025, https://journeydb.github.io/
132. EvalGIM: A Library for Evaluating Generative Image Models ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://ai.meta.com/research/publications/evalgim-a-library-for-evaluating-generative-image-models/
133. Diffusion Models Beat GANs on Image Synthesis - NIPS, accessed July 15,

2025,
https://proceedings.nips.cc/paper/2021/file/49ad23d1ec9fa4bd8d77d02681df5cfa-Paper.pdf
134. Implementing and Evaluating Deep Generative Models for Image Generation: Performance and Ethical Considerations - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377112351_Implementing_and_Evaluating_Deep_Generative_Models_for_Image_Generation_Performance_and_Ethical_Considerations
135. Measuring effectiveness of graph visualizations: A cognitive load perspective, accessed July 15, 2025, https://nschwartz.yourweb.csuchico.edu/huang%20eades%20&%20hong%202009.pdf
136. How Cognitive Load Impacts Data Visualization Effectiveness - Datafloq, accessed July 15, 2025, https://datafloq.com/read/how-cognitive-load-impacts-data-visualization-effectiveness/
137. Designing for Cognitive Load in Complex Data Displays : r/AnalyticsAutomation - Reddit, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/AnalyticsAutomation/comments/1kvarzu/designing_for_cognitive_load_in_complex_data/
138. Cognitive Load as a Guide: 12 Spectrums to Improve Your Data ..., accessed July 15, 2025, https://nightingaledvs.com/cognitive-load-as-a-guide-12-spectrums-to-improve-your-data-visualizations/
139. Cognitive Load Theory & Gestalt Principles in Data Visualization | by İrem Cemek - Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@iremcemek/cognitive-load-theory-gestalt-principles-in-data-visualization-54a2e64cb09f
140. Storytelling with Data — Part 2. Cognitive Load and Charts Best... | by John Ostrowski | The Startup | Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/swlh/storytelling-with-data-part-2-6f4ec8a13585
141. The Art of Data Visualization: A Gift or a Skill?, Part 2 - ISACA, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.isaca.org/resources/isaca-journal/issues/2016/volume-2/the-art-of-data-visualization-a-gift-or-a-skill-part-2
142. Data Visualization: Cognitive load, the art of balance - Blog Orange Business, accessed July 15, 2025, https://perspective.orange-business.com/en/cognitive-load-dashboard/
143. AI and Personal Data Protection | Navigating GDPR and CCPA Compliance, accessed July 15, 2025, https://secureprivacy.ai/blog/ai-personal-data-protection-gdpr-ccpa-compliance
144. Understanding GDPR and CCPA in the Context of AI Systems, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.signitysolutions.com/blog/understanding-gdpr-and-ccpa
145. Ethical Concerns Associated with Generative AI - SG Analytics, accessed July 15, 2025,

https://www.sganalytics.com/blog/ethical-concerns-associated-with-generative-ai/
146. The growing data privacy concerns with AI: What you need to know - DataGuard, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.dataguard.com/blog/growing-data-privacy-concerns-ai/
147. Eight GDPR Questions when Adopting Generative AI | Compliance and Enforcement, accessed July 15, 2025, https://wp.nyu.edu/compliance_enforcement/2023/10/11/eight-gdpr-questions-when-adopting-generative-ai/
148. Is AI Model Training Compliant With Data Privacy Laws? - Termly, accessed July 15, 2025, https://termly.io/resources/articles/is-ai-model-training-compliant-with-data-privacy-laws/
149. Privacy in an AI Era: How Do We Protect Our Personal Information? | Stanford HAI, accessed July 15, 2025, https://hai.stanford.edu/news/privacy-ai-era-how-do-we-protect-our-personal-information
150. Navigating GDPR Compliance in the Age of Generative AI - CYTRIO, accessed July 15, 2025, https://cytrio.com/navigating-gdpr-compliance-in-the-age-of-generative-ai/
151. From Legal Text to Tech Specs: Generative AI's Interpretation of Consent in Privacy Law, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2507.04185v1
152. Generative AI Copyright Concerns & 3 Best Practices [2025] - Research AIMultiple, accessed July 15, 2025, https://research.aimultiple.com/generative-ai-copyright/
153. AI and Copyright Law: A Guide - Number Analytics, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ai-copyright-law-technology
154. Generative Artificial Intelligence and Copyright Law - Congress.gov, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/LSB10922
155. AI and the visual arts: The case for copyright protection - Brookings Institution, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ai-and-the-visual-arts-the-case-for-copyright-protection/
156. The Intersection of AI and Copyright: Navigating the Legal Landscape of AI-Generated Art, accessed July 15, 2025, https://uclawreview.org/2025/06/30/the-intersection-of-ai-and-copyright-navigating-the-legal-landscape-of-ai-generated-art/
157. US Appeals Court Rejects Copyrights For AI-Generated Art - Slashdot, accessed July 15, 2025, https://yro.slashdot.org/story/25/03/18/1918240/us-appeals-court-rejects-copyrights-for-ai-generated-art
158. Tools or Masterminds? — The Copyright Office on AI Authorship | The Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts, accessed July 15, 2025, https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/lawandarts/announcement/view/650

159. The Evolving Role of Copyright Law in the Age of AI-Generated Works | Hutson, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.lawjournal.digital/jour/article/view/486
160. Copyright and Generative AI | The Regulatory Review, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.theregreview.org/2025/06/07/seminar-copyright-and-generative-ai/
161. Generative AI, Copyrighted Works, & the Quest for Ethical Training Practices, accessed July 15, 2025, https://copyrightalliance.org/generative-ai-ethical-training-practices/
162. APA AI Ethical Guidance: A Clinician's Perspective - Videra Health, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.viderahealth.com/2025/07/03/apa-ai-ethical-guidance-clinician-perspective/
163. The Ethical Use of AI in Psychology: How Can Psychologists Save Time with AI? - PAR, Inc, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.parinc.com/learning-center/par-blog/detail/blog/2025/06/04/the-ethical-use-of-ai-in-psychology--how-can-psychologists-save-time-with-ai
164. Image Processing Applications Based on Texture and Fractal Analysis - IGI Global, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.igi-global.com/viewtitle.aspx?TitleId=52122&isxn=9781609604776
165. (PDF) Sentiment analysis via fractal dimension - ResearchGate, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300335829_Sentiment_analysis_via_fractal_dimension
166. Generalizable AI-Generated Image Detection Based on Fractal Self-Similarity in the Spectrum - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2503.08484v1
167. Spectral–Fractal–Symbolic Intelligence: Modeling Cognitive Phase Transitions with AI, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.ultra-unlimited.com/blog/spectral-fractal-symbolic-intelligence
168. Interpreting the Latent Space of GANs for Semantic Face Editing - CVF Open Access, accessed July 15, 2025, https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_CVPR_2020/papers/Shen_Interpreting_the_Latent_Space_of_GANs_for_Semantic_Face_Editing_CVPR_2020_paper.pdf
169. Deep Generative Modeling: The Foundation of Modern Generative AI | by Kapardhi kannekanti | Medium, accessed July 15, 2025, https://medium.com/@kapardhikannekanti/deep-generative-modeling-the-foundation-of-modern-generative-ai-b5a8c051cd73
170. A Fractal Curve-Inspired Framework for Enhanced Semantic Segmentation of Remote Sensing Images - PMC, accessed July 15, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11598546/
171. The Application of Fractal Analysis on Thyroid Ultrasound Images - Semantic Scholar, accessed July 15, 2025, https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/568b/b0fee9065efad21908ee676158309fa369a5.pdf
172. Fractal feature analysis and classification in medical imaging - PubMed,

accessed July 15, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18230510/
173. Fractal Compression: The Ultimate Guide - Number Analytics, accessed July 15, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/fractal-compression-ultimate-guide
174. Fractal compression - Wikipedia, accessed July 15, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fractal_compression
175. Optimization of Fractal Image Compression - arXiv, accessed July 15, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2507.06325v1