Copying a Reference Is Not the Same as Preserving a Subject

Caleb Chapman (CD), Cody Thompson (IL), Derek Jenkins (SC)

Abstract

High resemblance to an input image can coexist with failure to carry out the requested motion or scene. The distinction matters when reference-conditioned generators are assessed using similarity alone. This conceptual analysis develops a comparison between recognizable subject continuity and literal reuse of reference appearance. ARGUS provides the motivating task. The proposed evidence includes transformation execution, temporal behavior, and independent identity judgments; none is newly measured here. The argument identifies when close copying is useful and when it leaves the intended generation capability untested.

1. Similarity can reward a shortcut

An output that closely repeats a reference can be appropriate when faithful reproduction is the user's goal. A different task asks the same person to move, change viewpoint, or enter another scene. There, strong resemblance to one input frame is insufficient evidence of success. An evaluator needs to know whether the person remains recognizable through the requested transformation, not simply whether the output stays close to a convenient source observation.

ARGUS uses organized reference observations for subject-preserving video generation (Meng et al., 2026b). Its task motivates a distinction between using identity evidence and repeating an input's entire appearance. The present article develops that distinction without diagnosing copying in ARGUS or any other generator. No nearest-reference search, output comparison, or motion measurement is conducted. The scientific question is how a future study could identify successful subject continuity without automatically rewarding avoidance of the transformation that makes the task demanding.

The validity of an identity evaluation depends partly on how its scientific objects are named and linked. LFW's identity, image, pair, and fold units are explicit parts of its protocol (Huang et al., 2008). The scikit-learn implementation documents which file corresponds to each supported task (Pedregosa et al., 2011). Dataset provenance should similarly make the intended use and selection process recoverable (Gebru et al., 2021). In video generation, an evaluator needs additional links among reference observations, subjects, clips, and frames. Repeated references can provide useful evidence without becoming independent subjects. A pair-level metadata audit can reveal those relationships, but it cannot evaluate the visual content of a generated clip. The distinction is productive: data organization can be checked before an expensive model study begins, and the missing measurements can be specified rather than silently assumed to exist.

Discriminative identity representations address a different question from the design of the test population. FaceNet learns an embedding for verification and related recognition tasks (Schroff et al., 2015). ArcFace (Deng et al., 2018) and CosFace (Wang et al., 2018) develop margin-based approaches to discriminative face learning. These methods do not determine which reference views should be supplied to a generator. Dataset choices also alter the challenge: VGGFace2 emphasizes pose and age variation (Cao et al., 2017), MegaFace increases the scale of recognition distractors (Kemelmacher-Shlizerman et al., 2015), and FairFace studies representation across annotated demographic groups (Kärkkäinen and Joo, 2019). Their relevance is to separate distinct kinds of coverage. Many comparisons of a small reference set cannot replace missing pose variation or a different population of people. A study should state which identity measurement it uses, how thresholds are selected, and what the represented cases actually cover. Strong

performance on one protocol does not establish universal validity of the embedding across generated or stylized subjects.

2. Comparing preservation and transformation together

A proposed evaluation would define the requested change before selecting metrics. If the instruction asks for a new camera view, the outcome should include whether that view is produced. If it asks for motion, the motion needs an appropriate temporal assessment. Identity judgments would remain a separate endpoint. A clip that preserves the subject but does little else can then be distinguished from a clip that performs the action while substituting another person.

Reference resemblance could still be reported, provided its interpretation is explicit. The study might compare output frames with the supplied observations using declared representations, but a high score would not alone establish memorization or copying. Similar content can arise through several routes. A claim about literal reuse would require additional evidence suited to that mechanism. The proposed analysis focuses on observable task behavior and avoids treating one similarity pattern as a complete account of how a model produced its output.

The comparison should preserve reference budgets, source versions, generation settings, and selection opportunities. A method given more views may legitimately obtain better coverage, while a method allowed many retries may find a more favorable sample. Both differences belong in the workflow record. Matching only output duration or nominal sample count would leave important information differences unresolved and could make an apparent preservation advantage reflect unequal opportunity rather than the conditioning method itself.

A large collection of measurements does not guarantee a large collection of independent cases. Repeated observations can share unrecorded acquisition conditions or a common source, making row-level uncertainty misleading. White's covariance estimator addresses heteroskedasticity within a specified regression (White, 1980), while cluster methods address a declared form of grouped dependence (Cameron and Miller, 2015). Neither approach repairs a poorly defined outcome or establishes representativeness of the observed sample. A report should identify the number of groups, their relative sizes, and the reason for selecting the grouping level. When only a few independent groups are available, apparently precise numerical intervals warrant particular caution. This is a limitation of the evidence structure, rather than a reason to count correlated measurements as fresh observations.

Describing a contrast accurately can be more valuable than giving it an unjustified mechanistic name. A causal interpretation needs assumptions about how exposure and outcome arose, including selection into the analyzed sample. Causal diagrams provide a language for those assumptions (Greenland et al., 1999). If several alternative metrics or partitions are examined, the investigator should also account for the freedom to select whichever result appears strongest. False-discovery control is relevant to explicit collections of statistical tests (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995), while a descriptive sensitivity analysis should be presented as such. A model can fit the observed rows well and still leave the principal explanation unresolved. Reporting that boundary preserves the value of the observation without overstating what adjustment or a significance threshold has established.

A subject-generation pipeline can succeed at using a reference without succeeding at every identity requirement. DreamBooth's model adaptation (Ruiz et al., 2022) and IP-Adapter's image prompting (Ye et al., 2023) offer examples of reference use with different costs and information access. CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) and DINO (Caron et al., 2021) provide further visual representations whose similarity scores may emphasize other aspects of content. The evaluation should therefore define its target before choosing

a convenient feature. If the intended target is a recognizable moving person, that target needs appropriate observations across the relevant views and expressions. A high generic image similarity can instead reflect scene layout or texture. Matching reference budgets and documenting the evaluator's representation permit those explanations to be compared. The objective is to connect a claimed conditioning advantage to the particular identity evidence the resulting output actually preserves.

3. Evidence that a score should not replace

Independent human assessment can ask whether the intended subject remains recognizable and whether the transformation is fulfilled. These questions should be separated from overall visual preference. A nearly static reference-like clip can look appealing, while a more demanding correct transformation can contain minor artifacts. Combining those outcomes without an explicit preference rule would allow presentation quality to determine the meaning of preservation. Retaining separate judgments permits the application to choose among the resulting tradeoffs.

Temporal records are particularly important. A clip can begin with a near-copy and later change subject, or it can depart visibly from the initial image while retaining the person throughout. A representative still cannot establish either trajectory. The proposed protocol would examine declared intervals and preserve uncertainty where identity cannot be assessed. It would also report measurement coverage so that unscorable motion does not disappear from a result described as robust across the full clip.

The final conclusion should be tied to the range of transformations tested. A study of modest pose changes cannot establish preservation during every complex action or scene transition. Equally, a limited successful transformation is valuable evidence when its requirements are explicit. The key is to avoid defining the endpoint in a way that predetermines the winner: neither maximum reference resemblance nor maximum visual difference alone is a sufficient measure of preserving a subject while producing the requested new video.

An evaluation protocol should state what remains unfamiliar at assessment time. Leaving out an observation while retaining its close relatives can test interpolation rather than the broader transfer suggested by the study's wording. Validation methods for structured data emphasize matching the split to temporal, spatial, or hierarchical dependence (Roberts et al., 2017). Separately, parameter selection can bias an evaluation if the same observations guide both choices and reporting (Varma and Simon, 2006). These issues are not solved by calling a split a test set. The record should identify shared sources, the information accessible during development, and the stage at which each design choice was fixed. A result can be informative within a narrow boundary while providing no direct evidence about a more distant deployment population.

An automated measurement should not inherit the authority of its training labels without a direct assessment of use. The relevant checks include systematic disagreement with the intended procedure (Bland and Altman, 1986) and calibration of any probability claims (Guo et al., 2017). Ranking performance, absolute accuracy, and confidence reliability are distinct outcomes. A study can improve one while leaving the others unchanged. Keeping the measurements separate permits examination of those tradeoffs and avoids implying that one favorable statistic establishes all aspects of validity. When independent judgments are unavailable, the limitation should remain part of the result. The absence of a target observation cannot be repaired by combining several correlated proxies into a more elaborate total score.

4. Designing an interpretable preservation study

Video evaluation should preserve the distinction among identity, temporal behavior, and general visual appearance. VBench offers a multidimensional approach to video assessment (Huang et al., 2023), while structural similarity (Wang et al., 2004), learned perceptual metrics (Zhang et al., 2018), and generative video-distribution evaluation (Unterthiner et al., 2018) provide different kinds of measurements. Their outputs can disagree for scientifically meaningful reasons. A temporal average may dilute a brief subject substitution, and a strong reference match may reward a nearly static output that fails to carry out the requested motion. The test should therefore retain where and when each observation was made. Human judgments or task-specific measurements may be needed to determine whether a disagreement is consequential. Combining metrics is reasonable only when the combination's interpretation is explicit. A total score should not conceal the fact that one component was unavailable or inappropriate for the very cases motivating the new generation method.

A system's reliable operating region may be narrower than the collection of inputs an interface accepts. Selective prediction separates performance on accepted cases from the fraction of cases accepted (Geifman and El-Yaniv, 2017). Reporting only the former can hide a substantial loss of coverage. Uncertainty estimates may also change under distribution shift (Ovadia et al., 2019), so familiar-condition confidence is not automatically evidence about new subjects, scenes, or control histories. A useful evaluation records rejected, ambiguous, and unsupported cases alongside successful ones. This makes it possible to distinguish limited but honest capability from a system that answers broadly with unreliable certainty. Any proposed deferral rule still requires assessment on its intended input population; it is not validated merely by being described.

Reproducibility begins with preserving which scientific objects are being linked. Stable identifiers and reusable metadata help connect inputs, reference observations, model versions, and reported outcomes (Wilkinson et al., 2016). The scoring pipeline also has dependencies that can change the interpretation of a result: preprocessing, representation checkpoints, thresholds, and aggregation code can all matter (Sculley et al., 2015). A compact release should retain those decisions rather than only the final mean. Where source data cannot be redistributed, an access description and hashes can still identify the analyzed inputs. This record allows later users to distinguish a change in the underlying system from a change in how the system was measured. Reproducibility is therefore part of interpretation, not simply a final packaging step.

5. Conclusion

Reference resemblance belongs beside evidence of transformation, recognizability, and temporal behavior. The proposed design reports no new copying or preservation result. It clarifies how close reproduction can be useful without proving the more demanding capability of generating a recognizable subject under change. A future comparison should therefore retain the requested task and its observed execution rather than allow one convenient similarity score to stand for the complete generation objective.

References

Meng, Zijie, et al. "Argus: Stacked multi-view identity mosaic injection for subject-preserving video generation." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.11670* (2026).

White, Halbert. “A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity.” *Econometrica*, vol. 48, no. 4, 1980, pp. 817-838. https://doi.org/10.2307/1912934.

Cameron, A. Colin, and Douglas L. Miller. “A Practitioner’s Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference.” *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2015, pp. 317-372. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.50.2.317.

Greenland, Sander, Judea Pearl, and James M. Robins. “Causal Diagrams for Epidemiologic Research.” *Epidemiology*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1999, pp. 37-48. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001648-199901000-00008.

Benjamini, Yoav and Yosef Hochberg. “Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, vol. 57, no. 1, 1995, pp. 289-300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x.

Roberts, David R., et al. “Cross-validation strategies for data with temporal, spatial, hierarchical, or phylogenetic structure.” *Ecography*, vol. 40, no. 8, 2017, pp. 913-929. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02881.

Varma, Sudhir and Richard Simon. “Bias in error estimation when using cross-validation for model selection.” *BMC Bioinformatics*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-7-91.

Wilkinson, Mark D., et al. "The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship." *Scientific Data*, vol. 3, 2016, article 160018. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18.

Sculley, D., et al. "Hidden Technical Debt in Machine Learning Systems." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 28, 2015. https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2015/hash/86df7dcfd896fcaf2674f757a2463eba-Abstract.html

Bland, J. Martin, and Douglas G. Altman. "Statistical Methods for Assessing Agreement between Two Methods of Clinical Measurement." *The Lancet*, vol. 327, no. 8476, 1986, pp. 307-310. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(86)90837-8.

Guo, Chuan, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. “On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks.” *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, vol. 70, 2017, pp. 1321-1330. https://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/guo17a.html.

Geifman, Yonatan, and Ran El-Yaniv. “Selective Classification for Deep Neural Networks.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017. https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.08500.

Ovadia, Yaniv, et al. “Can You Trust Your Model’s Uncertainty? Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty Under Dataset Shift.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019. https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02530.

Huang, Gary B., Marwan Mattar, Tamara Berg, and Erik Learned-Miller. "Labeled Faces in the Wild: A Database for Studying Face Recognition in Unconstrained Environments." *ECCV Workshop on Faces in Real-Life Images*, 2008. https://cs.umass.edu/~elm/papers/Huang_eccv2008-lfw.pdf.

Schroff, Florian, et al.. "FaceNet: A Unified Embedding for Face Recognition and Clustering" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.03832*, 2015. https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03832.

Deng, Jiankang, et al.. "ArcFace: Additive Angular Margin Loss for Deep Face Recognition" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07698*, 2018. https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.07698.

Wang, Hao, et al.. "CosFace: Large Margin Cosine Loss for Deep Face Recognition" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09414*, 2018. https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.09414.

Cao, Qiong, et al.. "VGGFace2: A dataset for recognising faces across pose and age" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.08092*, 2017. https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.08092.

Kemelmacher-Shlizerman, Ira, et al.. "The MegaFace Benchmark: 1 Million Faces for Recognition at Scale" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.00596*, 2015. https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.00596.

Kärkkäinen, Kimmo and Jungseock Joo. "FairFace: Face Attribute Dataset for Balanced Race, Gender, and Age" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04913*, 2019. https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.04913.

Ruiz, Nataniel, et al.. "DreamBooth: Fine Tuning Text-to-Image Diffusion Models for Subject-Driven Generation" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.12242*, 2022. https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.12242.

Ye, Hu, et al.. "IP-Adapter: Text Compatible Image Prompt Adapter for Text-to-Image Diffusion Models" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06721*, 2023. https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06721.

Huang, Ziqi, et al.. "VBench: Comprehensive Benchmark Suite for Video Generative Models" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17982*, 2023. https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17982.

Caron, Mathilde, et al.. "Emerging Properties in Self-Supervised Vision Transformers" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14294*, 2021. https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.14294.

Radford, Alec, et al.. "Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00020*, 2021. https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020.

Zhang, Richard, et al.. "The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Deep Features as a Perceptual Metric" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.03924*, 2018. https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.03924.

Unterthiner, Thomas, et al.. "Towards Accurate Generative Models of Video: A New Metric & Challenges" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01717*, 2018. https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.01717.

Wang, Zhou, Alan C. Bovik, Hamid R. Sheikh, and Eero P. Simoncelli. "Image Quality Assessment: From Error Visibility to Structural Similarity." *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2004, pp. 600-612. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2003.819861.

Gebru, Timnit, et al.. "Datasheets for datasets" *Communications of the ACM*, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723.

Pedregosa, Fabian, et al. "Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python." *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, 2011, pp. 2825-2830. https://jmlr.org/papers/v12/pedregosa11a.html.