

Spatiotemporal Generative Models for Video and 4D Scenes: Architectures, Control, and Evaluation

Author Name(s) TBD

Affiliation(s) TBD

Email(s) TBD

Index Terms—spatiotemporal generative models, video generation, text-to-video, world simulators, temporal coherence, motion control, physics-aware generation, 4D scenes, Gaussian splatting

Abstract—Spatiotemporal generative models have advanced from short, stylized clips to systems that can synthesize longer videos, follow structured motion controls, and, in some settings, support interactive rollouts. In parallel, a fast-growing line of work generates explicit 3D/4D scene representations (e.g., dynamic radiance fields and Gaussian splats) that enable re-rendering under viewpoint changes and more direct scene editing. This review surveys objectives and architectures for video and 4D generation, with an emphasis on temporal coherence, motion/camera control, and the role of physics and interaction priors. We propose a control-surface view that unifies prompting, trajectory/camera interfaces, and editing operators, summarize evidence regimes for frontier systems, and recommend evaluation protocols that stress-test coherence, controllability, and geometric consistency beyond average-case realism. Our goal is a practical, evidence-bounded map of design choices and evaluation practices for researchers and practitioners building video “world simulators” and 4D generative pipelines.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

Recent progress in generative modeling has turned video from a niche output modality into a scalable target for large spatiotemporal generators. Diffusion-based video models demonstrate strong perceptual quality and text alignment, and have become a common backbone for both research prototypes and deployed systems [1]–[5]. At the same time, token-based and hybrid approaches explore alternative training and control interfaces, blurring lines between “video generation” and broader sequence modeling [6]–[8].

Beyond short clips, a recurring aspiration is to treat a generator as a controllable simulator: a model that maintains persistent scene state, responds to interventions, and supports interactive rollouts. This framing appears explicitly in recent technical reports and in research on generative interactive environments [9]–[11]. In practice, the “world simulator” label spans a spectrum of task settings, from open-loop text-to-video to closed-loop environment generation for agent interaction [10]–[12].

This review focuses on three tightly coupled themes: (i) video models as scalable spatiotemporal generators (and when such models meaningfully support “world simulator” claims), (ii) temporal coherence, motion control, and physics/interaction priors, and (iii) 3D/4D-aware generation and rendering, where the output is a dynamic scene representation rather than pixels alone [13]–[15]. We emphasize evidence-bounded comparisons, control interfaces, and evaluation protocols, while avoiding repetitive year-centric narration. Figure 1 summarizes the task settings and evaluation axes used throughout the paper.




Fig. 1. Task settings and evaluation axes used throughout the paper. We treat “world simulator” claims as a spectrum, and separate open-loop generation from closed-loop interactive rollouts [9]–[11].

Our contributions are:

- a compact taxonomy of spatiotemporal generative objectives, representations, and spacetime backbones [2], [16], [17];
- a control-surface view of coherence mechanisms and motion/camera interfaces for generation and editing [18]–[21];
- a 3D/4D-aware perspective that connects video generators to dynamic scene representations and rendering-time constraints [13]–[15], [22];
- practical evaluation guidance, highlighting what common metrics capture and where they fail [23]–[26].

II. FOUNDATIONS: SPATIOTEMPORAL GENERATIVE MODELING

We organize spatiotemporal generators along three axes: (i) the *generative objective* (diffusion/score vs transport/flow vs autoregressive), (ii) the *representation* (pixels, latents, or tokens), and (iii) the *output type* (video frames vs 3D/4D scene representations). This section introduces these building blocks and the design tradeoffs they induce [1], [16], [17], [27]. Figure 2 provides a minimal taxonomy, and Figure 3 sketches a backbone-level view of diffusion/flow-style generators [2], [5], [19]. Table I complements this view with a compact summary of objective families and their typical sampling profiles.

A. Objectives: diffusion, score models, and transport

Diffusion models learn to reverse a forward noising process, typically by predicting noise or a related target at multiple noise levels [1]. The continuous-time view unifies many variants under stochastic differential equations (SDEs) and clarifies the role of samplers and noise schedules [27]. In parallel, transport-based objectives such as flow matching learn velocity fields that map a simple source distribution to the data distribution [16], and rectified-flow-style training seeks straighter trajectories that can reduce sampling cost [17]. For video, these objectives interact with temporal consistency because sampling proceeds along a trajectory in model time while the generated content must remain coherent along *scene time*.

B. Representations: pixels, latents, and tokens

Video generation is often memory-bound; many practical systems therefore operate in a learned latent space, amortizing high-resolution synthesis while retaining perceptual detail [4], [28]. Tokenization offers an alternative that can support long-horizon modeling and discrete control interfaces, at the cost of representation bottlenecks and token design choices [6], [7]. For 3D/4D-aware generation, the representation may be an explicit scene model (e.g., Gaussians) that enables fast rendering and view-dependent effects, shifting some difficulty from generation to representation learning and optimization [14], [15], [22].

C. Backbones: spacetime U-Nets and diffusion transformers

Early video diffusion work often adapts image U-Nets by adding temporal convolutions or attention, balancing capacity against the quadratic cost of global spacetime attention [2]. Space-time diffusion designs model space and time jointly to improve coherence, while remaining compatible with diffusion training and guidance [5]. More recently, transformer backbones have become common in large generators, motivated by scaling behavior and unified token processing over space-time [8], [29].

D. Conditioning and control channels

Conditioning choices determine what the model can be *asked* to do at inference time. Text-to-video systems commonly use cross-attention to text embeddings, while additional controls (depth/pose/edges/trajectories) can be injected via dedicated control networks or adapters [18], [19], [30]. Because control signals are often imperfect or underspecified, robustness to control noise and explicit mechanisms for temporal stabilization are central to long-horizon generation [21], [31].

E. Scaling, factorization, and long-horizon generation

Scaling video models stresses both training (data, compute, memory) and inference (sampling cost, temporal drift). Recent systems therefore explore factorization strategies that decouple *scene construction* from *temporal synthesis*, aiming to preserve global consistency while extending duration [32], [33].

Family	Sampling profile	Typical tradeoffs in video
Diffusion / score	many-step denoising	strong quality; expensive sampling; needs explicit coherence mechanisms [1], [2]
Flow matching / rectified	ODE/velocity fields	fewer-step generation possible; training/objective choices matter for stability [16], [17]
Auto-regressive	token-by-token rollout	long context and discrete controls; sensitive to tokenization and error accumulation [6], [7]

TABLE I
OBJECTIVE FAMILIES AND THEIR TYPICAL SAMPLING PROFILES IN SPATIOTEMPORAL GENERATION. MANY PRACTICAL SYSTEMS HYBRIDIZE THESE CHOICES.




Fig. 2. A minimal taxonomy for video and 4D generators: objective family, representation, and output type. Concrete systems choose points in this space (often hybridizing choices) [2], [7], [14]–[16], [28].

Autoregressive spacetime modeling provides another route to long-context generation, though it inherits tokenization and compounding-error challenges [6], [7], [34]. Geometry-aware priors can further stabilize long rollouts by propagating 3D structure or by conditioning on intermediate scene state [35], [36].

III. FRONTIER SYSTEMS AND WORLD-SIMULATOR FRAMING

Frontier video generators span a wide range of disclosure regimes. Some are released as detailed technical reports (often on arXiv) with explicit evaluation sections [5], [8], [10], while others are primarily described via product documentation, system cards, or API references [9], [37]–[41]. This creates a fundamental asymmetry: closed systems may expose rich user-facing controls, but provide limited information about training data, compute, and standardized evaluation protocols [37], [39].

A. Capability axes and evidence types

We compare systems along axes that matter for downstream use and scientific evaluation: perceptual fidelity, duration, temporal coherence, controllability, and (when applicable) geometric/3D consistency. For each axis, we treat the *evidence type* as part of the claim: peer-reviewed or arXiv reports (stronger for measurable attributes), official docs/system cards (stronger for availability and documented controls), and third-party anecdotes (excluded from quantitative comparison). When a field is not explicitly disclosed, we mark it as unknown rather than inferring it [37], [39].

B. A compact comparison snapshot

Table II summarizes a small set of representative systems and what can be reliably said about them from public sources.




Fig. 3. Backbone schematic for diffusion/flow generators with conditioning controls.




Fig. 4. Illustrative timeline of a few widely cited milestones and publicly documented releases (not exhaustive). Each label corresponds to a specific public report or documentation source [2]–[5], [8]–[10], [37], [38].

The goal is not a leaderboard; it is a transparency-aware map of what claims are *supported* and what remains underspecified [37], [39], [40]. Figure 4 provides an illustrative (non-exhaustive) timeline of a few widely cited milestones and documented releases.

C. Reporting checklist for comparability

For the community to evaluate “world simulator” progress without over-indexing on isolated demos, reports should make a small set of choices explicit: prompt sets, sampling settings, control inputs, and what is being measured. Benchmark suites provide partial standardization but cannot replace transparent reporting [23], [24]. We recommend a lightweight checklist (Table III) that applies to both open papers and product-facing documentation.

Finally, we note a growing set of research systems that explicitly target long-horizon and interactive behavior, including 3D-aware long-video generation and general interactive world models [33], [36]. These systems motivate evaluation beyond short clips and toward closed-loop consistency tests.

IV. TEMPORAL COHERENCE AND MOTION CONTROL

Temporal coherence is the core bottleneck for treating a video generator as a reliable spatiotemporal engine. Common failure modes include flicker, identity drift, inconsistent geometry across frames, and camera-motion artifacts; these failures often appear even when per-frame quality is high [2], [5], [24]. We summarize coherence mechanisms and control interfaces through a “control surface” lens: what inputs can the user (or an upstream planner) provide, and what consistency guarantees are empirically supported.

A. Mechanisms for temporal consistency

Coherence can be improved at multiple levels. *Architecture-level* mechanisms increase temporal receptive field (e.g., spacetime attention) but must manage quadratic complexity and memory [2], [5]. *Training-level* mechanisms introduce explicit temporal constraints (e.g., multi-frame supervision or structured motion priors), often trading flexibility for stability




Fig. 5. Coherence mechanisms by intervention layer. In practice, long-horizon stability often relies on inference-time strategies, while fine-grained edits commonly operate through attention control or targeted tuning [20], [31].




Fig. 6. A control-surface taxonomy for video generation and editing. Different methods expose different subsets of these interfaces, with varying robustness to underspecified or noisy controls [18]–[21], [30], [46].

[18], [19]. *Inference-level* mechanisms stabilize long generation through sliding windows, anchoring, or consistency post-processing without retraining, which is attractive for frontier or closed models where weights are inaccessible [31]. Figure 5 sketches this design space.

B. Control surfaces: from prompts to trajectories and cameras

Control mechanisms can be grouped by the *structure* of the provided constraint [18], [30]. Low-bandwidth controls include prompts and style references; higher-bandwidth controls specify spatial layouts, keyframes, object motion trajectories, or camera motion. Control networks originally developed for images (e.g., ControlNet) motivate analogous interfaces for video, but temporal consistency makes the mapping nontrivial [18], [30].

Trajectory and camera controls are particularly important for world-simulator use cases because they provide an explicit handle on motion and viewpoint. Representative approaches include unified motion controllers, tuning-free trajectory control, and explicit disentanglement between camera pose and temporal progression [19], [21], [47]. Zero-shot object motion control is another complementary direction, aiming to steer moving entities without task-specific finetuning [48]. Camera control can also be framed as an editing task on user-provided videos [49]. Related “re-angle” formulations cast viewpoint changes as video-to-video translation with implicit 4D structure [50]. Figure 6 summarizes common control surfaces. Table IV provides a concrete mapping from control surfaces to representative methods (not exhaustive).

C. Long-horizon and multi-shot coherence

Long-horizon generation amplifies small inconsistencies into visible drift: character identity changes, object persistence failures, and camera-motion artifacts accumulate across windows [24], [31]. A common mitigation is to introduce hierarchical or multistage generation, where a coarse plan (scene

System	Access	Output	Documented control surfaces	Public evidence (non-exhaustive)
Sora / Sora 2	Product	Video	Prompt + product/UI controls (details vary); safety disclosures ^a	OpenAI report + system card + release notes [9], [37], [38]
Vevo (Vertex AI)	API / cloud	Video	Prompt; API-level options; model/version-specific constraints ^b	Google Cloud model + API docs [39], [42], [43]
Runway Gen-4.5	Product	Video	Prompt + documented creation workflow; product constraints ^c	Runway help docs [40]
Luma Ray3	Product	Video	Prompt + product controls (undisclosed details in many cases)	Luma press/product page [41]
Pika (1.0+)	Product	Video	Prompt + product controls (undisclosed details in many cases)	Pika blog (milestones) [44]
Stable Video Diffusion	Open weights	Video	Prompt + image/video conditioning (method dependent)	Open arXiv report with released weights [4]
Lumiere / Movie Gen / Genie	Research reports	Video / environments	As reported in each paper (e.g., prompting, structured controls)	Technical reports and evaluations [5], [8], [10]

^a We treat system cards as evidence for safety/evaluation process, not as a complete specification of model internals.

^b Documented constraints vary by model version; use the cited docs for up-to-date API-facing details.

^c Product documentation is used for workflow and constraints; undisclosed fields are treated as unknown.

TABLE II

TRANSPARENCY-AWARE COMPARISON: ONLY FIELDS EXPLICITLY SUPPORTED BY PUBLIC SOURCES ARE INCLUDED; MISSING INFORMATION IS TREATED AS UNKNOWN.

Item	What to disclose (minimum)
Prompts	prompt sets, constraints, and any prompt filtering [24]
Sampling	steps, guidance, windowing/anchoring, post-processing [31]
Controls	which control surfaces are supported and failure modes under noisy controls [19]
Geometry	whether 3D/4D priors are used (explicit or implicit) [35], [45]
Safety	threat model, mitigations, and evaluation methods [37]

TABLE III

A MINIMAL REPORTING CHECKLIST FOR REPRODUCIBLE COMPARISONS.
WHEN FIELDS ARE UNDISCLOSED, DOWNSTREAM COMPARISONS SHOULD
TREAT THEM AS UNKNOWN RATHER THAN INFERRED.

layout, keyframes, or motion scaffold) is refined into higher-frequency details, reducing the burden on a single denoising trajectory [32], [53]. Another perspective is to make structure explicit: tracking- or correspondence-derived signals can distill structure-preserving motion cues that improve stability under edits and long rollouts [52]. For 3D-aware long video, explicitly propagating geometry provides a complementary route to persistence beyond texture-level consistency [33], [35].

D. Constraint-based editing and controllable stories

Editing often demands local, semantically meaningful changes while preserving the rest of the scene. Region- and instruction-driven video editing frameworks therefore combine in-context constraints with temporal stabilization to maintain coherence under localized edits [20], [51]. These interfaces are particularly relevant for “world simulator” applications where the user (or an agent) issues interventions mid-rollout rather than re-generating from scratch [9].

V. PHYSICS AND INTERACTION PRIORS

Video generators are often trained to match pixel distributions, so “physics” is not guaranteed unless it is encoded in




Fig. 7. Constraint-in-the-loop patterns for physics-aware generation. The “physics” component can be a hard constraint, a soft loss, a simulator, or a learned discriminator; the key is that it provides a testable signal tied to dynamics rather than appearance alone [54], [56], [57].

the data, architecture, or objective. Nevertheless, physics and interaction priors are central for world-simulator ambitions: agents require controllable dynamics, contact events, and counterfactual interventions, not just plausible-looking motion [9], [10], [12].

A. Injecting physical constraints

One family of approaches directly injects physical rules or constraints into the generative process, for example by penalizing violations, constraining motion fields, or guiding sampling toward physically consistent trajectories [54]. Related directions treat “physical alignment” as an intervention problem for diffusion models, where adaptive constraints or corrective signals are learned to reduce violations under distribution shift [55]. Another family targets interaction-rich settings, where the generated video must reflect object-level dynamics and contact, making evaluation more diagnostic than pure perceptual metrics [56]. Figure 7 summarizes common integration patterns.

B. Interaction and diagnostics

Interaction-focused methods can couple generation to 3D object representations, enabling “what-if” interventions and object-centric control [57]. Domain-grounded world models (e.g., driving) further provide structured state representations (occupancy, geometry priors) that support more explicit physical checks [12]. Recent work also explores interaction-heavy

Control surface	Typical signal	Representative methods	Notes / failure modes
Motion adapters	learned temporal modules	AnimateDiff [18]	Reuses image priors; can drift for long horizons without stabilization.
Trajectories	sparse paths / keypoints	MotionCtrl, FreeTraj [19], [47]	Sensitive to underspecified depth/occlusion; may trade fidelity for control adherence.
Camera	pose/path/time	BulletTime, ReCapture [21], [49]	Camera control can conflict with identity/persistence unless geometry or anchors are used.
Zero-shot motion	object motion edits	Motion-Zero [48]	Control success depends on object segmentation/association and prompt ambiguity.
Attention edits	cross-attention control	Video-P2P [20]	Good for localized semantic edits; can break global motion consistency.
One-shot tuning	video-specific finetune	Tune-A-Video [46]	Preserves a specific video style/identity; limited transfer across scenes.
Region constraints	in-context spatial edits	Region-Constraint editing [51]	Strong locality; needs temporal stabilization to prevent flicker at boundaries.
Structure distillation	tracking-derived motion	Structure From Tracking [52]	Improves motion structure; depends on tracker quality and domain shift.

TABLE IV

CONTROL SURFACES AND REPRESENTATIVE METHODS. THE TABLE IS ILLUSTRATIVE; MANY SYSTEMS COMBINE MULTIPLE CONTROLS AND ADD INFERENCE-TIME STABILIZATION [31].

Check	What to test (examples)
Contact	collisions, sliding vs sticking, interpenetration frequency
Forces	gravity direction consistency; acceleration plausibility under control
Conservation	momentum and energy trends in simple rigid-body settings (where measurable)
Constraints	joint limits; nonholonomic constraints in locomotion/wheels
Counterf.	change an object or action; verify localized, causal effects
Long horizon	drift accumulation; stability under repeated interventions

TABLE V

PHYSICS/INTERACTION EVALUATION CHECKLIST. THESE CHECKS ARE MOST INFORMATIVE WHEN PAIRED WITH A DOMAIN DEFINITION AND EXPLICIT CONTROL INPUTS [12], [54], [56].

human-object and human-to-robot settings, where plausibility can be tested by downstream physical feasibility of inferred actions [58]–[60].

Because physics failures are often subtle, we advocate diagnostics that probe invariances and counterfactual consistency rather than relying only on generic video metrics [54], [56]. Table V lists practical checks that can be adapted to different domains.

VI. 3D/4D-AWARE GENERATION AND RENDERING

Many “world simulator” use cases require more than pixel realism: they require a *scene representation* that can be queried, edited, and rendered under viewpoint changes. This motivates 3D/4D-aware generators that either (i) produce an explicit 3D/4D representation and render video from it, or (ii) use 3D/4D priors to stabilize video generation and control [13]–[15], [45].

A. Representations and rendering tradeoffs

Neural radiance fields (NeRF) represent scenes implicitly and can achieve high fidelity, but typically require costly




Fig. 8. Representation tradeoffs for view synthesis and rendering. 4DGS inherits 3DGS speed but must additionally stabilize dynamics over time [13]–[15], [61].

rendering and optimization [13], [61]. 3D Gaussian splatting (3DGS) represents scenes with explicit primitives that enable real-time rendering, at the cost of different regularization and optimization challenges [14]. 4D Gaussian splatting (4DGS) extends this to time-varying scenes, adding temporal regularization and motion modeling challenges [15]. Some recent formulations explicitly model 4D Gaussians as a learned dynamical system, strengthening the link between representation learning and motion modeling [62]. Figure 8 summarizes the trade space.

B. From text or video to 4D scenes

Text-to-3D pipelines often use a strong 2D generator as a prior to optimize a 3D representation (e.g., DreamFusion) [63]. Gaussian-based pipelines can reduce optimization cost and enable fast rendering, motivating generative 3D and 4D Gaussians [64], [65]. Text-to-4D Gaussian methods incorporate explicit temporal modeling and alignment strategies to reduce prompt drift and temporal artifacts [66]–[68]. When the input is video, learned transformers over Gaussian primitives can model dynamics directly from monocular sequences [22]. Diffusion models can also be trained directly for 3D/4D view synthesis, providing another route to multi-view consistency [69]. Table VI summarizes representative 3D/4D-aware




Fig. 9. Typical text/video-to-4D pipeline. Methods differ in how much is learned vs optimized, and how temporal consistency is enforced [22], [63], [65], [66], [68].

pipelines and where they sit on the generation–reconstruction spectrum. Figure 9 highlights common pipeline components.

C. Alignment and synchronization for multi-video 4D

When reconstructing or generating a dynamic scene from multiple videos, temporal alignment becomes a first-order problem: inconsistent timing can be misinterpreted as non-rigid deformation or appearance change [15], [70]. Recent 4D Gaussian methods therefore explicitly address cross-video motion alignment and synchronization, highlighting correspondence as a critical primitive for multi-view dynamic scenes [15], [70]. For generative 4D pipelines, the same issue appears as prompt-consistency and motion-consistency constraints that must hold across renders and edits [22], [68].

D. 4D-aware video generation and view control

An alternative to explicit 4D reconstruction is to treat geometry as a *control signal* for video diffusion, which can improve view consistency and enable re-rendering or camera changes [45], [49], [50]. This hybrid view blurs generation and rendering: the model may still output pixels, but it is guided by intermediate 3D/4D structure.

E. Integration patterns and failure modes

4D-aware generation can be viewed as a question of *where* the scene representation sits in the pipeline: as the *primary output* (render-first), as a *latent intermediate* used to guide video generation (generate-first), or as an *editable state* derived from observed video (reconstruct-then-edit) [15], [22], [45], [63]. These choices directly affect what controls are natural to expose. For example, explicit 4D representations make camera paths and re-rendering “cheap” at inference time, while pixel-video generators must internalize camera control as part of the generative process [15], [21], [50].

Render-first pipelines produce a scene representation (NeRF/3DGS/4DGS or variants) and then render video from it. They offer a clean interface for view control and can enforce cross-view consistency via the renderer, but they inherit difficult dynamics problems: non-rigid motion, topology changes, and occlusion can be absorbed into the representation in ways that look plausible from some views but fail under viewpoint changes [13]–[15], [62]. Multi-video settings amplify this,

since time misalignment can masquerade as deformation unless correspondence and synchronization are handled explicitly [70].

Generate-first pipelines keep the output as pixels (or latents) but introduce geometry as a control channel (e.g., depth/pose/camera) or as an intermediate warping prior. This leverages strong video priors and can support editing and camera changes, but it does not automatically guarantee a consistent underlying scene; geometry may serve as a soft guide that competes with appearance priors and text alignment [35], [45], [49], [50]. In long-horizon generation, this can surface as a mismatch between apparent camera motion and object permanence, especially when occlusions or disocclusions require the model to “invent” unseen content [31], [33].

Reconstruct-then-edit pipelines infer a 4D representation from video, edit it (or condition generation on it), and render back out. This supports representation-level constraints (e.g., temporal regularizers) and can make edits more consistent across frames and viewpoints, but it raises new evaluation questions: whether improvements reflect better geometry, better rendering, or simply stronger priors in the editing module [22], [71]. Across these patterns, common failure modes include temporal jitter in geometry, “floaters” and ghosting artifacts, prompt drift across time, and fragile edit propagation under viewpoint changes [15], [22], [68].

Table VII summarizes these integration patterns and the kinds of controls and tests they suggest.

VII. EVALUATION AND BENCHMARKS

Evaluation is the hinge between “impressive demos” and reproducible scientific progress [23], [24]. For spatiotemporal generators, we recommend reporting results along multiple axes: perceptual fidelity, temporal coherence, controllability under structured constraints, and (when applicable) 3D/4D consistency. No single metric captures these dimensions, and many popular metrics are sensitive to protocol details [23], [24].

A. Metrics and what they actually measure

Distributional metrics such as Fréchet Video Distance (FVD) capture some aspects of realism and temporal statistics, but can miss failure modes that humans perceive strongly (identity drift, object persistence, physical implausibility) [23]. Benchmark suites such as VBench aim to cover multiple aspects, but remain constrained by choice of prompts, reference models, and automated proxies [24]. Targeted benchmarks (e.g., compositional prompts) can reveal systematic generalization gaps that are hidden by aggregate metrics [25]. More recent work explores reasoning-based evaluation that attempts to align automated judgments with human preferences, at the cost of additional model and prompt dependence [26], [72]. As models expand beyond silent video toward audio-visual generation, benchmarks and unified evaluation protocols are emerging for the joint modality [73], [74].

Method	Input → output	Consistency mechanism	Notes
DreamFusion [63]	text → NeRF	rendering-loop optimization (SDS)	Strong 2D prior; slower optimization; view consistency emerges from 3D rendering.
DreamGaussian [64]	text → 3DGS	generative Gaussian pipeline	Faster than NeRF optimization; output is explicit primitives for real-time rendering.
DreamGaussian4D [65]	text → 4DGS	temporal regularization + generative priors	Dynamic extension; must stabilize motion/deformation and appearance over time.
Align Your Gaussians [66]	text → 4DGS	composed diffusion + alignment	Illustrates modular composition; consistency depends on alignment signals and decomposition.
PLA4D [67]	text → 4DGS	pixel-level alignment	Emphasizes alignment to reduce drift; evaluation must probe temporal stability.
STP4D [68]	text → 4DGS	prompt-consistent temporal modeling	Targets prompt consistency as a first-class objective; useful for long-rollout stress tests.
4DGT [22]	video → 4DGS	spatio-temporal modeling	Learns dynamics from monocular video; connects to spacetime transformers.
OmniView [69]	views → 3D/4D synthesis	transformer dynamics over Gaussians	Alternative route: train diffusion directly for view synthesis; may not output explicit 4D primitives.
SyncTrack4D [70]	multi-video → 4DGS	diffusion for multi-view consistency	Highlights synchronization as a prerequisite for multi-video 4D; correspondence understood as a core primitive.
4DGS dynamical system [62]	4DGS → dynamics	cross-video motion alignment	Shifts focus from reconstruction to dynamics modeling; useful for “world model” discussions.
Diffusion as Shader [45]	controls → video	explicit dynamical-system modeling	Uses 3D-aware signals to control video without full 4D reconstruction.
Reangle-A-Video [50]	video → reangled video	geometry-aware diffusion guidance	Treats viewpoint change as translation; useful for camera-control framing.
		implicit 4D via translation	

TABLE VI

REPRESENTATIVE 3D/4D-AWARE PIPELINES AND THEIR CONSISTENCY MECHANISMS. MANY SYSTEMS COMBINE LEARNED COMPONENTS WITH OPTIMIZATION, AND EVALUATION MUST SEPARATE VIEW CONSISTENCY FROM APPEARANCE REALISM.

Pattern	Implications (controls, tests, typical failure modes)
Render-first	Camera/view control at render time; evaluate cross-view stability and time alignment; failures often appear under novel views (jitter, deformation ambiguity) [15], [70].
Generate-first	Geometry as a soft guide/control; evaluate control adherence vs fidelity tradeoffs and long-horizon occlusion handling; failures include scene inconsistency under edits/view changes [45], [50].
Reconstruct-edit	Representation becomes editable state; evaluate whether edits preserve geometry and timing; failures include prior-dominated “improvements” that do not generalize [22], [71].

TABLE VII

INTEGRATION PATTERNS BETWEEN VIDEO GENERATORS AND 4D SCENE REPRESENTATIONS. THE PATTERN SUGGESTS WHICH CONTROL SURFACES ARE NATURAL AND WHICH STRESS TESTS ARE MOST DIAGNOSTIC.

Benchmark metric	/ Coverage (typical)
FVD	Distributional realism + temporal statistics; weak on fine-grained control and physics [23]
VBench	Multi-axis suite for video generators; combines automated proxies and structured tests [24]
T2V-CompBench	Compositional prompt following; probes binding and attribute/object consistency [25]
TiViBench	“Think-in-video” reasoning/consistency probes; beyond short-clip fidelity [72]
Physics tests	Contact/collision and dynamics plausibility (domain-specific) [54], [56]
4D tests	View consistency and temporal stability in dynamic scenes [15], [22]

TABLE VIII

BENCHMARKS AND METRICS MAPPED TO EVALUATION AXES. COVERAGE VARIES BY PROTOCOL; “PHYSICS” AND “4D” TESTS ARE TYPICALLY DOMAIN- AND REPRESENTATION-DEPENDENT.

B. Benchmark-to-axis mapping

Table VIII summarizes a small set of widely cited benchmarks and how they map onto the evaluation axes we use throughout the review. The intended use is to encourage *coverage*: pairing a global metric with targeted tests for coherence, control, and (when relevant) physics or 4D consistency [22], [54], [56].

C. Stress tests: long-horizon and intervention consistency

Aggregate scores can hide long-tail failures that matter for downstream use: identity drift that appears only after many seconds, camera-control artifacts that emerge under large motion, or physics violations that occur only under specific interactions. We therefore recommend reporting *stress tests* that scale duration and systematically vary control inputs,

rather than relying only on average-case prompt suites [24], [25], [31].

Stress tests are most informative when framed as controllability problems: specify an input constraint (trajectory, camera path, interaction, or edit), define a measurable success criterion, and report failure rates across a prompt set and multiple seeds [19], [47], [56]. For 4D outputs, stress tests should include viewpoint changes and cross-view temporal stability (e.g., camera loops and repeated re-rendering), since these directly probe whether a representation behaves like a stable dynamic scene rather than a collection of per-view hallucinations [15], [22], [70]. Table IX summarizes a few actionable templates.

Axis	Stress test (examples)	What to measure	Common pitfalls
Duration	increase length; vary window stride/overlap	drift rate; reappearance stability; failure counts vs time	reporting only best segments; hidden post-processing for long clips [31]
Coherence	occlusion/reappearance; multi-shot continuity	identity embedding stability; track fragmentation; flicker indicators	biased prompts that avoid occlusion; evaluating only per-frame realism [24]
Control	trajectories, keyframes, and camera paths	path adherence; target localization; camera smoothness under constraints	underspecified depth/occlusion; trading fidelity for compliance without reporting [19], [47]
Editing	local edit at time t (region/instruction)	edit localization; temporal propagation; boundary flicker	leaking edits globally; temporal seams at edit boundaries [20], [51]
Physics	contact/collision and counterfactual actions	penetration frequency; causal effect localization; stability under interventions	“physics” judged by appearance only; unclear domain definition [54], [56]
4D view	camera loops; render novel views over time	view-consistency; temporal jitter in geometry; re-render stability	mixing renderer settings; measuring only photometric similarity [15], [22]
Multi-video	cross-video synchronization / alignment	timing error; correspondence consistency across views	conflating mis-sync with non-rigid motion; unclear alignment method [70]

TABLE IX

STRESS-TEST TEMPLATES FOR SPATIOTEMPORAL GENERATORS. THE GOAL IS COVERAGE AND TRANSPARENCY: DEFINE CONSTRAINTS, REPORT MEASURABLE SUCCESS CRITERIA AND FAILURE RATES, AND SEPARATE RENDERING SETTINGS FROM MODEL BEHAVIOR [15], [24], [31].

Item	What to report / test (examples)
Rep.	NeRF vs 3DGS vs 4DGS; deformation model; renderer settings [13]–[15]
Views	camera trajectories; view split (train/test); motion distribution
Align.	time sync / correspondence method; failure cases and timing error [70]
Metrics	appearance (PSNR/SSIM/LPIPS); geometry (depth/point error); motion stability (track jitter)
Control	view changes, re-render loops, and edit propagation under constraints [22]
Artifacts	ghosting/floater; temporal jitter; deformation ambiguity [15]

TABLE X

A MINIMAL 4D EVALUATION CHECKLIST. THE AIM IS TO MAKE VIEW-CONSISTENCY AND TEMPORAL STABILITY TESTABLE AND COMPARABLE ACROSS PIPELINES.




Fig. 10. Evaluation workflow emphasizing protocol transparency and axis coverage [23], [24].

D. Geometry-aware evaluation for 4D outputs

For explicit 4D representations, evaluation should separate (i) appearance realism under a fixed renderer from (ii) geometric and temporal stability of the underlying scene. Novel-view metrics (e.g., photometric similarity under held-out views) can be informative, but dynamic scenes introduce alignment and correspondence ambiguities that can dominate results if left underspecified [13], [15], [22]. When multiple videos or viewpoints are involved, time synchronization is part of the method and should be evaluated and reported explicitly [70].

We recommend reporting a minimal set of 4D-specific protocol details and checks, summarized in Table X, alongside the general protocol hygiene guidance in this section.

E. Human evaluation and preference protocols

Human studies remain the most direct way to assess semantic alignment, narrative coherence, and fine-grained artifacts that escape automated metrics. Human evaluation is a protocol design problem: prompt selection, rater training, pairwise vs absolute scoring, and clip length can substantially change conclusions [24], [26]. We recommend reporting at least: the full prompt set, the sampling settings, the rater pool definition, and inter-rater agreement (when feasible), and using

pairwise comparisons for subtle preferences [24]. When using vision-language model (VLM) or large language model (LLM) judges, treat the judge as part of the benchmark and report prompts and model versions explicitly [26], [72].

F. Protocol and reporting hygiene

We recommend reporting prompt sets, sampling details, and any post-processing used for long videos, since these choices can dominate the observed failure modes [31]. For closed systems, the most robust comparisons are those grounded in official documentation and explicitly scoped claims, rather than speculative reconstructions of training data or compute [37], [39]. Figure 10 illustrates a protocol that separates generation, control stress-tests, and evaluation.

VIII. SAFETY AND PROVENANCE (OPTIONAL)

Frontier video generators raise familiar synthetic-media risks (misinformation, impersonation) and also new risks tied to controllable simulation and interactive rollouts (automated content generation at scale, targeted manipulation). We keep this section brief and evidence-first: we cite system cards and release notes where available, and treat technical mitigation claims as conditional on explicit threat models [37], [38].

Risk	Example mode	failure	Mitigation levers (evidence-bounded)
Misuse	misinformation / impersonation		access controls + safety policies; provenance standards; watermarking/detection [37], [75], [76]
Privacy	training data leakage; face/voice misuse		dataset governance; safety filters; evaluation + red teaming [37]
IP	copyrighted content replication		provenance metadata; licensing-aware training; auditing [75]
Detection	de-watermarking / editing attacks		robustness benchmarks; temporal watermark designs; attacker-model clarity [77], [79]
3D/4D	re-rendering without attribution		representation-level provenance; renderer-integrated checks [15], [71]

TABLE XI

RISK–MITIGATION MATRIX FOR GENERATIVE VIDEO AND 4D CONTENT.
MITIGATIONS ARE CONDITIONAL ON THREAT MODEL AND DEPLOYMENT
CONSTRAINTS; WE AVOID CLAIMING UNIVERSAL ROBUSTNESS.

A. Provenance and attribution

Provenance mechanisms range from cryptographic content credentials and signing standards to statistical watermarking and detection. Standards such as C2PA aim to attach verifiable provenance metadata across the content lifecycle [75]. Complementary approaches embed watermarks to support detection even when metadata is stripped, though robustness depends on the editing and compression pipeline [76]–[78].

B. Detection, robustness, and the attacker model

Detection is not a solved problem: benchmarks explicitly study de-watermarking, adversarial editing, and human/VLM susceptibility [79], [80]. For 3D/4D outputs, provenance extends beyond pixels to scene representations and renderers, motivating representation-level watermarking discussions [15], [71]. Table XI summarizes a few concrete risk–mitigation levers and the kinds of evidence we rely on.

IX. OPEN PROBLEMS AND CONCLUSION

Despite rapid progress, several open problems remain central for turning video generators into reliable spatiotemporal engines.

A. Open problems

- **Long-horizon state and memory:** stabilizing identity and scene layout over long rollouts without collapsing diversity remains difficult, and often relies on inference-time heuristics [5], [31].
- **Controllability vs generalization:** stronger control signals can improve reliability but may overconstrain the generator or reduce robustness to noisy constraints [19], [21], [47].
- **Physics and interaction:** adding explicit constraints helps in targeted settings, but general physical plausibility across domains is far from solved [12], [54], [56].
- **4D consistency and editability:** dynamic scene representations enable fast rendering and view control, but introduce

new failure modes (temporal drift, deformation ambiguity, attribution under re-rendering) [15], [22], [71].

- **Evaluation robustness:** benchmark scores can be fragile to protocol choices; multi-axis evaluation and transparent reporting are necessary for scientific comparability [23], [24], [26].

B. Conclusion

Spatiotemporal generative models are converging toward systems that can generate, edit, and (in some cases) simulate dynamic scenes under explicit controls. A unifying view is to treat “world simulator” capability as a spectrum that depends on controllability, temporal/physical consistency, and evaluation hygiene, not just visual fidelity [9], [10]. Progress will likely come from tighter coupling between objectives (diffusion/flow/AR), scene representations (video vs 4D), and evaluation protocols that stress-test coherence, physics, and provenance in realistic deployment settings [15], [16], [24].

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models,” 2020.
- [2] J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet, “Video diffusion models,” 2022.
- [3] J. Ho, W. Chan, C. Saharia, J. Whang, R. Gao, A. Gritsenko, D. P. Kingma, B. Poole, M. Norouzi, D. J. Fleet, and T. Salimans, “Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models,” 2022.
- [4] A. Blattmann, T. Dockhorn, S. Kulal, D. Mendelevitch, M. Kilian, D. Lorenz, Y. Levi, Z. English, V. Voleti, A. Letts, V. Jampani, and R. Rombach, “Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets,” 2023.
- [5] O. Bar-Tal, H. Chefer, O. Tov, C. Herrmann, R. Paiss, S. Zada, A. Ephrat, J. Hur, G. Liu, A. Raj, Y. Li, M. Rubinstein, T. Michaeli, O. Wang, D. Sun, T. Dekel, and I. Mossner, “Lumiere: A space-time diffusion model for video generation,” 2024.
- [6] R. Villegas, M. Babaeizadeh, P.-J. Kindermans, H. Moraldo, H. Zhang, M. T. Saffar, S. Castro, J. Kunze, and D. Erhan, “Phenaki: Variable length video generation from open domain textual description,” 2022.
- [7] D. Kondratyuk, L. Yu, X. Gu, J. Lezama, J. Huang, G. Schindler, R. Horning, V. Birodkar, J. Yan, M.-C. Chiu, K. Somandepalli, H. Akbari, Y. Alon, Y. Cheng, J. Dillon, A. Gupta, M. Hahn, A. Hauth, D. Hendon, A. Martinez, D. Minnen, M. Sirotenko, K. Sohn, X. Yang, H. Adam, M.-H. Yang, I. Essa, H. Wang, D. A. Ross, B. Seybold, and L. Jiang, “Videopoet: A large language model for zero-shot video generation,” 2024.
- [8] A. Polyak, A. Zohar, A. Brown, A. Tjandra, A. Sinha, A. Lee, A. Vydas, B. Shi, C.-Y. Ma, C.-Y. Chuang, D. Yan, D. Choudhary, D. Wang, G. Sethi, G. Pang, H. Ma, I. Misra, J. Hou, J. Wang, K. Jagadeesh, K. Li, L. Zhang, M. Singh, M. Williamson, M. Le, M. Yu, M. K. Singh, P. Zhang, P. Vajda, Q. Duval, R. Girdhar, R. Sumbaly, S. S. Rambhatla, S. Tsai, S. Azadi, S. Datta, S. Chen, S. Bell, S. Ramaswamy, S. Sheynin, S. Bhattacharya, S. Motwani, T. Xu, T. Li, T. Hou, W.-N. Hsu, X. Yin, X. Dai, Y. Taigman, Y. Luo, Y.-C. Liu, Y.-C. Wu, Y. Zhao, Y. Kirstain, Z. He, Z. He, A. Pumarola, A. Thabet, A. Sanakoyeu, A. Mallya, B. Guo, B. Araya, B. Kerr, C. Wood, C. Liu, C. Peng, D. Vengertsev, E. Schonfeld, E. Blanchard, F. Juefei-Xu, F. Nord, J. Liang, J. Hoffman, J. Kohler, K. Fire, K. Sivakumar, L. Chen, L. Yu, L. Gao, M. Georgopoulos, R. Moritz, S. K. Sampson, S. Li, S. Parmeggiani, S. Fine, T. Fowler, V. Petrovic, and Y. Du, “Movie gen: A cast of media foundation models,” 2025.
- [9] OpenAI, “Video generation models as world simulators.” <https://openai.com/index/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [10] J. Bruce, M. Dennis, A. Edwards, J. Parker-Holder, Y. Shi, E. Hughes, M. Lai, A. Mavalankar, R. Steigerwald, C. Apps, Y. Aytar, S. Bechtle, F. Behbahani, S. Chan, N. Heess, L. Gonzalez, S. Osindero, S. Ozair, S. Reed, J. Zhang, K. Zolna, J. Clune, N. de Freitas, S. Singh, and T. Rocktäschel, “Genie: Generative interactive environments,” 2024.
- [11] N. Savov, N. Kazemi, M. Mahdi, D. P. Paudel, X. Wang, and L. V. Gool, “Exploration-driven generative interactive environments,” 2025.
- [12] Z. Yang, Z. Liu, Y. Lu, L. Hou, C. Miao, S. Peng, B. Feng, X. Bai, and H. Zhao, “Genidrive: Towards physics-aware driving world model with 4d occupancy guided video generation,” 2025.
- [13] B. Mildenhall, P. P. Srinivasan, M. Tancik, J. T. Barron, R. Ramamoorthi, and R. Ng, “Nerf: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis,” 2020.
- [14] B. Kerbl, G. Kopanas, T. Leimkühler, and G. Drettakis, “3d gaussian splatting for real-time radiance field rendering,” 2023.
- [15] G. Wu, T. Yi, J. Fang, L. Xie, X. Zhang, W. Wei, W. Liu, Q. Tian, and X. Wang, “4d gaussian splatting for real-time dynamic scene rendering,” 2024.
- [16] Y. Lipman, R. T. Q. Chen, H. Ben-Hamu, M. Nickel, and M. Le, “Flow matching for generative modeling,” 2023.
- [17] X. Liu, C. Gong, and Q. Liu, “Flow straight and fast: Learning to generate and transfer data with rectified flow,” 2022.
- [18] Y. Guo, C. Yang, A. Rao, Z. Liang, Y. Wang, Y. Qiao, M. Agrawala, D. Lin, and B. Dai, “Animatediff: Animate your personalized text-to-image diffusion models without specific tuning,” 2024.
- [19] Z. Wang, Z. Yuan, X. Wang, T. Chen, M. Xia, P. Luo, and Y. Shan, “Motionctrl: A unified and flexible motion controller for video generation,” 2024.
- [20] S. Liu, Y. Zhang, W. Li, Z. Lin, and J. Jia, “Video-p2p: Video editing with cross-attention control,” 2023.
- [21] Y. Wang, Q. Zhang, S. Cai, T. Wu, J. Ackermann, Z. Kuang, Y. Zheng, F. Rajić, S. Tang, and G. Wetzstein, “Bulletttime: Decoupled control of time and camera pose for video generation,” 2025.
- [22] Z. Xu, Z. Li, Z. Dong, X. Zhou, R. Newcombe, and Z. Lv, “4dgt: Learning a 4d gaussian transformer using real-world monocular videos,” 2025.
- [23] T. Unterthiner, S. van Steenkiste, K. Kurach, R. Marinier, M. Michalski, and S. Gelly, “Towards accurate generative models of video: A new metric and challenges,” 2019.
- [24] Z. Huang, Y. He, J. Yu, F. Zhang, C. Si, Y. Jiang, Y. Zhang, T. Wu, Q. Jin, N. Champaisit, Y. Wang, X. Chen, L. Wang, D. Lin, Y. Qiao, and Z. Liu, “Vbench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models,” 2023.
- [25] K. Sun, K. Huang, X. Liu, Y. Wu, Z. Xu, Z. Li, and X. Liu, “T2v-compbench: A comprehensive benchmark for compositional text-to-video generation,” 2025.
- [26] Z. Mou, B. Xia, Z. Huang, W. Yang, and J. Jia, “Gradeo: Towards human-like evaluation for text-to-video generation via multi-step reasoning,” 2025.
- [27] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, “Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations,” 2021.
- [28] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” 2022.
- [29] W. Peebles and S. Xie, “Scalable diffusion models with transformers,” 2023.
- [30] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, “Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models,” 2023.
- [31] X. Li, F. Zhang, J. Pan, Y. Hou, V. Y. F. Tan, and Z. Yang, “Enhancing long video generation consistency without tuning,” 2025.
- [32] M. Hassan, B. V. Delft, W. Li, and A. Alahi, “Factorized video generation: Decoupling scene construction and temporal synthesis in text-to-video diffusion models,” 2025.
- [33] K. Zhang, Y. Mei, J. Xu, and V. M. Patel, “Endless world: Real-time 3d-aware long video generation,” 2025.
- [34] J. Liu, J. Han, B. Yan, H. Wu, F. Zhu, X. Wang, Y. Jiang, B. Peng, and Z. Yuan, “Infinitystar: Unified spacetime autoregressive modeling for visual generation,” 2025.
- [35] H. Kong, X. Yang, X. Zheng, and X. Wang, “Worldwarp: Propagating 3d geometry with asynchronous video diffusion,” 2025.
- [36] Y. Zhu, J. Feng, W. Zheng, Y. Gao, X. Tao, P. Wan, J. Zhou, and J. Lu, “Astra: General interactive world model with autoregressive denoising,” 2025.
- [37] OpenAI, “Sora system card.” <https://openai.com/index/sora-system-card/>, Dec. 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [38] OpenAI, “Sora 2 is here.” <https://openai.com/index/sora-2-is-here/>, Sept. 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [39] Google Cloud, “Veo on vertex ai video generation api.” <https://docs.cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/model-reference/veo-video-generation>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [40] Runway, “Creating with gen-4.5.” <https://help.runwayml.com/hc/en-us/articles/46974685288467-Creating-with-Gen-4-5>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [41] Luma AI, “Ray3.” <https://lumalabs.ai/press/ray3>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [42] Google Cloud, “Veo 2 (vertex ai model documentation).” <https://docs.cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/models/veo/2-0-generate>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [43] Google Cloud, “Veo 3 (vertex ai model documentation).” <https://docs.cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/models/veo/3-0-generate>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [44] Pika, “Pika raises \$80m, so anyone can make video on command.” <https://pika.art/blog>, June 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [45] Z. Gu, R. Yan, J. Lu, P. Li, Z. Dou, C. Si, Z. Dong, Q. Liu, C. Lin, Z. Liu, W. Wang, and Y. Liu, “Diffusion as shader: 3d-aware video diffusion for versatile video generation control,” 2025.
- [46] J. Z. Wu, Y. Ge, X. Wang, W. Lei, Y. Gu, Y. Shi, W. Hsu, Y. Shan, X. Qie, and M. Z. Shou, “Tune-a-video: One-shot tuning of image diffusion models for text-to-video generation,” 2023.
- [47] H. Qiu, Z. Chen, Z. Wang, Y. He, M. Xia, and Z. Liu, “Freetraj: Tuning-free trajectory control in video diffusion models,” 2024.

- [48] C. Chen, J. Shu, G. He, C. Wang, and Y. Li, “Motion-zero: Zero-shot moving object control framework for diffusion-based video generation,” 2025.
- [49] D. J. Zhang, R. Paiss, S. Zada, N. Karnad, D. E. Jacobs, Y. Pritch, I. Mosserei, M. Z. Shou, N. Wadhwa, and N. Ruiz, “Recapture: Generative video camera controls for user-provided videos using masked video fine-tuning,” 2024.
- [50] H. Jeong, S. Lee, and J. C. Ye, “Reangle-a-video: 4d video generation as video-to-video translation,” 2025.
- [51] Z. Zhang, F. Long, W. Li, Z. Qiu, W. Liu, T. Yao, and T. Mei, “Region-constraint in-context generation for instructional video editing,” 2025.
- [52] Y. Fei, G. Stoica, J. Liu, Q. Chen, R. Krishna, X. Wang, and B. Liu, “Structure from tracking: Distilling structure-preserving motion for video generation,” 2025.
- [53] C. Jain, R. Sharma, A. Garg, I. Bhanuka, P. Narang, and D. Kumar, “Lights, camera, consistency: A multistage pipeline for character-stable ai video stories,” 2025.
- [54] K. Zhang, C. Xiao, J. Xu, Y. Mei, and V. M. Patel, “Think before you diffuse: Infusing physical rules into video diffusion,” 2025.
- [55] S. Yu and C. Lu, “Lina: Learning interventions adaptively for physical alignment and generalization in diffusion models,” 2025.
- [56] D. Romero, A. Bermudez, H. Li, F. Pizzati, and I. Laptev, “Learning to generate rigid body interactions with video diffusion models,” 2025.
- [57] T. Zhang, H.-X. Yu, R. Wu, B. Y. Feng, C. Zheng, N. Snavely, J. Wu, and W. T. Freeman, “Physdreamer: Physics-based interaction with 3d objects via video generation,” 2024.
- [58] W. Zhang, L. G. Foo, T. Beeler, R. Dabral, and C. Theobalt, “Vhoi: Controllable video generation of human-object interactions from sparse trajectories via motion densification,” 2025.
- [59] J. Ni, Z. Wang, W. Lin, A. Bar, Y. LeCun, T. Darrell, J. Malik, and R. Herzig, “From generated human videos to physically plausible robot trajectories,” 2025.
- [60] H. Ci, X. Liu, P. Yang, Y. Song, and M. Z. Shou, “H2r-grounder: A paired-data-free paradigm for translating human interaction videos into physically grounded robot videos,” 2025.
- [61] A. Pumarola, E. Corona, G. Pons-Moll, and F. Moreno-Noguer, “D-nerf: Neural radiance fields for dynamic scenes,” 2020.
- [62] A. C. Asirimwe and C. Vondrick, “4d gaussian splatting as a learned dynamical system,” 2025.
- [63] B. Poole, A. Jain, J. T. Barron, and B. Mildenhall, “Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion,” 2022.
- [64] J. Tang, J. Ren, H. Zhou, Z. Liu, and G. Zeng, “Dreamgaussian: Generative gaussian splatting for efficient 3d content creation,” 2024.
- [65] J. Ren, L. Pan, J. Tang, C. Zhang, A. Cao, G. Zeng, and Z. Liu, “Dreamgaussian4d: Generative 4d gaussian splatting,” 2024.
- [66] H. Ling, S. W. Kim, A. Torralba, S. Fidler, and K. Kreis, “Align your gaussians: Text-to-4d with dynamic 3d gaussians and composed diffusion models,” 2024.
- [67] Q. Miao, J. Quan, K. Li, and Y. Luo, “Pla4d: Pixel-level alignments for text-to-4d gaussian splatting,” 2024.
- [68] Y. Deng, H. Xiong, B. Feng, X. Wang, and W. Liu, “Stp4d: Spatio-temporal-prompt consistent modeling for text-to-4d gaussian splatting,” 2025.
- [69] X. Fan, S. Girish, V. Ramanujan, C. Wang, A. Mirzaei, P. Sushko, A. Siarohin, S. Tulyakov, and R. Krishna, “Omniview: An all-seeing diffusion model for 3d and 4d view synthesis,” 2025.
- [70] Y. Lee, T.-W. Huang, S. Gehlot, J. Choi, G.-M. Su, and D. Manocha, “Syntrack4d: Cross-video motion alignment and video synchronization for multi-video 4d gaussian splatting,” 2025.
- [71] L. Zhao, Z. Hong, Z. Ren, R. Chen, M. Gong, and T. Liu, “Rdsplat: Robust watermarking against diffusion editing for 3d gaussian splatting,” 2025.
- [72] H. H. Chen, D. Lan, W.-J. Shu, Q. Liu, Z. Wang, S. Chen, W. Cheng, K. Chen, H. Zhang, Z. Zhang, R. Guo, Y. Cheng, and Y.-C. Chen, “Tivibench: Benchmarking think-in-video reasoning for video generative models,” 2025.
- [73] D. Hua, X. Wang, B. Zeng, X. Huang, H. Liang, J. Niu, X. Chen, Q. Xu, and W. Zhang, “Vabench: A comprehensive benchmark for audio-video generation,” 2025.
- [74] Z. Cao, T. Wang, J. Wang, Y. Wang, Y. Zhang, J. Chen, M. Deng, J. Wang, Y. Guo, C. Liao, Y. Zhang, Z. Zhang, and J. Liu, “T2av-compass: Towards unified evaluation for text-to-audio-video generation,” 2025.
- [75] Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (C2PA), “C2pa specification.” <https://c2pa.org/specifications/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [76] S. Fares, N. Tastan, and K. Nandakumar, “Spdmark: Selective parameter displacement for robust video watermarking,” 2025.
- [77] U. Jeong, S. In, H. Ryu, J. Choi, F. Yang, J. Jeong, S. Kim, and S. Kim, “Waterflow: Watermark temporal robustness via flow consistency,” 2025.
- [78] Google DeepMind, “Synthid.” <https://deepmind.google/technologies/synthid/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-29.
- [79] Z. Wang, X. Liu, and L. Sun, “Robustsora: De-watermarked benchmark for robust ai-generated video detection,” 2025.
- [80] J. Wang, W. Wu, Y. Zhan, R. Zhao, M. Hu, J. Cheng, W. Liu, P. Torr, and K. Q. Lin, “Video reality test: Can ai-generated asmr videos fool vlms and humans?,” 2025.