

Benchmarking AIGC Video Quality Assessment: A Dataset and Unified Model

Zhichao Zhang, Xinyue Li, Wei Sun, Jun Jia, Xionghuo Min, Zicheng Zhang, Chunyi Li, Zijian Chen, Puyi Wang, Zhongpeng Ji, Fengyu Sun, Shangling Jui, and Guangtao Zhai

Abstract—In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) driven video generation has garnered significant attention due to advancements in stable diffusion and large language model techniques. Thus, there is a great demand for accurate video quality assessment (VQA) models to measure the perceptual quality of AI-generated content (AIGC) videos as well as optimize video generation techniques. However, assessing the quality of AIGC videos is quite challenging due to the highly complex distortions they exhibit (*e.g.*, unnatural action, irrational objects, etc.). Therefore, in this paper, we try to systemically investigate the AIGC-VQA problem from both subjective and objective quality assessment perspectives. For the subjective perspective, we construct a *Large-scale Generated Video Quality assessment (LGVQ)* dataset, consisting of 2,808 AIGC videos generated by 6 video generation models using 468 carefully selected text prompts. Unlike previous subjective VQA experiments, we evaluate the perceptual quality of AIGC videos from three dimensions: *spatial quality, temporal quality, and text-to-video alignment*, which hold utmost importance for current video generation techniques. For the objective perspective, we establish a benchmark for evaluating existing quality assessment metrics on the LGVQ dataset, which reveals that current metrics perform poorly on the LGVQ dataset. Thus, we propose a *Unify Generated Video Quality assessment (UGVQ)* model to comprehensively and accurately evaluate the quality of AIGC videos across three aspects using a unified model, which uses visual, textual and motion features of video and corresponding prompt, and integrates key features to enhance feature expression. We hope that our benchmark can promote the development of quality evaluation metrics for AIGC videos. The LGVQ dataset and the UGVQ metric will be publicly released.

Index Terms—video generation, AIGC, video quality assessment, dataset, benchmark.

I. INTRODUCTION

WITH the rapid development of generative models and digital media techniques, artificial intelligence (AI)-generated content (AIGC) media, leveraging generative models to automatically create media content, has gained substantial attention in recent years. A typical form of AIGC media is text-to-video (T2V) [1]–[3], also known as AIGC videos, where videos are generated entirely based on textual descriptions. Because of the highly simplistic generation process, AIGC videos can be widely used in industries including film [4], gaming [5], advertising [6], and more. Although significant advancements have been made in the field of AIGC videos, they still face various quality issues. For example, AIGC videos may exhibit severe spatial and temporal distortions, such as blurred objects and backgrounds, poor action continuity, etc. Moreover, discrepancies between AIGC videos and the original text may impede their effectiveness in real-

world applications. We show some typical distortions of AIGC videos in Fig. 1.

In the spatial domain, distortions include blurriness and irrational objects. Blurriness results in poor sharpness, and irrational objects show forms that defy physical logic. Temporal distortions involve motion blur, causing significant distortion in rapidly moving parts, and frame jitter, leading to incoherent frames and severe shaking. Alignment distortions encompass event inconsistency, where the described action mismatches the video content, and context inconsistency, where the main subject or object in the prompt is inconsistent with the video.

Therefore, how to effectively evaluate the perceptual quality of AIGC videos is crucial for measuring the progress of video generation techniques, selecting the best AIGC videos from a set of candidates generated by T2V models and optimizing the video generation techniques [7].

Video quality assessment has been applied in various fields [8]–[10], most methods focus on User-Generated Content (UGC). However, there is still no fair metric for AIGC videos. In previous video generation studies [1]–[3], [11], only a few metrics are utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of video generation methods, such as IS [12], FID [13], FVD [14], KVD [15], CLIP [16], CLIPScore [17], FCS [3]. However, FID, FVD, and KVD compare the distribution of Inception [18] features of generated frames with that of a set of real images/videos, thus failing to capture distortion-level and semantic-level quality characteristics. IS [12] does not require reference videos for comparison but relies on pre-trained classification models. Furthermore, motion generation poses a great challenge for current video generation techniques, yet FID [13] and FVD [14] are unable to quantify the impact of temporal-level distortions on visual quality. CLIP-based methods such as CLIPScore [17], and FCS [3] are frequently employed to assess the alignment between the generated video and its prompt text.

Towards this goal, we establish a benchmark for AIGC-VQA to evaluate the effectiveness of existing quality assessment metrics in assessing the perceptual quality of AIGC videos. We first construct a *Large-scale Generated Video Quality assessment (LGVQ)* dataset to subjectively evaluate the three most critical quality dimensions (*i.e.*, *spatial quality, temporal quality, and text-to-video alignment*) of AIGC videos. To enhance the utility of the benchmark, the generated video content should cover wide a range of real-world scenes as possible. So, we structurally partition the text prompts into three components: *foreground, background, and motion*. For each component, we include typical elements that frequently




Fig. 1: Typical distortion types of AIGC videos. Spatial distortions mainly include (a) blurriness and (b) irrational objects, temporal distortions include (c) motion blur and (d) frame jitter, and alignment distortions include (e) event inconsistency and (f) context inconsistency.

occur in daily life. Specifically, the foreground includes four categories: *people*, *animals*, *plants*, and *man-made objects*, and the background is categorized into *indoor scenes*, *outdoor natural scenes*, and *outdoor man-made scenes*. For motions, we focus on three types: *static*, *dynamic*, and *local movement* (e.g., *watching belongs to static*, *running belongs to dynamic*, and *taking belongs to local movement*). By combining different words or phrases from the aforementioned types, we obtain 468 text prompts for video generation. Then, six mainstream T2V algorithms are selected to generate 2,808 AIGC videos. To obtain the perceptual quality labels of these videos, we invite 54 subjects to provide their ratings of the spatial quality, temporal quality, and text-to-video alignment for each video.

Subsequently, we bench existing quality assessment metrics on the LGVQ dataset to analyze their ability in assessing the quality of AIGC videos. Given that LGVQ provides spatial quality, temporal quality, and text-to-alignment labels for each AIGC video, we evaluate three categories of quality assessment metrics for the AIGC-VQA benchmark: image quality assessment (IQA) methods for spatial quality evaluation, video quality assessment (VQA) methods for temporal quality evaluation, and CLIP-based methods for text-to-video alignment evaluation. Specifically, we test 10 IQA methods, 10 VQA methods, and 8 alignment methods on LGVQ.

Therefore, we further propose a *Unify Generated Video Quality assessment (UGVQ)* model to simultaneously evaluate the three aspects of the quality of AIGC videos. UGVQ leverages the visual and textual features of CLIP [19] and the motion features of SlowFast [20] as the quality-aware feature representation. We use visual CLIP [19] features and the motion features of SlowFast [20] as the frame-level spatial feature and the video-level temporal feature, respectively. For the text-to-video alignment, we use textual CLIP [19] features as the prompt semantics, and use the visual CLIP [19] features as the semantics of the frames. Then, we propose a video-level spatial feature extractor to extract spatial features from consecutive frames. To enhance the quality-aware feature representation, we propose a feature fusion module to fuse the spatial features,

text features, and temporal features. Experiments show that UGVQ exhibits the best performance in assessing all three quality aspects of AIGC videos compared to existing quality metrics re-trained on the LGVQ dataset, suggesting that UGVQ can be used for an effective and comprehensive VQA metric for assessing the quality of AIGC videos.

II. RELATED WORKS

A. Video Generation Techniques

With the development of artificial intelligence, video generation, especially text-to-video (T2V) generation, has made significant progress. T2V models can be categorized into three types: GAN/VAE-based [21]–[24], Autoregressive-based [25]–[30], and Diffusion-based [31]–[41].

Initially, researchers used Variational Autoencoders (VAE) or Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) for T2V generation. For instance, Li *et al.* [23] trained a conditional video generative model combining VAE and GAN to extract static and dynamic information from text. Deng *et al.* [24] proposed the introspective recurrent convolutional GAN.

Autoregressive models (e.g., Transformer) have also been explored for T2V generation. For instance, NÜWA [25] leverages a 3D transformer encoder-decoder with a nearby attention mechanism for high-quality video synthesis. NÜWA-Infinity [26] presents a “*render-and-optimize*” strategy for infinite visual generation. CogVideo [27] utilizes pre-trained weights from the text-to-image model and employs a multi-frame-rate hierarchical training strategy to enhance text-video alignment. Phenaki [28] uses a variable-length video generation method with a C-ViViT encoder-decoder structure to compress video into discrete tokens.

Diffusion models [42] have significantly advanced text-to-image generation and are now being explored for T2V generation [43]–[45]. The Video Diffusion Model [31] applies the diffusion model to video generation using a 3D U-Net architecture combined with temporal attention. LVDM [32] introduces a hierarchical latent video diffusion model. Gen-1 [46] is a structure and content-guided video diffusion model,

training on monocular depth estimates for control over structure and content. Tune-a-video [33] employs a spatiotemporal attention mechanism to maintain frame consistency. Video Crafter1 [37] uses a video VAE and a video latent diffusion process for lower-dimensional latent representation and video generation. NÜWA-XL [41] uses two diffusion models to generate keyframes and refine adjacent frames.

Despite these advancements, challenges like unrealistic motion, intermittent object appearances, and unrealistic phenomena remain [47], [48]. Quality assessment for T2V videos is crucial for measuring progress and further promoting the development of T2V models.

B. Quality Metrics for AIGC Videos

Spatial quality metrics aim to measure the frame-level visual quality of videos. IS [12] and FID [13] are the most frequently used metrics to evaluate spatial quality. However, many studies [49], [50] have indicated that IS and FID exhibit poor correlation with human visual perception. On the other hand, image quality assessment (IQA) is design to quantify the perceptual quality of images. Many popular IQA methods, such as SSIM [51], UNIQUE [52], StairIQA [53], MUSIQ [54], LIQE [55], etc., have demonstrated remarkable capability in measuring the perceptual quality of natural images.

Temporal quality metrics are responsible for assessing the temporal coherence of AIGC videos. Previous T2V studies utilize FVD [14] to gauge the disparity between features extracted by pre-trained Inflated-3D Convnets (I3D) [56] from generated videos and realistic videos. Similar to FID, FVD also demonstrates a weak correlation with human visual perception. As related research, user-generated content (UGC) VQA models [57], such as SimpleVQA [58], FastVQA [59], DOVER [60], OV-PSNR [61], SSL [62], etc., have attempted to utilize action recognition network (*e.g.* SlowFast [20], Video Swin Transformer [63]) to represent the temporal quality feature. However, several studies [64], [65] have shown that the current UGC VQA datasets pose little challenge to temporal quality analyzers in UGC VQA models

Text-to-video alignment metrics evaluate the consistency between the generated videos and textual descriptions. CLIP-based methods, such as CLIP [17], BLIP [66], and viCLIP [67] are frequently used to evaluate the consistency between the AIGC videos and their text prompts. While these methods are trained on large-scale text-image datasets [68], [69] to maximize the similarity of positive pairs, recent studies [49], [70] demonstrate that they have poor consistency with human visual perception. Hence, some studies have constructed human-rated text-to-image alignment datasets [68], [69], [71]. Based on these datasets, they develop alignment assessment models, like ImageReward [71], PickScore [68], HPSv1 [72], HPSv2 [69], etc., to evaluate the consistency between the text prompts and AIGC images.

III. SUBJECTIVE QUALITY ASSESSMENT STUDY

A. LGVQ Dataset

We first construct LGVQ, a large-scale generated video dataset consisting of diverse AIGC videos, to serve as the




Fig. 2: Illustration of the MOSs probability density of the LGVQ dataset.

TABLE I: Video formats generated by the six T2V models in the LGVQ dataset.

Methods	Time Duration	FPS	Resolution
Gen-2 [75]	96	24	1408 × 768
Tune-a-video [3]	24	10	512 × 512
Video Crafter [1]	16	8	256 × 256
Text2Video-Zero [2]	36	12	512 × 512
HotShot [11]	8	4	672 × 384
Video Fusion [76]	16	8	256 × 256

benchmark for testing the perceptual quality of AIGC videos subjectively and objectively.

Prompts Selection. Existing benchmarks such as VBench [73] and FETV [74] offer extensive but somewhat broad classifications. VBench, for example, categorizes text prompts into eight classes: *animal*, *architecture*, *food*, *human*, *lifestyle*, *plant*, *scenery*, and *vehicles*. Similarly, FETV identifies nine categories: *people*, *animals*, *vehicles*, *plants*, *artifacts*, *food*, *building*, *scenery*, and *illustrations*. These categories provide a solid foundation but often lack specificity in terms of motion and dynamic events.

Generally, models perform significantly better on static prompts compared to dynamic ones. Our method introduces a detailed division into *static*, *dynamic*, and *local movement*. This refined classification allows for a more precise depiction of the inherent motion in each scenario, facilitating a more comprehensive and descriptive set of prompts.

Specifically, we decompose the prompts into three components: *foreground*, *background*, and *motion state*. The *foreground* refers to the main subject of the event, including four categories: *people*, *animals*, *plants*, and *man-made objects*. The *background* refers to the environment and location where the event occurs, divided into *indoor scenes*, *outdoor natural scenes*, and *outdoor man-made scenes*. The *motion state* refers to the main motion pattern of the event, mainly divided into *static*, *dynamic*, and *local movement*. Each prompt needs to choose one or more elements from the components of *foreground*, *background*, and *motion* types.

T2V Methods Selection. We select six SOTA text-to-video models, including Gen-2 [75], Hotshot-XL [11], Video Fusion [76], Video Crafter [1], Text2Video-Zero [2], and Tune-a-video [3], to generate the videos for each prompt. So, there are a total of 2,808 AIGC videos in LGVQ. The detailed information of videos generated by six T2V methods is shown in Table.I.




Fig. 3: Comparison of MOSs of different generation elements. The quality scores are adjusted to range from 20 to 70.




Fig. 4: Comparison of MOSs of different generation methods. The quality scores are adjusted to range from 20 to 70.

B. Subjective Quality Assessment Experiment

We conducted a subjective quality assessment on the LGVQ dataset to derive quality labels for each AIGC video. This experiment targeted the investigation of main distortion types in AIGC videos on perceptual quality, as highlighted in Fig. 1, including three critical quality aspects: (1) Spatial quality focuses on the visual appearance of individual frames. (2) Temporal quality evaluates the coherence across video frames. (3) Text-to-video alignment assesses the correspondence between the video content and the accompanying text prompt.

Before the formal assessments, participants underwent a training session where they reviewed sample videos that were not included in the formal experiment. This session was intended to familiarize them with the evaluation criteria and the rating interface. Example distortions and quality attributes were discussed to calibrate participant expectations and rating standards.

We follow the recommended method in [77] to process the raw subjective ratings. First, the rating of an image is considered as an outlier if it is far from 2 (if normal) or $\sqrt{20}$ (if nonnormal) standard deviations about the mean rating of that image. A subject with more than 5% outlier ratings is also rejected. The MOSs distribution is illustrated in Fig. 2, highlighting the variability and trends across the dataset.

C. MOSs Analysis

The MOSs of Different Generation Elements. We calculated the average MOS across six T2V generation models to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of current mainstream T2V models in generating various objects and actions. The results are shown in Fig. 3. For the foreground elements, the spatial and temporal quality of the human category is relatively low, which may be due to the complexity of human actions, postures, and expressions. In contrast, the spatial quality

of animals, plants, and man-made objects is satisfactory. In terms of motion state, whether it is spatial, temporal, or T2V alignment quality, static objects clearly outperform locally moving objects, and fully moving objects perform the worst. This indicates that when the subject needs strong temporal changes, its temporal quality will decrease, and the spatial quality of this moving subject will also be affected. In terms of alignment quality, static and locally moving objects align better with the text prompts, whereas fully moving objects present increased challenges in alignment, leading to lower scores. For background elements, natural scenery performs best in terms of spatial and temporal quality, followed by indoor scenes and man-made outdoor scenes.

The MOSs of Different Generation Methods. We also analyze the generation effect of six T2V models from three evaluation dimensions: spatial, temporal, and alignment. The results are shown in Fig. 4. For spatial quality, Gen-2 demonstrates outstanding performance across foreground, background, and motion state categories, surpassing all other models significantly. Text2Video-Zero follows closely, ranking second in all categories. Hotshot-XL and Video Fusion are comparable in quality. Video Crafter and Tune-a-video exhibit the poorest overall performance. For temporal quality, Gen-2 continues to excel overall. Following closely are Hotshot-XL and Video Fusion, which exhibit similar quality levels. Video Crafter performs moderately in terms of temporal quality. In addition, we found that the performance of the *static* motion of Hotshot-XL, Video Fusion, and Video Crafter is much higher than their performance of the *dynamic* motion, indicating that they are difficult to generate high-frequency movement. The Text2Video-Zero and Tune-a-video models perform the worst in this aspect. For text-to-video alignment, the differences between the 6 models are relatively small. Comparing all 10 aspects, the overall quality ranking of the 6 models from high

TABLE II: The benchmark of existing IQA, VQA, and text-to-image alignment methods on the LGVQ dataset.

	Method	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE
Spatial	UNIQUE (TIP, 2021) [52]	0.130	0.089	0.231	13.471
	MUSIQ (ICCV, 2021) [54]	0.389	0.221	0.431	10.078
	–	0.327	0.211	0.404	10.504
	StairQA (JSTSP, 2023) [53]	0.334	0.209	0.393	10.521
	–	0.320	0.209	0.393	10.521
	–	0.284	0.184	0.372	11.209
	CLIP-IQA (AAAI, 2023) [78]	0.320	0.213	0.346	11.302
	CLIP-IQA+ (AAAI, 2023) [78]	0.341	0.221	0.355	10.917
	LIQE (CVPR, 2023) [55]	0.174	0.116	0.209	13.665
	NIQE (ISPL, 2012) [79]	0.228	0.127	0.293	13.072
BRISQUE (TIP, 2012) [80]	0.255	0.155	0.457	10.836	
Temporal	TLVQM (TIP, 2019) [81]	0.286	0.189	0.437	10.615
	RAPIQUE (JSP, 2021) [82]	0.313	0.212	0.451	10.208
	–	0.347	0.231	0.469	10.107
	VSFA (ACMMM, 2019) [83]	0.295	0.192	0.451	10.858
	SimpleVQA (ACMMM, 2022) [58]	0.271	0.182	0.419	10.945
	–	0.289	0.197	0.432	10.901
	–	0.304	0.205	0.448	10.889
	FastVQA (ECCV, 2023) [59]	0.374	0.255	0.473	10.130
	–	0.361	0.247	0.468	10.197
	DOVER (ICCV, 2023) [60]	0.254	0.164	0.514	11.001
–	0.249	0.161	0.493	10.904	
VIDEAL (TIP, 2021) [84]	0.238	0.155	0.421	11.219	
PatchVQ (CVPR, 2021) [85]	0.275	0.181	0.439	10.910	
Alignment	CLIP (ICML, 2021) [19]	0.324	0.239	0.388	10.782
	CLIPScore (EMNLP, 2021) [17]	0.372	0.254	0.405	10.604
	BLIP (ICML, 2022) [66]	0.379	0.260	0.389	10.540
	viCLIP (ArXiv, 2022) [67]	0.397	0.280	0.421	9.599
	ImageReward (NIPS, 2023) [71]	0.369	0.255	0.371	10.546
	PickScore (NIPS, 2023) [68]	0.381	0.262	0.382	9.906
	HPSv1 (ICCV, 2023) [72]	0.248	0.171	0.339	11.283
	HPSv2 (ArXiv, 2023) [69]	0.325	0.223	0.395	10.434

to low is Gen-2, Hotshot-XL, Video Fusion, Text2Video-Zero, Video Crafter, and Tune-a-video.

IV. AIGC VQA BENCHMARK

To provide a comprehensive and detailed evaluation for T2V models, we create this benchmark by incorporating a wide range of quality metrics. Our benchmark allows for an in-depth assessment of various aspects of AI-generated video, including spatial and temporal quality, as well as text-to-video alignment. This benchmark not only highlights the strengths and weaknesses of existing models but also drives innovation by identifying areas that require improvement.

A. Compared Quality Metrics.

For spatial quality, we test two handcrafted-based IQA models, *i.e.* NIQE [79], and BRISQUE [80], and six deep learning-based IQA methods including UNIQUE [52], MUSIQ [54], StairQA [53], CLIP-IQA [78], LIQE [55], CLIP-IQA+ [78]. For temporal quality, we test two handcrafted-based VQA models, *i.e.* TLVQA [81] and RAPIQUE [82], and six deep learning-based VQA models, *i.e.* VSFA [83], SimpleVQA [58], FastVQA [59], DOVER [60], VIDEAL [84] and PatchVQ [85]. For text-to-video alignment, we evaluate four CLIP-based methods including CLIP [19], CLIPScore [17], BLIP [66], and viCLIP [67], and four text-to-image alignment assessment methods including ImageReward [71], PickScore [68], HPSv1 [72], and HPSv2 [69].

B. Results

We present the results in Table II, from which we observe that across all three quality dimensions, the performance of

all quality metrics is notably poor on the LGVQ dataset. For spatial quality metrics, the method MUSIQ, trained on the KonIQ-10K dataset, shows a notably higher SRCC value of 0.389, indicating relatively better performance in capturing the image quality perturbations specific to AI-generated content. Conversely, the method LIQE exhibits the lowest SRCC score, possibly due to its reliance on less robust feature representations for complex image distortions typical of AIGC videos. For temporal quality metrics, the VSFA model trained on the KonViD-1k dataset, leads with an SRCC of 0.295, suggesting mediocrity in dealing with temporal quality variations. On the other hand, the DOVER model scores lower with an SRCC of 0.254, which may stem from its approach that might be less adaptive to the specific temporal dynamics and distortion patterns present in AIGC videos. For text-to-video alignment, the method viCLIP, leveraging a large-scale dataset InternVid-10M, achieves an SRCC of 0.280, showing poor performance in aligning textual descriptions with video content. However, the method BLIP shows a lesser SRCC value of 0.254, possibly indicating challenges in handling the intricate semantic relationships required for effective text-to-video mapping in AIGC scenarios.

Overall, the performance of all quality metrics is poor on the LGVQ dataset. This suggests that existing methods might not yet be fully equipped to handle the unique spatial and temporal distortion types associated with AIGC videos. Additionally, the lower performance across the board might also indicate a fundamental limitation in current methodologies to fully comprehend and evaluate the diverse and complex action concepts depicted in AIGC videos.

V. PROPOSED METHOD

In this session, we introduce UGVQ (Text-to-Video Unify Generated Video Quality), a structured framework designed to comprehensively assess video quality. The UGVQ comprises three key modules: a feature extraction module, a text-visual feature fusion module, and a quality regression module.

A. Quality-aware Feature Extraction

To accurately evaluate the quality of AIGC video regarding spatial, temporal, and alignment, we extract the features related to the quality of these three aspects.

1) *Spatial-aware Feature*: Given a video v composed of n frames, $v = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$. First, we sample k key frames from n video frames. Then, we use the frame-level spatial feature extractor to get the spatial feature of k key frames. The set of the frame-level spatial features is shown in Eq (1),

$$\{S_f(v_i), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}\}, \quad (1)$$

where S_f donate the frame-level spatial feature extractor.

A video is composed of multiple frames (images), however, the spatial feature of a video is not a simple combination of the spatial feature of the frames. Therefore, we train a video-level spatial feature extractor S_v to obtain the time series feature of a set of video frames as the spatial features of a given video v with n frames. The structure diagram is shown in Fig.6. We split the features of the frames according to different scales,




Fig. 5: The proposed UGVQ Framework. The spatial, temporal, and text feature extractor is used to extract features from sampled frames, videos, and prompts, respectively. The video feature extractor extracts video-level spatial features from frame-level spatial features. The feature fusion module fuses the video-level spatial feature, text feature, and temporal feature to obtain the fusion feature. The quality regression module regresses all four features to spatial, temporal, and alignment quality.




Fig. 6: The proposed video-level spatial feature extractor.

then use a feature extractor to obtain the video features of the two scales respectively, and finally use MLP to fuse these two scales. The formula is shown as Eq (2),

$$s_v = S_v(\{S_f(v_i), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}\}), \quad (2)$$

where S_v represents video-level spatial feature extractor, and s_v represents video-level spatial feature of video v .

2) *Temporal-aware Feature*: We use the pre-trained action recognition model as a temporal-aware feature extractor to obtain the motion features of each video. Action recognition networks [20] are commonly used to obtain features related to motion detection and motion classification, which can largely recognize the phenomenon of motion and frame discontinuity in AIGC videos. Therefore, for video v and action recognition network, we can get temporal features t_v by Eq (3).

$$t_v = T(v), \quad (3)$$

where T donate the action recognition network.

3) *Alignment-aware Feature*: For the AIGC video, the alignment of the prompt with the generated video content is an important aspect of quality assessment. Obtaining semantic features of the prompt and generated video is the key to judging the alignment. In Session II, we mentioned that CLIP [19] is an effective method to evaluate the similarity




Fig. 7: The proposed fuse block. This module adjusts the two input features to the same size by a 1×1 convolutional layer and then fuses the two input features with the attention mechanism.

of text and image. In this work, we also use CLIP-based methods [68] to obtain semantic features of prompt and video frame respectively. For a given prompt p and corresponding video v_p , we can obtain the text feature through text semantics extractor E_p , as shown in Eq (4),

$$e_p = E_p(p), \quad (4)$$

where e_p represent the semantic feature of prompt p .

B. Feature Fusion Module

We propose the feature fusion module to fuse three kinds of features extracted in Section V-A to enhance quality-aware feature representations. For a given prompt p and the corresponding generated video v_p , we can obtain the spatial feature s_v of video v by Eq (1) and Eq (2), the temporal feature t_v by Eq (3), and the prompt semantic feature e_p by Eq (4). Then, we fuse e_v and e_p by Eq (5),

$$j_1 = \text{FFM}(s_v, e_p), \quad (5)$$

which can enhance the feature expression of the alignment-aware features. In addition, we fuse temporal features of the video t_v and prompt semantics e_p to improve the performance of alignment and temporal quality, as shown in Eq (6),

$$j_2 = \text{FFM}(t_v, e_p), \quad (6)$$

where FFM denote the feature fusion module.

TABLE III: The performance of the proposed UGVQ method, and existing IQA, VQA, and text-to-image alignment methods on the LGVQ, FETV, and MQT datasets.

Aspects	Methods	LGVQ				FETV				MQT			
		SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE
Spatial	UNIQUE [52]	0.716	0.525	0.768	7.675	0.764	0.637	0.794	0.492	0.689	0.519	0.702	0.917
	MUSIQ [54]	0.669	0.491	0.682	8.397	0.722	0.613	0.758	0.607	0.678	0.498	0.689	0.938
	StairIQA [53]	0.701	0.521	0.737	7.984	0.806	0.643	0.812	0.476	0.695	0.535	0.710	0.904
	CLIP-IQA [78]	0.684	0.502	0.709	8.124	0.741	0.619	0.767	0.545	0.713	0.537	0.722	0.877
	LIQE [55]	0.721	0.538	0.752	7.597	0.765	0.635	0.799	0.507	0.722	0.546	0.738	0.851
	Ours	0.759	0.567	0.795	7.190	0.841	0.685	0.841	0.445	-	-	-	-
Temporal	TLVQM [81]	0.828	0.616	0.832	7.927	0.825	0.675	0.837	0.632	0.813	0.605	0.831	0.761
	RAPIQUE [82]	0.836	0.641	0.851	7.661	0.833	0.691	0.854	0.618	0.822	0.627	0.837	0.737
	VSFA [83]	0.841	0.643	0.857	6.942	0.839	0.705	0.859	0.515	0.834	0.630	0.851	0.712
	SimpleVQA [58]	0.857	0.659	0.867	6.747	0.852	0.726	0.862	0.469	0.848	0.644	0.856	0.684
	FastVQA [59]	0.849	0.647	0.843	7.548	0.842	0.714	0.847	0.562	0.842	0.638	0.849	0.689
	DOVER [60]	0.867	0.672	0.878	6.498	0.868	0.731	0.881	0.583	0.854	0.665	0.869	0.673
	Ours	0.893	0.703	0.907	5.695	0.897	0.753	0.907	0.412	0.898	0.733	0.909	0.642
	Alignment	CLIPScore [17]	0.446	0.301	0.453	11.212	0.607	0.498	0.633	0.768	0.772	0.611	0.783
BLIP [66]		0.455	0.319	0.464	11.008	0.616	0.505	0.645	0.754	0.761	0.616	0.772	0.951
viCLIP [67]		0.479	0.338	0.487	10.765	0.628	0.518	0.652	0.746	0.798	0.628	0.818	0.871
ImageReward [71]		0.498	0.344	0.499	10.348	0.657	0.519	0.687	0.720	0.794	0.624	0.812	0.889
PickScore [68]		0.501	0.353	0.515	9.995	0.669	0.533	0.708	0.697	0.823	0.649	0.831	0.821
HPSv1 [72]		0.481	0.341	0.497	10.578	0.639	0.525	0.680	0.739	0.781	0.620	0.785	0.903
HPSv2 [69]		0.504	0.357	0.511	10.104	0.686	0.540	0.703	0.705	0.819	0.643	0.821	0.852
Ours		0.551	0.394	0.555	9.480	0.734	0.572	0.737	0.675	0.845	0.668	0.851	0.775

We finally fuse the above two fuse features to obtain the fusion feature by Eq (7)

$$j = \text{JFM}(j_1, j_2), \quad (7)$$

where j donate the fused feature of j_1 and j_2 .

The overall framework of the feature fusion module is shown in Fig(5), and the fuse block is shown in Fig(7).

C. Quality Regression Module

Through the above research, we obtained 3 quality-related features and one fusion feature, namely the spatial-aware feature s_v , the temporal-aware feature t_v , the alignment-aware feature e_p , and the fusion feature j . To maximize the performance, we concat all four features and input them into the quality regression model. The regression model was implemented by two MLP layers. The quality regression model will ultimately output three scores as spatial, temporal, and alignment quality of the prompt and the corresponding video, as shown in Eq (8),

$$s_s, s_t, s_a = \text{QRM}(\text{concat}(s_v, t_v, e_p, j)), \quad (8)$$

where QRM donates the quality regression module, and s_s, s_t, s_a represent the score of the spatial quality, temporal quality, and text-to-video alignment.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experiment Settings

1) *Test Dataset*: We validate our proposed method on LGVQ, and the other two published datasets, FETV [74] and MQT [86]. The FETV dataset contains 2,476 videos, which were generated by 619 prompts and 4 text-to-video models with 4 quality dimensions, static quality, temporal quality, overall alignment, and fine-grained alignment. In this paper,

we use static quality, temporal quality, and overall alignment for our experiments. The MQT [86] dataset contains 1,005 videos, which were generated by 201 prompts and 5 text-to-video models with 2 quality dimensions, alignment, and perception. In our experiments, we change the number of nodes in the last MLP in the quality regression module to predict the alignment and perception quality in MQT [86].

2) *Training Protocols*: To validate the performance of our proposed method comprehensively, all experiments use a training/validation/testing mode. The model is selected based on the best performance on the validation set, and the chosen model is then evaluated on the test set. The average results from all trials represent the final performance, reflecting the generalization ability of our method. In our experiment, the ratio of the training, validation, and testing sets is approximately 7:1:2. Additionally, for all three datasets, there were duplicate prompts for video generation, meaning one prompt corresponded to multiple videos. To validate the generalization of our method in prompt-related tasks, all experiments use invisible prompt mode, which means that the prompt in the test or validation set does not appear in the train set.

B. Performance Comparison

The performance of the IQA-based, VQA-based, and alignment-based models on proposed LGVQ databases are listed in Table. III. The performance shows that the proposed method has excellent performance on temporal quality, which indicates that the UGVQ has a good effect on detecting the frame stabs and motion incoherence in AIGC video, and satisfies human subjective perception. For spatial quality, we do not directly use IQA-related pre-trained models to generate spatial-aware features, but our method still performs well in terms of spatial quality. The alignment quality is relatively poor among the three aspects, which may be because it is

TABLE IV: Ablation study of the proposed UGVQ methods. No.8 is the proposed UGVQ model.

No.	Features					Spatial			Temporal				Alignment				
	frame-level	text	motion	video-level	fusion	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	RMSE
1	✓					0.706	0.563	0.738	7.476	0.814	0.625	0.828	8.024	0.483	0.358	0.526	9.858
2		✓				0.248	0.222	0.315	11.235	0.222	0.151	0.238	13.194	0.308	0.213	0.334	10.684
3			✓			0.581	0.433	0.628	9.181	0.876	0.683	0.892	6.241	0.471	0.351	0.496	9.864
4	✓	✓				0.739	0.579	0.795	7.107	0.837	0.649	0.843	7.277	0.511	0.369	0.531	9.834
5	✓	✓	✓			0.748	0.559	0.781	7.315	0.889	0.697	0.902	5.834	0.525	0.376	0.548	9.611
6	✓	✓	✓	✓		0.752	0.561	0.787	7.210	0.889	0.698	0.901	5.838	0.511	0.368	0.533	9.742
7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.753	0.563	0.790	7.208	0.891	0.699	0.903	5.781	0.543	0.386	0.551	9.499
8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.759	0.567	0.795	7.190	0.895	0.703	0.907	5.695	0.551	0.394	0.555	9.480

TABLE V: The performance of the proposed UGVQ method, and existing IQA, VQA, and text-to-image alignment methods on cross-dataset evaluation.

Aspects	Methods	LGVQ \rightarrow FETV			FETV \rightarrow LGVQ		
		SRCC	KRCC	PLCC	SRCC	KRCC	PLCC
Spatial	UNIQUE [52]	0.389	0.272	0.383	0.360	0.252	0.353
	MUSIQ [54]	0.426	0.312	0.472	0.406	0.281	0.404
	StairIQA [53]	0.501	0.360	0.539	0.484	0.346	0.500
	CLIP-IQA [78]	0.503	0.361	0.543	0.493	0.355	0.501
	LIQE [55]	0.478	0.341	0.519	0.461	0.340	0.477
	Ours	0.553	0.406	0.555	0.521	0.359	0.524
Temporal	TLVQM [81]	0.306	0.211	0.314	0.310	0.211	0.314
	RAPIQUE [82]	0.373	0.260	0.351	0.347	0.247	0.351
	VSEA [83]	0.396	0.272	0.364	0.388	0.274	0.398
	SimpleVQA [58]	0.501	0.366	0.511	0.419	0.279	0.407
	FastVQA [59]	0.482	0.324	0.494	0.397	0.272	0.364
	DOVER [60]	0.494	0.349	0.483	0.427	0.287	0.406
	Ours	0.512	0.368	0.535	0.442	0.296	0.432
Alignment	CLIPScore [17]	0.234	0.167	0.252	0.168	0.112	0.205
	BLIP [66]	0.216	0.144	0.233	0.151	0.103	0.193
	viCLIP [67]	0.253	0.173	0.274	0.177	0.117	0.212
	ImageReward [71]	0.261	0.183	0.283	0.193	0.135	0.245
	PickScore [68]	0.259	0.178	0.284	0.181	0.124	0.229
	HPSv1 [72]	0.228	0.152	0.248	0.153	0.104	0.195
	HPSv2 [69]	0.263	0.189	0.285	0.201	0.140	0.243
Ours	0.278	0.196	0.292	0.217	0.148	0.255	

inherently a cross-modal task, and eliminating the spacing between modalities is more difficult than the other two aspects. In addition, we directly used the pre-trained CLIP-based model to extract semantic features of video frames and prompts without training, resulting in a lack of discriminative features.

We conducted experiments on two other T2V datasets, MQT [86], and FETV [74], respectively. We compare IQA-based, VQA-based, and alignment-based models on FETV and MQT datasets, and the performance results are shown in Table.III. Experimental results show that the UGVQ performs better on FETV and MQT datasets.

C. Ablation Study

We conduct ablation experiments in this section to verify the effectiveness of the 3 main components in our UGVQ method, *i.e.*, the overall architecture of UGVQ, the video-level spatial feature extraction, and the feature fusion module. Moreover, we further verify the effect of each feature on the performance of various qualities. The performance results are shown in Table.IV.

Through No.1, No.2, and No.3 experiments in Table.IV, we find that frame features, text features, and motion features all have a certain correlation with the quality of spatial, temporal, and text-video alignment. Among them, text features have a low correlation with the quality of all three aspects due to the lack of corresponding video or frame features. Through No.4, we found that the combination of text features and

frame features significantly improved the performance in text-video alignment. Through comparison with No.4 and No.5, it was found that the temporal performance in No.4 was still adversely affected due to the lack of motion features. In No.5, motion features significantly improved temporal performance, which indicates that the motion features extracted by the action recognition model have a good effect on detecting the frame stabs and motion incoherence in AIGC video. Through No.5, No.7, and No.8, we found that our proposed video-level spatial feature extractor and feature fusion module effectively improved the performance of the three aspects of quality, and proved the effectiveness of the video feature extractor and feature fusion module.

D. Cross-Dataset Evaluation

To verify the generalization performance of our proposed method, we conducted cross-dataset experiments on other datasets. We set up two sets of experiments. First, we train the UGVQ model on all the data in our proposed LGVQ dataset and then test the performance on all the FETV data. Second, we train the UGVQ model on the FETV dataset and then test it on LGVQ data. We run the same experiments on IQA-based, VQA-based, and alignment-based methods. The performance results are shown in Table.V. Compared with the IQA-based, VQA-based, and alignment-based methods, we can find that our method has the best spatial, temporal, and alignment performance. However, numerically, it still needs to be improved.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we establish a new quality assessment dataset (*i.e.* LGVQ) and benchmark for AIGC videos. LGVQ consists of 2,808 AIGC videos generated by 6 T2V generation methods using 468 text prompts. We conduct a subjective quality assessment experiment on LGVQ, evaluating the videos from three dimensions. Then, we test IQA, VQA, and text-to-image alignment methods on the LGVQ dataset, revealing their limitations in measuring the perceptual quality of AIGC videos. To address this issue, we develop a unified generated video quality assessment (*i.e.* UGVQ) model capable of simultaneously evaluating the three quality dimensions of AIGC videos.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Chen, M. Xia, Y. He, Y. Zhang, X. Cun, S. Yang, J. Xing, Y. Liu, Q. Chen, X. Wang, C. Weng, and Y. Shan, "Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation," 2023.

- [2] L. Khachatryan, A. Movsisyan, V. Tadevosyan, R. Henschel, Z. Wang, S. Navasardyan, and H. Shi, "Text2video-zero: Text-to-image diffusion models are zero-shot video generators," 2023.
- [3] J. Z. Wu, Y. Ge, X. Wang, S. 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," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2023, pp. 7623–7633.
- [4] R. Gu, H. Li, C. Su, and W. Wu, "Innovative digital storytelling with aigc: Exploration and discussion of recent advances," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14329*, 2023.
- [5] Y. Wang, Y. Pan, M. Yan, Z. Su, and T. H. Luan, "A survey on chatgpt: Ai-generated contents, challenges, and solutions," *IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society*, 2023.
- [6] D. Du, Y. Zhang, and J. Ge, "Effect of ai generated content advertising on consumer engagement," in *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer, 2023, pp. 121–129.
- [7] K. Black, M. Janner, Y. Du, I. Kostrikov, and S. Levine, "Training diffusion models with reinforcement learning," in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [8] Y. Li, S. Meng, X. Zhang, M. Wang, S. Wang, Y. Wang, and S. Ma, "User-generated video quality assessment: A subjective and objective study," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 25, pp. 154–166, 2023.
- [9] X. Guan, F. Li, Y. Zhang, and P. C. Cosman, "End-to-end blind video quality assessment based on visual and memory attention modeling," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 25, pp. 5206–5221, 2023.
- [10] Y. Li, B. Chen, B. Chen, M. Wang, S. Wang, and W. Lin, "Perceptual quality assessment of face video compression: A benchmark and an effective method," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, pp. 1–13, 2024.
- [11] J. Mullan, D. Crawbuck, and A. Sastry, "Hotshot-xl," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/hotshotco/hotshot-xl>
- [12] T. Salimans, I. Goodfellow, W. Zaremba, V. Cheung, A. Radford, and X. Chen, "Improved techniques for training gans," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [13] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, and S. Hochreiter, "Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [14] T. Unterthiner, S. van Steenkiste, K. Kurach, R. Marinier, M. Michalski, and S. Gelly, "Towards accurate generative models of video: A new metric challenges," 2019.
- [15] M. Binkowski, D. J. Sutherland, M. Arbel, and A. Gretton, "Towards accurate generative models of video: A new metric & challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01717*, 2018.
- [16] C. Wu, L. Huang, Q. Zhang, B. Li, L. Ji, F. Yang, G. Sapiro, and N. Duan, "Godiva: Generating open-domain videos from natural descriptions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14806*, 2021.
- [17] J. Hessel, A. Holtzman, M. Forbes, R. Le Bras, and Y. Choi, "Clipscore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2021, pp. 7514–7528.
- [18] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, "Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift," in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, F. Bach and D. Blei, Eds., vol. 37. Lille, France: PMLR, 07–09 Jul 2015, pp. 448–456.
- [19] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [20] C. Feichtenhofer, H. Fan, J. Malik, and K. He, "Slowfast networks for video recognition," in *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019, pp. 6201–6210.
- [21] G. Mittal, T. Marwah, and V. N. Balasubramanian, "Sync-draw: Automatic video generation using deep recurrent attentive architectures," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 2017, pp. 1096–1104.
- [22] Y. Pan, Z. Qiu, T. Yao, H. Li, and T. Mei, "To create what you tell: Generating videos from captions," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 2017, pp. 1789–1798.
- [23] Y. Li, M. Min, D. Shen, D. Carlson, and L. Carin, "Video generation from text," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2018.
- [24] K. Deng, T. Fei, X. Huang, and Y. Peng, "Irc-gan: Introspective recurrent convolutional gan for text-to-video generation." in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 2216–2222.
- [25] C. Wu, J. Liang, L. Ji, F. Yang, Y. Fang, D. Jiang, and N. Duan, "Nuwa: Visual synthesis pre-training for neural visual world creation," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 720–736.
- [26] J. Liang, C. Wu, X. Hu, Z. Gan, J. Wang, L. Wang, Z. Liu, Y. Fang, and N. Duan, "Nuwa-infinity: Autoregressive over autoregressive generation for infinite visual synthesis," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 15 420–15 432, 2022.
- [27] W. Hong, M. Ding, W. Zheng, X. Liu, and J. Tang, "Cogvideo: Large-scale pretraining for text-to-video generation via transformers," in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [28] 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 descriptions," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [29] J. Bruce, M. D. Dennis, A. Edwards, J. Parker-Holder, Y. Shi, E. Hughes, M. Lai, A. Mavalankar, R. Steigerwald, C. Apps, Y. Aytar, S. M. E. Bechtle, F. Behbahani, S. C. 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," in *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [30] S. Ge, T. Hayes, H. Yang, X. Yin, G. Pang, D. Jacobs, J.-B. Huang, and D. Parikh, "Long video generation with time-agnostic vqgan and time-sensitive transformer," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 102–118.
- [31] J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet, "Video diffusion models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 8633–8646, 2022.
- [32] Y. He, T. Yang, Y. Zhang, Y. Shan, and Q. Chen, "Latent video diffusion models for high-fidelity long video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13221*, 2022.
- [33] J. Z. Wu, Y. Ge, X. Wang, S. 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," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 7623–7633.
- [34] D. Zhou, W. Wang, H. Yan, W. Lv, Y. Zhu, and J. Feng, "Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11018*, 2022.
- [35] Y. Zeng, G. Wei, J. Zheng, J. Zou, Y. Wei, Y. Zhang, and H. Li, "Make pixels dance: High-dynamic video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10982*, 2023.
- [36] H. Chen, Y. Zhang, X. Cun, M. Xia, X. Wang, C. Weng, and Y. Shan, "Videocrafter2: Overcoming data limitations for high-quality video diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09047*, 2024.
- [37] H. Chen, M. Xia, Y. He, Y. Zhang, X. Cun, S. Yang, J. Xing, Y. Liu, Q. Chen, X. Wang *et al.*, "Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19512*, 2023.
- [38] U. Singer, A. Polyak, T. Hayes, X. Yin, J. An, S. Zhang, Q. Hu, H. Yang, O. Ashual, O. Gafni *et al.*, "Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022.
- [39] 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.
- [40] L. Khachatryan, A. Movsisyan, V. Tadevosyan, R. Henschel, Z. Wang, S. Navasardyan, and H. Shi, "Text2video-zero: Text-to-image diffusion models are zero-shot video generators," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 15 954–15 964.
- [41] S. Yin, C. Wu, H. Yang, J. Wang, X. Wang, M. Ni, Z. Yang, L. Li, S. Liu, F. Yang *et al.*, "Nuwa-xl: Diffusion over diffusion for extremely long video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12346*, 2023.
- [42] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [43] J. Betker, G. Goh, L. Jing, T. Brooks, J. Wang, L. Li, L. Ouyang, J. Zhuang, J. Lee, Y. Guo *et al.*, "Improving image generation with better captions," *Computer Science*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 8, 2023.
- [44] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, "Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 3836–3847.
- [45] C. Zhang, C. Zhang, M. Zhang, and I. S. Kweon, "Text-to-image diffusion model in generative ai: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07909*, 2023.

- [46] P. Esser, J. Chiu, P. Atighehchian, J. Granskog, and A. Germanidis, "Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 7346–7356.
- [47] R. Sun, Y. Zhang, T. Shah, J. Sun, S. Zhang, W. Li, H. Duan, and B. Wei, "From sora what we can see: A survey of text-to-video generation."
- [48] J. Cho, F. D. Puspitasari, S. Zheng, J. Zheng, L.-H. Lee, T.-H. Kim, C. S. Hong, and C. Zhang, "Sora as an agi world model? a complete survey on text-to-video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05131*, 2024.
- [49] M. Otani, R. Togashi, Y. Sawai, R. Ishigami, Y. Nakashima, E. Rahtu, J. Heikkil, and S. Satoh, "Toward verifiable and reproducible human evaluation for text-to-image generation," pp. 14277–14286, 2023.
- [50] Z. Chen, W. Sun, Y. Tian, J. Jia, Z. Zhang, J. Wang, R. Huang, X. Min, G. Zhai, and W. Zhang, "Gai: Rethinking action quality assessment for ai-generated videos," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06087*, 2024.
- [51] L. Zhang and H. Li, "Sr-sim: A fast and high performance iqa index based on spectral residual," in *2012 19th IEEE international conference on image processing*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 1473–1476.
- [52] W. Zhang, K. Ma, G. Zhai, and X. Yang, "Uncertainty-aware blind image quality assessment in the laboratory and wild," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 3474–3486, 2021.
- [53] W. Sun, X. Min, D. Tu, S. Ma, and G. Zhai, "Blind quality assessment for in-the-wild images via hierarchical feature fusion and iterative mixed database training," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 2023.
- [54] J. Ke, Q. Wang, Y. Wang, P. Milanfar, and F. Yang, "Musiq: Multi-scale image quality transformer," in *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021, pp. 5128–5137.
- [55] W. Zhang, G. Zhai, Y. Wei, X. Yang, and K. Ma, "Blind image quality assessment via vision-language correspondence: A multitask learning perspective," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2023, pp. 14071–14081.
- [56] J. Carreira and A. Zisserman, "Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset," in *proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 6299–6308.
- [57] X. Min, H. Duan, W. Sun, Y. Zhu, and G. Zhai, "Perceptual video quality assessment: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03413*, 2024.
- [58] W. Sun, X. Min, W. Lu, and G. Zhai, "A deep learning based no-reference quality assessment model for ugc videos," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2022, p. 856865.
- [59] H. Wu, C. Chen, J. Hou, L. Liao, A. Wang, W. Sun, Q. Yan, and W. Lin, "Fast-vqa: Efficient end-to-end video quality assessment with fragment sampling," in *Computer Vision ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 2327, 2022, Proceedings, Part VI*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2022, p. 538554.
- [60] H. Wu, E. Zhang, L. Liao, C. Chen, J. H. Hou, A. Wang, W. S. Sun, Q. Yan, and W. Lin, "Exploring video quality assessment on user generated contents from aesthetic and technical perspectives," in *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023.
- [61] P. Gao, P. Zhang, and A. Smolic, "Quality assessment for omnidirectional video: A spatio-temporal distortion modeling approach," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 24, pp. 1–16, 2022.
- [62] S. Mitra, S. Jogani, and R. Soundararajan, "Semi-supervised learning of perceptual video quality by generating consistent pairwise pseudo-ranks," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 26, pp. 6215–6227, 2024.
- [63] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo, "Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021.
- [64] Y. Fang, Z. Li, J. Yan, X. Sui, and H. Liu, "Study of spatio-temporal modeling in video quality assessment," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 2023.
- [65] W. Sun, W. Wen, X. Min, L. Lan, G. Zhai, and K. Ma, "Analysis of video quality datasets via design of minimalistic video quality models," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [66] J. Li, D. Li, C. Xiong, and S. Hoi, "Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation," in *ICML*, 2022.
- [67] Y. Wang, K. Li, Y. Li, Y. He, B. Huang, Z. Zhao, H. Zhang, J. Xu, Y. Liu, Z. Wang, S. Xing, G. Chen, J. Pan, J. Yu, Y. Wang, L. Wang, and Y. Qiao, "Internvideo: General video foundation models via generative and discriminative learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191*, 2022.
- [68] Y. Kirstain, A. Poliak, U. Singer, and O. Levy, "Pick-a-pic: An open dataset of user preferences for text-to-image generation," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2023.
- [69] X. Wu, Y. Hao, K. Sun, Y. Chen, F. Zhu, R. Zhao, and H. Li, "Human preference score v2: A solid benchmark for evaluating human preferences of text-to-image synthesis," 2023.
- [70] M. Ding, W. Zheng, W. Hong, and J. Tang, "Cogview2: Faster and better text-to-image generation via hierarchical transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.14217*, 2022.
- [71] J. Xu, X. Liu, Y. Wu, Y. Tong, Q. Li, M. Ding, J. Tang, and Y. Dong, "Imagereward: Learning and evaluating human preferences for text-to-image generation," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [72] X. Wu, K. Sun, F. Zhu, R. Zhao, and H. Li, "Human preference score: Better aligning text-to-image models with human preference," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2023, pp. 2096–2105.
- [73] Z. Huang, Y. He, J. Yu, F. Zhang, C. Si, Y. Jiang, Y. Zhang, T. Wu, Q. Jin, N. Chanpaisit, Y. Wang, X. Chen, L. Wang, D. Lin, Y. Qiao, and Z. Liu, "Vbench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2024, pp. 21807–21818.
- [74] Y. Liu, L. Li, S. Ren, R. Gao, S. Li, S. Chen, X. Sun, and L. Hou, "Fetv: A benchmark for fine-grained evaluation of open-domain text-to-video generation," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, Eds., vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 62352–62387.
- [75] P. Esser, J. Chiu, P. Atighehchian, J. Granskog, and A. Germanidis, "Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2023, pp. 7346–7356.
- [76] Z. Luo, D. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Huang, L. Wang, Y. Shen, D. Zhao, J. Zhou, and T. Tan, "Notice of removal: Videofusion: Decomposed diffusion models for high-quality video generation," in *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023, pp. 10209–10218.
- [77] "Methodology for the subjective assessment of the quality of television pictures," *International Telecommunication Union*, 2002.
- [78] J. Wang, K. C. Chan, and C. C. Loy, "Exploring clip for assessing the look and feel of images," *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 2555–2563, Jun. 2023.
- [79] A. Mittal, R. Soundararajan, and A. C. Bovik, "Making a completely blind image quality analyzer," *IEEE Signal processing letters*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 209–212, 2012.
- [80] A. Mittal, A. K. Moorthy, and A. C. Bovik, "No-reference image quality assessment in the spatial domain," *IEEE Transactions on image processing*, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 4695–4708, 2012.
- [81] J. Korhonen, "Two-level approach for no-reference consumer video quality assessment," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 28, no. 12, pp. 5923–5938, 2019.
- [82] Z. Tu, X. Yu, Y. Wang, N. Birkbeck, B. Adsumilli, and A. C. Bovik, "Rapique: Rapid and accurate video quality prediction of user generated content," *IEEE Open Journal of Signal Processing*, vol. 2, pp. 425–440, 2021.
- [83] D. Li, T. Jiang, and M. Jiang, "Quality assessment of in-the-wild videos," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, ser. MM '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 23512359.
- [84] Z. Tu, Y. Wang, N. Birkbeck, B. Adsumilli, and A. C. Bovik, "Ugc-vqa: Benchmarking blind video quality assessment for user generated content," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 4449–4464, 2021.
- [85] Z. Ying, M. Mandal, D. Ghadiyaram, and A. Bovik, "Patch-vq: 'patching up' the video quality problem," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2021, pp. 14019–14029.
- [86] I. Chivileva, P. Lynch, T. E. Ward, and A. F. Smeaton, "Measuring the quality of text-to-video model outputs: Metrics and dataset," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08009*, 2023.