

OnlineVPO: Align Video Diffusion Model with Online Video-Centric Preference Optimization

Jiacheng Zhang^{1,†} Jie Wu^{2,†,‡} Weifeng Chen² Yatai Ji¹
 Xuefeng Xiao² Weilin Huang² Kai Han^{1,*}

¹The University of Hong Kong ²ByteDance
 zhangjc144@connect.hku.hk kaihanx@hku.hk
 Project Page: <https://onlinevpo.github.io/>

Abstract

In recent years, the field of text-to-video (T2V) generation has made significant strides. Despite this progress, there is still a gap between theoretical advancements and practical application, amplified by issues like degraded image quality and flickering artifacts. Recent advancements in enhancing the video diffusion model (VDM) through feedback learning have shown promising results. However, these methods still exhibit notable limitations, such as misaligned feedback and inferior scalability. To tackle these issues, we introduce OnlineVPO, a more efficient preference learning approach tailored specifically for video diffusion models. Our method features two novel designs, firstly, instead of directly using image-based reward feedback, we leverage the video quality assessment (VQA) model trained on synthetic data as the reward model to provide distribution and modality-aligned feedback on the video diffusion model. Additionally, we introduce an online DPO algorithm to address the off-policy optimization and scalability issue in existing video preference learning frameworks. By employing the video reward model to offer concise video feedback on the fly, OnlineVPO offers effective and efficient preference guidance. Extensive experiments on the open-source video-diffusion model demonstrate OnlineVPO as a simple yet effective and more importantly scalable preference learning algorithm for video diffusion models, offering valuable insights for future advancements in this domain.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the text-to-video (T2V) generation landscape has undergone a significant transformation with the advent of diffusion models. This field has witnessed remarkable growth, with notable open-source models such

*: Corresponding Author. †: Equal Contribution. ‡: Project Lead. Work done during an internship at ByteDance.




Figure 1. **Comparison of the existing preference learning methods for VDMs.** Existing methods such as InstructVideo and VADER, utilize the ReFL framework to achieve feedback learning for video generation, leading to suboptimal results due to its reliance on the misaligned feedback from the image-based rewards or video discriminant models. Moreover, these methods suffer in scalability caused of their memory-costly decode operation. While naive applied DPO, *i.e.*, DiffusionDPO, encounters inefficient optimization caused by the offline feedback with the pre-collected preference datasets. By contrast, our proposed **OnlineVPO** capitalizes on video-centric feedback, achieving superior efficiency, effectiveness, and scalability in preference optimization through an online iterative preference learning framework.

as SVD [9] and commercial video generation products like Gen-2 [17], PikaLab [1], and Sora [11] quickly emerging. This study focuses primarily on open-source methodologies [9, 51, 58]. While the video outputs produced by these open-source models are impressive, a noticeable gap remains when translating these models into practical applications, characterized by issues such as reduced image quality, frame instability, *etc.*

Feedback learning has recently captured significant attention in the field of large-language models [2, 40, 41] (LLMs), with RLHF [3, 30] (reinforcement learning with human feedback) emerging as a prominent approach. RLHF harnesses human preference about the LLM outputs as a signal and fine-tunes the LLM through reinforcement learn-

ing to align its outputs with human preferences. The success of RLHF has spurred a rise in related research efforts, leading to the development of diverse feedback-learning methodologies such as DPO [33] and KTO [18]. Inspired by these, there is a growing exploration of implementing feedback learning in video generation, as demonstrated by works like InstructVideo [53], T2V-Turbo [26], and VADER [32], representing a promising frontier in enhancing video diffusion models (VDMs). Despite the notable achievements, as depicted in Figure 1, current methodologies still face a series of limitations.

- *Lack of Video-Centric Preference Feedback:* Given the expensive, time-consuming, and labor-intensive nature of video preference data collection, existing methods primarily rely on image-based reward models to provide feedback to enhance video generation. For instance, InstructVideo advocates employing an image reward model to assess individual frames within a video, tailoring reward values frame by frame to refine preference alignment in video synthesis. Despite efforts by T2V-Turbo and VADER to incorporate video-related discriminant models like VidCLIP [45] and JPEA [7] alongside image reward models to enhance video consistency and visual coherence assessment, these discriminant models are not specifically designed for evaluating video quality. Consequently, the absence of video quality-aware feedback leads to sub-optimal results.
- *Lack of Efficient, Effective, Scalable and Memory-friendly Video Feedback Learning Techniques:* The present method, including InstructVideo, T2V-Turbo, and VADER, predominantly relies on REFL [50] (reward feedback learning) for training. These approaches necessitate scoring the complete video output decoded by VAE using the reward model, followed by propagating the reward signal throughout the sampling chain. Scaling these methods to accommodate larger-parameters video/reward models or higher-resolution/longer-duration video outputs will inevitably trigger substantial memory constraints. Furthermore, these techniques are very prone to reward hacking issues [38] during reward tuning, often culminating in suboptimal optimization outcomes.

In response to these challenges, we introduce **OnlineVPO**, an efficient and effective preference learning approach tailored for video generation models. Primarily diverging from prior practices that relied on image-based reward models or video discriminative models for feedback provision, we advocate for the direct utilization of existing video quality assessment models, trained using synthetic data, as video reward models. These reward models, crafted to align with preference distributions (quality-aware) and modalities (video-centric) specific to video generation models, furnish tailored video preference feedback finely attuned to the needs of video diffusion models. More-

over, to address the inherent challenges associated with the REFL optimization paradigm in VDMs, we investigate the application of the DPO paradigm for video generation refinement. We discover that DPO typically fine-tunes with a preference dataset collected ahead of training. This preference feedback is typically purely offline due to the current policy’s inability to receive precise feedback about its own generations during training. This engenders a notable distribution bias between the dataset-generating policy and the policy under alignment. Hence, we propose an online DPO algorithm to address this disparity in video preference learning. Specifically, our approach entails the utilization of the video reward model to furnish online feedback during the video generation model’s training phase, facilitating on-policy learning. This methodological framework encompasses sequential steps: (i) sampling multiple videos from the current video generation policy model upon prompt receipt; (ii) evaluating and ranking these videos using the video reward model to obtain online video generation feedback; (iii) leveraging the DPO loss function to iteratively refine the policy network based on this real-time feedback. Although the training paradigm appears straightforward, we demonstrate the superior efficacy and efficiency of OnlineVPO in preference learning for video diffusion models.

The main contributions of our efforts are as follows:

- *Feedback Source:* We examined reward feedback for video diffusion models and pointed out that video quality assessment models trained with synthetic data are a superior alternative;
- *Feedback Algorithm:* We designed a straightforward preference learning algorithm for video diffusion models; it can assess the video quality of the current policy on the fly and provide timely and precise feedback, at the same time retain the excellent scalability;
- *Feedback Performance:* We have demonstrated the effectiveness of our methodology and provided some observations analysis, which provides some insights for future progress in this area.

2. Related Work

2.1. Diffusion-based Video Generation

Diffusion models [14, 22, 35] have shown impressive performance in generating high-quality videos. Early works [10, 20, 25, 37, 44, 46, 48, 59] commonly inflate the pre-trained image diffusion model [35] into the video diffusion model by incorporating temporal layers (*e.g.* temporal convolution or temporal attention). For instance, Animatediff [20] decouples video generation into content and motion generation and incorporates an additional motion module on the base image generation model to achieve video clip generation. Subsequently, large video pre-trained diffusion models [6, 9, 12, 13] represented works such

as VideoCrafter [12] exhibit impressive video quality with large-scale video pre-train datasets. However, these methods encounter limitations in generating long videos due to inherent limitations in capacity and scalability within the UNet design. Spearheaded by groundbreaking works like Sora [11], a wave of DiT-based video diffusion models [5, 23, 51, 52, 58] has steadily emerged. With the large-scale training and scalability of DiT [14, 31] architecture, these models can generate longer videos of up to 1 minute. Despite these advancements, challenges such as poor image quality, frame flicker, and subject inconsistencies in the generated video persist. In this study, we aim to address these issues through preference learning.

2.2. Preference Learning from Human Feedback

Preference learning is designed to boost the performance of generative models by fine-tuning the generative model based on human preference. As a prominent representative, reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF), which has emerged alongside the rapid development of modern large-language models (LLMs) such as those in [16, 30], showcases remarkable capabilities in enhancing the harmlessness and helpfulness of LLMs by aligning them with human preference feedback using reinforcement learning techniques (*e.g.* PPO in [36]). Inspired by these advancements, researchers have delved into preference learning within the image generation domain, as seen in [15, 27, 34, 43, 49, 50, 54–56]. For instance, following the principles of RLHF in the LLM domain, Black et al. [8] put forward DDPO, which employs PPO to enhance the quality of image generation with diverse reward functions. In contrast, Xu et al. [50] proposed the direct preference tuning framework, ImageReward, which directly optimizes the denoised image to increase the reward score under the guidance of a human preference model. Unlike the extensive research on preference learning for image generation, only a limited number of works have explored preference learning for video generation. InstructVideo in [53] directly utilizes the image reward model (*e.g.* HPSv2 in [49]) to score multiple frames with a frame-wise weighting strategy to achieve fine-tuning rewards for video generation. Li et al. [26] suggests using mixed reward supervision from image and video reward models to accelerate the video generation model. VADER in [32] explores various reward functions for fine-tuning. However, most of these methods fail to utilize data-distribution-aligned and video-centric preference feedback. This shortcoming causes their methods to fall short in optimizing dynamics such as frame flicker.

3. Methodology

In this section, we will introduce our onlineVPO approach for video feedback learning. Firstly, we present some preliminaries regarding preference learning from human feed-




Figure 2. **Overview of the Proposed OnlineVPO.** The entire process is iterative and encompasses two crucial designs: video-centric preference feedback generation and online video preference optimization. We iteratively update the reference model to achieve higher learning efficiency.

back, encompassing reward feedback learning (ReFL) and direct preference optimization (DPO). Subsequently, we present the video-centric preference feedback signal and online preference learning algorithm. The overview of our method is depicted in Figure 2.

3.1. Preliminary

Reward Feedback Learning (ReFL). ReFL [50] is an effective preference learning method that utilizes a well-trained human preference reward model r for preference Fine-tuning. It begins with an input prompt c , initializing a latent variable x_T at random. The latent variable is then progressively denoised until reaching a randomly selected timestep t . At this point, the denoised image x'_0 is directly predicted from x_t . The reward model r then is applied to this denoised image, generating the expected preference score $r_\theta(c, x'_0)$. ReFL maximizes such preference scores to align the generated images more closely with human preferences:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ReFL}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{c \sim p(c)} \mathbb{E}_{x'_0 \sim p(x'_0|c)} [-r(x'_0, c)] \quad (1)$$

Direct Preference Optimization (DPO). DPO [33] is one of the most popular preference optimization methods. Instead of learning an explicit reward model, DPO reparameterizes the reward function r using a closed-form expression with the optimal policy:

$$r(x, y) = \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y | x)} + \beta \log Z(x) \quad (2)$$

DPO formulates the probability of preference generation via the policy model rather than the reward model, yielding the objective $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\theta)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim D} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w | x)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l | x)} \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

Method	Reward Model			Feedback Attributes	
	RM Guidance	Video Reward	Video Quality-Aware	Online Feedback	Scalability
InstructVideo	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
T2V-Turbo	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
VADER	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Diffusion-DPO	✗	✗	-	✗	✓
OnlineVPO(Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1. We compare OnlineVPO with other feedback learning algorithms in terms of reward model and feedback attribute. OnlineVPO leverages a video quality-aware reward model to offer online and scalable feedback signals.

Criteria	Preference	Recall↑		
	MRR ↑	@1	@2	@4
Aesthetic Score	42.73	12.45	26.24	77.37
ImageReward	44.17	14.25	27.44	78.69
MPS	45.52	15.06	27.39	79.45
HPSv2	46.30	24.60	31.09	80.12
VideoScore	67.23	41.38	62.74	92.66

Table 2. We analyze the performance of several widely used image preference models on distinguishing the human-preferred video from 8 candidates. **MRR** is the *Mean Reciprocal Rank*, denoting the average reciprocal of the rank of the ground truth preferred video after the scoring. Recall @ k is the proportion of preferred videos ranked at the top- k elements.

where (y_w, y_l) is the preferred and unpreferred response from the preference dataset D .

3.2. Video-Centric Preference Feedback Signal

Existing video preference learning methodologies [26, 53] directly employ off-the-shelf image reward models for preference optimization. The primary motivation for these approaches to adopt this sub-optimal solution lies in the current dearth of video feedback data and the excessively high cost associated with collecting manual feedback for large-scale video generation. Utilizing image reward models presents an intuitive and cost-effective solution. Nevertheless, this modality discrepancy renders them incapable of measuring video dynamics, such as subject consistency and frame flicker, leading to inaccurate video preference feedback. To illustrate that, we curate around 100 prompts and generate 8 candidate videos with various video generative models. We first employ human annotators to select the best video after receiving relevant training, and then, we utilize several commonly used image preference models to rank these candidates and calculate the performance of finding the target video. It is evident in Tab.2 that the image-based preference model performs poorly at distinguishing the most preferred samples in the context of the video. As a comparison, the video quality assessment model VideoScore aligns very well with human preference.

To address this problem, we investigate the application of recent video quality assessment models trained on syn-

thetic data. Although these models are not specifically designed for preference learning, they exhibit high consistency in terms of data distribution, quality preference, and modality. These models can not only assess the overall video quality (*e.g.* overall score) but also evaluate the quality of specific dimensions [21], such as temporal consistency and motion. Compared with image-based reward models or video discriminative models in existing methods, these models can offer more precise, robust, and highly-aligned feedback signals with the video diffusion model.

3.3. Video Online Preference Learning

Current video preference learning methods primarily follow the ReFL preference learning paradigm, which presents disadvantages including the requirement of a discriminable reward model and the risk of over-optimization. Furthermore, its scalability issues come to the fore when confronted with longer and higher-resolution videos. Hence, we explore the utilization of direct preference optimization (DPO) to conduct preference learning for the video diffusion model. However, DPO suffers from problems such as sluggish off-line policy updates and insufficient optimization efficiency. To address this, we propose an online preference learning strategy, which consists of two novel designs, namely *online preference sample generation* and *curriculum reference update*, to facilitate more effective preference optimization.

Online Preference Sample Generation: The preference dataset employed in DPO is collected ahead of aligning the model’s prediction and remains unchanged during the entire training process. This causes the aligned model to be unable to acquire precise feedback regarding its own predictions, thereby resulting in sub-optimal performance. To tackle this issue, we propose the online preference sample generation to facilitate more effective preference optimization. Specifically, rather than using a fixed preference pair (y_w, y_l) from the dataset, during each optimization step, we generate multiple videos $\mathcal{V} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N\}$ with the policy model π_θ , and then the preferred and unpreferred samples are differentiated with the video reward model R_v , we have $(\tilde{y}_w, \tilde{y}_l) = (\mathcal{V}_{\max_i \mathcal{R}(y_i)}, \mathcal{V}_{\min_i \mathcal{R}(y_i)})$. In this way, the video diffusion model is enabled to obtain online and accurate feedback on the fly over the alignment procedure,

Algorithm 1: Online Video Preference Optimization (OnlineVPO).

Input: Prompt Set $\mathcal{M} = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$, Video Diffusion Model $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, Video Reward Model $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$, Curriculum Update Interval K

Output: Preference-aligned Video Diffusion Model $\mathcal{G}^*(\cdot)$

```
1 step = 0
2 for  $x_i$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  do
3   // Online Preference Sample Generation
4    $\mathcal{V} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N\} \sim \mathcal{G}(x_i)$ 
5    $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{R}(y_1), \mathcal{R}(y_2), \dots, \mathcal{R}(y_N)\}$ 
6    $\tilde{y}_w = \mathcal{V}_{\max_i \mathcal{R}(y_i)}$ ;  $\tilde{y}_l = \mathcal{V}_{\min_i \mathcal{R}(y_i)}$ 
7    $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}} =$ 
8    $\mathbb{E} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta \log \frac{\mathcal{G}_\theta(\tilde{y}_w|x)}{\mathcal{G}_{\text{ref}}(\tilde{y}_w|x)} - \beta \log \frac{\mathcal{G}_\theta(\tilde{y}_l|x)}{\mathcal{G}_{\text{ref}}(\tilde{y}_l|x)} \right) \right]$ 
9   // Update  $\mathcal{G}_\theta$  with DPO loss
10   $\mathcal{G}_\theta \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_\theta + \nabla_{\mathcal{G}_\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}$ 
11  step = step + 1
12  // Curriculum Preference Update
13  if (step mod  $K$ ) = 0 then
14     $\mathcal{G}_{\text{ref}} = \mathcal{G}_\theta$ 
```

yielding more real-time and effective supervision for the optimized model toward the preferred direction.

Curriculum Preference Update: The reference model serves as a restraint on the deviation of the model distribution and motivates the model to outperform the reference model within the neighborhood of the latter. Although this design stabilizes the training process, it also leads to restricted exploration. Our crucial discovery is that the model decelerates the optimization rate after a suitable number of optimization steps. This is because the current model has largely completed exploration within the constraints of the current reference model and demonstrates significantly superior preference alignment compared to the reference model. Subsequently, using a fixed reference model will confine the current model’s space for further enhancement. Consequently, we propose updating the reference model with the newly aligned target model after the optimization step. This design compels the model to continuously explore better alignments in a curriculum manner, thereby yielding more efficient preference learning.

The complete procedure of our method is presented in Algorithm.1, and the comparison of our method with other preference learning methods is summarized in Table.1.

4. Experiment

4.1. Experiment Setup

Implementation details. We implement our method with the OpenSora v1.2 [58], an open-sourced video generation model. We fine-tune OpenSora with the commonly utilized WebVid-10M [4] dataset. The training batch size

is set to 8, and the AdamW [29] optimizer with a learning rate of 1e-5 is employed. During online sample generation, we generate candidate 240p videos, each having 34 frames and an aspect ratio of 9:16. The curriculum update interval is set to $K = 200$. When generating the samples, the inference step is set to 30, and 51 frames are sampled. Unless otherwise stated, VideoScore [21] is adopted as our video reward model.

Baseline Methods. We compared our method with the current state-of-the-art video preference learning methods, InstructVideo [53] and VADER [32]. InstructVideo utilizes the image reward model to achieve video preference learning through the frame-wise weighting strategy, while VADER combines both the image reward model and other video self-supervised models, such as V-JEPA [7] to provide video generation feedback.

Evaluation Metrics. The standard video evaluation benchmark VBench [24] is employed to conduct evaluations against a wide range of baseline methods. VBench is designed to evaluate T2V models from various disentangled dimensions comprehensively. Each dimension within VBench is customized with specific prompts and evaluation methods. We choose seven representative dimensions of the video quality that align with human perception for our final evaluation: *dynamic degrees*, *subject consistency*, *background consistency*, *aesthetic quality*, *image quality*, *motion smoothness*.

4.2. Compared with State-of-the-art Methods

Table 3 showcases the quantitative comparison between our method and other approaches on the VBench dataset [24]. It is evident that when our method is applied to OpenSora, it leads to a remarkable performance enhancement and surpasses the existing state-of-the-art method, InstructVideo, particularly in the dimensions of subject consistency and temporal flicker, and achieves the best overall quality score. Even when compared with methods like VADER, which utilize a mixed reward combining image-based and video-discriminant rewards, our method still exhibits more advanced performance, thereby emphasizing the significance of reward feedback that is cognizant of video quality. We note that our method lags behind other methods to a notable extent in the dimension of dynamic degree. Nevertheless, it is worth highlighting that blindly enhancing the dynamic degree does not necessarily imply better video quality. Instead, it merely serves as a reference metric for comprehensively evaluating the video quality. For instance, despite the fact that EasyAnimate and ModelScope-T2V possess a considerably higher dynamic degree, the subject consistency of the videos they generate remains unsatisfactory, which would affect the video watch experience significantly.

User Study. To conduct a qualitative comparison of the video generation results among different feedback learn-

Models	Subject Consist.	Background Consist.	Temporal Flicker.	Motion Smooth.	Aesthetic Quality	Dynamic Degree	Image Quality
ModelScope [44]	86.41	92.25	93.69	95.48	42.41	66.00	61.69
LaVie [46]	92.50	95.92	94.72	96.47	56.17	60.00	62.09
VideoCrafter1 [12]	96.61	96.47	95.64	97.64	59.52	48.00	65.03
EasyAnimate [51]	92.32	95.40	96.69	97.81	54.82	81.00	54.63
VideoCrafter2 [13]	<u>96.65</u>	<u>97.52</u>	95.75	97.67	<u>59.10</u>	50.00	66.85
InstructVideo [53]	96.45	97.08	95.30	96.76	50.01	<u>61.22</u>	70.09
VADER [32]	95.53	97.11	97.42	<u>98.89</u>	53.43	41.12	66.08
OpenSora	95.35	96.42	<u>98.34</u>	98.71	52.74	44.00	62.41
OpenSora + OnlineVPO	97.58	97.74	98.73	99.36	55.37	43.00	<u>67.36</u>

Table 3. Quantitive performance comparison on VBench [24]. We compare our method with various video diffusion models, other existing video preference learning methods, and our baseline model - OpenSora. Our method demonstrates superior performance in optimizing the key aspects of video generation, such as subject consistency, temporal flicker mitigation, etc.



Figure 3. Visual comparison between different preference optimization methods upon Open-sora. Existing preference optimization methods suffer from optimizing video temporal dynamic quality due to the lack of video-centric reward feedback, while OnlineVPO exploits the video quality-aware reward model and online preference learning to achieve superior video generation performance.

ing methods, a user study was implemented on the VBench dataset. We contrast the videos generated by OnlineVPO with those produced by the original model, DiffusionDPO, InstructVideo, and VADER. Ten users were assigned the task of comparing pairs of videos and identifying which one exhibits a higher overall quality. Figure 4 presents a summary of the preference rate of OnlineVPO over other methods. The results indicate that our approach performs optimally under human subjective evaluation.

Visualization. We showcase some visual comparison results between ours and other methods in Figure 3. It can be observed that the videos generated by our model are more stable and less susceptible to temporal collapse. For instance, in the first example, both the original OpenSora and Diffusion-DPO exhibit character collapse in the second

frame, with the distorted and broken face. InstructVideo shows some better results but still gets some blurred frames. For example, the blurry face in the second frame and the fox’s limbs exhibit varying degrees of distortion in the third frame. In contrast, our results possess higher image quality, greater clarity, a more temporal consistency on the overall structure through the whole frames, and stronger comprehensive performance.

4.3. Analysis and Insights

We conduct a series of ablation studies to verify the effectiveness of our key designs and endeavor to provide crucial insights into preference learning for video generation. Unless otherwise stated, our experiments are performed with Open-Sora v1.2 as the video generation model and




Figure 4. **User Study** on the performance of the VDM optimized by OnlineVPO and other methods.

VideoScore as the video reward model.

OnlineVPO or ReFL. We conduct ablation studies on the two mainstream preference learning paradigms within the context of video generation. Specifically, given that the VideoScore is an LLM-based differentiable T2VQA model, we utilize it as the proxy human preference model in ReFL and subsequently perform the reward-feedback tuning for the video generation model following a similar practice in [50]. The comparison between OnlineVPO and ReFL preference learning is summarized in Table 4(c). It can be observed that ReFL attains inferior optimization performance.

Optimization Dimension. Human preferences regarding video quality are multi-dimensional. Hence, we analyze the performance of online preference optimization across different dimensions. We present the optimization performance of our method with respect to preference feedback for *visual quality*, *temporal consistency*, *dynamics*, and *t2v alignment*. As shown in Table 4(b), feedback from temporal consistency yields the optimal performance, highlighting the necessity of temporal dynamics feedback in video generation. This feedback can further enhance the performance of other model dimensions. We also investigated the use of feedback from all dimensions for optimization. In this case, we constructed online preference pairs by computing the average of reward scores from all dimensions. We refer to this scheme as *global*. However, the performance of the model with feedback from all dimensions is lower compared to single-dimension optimization. We speculate that this is due to potential feedback conflicts that arise when integrating feedback from different dimensions. For example, motion can introduce certain picture fluctuations and blurring, which is detrimental to aesthetics. Static pictures might be aesthetically pleasing and possess high temporal consistency, yet their motion amplitude can be severely affected. The comprehensive average ultimately results in mediocre outcomes. In our future work, we will explore the optimal reward ratio for different dimensions.

Video Reward Model Benefits More. We conduct ablation studies on the reward model utilized for preference learning in the context of video generation. Specifically, we explore several image reward models to offer video preference su-




Figure 5. **Reward Curve** along the training process when adopting the ReFL or OnlineVPO video preference learning paradigm.

pervision, namely the Laion aesthetic predictor¹, ImageReward [50], and MPS [56]. These image-based reward models are exploited through the OnlineVPO approach. Additionally, we further attempt to employ Q-Align [47] as the design for the video reward model. The results are summarized in Table 4(a). Although leveraging image reward models to supervise video preference learning can bring about certain performance enhancements, these improvements are predominantly confined to the image level, such as in aspects of image quality and aesthetic quality. In contrast, for the dimension that pertains to video temporal dynamics, only marginal improvements are witnessed, particularly in terms of dynamic degree and temporal consistency. By comparison, video reward models that possess a comprehensive understanding of video quality result in consistent performance improvements across various dimensions after preference tuning, with VideoScore achieving optimal performance. These results thereby emphasize the significance of a reliable video reward model.

Online-policy Superior to Offline-policy. We verify the indispensability of online-policy learning. Specifically, we utilize the VideoScore to generate preference data pairs prior to the training process. Subsequently, the video diffusion model is aligned in accordance with the standard DPO procedure. Since these preference pairs remain unaltered throughout the training process, a disparity emerges between the preference data distribution and the model’s generation during training, thereby resulting in mismatched feedback. Hence, this constitutes a form of offline-policy learning. The performance comparison is presented in Table 4(d), which clearly illustrates that the online policy approach exhibits superior performance.

Reward Learning Efficiency. We depict the variations in rewards of diverse feedback learning methods during the training process in Figure 5. It is observable that our method can attain stable performance enhancements. Among these, the approach of updating the reference model in a curriculum manner can achieve more rapid and more efficient improvement. The reward curve of ReFL shows a performance pattern of initially rising and subsequently declining. The

¹<https://github.com/christophschuhmann/improved-aesthetic-predictor>

Method	Dynamic Degree	Subject Consist.	Aesthetic Quality
Aesthetic	40.1	95.04	52.33
ImageReward	46.0	96.26	51.04
MPS	42.0	95.93	51.54
QAlign	43.6	96.36	53.75
VideoScore	43.0	97.58	55.37

(a) Performance comparison of different video feedback sources.

Method	Dynamic Degree	Subject Consist.	Aesthetic Quality	Image Quality
ReFL	40.0	96.59	51.84	63.06
Ours	43.0	97.58	55.37	67.36

(c) Performance comparison with onlineVPO and REFL.

Feedback Dimension	Dynamic Degree	Subject Consist.	Aesthetic Quality
Visual quality	38.0	<u>96.56</u>	<u>52.97</u>
Dynamic degree	57.0	92.09	49.02
T2V alignment	44.0	96.19	50.52
Temporal consistency	43.0	97.58	55.37
Global	<u>55.0</u>	95.37	51.33

(b) Performance comparison with different feedback dimensions.

Method	Dynamic Degree	Subject Consist.	Aesthetic Quality
Offline-policy	28.0	97.07	53.28
Online-policy	43.0	97.58	55.37

(d) Performance comparison with offline and online policy learning.

Table 4. **OnlineVPO Analysis Ablation.** We perform ablations on (a) video preference feedback sources. (b) video feedback dimension of online preference learning. (c) preference optimization paradigms. (d) offline- or online-policy exploits the preference feedback.

underlying reason is that this method is more prone to encountering the issue of reward hacking, which ultimately leads to the collapse of the final model.

Scalability Analysis. To further investigate the scalability, we visualized the upper limit of GPU memory for both our method and the ReFL algorithm under several resolution and output frame settings in Figure 7. It can be seen that our method still has 25% of available space from the upper limit of video GPU under the 720p with 68 frames of output setting. In contrast, the ReFL method can only perform under the conditions of 240p output with 68 frames or 360p output with 17 frames at most. This indicates that when confronted with large-scale video optimization scenarios, OnlineVPO offers more potential for scalability.

Understanding Online Preference Learning We present more insight into the online preference learning design. It is worth mentioning that the RL step in the widely used RLHF in LLM is also the online preference learning fashion as the training data is acquired interactively. Specifically, PPO-based RLHF methods interact online with the language model being aligned, estimate the unbiased gradient with these generated samples via policy gradient techniques, and utilize the value function to reduce the estimation variance. Such online interaction is crucial to the success of RLHF techniques in aligning the language models as proved by [60]. Even though DPO [33] eliminates the separated reward model during preference alignment, it exploits the pre-collected offline dataset, weakening its effectiveness. Our OnlineVPO proposes to bridge the gap between DPO and classical RLHF techniques by integrating online preference sample generation into DPO optimization. On the one hand, OnlineVPO boosts the performance of DPO with the online preference sample generation, on the other hand, it avoids the optimization challenge caused by the complicated RL tuning via the simple DPO objective. In short, OnlineVPO combines the merits of both classical PPO-based RLHF methods and DPO, leading to superior




Figure 7. The **Scalability Analysis** between OnlineVPO and REFL. The dotted line is the limit of A100 GPU Memory. We replace the value that exceeds the limit with a specific value.

performance in aligning video diffusion models.

4.4. Ablation Study

We present more ablation studies to facilitate understanding our method more comprehensively.

Number of Candidates N . OnlineVPO generates multiple video candidates and exploits the video reward model to determine the preference pair in an online manner. We analyze the impact of varying the number of video candidates N in Table.5(a). It clearly can be seen that increasing the number of video candidates leads to better performance. Generally, more video candidates can result in more diverse data samples, facilitating more robust and effective prefer-

# Number	Dynamic Degree	Subject Consist.	Aesthetic Quality	# Interval	Dynamic Degree	Subject Consist.	Aesthetic Quality	# Method	FVD↓	Dynamic Quality↑
2	42.4	96.09	49.16	100	42.7	97.02	53.74	OpenSora	316.21	60.12
4	42.0	97.09	54.33	200	43.0	97.58	55.37	InstructVideo	296.50	58.37
6	43.0	97.58	55.37	400	41.0	96.64	51.26	VADER	244.78	61.89
8	43.1	97.21	54.75	600	45.0	96.11	51.88	Ours	201.51	65.74

(a) Ablation of the candidate number.

(b) Ablation of the curriculum interval.

(c) Comparison with more metrics.

Table 5. **OnlineVPO Ablations.** We perform ablations on (a) the number of video candidates when constructing the online preference pair. (b) the curriculum interval to update the reference model. (c) performance comparison with more evaluation metrics.

Models	Subject Consist.	Background Consist.	Temporal Flicker.	Motion Smooth.	Aesthetic Quality	Dynamic Degree	Image Quality
CogVideoX-2B	92.78	96.35	96.99	98.19	49.37	55.55	58.00
CogVideoX-2B + OnlineVPO	94.57	96.63	97.53	98.67	49.99	39.39	55.67

Table 6. **Quantitive Performance Comparison with CogVideoX-2b on VBench [24].** All the results are sampled with 50 inference steps. Our method still demonstrates notable performance enhancement upon such an advanced video diffusion model.

ence sample selection. However, performance gains tend to diminish once the number of candidates reaches 4 or more. Therefore, we opt to set the N to 4 for our study.

Number of Curriculum Interval K . OnlineVPO employs a curriculum-based approach to iteratively update the reference model, enhancing the efficiency of preference optimization. We investigate the impact of varying the frequency of reference model updates. As shown in Table.5(b) both more frequent and less frequent updates yield inferior performance. Frequent updates to the reference model can prevent it from serving as a stable baseline for optimizing targets, leading to suboptimal optimization. Conversely, infrequent updates may struggle to realign an already biased model. The optimal performance is observed with an update interval of $K = 200$, striking a harmonious balance between these two scenarios.

Other Base Model. In addition to the OpenSora v1.2, we further assess our approach using the advanced video diffusion model CogVideoX [52]. Specifically, we conduct experiments with the CogVideoX-2b, a recently released powerful video generative model. As illustrated in Table.6, our method continues to show significant performance improvements compared to this sophisticated video generative model in temporal dynamic-related aspects such as subject consistency and temporal flicker, albeit with a slight trade-off in dynamic degree and image quality.

Other Evaluation Metrics we also incorporate the FVD [42] and Video Dynamic Quality [28] metrics to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of our method. Specifically, we compute FVD on the UCF-101 [39] dataset following the methodology of [57]. However, FVD is criticized for its focus on individual frame quality. Therefore, we utilize the improved FVD implementation by Ge et al. [19] and compare our method’s performance with others. Moreover, Video Dynamic Quality is a metric tailored to

evaluate the dynamic characteristics of generated videos. We employ this metric to assess how well our method optimizes video dynamics. The results are summarized in Table.5(c). Our approach demonstrates superior performance compared to other methods based on these two metrics. Taking the dynamic quality as an example, despite some improvement observed in InstructVideo in terms of FVD, it suffers the performance degeneration in dynamic quality. This is attributed to the naive application of the image-based reward model in a frame-wise manner, which enhances the frame image quality but can lead to temporal inconsistency. The effort made by the VADER only brings marginal improvement in dynamic quality due to the lack of the targeted video reward model. In contrast, OnlineVPO, leveraging a video reward model and online video preference learning, showcases significant enhancements in dynamic quality compared to the baseline.

5. Conclusion

We present OnlineVPO, a novel, effective, and highly scalable current video feedback learning method. By leveraging video quality assessment models trained on synthetic data as video reward models, we bridge the distribution and modality gap with video-centric feedback in the level of reward. Through an Online Curriculum DPO algorithm, we achieve efficient on-policy learning for the video diffusion model. OnlineVPO offers a tailored solution to optimize video diffusion models efficiently and effectively. Extensive experiments on the open-sourced video generation models demonstrate the superiority of our method.

Acknowledgments This work is supported by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council - General Research Fund (Grant No.: 17211024).

References

- [1] Pika ai. <https://pika.art>, 2024. 1
- [2] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 1
- [3] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022. 1
- [4] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *ICCV*, 2021. 5
- [5] Fan Bao, Chendong Xiang, Gang Yue, Guande He, Hongzhou Zhu, Kaiwen Zheng, Min Zhao, Shilong Liu, Yaole Wang, and Jun Zhu. Vidu: a highly consistent, dynamic and skilled text-to-video generator with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04233*, 2024. 3
- [6] Omer Bar-Tal, Hila Chefer, Omer Tov, Charles Herrmann, Roni Paiss, Shiran Zada, Ariel Ephrat, Junhwa Hur, Yuanzhen Li, Tomer Michaeli, et al. Lumiere: A space-time diffusion model for video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12945*, 2024. 2
- [7] Adrien Bardes, Quentin Garrido, Jean Ponce, Michael Rabbat, Yann LeCun, Mahmoud Assran, and Nicolas Ballas. Revisiting feature prediction for learning visual representations from video. *arXiv:2404.08471*, 2024. 2, 5
- [8] Kevin Black, Michael Janner, Yilun Du, Ilya Kostrikov, and Sergey Levine. Training diffusion models with reinforcement learning. In *ICLR*, 2024. 3
- [9] Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Sumith Kulal, Daniel Mendelevitch, Maciej Kilian, Dominik Lorenz, Yam Levi, Zion English, Vikram Voleti, Adam Letts, et al. Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15127*, 2023. 1, 2
- [10] Andreas Blattmann, Robin Rombach, Huan Ling, Tim Dockhorn, Seung Wook Kim, Sanja Fidler, and Karsten Kreis. Align your latents: High-resolution video synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2
- [11] Tim Brooks, Bill Peebles, Connor Holmes, Will DePue, Yufei Guo, Li Jing, David Schnurr, Joe Taylor, Troy Luhman, Eric Luhman, Clarence Ng, Ricky Wang, and Aditya Ramesh. Video generation models as world simulators. <https://openai.com/research/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators>., 2024. 1, 3
- [12] Haoxin Chen, Menghan Xia, Yingqing He, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Shaoshu Yang, Jinbo Xing, Yaofang Liu, Qifeng Chen, Xintao Wang, et al. Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19512*, 2023. 2, 3, 6
- [13] Haoxin Chen, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Menghan Xia, Xintao Wang, Chao Weng, and Ying Shan. Videocrafter2: Overcoming data limitations for high-quality video diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 6
- [14] Junsong Chen, Jincheng Yu, Chongjian Ge, Lewei Yao, Enze Xie, Yue Wu, Zhongdao Wang, James Kwok, Ping Luo, Huchuan Lu, et al. Pixart-alpha: Fast training of diffusion transformer for photorealistic text-to-image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00426*, 2023. 2, 3
- [15] Weifeng Chen, Jiacheng Zhang, Jie Wu, Hefeng Wu, Xuefeng Xiao, and Liang Lin. Id-aligner: Enhancing identity-preserving text-to-image generation with reward feedback learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15449*, 2024. 3
- [16] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024. 3
- [17] Patrick Esser, Johnathan Chiu, Parmida Atighehchian, Jonathan Granskog, and Anastasis Germanidis. Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models. In *ICCV*, 2023. 1
- [18] Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. In *ICML*, 2024. 2
- [19] Songwei Ge, Aniruddha Mahapatra, Gaurav Parmar, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Jia-Bin Huang. On the content bias in fréchet video distance. In *CVPR*, 2024. 9
- [20] Yuwei Guo, Ceyuan Yang, Anyi Rao, Zhengyang Liang, Yaohui Wang, Yu Qiao, Maneesh Agrawala, Dahua Lin, and Bo Dai. Animatediff: Animate your personalized text-to-image diffusion models without specific tuning. In *ICLR*, 2024. 2
- [21] Xuan He, Dongfu Jiang, Ge Zhang, Max Ku, Achint Soni, Sherman Siu, Haonan Chen, Abhranil Chandra, Ziyang Jiang, Aaran Arulraj, Kai Wang, Quy Duc Do, Yuansheng Ni, Bohan Lyu, Yaswanth Narsupalli, Rongqi Fan, Zhiheng Lyu, Yuchen Lin, and Wenhu Chen. Videoscore: Building automatic metrics to simulate fine-grained human feedback for video generation. In *EMNLP*, 2024. 4, 5
- [22] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *NeurIPS*, 2020. 2
- [23] Wenyi Hong, Ming Ding, Wendi Zheng, Xinghan Liu, and Jie Tang. Cogvideo: Large-scale pretraining for text-to-video generation via transformers. In *ICLR*, 2023. 3
- [24] Ziqi Huang, Yanan He, Jiashuo Yu, Fan Zhang, Chenyang Si, Yuming Jiang, Yuanhan Zhang, Tianxing Wu, Qingyang Jin, Nattapol Chanpaisit, et al. Vbench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 5, 6, 9
- [25] Levon Khachatryan, Andranik Movsisyan, Vahram Tadevosyan, Roberto Henschel, Zhangyang Wang, Shant Navasardyan, and Humphrey Shi. Text2video-zero: Text-to-image diffusion models are zero-shot video generators. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [26] Jiachen Li, Weixi Feng, Tsu-Jui Fu, Xinyi Wang, Sugato Basu, Wenhu Chen, and William Yang Wang. T2v-turbo: Breaking the quality bottleneck of video consistency model with mixed reward feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18750*, 2024. 2, 3, 4
- [27] Ming Li, Taojiannan Yang, Huafeng Kuang, Jie Wu, Zhaoning Wang, Xuefeng Xiao, and Chen Chen. Controlnet++:

- Improving conditional controls with efficient consistency feedback. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [28] Mingxiang Liao, Hannan Lu, Xinyu Zhang, Fang Wan, Tianyu Wang, Yuzhong Zhao, Wangmeng Zuo, Qixiang Ye, and Jingdong Wang. Evaluation of text-to-video generation models: A dynamics perspective. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 9
- [29] I Loshchilov. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017. 5
- [30] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *NeurIPS*, 2022. 1, 3
- [31] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3
- [32] Mihir Prabhudesai, Russell Mendonca, Zheyang Qin, Kate-rina Fragkiadaki, and Deepak Pathak. Video diffusion alignment via reward gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08737*, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 6
- [33] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. 2024. 2, 3, 8
- [34] Yuxi Ren, Jie Wu, Yanzuo Lu, Huafeng Kuang, Xin Xia, Xionghui Wang, Qianqian Wang, Yixing Zhu, Pan Xie, Shiyin Wang, et al. Byteedit: Boost, comply and accelerate generative image editing. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [35] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022. 2
- [36] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017. 3
- [37] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Thomas Hayes, Xi Yin, Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Qiyuan Hu, Harry Yang, Oron Ashual, Oran Gafni, et al. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. In *ICLR*, 2023. 2
- [38] Joar Skalse, Nikolaus Howe, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, and David Krueger. Defining and characterizing reward gaming. *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2
- [39] K Soomro. Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012. 9
- [40] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 1
- [41] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 1
- [42] Thomas Unterthiner, Sjoerd van Steenkiste, Karol Kurach, Raphael Marinier, Marcin Michalski, and Sylvain Gelly. Towards accurate generative models of video: A new metric & challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01717*, 2018. 9
- [43] Bram Wallace, Meihua Dang, Rafael Rafailov, Linqi Zhou, Aaron Lou, Senthil Purushwalkam, Stefano Ermon, Caiming Xiong, Shafiq Joty, and Nikhil Naik. Diffusion model alignment using direct preference optimization. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [44] Jiuniu Wang, Hangjie Yuan, Dayou Chen, Yingya Zhang, Xiang Wang, and Shiwei Zhang. Modelscope text-to-video technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06571*, 2023. 2, 6
- [45] Yi Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Kunchang Li, Jiashuo Yu, Xin Ma, Xinhao Li, Guo Chen, Xinyuan Chen, Yaohui Wang, et al. Internvid: A large-scale video-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06942*, 2023. 2
- [46] Yaohui Wang, Xinyuan Chen, Xin Ma, Shangchen Zhou, Ziqi Huang, Yi Wang, Ceyuan Yang, Yanan He, Jiashuo Yu, Peiqing Yang, et al. Lavie: High-quality video generation with cascaded latent diffusion models. In *IJCV*, 2024. 2, 6
- [47] Haoning Wu, Zicheng Zhang, Weixia Zhang, Chaofeng Chen, Chunyi Li, Liang Liao, Annan Wang, Erli Zhang, Wenxiu Sun, Qiong Yan, Xiongkuo Min, Guangtai Zhai, and Weisi Lin. Q-align: Teaching llms for visual scoring via discrete text-defined levels. In *ICML*, 2024. 7
- [48] Jay Zhangjie Wu, Yixiao Ge, Xintao Wang, Stan Weixian Lei, Yuchao Gu, Yufei Shi, Wynne Hsu, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Mike Zheng Shou. Tune-a-video: One-shot tuning of image diffusion models for text-to-video generation. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [49] Xiaoshi Wu, Yiming Hao, Keqiang Sun, Yixiong Chen, Feng Zhu, Rui Zhao, and Hongsheng Li. Human preference score v2: A solid benchmark for evaluating human preferences of text-to-image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09341*, 2023. 3
- [50] Jiazheng Xu, Xiao Liu, Yuchen Wu, Yuxuan Tong, Qinkai Li, Ming Ding, Jie Tang, and Yuxiao Dong. Imagere-ward: Learning and evaluating human preferences for text-to-image generation. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2, 3, 7
- [51] Jiaqi Xu, Xinyi Zou, Kunzhe Huang, Yunkuo Chen, Bo Liu, MengLi Cheng, Xing Shi, and Jun Huang. Easycanimate: A high-performance long video generation method based on transformer architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18991*, 2024. 1, 3, 6
- [52] Zhuoyi Yang, Jiayan Teng, Wendi Zheng, Ming Ding, Shiyu Huang, Jiazheng Xu, Yuanming Yang, Wenyi Hong, Xiaohan Zhang, Guanyu Feng, et al. Cogvideox: Text-to-video diffusion models with an expert transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06072*, 2024. 3, 9
- [53] Hangjie Yuan, Shiwei Zhang, Xiang Wang, Yujie Wei, Tao Feng, Yining Pan, Yingya Zhang, Ziwei Liu, Samuel Albanie, and Dong Ni. Instructvideo: instructing video diffusion models with human feedback. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
- [54] Jiacheng Zhang, Jie Wu, Huafeng Kuang, Haiming Zhang, Yuxi Ren, Weifeng Chen, Manlin Zhang, Xuefeng Xiao, and Guanbin Li. Treereward: Improve diffusion model via tree-structured feedback learning. In *ACMMM*, 2024. 3
- [55] Jiacheng Zhang, Jie Wu, Yuxi Ren, Xin Xia, Huafeng Kuang, Pan Xie, Jiashi Li, Xuefeng Xiao, Min Zheng, Lean Fu, et al.

- Unifl: Improve stable diffusion via unified feedback learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05595*, 2024.
- [56] Sixian Zhang, Bohan Wang, Junqiang Wu, Yan Li, Tingting Gao, Di Zhang, and Zhongyuan Wang. Learning multi-dimensional human preference for text-to-image generation. In *CVPR*, 2024. [3](#), [7](#)
- [57] Zhixing Zhang, Yanyu Li, Yushu Wu, Yanwu Xu, Anil Kag, Ivan Skorokhodov, Willi Menapace, Aliaksandr Siarohin, Junli Cao, Dimitris Metaxas, Sergey Tulyakov, and Jian Ren. Sf-v: Single forward video generation model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04324*, 2024. [9](#)
- [58] Zangwei Zheng, Xiangyu Peng, Tianji Yang, Chenhui Shen, Shenggui Li, Hongxin Liu, Yukun Zhou, Tianyi Li, and Yang You. Open-sora: Democratizing efficient video production for all, 2024. [1](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [59] Daquan Zhou, Weimin Wang, Hanshu Yan, Weiwei Lv, Yizhe Zhu, and Jiashi Feng. Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11018*, 2022. [2](#)
- [60] Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019. [8](#)