

# Towards Generalist Robot Learning from Internet Video: A Survey

**Robert McCarthy**  
*University College London*

ROBERT.MCCARTHY.22@UCL.AC.UK

**Daniel C.H. Tan**  
*University College London*

DANIEL.TAN.22@UCL.AC.UK

**Dominik Schmidt**  
*Weco AI*

DOMINIK@WECO.AI

**Fernando Acero**  
*University College London*

FERNANDO.ACERO@UCL.AC.UK

**Nathan Herr**  
*University College London*

NATHAN.HERR.19@UCL.AC.UK

**Yilun Du**  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

YILUNDU@MIT.EDU

**Thomas G. Thuruthel**  
*University College London*

T.THURUTHEL@UCL.AC.UK

**Zhibhin Li**  
*University College London*

ALEX.LI@UCL.AC.UK

## Abstract

This survey presents an overview of methods for *learning from video* (LfV) in the context of reinforcement learning (RL) and robotics. We focus on methods capable of scaling to large internet video datasets and, in the process, extracting foundational knowledge about the world’s dynamics and physical human behaviour. Such methods hold great promise for developing general-purpose robots.

We open with an overview of fundamental concepts relevant to the LfV-for-robotics setting. This includes a discussion of the exciting benefits LfV methods can offer (e.g., improved generalization beyond the available robot data) and commentary on key LfV challenges (e.g., missing information in video and LfV distribution shifts). Our literature review begins with an analysis of video foundation model techniques that can extract knowledge from large, heterogeneous video datasets. Next, we review methods that specifically leverage video data for robot learning. Here, we categorise work according to which RL knowledge modality (KM) benefits from the use of video data. We additionally highlight techniques for mitigating LfV challenges, including reviewing action representations that address missing action labels in video.

Finally, we examine LfV datasets and benchmarks, before concluding with a discussion of challenges and opportunities in LfV. Here, we advocate for scalable foundation model approaches that can leverage the full range of internet video data, and that target the learning of the most promising RL KMs: the policy and dynamics model. Overall, we hope this survey will serve as a comprehensive reference for the emerging field of LfV, catalysing further research in the area and facilitating progress towards the development of general-purpose robots.

**Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Reinforcement Learning . . . . .	7
2.2	Contemporary Machine Learning . . . . .	9
2.3	Related Surveys . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>LfV-for-Robotics: Preliminaries</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	The LfV Setting . . . . .	12
3.2	Potential Benefits . . . . .	13
3.3	Challenges . . . . .	15
3.4	Evaluating LfV Methods . . . . .	16
<b>4</b>	<b>Towards Video Foundation Models</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1	Video Encoders . . . . .	18
4.2	Video Prediction Models . . . . .	22
4.3	Video-to-Text Models . . . . .	26
<b>5</b>	<b>LfV-for-Robotics: Methods</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1	Mitigating LfV Challenges . . . . .	29
5.1.1	Action Representations . . . . .	29
5.1.2	Representations to Address LfV Distribution-Shift . . . . .	34
5.2	Applications to RL Knowledge Modalities . . . . .	37
5.2.1	Policies . . . . .	38
5.2.2	Dynamics Models . . . . .	44
5.2.3	Reward Functions . . . . .	47
5.2.4	Value Functions . . . . .	50
<b>6</b>	<b>Datasets</b>	<b>52</b>
6.1	Desiderata . . . . .	52
6.2	Curating Video Data . . . . .	54
6.3	Existing Datasets . . . . .	57
<b>7</b>	<b>Benchmarks</b>	<b>59</b>
7.1	Designing Benchmarks for LfV . . . . .	59
7.2	Existing Benchmarks . . . . .	61
<b>8</b>	<b>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</b>	<b>62</b>
8.1	High-level Recommendations . . . . .	63
8.2	Video Foundation Models for LfV . . . . .	63
8.3	Overcoming LfV Challenges . . . . .	65
8.4	Other Generalist Robotics Challenges: Is Scaling Enough? . . . . .	66
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>68</b>




Figure 1: An overview of the key concepts and taxonomies in this survey. The top green box presents the high-level motivation behind LfV. The middle orange boxes highlight the potential benefits of LfV (Section 3.2) and the challenges in LfV (Section 3.3). The bottom blue box visualises possible components in a pipeline for learning from large-scale internet video, as per the taxonomies presented in the survey. Large internet video datasets (Section 6) can be used to pretrain (video) foundation models (Section 4). These models can be adapted (e.g., via zero-shot transfer or finetuning) into reinforcement learning (RL) ‘knowledge modalities’ (Wulfmeier et al., 2023) and used in the robot domain (Section 5.2). The diagram additionally highlights that action representations (Section 5.1.1) can be used to mitigate the issue of missing action labels in video.

## 1. Introduction

This survey is concerned with the goal of obtaining *generalist robots*. These are robots capable of performing a diverse range of physical tasks in unstructured real-world environments. Such robots would be highly useful and have a wide range of commercial applications (e.g., household or factory robots). Nevertheless, the generalist robot setting presents several challenges. First, a generalist robot must be highly competent. This includes maintaining capabilities ranging from the high-level (e.g., reasoning and planning) to the low-level (e.g., dexterity and skill). Second, to operate in unstructured settings, a generalist robot must rely on imperfect partial observations (e.g., visual and tactile sensing) to perceive the world.

How could we obtain such a robot? Classical robotics techniques are insufficient as they cannot usually handle unstructured and unseen scenarios (Krotkov et al., 2018). In contrast, machine learning (ML) techniques are more promising (Peters et al., 2016; Ibarz et al., 2021). Now, it is commonly argued that progress in ML is driven by improvements in data, algorithms, and computing power. Fortunately, the cost of compute is ever decreasing (Moore, 1998; Mack, 2011), and highly effective algorithms have recently been developed — including expressive deep learning architectures such as transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) — whose performances consistently and predictably improve with increased compute and data (Kaplan et al., 2020). Combining these algorithms with massive, diverse datasets scraped from the internet has led to remarkable improvements in natural language processing (OpenAI, 2023), image generation (Betker et al., 2023), and, most recently, video generation (Brooks et al., 2024).

Promisingly, these deep learning methods are transferable to robotics (Brohan et al., 2022; Team et al., 2023). However, unlike other domains, robotics is missing a key ingredient: suitably large and diverse datasets. Indeed, robotics faces a *chicken-and-egg* problem. We cannot easily collect real-world robot data due to the limited capabilities of our robots (deploying these robots to collect data can be ineffective and dangerous). Subsequently, we cannot easily improve our robots due to the lack of data. Thus, arguably, data is currently *the* key bottleneck to progress in robotics.

How can we overcome this data bottleneck? One possibility is to use human-teleoperation to collect real robot data, however, this is expensive and can be difficult in tasks requiring skill or dexterity. Another option is to leverage simulation. However, simulation comes with several issues, including inaccurate simulated physics and difficulties regarding creating a suitable diversity of simulated environments and tasks. A final option is to, like previous deep learning successes (OpenAI, 2023; Betker et al., 2023), leverage the vast quantities of data already available on the internet.

Now, whilst any practical approach may leverage all three of the above data sources, in this paper we focus on learning from internet data. Specifically, our interest lies in *internet video data*. Our reasoning here is threefold.

1. *Relevant information content.* The information content of internet video is highly relevant to generalist robotics. Compared to text or image data, video can uniquely offer information regarding the physics and dynamics of the world, and information regarding human behaviours and actions (Yang et al., 2024). Like images, video can provide visual and spatial information, and can ground knowledge and concepts

learned from text data. Crucially, internet video has excellent coverage over many behaviours and tasks relevant to a generalist robot (e.g., household chores).

2. *High in quantity and diversity.* There are huge quantities of video data freely available on the internet (YouTube alone contains over ten thousand years of footage, see Sjöberg, 2023). Importantly, this data is highly diverse. The largest open-source robot dataset (Padalkar et al., 2023) pales in comparison (see Figure 8), both in terms of quantity and diversity of the data.
3. *Internet video is relatively untapped.* The use of real and simulated robot data has been extensively explored (Brohan et al., 2022; Team et al., 2023; Akkaya et al., 2019; Kaufmann et al., 2023a). Meanwhile, internet text and image data have been heavily exploited to train foundation models (OpenAI, 2023; Betker et al., 2023), and leveraging these foundation models for robotics has become increasingly common (Ahn et al., 2022; Liang et al., 2023; Brohan et al., 2023; Shah et al., 2023). However, the use of internet video data is in more nascent stages, both in the general ML literature, and in robotics. As such, there are opportunities for progress to be made via research focused on leveraging internet video data.

Given its size and relevant content, we believe internet video data can help mitigate the data bottleneck issue in robotics. Specifically, we hope to obtain the following benefits from internet video: (i) improved generalization beyond the available robot data, (ii) improved data-efficiency and performances in-distribution of the robot data, and, speculatively, (iii) obtain emergent capabilities not extractable from robot data alone. Indeed, recent progress in the emerging field of LfV has been promising, demonstrating evidence of these benefits. This has included work leveraging large-scale video prediction models to act as robot dynamics models (Yang et al., 2023c; Bruce et al., 2024), or work leveraging both robot data and internet video to train foundational robot policies (Sohn et al., 2024).

Nevertheless, leveraging internet video comes with a number of fundamental and practical challenges. First, in general, video is a challenging data modality: it is high-dimensional, noisy, stochastic, and poorly labelled. Second, utilising video data specifically for robotics introduces its own set of issues. Video lacks information critical to robotics, including action labels and low-level force and proprioceptive information. Moreover, there may be various distribution shifts between internet video and the robot domain. Given these challenges, we outline two key questions for LfV research: (i) How to extract relevant knowledge from internet video? (ii) How to apply video-extracted knowledge to robotics?

In this survey (see Figure 1), we review literature that attempts to answer these questions. For the first question, we survey video foundation model techniques promising for extracting knowledge from large-scale internet video. For the second, we perform a thorough analysis of literature leveraging video data to aid robot learning. A more elaborate overview of the survey’s contents is provided in a paragraph below. We conclude the survey by discussing challenges and opportunities for future LfV research. This includes advocating for scalable approaches that can leverage as much internet video data as possible, and recommendations to target the learning of policies and dynamics models from video data in order to best obtain the potential benefits of LfV.

These promising opportunities, combined with recent advances in LfV (Yang et al., 2023c; Bruce et al., 2024), suggest that the promised benefits of LfV are well within reach. We hope this comprehensive survey can encourage and inform future LfV research, ultimately serving to accelerate our progress towards the creation of generalist robots.

**Survey structure.** The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows.

- *Background (Section 2).* First, we introduce key RL concepts, including formalising the RL setting and providing more detail on RL Knowledge modalities (Section 2.1). Second, a broad overview of relevant machine learning literature provides the reader with additional context to LfV (Section 2.2). Finally, details of related surveys are discussed (Section 2.3).
- *LfV-for-robotics: Preliminaries (Section 3).* We provide useful preliminary information regarding the LfV setting in advance of our literature reviews of Sections 4 and 5. We formalize the LfV setting (Section 3.1) and outline the potential benefits of LfV (Section 3.2), the challenges in LfV (Section 3.3), and metrics for evaluating LfV methods (Section 3.4).
- *Towards Video Foundation Models (Section 4).* Improved video foundation models and techniques will be vital for future progress in LfV. As such, we dedicate this section to surveying literature regarding three relevant types of video foundation models: video encoders (Section 4.1), video prediction models (Section 4.2), and video-to-text models (Section 4.3). Corresponding limitations and promising future directions are discussed.
- *LfV-for-robotics: Methods (Section 5).* This section reviews literature that leverages video data to aid robot learning. First, we identify and taxonomise common strategies used to address LfV challenges (Section 5.1). This includes methods using action representations to mitigate missing action labels in video (Section 5.1.1), and methods that aim to explicitly address LfV distribution shifts (Section 5.1.2). Second, we present our main taxonomy of the LfV-for-robotics literature (Section 5.2), categorising methods according to which component of the RL algorithm benefits from the use of video. For each component, we detail the different techniques seen in the literature and discuss advantages, disadvantages, and promising directions.
- *Datasets (Section 6).* High quality video datasets are essential for LfV progress. Here, we outline the desiderata for LfV video datasets (Section 6.1), provide in-depth details on techniques for curating video data (Section 6.2), and review and critique relevant existing video datasets (Section 6.3).
- *Benchmarks (Section 7).* First, we give recommendations for how an LfV benchmark should be designed (Section 7.1). Second, we present details of existing benchmarks, whilst suggesting LfV-specific improvements (Section 7.2).
- *Challenges & Opportunities (Section 8).* We discuss the key challenges and opportunities for future LfV research. First, we give high-level recommendations for future LfV research (Section 8.1). Second, we discuss in more detail how video foundation

model techniques can benefit LfV (Section 8.2). Third, we identify paths towards overcoming key LfV challenges (Section 8.3). Finally, we direct attention towards challenges that may not be resolved via naive scaling to internet video data (Section 8.4).

- *Conclusion (Section 9)*. We conclude with a summary of the key takeaways of the survey.

**Contributions.** We now summarize the key contributions of this survey.

- *Advocacy for Learning from Videos (LfV)*: This survey highlights the promise of LfV methodologies for generalist robotics, and should serve to encourage further research in the area. Specifically, we advocate for approaches that can scale to large, diverse internet video datasets.
- *Formalization of Fundamental Concepts*: We explicitly discuss and formalize fundamental LfV concepts and notions in a single document.
- *Enumeration and Taxonomization*: We synthesise the relevant literature into useful and comprehensive taxonomies. This facilitates a holistic understanding of the LfV research landscape, providing a structured framework in which future LfV research can be placed and assessed.
- *Critical Analysis*: Throughout the survey, we conduct critical analyses and discussions of existing approaches; identifying their advantages, disadvantages, and corresponding promising future directions.
- *Identification of Key Challenges and Opportunities*: After our thorough analysis of the LfV setting and literature, we outline key challenges and opportunities for future LfV research. This should serve to encourage further progress in LfV along these directions.

## 2. Background

In this section we introduce relevant formalisms and concepts related to reinforcement learning (RL) (Section 2.1), discuss relevant prior work in ML (Section 2.2), and detail existing LfV-related surveys (Section 2.3).

### 2.1 Reinforcement Learning

We first formalise the reinforcement learning (RL) setting. We then summarise the RL concepts introduced by Wulfmeier et al. (2023) that we make use of throughout the rest of the survey. Specifically, we will detail the notion of a reinforcement learning *Knowledge Modality (KM)*, and will refer to several *mechanisms of transfer* for transferring pretrained KMs to a downstream domain.

**Formalism.** In reinforcement learning (RL), an agent observes its environment, takes an action, and receives a reward after the state of the environment changes. This can be formalised as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) consisting of the state space  $\mathcal{S}$ , the action space  $\mathcal{A}$ , and the transition probability  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$  of reaching state  $s_t + 1$  from state  $s_t$  when executing action  $a_t$ . The agent’s behaviour is given in terms of a policy  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$ . When aspects of the state cannot be observed, the environment is termed a Partially Observable MDP (POMDP) and the agent only has access to observations  $o_t \in \mathcal{O}$  that are partial mappings of the state  $o_t = f(s_t)$ . Unless stated otherwise, we will always use a POMDP setting. Throughout the paper we will simplify the notation and denote any agent observations as  $s_t$ .

The agent aims to maximise its sum of discounted future rewards, commonly referred to as its ‘returns’. This is captured by the objective in Equation 1:

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{[p(s_0), p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t), \pi(a_t|s_t)]_{t=0\dots T}} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the discount factor,  $r_t = r(s_t, a_t)$  is the reward, and  $\rho(s_0)$  is the initial state distribution. The optimal policy  $\pi^*(a_t|s_t)$  maximises Equation 1.

**Reinforcement Learning Knowledge Modalities.** An RL Knowledge Modality (KM) is some function learned from data that represents specific types of RL-related knowledge. We now give a brief summary of the KMs we refer to throughout this survey. Notably, we will use the notion of a KM to define our main taxonomy of LfV methods in Section 5.2. In our summaries below, we touch on how each KM can be learned in standard RL settings. However, video data is missing necessary action and reward labels, meaning alternative approaches are often required in the LfV setting.

*Policy,  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$ .* This is a mapping from states to actions directly describing the agent’s behaviour.  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$  can be learned via imitation learning from  $(s_t, a_t)$  tuples or via offline RL (Levine et al., 2020) from trajectories of  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$  tuples.

*State or State-Action Value Function,  $V_\pi(s_t)$  or  $Q_\pi(s_t, a_t)$ .* These functions map from states or state-action pairs to the expected future return when acting under a particular policy  $\pi$ . Given transition tuples  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$  for  $Q$ , or  $(s_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$  for  $V$ , the value functions are commonly learned using Monte Carlo estimates (determined over complete trajectories), or Temporal Difference estimates (determined over individual transitions) (Sutton & Barto, 2018). The value function estimates the quality of states or actions, and thus can be used to aid planning (Schrittwieser et al., 2019) or the learning of the policy (Lillicrap et al., 2015; Schulman et al., 2017).

*Dynamics Model,  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ .* This function predicts the next state given the current state and action. It is commonly learned using supervised learning and transition tuples of the form  $(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$ . A dynamics model can be used: (i) for planning, e.g., via model predictive control (MPC) (Garcia et al., 1989; Hafner et al., 2018); (ii) to generate synthetic data to improve sample efficiency when learning a policy (Sutton, 1990; Janner et al., 2019); or (iii) to help generate value gradients for policy training by backpropagating through dynamics-model-generated trajectories (Hafner et al., 2023).



*Reward Model*,  $r(s_t, a_t)$ . This function predicts the reward provided by the environment for a specific state-action pair. Note, other formulations, such as  $r(s_t, s_{t+1})$  or  $r(s_{t+1})$  are also acceptable. Depending on the formulation, models of the reward may be learned via supervised learning on tuples containing some, or all, of the following information:  $(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$ .

**Transfer Mechanisms.** RL KMs can be pretrained on a source MDP or dataset and can subsequently be transferred to a target MDP. In the case of LfV, this involves learning a KM from a video dataset and adapting it to the robot MDP using robot data. There are several possible transfer mechanisms here. Wulfmeier et al. (2023) distinguish between direct and indirect mechanisms.

*Direct transfer mechanisms.* (1) *Generalisation and zero-shot transfer* involves using the pretrained KM directly in the target setting, without further fine-tuning or adaptation (Escontrela et al., 2023). (2) *Fine-tuning* involves continuing the training of the KM on data from the target domain. (3) *Representation transfer* involves the definition of a new model that is composed of parts of the pretrained KM and elsewhere is randomly initialised (Nair et al., 2022; Majumdar et al., 2023). The new model is then trained using data from the source domain. Unlike Wulfmeier et al. (2023), we may use the terms ‘fine-tuning’ and ‘representation transfer’ interchangeably in this survey. (4) *Hierarchy: conditioning* involves using the pretrained KM to condition a new KM being trained for the target MDP (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Wang et al., 2023a; Wen et al., 2023). (5) *Hierarchy: composition* involves composing solutions from multiple pretrained KMs (Wulfmeier et al., 2019). (6) *Meta-learning* methods pretrain the KM such that it can adapt quickly to unseen domains, e.g., using gradient-based approaches (Finn et al., 2017) or in-context learning (Akkaya et al., 2019; Laskin et al., 2022).

*Indirect transfer mechanisms.* (1) *Transfer via (auxiliary) objectives:* Here, the pretrained KM is used to help define a learning objective for the downstream KM. For example, one can distill knowledge by training with regularisation towards the previous KM (Tirumala et al., 2022; Ye et al., 2023). (2) *Transfer via data (e.g., by shaping exploration):* Here, for example, we can use a pretrained policy for data collection in the target domain, and learn a new KM off-policy from this collected experience (Campos et al., 2021).

## 2.2 Contemporary Machine Learning

We provide a general overview of machine learning literature relevant to the goal of utilising internet video data to help obtain general-purpose robots. This serves to provide additional context to the video foundation model literature (Section 4) and LfV-for-robotics literature (Section 5) we review later in this survey.

**Foundation Models.** Progress in deep learning has continually been driven by scaling up dataset and model sizes (Krizhevsky et al., 2012; He et al., 2016; Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020). ‘Foundation models’ are large models pretrained on large diverse datasets. Whereas previously ML research would train task-specific models, it is now common to employ more general-purpose foundation models (either zero-shot or finetuned) to solve wide varieties of downstream tasks. It is important to note here that, in addition to scaling, improved model architectures – i.e., transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) and diffusion models

(Ho et al., 2020) – have been crucial for advances in foundation models. We now give an overview of foundation model research across several domains.

*Language.* Large language models (LLMs) have led to remarkable progress in natural language processing (OpenAI, 2023). Huge, diverse textual datasets scraped from the internet have been used to pretrain transformer models with billions of parameters via simple self-supervised next-token prediction objectives (Brown et al., 2020; Narang & Chowdhery, 2022). This pretraining scheme allows the model to learn vast amounts of declarative and procedural knowledge from internet data. These models can be further improved via supervised finetuning on small, high-quality datasets, and via reinforcement learning from human (or AI) feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022).

*Images.* Deep learning image recognition performances initially benefited from the use of the relatively large ImageNet dataset (Deng et al., 2009; Krizhevsky et al., 2012), and subsequently from the training of image-language models on large internet-scraped image-text datasets (Radford et al., 2021). Recently, text-conditioned image generation has excelled due to the use of large diffusion models and internet-scale data (Betker et al., 2023), whilst other efforts have sought to train multi-modal vision-language models (VLMs) that can input and output images and text (Alayrac et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023; Team et al., 2023). Note, we discuss *video* foundation models efforts in Section 4.

*Embodied Agents.* Preliminary efforts have been made to develop ‘agentic’ foundation models that can output low-level actions in an embodied setting (e.g., a robotic setting). Three distinct approaches have been seen here. (1) Internet-pretrained foundation models (e.g., a VLM) have been finetuned on action-labelled agentic data (Brohan et al., 2023). (2) Sequence models have been jointly pretrained on internet data and action-labelled agentic data (Reed et al., 2022; Sohn et al., 2024). (3) Large models have been trained solely on action-labelled agentic data (Brohan et al., 2022; Team et al., 2023). We note that the agentic datasets used here have been small relative to internet-scale data. In related work, LLMs have been prompted to act as agents or planners (Ahn et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2022; Park et al., 2023).

**Deep Reinforcement Learning.** Progress in deep reinforcement learning (Schulman et al., 2017; Lillicrap et al., 2015; Haarnoja et al., 2018) has been promising for robotics. However, standard online RL is impractical for real-world robotics: it is time-consuming, costly, and potentially dangerous. Algorithmic solutions have been proposed in the RL literature to address these issues. Regularization can be applied to off-policy RL algorithms, enabling more gradient update steps and improving data-efficiency (Nauman et al., 2024). Offline RL algorithms learn from previously collected data and avoid issues with online learning (Levine et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021). Model-based RL approaches – which learn an explicit model of their environment – can improve data-efficiency (and overall performance) versus model-free counterparts (Janner et al., 2019; Hafner et al., 2023). When learning from pixel observations, efficiency can be improved via auxiliary learning objectives (Yarats et al., 2019), pretraining on prior image data (Wang et al., 2022), and data-augmentation (Yarats et al., 2021). Recently, the use of modern diffusion architectures has improved learning from diverse offline data (Wang et al., 2022), whilst

transformer architectures have allowed for in-context learning (Lee et al., 2023; Laskin et al., 2022). Elsewhere, curiosity-based exploration methods have previously been proposed to accelerate online RL (Burda et al., 2018; Pathak et al., 2017).

**Scaling Robot Learning.** A lack of available data, combined with the impractical nature of real-world online RL, has limited progress in robot learning. We now detail a number of proposed approaches that seek to scale-up robot learning in light of these issues.

*Simulation.* The use of simulation has often been proposed as a solution to the difficulties of real-world RL. This has led to impressive results in narrow settings, including legged locomotion (Zhuang et al., 2023) and drone racing (Kaufmann et al., 2023a). However, simulation presents a number of issues. (1) Inaccuracies in low-level simulation physics creates a ‘sim-to-real’ gap (Zhao et al., 2020) that must be overcome. A common solution here is to employ domain randomization (Tobin et al., 2017). (2) Manually creating a suitable diversity of simulated environments and tasks for generalist robotics is a challenge. Recent works seek to tackle this using procedurally generated environments (Deitke et al., 2022), or LLM-assisted environment design (Xian et al., 2023; Faldor et al., 2024). (3) We often lack a policy capable of collecting high-quality data in the simulated environment. Solutions here have included using humans to collect the data (Mees et al., 2022), or using LLMs with access to privileged simulation information as policies (Ha et al., 2023).

*Scaling real world data collection.* Recent efforts have sought to collect larger real-world robot datasets. Efforts here have involved the use of human teleoperated data collection (Brohan et al., 2022; Khazatsky et al., 2024) and pooling data from different academic labs (Padalkar et al., 2023). Other work has investigated methods for automating data collection to improve scalability versus teleoperation (Bousmalis et al., 2023; Ahn et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2023a). For example, Ahn et al. (2024) use VLMs and LLMs to orchestrate a fleet of data collecting robots. Finally, we note that several commercial companies have demonstrated evidence of infrastructure suitable for large-scale robot data-collection (Sohn et al., 2024; Jang, 2024).

*Internet data.* Robot learning can be aided via the use of internet data. This may be done indirectly via the use of pretrained foundation models. Image and video data has been used to pretrain visual representations for robotics (Wang et al., 2022; Nair et al., 2022). Foundational VLMs and LLMs have been used to help define reward functions for the robot learner (Tam et al., 2022; Du et al., 2023c; Yu et al., 2023b; Klissarov et al., 2023). LLMs have been employed as high-level planners in long-horizons tasks (Ahn et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2022). Finally, as touched on above, internet data has been used to help train agentic foundation models (Brohan et al., 2023; Sohn et al., 2024). We elaborate on how internet *video* data has been used to aid robot learning in Section 5.2.

### 2.3 Related Surveys

We note prior surveys and works with content directly related to ours. This is done to guide the reader to other relevant work, and to provide further context to the contributions of our work.

*Reinforcement and robot learning.* Robot learning and RL in robotics have previously been surveyed by Kober et al. (2013), Peters et al. (2016), Kroemer et al. (2021). Wulfmeier et al. (2023) highlight the promise of transferring pretrained knowledge from a source to a target domain in RL (see Section 2.1). Prudencio et al. (2023) review of offline RL methods, Kirk et al. (2023) provide an analysis of zero-shot generalization in RL, whilst Ravichandar et al. (2020), Gavenski et al. (2024) survey methods for imitating demonstration data.

*Foundation models for robotics.* Yang et al. (2023) review methods for utilising foundation models in decision-making applications, including robotics. Hu et al. (2023a) similarly review methods for utilising foundational VLMs and LLMs for robotics, and detail techniques for developing robot foundation models.

*Machine learning for video.* Schiappa et al. (2023) review self-supervised learning methods for video data. Ming et al. (2024) survey video prediction methods. Madan et al. (2024) review the use of foundation models for video understanding. Tang et al. (2023) review the use of LLMs in video understanding, whilst Zhang et al. (2024) detail how LLMs can be adapted to support multi-modal inputs and outputs.

*Learning from video for robotics.* Torabi et al. (2019) review imitation learning from observational data. However, these methods assume access to expert demonstrations (and thus are not scalable to internet video). More recently, Yang et al. (2024) advocate for the use of video (and video generation methods in particular) as a unified interface to absorb internet knowledge and represent diverse tasks. In contrast to this work, we focus solely on general-purpose robot applications and present thorough reviews of literature relevant to the LfV-for-robotics setting. The work most relevant to ours is a recent survey of video-based learning approaches for robot manipulation (Eze & Crick, 2024). In contrast to this work, we place a stronger emphasis on the goal of obtaining generalist robots and on the promise of approaches that can scale to large, diverse internet video data. Under this lens, we present different and richer taxonomies, and provide a more holistic analysis of LfV-relevant literature. This includes reviewing video foundation model techniques, action representations, video datasets, and relevant benchmarks; and categorising LfV methods according to which RL KM they target.

### 3. LfV-for-Robotics: Preliminaries

In this section, we establish useful preliminary information and concepts related to the LfV-for-robotics setting. This is done ahead of our main literature reviews of Sections 4 and 5. First, we formalise and clarify the LfV and generalist robot settings we are interested in (Section 3.1). We then discuss the exciting potential benefits video data may offer to robotics (Section 3.2), before discussing the key challenges in LfV (Section 3.3). Finally, in light of these benefits and challenges, we provide recommendations regarding evaluation of LfV methods (Section 3.4).

#### 3.1 The LfV Setting

**Formalising the LfV setting.** We assume access to a video dataset  $D_{\text{video}}$ . Here, we denote a video clip as  $\tau = (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_T)$ , where  $\tau$  is the full clip and each  $s$  is an image ob-

servation. We use  $s$  to represent images for compatibility with the RL observation notation established in Section 2.1. Optionally,  $D_{\text{video}}$  may come paired with language annotations or annotations/labels of other modalities. In general, we will also assume access to a robot dataset  $D_{\text{robot}}$ , which contains trajectories of transition tuples  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$  (though  $r_t$  may often be missing). The goal of LfV is to leverage  $D_{\text{video}}$  to improve robot performances versus when learning from  $D_{\text{robot}}$  alone.

**LfV for generalist robots.** Though  $D_{\text{video}}$  may come from any source, in this survey we are primarily interested in methods that can leverage large-scale video data gathered from the internet. We will generally assume that such an internet dataset consists primarily of videos of humans and has good coverage over the full range of physical tasks that humans commonly perform.

We loosely define a ‘generalist robot’ as a general-purpose robot that can perform a diverse range of every-day physical human tasks in unstructured real-world settings. Such settings are POMDPs, where the robot must rely heavily on visual observations. Throughout this survey, unless stated otherwise, we assume the general-purpose robot has an embodiment and affordances similar to those of a human. We also assume the robot should perform tasks similar to those humans commonly perform, doing so in a comparable manner. Under these assumptions, internet video can be particularly useful to the robot: it provides an extensive dataset of videos featuring embodiments similar to the robot performing relevant tasks and behaviours.

We note some limitations to these assumptions. First, for certain robot tasks, non-human-like embodiments may prove more effective. Second, the robot may need to perform specific tasks not commonly performed by humans. In these cases, internet video will be less useful for the specific embodiment and task. Nevertheless, it can still be generally informative about the world and physical behaviour. Moreover, we believe aiming for humanoid robots that can perform human-like tasks is a good starting point for generalist robot efforts.

### 3.2 Potential Benefits

Robotic datasets are expensive to acquire and thus are currently task-specific or relatively narrow (Padalkar et al., 2023). In contrast, diverse video data is freely available in vast quantities on the internet. To achieve our goal of obtaining generalist robots, we advocate for the use of methods that can leverage this data in a scalable manner. In this section, we briefly outline the specific benefits we hope to obtain from methods that do so.

**Generalization beyond  $D_{\text{robot}}$ .** LfV offers the exciting possibility of generalizing beyond narrow robot datasets  $D_{\text{robot}}$  to the full space of tasks covered in  $D_{\text{video}}$ . We now explain the rationale behind this expectation. First, consider a  $D_{\text{robot}}$  that contains most of the low-level skills or ‘atomic’ actions that will ever be required from the robot (e.g., specific grasping motions or locomotion skills). Now consider a task unseen in  $D_{\text{robot}}$  but seen in  $D_{\text{video}}$ . In this case, our combined dataset ( $D_{\text{combined}} = D_{\text{robot}} + D_{\text{video}}$ ) contains most information required to complete the task.  $D_{\text{robot}}$  provides information regarding how to execute the low-level skills, whilst  $D_{\text{video}}$  provides higher-level information regarding how to complete the overall task (e.g., visually, what movements are required and what steps




Figure 2: Generalization in the Learning from Videos (LfV) setting. The x-axis indicates the range of behaviours expected from a generalist robot. The y-axis indicates the ‘levels’ of information contained in data. The figure demonstrates that internet data has better coverage over desired behaviours (i.e., the x-axis) than narrow robot datasets, but lacks crucial low-level information essential to robotics. Generalising beyond the robot data despite this missing low-level information is a key LfV challenge. See Sections 3.2 and 3.3 for further discussion.

are involved). Thus, a suitable LfV method may be capable of leveraging  $D_{\text{video}}$  to generalise beyond  $D_{\text{robot}}$  and solve the task. There is preliminary evidence of this in LfV-related literature (Brohan et al., 2023; Du et al., 2023a; Wu et al., 2023a; Wang et al., 2023a). Figure 2 explores this generalization setting in more detail.

**Emergent capabilities.** Learning from internet-scale video may yield capabilities qualitatively beyond what can be obtained when learning only from a narrow  $D_{\text{robot}}$ . We expect this for two reasons. First, in other domains, large quantities of internet data have allowed for unexpected ‘emergent’ capabilities (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020). Second, diverse internet video paired with language annotations offers a path towards stitching together the lower-level knowledge obtained from robotic and video data with the rich abstractions and comprehensive world knowledge obtained from textual data (OpenAI, 2023).

**Improvements in-distribution of  $D_{\text{robot}}$ .** Finally, we also expect video data to yield improvements in tasks that are in-distribution of the robot dataset. First, utilising a large video dataset can allow for improved data-efficiency with respect to  $D_{\text{robot}}$  (Nair et al., 2022). Second, LfV approaches may obtain higher absolute task performance (e.g., higher success rates) in settings in-distribution of  $D_{\text{robot}}$ , versus non-LfV approaches (Wu et al., 2023a).

### 3.3 Challenges

Here, we discuss the key fundamental and practical challenges that may be encountered when attempting to learn from internet video for robotics (see Figure 3 for visualizations).

**Missing action labels.** Raw video data lacks the action labels required by existing imitation (Brohan et al., 2022) and offline RL (Chebotar et al., 2023) methods for learning from demonstrations. Moreover, adding robot-action labels retrospectively to internet video data is generally not an option: the low-level actions of a robot are incompatible with the unrestricted action space of heterogeneous video data. One solution to this problem is to use *alternative action representations* (see Section 5.1.1). Raw video data also lacks other RL-relevant metadata, such as reward labels (which can inform on the quality of the data), goal labels (which can be useful for goal-conditioning), or end-of-episode labels.

**Distribution-shift.** There may be a distributional shift between an internet video dataset and the downstream robot domain. This can include differences in physical embodiments, camera viewpoints, or environments. Additionally, humans in videos may be performing behaviours which are sub-optimal or irrelevant to the downstream robot task. These shifts present a challenge to deep learning methods. Mitigations to this problem include: (i) scaling to ever larger and more diverse video data to aid generalization, (ii) training on robot data in addition to internet videos, and (iii) using explicit methods to address the distribution shifts (see Section 5.1.2).

**Missing low-level information.** For certain skillful or dexterous behaviours, robots require low-level percepts such as tactile sensing, forces, proprioception, or depth sensing. This crucial low-level information is not explicitly available in internet video. A key challenge in LfV is to obtain generalization beyond  $D_{\text{robot}}$  despite the missing low-level information in  $D_{\text{video}}$ . This challenge is visualized in Figure 2.

**Controllability, stochasticity, and partial observability.** In unlabelled video, it is impossible to distinguish which parts of transitions are affected (i.e., controlled) by a specific agent’s actions and which effects are simply due to the external environment or noise. This can be particularly problematic for methods that attempt to extract action information from video (Section 5.1.1). Furthermore, the stochastic nature and partial-observability of the underlying environments in video can make accurate video prediction a significant challenge.

**High-dimensionality, noise, and redundancy.** Methods that learn from or generate video data are typically computationally demanding due to the high-dimensional nature of video data. Additionally, video can contain significant noise and redundant information. This is in stark comparison to language data, which is highly compressed and structured. These characteristics make it more difficult to extract meaningful information from video data. To overcome this, many works attempt to learn and operate in a latent representation-space of video (Yan et al., 2021; Bardes et al., 2023), rather than in raw pixel-space.

**Dataset limitations.** Finally, the limitations of existing video datasets present a practical challenge to LfV methods. First, open-source curated video datasets are still small relative to internet scales (see Figure 8). Second, language annotations of video are often

sparse, coarse, noisy, or non-existent. We give details on desiderata for video datasets, and methods for curating improved video data, in Section 6.




Figure 3: Key challenges in LfV (see Section 3.3) are visualised, including: missing (action and low-level) information in video, LfV distribution shifts, and the high-dimensional nature of video data.

### 3.4 Evaluating LfV Methods

Here, we provide guidelines regarding how LfV methods should be evaluated. These recommendations are predicated on our goal of scaling to diverse internet video data to help us obtain generalist robots. They are also informed by the potential benefits of LfV and LfV challenges, as discussed in the previous sections. We encourage the reader to bear the following criteria in mind when assessing the LfV-for-robotics literature review in Section 5.

**Scalability.** The *scalability* of the LfV method should be assessed. We now discuss characteristics of an LfV method that influence its scalability. These characteristics cannot usually be measured quantitatively, but, to an extent, can be assessed qualitatively.

1. *Can the method scale to diverse internet data, and to the generalist robot setting?* First, we are interested in LfV methods that can leverage the full range of available internet video, and can extract as much information as possible from this heterogeneous data. We thus consider LfV methods that make limiting assumptions on the nature of the video data to be less promising (e.g., some methods assume minimal domain shift between the video data and the robot domain; see Stadie et al., 2017; Xiong et al., 2021; Baker et al., 2022). Second, we are interested in LfV methods that can be applied to unstructured generalist robot settings. Some past LfV methods are



only applicable in narrow, contained robot settings (Torabi et al., 2018b; Sermanet et al., 2018).

2. *Can the method benefit from advances in video foundation models?* There are many commercial forces that will encourage improvements in video foundational models in the coming years. LfV methods that can benefit from these advances (Du et al., 2023a; Yang et al., 2023c; Sohn et al., 2024) (by leveraging either the improved models or the improved techniques and datasets) are particularly promising.

**Downstream performance gains.** We should evaluate the extent to which an LfV method can provide the potential benefits (see Section 3.2) of LfV. Here, we can obtain concrete quantitative metrics. We now detail these metrics (inspired partially by those outlined by Wulfmeier et al. (2023) for the RL transfer setting):

1. *Performance in-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ .* We can measure the performance (e.g., the task success rate) of the robot in settings in-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ , after training on  $\mathcal{D}_{video}$  and a fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ .
2. *Data-efficiency in-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ .* We can measure the quantity of data in  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$  required to reach a certain performance-level in settings in-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ , when also training on  $\mathcal{D}_{video}$ .
3. *Generalization beyond  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ .* We can measure the performance of the robot in settings out-of-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ , after training on  $\mathcal{D}_{video}$  and a fixed size  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$ .

These metrics cover the benefits of *generalization beyond  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$*  and *improvements in-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{robot}$* , as outlined in Section 3.2. However, the benefit of *emergent capabilities* is not accounted for: this benefit likely must be evaluated qualitatively. These metrics can be used to compare LfV methods to non-LfV baselines (i.e., to equivalent methods that do not use video data). This will provide a concrete measure of the benefits  $\mathcal{D}_{video}$  is providing.

#### 4. Towards Video Foundation Models

Foundation models are large deep learning models trained on large, diverse datasets. They maintain general knowledge and capabilities useful in a wide range of downstream settings. This has most notably been demonstrated in natural language processing with large language models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2023; Team et al., 2023). In this section, we focus on *video foundation model* techniques, which can act as a general means for extracting robotics-relevant knowledge (e.g., knowledge regarding physics and behaviours) from large-scale internet video data. We are interested in these models due to the following LfV use-cases (see Figure 4):

- *Using pretrained video foundation models:* A pretrained video foundation model can be adapted for downstream robot applications. For example, a video prediction model can be adapted into a robot dynamics model (Yang et al., 2023c).

- *Using video foundation model techniques and datasets:* Techniques and datasets used originally for video foundation models can be customized for robotics purposes. For example, a robot foundation model can be trained on both video and robot data, using techniques inspired by video foundation modelling (Sohn et al., 2024).

We categorise the video foundation model literature according to three functionalities a video foundation model can provide: (i) video encoding (Section 4.1), (ii) video prediction (Section 4.2), and (iii) video-to-text generation (Section 4.3). We explain in each subsection why these functionalities are relevant to LfV. We note that, in practice, some models may perform multiple of these functions (e.g., any-to-any sequence models can perform both video prediction and video-to-text generation; see Liu et al., 2024b).




Figure 4: Video Foundation Models (see Section 4) for LfV. The top green box presents different categories of video foundation models and their applications to robotics. The bottom blue boxes illustrate two approaches by which video foundation models can contribute to LfV: (left) pretrained video foundation models can be finetuned into robot foundation models; (right) video foundation model techniques and datasets can be used to train robot foundation models.

### 4.1 Video Encoders

Foundational video encoders can provide rich and robust video representations for downstream robotic applications. LfV representation transfer approaches can take a video en-

coder and finetune it into an RL KM (e.g., into a policy, see Section 5.2.1). Other approaches have used frozen pretrained video representations to help define robot reward functions (Fan et al., 2022; Sontakke et al., 2023; Nair et al., 2022) (see Section 5.2.3). In this section, we first give a broad overview of techniques that can be used to train video encoders, before discussing in more detail recent promising techniques for training *foundational* video encoders.

**Video Representation Learning Overview: Derive  $Y$  from  $\bar{X}$ , apply a supervised loss.** Let  $\bar{X}$  be a video clip  $X$  paired with some corresponding labels and data modalities. Most methods for learning video encoders can be framed as first deriving a ‘label’  $Y$  from  $\bar{X}$  and then using  $Y$  to define a learning objective. We now give an overview of the various ways in which  $Y$  can be defined and used for video representation learning.

- **How to Define  $Y$ ?** (1) *Transforms of  $X$* :  $Y$  can be some transform of the video  $X$  itself, such as an augmentation of the video (e.g., view augmentations or spatial shifts) (Schiappa et al., 2023), a masked version of the video (Wang et al., 2023c), or a slice of the video. (2) *Paired information*:  $Y$  can be derived from additional information paired with the video. This can include labels or data of another modality. Labels relevant to robotics could include the class of action performed in the video (Kay et al., 2017), object masks and bounding boxes (Ding et al., 2023a), or human poses and affordances (Shan et al., 2020). Relevant modalities may include corresponding audio, speech transcriptions, language annotations, or 3D depth information (Grauman et al., 2021). Occasionally,  $X$  may be paired with another video, for example an equivalent video from a different viewpoint (Grauman et al., 2023). (3) *Meta-data*: Meta-data associated with the video can also be used for  $Y$ . Some examples here include appearance statistics and video playback speed (Schiappa et al., 2023).
- **How to Use  $Y$ ?** (1) *Prediction*: One option here is to predict  $Y$  from  $X$  (i.e., perform classification, regression, or generation). For example, predicting a language description of a video (Karamcheti et al., 2023), or predicting the next frame in a video (i.e., video prediction) (Gao et al., 2022). Another variation is to predict  $Y$  from  $Y$ , i.e., auto-encoding. Here  $Y$  is encoded into a bottleneck (a compressed representation of the video) and is then reconstructed (Tong et al., 2022; Villegas et al., 2022). For generative approaches (e.g., autoencoding or next-frame prediction), reconstruction (van den Oord et al., 2017) or adversarial losses (Esser et al., 2020) could be employed. (2) *Joint-embeddings*: We can define objectives where the loss is calculated via embeddings of  $X$  and  $Y$ . Contrastive learning approaches have been heavily explored here (Schiappa et al., 2023). Noise-contrastive estimation objectives (NCE) (Oord et al., 2018) have been popular, most commonly used to contrast the video  $X$  with positive and negative pairs of language descriptions (Xu et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2024; Papalampidi et al., 2023). Other contrastive objectives include binary cross-entropy losses, or score-based approaches (Schiappa et al., 2023). Non-contrastive joint-embedding approaches also exist. BYOL (Grill et al., 2020) define  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  (two augmentations of  $X$ ) and train an ‘online’ network to predict the ‘target’ network embedding of  $Y_1$  from  $Y_2$ . V-JEPA (Bardes et al., 2023) similarly define a learning objective by predicting the embedding of  $X$  from an embedding of  $Y$ .

The taxonomy presented above covers many schemes that can be used to train video encoders. However, it may neglect some learning objectives. We identify temporal-difference learning from video (Bhateja et al., 2023) as one neglected objective, however there may be others.

**Foundational Video Encoders: Learning objectives.** We now categorise and detail promising learning objectives and techniques for training foundational video encoders from internet-scale video data. We focus primarily on *video-based* architectures that learn to jointly represent the spatio-temporal information in video in an end-to-end manner (Arnab et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2023b; Zhao et al., 2024). In contrast to models that rely on (but are ultimately limited by) strong hand-crafted inductive biases to process video (Simonyan & Zisserman, 2014; Girdhar et al., 2017), we consider video-based methods to be more promising: when scaled appropriately to internet video data, these methods can learn richer, more informative video representations.

- **Video-language objectives.** Text annotations are useful for learning semantic representations of video. We note several learning objectives in the literature that leverage text annotations: (i) video-text contrastive losses (Xu et al., 2021), (ii) video-text matching (Li et al., 2023), (iii) masked language modelling (Li et al., 2023), and (iv) video-to-text losses (Papalampidi et al., 2023). Video-text contrastive NCE losses have been very popular (Xu et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2024; Papalampidi et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b). Wang et al. (2023b) accelerate contrastive training by randomly masking input video in the early stages of training. Papalampidi et al. (2023) use a learning schedule, moving from shorter to longer videos over the course of the contrastive training. Note, the strategy for sampling negative examples and mini-batches is crucial for contrastive approaches. Zhao et al. (2024) alternate between mini-batches from different datasets, Xu et al. (2021) use retrieval augmented sampling to chose mini-batches, whilst Bagad et al. (2023) artificially create negative samples to improve temporal representations. Elsewhere, other video-text losses have generally been used in conjunction with an NCE loss. Li et al. (2023) combine video-text contrastive, video-text matching, and masked language modelling objectives. Yan et al. (2022), Papalampidi et al. (2023) combine a video-to-text objective with the video-text contrastive objective.
- **Masked auto-encoding (MAE).** Video MAE involves encoding and reconstructing a masked video, with the reconstruction loss acting as the learning objective (Tong et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023c; Girdhar et al., 2022). Tong et al. (2022) tokenise the video and mask in token space, with two important design decisions being made: (i) due to temporal redundancy in video, an extremely high masking ratio (90-95%) is employed; (ii) a tube masking scheme – which extends masks along the temporal dimension – mitigates issues related to easy reconstruction in areas with minimal motion. Wang et al. (2023c) additionally perform masking in the decoder to further improve computational efficiency. Li et al. (2023) perform semantic masking, where semantically relevant parts of images (as determined by an image-language model) are prioritized for masking. Related methods use masked distillation schemes (Wang et al., 2022), or vector-quantized auto-encoding (Yu et al., 2023) (see below).

- **Vector-quantized (VQ) auto-encoding.** VQ-AEs (van den Oord et al., 2017) use codebooks to encode video to discrete representations in the AE bottleneck. The reconstruction objective can either be a pixel-error loss (i.e., a VQ-VAE; see van den Oord et al., 2017), or an adversarial loss (i.e., a VQ-GAN; see Esser et al., 2020). When deciding the encoder-decoder architecture, crucial decisions must be made regarding how to fuse the spatio-temporal information in video. A simple choice is to encode each frame individually using a 2D VQ-AE (Seo et al., 2022b). However, this can neglect the importance of fusing information along the temporal dimension. To more naturally fuse spatio-temporal information in video, 3D convolutions have been explored (Yan et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2022), as have various spatio-temporal attention schemes (Arnab et al., 2021; Bertasius et al., 2021). Yu et al. (2023b) use temporally causal 3D convolutions (in addition to lookup-free quantization) to improve upon Yu et al. (2022). Villegas et al. (2022) use a C-ViViT (a causal variation of the ViViT architecture; see Arnab et al., 2021) encoder-decoder, compressing video in space and time, whilst staying auto-regressive in time. Bruce et al. (2024) improve the computational efficiency here via the use of a ST-transformer (Xu et al., 2020) encoder-decoder. These VQ-AEs models can be framed as video tokenizers and are often used to provide a compressed latent space for video prediction models (Yan et al., 2021) (see Section 4.2).
- **Distillation losses.** A number of works have explored the use of student-teacher distillation losses (Wang et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023). Wang et al. (2022) pretrain separate image and video teachers (to provide improved guiding spatial and temporal features, respectively) and train a student to reconstruct each teacher’s features. Zhao et al. (2024) freeze a video encoder from an initial video-text contrastive learning stage, and use it to provide a distillation loss during a second MAE stage. Li et al. (2023) use a frozen image-language model to provide a distillation loss throughout training, improving the learning of semantic features.
- **Joint-embedding Prediction Architectures (JEPA).** JEPA approaches – which predict the representation of an input  $Y$  (e.g., a masked version of a video) from the representation of another input  $X$  (e.g., the original video) – have recently been applied to video (Bardes et al., 2023). Versus pixel-reconstruction approaches, JEPA methods may better mitigate issues related to video’s high-dimensionality and noise in video.

The different objectives above can be combined to complement each other. For example, video-text objectives that capture semantic features (but suffer from noisy labels), can be combined with masked modelling objectives that better capture low-level features (and do not require language labels) (Li et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024). This is often done in a multi-stage training framework (Zhao et al., 2024). Other multi-stage pipelines have been employed, including: pretraining on diverse lower-quality data before finetuning on higher-quality data (Wang et al., 2023c), or starting with shorter videos before moving to longer videos (Liu et al., 2024b).

Finally, we note that *video-based* techniques often bootstrap from image data, which can be more freely available and often comes with improved language annotations (Schuhmann

et al., 2022). Some techniques here include: using image data jointly with video data during training (Papalampidi et al., 2023); using pretrained image models to provide a distillation loss (Li et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2022); or adapting pretrained image models into video models (Yan et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2023).

**Discussion.** Promising initial steps have been taken towards obtaining foundational video encoders. For example, Zhao et al. (2024) have trained a leading 1B parameter model on  $\sim 600\text{M}$  video-text pairs. However, a major bottleneck to further advances is the computational difficulties of processing large-scale video data. Indeed, many of the methods above employ specific mechanisms (e.g., masking; see Wang et al., 2023c) to mitigate computational demands. Papalampidi et al. (2023) perform a relevant analysis of the trade-offs between model accuracy and reducing computational demands. Another bottleneck is the quality of the video data itself. In particular, language annotations are often sparse and noisy. Finally, we note that representing long video sequences remains a major challenge (Papalampidi et al., 2023). Improved architectures (such as recent state-space models; see Li et al., 2024) may help with both computational demands and long-term video modelling. Image-based models still often outperform video-based models in video understanding tasks (Madan et al., 2024); video-based models should be further scaled-up (i.e. scale-up both the dataset and models size) to rectify this.

## 4.2 Video Prediction Models

This section is dedicated to models that can perform next-frame video prediction  $p(s_{t+1}|s_{t-k:t})$ . Via training on internet video, such models can learn information regarding the world dynamics and human behaviours. They can thus be useful for downstream robotic applications in several ways:

- *Dynamics:* A video prediction model can be adapted into a robot dynamics model to serve as a planner (Du et al., 2023b) or simulator (Yang et al., 2023c) (see Section 5.2.2).
- *Policies:* The video prediction objective implicitly allows the model to learn the distribution of behaviours in the video dataset (Escontrela et al., 2023). As such, video prediction models can act as policies by generating ‘observations-as-actions’: i.e., videos of future behaviours the robot should execute (Du et al., 2023a) (see Section 5.2.1).
- *Representations:* Due to the relevant information they represent, video predictors can be used for LfV representation transfer approaches (Wu et al., 2023a).
- *Rewards:* Finally, a reward signal can be defined that encourages the robot to match the behaviour expected by the video predictor (Escontrela et al., 2023) (see Section 5.2.3).

We elaborate more on how video prediction models can be applied to robot learning in Section 5.2. In this section, we give an overview of literature relevant to foundational video prediction models. We focus on the most promising recent techniques: diffusion, autoregressive transformers, and masking transformers. We are primarily concerned with

models that can perform *next-frame video prediction*  $p(s_{t+1}|s_{t-k:t})$ . However, also relevant are models that can more generally perform some form of *conditional video generation*  $p(\tau|c)$  (where  $\tau$  is a video clip and  $c$  is some conditioning information) (Yang et al., 2024).

**Technique: Diffusion.** Diffusion models (Ho et al., 2020) have become popular in video generation due to their expressiveness and controllability. Indeed, many SOTA video generation models leverage diffusion (Brooks et al., 2024; Bar-Tal et al., 2024). Diffusion models can easily model continuous output spaces and can sample multiple frames in parallel. However, their sampling speeds can be slow and long video generation remains a challenge (Yang et al., 2024). We now give an overview of diffusion-based video prediction methods.

*Pixel vs latent-space prediction.* Some works perform the diffusion process directly in pixel-space (Ho et al., 2022; Singer et al., 2022; Ho et al., 2022), whilst others do so in a learned latent space (Brooks et al., 2024; Bar-Tal et al., 2024; Blattmann et al., 2023a). Blattmann et al. (2023b), Zhou et al. (2022) use a pretrained image VQ-AE to define the latent space, and add temporal layers into the pretrained decoder to reduce flickering artifacts. More information on learning VQ-AEs for video can be found in Section 4.1. Predicting in latent space aids computational efficiency, but can result in inferior alignment of the generated video with the text prompt. Zhang et al. (2023) combine both pixel-level and latent diffusion into a hybrid model in an attempt to obtain the benefits of both.

*Leveraging image data.* Video data is more limited in quantity and quality than image data. In particular, video often comes with inferior text annotations. As such, most diffusion video prediction models attempt to utilise image data in some way. Ho et al. (2022, 2022) jointly train on image and video data. Bar-Tal et al. (2024), Ge et al. (2023), Blattmann et al. (2023b) take a pretrained image diffusion model and “inflate” it into a video model. This involves modifying the architecture to include temporal connections and finetuning it on video data. Meanwhile, Dai et al. (2023) factorise the video generation process: first generating an image with a pretrained image diffusion model, then generating a video conditioned on the image.

*Video generation pipelines.* The pipeline for generating video with diffusion models often involves some combination of the following steps (Ho et al., 2022; Ge et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2022): key-frame generation, interpolation between key-frames, and spatial super-resolution upsampling. The hierarchical approach of generating key-frames before interpolating can serve to simplify generation of longer videos. However, Bar-Tal et al. (2024) generate the entire temporal duration in a single forward pass, obtaining improved global temporal consistency. Meanwhile, the use of ‘cascaded’ spatial super resolution can help keep the base model simple, reducing computational requirements and aiding generalization abilities (Ho et al., 2022).

*Other techniques and findings.* Ge et al. (2023) find that naive extension of the image noise prior to video leads to sub-optimal performance. They instead use a scheme that better preserves natural correlations in video. Blattmann et al. (2023a) perform an in-depth analysis of the effects of data-quality on video diffusion models, finding pretraining on large diverse data and finetuning on smaller high-quality data to be an effective scheme. Beyond video prediction, video diffusion models can be used for video editing, video in-filling and

in-painting (Brooks et al., 2024; Bar-Tal et al., 2024), and can be flexibly conditioned on different input modalities (Chen et al., 2023c; Xing et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024).

**Technique: Autoregressive and masking transformers.** Transformer-based methods have recently achieved promising results in video prediction. We now give an overview of different methods seen in the literature.

*Pixel vs latent-space predictions.* Whilst early work made predictions directly in pixel-space (Weissenborn et al., 2019), subsequent methods do so in a learned latent space (Yan et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2022; Kondratyuk et al., 2023). This latent space is generally pretrained via vector-quantized auto-encoding (VQ-AE), providing a discrete token-space suitable for the transformer architecture. Predicting in latent space can improve computational efficiency and can mitigate issues related to pixel-level noise and redundancy (Yan et al., 2021). State-of-the-art VQ-AE video tokenizers used here jointly represent spatio-temporal information using 3D convolutions (Yan et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2022; Ge et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2023) or causal spatio-temporal attention mechanisms (Villegas et al., 2022; Bruce et al., 2024). We provide more details on various VQ-AE architectures in Section 4.1.

*Autoregressive training.* Autoregressive next-token prediction is a standard objective for training transformer sequence models. However, in video the embedding of a single image frame may consist of multiple tokens. Thus, decisions must be made regarding the order in which tokens are predicted. One option is to simply flatten the discrete tokens in ‘raster scan’ order, and predict these tokens sequentially (Yan et al., 2021; Seo et al., 2022b; Hu et al., 2023). Rather than sequentially decoding, other approaches (Bruce et al., 2024) predict the next-frame autoregressively using MaskGit (Chang et al., 2022) scheduled parallel decoding. This involves decoding all masked tokens of an image simultaneously, then refining the image iteratively, conditioned on the previous generation (note, this draws strong parallels to the diffusion process). This parallel decoding process is more computationally efficient than standard autoregressive prediction.

*Masked decoding training.* Rather than training via autoregressive next-frame prediction, other works mask parts of the video and train the model to decode the masked tokens in parallel (usually following a MaskGit process) (Yu et al., 2022, 2023b; Gupta et al., 2022). This mask decoding training allows for multiple tasks to be performed at inference time, including: video prediction, video in-painting, frame-interpolation, and video editing (Yu et al., 2022). Masked models are more computationally efficient and do not suffer from the ‘drifting’ effect that can occur in auto-regressive models. However, they may suffer from sampling bias introduced by independence assumptions within individual sampling steps (Yang et al., 2024).

*Other notable techniques and findings.* Several techniques have been proposed to improve long-horizon video predictions. Yan et al. (2023) use aggressive spatio-temporal compression to aid consistency in long-horizon predictions. Ge et al. (2022) improve long video prediction by first predicting key-frames, then interpolating. Meanwhile, different transformer architectures have been proposed to reduce computational requirements on longer



sequence lengths (Dao et al., 2022; Hawthorne et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024b). Recent advances in state-space models may also be relevant here (Gu & Dao, 2023; Tong et al., 2022). Elsewhere, Kondratyuk et al. (2023), Liu et al. (2024b) use separate tokenizers for different modalities, allowing their transformer prediction model to input and output additional modalities (e.g., text).

**Technique: Others.** Here, we briefly outline less promising video prediction techniques from the literature. Initial video prediction techniques were based on recurrent or convolutional architectures (Srivastava et al., 2015; Lotter et al., 2016; Chiappa et al., 2017). However, these often make a limiting assumption that the environment is deterministic. Latent-variable (VAE) video models (Babaeizadeh et al., 2017; Denton & Fergus, 2018; Villegas et al., 2019) attempt to account for stochasticity in videos, but tend to generate blurry outputs due to limited representational power and underfitting. An interesting extension of these approaches is the use of hierarchical VAE models (Saxena et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021). GAN-based methods (Vondrick et al., 2016; Clark et al., 2019; Tulyakov et al., 2018) can produce more realistic videos, but are known to suffer from training instability and limited generation diversity. Elsewhere, Wu et al. (2022), Jiang et al. (2023) propose object-centric video prediction models, Lin et al. (2022) use neural radiance field (NeRF) representations, and Whitney et al. (2023) learn a 3D particle-based simulator from RGB-D videos.

**Conditioning video predictions.** The use of conditioning information can simplify the video prediction problem and allow for more control over generated videos. Such conditioning is valuable for downstream robotics: it can allow us to simulate the effects of different action strategies. Yang et al. (2024) outline various popular conditioning schemes for video generation models  $p(\tau|c)$ . Here, we briefly outline the different modalities of information that can be used as conditioning information.

*Language* is a popular choice for conditioning video generations. Indeed, text-to-video models  $p(\tau|c = \textit{text})$  represent much of the state-of-the-art in video generation (Brooks et al., 2024; Bar-Tal et al., 2024; Kondratyuk et al., 2023). Language can allow for flexible and intuitive control over generated video, at varying levels of detail.

*Images and Video* can be used to condition video predictions. The next-frame prediction problem requires conditioning on the previous frame(s)  $p(s_{t+1}|s_{t-k:t})$  (Gao et al., 2022). Video in-filling predicts a video that joins initial and final conditioning frames  $p(s_{t+1:t+H-1}|s_t, s_{t+H})$  (Höppe et al., 2022). Video editing, in-painting, and stylization applications  $p(\tau|\bar{\tau})$  are all conditioned on an initial input video  $\bar{\tau}$  (Brooks et al., 2024; Bar-Tal et al., 2024).

*Action* information can be used to condition video predictions  $p(s_{t+1}|c = \{s_{t-k:t}, \textit{action}\})$ . Bruce et al. (2024) use a learned single-step latent action-space to condition next-frame predictions. Yang et al. (2023c) use robot actions (when labels are available) to condition next-frame predictions. The next-frame predictions of stochastic video prediction models can be conditioned via their latent variable (Rybkin et al., 2018). We outline various action representations that may be suitable for conditioning video predictions in Section 5.1.1.

*Other.* Briefly, recent methods have used hand-drawn sketches (Wang et al., 2024), depth information (Xing et al., 2024), (hand-drawn) motion guidance (Wang et al., 2024), motion priors (Chen et al., 2023c), and structured scene information (Wang et al., 2023a) to condition video generations.

**Discussion.** The recent Sora (Yang et al., 2023c) model represented a major advance in foundational video generation capabilities, demonstrating improvements in visual quality, physical realism, and generation lengths. However, the model (i) can hallucinate, generating video with inaccurate physics and incorrect cause-and-effect relationships; and (ii) struggles to recreate precise descriptions or spatial details in its prompt. In addition to these challenges, foundational video generation models also face challenges related to computational efficiency, longer video generation, and limited generalization.

Nevertheless, there are promising avenues here. Improved architectures can deal with computational issues (Liu et al., 2024b; Jiang et al., 2024) and long video generation (Yan et al., 2023). Yang et al. (2024) discuss the pros and cons between diffusion, autoregressive transformer, and masked transformer video prediction methods, and advocate for methods that combine the advantages of each. Meanwhile, RL finetuning (Black et al., 2023a) may improve hallucination issues. Generalization could be aided via compositional approaches (Zhou et al., 2024; Du & Kaelbling, 2024). In general, further gains can be obtained via improved video datasets (following the dataset desiderata outlined in Section 6.1). More speculative directions include leveraging 3D information to improve the physical realism of video generations (Zhen et al., 2024), or exploring the use of hierarchy and temporal abstractions for improved long video generation.

A direction of particular interest to robotics is the pursuit of methods that allow for fine-grained, single-step conditioning of video predictions. Bruce et al. (2024) use learned latent action representations. There is room for further research here, and we outline various other suitable action representations in Section 5.1.1. Finally, we advocate for progress in open-sourced foundational video prediction models: open-sourced models will render LfV research more accessible to the wider community.

### 4.3 Video-to-Text Models

Here we refer to models with video-to-text capabilities. A capable video-to-text model can perform, for example, video question answering or video summarization. There are numerous commercial applications for such models and we are likely to see increasingly capable models in the near future. A capable video-to-text foundation models could be valuable to robotics in several ways:

- *High-quality representations:* A capable video-to-text model will have robust, high-quality video representations. Compared to a video-only model, it will likely have improved high-level semantic representations. Compared to an image-to-text model, it will have improved temporal-dynamic representations. Robotics can bootstrap from such models via representation transfer (Brohan et al., 2023), or by adding robot data directly into the model’s pretraining corpus (Reed et al., 2022).
- *Grounded reasoning and planning:* LLMs have proven useful as planning modules in robotics (Ahn et al., 2022), but their lack of grounding in the physical world is limiting.

In contrast, video-to-text models can perceive the environment through information-rich video, allowing for improved and closed-loop reasoning and planning.

- *Annotating robot data:* High-quality language annotations can provide valuable conditioning information in many ML domains (Betker et al., 2023; Brooks et al., 2024). Robotics is no different (Team et al., 2023). Capable video-to-text models could serve as useful language annotators for robotic datasets (Blank et al., 2024).
- *Rewards:* A sufficiently capable video-to-text model can provide reward or value estimates for a robot learner. For example, this could be done through a visual-question answering framework (Du et al., 2023c), or via an RL-from-AI-feedback framework (Klissarov et al., 2023) (see Section 5.2.3).

In this section, we give an overview of existing video-to-text methods and models. We do so with an emphasis on methods promising for obtaining foundational video-to-text models. We note that research here is somewhat preliminary: low-quality video captions and the difficulties of the video modality mean progress lags behind foundation models in other domains.

**Zero-shot combination of pretrained models.** Due to the difficulties of training a monolithic video-to-text model, previous work has explicitly decomposed the problem, assigning the sub-tasks to frozen pretrained models. These pretrained models often communicate via language. Chen et al. (2023b) use an image-language model to answer questions about individual video frames, and an LLM to synthesize this information to produce a global summary of the video. Shang et al. (2024) use a more sophisticated scheme for video question answering. Zeng et al. (2022) make use of a wider range of pretrained models, including audio-language models and object detectors. Li et al. (2022) solve multimodal problems, including video-to-text tasks, by composing pre-trained models via a closed-loop iterative consensus optimization process. Whilst these compositional approaches can be effective, their modular structure and lack of end-to-end video training mean they can lack rich, nuanced video representations and understandings.

**Leveraging pretrained LLMs via adaptors and finetuning.** Alayrac et al. (2022), Li et al. (2022) introduced schemes for adapting pretrained LLMs to be additionally conditioned on image inputs. Recent improvements in open-source LLMs (Touvron et al., 2023) have seen these approaches extended into the realm of video. Here, approaches typically involve the following steps: (i) obtain a pretrained LLM and an (often pretrained) video encoder; (ii) define an adaptor module to channel information from the video encoder output into the LLM; and finally (iii) finetune the combined model on video-text data. We now give more details on these methods.

*Pretrained LLMs.* Works in this space (Zhang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023) have often leveraged open-source LLMs from the LLaMa (Touvron et al., 2023) family. More recent SOTA open-source LLMs would also be suitable (Jiang et al., 2024; Team et al., 2024).

*Video encoders.* The encoder used can be frame-based (i.e., each frame is encoded separately) (Maaz et al., 2023) or can jointly encode spatio-temporal information (Papalampidi

et al., 2023). Image-pretrained encoders based on CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) have commonly been used (Maaz et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). Many of the encoders from Section 4.1 may be suitable (as demonstrated by Zhao et al., 2024; Papalampidi et al., 2023).

*Adaptors.* Tang et al. (2023) identify two main categories of adaptors used in the literature. (1) Connective adaptors connect the outputs of the video encoder to the input space of the LLM, e.g., with linear projections (Chen et al., 2023a), MLP layers (Lin et al., 2023), and more complex adaptors such as Q-formers (Zhang et al., 2023). (2) Insertive adaptors insert the outputs of the video encoder into the internal layers of the LLM, e.g., via cross-attention (Alayrac et al., 2022; Papalampidi et al., 2023). We direct the reader to Zhang et al. (2024) for more information on different adaptor types.

*Training pipelines.* Once the new video-to-text architecture is defined, a common training scheme is: (i) convert large, diverse video-text data into token sequences and perform next-token prediction pretraining, then (ii) perform supervised instruction-tuning on small high-quality instruction datasets (Lin et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023). Following trends in LLMs, future work may investigate a third RLHF finetuning stage (Kaufmann et al., 2023b). Finally, we note that during training the LLM and/or video encoder may be finetuned (Lin et al., 2023), or kept frozen (Maaz et al., 2023).

**Natively multi-modal models.** The previously discussed methods have involved combining and finetuning pretrained models not initially intended for video-to-text purposes. In this paragraph, we highlight end-to-end training pipelines that (loosely) are more *natively* multi-modal. We note this is a particularly preliminary area of research. Nevertheless, recent trends towards multi-modal any-to-any sequence models – where video-to-text is formulated as an interleaved video and text sequence modelling problem – are promising. Liu et al. (2024b), Team et al. (2023), Jin et al. (2023) all train multi-modal any-to-any (or any-to-text) autoregressive transformers via next token prediction. This requires the use of modality specific encoders and decoders. Note, in practice, these methods may still initialise their model with a pretrained LLM (Jin et al., 2023), or perform an initial stage of training on text-only data (Liu et al., 2024b).

**Discussion.** Whilst there has been progress in video-to-text models, state-of-the-art capabilities are still limited. Schemes that combine pretrained models in a zero-shot manner can be useful in some applications, but a lack of end-to-end training means they do not maintain rich or fine-grained video representations. Methods that adapt pretrained LLMs have often only fine-tuned on small quantities of video-text pairs and can suffer from hallucinations (Lin et al., 2023; Maaz et al., 2023). More generally, current video-to-text models can struggle with spatial relationships, fine-grained and subtle spatio-temporal details, and long-term understandings.

A key bottleneck to progress here is the quality (and quantity) of available video-text data. Versus existing image datasets (Schuhmann et al., 2022), available video datasets are smaller and can have inferior text annotations. Annotations are often sparse, and can be coarse or noisy. Improved annotations with low-level details will enhance fine-grained understandings, which are particularly relevant to robotic applications. We give details on methods for captioning video data in Section 6.2. Progress in long video understanding will be aided by more efficient architectures for handling longer contexts (Liu et al., 2023a;

Gu & Dao, 2023; Balažević et al., 2024). Finally, we advocate for more research into ‘natively’ multi-modal models, where the full training pipeline is designed with video-to-text functionalities in mind.

## 5. LfV-for-Robotics: Methods

We have previously outlined preliminary information for the LfV-for-robotics setting (Section 3), and reviewed video foundation models as a general-purpose approach for extracting knowledge from internet video (Section 4). In this section, we will review literature specifically leveraging video data for robotics. We begin by reviewing some common methods used to mitigate LfV challenges (Section 5.1). We then move to our primary categorization of the LfV-for-robotics literature (Section 5.2).

### 5.1 Mitigating LfV Challenges


The key LfV challenges are outlined in Section 3.3. In this section, we detail two categories of techniques that each address a key challenge: (1) The use of alternative action representations to mitigate missing action labels in video data (Section 5.1.1). (2) The use of certain representations that explicitly address LfV distribution-shift issues (Section 5.1.2). These techniques reoccur across various LfV methods, and are used as a single component within a larger LfV pipeline. We have thus separated out details of these techniques into the following self-contained subsections, ahead of our main analysis of the LfV literature in Section 5.2.

#### 5.1.1 ACTION REPRESENTATIONS


Transition tuples of robot data commonly come in the form of  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$ . With this action-labelled data, RL knowledge modalities (KMs) (see Section 2.1) that require action information can be trained. For example, one could use behaviour cloning over the robot data to obtain an action-generating policy  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$ . However, video data transition tuples are missing action labels: coming in the form of  $(s_t, s_{t+1})$ . Thus, video data cannot naively be used to train policies, action-value functions, or dynamics models.

In this section, we review works that define or learn some representation space that is analogous to the notion of an action; an *alternative action representation*. We use  $\hat{a} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to denote a single alternative action and its underlying alternative action space. An intuitive example here is the use of language to represent action information: e.g.,  $\hat{a} =$  “pick up the cube”. With  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  learned or defined, video data can be relabelled from  $(s_t, s_{t+1})$  to  $(s_t, \hat{a}_t, s_{t+1})$  and used to train an alternate action version of an RL KM (see Figure 5a). In the literature, alternative action policies  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023), dynamics models  $p_{\text{alt}}(s_{t+1}|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  (Bruce et al., 2024), and value functions  $Q_{\text{alt}}(s_t, \hat{a}_t)$  (Bhateja et al., 2023) have been trained. These alternative action KMs can be useful downstream for their representations (Bhateja et al., 2023; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023), or if a mapping from the alternative to robot action space  $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{A}}$  is obtained (Wang et al., 2023a; Wen et al., 2023; Du et al., 2023a).

Before detailing the different categories of alternative action representations  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  in the literature, we first touch on some preliminary discussion points:



(a) Action-free videos can be labelled with alternative action representations  $\hat{a}$ . This labelled data can be used to train an alternative action RL knowledge modality (e.g., a policy, value function, or dynamics model).



(b) Categories of action representations that can be learned or obtained from video data.

Figure 5: Recovering action representations from video to overcome the missing action-label problem in LfV (Section 5.1.1).

- $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  should be inferable from video data. Action representations that can be obtained from raw, unlabelled video are appealing as they can leverage the full range of available video data. However,  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 's that require labelled video (e.g., language captions) are also valid.
- $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  should contain 'action' information. We can operationalize this in two ways. First,  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  should be predictive of future video frames: i.e., learning  $p_{\text{alt}}(s_{t+1}|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  should be easier than  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t)$ . Second,  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  should be predictive of robot actions: i.e., learning  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  should be easier than  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$ .
- $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  should be well-structured. It may be beneficial for  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to contain minimal information, to be disentangled, and to maintain consistent meaning across the state space. This may particularly be the case for shorter-horizon versions of  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ . This can allow for the learning of  $\pi(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  and  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  in a more data-efficient and generalisable manner (Rybkin et al., 2018; Bruce et al., 2024).
- $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  should be transferable across embodiments. It should capture a high-level, general notion of an action, and transfer from the embodiments in the video data (i.e., humans) to the target robot embodiment(s).
- *Other notable characteristics.* We note two final characteristics that vary across different categories of alternative action representations. We reserve judgement here until the discussion at the end of the section. (1) Learned vs defined:  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  can be on a spectrum from being entirely learned from data (e.g., single-step latent actions), to simply being manually defined (e.g., observations-as-action). (2) Time-horizons:  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  can contain only short horizon action information (e.g., single-step latent actions) or longer horizon action information (e.g., multi-step latent actions).

We now outline the main categories of  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  we have identified in the literature (see Figure 5b). Here, we focus on detailing how  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  can be defined and learned from video data. More details on how alternative action representations can be used downstream for robotics are found throughout Section 5.2.

**Single-step latent actions.** We consider *learned* action representations where,  $\hat{a}_t$  (i.e., the latent action) only contains information regarding the action that took us from  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+1}$ . Methods that learn such a latent representation commonly do so using a next-state prediction objective  $p(s_{t+1}|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$ , such that  $\hat{a}_t$  is informative for the predictions of the forward dynamics model (FDM) (Edwards et al., 2018; Rybkin et al., 2018; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Bruce et al., 2024).

Edwards et al. (2018) introduce latent-action policies  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$ , but their method can only learn discrete latent action spaces, and is susceptible to mode collapse (Struckmeier & Kyrki, 2022; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023). Approaches to learn continuous latent action spaces (Rybkin et al., 2018; Schmeckpeper et al., 2019; Chang et al., 2022; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Bruce et al., 2024) generally work as follows: (1) A latent inverse dynamics model (IDM) encodes past-frames to infer  $\hat{a}_t$ . (2)  $\hat{a}_t$  is then passed, along with the past-frames, to an FDM  $p(s_{t+1}|\hat{a}_t, \{s_{t-k}, \dots, s_t\})$  which predicts  $s_{t+1}$ . (3) This setup is trained end-to-end via the FDM prediction error. Additionally, some form of regularisation is usually employed

to prevent the IDM from copying the entire observation  $s_{t+1}$  into the latent action (i.e., to minimize the information in the latent action). Rybkin et al. (2018) regularise latent actions towards a Gaussian prior and enforce a composability loss, whilst Schmidt and Jiang (2023), Bruce et al. (2024) use a vector-quantization bottleneck. Rybkin et al. (2018), Schmidt and Jiang (2023) show their regularization techniques to improve disentanglement of the latent action and to thus improve downstream performances.

We note some potential limitations of these approaches. First, learned latent action spaces jointly model visual changes caused by the agent and the external environment: often, we would like to only represent changes due to actions taken by a single agent. Second, these approaches model environment transitions on a visual level, thus they may omit non-visual low-level information relevant to robot actions (such as forces). We finally note that more research into learning single-step latent action-spaces from realistic internet video is required.

**Multi-step latent actions.** Here, we discuss *learned* action representations  $\hat{a}$  that contain information regarding the actions taken across multiple time steps of a video (i.e., from  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+k}$ ). Here, any means of representing video segments could be applicable, including the video representation methods seen in Section 4.1 (though some will have more suitable properties than others). The use of variational auto-encoding to represent videos as *latent plans* has been explored extensively with action-labelled demonstrations (Lynch et al., 2020; Cui et al., 2022; Rosete-Beas et al., 2022), but less so with action-free video. Wang et al. (2023a) learn latent plan representations from action-free videos via auto-encoding, but use 3D human hand trajectories as the decoder target (rather than raw video). Several other approaches have been explored in the LfV literature. From language-captioned video, representations of video trajectories have been learned using video-language contrastive losses (Fan et al., 2022; Lifshitz et al., 2023; Sontakke et al., 2023). Chane-Sane et al. (2023), Chen et al. (2021) obtain useful representations of video clips by performing supervised contrastive learning whilst using clip-level action labels. Xu et al. (2023) learn representations of video clips using a self-supervised learning clustering framework. Further approaches for learning multi-step latent actions are seen in Tomar et al. (2023), Pertsch et al. (2022), Cai et al. (2023).

**Observations-as-action.** A simple approach is to use future observations (i.e., future image frames in the video) as the action representation: future observations (or an encoding thereof) provide information regarding what actions will be taken next in the video. A benefit here is that this  $\hat{A}$  is directly available from raw video; no additional labels or learning steps are required. Observations-as-actions can be implemented on varying time-horizons, as we now describe.

(1) *Next-observation-as-action.* These methods use the next observation  $s_{t+1}$  as  $\hat{a}_t$  (Du et al., 2023a; Thomas et al., 2023; He et al., 2024):  $s_{t+1}$  provides clear information about the action that should be taken at  $s_t$ . (2) *Observations-as-subgoals:* A subgoal can be viewed as a high-level action. In ‘observations-as-subgoals’ methods (Black et al., 2023b; Park et al., 2024; Bhateja et al., 2023), an observation (or embedding thereof) from  $k$  time-steps into the future is used as a sub-goal/alternative-action representation. Some simple strategies for defining sub-goals in the video data include: choosing a fixed time-horizon  $k$  (Black et al., 2023b; Du et al., 2023a), or randomly sampling observations beyond the



current timestep (Bhateja et al., 2023). More complex strategies include using key-frame identification to identify bottleneck states in video (Pertsch et al., 2019). Liu et al. (2023b) identify critical states in videos, but require access to reward labels.

**Language-as-action.** Natural language can be used as a flexible high-level action-space (e.g.,  $\hat{a}_t = \text{“pick up the cube”}$ ) (Belkhale et al., 2024; Shi et al., 2024), and allow for interfacing with other language models (Du et al., 2023b). Some video datasets come with language-action annotations (Grauman et al., 2021). Otherwise, general annotations can be further processed (e.g., using LLMs) to convert them into a more suitable ‘action-like’ form (Mu et al., 2023). If the video does not come with language descriptions, manual or automated captioning methods can be used to obtain suitable annotations (see Section 6.2). One downside here is that language is coarse and language descriptions may omit important lower-level action information.

**Visual motion information.** Other works have used visual motion information in video to define  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Wen et al. (2023) do so by labelling video data with 2D point trajectories: random points on objects are sampled and tracked throughout the video using an off-the-shelf point tracker (Karaev et al., 2023). Yuan et al. (2024) follow a similar approach, but use 3D point trajectories. The 3D annotations are obtained from 3D annotated datasets (but they note depth estimation (Bhat et al., 2023) techniques could also be used). Elsewhere, Ko et al. (2023) use an off-the-shelf model (Xu et al., 2022) to predict optical flow between two images, giving a pixel-level dense correspondence map between two frames. In a related approach, Nasiriany et al. (2024) represent actions via visual arrows in images. Finally, Wang et al. (2023b) use structure-from-motion (Schonberger & Frahm, 2016) to recover action information, Yuan et al. (2021) use the motions of object-centric representations, and Yang et al. (2023c) optionally use camera frame motion/angle information as conditioning information for a video predictor.

**(Human)-embodiment information.** Off-the-shelf human-hand detection models (Rong et al., 2020; Shan et al., 2020) can extract hand poses or affordances from videos which can act as an alternative action representation (Bharadhwaj et al., 2023; Bahl et al., 2023; Shaw et al., 2022; Qin et al., 2022, 2021). For example,  $\hat{a}_t$  can be defined as the pose that should be reached at time  $t + 1$ . Bharadhwaj et al. (2023) use object masks in addition to human poses to define  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Animal embodiment information could also be used (Peng et al., 2020). More details on methods for detecting human hand poses and affordances are provided in Section 5.1.2.

**IDM pseudo-action labels.** Though not technically an *alternative* action representation, these methods train an inverse dynamics model  $p^{-1}(a_t|s_t, s_{t+1})$  on action-labelled robot data, and use it to provide pseudo-action labels for action-free video data (Baker et al., 2022; Torabi et al., 2018a; Schmeckpeper et al., 2020). However, these simple approaches are unlikely to scale to diverse internet video as they require either: (i) minimal domain-shift between the video data and the robot domain (e.g., Baker et al. (2022) assume identical embodiments), or (ii) an explicit mechanism to deal with domain-shift that may not scale well to diverse internet video (Schmeckpeper et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2023) (see Section 5.1.2).

**Discussion.** Alternative action representations are promising for tackling the problem of missing action labels in video data. We now discuss which categories of alternative action representations may be most useful for LfV.

*How scalable is  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to internet video?* Observations-as-action, single-step latent actions, and (some) multi-step latent actions do not require the video to be labelled. Thus (in theory) they can leverage the full range of available video data. Latent actions must be learned and may face optimisation difficulties. However, they may be more suitable as action representations than high-dimensional observations. More experimental evidence is required to verify latent actions can scale well to diverse internet video and outperform simpler observations-as-action  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 's.

The remaining  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 's all require some labelling of the video data, which may limit their scalability. Nevertheless, language-as-actions can be highly useful (Du et al., 2023b), and most curated video datasets come paired with language annotations (see Section 6.3). Videos can be labelled with visual motion and human-embodiment information using off-the-shelf models. However, it is unclear how well this labelling will scale to more heterogeneous internet video datasets. Nevertheless, tracking point trajectories appears to be a relatively flexible approach (Wen et al., 2023).

*Using  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to emulate  $\mathcal{A}$ .* We may wish for  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to act (somewhat) as a direct replacement for robot actions. For example, we can train fine-grained conditioned dynamics model  $p_{\text{alt}}(s_{t+1}|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  (Bruce et al., 2024), or train a policy  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  which outputs alternative actions than can easily be decoded to robot actions (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023). In these cases, the ease of decoding  $a_t$  from  $\hat{a}_t$  is likely a good proxy for the utility  $\hat{a}_t$  provides. Decoding may be simplified if  $\hat{a}_t$  contains more mutual information with  $a_t$ . This perhaps advocates for the use of shorter-horizon, or less abstracted, versions of  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Additionally, minimising the information in  $\hat{a}_t$  (as seen in Rybkin et al., 2018; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023) could simplify decoding and improve decoding generalization by reducing spurious correlations.

*Using  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  as a high-level action-space.* Abstract/high-level action-spaces have proven useful in long-horizon tasks (Hafner et al., 2022). Moreover, video is missing important low-level information for robotics (e.g., explicit force information), meaning  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  may not be fully informative for decoding low-level robot actions (and so, in many cases, the decoder should be defined as  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  rather than  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t)$ ). These suggest that extracting slightly abstracted or longer-horizon action representations from video – used in hierarchical setups to complement rather than emulate the robot action space – could be a fruitful path (Du et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2023a).

### 5.1.2 REPRESENTATIONS TO ADDRESS LFV DISTRIBUTION-SHIFT

Distribution shift between internet videos and the target robot domain poses a challenge to LfV approaches (see Section 3.3). For example, a common shift is the embodiment differences between humans and robots. Such distribution shifts can hinder our ability to transfer knowledge from the video data to the robot.

We are aware of three strategies that may help overcome these distribution shift issues.

1. *Scaling to large, diverse datasets:* Higher coverage in the pretraining video dataset will minimise unseen shifts encountered in the downstream robot domain. Additionally, the increased scale of pretraining may improve the overall generalization abilities of the model.
2. *Leveraging in-domain robot data:* In-domain robot data can be incorporated into the video training data, or the video model can be finetuned on robot data.
3. *Using representations that explicitly address distribution-shift:* This involves explicitly learning/defining a representation of (human) video that is more transferable to the robot domain. For example, embodiment invariant representations can be learned (Schmeckpeper et al., 2020). Once the transferable representation is obtained, works have most commonly used it to: (i) define a reward function encouraging the robot to match the behaviour in the video (Zakka et al., 2021), or, if the representation contains action information, (ii) to help train a policy via behaviour cloning of the represented video (Bharadhwaj et al., 2023).

In this section we categorise and detail representations that explicitly address LfV distribution-shifts, as seen in the literature. We focus solely on how to obtain the representation. Details regarding how the obtained representation can be used to help define a reward function etc., are found throughout Section 5.2.

**Method: (Human)-embodiment-aware approaches.** In LfV, we are most often interested in learning from human behaviour: we wish for our robots to replicate this behaviour. In particular, for we are often interested in replicating the behaviour and effects of the human hand. There is a line of LfV research that explicitly detects human embodiment information in video, and subsequently transfers this information to the robot. Note, animal embodiment information could also be used (Peng et al., 2020).

*What types of human embodiment information can be detected?*

(1) *Poses:* Several works explicitly estimate the pose of the human body or hand in videos. This involves estimating the positions and orientations of various joints or key points on the body. The human hand is often represented using the MANO hand model (Romero et al., 2022). The human-body can be represented by, for example, by the SMPL/SMPL-X models (Loper et al., 2023; Pavlakos et al., 2019). Once a human-hand pose is detected, it may need to be retargeted to the robot embodiment. This can be achieved by directly optimising a loss function (Shaw et al., 2022), or by training a retargeting network to minimise a retargeting loss function (Sivakumar et al., 2022).

(2) *Affordances:* Affordances are a common notion in robotics (Ardón et al., 2020). A common affordance detected in human videos in the LfV literature is the combined use of: (i) grasp/contact points (i.e., where on the object does the hand make contact?); and (ii) grasp trajectories (i.e., once contact is made, where will the hand move?) (Bahl et al., 2023; Mendonca et al., 2023). Such an affordance can naturally transfer from human to robot embodiment. This affordance information can be extracted from videos using an off-the-shelf model (Shan et al., 2020), and using further tricks to ensure accurate, usable affordance labels (Bahl et al., 2023). Note, 2D affordances can be converted to 3D using depth estimation (Mendonca et al., 2023).

(3) *Masks and Bounding boxes*: Masks or bounding boxes of human hands and objects can be used (Bharadhwaj et al., 2023). These can be obtained from videos using off-the shelf models (Kirillov et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022) or via labelled datasets (Darkhalil et al., 2022).

*How to use this human embodiment-centric information?* With a video dataset labelled with human-centric information, one of the following can be performed: (1) The original process for extracting the human-centric information from the video/image can be distilled into a single model (Mendonca et al., 2023). This can be useful when the original method is convoluted or unlikely to generalize. It may also be a good auxiliary representation learning objective for robot manipulation (Bahl et al., 2023). (2) The extracted information can be treated as an ‘alternative action representation’ (Bharadhwaj et al., 2023; Bahl et al., 2023; Shaw et al., 2022; Qin et al., 2022, 2021) (see Section 5.1.1), or as state-observations when retargeted to the robot embodiment (Radosavovic et al., 2024).

*Limitations.* Human hand poses can be directly retargeted to certain robot hands, and the affordances detailed above are (in theory) embodiment agnostic. However, we note there still can be difficulties transferring this information to the robot. For example, a model trained to propose future poses solely on human images is unlikely to generalise zero-shot to robot images. This has led to tricks being used in the LfV literature, such as predicting affordances only when the embodiment is out of frame (Bahl et al., 2023), or in-painting human embodiments over robot embodiments (Bharadhwaj et al., 2023).

**Method: Learned invariant representations.** Here we refer to methods that *learn* a representation that is invariant to a specific distribution shift between the video dataset and robot domain. We now briefly list some methods seen in the LfV literature, before commenting on limitations.

*Methods.* (1) Domain confusion techniques can learn representations that are invariant across viewpoints (Stadie et al., 2017) and embodiments (Schmeckpeper et al., 2020). (2) Contrastive learning techniques can encourage invariance across a particular axis; Sermanet et al. (2018) learn viewpoint invariant representations given time-aligned videos from different viewpoints. In related work, Aytar et al. (2018) use temporal distance classification to learn representations that generalise across visual changes. (3) Temporal cycle-consistency objectives can learn embodiment invariant representations; Zakka et al. (2021) do so using videos of different embodiments performing the same task. (4) Factorized representations have also been proposed. Schmeckpeper et al. (2019), Shang and Ryoo (2021) factorise a learned representation into two components: one that is common across distributions, and one that is unique to each distribution. Chang et al. (2023) use embodiment segmentation and in-painting removal to obtain explicit factorized representations of the agent and environment. (5) Image translation methods can convert an image from the source distribution (e.g., human embodiment) to the target (e.g., robot embodiment). This can be done, for example, using Cycle-GANs (Smith et al., 2019) or diffusion in-painting (Bahl et al., 2022; Bharadhwaj et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024).

*Limitations.* There are some inherent limitations to the scalability of these approaches. (1) Invariant representations can omit useful information. For example, it may be beneficial

to be aware of differences between human and the robot embodiment. (2) These methods can have overly strict requirements on the video data. For example, Sermanet et al. (2018) assume access to multiple videos of the same scene but from different viewpoints. (3) Many of these methods only provide invariance to a single type of distribution shift (e.g., embodiment differences only). In reality, there may be many distinct shifts between a video and the robot setting.

**Method: Transferable abstractions.** Some methods exploit abstractions that naturally transfer well from human to robot. Sieb et al. (2020), Kumar et al. (2022) use object-centric graphical representations to imitate human videos. Nagarajan and Grauman (2021) learn object-centric activity-context priors from human videos. Karnan et al. (2021), Xiong et al. (2021) detect key-points to compare human and robot videos. As touched on above, Bahl et al. (2023), Mendonca et al. (2023) leverage embodiment-agnostic affordances. These methods all respectively benefit from the use of off-the-shelf object, key-point, and human-hand detectors. Meanwhile, language has also been used as a transferable abstraction (Chen et al., 2021; Mu et al., 2023; Pertsch et al., 2022).

**Method: Others.** Kim et al. (2023) collect video data using eye-in-hand demonstrations to bypass embodiment differences. Young et al. (2020) have humans use a manipulator similar to the robot whilst collecting video demonstrations. These approaches help bypass LfV distribution shifts, but do not present a method that can scale to internet video data.

**Discussion.** These methods highlight the trade-off that must be made between: (i) imposing structure and inductive biases to improve performance in narrow settings, and (ii) opting for end-to-end learning methods that are more scalable, but are less effective in the small data regime and narrow settings. As the central focus of this survey is on scaling to diverse internet data, to tackle unstructured environments with generalist robots, we advocate for methods following the spirit of (ii). Through this lens, we regard some of the methods in this section to be less promising: we have commented on their limitations above.

Nevertheless, human and object-centric information is certainly relevant to robot manipulation. It remains to be seen how far these approaches can take us. Rather than explicitly using these representations downstream, a more flexible approach may be to use them to provide auxiliary learning objectives, or to inform automated language annotation efforts. Improving the quality of the off-the-shelf models that can label video with these representations may be a worthwhile direction.

## 5.2 Applications to RL Knowledge Modalities

This section presents our main analysis of the LfV-for-robotics literature. We taxonomise this literature according to the downstream RL knowledge modality (KM) that most directly benefits from the use of video data (see Figure 2.1). The KMs we consider here are: policies (Section 5.2.1), dynamics models (Section 5.2.2), reward functions (Section 5.2.3), and value functions (Section 5.2.4). For general information on these KMs, we refer the reader back to Section 2.1. Within each category, we aim to summarise the methods and findings in the literature, before concluding with a brief discussion of advantages, disadvantages, and future directions.




Figure 6: LfV applications to RL Knowledge Modalities (Section 5.2). We classify the LfV-for-robotics literature according to which Reinforcement Learning (RL) Knowledge Modality (KM) benefits from the use of video data, resulting in the taxonomy illustrated in the above figure.

### 5.2.1 POLICIES

Ultimately, the goal of LfV is to use video data to help obtain a policy  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$ . In this section, we detail literature where  $\pi$  is the RL KM that most directly benefits from the use of video data. We first identify and detail several distinct categories of methods (see Figure 7), before moving to a brief discussion.

**Method: Representation transfer.** Here, visual representations are first pretrained on video data using some learning objective. Subsequently, the representations are transferred – either frozen or to be finetuned – to aid downstream learning of a policy. Figure 7 visualizes this process.

A distinct branch of the literature uses representation transfer to aid imitation learning from offline robot data. A number of video-pretraining learning objectives have been explored here. This includes: frame-level objectives such as masked-autoencoding (MAE) (Radosavovic et al., 2022), contrastive learning (Chen et al., 2021; Jing et al., 2023), and others (Zhao et al., 2022); time-contrastive learning objectives (Ma et al., 2022, 2023; Nair et al., 2022); video prediction objectives (Wu et al., 2023a; He et al., 2024); TD learning (Bhateja et al., 2023); predicting affordances from videos (Bahl et al., 2023); and various objectives that leverage language labels, such as image-language contrastive learning (Ma et al., 2023), video-language alignment (Nair et al., 2022) and video captioning (Karamcheti et al., 2023). See Section 4.1 for more details on video self-supervised learning objectives. Often, works have combined multiple objectives (Nair et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2023; Karamcheti et al., 2023): e.g., pairing an objective that learns low-level spatial features (e.g., MAE) with one that learns higher-level semantic features (e.g., language captioning) (Karamcheti et al., 2023). Elsewhere, Schmidt and Jiang (2023) pretrain representations via the prediction of latent actions from video.

Representation transfer approaches benefit from using video that contains robot-relevant content (Jing et al., 2023). Nair et al. (2022), Ma et al. (2023), Karamcheti et al. (2023), Majumdar et al. (2023) leverage ego-centric human video (Grauman et al., 2021; Damen et al., 2018, 2022; Goyal et al., 2017) and/or navigation video (Zhou et al., 2018). Radosavovic et al. (2022) additionally leverage third-person video of humans interacting with objects (Shan et al., 2020; Miech et al., 2019). Other works have leveraged videos of robots (Dasari et al., 2023), or videos of humans operating robot-like grippers (Shafiullah et al., 2023). Combining multiple datasets to improve data diversity has proven beneficial (Majumdar et al., 2023; Dasari et al., 2023; Radosavovic et al., 2022).

There have been several large-scale analyses of representation transfer from video data, including ablating various pretraining design choices (Jing et al., 2023; Silwal et al., 2023), and how downstream performance is effected by distribution-shifts (Zhao et al., 2022; Burns et al., 2023), the robot task (Majumdar et al., 2023), and the choice of policy learning algorithm (Hu et al., 2023b). Majumdar et al. (2023) find that downstream finetuning of representations (versus keeping them frozen) can be beneficial when there is a large amount of finetuning data, but not in the few-shot setting. In the few-shot setting, the use of a self-supervised learning objective may improve finetuning performances (Ma et al., 2023).

**Method: Multi-modal models.** Here, we refer to methods that train a monolithic model jointly on video and robot data. Recent trends towards multi-modal any-to-any sequence models (Liu et al., 2024b), and towards the pooling of cross-robot embodiment data (Padalkar et al., 2023), suggest these monolithic methods may become increasingly popular and effective. However, these approaches are still in their nascent stages. Reed et al. (2022) trains a sequence model on multi-modal data, including image, text, and robot data, but do not use video data. Radosavovic et al. (2024) train a sequence model for locomotion on both action-labelled robot data and action-free pose trajectories extracted from YouTube videos. Sohn et al. (2024) is a 8 billion parameter any-to-any transformer trained on text, images, videos, and robot perceptions and actions, but experimental details are not published. These methods are promising due to their simplicity and scalability. They can scale well with increasing robot and video dataset sizes, and may obtain positive transfer between the different modalities of data.

**Method: Alternate-action policies  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$ .** In Section 5.1.1, we outlined different alternative action representations  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ , and how they can be obtained from video data, as seen in the LfV literature. Here we detail methods that use such representations to train an alternate-action policy  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  from video data. These methods tend to use supervised learning objectives. A pretrained  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  can be used for representation transfer, or to condition a decoder  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  (see the following paragraph) (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023).

*Single-step latent actions.* Edwards et al. (2018), Schmidt and Jiang (2023), Bruce et al. (2024) label expert video data with latent actions using a learned latent inverse dynamics model. This labelled video data is used to train a latent-action policy  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}|s)$  using behaviour cloning.

*Multi-step latent actions.* Wang et al. (2023a) learn a latent planner that takes in the current and goal image and outputs a ‘latent plan’. Pertsch et al. (2022) train two separate high-level policies from video data to give representations of the actions that should be taken in

future time-steps. In the literature, multi-step latent action representations are mostly used downstream for ‘video-as-instructions’ methods (see below). Using these representations to train a  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}|s)$  appears to be an underexplored direction.

*Language-actions.* Ajay et al. (2023) use a pretrained LLM to generate language actions that condition video predictions for a ‘video-as-policy’ method (see below). Elsewhere, to obtain language-policies, Yang et al. (2023c), Du et al. (2023b), Mu et al. (2023) supervise-finetune internet-pretrained VLMs or LLMs on language-labelled video data.

*Observations-as-action.* (1) *Next-observation-as-action policies:* Here, the  $\hat{a}$  proposed by  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}|s)$  is the next observation (or sequence of observations) the robot should observe. The observation may be in the form of an image, or an image representation. We detail relevant ‘video-as-policy’ methods that propose video sequences in a below paragraph (Du et al., 2023a). Via a video prediction objective, Thomas et al. (2023), He et al. (2024) learn planners that propose video sequences in embedding space. (2) *Sub-goal policies:* These methods train a policy that proposes a sub-goal image (or image representation). Black et al. (2023b) supervise finetune an image-editing diffusion model on video data to edit the current observation into a subgoal image. From action-free data, Park et al. (2024) learn a high-level policy that outputs image representations as subgoal.

*Visual motion information.* From demonstration videos labelled with 2D point trajectories, Wen et al. (2023) train a language-conditioned transformer (via a supervised objective) to output point trajectories that act as sub-goals for a low-level robot policy. Yuan et al. (2024) follow a similar scheme, but use 3D point trajectories.

*Human-embodiment information.* Given videos labelled with affordances or hand pose information (see Section 5.1.2), several works have trained a ‘policy’ to propose an affordance/pose given an image observation (Bahl et al., 2023; Shaw et al., 2022; Qin et al., 2022, 2021; Peng et al., 2018). Bharadhwaj et al. (2023) learn a planner that predicts future hand and object masks.

**Method: Alternative action decoders  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$ .** Here, we refer to methods that train a low-level robot policy  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s)$  – i.e., it must decode  $\hat{a}_t$  to  $a_t$ . There are two ways such a can be used downstream. (1) *Hierarchical conditioning via  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$ :* Given a  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  pretrained from video, here we can define our final compositional policy as  $\pi(a_t|\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t), s_t)$ . (2) *Video-as-instructions:* Here, video instructions (usually human demonstrations) can be embedded into a compressed representation  $\hat{a}_t$ , allowing the low-level policy to more easily learn to follow the instructions (Chane-Sane et al., 2023; Cai et al., 2023; Lifshitz et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023). Now, the decoding policy  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  can either be learned through data, or can be manually crafted.

*Learning the decoder:* The robot dataset can be labelled with alternative actions – obtaining tuples of the form  $(s_t, a_t, \hat{a}_t, s_{t+1})$  – and the decoder can be learned via supervised learning / behaviour cloning. This has been done with single-step latent actions (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Bruce et al., 2024), multi-step latent actions (Wang et al., 2023a), point-trajectory latent actions (Wen et al., 2023), and next-observation alternative actions (Du



et al., 2023a) (see ‘video-as-policy’ methods in the following paragraph) and sub-goal observation alternative actions (Black et al., 2023b). Elsewhere, Liu et al. (2022) learn the mapping  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  via a decoupled generative adversarial training scheme. Jain et al. (2024) learn a mapping from human demonstration videos to robot actions end-to-end, but require a dataset of human video demonstrations paired with equivalent robot trajectories. We note  $\pi(a_t|\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t), s_t)$  could be trained via online RL, either end-to-end, or with the pretrained  $\pi_{\text{alt}}$  kept frozen.

*Defining the decoder:* Other works obtain the mapping  $\pi(a_t|\hat{a}_t, s_t)$  without any learning from robot data. Ko et al. (2023) infer low-level robot actions from optical flow, Yuan et al. (2024) infer actions from 3D flow predictions, whilst Nasiriany et al. (2024) map from robot action to visual arrows and back. Other works have retargeted human-hand pose actions to robot poses (Qin et al., 2021; Sivakumar et al., 2022).

**Method: Policy-as-video.** These methods use video prediction models (pretrained on video data) as robot policies. Du et al. (2023a) introduce this paradigm, using (i) a language-conditioned video predictor to generate plausible video trajectories that complete a language-specified task, and (ii) an action-decoding IDM  $p^{-1}(a_t|s_t, s_{t+1})$  (trained on robot data) to extract actions from the generated video. Note, these video-as-policy methods fit into the *hierarchical conditioning via  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$*  scheme outlined above. Ajay et al. (2023) extend the approach in Du et al. (2023a) by firstly using LLMs to condition video predictions, and secondly by enforcing compositional consistency between the LLM plans, the video generations, and the IDM actions. Du et al. (2023b) improve the action decoding model by switching the IDM objective to a more flexible goal-conditioned behaviour-cloning objective. Due the computational costs of these policy-as-video methods, Ye et al. (2023) distill their behaviours into a simpler policy.

**Method: IDM pseudo-actions.** These methods train  $p^{-1}(a_t|s_t, s_{t+1})$ , an inverse dynamics model (IDM), on action-labelled robot data and use it to label video data with pseudo-actions. The pseudo-labelled video data can then be used to help train the policy  $\pi(a|s)$ . Baker et al. (2022) do so with Minecraft videos from Youtube. However, as mentioned in Section 5.1.1, naive IDM pseudo-action approaches are unlikely to scale to diverse internet videos.

**Results: Performance gains.** The methods in this section show promising signs of achieving the potential benefits of LfV (see Section 3.2). Compared to baselines learned only from robot data, results here have demonstrated: improved task-success rates (Radosavovic et al., 2022; Nair et al., 2022; Parisi et al., 2022), improved robot-data-efficiency during offline (Nair et al., 2022) and online (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Ye et al., 2023) learning, improved generalization beyond the robot dataset (Du et al., 2023a; Wang et al., 2023a; Black et al., 2023b; Thomas et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2022), and improved long-horizon performances (Ajay et al., 2023). However, many only do so using toy video datasets – for example, robot data stripped of action labels (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Wen et al., 2023; Ko et al., 2023; Thomas et al., 2023), or human videos in the same environment as the downstream robot (Wang et al., 2023a). When adding diverse human videos to pretraining, representation transfer approaches have thus far seen the biggest relative performance gains (Nair et al., 2022). Elsewhere, performance gains have been more modest (Wu et al., 2023a;




Figure 7: Learning policies from video (Section 5.2.1). (a) Representations are pretrained on video data and used downstream whilst training a policy on robot data. (b) A model is trained jointly on video and robot data and can predict robot actions. (c) A  $\pi_{alt}$  is trained on video data to output an action representation (see Section 5.1.1), which conditions an action-decoding  $\pi$  trained on robot data. (d) Policy-as-Video is a specific instantiation of this hierarchical setup where the action representation is a video and the decoder is (often) an inverse dynamics model (IDM).

Du et al., 2023a; Ajay et al., 2023; Shaw et al., 2022; Black et al., 2023b), possibly due to the small-scale of the video data (relative to internet-scale).

**Discussion.** We discuss the advantages and disadvantages of targeting the policy KM, before highlighting promising directions.

*Advantages and disadvantages.* Since our end-goal is to obtain a policy, this is one of the most promising RL KMs to target. However, obtaining a policy from internet video comes with some challenges. (1) Video lacks lower-level information a robot policy may require (e.g., action labels, forces, tactile info; see Section 3.3). Thus, additional robot data is often needed to help obtain the final policy (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Du et al., 2023a). This is in contrast to LfV reward functions (see Section 5.2.3), which can often perform well after being trained solely on video data (Sontakke et al., 2023; Escontrela et al., 2023). (2) Policies prefer expert data, but the behaviours in internet video may often be diverse and non-expert. This is in contrast to dynamics models, which can more easily consume mixed-quality data. Offline RL methods can learn policies from mixed quality data, but video lacks reward labels off-the-shelf and offline RL can be difficult in practice (Levine et al., 2020). Nevertheless, sequence modelling on large mixed-quality data, before finetuning on smaller expert data, has proven highly effective in other domains (Achiam et al., 2023) and may be suitable for learning policies from video.

*Promising and scalable directions.* ‘Representation transfer’ and ‘Multi-modal models’ both appear to be promising and scalable to internet video. Jointly pretraining multi-modal foundation models on both video and robot data (in addition to other modalities, such as text) is a direction ripe for further research. Meanwhile, there are several neglected but promising directions for representation transfer approaches. This includes: using pretrained encoders that jointly represent spatio-temporal information (versus embedding images individually); using control-centric representation learning objectives (e.g., TD learning, predicting alternative actions, video prediction); and scaling up these approaches by using representations from video foundation models (see Section 4) or training on larger internet-scraped video datasets (see Section 6.3).

Methods that leverage alternative action representations  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  will be limited by the scalability of their  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ , as discussed in more detail in Section 5.1.1. Policy-as-video approaches will scale well with increased video dataset sizes and advances in video prediction foundation models. However, their scalability could be limited by their current reliance on language labels for language-conditioning. Improved techniques for captioning video data (see Section 6.2) will be beneficial here, and more generally: versus offline RL, combining conditioning information with supervised learning can simplify the training of policies from non-expert data (Emmons et al., 2021). Nevertheless, training a  $\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t)$  from video via offline RL is an underexplored direction. Latent action approaches (Schmidt & Jiang, 2023) can learn from entirely unlabelled data but further research is required to scale them to large, realistic internet video. An interesting question is whether  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ ’s are best utilised in a monolithic model setup (e.g., for pretraining representations, or to be used by any-to-any sequence models), or in a hierarchical setup where the policy is defined as  $\pi(a_t|\pi_{\text{alt}}(\hat{a}_t|s_t), s_t)$ . In hierarchical setups, we should explore the extent to which either  $\pi_{\text{alt}}$  or  $\pi$  is the performance bottleneck.

### 5.2.2 DYNAMICS MODELS

Video prediction models  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t)$  capture temporal dynamics information – information about the dynamics and physics of the world. This information and their functionality is highly relevant to robot dynamics models  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ . A line of LfV research has sought to use video prediction objectives on video datasets to aid the learning of a robot dynamics models. This can involve pretraining  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t)$  on  $D_{\text{video}}$  and adapting it into  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$  using  $D_{\text{robot}}$ . Alternatively, it could involve jointly pretraining on  $D_{\text{video}}$  and  $D_{\text{robot}}$ .

It is worth noting that a standard video prediction model may have several deficiencies when it comes to employing it as a dynamics model. These relate to:

1. *Action-conditioning*: A standard dynamics model  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$  should be conditioned on low-level robot actions  $a_t$ .
2. *Missing low-level information*: A robot dynamics model may need to account for low-level information not contained in video (e.g., proprioceptive forces and tactile info) to make accurate predictions.
3. *Distribution shifts*: Due to distribution shifts, a pretrained video predictor may not transfer well zero-shot from its video dataset to the robot domain.

Much of the research in this section investigates mechanisms to address these issues. We begin by detailing the various video prediction pretraining schemes seen in the LfV literature, before outlining how the pretrained models can be adapted and utilized for downstream robotic settings.

**Pretraining: Architectures and Datasets.** Here, we outline the model architecture and dataset combinations used to pretrain video prediction models in the LfV literature. For more details on video prediction models in general, see Section 4.2.

Some LfV works simply use toy simulated video datasets (Seo et al., 2022a), or small-scale custom human videos (Schmeckpeper et al., 2019). However, others have scaled to larger internet video datasets (Yang et al., 2023c; Bruce et al., 2024).

Video diffusion architectures have recently been scaled to increasingly large human video datasets (Yang et al., 2023c; Du et al., 2023a, 2023b). UniSim (Yang et al., 2023c) train a 5.7B parameter model on a combination of human and robot video datasets. This includes the use of 13M internet videos, and 800M internet text-image pairs.

Autoregressive transformer architectures have also been employed (Hu et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023a; Bruce et al., 2024). Bruce et al. (2024) introduce a spatial-temporal transformer (Xu et al., 2020) tokenizer to incorporate temporal dynamics into embeddings, and predict next frames autoregressively using MaskGit (Chang et al., 2022). They train an 11B parameter foundation model on 200,000 hours of publicly available internet gaming video, and scale well with additional computational resources. In the domain of self-driving, Hu et al. (2023) train an auto-regressive transformer on 4,700 hours of proprietary driving video, also scaling well with increased compute and model size.

Other LfV works (Seo et al., 2022a; Mendonca et al., 2023) base their video predictor on the recurrent state-space model of Dreamer (Hafner et al., 2023), a state-of-the-art model-based RL architecture. Wu et al. (2023b) adopt a specialized version of the architecture that

separates modelling of context information and dynamics information, serving to mitigate underfitting when training on human videos.

**Pretraining: Action-conditioning.** In pretraining, the action-conditioning problem mentioned above can be mitigated by either: (1) pretraining jointly on both video and robot data (Yang et al., 2023c; Sohn et al., 2024), or (2) pretraining an alternative-action-conditioned video predictor  $p_{\text{alt}}(s_{t+1}|s_t, \hat{a}_t)$  (Yang et al., 2023c; Bruce et al., 2024): conditioning on an  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  allows for more control over video generations, and often be a mapping can be obtained from  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to the robot action space (Rybkin et al., 2018; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023). We now outline the different action conditioning schemes seen in the LfV literature.

*Language-as-action.* A popular choice is to train text-conditioned video predictors (Yang et al., 2023c; Du et al., 2023b). Note, language-actions are generally temporally extended – i.e., a single language ‘action’ may result in multiple timesteps of generated video.

*Single-step latent actions.* Video predictors have been trained to be conditioned on learned single-step latent actions (Rybkin et al., 2018; Bruce et al., 2024), allowing predictions to be conditioned at each time-step.

*Observations-as-action.* The video predictor could be conditioned on a goal image, encouraging generation of a video that connects the current observation to the goal image (Du et al., 2023a).

*Conditioning on multiple action-types.* UniSim (Yang et al., 2023c) train a large-scale video diffusion model on video and robot data to be conditioned on several different action-spaces. The model can be conditioned on robot actions (obtained from robot data), language actions (obtained from language-labelled videos and images), and camera motion actions. Note, the robot action-conditioning is only meaningful when applied to robot video.

*Other.* Mendonca et al. (2023) pretrain a video predictor to be conditioned on future grasp location and post-grasp waypoint affordance information. Yuan et al. (2021), Wang et al. (2023b) use motion information for conditioning. As touched on above, Yang et al. (2023c) can condition generations on camera motion and camera pose information. Any of the other  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ ’s mentioned in Section 5.1.1 may also be valid.

**Downstream: Adapting the video predictor.** A pretrained video predictor may require adaptation before it can be used as a dynamics model. An obvious approach is to finetune it on robot data (Du et al., 2023a; Ajay et al., 2023), though we note there are currently few works that finetune an action-free video predictor  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t)$  into an action-conditioned dynamics model  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ . Mendonca et al. (2023) pretrain on video with affordance-based conditioning, and add optional robot-action-conditioning during finetuning to create a hybrid action space. Seo et al. (2022a) find naive finetuning on robot data to result in the erasure of pretraining knowledge, and instead ‘stack’ a new action-conditioned model on top of the pretrained model. In related work, Yang et al. (2023b) demonstrate that the score function of a large pretrained video diffusion model can guide the generations of a smaller task-specific video model.

Note, where applicable, adaptation can involve obtaining a mapping from the  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  used in pretraining to the robot action space. Rybkin et al. (2018) perform MPC using latent

action-conditioning and learn a mapping from  $\hat{a}$  to  $a$  to execute these plans. Section 5.2.1 elaborates on methods that map from  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Downstream: Using the dynamics model.** Once the dynamics model has been obtained with the help of video data, it has been used in several ways in the LfV literature.

- *As a simulator:*  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$  can be used to generate synthetic data. UniSim (Yang et al., 2023c) do so to train a policy with RL using synthetic rollouts, and with behaviour cloning via hindsight relabelling of synthetic trajectories. Genie (Bruce et al., 2024) present their dynamics model as one that can generate unlimited simulated data for open-ended learning.
- *As a differentiable simulator:* Seo et al. (2022a), Wu et al. (2023b) backpropagate through model-generated rollouts as part the Dreamer (Hafner et al., 2023) model-based RL algorithm.
- *For planning:* Several LfV works use the dynamics model for standard MPC (Rybkin et al., 2018; Mendonca et al., 2023). Du et al. (2023b) use language actions to condition video generations and perform a tree-search to choose suitable video-based plans.

These use-cases often require evaluation of the model-generated trajectories: i.e., reward or return estimates are required. Some works learn these estimates via a downstream finetuning stage, making use of reward-labelled robot data (Seo et al., 2022a). Mendonca et al. (2023), Rybkin et al. (2018) use representational similarity between the current observation and a goal image to obtain a reward signal. Yang et al. (2023c) pretrain a model from scratch to predict the number of steps till task completion in a video, whilst Du et al. (2023b) similarly finetune a VLM. Other methods for learning reward functions (see Section 5.2.3) or value functions (see Section 5.2.4) from video may be applicable here.

**Downstream: Performance Gains.** There is evidence in the literature that video data can boost the performance of model-based RL approaches. Seo et al. (2022a) demonstrate improved robot data-efficiency, but use a toy video dataset. (Bruce et al., 2024) show their video-game foundation model to exhibit initial signs of impressive generalization. When pretraining with large human video datasets, several works have demonstrated moderate performance gains (Mendonca et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023b). Here, Yang et al. (2023c), Du et al. (2023b) demonstrate that large-scale pretrained video diffusion models can be particularly useful in long-horizon tasks.

**Discussion.** Recent breakthroughs in video generation (Brooks et al., 2024), combined with recent progress in the LfV literature (Yang et al., 2023c; Bruce et al., 2024), render using video data to help learn dynamics models an attractive direction. We now briefly touch on related discussion points.

*Advantages and Disadvantages.* Video data can be very useful for obtaining a robot dynamics model and dynamics models are very useful for obtaining robot policies. Moreover, video prediction/dynamics models can learn from diverse, mixed-quality data without much issue, and thus can scale well to internet video. Thus, targeting the dynamics model KM

is a highly promising LfV direction. However, there are several challenges here. First, like policies, dynamics models often require low-level information unavailable in video. Second, foundational video prediction models are currently prone to hallucinations (Brooks et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024). Similarly, the video predictor may not fully understand what the robot can or cannot control in the environment, leading to video generations where uncontrollable elements behave in an unrealistically favourable manner (Yang et al., 2022).

*Scaling and Foundation Models.* An obvious route to improved performances here is to continue to scale our dataset and model sizes (Bruce et al., 2024; Hu et al., 2023). For datasets, this can be achieved by leveraging internet video. Advances in foundational video prediction models will be relevant here (see Section 4.2), and corresponding issues such as hallucination should be tackled. Here we advocate for more open-sourcing of state-of-the-art models to allow access to LfV researchers. Additionally, foundational video prediction model training pipelines can be customized for LfV purposes (Yang et al., 2023c; Sohn et al., 2024). This could involve experimenting with scalable alternative action conditioning techniques (Bruce et al. (2024) present a promising option here), or incorporating 3D information into the model (Zhen et al., 2024; Peri et al., 2024).

*Other promising directions.* (1) Improved mechanisms for efficiently adapting a video predictor into a dynamics model should be investigated. (2) Hierarchy in world models has often been advocated for (LeCun, 2022). A hierarchy where higher levels are learned from video data and the lower-levels are learned from robot data may be suitable. (3) Approaches that learn dynamics models from video are particularly promising for autonomous driving applications, due to the existence of large driving video datasets (Hu et al., 2023; Caesar et al., 2019). (4) An interesting but underexplored direction is to combine standard analytic simulation (Todorov et al., 2012; Makoviychuk et al., 2021) with video prediction simulation (Yang et al., 2023c) to obtain the benefits of both. (5) Using foundational video predictors to generate synthetic data is an interesting direction. This can include generating synthetic video rollouts, or augmenting existing data using video editing capabilities (Yu et al., 2023a).

### 5.2.3 REWARD FUNCTIONS

The reward function is an essential component of an RL algorithm. However, manual reward design is difficult to scale to real-world generalist robot settings for several reasons. First, in the real world, complex sensing systems may be required to track reward-relevant information. Second, reward shaping can be tricky, even for seemingly simple behaviours (Popov et al., 2017; OpenAI, 2020). LfV research has sought to tackle this issue by extracting visual reward functions from video data. In this section, we detail any method that uses video data to help relabel transition tuples  $(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$  to  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$ , thus allowing the tuples to be used for online or offline RL.

**Extracting reward functions from video.** We now describe the main clusters of methods for extracting and constructing reward functions from video data.

- **Video-language model rewards.** These methods specify the task via language and use a video-language model (VidLM) to provide a reward signal. These methods are

promising as language is a simple and intuitive way to specify a task, and foundational VidLMs are likely to improve into the future. More details on foundational VidLMs can be found in Section 4. We identify two categories of methods here.

(1) *Video-text similarity*: A dual encoder video-language model can be trained to embed videos and language into the same representation-space (Xu et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2024). From such a model, a reward can be defined as the similarity (in embedding space) between a language task-description and a video of the robot’s behaviour. Fan et al. (2022), Ding et al. (2023b) do so in MineCraft, leveraging internet videos to train the dual-encoder. Sontakke et al. (2023) pretrain the dual-encoder on a human video dataset to provide rewards for simulated robot manipulation tasks. Baumli et al. (2023) study dual-encoder image-text rewards in detail.

(2) *Visual question answering*: A video-to-text model (see Section 4.3) can provide rewards via visual question answering (VQA). For example, it can be passed a video of the robots attempt and asked to classify whether the task has been completed. A denser reward could be achieved by asking the model to score the robots progress, or by using the model to provide feedback within an ‘RL-AI-F’ framework (Klissarov et al., 2023). VQA rewards have been used with images as input (Du et al., 2023c), whilst Yang et al. (2023a) use video data to finetune an image-based VQA success checker. Liu et al. (2024) employ video-based VQA rewards, but, overall, the limited capabilities of current video-to-text models has hindered progress here.

- **Video-predictors as reward functions.** A video prediction model  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t)$  can be converted into a reward function (Zhu et al., 2023; Escontrela et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023b). These methods define a reward based on the likelihood of the robot video under the video predictor, implicitly encouraging the robot to match the behaviour distribution of the video data. For example, Escontrela et al. (2023) define the reward as the probability of the achieved  $s_{t+1}$  according to an autoregressive transformer  $p(s_{t+1}|s_t)$ . Thus far, works in this space have used toy and expert video data. However, language-conditioned video prediction may allow these approaches to scale to diverse, non-expert internet video (Escontrela et al., 2023). Overall, these methods are promising as they will improve with advances in foundational video prediction models (Brooks et al., 2024).
- **Representational similarity to a reference.** Here, we refer to methods that define the reward as the similarity between the robot’s observation and a reference observation (i.e., a goal image or demonstration video). These methods require the use of a visual representation that allows for meaningful similarity comparisons. We outline two distinct approaches here.

(1) *Standard deep representations*: Representational similarity between the current observation and a goal image can define the reward. This has been done using representations learned from video data (see Section 4.1). Some representation spaces can be more effective than others. A principled approach is to use representations obtained via time-contrastive objectives (Ma et al., 2022) or quasimetric functions (Wang et al., 2023), which give implicit measurements of the temporal distance be-



tween two images. Hu et al. (2023b) find that many standard deep representations can be effective, though masked autoencoding-based representations perform poorly.

(2) *Representations that address LfV distribution shifts*: When comparing robot videos to reference human videos, distribution-shifts (such as embodiment differences) can prevent meaningful comparison. Here, we detail methods that use representations designed to explicitly ignore such distributions shifts when defining their reward. We give more details on these representations in Section 5.1.2, where we note limitations to their scalability. Mechanisms to overcome the LfV embodiment gap whilst providing rewards have included: embodiment-invariant representations learned via a temporal-cycle consistency loss (Zakka et al., 2021), object-centric and/or graphical representations (Kumar et al., 2022; Sieb et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2020), and re-targeting human hand poses to the robot embodiment (Mandikal & Grauman, 2022; Qin et al., 2021). Elsewhere, Sermanet et al. (2018), Aytar et al. (2018) compare the similarity between the robot and a reference video using viewpoint invariant representations. Related research encourages the robot to match human behavioural priors using embodiment-agnostic affordances (Bahl et al., 2023), or factorized representations (Chang et al., 2023; Shang & Ryoo, 2021).

- **Potential-based shaping with value functions.** A value function  $V(s_t)$  pretrained from video can provide a dense reward via ‘potential-based shaping’, as follows:  $r_t = V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t)$ . In the LfV literature, such rewards have been defined using value functions pretrained on video data via TD learning (Chang et al., 2022), or time-contrastive learning (Ma et al., 2022). We refer the reader to Section 5.2.4 for details on how to train value functions from video data.
- **Generative adversarial imitation.** In LfV, generative adversarial imitation learning (Ho & Ermon, 2016) has been used to encourage the robot to match the behaviour distribution of a video dataset during online learning (Torabi et al., 2018b). This has often required the use of representations that explicitly ignore LfV distribution shifts (Stadie et al., 2017; Qin et al., 2021).
- **Other methods.** A task classifier can be trained on task-labelled video data to provide downstream rewards (Chen et al., 2021; Shao et al., 2020). Several methods use the number of steps-to-completion in the video as a proxy label to train a video reward model (Yang et al., 2023c; Edwards & Isbell, 2019). Others encourage similarity to a video-obtained behavioural prior: such as a video-pretrained policy (Ye et al., 2023), or a human affordance distribution (Bahl et al., 2023).

**Downstream Usage: Mechanisms of transfer.** A simple way to use an LfV-obtained reward function is zero-shot as the task reward (Escontrela et al., 2023). Some works further finetune the reward function on in-domain robot data to improve its accuracy (Sontakke et al., 2023). Other works use the LfV reward as an exploration or shaping bonus, in addition to a sparse task reward (Ye et al., 2023; Chang et al., 2022). Adeniji et al. (2023) pretrain the policy using the LfV reward, before finetuning the policy on a manually defined task reward. Though the literature mainly explores using LfV rewards for online RL, it is worth noting these methods could also provide reward labels for an offline RL dataset.

**Discussion.** We first discuss the advantages and disadvantages of learning reward functions from videos, before discussing promising directions.

*Advantages.* Learning reward functions purely from video data may be more feasible than other RL KMs. This is for two reasons. (1) Reward functions can function well whilst taking only visual information as input. Policies or dynamics models may need access to non-visual information, but LfV reward functions can be used zero-shot after video-only pretraining (Escontrela et al., 2023). (2) Evaluation is often easier than generation. The task of an ‘evaluating’ reward function may be easier to learn from passive video data than that of a ‘generating’ policy or dynamics model.

*Disadvantages.* If only a reward function is extracted from the video data, we may still require prohibitive quantities of additional robot data to learn a generalist robot policy. This is in contrast to other KMs (i.e., policies and dynamics models) which may better reduce demands on the robot data and better aid generalization beyond the robot data.

*Promising directions.* (1) The most promising approaches for learning reward functions from video are likely those that can leverage pretrained video foundation models. ‘Video-language model rewards’ and ‘Video-predictors as reward functions’ will continue to improve with progress in video foundation models. (2) One promising avenue is to combine LfV reward functions with other LfV KMs. For example, finetuning an LfV policy via online RL and LfV rewards. (3) An underexplored direction is to use LfV rewards to augment reward labels in offline RL data. (4) Video-language reward functions may prove useful for detecting safety-related metrics when deploying robots in the real world (Guan et al., 2024). (5) Many LfV reward functions are differentiable, making them suitable for use in certain model-based RL algorithms (Hafner et al., 2023; JyothirS et al., 2023). (6) Shaped reward functions can be extracted from video-to-text models via RL from AI feedback (RL-AI-F) methods (Klissarov et al., 2023).

#### 5.2.4 VALUE FUNCTIONS

Value functions (see Section 2.1) are an essential component of most deep RL algorithms (Schulman et al., 2017; Haarnoja et al., 2018). A small but distinct line of LfV research pretrains models that closely resemble value functions from video data. We note these pretrained models are often not used as a value function downstream, but rather have been used, for example, to provide representations or rewards. As such, many of these methods have been touched on in previous sections. Nevertheless, it is useful to detail methods that pretrain value functions from video in a self-contained subsection. We do so here.

**Pretraining: TD learning.** The temporal-difference (TD) learning objective is commonly used to learn value functions in RL (Sutton & Barto, 2018). Versus TD learning on robot data, video data poses additional challenges due to its missing labels. Namely, video is missing important action, reward, and goal labels.

*Missing action labels.* Missing action labels in video is an issue if we wish to obtain a state-action value function  $V(s_t, a_t)$ , which can be more useful than a state value function  $V(s_t)$  (Sutton & Barto, 2018). Solutions here often leverage some form of alternative

action representation (see Section 5.1.1). Bhateja et al. (2023), Ghosh et al. (2023) pretrain a value function from video that is conditioned on sub-goal alternative actions. During update steps, the sub-goals are observations sampled from a future timestep in the video. Edwards et al. (2020) similarly use a ‘next-observation-as-action’ approach, learning a Q-function conditioned on  $s_{t+1}$ , and employing a cycle-consistency objective to ensure the corresponding policy proposes physically plausible next-observation actions. Chang et al. (2022) use a learned single-step latent action to condition the Q-function. Chang et al. (2020) use an IDM pseudo-action labelling approach to label navigation video data with actions before TD-learning.

*Missing reward and goal labels.* TD learning requires reward information. Meanwhile, a generalist robot should be able to perform many tasks, and so its corresponding value function should be task/goal-conditionable. To obtain reward labels for TD learning, Bhateja et al. (2023), Ghosh et al. (2023), Park et al. (2024) use hindsight goal relabelling. From this goal label, a sparse reward is defined as  $r = (s == g)$  (where  $s$  is the current observation and  $g$  is the goal observation). In a semantic visual navigation setting, Chang et al. (2020) leverage object labels and off-the-shelf object detectors to provide goal and reward labels in video data. Other works assume a single task setting (Edwards et al., 2020), or assume access to reward labels in the video data (Edwards et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2022). Note, these are not scalable assumptions. We note that the LfV reward functions from Section 5.2.3 could be applicable here. Additionally, video-to-text models (see Section 4.3) could provide goal labels in textual form.

**Pretraining: Time-contrastive learning.** Time contrastive objectives can be used to learn implicit value functions from video (Ma et al., 2022). Importantly, these objectives do not require action labels for video pretraining. The objective induces a temporally smooth representation, and a value function can be defined by measuring the distance between the current observation and a goal image in the representation space. Quasimetric functions (Wang et al., 2023) and temporal cycle-consistency objectives (Zakka et al., 2021) have been used to learn similar representations. Note, the requirement for goal images is a limitation of these approaches.

**Pretraining: Others.** Edwards and Isbell (2019) use the number of timesteps remaining in video as heuristic value labels, and regress a value function to these labels. However, this approach assumes expert behaviour in the video. Du et al. (2023b) take a similar approach, finetuning a VLM to give heuristic value estimates. Liu et al. (2023b) use critical state identification to aid value prediction, but this assumes access to reward labels in the video data.

**Downstream Usage.** We now briefly outline how video pretrained value functions have been used in the downstream robot domain in the literature.

*As a value function.* The pretrained value function can be directly used downstream if: (i) it is an action-conditioned  $V(s_t, a_t)$  (Chang et al., 2020); (ii) it is an alternative action-conditioned  $V_{\text{alt}}(s_t, \hat{a}_t)$  and a mapping from  $\hat{a}$  to  $a$  can be obtained; or (iii) a dynamics model is available, allowing for planning with a unconditioned  $V(s_t)$  (Du et al., 2023b; Chang et al., 2022).

*Representation transfer.* After video pretraining, the value function may require finetuning on robot data: either to improve in-domain performances, or to allow for robot action-conditioning. Bhateja et al. (2023) initialise their downstream value function and policy representations from a video-pretrained value function.

*Potential-based reward shaping.* A reward function can be defined as:  $r = V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t)$ , and be used for downstream online RL (Edwards & Isbell, 2019; Ye et al., 2023; Chang et al., 2022). It may be desirable to do this if: (i) the pretrained value function is not fully reliable, but can provide useful auxiliary rewards to guide exploration; or (ii) the value function is not action-conditioned, so is not usable for Q-learning.

*TD bootstrapping.* If the pretrained value function is not action-conditioned it can still be used to accelerate downstream TD learning by using its estimates for the bootstrap term in the bellman backup (Edwards & Isbell, 2019).

**Discussion.** Research into learning value functions from video has been relatively scarce. Moreover, many of the methods in this section do not actually use the pretrained model as a value function downstream. These are perhaps due to notable challenges that come with learning value functions from videos. First, as noted above, there are issues related to missing action, reward, and goal labels in video. Second, value functions estimate returns under a particular policy, but the behaviour in video data is highly multi-modal. Third, TD learning from videos may run into common issues seen in the offline RL literature (Levine et al., 2020), such as overestimating the returns of out-of-distribution actions. An interesting future direction here is to use corresponding solutions from the offline RL literature (Kumar et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021). We also note that many of the works in this section employ toy video datasets or toy robot settings (Edwards et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2022). Nevertheless, Bhateja et al. (2023) have shown that TD learning from large-scale human video is a promising direction for real-world robotics.

## 6. Datasets

Previously, we have discussed methods for training video foundation models (see Section 4) and methods for utilising video data for robot learning (see Section 5.2). We now turn our attention to the video datasets themselves. In this section (see Figure 8), we will discuss the desired properties of video datasets (Section 6.1), summarise methods for curating video data (Section 6.2), and review existing datasets and their limitations (Section 6.3).

### 6.1 Desiderata

We now discuss the properties and characteristics desired from our LfV video datasets (under the lens of our intention to use them to help obtain generalist robots).

**Scale and Diversity.** Crucially, the dataset should be large in scale and high in diversity. Scale can be measured in terms of total video duration. Diversity refers to variety in the content of the data. Increased scale and diversity of training data can reliably improve deep learning performances and generalization (Brown et al., 2020). LfV is promising precisely due to the massive scale and diversity of the video data available on the internet.




Figure 8: LfV Datasets (Section 6). The log-scale plot at the bottom compares the sizes of the largest curated open-source datasets in three different categories. InternVid (Wang et al., 2023b), Ego4D (Grauman et al., 2021), and Open X-Embodiment (Padalkar et al., 2023) are the largest internet-scraped video, custom-recorded video, and robot datasets, respectively (to the best of our knowledge). Internet video is more abundantly available than robot data by several orders of magnitude. We estimated the hours in the Open X-Embodiment dataset by assuming the average trajectory length is 10 seconds (at the time of writing, the dataset contained  $\sim 2$  million trajectories). The number of hours of video on YouTube is a rough calculation (Sjöberg, 2023).

**Content Relevance.** It is also crucial for the content of the video data to be relevant to the downstream robotic setting. I.e., the video data should encapsulate information useful to the robot. This includes information regarding the dynamics of the world and how embodied agents can complete physical tasks. Crucially, the video data should have good coverage over the tasks and environments the generalist robot is likely to encounter upon deployment.

**Language Annotations.** Language annotations are textual descriptions (‘captions’) associated with segments of videos (‘clips’). Such annotations can be very useful: First, language conditioning is a powerful method for eliciting specific behaviours from generative models (Betker et al., 2023; Brooks et al., 2024). Second, language-labels can aid the learning of abstract, semantic representations of video (Zhao et al., 2024); video data is high-dimensional and noisy, making it difficult to learn such representations from scratch.

Our desiderata for language annotations are as follows. First, annotations should be *accurate* and well-*aligned* with the events in the video. Second, we desire descriptions of *varied granularity*. For robotics, we are particularly interested in low-level descriptions, such as detailed descriptions of actions, spatial information, and object relations. Meanwhile, higher-level descriptions can be useful for learning more abstracted representations. Third, additional forms of diversity in the language annotations may also be useful, such as syntactic diversity (Bansal et al., 2023).

**Other Desiderata.** We briefly note some less important desiderata not covered above. (1) *Continuity* within a clip (i.e., an absence of sharp scene transitions) can be important; many LfV methods assume this property (Bruce et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2023c). (2) *High-resolution* video can be beneficial for learning finer-grained understandings. (3) Video *length* can be important: training on longer clips may benefit long-horizon representations useful for multi-stage tasks. (4) Finally, video can be paired with other useful information besides language annotations. Object bounding boxes, segmentations, or human-pose estimates may aid representation learning efforts (Bahl et al., 2023), or inform automated language captioning (Blank et al., 2024). Other modalities such as audio or depth/3D information (Grauman et al., 2021) can provide additional information beyond what is contained in the RGB pixels.

## 6.2 Curating Video Data

Here, we give concrete details on techniques from the literature for curating video datasets. We discuss techniques for scraping video from the internet, techniques for recording custom video, and techniques for (manually and automatically) annotating video.

**Scraping Video from the Internet.** Diverse, large-scale video datasets can be obtained from internet repositories of pre-existing video data. Techniques here focus on ensuring only relevant and high-quality videos are scraped from these repositories. A typical pipeline for scraping internet video involves: (i) formulating a pool of query prompts used to search the repository (e.g., YouTube) for candidate videos; (ii) post-processing the pool of candidate videos; and (iii) optionally re-annotating the videos to improve the quality of labels. In the bullets below, we describe methods for constructing the query pool and filtering the initial pool of candidate videos.

- *Select internet repository.* YouTube is a popular choice due to the scale and diversity of its videos (Wang et al., 2023b; Xue et al., 2022; Zellers et al., 2021; Baker et al., 2022). Video repositories generally provide an API that can be used to search for and download video.
- *Obtain raw videos: Query Formulation.* A diverse pool of relevant query strings (e.g., “A person cleaning the dishes”) must be constructed to search the repository. To help construct the query pool, past works have: obtained lists of relevant behaviours from surveys of human time-use (Grauman et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023b); generated prompts based on desired nouns and verbs (Goyal et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2023b); crowd-sourced prompts from human workers (Sermanet et al., 2023; Goyal et al., 2017); leveraged listed activities from WikiHow (Miech et al., 2019); and used LLMs

to parse action prompts from text corpora (Wang et al., 2023b). Once the pool is constructed, a sanity check can be performed by visualising the resulting candidate videos across broad ‘categories’ (Nagrani et al., 2022; Miech et al., 2019; Goyal et al., 2017). With the query pool finalized, an initial raw video dataset can be obtained by collating the top  $k$  search results for each query (Miech et al., 2019).

- *Post-process: Split into clips.* It may be beneficial to post-process videos into clips which contain no ‘cuts’ between scenes. Blattmann et al. (2023a) do so using an off-the-shelf cut-detection model.
- *Post-process: Filter via metadata.* Internet videos naturally come paired with rich metadata. Approaches to identify and remove low-quality video based on this metadata include: filtering for popular and reputable publishers (Xue et al., 2022); filtering out videos with low view counts (Miech et al., 2019; Nagrani et al., 2022), low resolution (Xue et al., 2022), and too few captions (Miech et al., 2019; Xue et al., 2022); and filtering out older videos (Nagrani et al., 2022).
- *Post-process: Filter via automated metrics.* Optical flow can be used to filter out static scenes (Blattmann et al., 2023a). Image-language model embeddings (Radford et al., 2021) can measure the alignment between a video and its caption and provide an ‘aesthetic score’ (Schuhmann et al., 2022) used to filter out ‘uninteresting’ or lower-quality videos (Blattmann et al., 2023a). Shan et al. (2020) obtain a metric for video ‘realism’ via a pretrained neural network.

**Recording New Video.** Manually recording custom videos can be an effective (but expensive) means of collecting video relevant to specific robot tasks (Sermanet et al., 2023; Grauman et al., 2023) or embodiments (Sermanet et al., 2023; Shafiq et al., 2023).

- *Participant recruitment.* To record large-scale custom video data, past works have recruited participants through online crowd-sourcing platforms (Goyal et al., 2017), or locally via the institutions collecting the data (Grauman et al., 2021). Diversity in the recruited participants and their geographical locations is important to ensure diversity in the recorded video content. Existing work has surveyed potential participants to ensure a diverse mix of professions, hobbies, ages, genders, and nationalities (Damen et al., 2018; Grauman et al., 2021).
- *Unscripted data collection.* A simple approach to recording new videos is to ask participants to record their daily lives (Damen et al., 2018; Grauman et al., 2021). This process will naturally cover many relevant human activities.
- *Scripted data collection.* Video collection can otherwise be scripted, by providing text instructions to the participant. These instructions could be short-horizon (Goyal et al., 2017), or long-horizon and involving multiple subgoals (Sermanet et al., 2023). Scripted collection allows for more control over what behaviours are represented in the dataset, and can be used to collect rarer behaviours, such as skillful behaviours (Grauman et al., 2023). Scripted methods rely on constructing a relevant and diverse pool of instructions: techniques for formulating internet search queries, as outlined in the previous paragraph, are relevant here.

- *Other considerations.* (1) Video can be recorded from a first-person or third-person viewpoint. First-person video is less common on the internet, and can be particularly relevant to robotics. Thus, recording custom first-person videos may be particularly beneficial. (2) Diversity in the dataset can be improved via the use of a range of different commercial-grade cameras (Grauman et al., 2021). (3) For downstream robotics, it can be beneficial to use different embodiments whilst recording first-person videos. Sermanet et al. (2023) mix a diversity of embodiments, including human arms, human-controlled manual grippers, and robot arms. Shafiullah et al. (2023) use a low-cost human-controlled gripper that closely resembles the embodiment of the downstream robot.

**Manual Captioning.** The benefits language captions (i.e., textual descriptions of videos) can provide are outlined in Section 6.1. We now describe manual techniques for captioning video data. These may be performed by third-party workers or (where applicable) the person recording the video.

- *Instructing human annotators.* In the simplest scheme, human annotators are instructed to describe the contents of the video. Here, more specific instructions (potentially in the form of examples or a tutorial) can enhance annotation quality and avoid issues with variability in style and quality between annotators (Blattmann et al., 2023a; Damen et al., 2018). Elsewhere, Grauman et al. (2023) have third-party annotators provide expert commentaries, giving details on ‘how’ the activity is executed. They additionally prompt the participants recording the video to explain their thought processes whilst performing actions. After initial annotation is performed, Maaz et al. (2023) prompt workers to augmenting the descriptiveness of video captions.
- *Spoken vs. typed annotations.* Compared to typed annotations, Damen et al. (2018) find spoken annotations to result in higher quantity and quality of captions. Damen et al. (2022) improve the quality of retrospective spoken annotations by allowing participants to pause the video while annotating.
- *Annotating manually recorded video.* In the case of manually-recorded videos, annotations can be provided online (i.e., a narration by the person recording the video) (Grauman et al., 2023) or offline (i.e., retrospectively by a third-party annotator) (Grauman et al., 2021; Damen et al., 2018). Online annotations may be more cost effective. However, offline annotations may be more accurate and detailed. It is also possible to combine both approaches (Grauman et al., 2023).

**Automated Captioning.** Manual human annotations are expensive (Grauman et al., 2021). Thus, for larger-scale datasets, automated annotation pipelines are promising. Below, we describe various methods for automatically obtaining information about a videos content. Note, automated annotations may be noisier and less accurate than manual annotations.

- *Automatic speech recognition (ASR), metadata, and others.* A common strategy is to use ASR to convert speech in the video’s audio into text (Miech et al., 2019; Xue et al., 2022; Zellers et al., 2021). However, raw ASR captions can be noisy



and often unrelated to the contents of the video. Another source of information is corresponding metadata, such as descriptions, tags, and titles (Wang et al., 2023b). Elsewhere, Nagrani et al. (2022) obtain video captions by starting with a dataset of high-quality image-caption pairs, then mining video clips with similar frames and transferring the captions to those clips (‘Transfer’ in Table 1). Finally, captions can be obtained from the alt-text HTML attribute associated with web images and videos (Bain et al., 2021) (‘Alt-text’ in Table 1).

- *Off-the-shelf vision models.* An obvious option is to use end-to-end video-to-text captioning models (see Section 4.3) to obtain video-captions (Blattmann et al., 2023a). However, these models are currently unreliable, and thus have not often been used. An alternative is to use more reliable image-captioning models. One heuristic for short clips is to caption the video based on the image caption of its middle frame (Blattmann et al., 2023a). For longer videos, multiple frames in the video can be captioned, and these can be synthesised into a video caption (e.g., by an LLM) (Maaz et al., 2023). Elsewhere, off-the-shelf object detectors can be employed to gather information about the video contents (Zeng et al., 2022; Maaz et al., 2023; Ranasinghe et al., 2024; Blank et al., 2024). The methods in this bullet are referred to as ‘Generated’ in Table 1.
- *LLM processing.* When information about the video has been gathered from various sources, an LLM can be used to synthesise this information in a single coherent caption. Blattmann et al. (2023a), Maaz et al. (2023) summarise keyframe-based and full-clip captions into a single video caption. Wang et al. (2023b) summarise several keyframe captions into an overall caption. LLM post-processing can also be used to filter out inconsistent captions across sources or frames (Maaz et al., 2023). Compared to relying on a single captioning method, combining multiple sources of information followed by LLM processing may result in more detailed and accurate captions.

### 6.3 Existing Datasets

In this section, we provide an overview of existing video datasets relevant to LfV. We aim to highlight datasets that satisfy key desiderata from Section 6.1, and thus are promising for training foundational video and/or robotics models.

**Overview of Existing Datasets.** Table 1 presents details of our chosen representative set of existing video datasets. We now briefly discuss these datasets in more detail.

*Large-scale internet-scraped datasets.* These can be very large, spanning up to several decades worth of video data (Wang et al., 2023b; Xue et al., 2022). They are also diverse, capturing human behaviours in tasks and environments sampled from a global population. Several of these datasets are constructed using query-based searches of YouTube (Wang et al., 2023b; Miech et al., 2019; Stroud et al., 2020). To find videos, other datasets here leverage YouTube categories (Xue et al., 2022), aggregate video from previously existing datasets (Zellers et al., 2021), or scrape video from various webpages (Bain et al., 2021). Due to the large size of these datasets, their language captions are usually obtained via automated methods (see Section 6.2). In the literature, these large internet video datasets

have commonly been used in initial attempts at training large-scale video foundation models (Zhao et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023c) (see Section 4).

*Manually collected datasets.* These are generally not as large or diverse as the largest web-obtained video datasets. However, many contain content highly relevant to robotics. Ego4D (Grauman et al., 2021) contains egocentric video of diverse participants going about their daily lives. Ego-Exo4D (Grauman et al., 2023) contains paired egocentric and third-person video of skilled activities. RoboVQA (Sermanet et al., 2023) contains video of teleoperated robots and humans performing long-horizon household tasks. Something-something-V2 (Goyal et al., 2017) contains short clips of object-centric actions. Epic-Kitchens-100 (Damen et al., 2022) contains long-form video of cooking activities in real households. Here, it is common for captions to be provided manually by crowd-sourced workers. Due to their robotics-relevant content, these datasets have often been used in past LfV research (Nair et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2023c; Wu et al., 2023a).

*Other annotations.* All of the datasets in Table 1 come with text annotations. However, other annotation modalities are also possible. Whilst manually collecting video, Grauman et al. (2021, 2023) also occasionally collect corresponding audio, 3D meshes, eye-gazes, stereo, and synchronized video from different viewpoints. Shan et al. (2020) provide human-hand-centric labels for 100k images in their video dataset. However, large-scale internet video datasets generally lack these other annotations as they are costly to add manually or the information is simply not available (e.g., standard internet video does not come paired with 3D meshes).

Dataset Name	Content	Duration (h)	# Clips	Caption Type	Collection Method
InternVid (Wang et al., 2023b)	YouTube	760,000	230M	Generated	Internet
HD-VILA-100M (Xue et al., 2022)	YouTube	370,000	103M	ASR	Internet
YT-Temporal-180M (Zellers et al., 2021)	YouTube	-	180M	ASR	Internet
WTS-70M (Stroud et al., 2020)	YouTube	190,000	70M	Metadata	Internet
HowTo100M (Miech et al., 2019)	Instruction	134,000	136M	ASR	Internet
WebVid-10M (Bain et al., 2021) <sup>1</sup>	YouTube	52,000	10M	Alt-text	Internet
VideoCC3M (Nagrani et al., 2022) <sup>1</sup>	YouTube	18,000	6M	Transfer	Internet
100 Days of Hands (Shan et al., 2020)	Actions	3,100	27k	Metadata	Internet
Ego-4D (Grauman et al., 2021)	Everyday	3,600	28k	Manual	Manual
Ego-Exo-4D (Grauman et al., 2023)	Skilled	1,400	6k	Manual	Manual
SS-v2 (Goyal et al., 2017)	Actions	245	221k	Manual	Manual
RoboVQA (Sermanet et al., 2023)	Everyday	230	98k	Manual	Manual
Epic-Kitchens-100 (Damen et al., 2022)	Cooking	100	700	Manual	Manual

Table 1: Existing video datasets. Listed are: (top) large-scale, internet-scraped video datasets, and (bottom) robotics-relevant, manually-recorded video datasets. The datasets are ordered by decreasing total video duration. Details regarding ‘Caption Type’ can be found in Section 6.2.

1. These datasets are not publicly available at the time of writing.

**Discussion.** The largest internet-curated video datasets are two orders of magnitude larger than the largest manually-recorded video datasets, yet still barely scratch the surface of the full range of video content available online (see Figure 8). As such, we advocate for continued efforts into curating ever-larger internet video datasets for LfV.

Crucially, new curation efforts should optimise for other desiderata (Section 6.1), in addition to size. Diversity, content relevance, and quality in the video data can be ensured using improved query formulations and filtering mechanisms (Section 6.2). We note that low-quality language annotations are a key limitations of current internet-curated video datasets. Improved automated annotation methods that scale with increased dataset size will be important here.

We also note some less urgent limitations of current video datasets. Many existing datasets focus only on short clips which do not capture long-horizon behaviour (Wang et al., 2023b; Xue et al., 2022; Stroud et al., 2020). Many datasets primarily use Youtube as their video repository (Wang et al., 2023b; Miech et al., 2019; Stroud et al., 2020); it could be beneficial to also leverage other video repositories (e.g., Instagram, Tiktok, or Chinese video servers such as Weibo).

Finally, we note that whilst we primarily advocate for curating larger datasets, efforts to curate smaller-scale, higher-quality video dataset will still be useful. Such high-quality datasets can be used for finetuning models after pretraining on larger, lower-quality data (Blattmann et al., 2023a). Here, manual video recording and manual captioning techniques may still be a valid option.

## 7. Benchmarks

We now turn our attention to benchmarks that can be used to develop and evaluate the LfV-for-robotics methods of Section 5. Benchmarks can be crucial for catalysing rapid research progress in a given area (Deng et al., 2009). Here, we first give recommendations for how an LfV benchmark should be designed (Section 7.1). We subsequently review relevant benchmarks from the literature, commenting on limitations and proposing improvements (Section 7.2).

### 7.1 Designing Benchmarks for LfV

An LfV benchmark can serve to evaluate: (i) the capabilities of a policy obtained via an LfV approach; or (ii) the effectiveness of an LfV algorithm at producing a policy, under certain constraints (e.g., when constrained to use a fixed dataset). Specifically, we are interested in evaluating how well an LfV method/model can provide the potential benefits (Section 3.2) and handle the challenges (Section 3.3) of LfV.

In this section, we will describe different categories of LfV benchmarks and their corresponding desiderata. We will assume a setting where a pre-existing video dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  and robot dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  are used to train some policy  $\pi_{\text{lfv}}$  via an offline learning method. We assume this offline setting as online learning is impractical in robotics, and because this simplifies our explanations.

**Categories of LfV benchmarks.** All categories of benchmark we describe include a fixed set of evaluation environments  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  in which an LfV policy  $\pi_{\text{lfv}}$  is to be evaluated.

However, the categories differ based on whether they specify the datasets  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  used during training. Concretely, the categories of benchmark we identify are as follows.

- $B_e = \{\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}\}$ . Here, we take a  $\pi_{\text{lfv}}$  trained on any  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ , and evaluate it on a fixed  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ .
- $B_{e-r} = \{\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}\}$ . Here, a fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  is paired with  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ .  $\pi_{\text{lfv}}$  is trained on the fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  and any  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$ , and is evaluated on  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ .
- $B_{e-r-v} = \{\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}\}$ . Here, a fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  and a fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  are paired with  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ .  $\pi_{\text{lfv}}$  is trained only on the fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  and the fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$ , and is evaluated on  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ .

There are trade-offs between these categories. Benchmarks that fix the datasets (e.g.,  $B_{e-r-v}$ ) can provide a fairer comparison of LfV algorithms. However, they may end up being ‘toyish’ and not perfectly analogous to the scaled-up LfV setting. Whilst benchmarks that do not fix the data (i.e.,  $B_e$ ) cannot fairly compare LfV algorithms, they can be used to compare LfV models. This is useful as, ultimately, we primarily care about the quality of the final policy model.

**Desiderata and setups.** We now give more details on the desiderata for each potential component ( $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$ ) of an LfV benchmark.

- $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ . We would like  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  to be analogous to the generalist robot settings we are interested in. There are a number of considerations here. (1) *Relevance*: The environments and tasks should resemble those we expect to face in the generalist robot setting. (2) *Diversity*: There should be sufficient diversity in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ . This allows us to measure how  $\pi_{\text{lfv}}$  will handle diverse and unseen real-world scenarios. (3) *Realism*: The benchmark physics should be sufficiently realistic and it should include challenges that may be faced in the real-world (such as noisy observations and stochastic environments). To evaluate the ability of the LfV method to tackle the challenge of missing low-level information in video,  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  could require perception of information not contained in video data.
- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ . Here, we focus on how  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  should be defined in relation to  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ . (1)  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  should be drawn from  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ . Specifically, it should be drawn from a *subset* of the tasks and environments in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ , allowing us to directly measure performance both in and out-of-distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ . (2) To ensure LfV generalization (see Figure 2) is possible, it may be desirable to ensure the robot dataset contains all low-level, ‘atomic’ actions the robot can perform. (3) Behaviours in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  could be expert or suboptimal, uni-modal or multi-modal. Ideally, an LfV method should be able to learn from multi-modal, suboptimal behaviour: thus, the benchmark should test for this.
- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$ . The primary criteria for  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  is that it does not come with any action labels. Other desiderata depend on the extent to which we wish  $B_{e-r-v}$  to be a toy ‘sandbox’ for testing LfV algorithms.

(1) *Sandbox setups*: Here, we use assume a self-contained setting that allows for control over which LfV challenges are faced. (1) Following our assumption that internet video has good coverage over generalist behaviours (see Section 3.1),  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  should have good coverage over the environments and tasks in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ . This allows for direct assessment of how well an LfV algorithm can utilise a suitable  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  to generalise beyond  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ . (2) We can control certain aspects of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  to see how well the LfV method can overcome distribution shifts between  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  (e.g., embodiment gaps, viewpoint differences). (3) We can toggle the challenge of ‘controlability’ by managing the extent to which changes in the videos are due to effects beyond a single agent’s actions.

(2) *Approximating the scaled-up LfV setting*: We otherwise may wish for  $B_{\text{e-r-v}}$  to be more analogous to the scaled-up LfV setting. In this case, we likely will have less control over the specific characteristics of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$ . Here, we should ensure  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  resembles internet video in terms of its scale, diversity, and content. Thus,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  should ideally consist of real-world human videos scraped from the internet. Doing so will inherently present several LfV challenges, and allow for evaluation of the scalability of the LfV method.

## 7.2 Existing Benchmarks

We briefly highlight existing benchmarks suitable for each category outlined in the previous section. We close the section by commenting on limitations and gaps in the current selection of LfV benchmarks.

$B_{\text{e}} = \{\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}\}$ . There are a number of benchmarks that provide an  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  relevant to LfV research. (1) *Toy settings*: Simplified toy settings can be useful for prototyping and for controlled evaluation of specific LfV challenges. Relevant toy environments include video game settings and simple simulations (Chevalier-Boisvert et al., 2024; Bellemare et al., 2013; Tassa et al., 2018). The diversity of certain complex or open-ended video game environments (Fan et al., 2022; Küttler et al., 2020) can provide an excellent setting in which to test LfV policy generalization. (2) *Robotics simulators*: More realistic and robotics-relevant simulated environments are also available. These include benchmarks focused on low-level motor control and object interaction (Mees et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024a; Kumar et al., 2024; Makoviychuk et al., 2021; Pumacay et al., 2024). (3) *Embodied AI simulators*: There exist simulated benchmarks which contain realistic, relevant settings, re-creating human households and tasks resembling everyday activities (Puig et al., 2023; Kolve et al., 2017; Li et al., 2024). These involve mobile manipulation tasks and often abstract away low-level control to focus on higher-level planning. (4) *Real-robot setups*: All the benchmarks discussed thus far are simulated, and may be limited in their realism. Real-world robot evaluations with low-cost hardware have been proposed to tackle this issue (Ahn et al., 2020). However, real-world evaluation is more costly and time-consuming than simulation.

$B_{\text{e-r}} = \{\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}\}$ . Several benchmarks pair a  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  with an  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ . There are some robotic simulator benchmarks that fit this description. CALVIN (Mees et al., 2022), LanguageTable (Lynch et al., 2023), and LIBERO (Liu et al., 2024a) all provide demon-

stration or play data for tabletop manipulation tasks, whilst Maniskill (Gu et al., 2023) includes mobile manipulation tasks. To evaluate LfV generalization, we require a benchmark where there are settings in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  that are ‘held-out’ from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ . The Colosseum (Pumacay et al., 2024) and FactorWorld (Xie et al., 2023) are setup specifically for generalization testing, providing multiple different tasks and axes of environmental perturbation. Lastly, there exist relatively large real-world robot datasets which are not paired with any specific benchmark (Padalkar et al., 2023; Khazatsky et al., 2024). These can be relatively diverse and are somewhat analagous to the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  we would use in a realistic, scaled-up LfV setting. Thus, these datasets could be suitable for use in a real-world LfV benchmark.

$B_{e-r-v} = \{\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}\}$ . To the best of our knowledge, there are few benchmarks that specify a fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  along with a fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ . In a Minecraft video game setting, Fan et al. (2022) provide a  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  of 730k YouTube videos. The scale of the data and diversity of the Minecraft environment provides a useful LfV setting, though there are obvious disanalogies to real-world robotics. Xiong et al. (2022) provide a  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  collected from human demonstrations, coupled with a tightly paired simulation environment  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  and an associated  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$ . However, their code is yet to be released. Many previous LfV works have constructed a  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  by stripping action labels from a  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{robot}}$  (Seo et al., 2022a; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Wen et al., 2023). This can allow for easy setup of a scenario where  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$  has good coverage over  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ , but can neglect distribution shifts seen between the video data and the robot domain in realistic LfV settings.

**Discussion.** We provide recommendations for improvements in LfV benchmarking, based on limitations in the existing literature.

*Improving the diversity in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ .* The diversity in the most suitable robotic simulators (Mees et al., 2022; Lynch et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024a; Gu et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024) is still somewhat limited in terms of the tasks, environments, and objects presented. Improving the diversity of  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$  will allow us to better assess the applicability of the LfV method to generalist robot settings. One possibility here is to use procedural generation (Deitke et al., 2022) or LLM-assisted environment design (Xian et al., 2023) to improve diversity. Another is to aggregate multiple  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eval}}$ ’s within a common framework (Kumar et al., 2024).

*Establishing a fixed  $B_{e-r}$  and  $B_{e-r-v}$ .* There are currently no well-established LfV benchmarks in these categories. An established benchmark would bring an improved ability to compare LfV algorithms: past works have often chosen different  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{video}}$ ’s (Nair et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2023c; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023) and thus are difficult to compare. When designing such an LfV benchmark, we recommend following the desiderata and setup details from Section 7.1. This encourages the design of benchmarks that can evaluate how well a method can provide the benefits of LfV (Section 3.2) and how well it can handle the challenges of LfV (Section 3.3). These benchmarks should provide the LfV evaluation metrics outlined in Section 3.4.

## 8. Challenges & Opportunities

We now provide a comprehensive discussion of challenges and opportunities for future LfV research, based on our analysis of the existing literature. First, we give high-level recommendations for future LfV research (Section 8.1). Second, we detail promising directions for

utilising video foundation models and techniques for LfV (Section 8.2). Third, we highlight approaches for overcoming previously identified LfV challenges (Section 8.3). We conclude by discussing other challenges in generalist robotics may not be solved via scaling to larger datasets (Section 8.4).

### 8.1 High-level Recommendations

After our analysis of the LfV literature in Section 5, we now provide some high-level recommendations for future LfV research.

**Scalable approaches.** We should focus on methods that can scale well to large, diverse internet video. Many previous LfV works limit their scalability by making strong assumptions on the nature of the video data or the downstream robot setting (Baker et al., 2022; Stadie et al., 2017), or by using strong inductive biases (e.g., methods that explicitly address distribution shifts, see Section 5.1.2). We advocate for methods that can use simple but general learning objectives to extract knowledge from heterogenous video, similar to those used to train video foundation models (see Section 4). We further discuss opportunities for utilising video foundation model techniques in Section 8.2. Methods that can learn from unlabelled and suboptimal video data are most scalable (Bruce et al., 2024), though we note language labels can be highly valuable (Brooks et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2023c). We finally note that online RL is impractical in robotics and thus we should focus initially on LfV approaches that can operate in the offline learning setting (or that can perform online RL in simulation).

**Targeting the key benefits of LfV.** Future LfV research should focus more on obtaining the most promising LfV benefits (see Section 3.2), including: improving robot data-efficiency and improving generalization beyond the available robot data. This raises question of: *which RL KM should be targeted?* Much past LfV research has sought to extract reward functions from video (Section 5.2.3). Whilst these approaches are useful, we believe targeting the policy (Section 5.2.1) and dynamics model (Section 5.2.2) KMs is most promising for reducing reliance on robot data. Obtaining a policy is ultimately what we care about, and thus deserves significant focus. However, dynamics models are highly useful for obtaining a policy and can more easily be learned from suboptimal data.

**Improved evaluation of LfV methods.** We should more explicitly measure the extent to which an LfV method can handle LfV challenges and provides the potential benefits of LfV. In Section 3.4, we outline specific metrics that can be used here. It is often difficult to identify these metrics in existing LfV research. Tracking such metrics is informative for the community, and can serve as an optimization target to drive further advances. In Section 7.2 we advocate for the design of improved LfV benchmarks that can offer these metrics off-the-shelf.

### 8.2 Video Foundation Models for LfV

A highly promising LfV direction is to utilise large-scale internet video data to help train large foundation models for robotics. Here, we outline some related research avenues and discussion points.

**Improving and leveraging off-the-shelf video foundation models.** LfV methods can adapt a pretrained video foundation model into an RL KM (Du et al., 2023a; Yang et al., 2023c), or video foundation model techniques can be repurposed for LfV (Sohn et al., 2024; Bruce et al., 2024). Thus, improving video foundation models is a key LfV research avenue. Crucial directions here include addressing issues related to dataset limitations and computational requirements (see Section 8.3). We more generally highlight directions for improving video foundation models throughout the discussions of Section 4.

Now we ask: how to best utilise an off-the-shelf video foundation model for LfV? As per the previous section, we advocate for targeting the policy and dynamics model KMs. Whilst the video model could be used zero-shot, it will generally be beneficial to finetune it on robot data before deployment. Strong baselines will include finetuning the model into an action-outputting policy using offline robot data (Brohan et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023a), or (if the model has video generation capabilities) finetuning it into a robot dynamics model. Here, data-efficient (Hu et al., 2021) and computationally efficient (Yang et al., 2023b) adaptation mechanisms will be useful.

**Customising video foundation model pipelines for LfV.** Ultimately, the best LfV foundation models will be developed using a pipeline fully optimized for LfV purposes. We now touch on directions for developing video foundation models customized for LfV:

- Generic video foundation model capabilities could be improved in areas pertinent to robotics. For example, we could improve the physics realism of video prediction models (e.g., via RL finetuning; see Black et al., 2023a), or the fine-grained understandings of video-to-text models (e.g., via improved fine-grained language captioning of the video data). Including domain-specific robot videos in generic video foundation model pretraining could improve performances in the downstream robot setting.
- Custom, control-centric foundation models could be trained *solely* on action-free video data. One promising avenue is to use alternative action representations (see Section 5.1.1) to integrate explicit action information into the model (Bruce et al., 2024; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023). The use of TD learning objectives over video data is also relevant (Bhateja et al., 2023). Training on video paired with robotics-relevant low-level information (where available) is another avenue. Here, the use of 3D depth information (Zhen et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024) could improve crucial 3D understandings. Object masks or human-hand-centric information (see Section 5.1.2) may also be useful.
- Custom, control-centric foundation models could be trained *jointly* on action-free video *and* action-labelled robot data. This could involve having the video foundation model predict robot actions (Sohn et al., 2024) or conditioning video predictions on robot actions (Yang et al., 2023c). An interesting avenue here is to leverage both robot action labels and alternative action representations during pretraining. Elsewhere, the recent trend towards monolithic any-to-any sequence models (Liu et al., 2024b; Kondratyuk et al., 2023) is relevant. Such any-to-any models can be trained jointly on text, video, and robot data, and can act as policies, dynamics models, and high-level planners (Sohn et al., 2024).



**Monolithic vs compositional models.** The any-to-any sequence model of Sohn et al. (2024) is a monolithic approach. Monolithic models can be optimized end-to-end, and simple end-to-end approaches have thus far proven very effective in deep learning. Monolithic models may benefit from positive transfer between the different data modalities and tasks they handle.

In contrast, Ajay et al. (2023) present a hierarchical compositional approach, where a language model conditions predictions of a video generator, and an action model predicts actions from the generated video. Versus monolithic approaches, Du and Kaelbling (2024) argue that compositional approaches are more computationally efficient, more data-efficient, and can obtain improved generalization (Zhou et al., 2024). These advantages are very relevant to the LfV setting. Future LfV research should seek to better compare monolithic and compositional approaches. In particular, directly comparing generalization abilities (as per the generalization setting in Figure 2) would yield informative results.

**Open-sourcing video foundation models.** Finally, we advocate for increased open-sourcing of video foundation models. Open-sourced models will make cutting-edge LfV research more accessible to academic researchers, accelerating progress in LfV.

### 8.3 Overcoming LfV Challenges

In Section 3.3, we outlined the key challenges in LfV. Here, we discuss promising directions for overcoming some of these challenges.

**Improved datasets.** Improving and scaling our video datasets is a reliable way to advance our video foundation models. Future data curation efforts should optimise for the dataset desiderata we outline in Section 6.1, and follow the recommendations given in the discussion of Section 6.3. In summary, we should allocate more resources into scraping larger-scale video data from the internet and captioning this data with high-quality language annotations (following the techniques outlined in Section 6.2). Finally, we advocate for open-sourcing of future curated video datasets.

**Bridging the gap to low-level robot information.** Internet video lacks crucial low-level information (e.g., forces and tactile information) and mainly consists of human embodiments. Thus, we cannot rely entirely on internet video for robotics. A key LfV challenge is to minimise the quantity of robot data required, despite the missing low-level information in the video data (see Figure 2). Note, this challenge should be better evaluated in our LfV benchmarks (see Section 7).

The key question here is: what can be done to reduce demands on the robot data, in light of the missing low-level information problem? Whilst it is possible that simply scaling the robot and video datasets will implicitly solve this issue, here we discuss more explicit solutions.

*Efficiently incorporate low-level information into the video model.* Here, we could: use control-centric objectives over the video data, use video paired with low-level information (e.g., depth info), or incorporate low-level information via the use of robot data. See relevant recommendations in Section 8.2. The use of cheap simulated data to provide low-level robot information to the model is promising.

*Bypass the need to incorporate low-level information into the video model.* First, here one could use a coarse-action space (e.g., cartesian control for manipulation; see Brohan et al., 2022) that is less reliant on non-visual low-level information Ko et al. (2023). One possibility is to begin with a coarse action-space, and finetune for finer-grained control with the additional collected robot data. Second, similarly, a factorized/hierarchical approach could be employed. For example, a high-level policy trained on video can propose alternative actions, and a low-level policy trained on robot data can decode these to robot actions (Du et al., 2023a; Schmidt & Jiang, 2023; Wen et al., 2023) (see Section 5.2.1).

**Recovering action information from video.** The missing action label problem in LfV can be partially addressed using alternative action representations (see Section 5.1.1). These action representation approaches are promising and we encourage more research in the area. We recommend future research to: (1) Scale existing methods to realistic and diverse internet video. Many leading methods have yet to do so (Bruce et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2023). We note that scaling to unstructured internet video will aggravate certain issues. This includes the issue of controllability (where it is impossible to distinguish which changes are controlled by the agent’s actions and which are due to external environment factors). (2) Explicitly compare the pros and cons of different action representations. For example, compare accuracy when decoding robot actions from different alternative action representations; including measuring the data-efficiency and generalization abilities of the decoder. Another avenue is to investigate how different action representations transfer across the action-spaces of different robots. (3) Develop improved, novel alternative action representations, perhaps by combining the benefits of existing options.

**Tackling distribution shift.** Previous LfV works have attempted to address LfV distribution shifts using specific algorithmic mechanisms (see Section 5.1.2). However, these have not proven to be scalable to diverse internet video data. Thus, we advocate for implicitly addressing distribution shifts by scaling flexible methods to larger and more diverse internet video data, and, when possible, additionally training on robot data. Nevertheless, addressing LfV distribution shift in a robot-data-efficient manner is very much an open problem.

**Mitigating computational demands.** The high computational demands of training on video data can be mitigated via improved efficient architectures and taking inspiration from relevant work on LLMs (Wang et al., 2023c; Liu et al., 2023a; Balažević et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024). Of course, the ever decreasing cost of compute will also help (Moore, 1998). In addition to improving computational efficiency, methods that operate in a learned latent space (rather than pixel space) are promising for mitigating issues related to noise and redundancy in video (Bardes et al., 2023; Yan et al., 2021).

#### 8.4 Other Generalist Robotics Challenges: Is Scaling Enough?

Observing results in other machine learning domains (Achiam et al., 2023; Betker et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023c; Sutton, 2019), we can be reasonably confident that scaling current robot learning approaches to larger, improved datasets would yield significant improvements in capabilities. In this survey, we advocate for the use of internet video data to help us achieve this scaling. However, scaling alone may not take us all the way to generalist robots.

Here, we note some fundamental and practical challenges that may not be solved via scaling to internet video data under the current paradigm. Instead, many of these challenges may also require algorithmic advances.

*Safety and reliability.* Safety is paramount when deploying robots in the real world. Unfortunately, deep learning models are known to generalise poorly to unseen scenarios. Whilst scaling to internet data may provide the model with improved ‘common sense’, thus improving its reliability and generalization, this does not fundamentally solve the problem. Ensuring sufficient safety and reliability in high-risk applications will be a major future bottleneck to generalist robotics.

*Explainability, interpretability, and uncertainty.* Explainability and interpretability methods can help us better understand the reliability of the model. Scaling to large language datasets (paired with video) can improve explainability (Lanham et al., 2023; Wayve, 2024) and interpretability (Zou et al., 2023; Templeton et al., 2024) in deep learning models. However, current approaches are unconvincing and further algorithmic advancements are required. Elsewhere, algorithmic advancements to improve the uncertainty-awareness and calibration of large-scale deep learning models could benefit model safety.

*Long-horizon tasks and memory.* Generalist robots may need to operate on long time horizons. This presents two challenges. First, longer-horizon tasks may necessitate improved planning and reasoning abilities (we discuss ‘reasoning’ more below). Second, longer-horizon tasks require improved memory capabilities. Current solutions to long-term memory involve scaling up the context-length of the model (Liu et al., 2024b), or storing and retrieving from simple memory databases (Park et al., 2023). It is unclear whether these solutions will be sufficient to fundamentally address the problem.

*Latency.* Large foundation models currently have long inference times that limit their ability to perform real-time, low-level control at high frequencies (Reed et al., 2022; Brohan et al., 2022). Reducing inference latency (Jiang et al., 2024; Song et al., 2024) in robot foundation models is an important practical challenge.

*Continual learning and adaptation.* A generalist robot may regularly face novel scenarios. It must be able to adapt to these scenarios appropriately. To an extent, scaling to internet video data can improve generalization and in-context meta-learning abilities (Brown et al., 2020). Nevertheless, obtaining true continual learning (Abel et al., 2024) abilities is still an open problem, likely requiring algorithmic advances.

*Reasoning and causality.* There exists much speculation and empirical evidence regarding the inability of deep learning methods to learn truly ‘causal’ models (Berrevoets et al., 2023) and perform true ‘reasoning’ (Huang et al., 2023a; Anwar et al., 2024). Such causal understandings and reasoning abilities may be crucial for a generalist robot. If deep learning is fundamentally limited in these regards, then scaling to internet video data may be insufficient to achieve general-purpose robots.

## 9. Conclusion

Developing general-purpose robots is a grand challenge in robotics. However, current learning approaches are bottlenecked by a dearth of robot data. Learning from Video (LfV) methods seek to alleviate this issue by leveraging existing video data. These methods are promising as internet video comes in vast quantities and contains information highly relevant to general-purpose robots.

In this survey, we conducted a comprehensive review of the LfV setting and existing LfV literature, providing the reader with useful taxonomies and discussions throughout. We highlighted methods with the potential to scale well to large, heterogeneous internet video datasets: following recent trends in machine learning, we consider these methods to be most promising for developing general-purpose robots. The key takeaways of this survey are summarised below:

- *LfV preliminaries.* In Section 3, we outlined the exciting benefits that can be obtained from LfV (Section 3.2), key LfV challenges that stand in the way of these benefits (Section 3.3), and gave details on how LfV methods should be evaluated in light of these benefits and challenges (Section 3.4). These fundamental concepts should be used to guide future LfV research agendas.
- *Robot foundation models from internet video.* Foundation model techniques are highly promising for extracting knowledge from large, heterogeneous internet video datasets. We reviewed the video foundation model literature in Section 4, highlighting reoccurring issues related to low-quality video data and prohibitive computational requirements. In Section 8.2, we discussed directions for leveraging video foundation model techniques for robotics. Developing models customized for robotics is a particularly promising direction. Here, recent monolithic any-to-any sequence models offer a clear path forward. It will also be beneficial to pursue compositional approaches in parallel.
- *Takeaways from the LfV-for-robotics literature.* Our main analysis of the LfV-for-robotics literature (Section 5.2) yielded several important takeaways. First, future LfV research should prioritise scalability. We should avoid inductive biases that limit scalability (i.e., those seen in Section 5.1.2), and adopt scalable learning techniques similar to those used for video foundation models (Section 4). Whilst a reliance on language captions may limit scalability to an extent, this may become less of an issue as automated captioning methods improve (Section 6.2). Second, we should focus on methods that can best obtain the key LfV benefits (e.g., generalisation beyond the available robot data). This should involve targeting the most promising RL knowledge modalities: the policy (Section 5.2.1) and dynamics model (Section 5.2.2). Improved benchmarks that quantitatively measure LfV benefits (see Section 7.2) will facilitate these efforts.
- *Action representations.* In Section 5.1.1, we outlined methods for extracting action representations from video, which can serve to mitigate the LfV missing action label problem. These methods are promising. However, more research is required to scale them to larger-scale realistic internet video data.

- *Datasets.* We advocate for allocating increased resources into curating improved video datasets (as per the desiderata outlined in Section 6.1). Suitable methods for curating internet video data are outlined in Section 6.2.
- *Is scaling enough?* Exploiting internet video will drive significant advancements in robotics. However, the generalist robot setting presents challenges that may not be solved via naive scaling (Section 8.4). As LfV research advances and the data bottleneck becomes less of an issue, efforts should be refocused towards these challenges.

The analyses, taxonomies, and directions presented in this survey should serve as a valuable reference for future LfV research. This can catalyze further promising research in the area, and help accelerate our progress towards developing general-purpose robots.

## References

- Abel, D., Barreto, A., Van Roy, B., Precup, D., van Hasselt, H. P., & Singh, S. (2024). A definition of continual reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al. (2023). Gpt-4 technical report..
- Adeniji, A., Xie, A., Sferrazza, C., Seo, Y., James, S., & Abbeel, P. (2023). Language reward modulation for pretraining reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2308.12270*.
- Ahn, M., Brohan, A., Brown, N., Chebotar, Y., Cortes, O., David, B., Finn, C., Gopalakrishnan, K., Hausman, K., Herzog, A., Ho, D., Hsu, J., Ibarz, J., Ichter, B., Irpan, A., Jang, E., Ruano, R. J., Jeffrey, K., Jesmonth, S., Joshi, N. J., Julian, R. C., Kalashnikov, D., Kuang, Y., Lee, K.-H., Levine, S., Lu, Y., Luu, L., Parada, C., Pastor, P., Quiambao, J., Rao, K., Rettinghouse, J., Reyes, D. M., Sermanet, P., Sievers, N., Tan, C., Toshev, A., Vanhoucke, V., Xia, F., Xiao, T., Xu, P., Xu, S., & Yan, M. (2022). Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Ahn, M., Dwibedi, D., Finn, C., Arenas, M. G., Gopalakrishnan, K., Hausman, K., Ichter, B., Irpan, A., Joshi, N., Julian, R., et al. (2024). Autort: Embodied foundation models for large scale orchestration of robotic agents..
- Ahn, M., Zhu, H., Hartikainen, K., Ponte, H., Gupta, A., Levine, S., & Kumar, V. (2020). Robel: Robotics benchmarks for learning with low-cost robots. In *Conference on robot learning*, pp. 1300–1313. PMLR.
- Ajay, A., Han, S.-J., Du, Y., Li, S., Gupta, A., Jaakkola, T., Tenenbaum, J., Kaelbling, L. P., Srivastava, A., & Agrawal, P. (2023). Compositional foundation models for hierarchical planning. *ArXiv, abs/2309.08587*.
- Akkaya, I., Andrychowicz, M., Chociej, M., Litwin, M., McGrew, B., Petron, A., Paino, A., Plappert, M., Powell, G., Ribas, R., et al. (2019). Solving rubik’s cube with a robot hand..

- Alayrac, J.-B., Donahue, J., Luc, P., Miech, A., Barr, I., Hasson, Y., Lenc, K., Mensch, A., Millican, K., Reynolds, M., et al. (2022). Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35, 23716–23736.
- Anwar, U., Saparov, A., Rando, J., Paleka, D., Turpin, M., Hase, P., Lubana, E. S., Jenner, E., Casper, S., Sourbut, O., et al. (2024). Foundational challenges in assuring alignment and safety of large language models..
- Ardón, P., Pairet, È., Lohan, K. S., Ramamoorthy, S., & Petrick, R. (2020). Affordances in robotic tasks—a survey..
- Arnab, A., Deghani, M., Heigold, G., Sun, C., Lucic, M., & Schmid, C. (2021). Vivit: A video vision transformer..
- Aytar, Y., Pfaff, T., Budden, D., Paine, T. L., Wang, Z., & de Freitas, N. (2018). Playing hard exploration games by watching youtube. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Babaeizadeh, M., Finn, C., Erhan, D., Campbell, R. H., & Levine, S. (2017). Stochastic variational video prediction..
- Bagad, P., Tapaswi, M., & Snoek, C. G. M. (2023). Test of time: Instilling video-language models with a sense of time..
- Bahl, S., Gupta, A., & Pathak, D. (2022). Human-to-robot imitation in the wild. *ArXiv*, *abs/2207.09450*.
- Bahl, S., Mendonca, R., Chen, L., Jain, U., & Pathak, D. (2023). Affordances from human videos as a versatile representation for robotics..
- Bai, Y., Kadavath, S., Kundu, S., Askill, A., Kernion, J., Jones, A., Chen, A., Goldie, A., Mirhoseini, A., McKinnon, C., et al. (2022). Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback..
- Bain, M., Nagrani, A., Varol, G., & Zisserman, A. (2021). Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 1728–1738.
- Baker, B., Akkaya, I., Zhokhov, P., Huizinga, J., Tang, J., Ecoffet, A., Houghton, B., Sampe-dro, R., & Clune, J. (2022). Video pretraining (vpt): Learning to act by watching unlabeled online videos. *ArXiv*, *abs/2206.11795*.
- Balažević, I., Shi, Y., Papalampidi, P., Chaabouni, R., Koppula, S., & Hénaff, O. J. (2024). Memory consolidation enables long-context video understanding..
- Bansal, H., Bitton, Y., Szpektor, I., Chang, K.-W., & Grover, A. (2023). Videocon: Robust video-language alignment via contrast captions..
- Bar-Tal, O., Chefer, H., Tov, O., Herrmann, C., Paiss, R., Zada, S., Ephrat, A., Hur, J., Li, Y., Michaeli, T., et al. (2024). Lumiere: A space-time diffusion model for video generation..
- Bardes, A., Garrido, Q., Ponce, J., Chen, X., Rabbat, M., LeCun, Y., Assran, M., & Ballas, N. (2023). V-jepa: Latent video prediction for visual representation learning..

- Baumli, K., Baveja, S., Behbahani, F., Chan, H., Comanici, G., Flennerhag, S., Gazeau, M., Holsheimer, K., Horgan, D., Laskin, M., et al. (2023). Vision-language models as a source of rewards..
- Belkhale, S., Ding, T., Xiao, T., Sermanet, P., Vuong, Q., Tompson, J., Chebotar, Y., Dwibedi, D., & Sadigh, D. (2024). Rt-h: Action hierarchies using language..
- Bellemare, M. G., Naddaf, Y., Veness, J., & Bowling, M. (2013). The arcade learning environment: An evaluation platform for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47, 253–279.
- Berrevoets, J., Kacprzyk, K., Qian, Z., & van der Schaar, M. (2023). Causal deep learning..
- Bertasius, G., Wang, H., & Torresani, L. (2021). Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding?. In *ICML*, Vol. 2, p. 4.
- Betker, J., Goh, G., Jing, L., Brooks, T., Wang, J., Li, L., Ouyang, L., Zhuang, J., Lee, J., Guo, Y., et al. (2023). Improving image generation with better captions. *Computer Science*. <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/dall-e-3.pdf>, 2(3), 8.
- Bharadhwaj, H., Gupta, A., Kumar, V., & Tulsiani, S. (2023). Towards generalizable zero-shot manipulation via translating human interaction plans. *ArXiv*, [abs/2312.00775](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.00775).
- Bhat, S. F., Birkl, R., Wofk, D., Wonka, P., & Müller, M. (2023). Zoedepth: Zero-shot transfer by combining relative and metric depth..
- Bhateja, C., Guo, D., Ghosh, D., Singh, A., Tomar, M., Vuong, Q. H., Chebotar, Y., Levine, S., & Kumar, A. (2023). Robotic offline rl from internet videos via value-function pre-training. *ArXiv*, [abs/2309.13041](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13041).
- Black, K., Janner, M., Du, Y., Kostrikov, I., & Levine, S. (2023a). Training diffusion models with reinforcement learning..
- Black, K., Nakamoto, M., Atreya, P., Walke, H., Finn, C., Kumar, A., & Levine, S. (2023b). Zero-shot robotic manipulation with pretrained image-editing diffusion models. *ArXiv*, [abs/2310.10639](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10639).
- Blank, N., Reuss, M., Wenzel, F., Mees, O., & Lioutikov, R. (2024). Scaling robot policy learning via zero-shot labeling with foundation models. In *2nd Workshop on Mobile Manipulation and Embodied Intelligence at ICRA 2024*.
- Blattmann, A., Dockhorn, T., Kulal, S., Mendelevitch, D., Kilian, M., Lorenz, D., Levi, Y., English, Z., Voleti, V., Letts, A., et al. (2023a). Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets..
- Blattmann, A., Rombach, R., Ling, H., Dockhorn, T., Kim, S. W., Fidler, S., & Kreis, K. (2023b). Align your latents: High-resolution video synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 22563–22575.
- Bousmalis, K., Vezzani, G., Rao, D., Devin, C., Lee, A. X., Bauza, M., Davchev, T., Zhou, Y., Gupta, A., Raju, A., et al. (2023). Robocat: A self-improving foundation agent for robotic manipulation..

- Brohan, A., Brown, N., Carbajal, J., Chebotar, Y., Choromanski, K., Ding, T., Driess, D., Finn, C., Florence, P. R., Fu, C., Arenas, M. G., Gopalakrishnan, K., Han, K., Hausman, K., Herzog, A., Hsu, J., Ichter, B., Irpan, A., Joshi, N. J., Julian, R. C., Kalashnikov, D., Kuang, Y., Leal, I., Levine, S., Michalewski, H., Mordatch, I., Pertsch, K., Rao, K., Reymann, K., Ryoo, M. S., Salazar, G., Sanketi, P. R., Sermanet, P., Singh, J., Singh, A., Soricut, R., Tran, H., Vanhoucke, V., Vuong, Q. H., Wahid, A., Welker, S., Wohlhart, P., Xiao, T., Yu, T., & Zitkovich, B. (2023). Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control. *ArXiv, abs/2307.15818*.
- Brohan, A., Brown, N., Carbajal, J., Chebotar, Y., Dabis, J., Finn, C., Gopalakrishnan, K., Hausman, K., Herzog, A., Hsu, J., Ibarz, J., Ichter, B., Irpan, A., Jackson, T., Jesmonth, S., Joshi, N. J., Julian, R. C., Kalashnikov, D., Kuang, Y., Leal, I., Lee, K.-H., Levine, S., Lu, Y., Malla, U., Manjunath, D., Mordatch, I., Nachum, O., Parada, C., Peralta, J., Perez, E., Pertsch, K., Quiambao, J., Rao, K., Ryoo, M. S., Salazar, G., Sanketi, P. R., Sayed, K., Singh, J., Sontakke, S. A., Stone, A., Tan, C., Tran, H., Vanhoucke, V., Vega, S., Vuong, Q. H., Xia, F., Xiao, T., Xu, P., Xu, S., Yu, T., & Zitkovich, B. (2022). Rt-1: Robotics transformer for real-world control at scale. *ArXiv, abs/2212.06817*.
- Brooks, T., Peebles, B., Holmes, C., DePue, W., Guo, Y., Jing, L., Schnurr, D., Taylor, J., Luhman, T., Luhman, E., Ng, C., Wang, R., & Ramesh, A. (2024). Video generation models as world simulators..
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T. J., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *ArXiv, abs/2005.14165*.
- Bruce, J., Dennis, M., Edwards, A., Parker-Holder, J., Shi, Y., Hughes, E., Lai, M., Mavalankar, A., Steigerwald, R., Apps, C., Aytar, Y., Behtle, S., Behbahani, F. M. P., Chan, S., Heess, N. M. O., Gonzalez, L., Osindero, S., Ozair, S., Reed, S., Zhang, J., Zolna, K., Clune, J., de Freitas, N., Singh, S., & Rocktaschel, T. (2024). Genie: Generative interactive environments..
- Burda, Y., Edwards, H., Storkey, A. J., & Klimov, O. (2018). Exploration by random network distillation. *ArXiv, abs/1810.12894*.
- Burns, K., Witzel, Z., Hamid, J. I., Yu, T., Finn, C., & Hausman, K. (2023). What makes pre-trained visual representations successful for robust manipulation?. *ArXiv, abs/2312.12444*.
- Caesar, H., Bankiti, V., Lang, A. H., Vora, S., Liong, V. E., Xu, Q., Krishnan, A., Pan, Y., Baldan, G., & Beijbom, O. (2019). nuscenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving..
- Cai, S., Zhang, B., Wang, Z., Ma, X., Liu, A., & Liang, Y. (2023). Groot: Learning to follow instructions by watching gameplay videos. *ArXiv, abs/2310.08235*.



- Campos, V., Sprechmann, P., Hansen, S., Barreto, A., Kapturowski, S., Vitvitskyi, A., Badia, A. P., & Blundell, C. (2021). Beyond fine-tuning: Transferring behavior in reinforcement learning..
- Chane-Sane, E., Schmid, C., & Laptev, I. (2023). Learning video-conditioned policies for unseen manipulation tasks..
- Chang, H., Zhang, H., Jiang, L., Liu, C., & Freeman, W. T. (2022). Maskgit: Masked generative image transformer..
- Chang, M., Gupta, A., & Gupta, S. (2020). Semantic visual navigation by watching youtube videos. *ArXiv, abs/2006.10034*.
- Chang, M., Gupta, A., & Gupta, S. (2022). Learning value functions from undirected state-only experience. *ArXiv, abs/2204.12458*.
- Chang, M., Prakash, A., & Gupta, S. (2023). Look ma, no hands! agent-environment factorization of egocentric videos. *ArXiv, abs/2305.16301*.
- Chebatar, Y., Vuong, Q., Hausman, K., Xia, F., Lu, Y., Irpan, A., Kumar, A., Yu, T., Herzog, A., Pertsch, K., et al. (2023). Q-transformer: Scalable offline reinforcement learning via autoregressive q-functions. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 3909–3928. PMLR.
- Chen, A. S., Nair, S., & Finn, C. (2021). Learning generalizable robotic reward functions from ”in-the-wild” human videos. *ArXiv, abs/2103.16817*.
- Chen, G., Zheng, Y.-D., Wang, J., Xu, J., Huang, Y., Pan, J., Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Qiao, Y., Lu, T., et al. (2023a). Videollm: Modeling video sequence with large language models..
- Chen, J., Zhu, D., Haydarov, K., Li, X., & Elhoseiny, M. (2023b). Video chatcaptioner: Towards the enriched spatiotemporal descriptions..
- Chen, W., Wu, J., Xie, P., Wu, H., Li, J., Xia, X., Xiao, X., & Lin, L. (2023c). Control-a-video: Controllable text-to-video generation with diffusion models..
- Chen, X., Xie, S., & He, K. (2021). An empirical study of training self-supervised vision transformers..
- Chevalier-Boisvert, M., Dai, B., Towers, M., Perez-Vicente, R., Willems, L., Lahlou, S., Pal, S., Castro, P. S., & Terry, J. (2024). Minigrid & miniworld: Modular & customizable reinforcement learning environments for goal-oriented tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Chiappa, S., Racaniere, S., Wierstra, D., & Mohamed, S. (2017). Recurrent environment simulators..
- Clark, A., Donahue, J., & Simonyan, K. (2019). Adversarial video generation on complex datasets..
- Cui, Z. J., Wang, Y., Shafiullah, N. M. M., & Pinto, L. (2022). From play to policy: Conditional behavior generation from uncurated robot data. *ArXiv, abs/2210.10047*.
- Dai, X., Hou, J., Ma, C.-Y., Tsai, S., Wang, J., Wang, R., Zhang, P., Vandenhende, S., Wang, X., Dubey, A., et al. (2023). Emu: Enhancing image generation models using photogenic needles in a haystack..

- Damen, D., Doughty, H., Farinella, G. M., Fidler, S., Furnari, A., Kazakos, E., Moltisanti, D., Munro, J., Perrett, T., Price, W., et al. (2018). Scaling egocentric vision: The epic-kitchens dataset. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pp. 720–736.
- Damen, D., Doughty, H., Farinella, G. M., Furnari, A., Kazakos, E., Ma, J., Moltisanti, D., Munro, J., Perrett, T., Price, W., et al. (2022). Rescaling egocentric vision: Collection, pipeline and challenges for epic-kitchens-100..
- Dao, T., Fu, D., Ermon, S., Rudra, A., & Ré, C. (2022). Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *35*, 16344–16359.
- Darkhalil, A., Shan, D., Zhu, B., Ma, J., Kar, A., Higgins, R., Fidler, S., Fouhey, D., & Damen, D. (2022). Epic-kitchens visor benchmark: Video segmentations and object relations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *35*, 13745–13758.
- Dasari, S., Srirama, M. K., Jain, U., & Gupta, A. (2023). An unbiased look at datasets for visuo-motor pre-training. *ArXiv, abs/2310.09289*.
- Deitke, M., VanderBilt, E., Herrasti, A., Weihs, L., Ehsani, K., Salvador, J., Han, W., Kolve, E., Kembhavi, A., & Mottaghi, R. (2022). Proctor: Large-scale embodied ai using procedural generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *35*, 5982–5994.
- Deng, J., Dong, W., Socher, R., Li, L.-J., Li, K., & Fei-Fei, L. (2009). Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 248–255. Ieee.
- Denton, E., & Fergus, R. (2018). Stochastic video generation with a learned prior. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1174–1183. PMLR.
- Ding, H., Liu, C., He, S., Jiang, X., Torr, P. H., & Bai, S. (2023a). Mose: A new dataset for video object segmentation in complex scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 20224–20234.
- Ding, Z., Luo, H., Li, K., Yue, J., Huang, T., & Lu, Z. (2023b). Clip4mc: An rl-friendly vision-language model for minecraft. *ArXiv, abs/2303.10571*.
- Du, Y., & Kaelbling, L. P. (2024). Compositional generative modeling: A single model is not all you need. *ArXiv, abs/2402.01103*.
- Du, Y., Yang, M., Dai, B., Dai, H., Nachum, O., Tenenbaum, J. B., Schuurmans, D., & Abbeel, P. (2023a). Learning universal policies via text-guided video generation. *ArXiv, abs/2302.00111*.
- Du, Y., Yang, M., Florence, P. R., Xia, F., Wahid, A., Ichter, B., Sermanet, P., Yu, T., Abbeel, P., Tenenbaum, J., Kaelbling, L. P., Zeng, A., & Tompson, J. (2023b). Video language planning. *ArXiv, abs/2310.10625*.
- Du, Y., Konyushkova, K., Denil, M., Raju, A., Landon, J., Hill, F., de Freitas, N., & Cabi, S. (2023c). Vision-language models as success detectors..
- Edwards, A. D., & Isbell, C. L. (2019). Perceptual values from observation..

- Edwards, A. D., Sahni, H., Liu, R., Hung, J., Jain, A., Wang, R., Ecoffet, A., Miconi, T., Isbell, C. L., & Yosinski, J. (2020). Estimating  $q(s, s')$  with deep deterministic dynamics gradients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Edwards, A. D., Sahni, H., Schroecker, Y., & Isbell, C. L. (2018). Imitating latent policies from observation. *ArXiv, abs/1805.07914*.
- Emmons, S., Eysenbach, B., Kostrikov, I., & Levine, S. (2021). Rvs: What is essential for offline rl via supervised learning?..
- Escontrela, A., Adeniji, A., Yan, W., Jain, A., Peng, X. B., Goldberg, K., Lee, Y., Hafner, D., & Abbeel, P. (2023). Video prediction models as rewards for reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2305.14343*.
- Esser, P., Rombach, R., & Ommer, B. (2020). Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis..
- Eze, C., & Crick, C. (2024). Learning by watching: A review of video-based learning approaches for robot manipulation..
- Faldor, M., Zhang, J., Cully, A., & Clune, J. (2024). Omni-epic: Open-endedness via models of human notions of interestingness with environments programmed in code..
- Fan, L., Wang, G., Jiang, Y., Mandlekar, A., Yang, Y., Zhu, H., Tang, A., Huang, D.-A., Zhu, Y., & Anandkumar, A. (2022). Minedojo: Building open-ended embodied agents with internet-scale knowledge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 18343–18362.
- Finn, C., Abbeel, P., & Levine, S. (2017). Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1126–1135. PMLR.
- Gao, Z., Tan, C., Wu, L., & Li, S. Z. (2022). Simvp: Simpler yet better video prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 3170–3180.
- Garcia, C. E., Prett, D. M., & Morari, M. (1989). Model predictive control: Theory and practice—a survey. *Automatica*, 25(3), 335–348.
- Gavenski, N., Rodrigues, O., & Luck, M. (2024). Imitation learning: A survey of learning methods, environments and metrics..
- Ge, S., Hayes, T., Yang, H., Yin, X., Pang, G., Jacobs, D., Huang, J.-B., & Parikh, D. (2022). Long video generation with time-agnostic vqgan and time-sensitive transformer. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 102–118. Springer.
- Ge, S., Nah, S., Liu, G., Poon, T., Tao, A., Catanzaro, B., Jacobs, D., Huang, J.-B., Liu, M.-Y., & Balaji, Y. (2023). Preserve your own correlation: A noise prior for video diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 22930–22941.
- Ghosh, D., Bhateja, C. A., & Levine, S. (2023). Reinforcement learning from passive data via latent intentions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 11321–11339. PMLR.

- Girdhar, R., El-Nouby, A., Singh, M., Alwala, K. V., Joulin, A., & Misra, I. (2022). Omnia: Single model masked pretraining on images and videos..
- Girdhar, R., Ramanan, D., Gupta, A., Sivic, J., & Russell, B. (2017). Actionvlad: Learning spatio-temporal aggregation for action classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 971–980.
- Goyal, R., Kahou, S. E., Michalski, V., Materzynska, J., Westphal, S., Kim, H., Haenel, V., Fründ, I., Yianilos, P. N., Mueller-Freitag, M., Hoppe, F., Thureau, C., Bax, I., & Memisevic, R. (2017). The “something something” video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense..
- Grauman, K., Westbury, A., Byrne, E., Chavis, Z. Q., Furnari, A., Girdhar, R., Hamburger, J., Jiang, H., Liu, M., Liu, X., Martin, M., Nagarajan, T., Radosavovic, I., Ramakrishnan, S. K., Ryan, F., & et. al., J. S. (2021). Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video..
- Grauman, K., Westbury, A., Torresani, L., Kitani, K., Malik, J., Afouras, T., Ashutosh, K., Baiyya, V., Bansal, S., Boote, B., et al. (2023). Ego-exo4d: Understanding skilled human activity from first-and third-person perspectives..
- Grill, J.-B., Strub, F., Alché, F., Tallec, C., Richemond, P., Buchatskaya, E., Doersch, C., Avila Pires, B., Guo, Z., Gheshlaghi Azar, M., et al. (2020). Bootstrap your own latent—a new approach to self-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, *33*, 21271–21284.
- Gu, A., & Dao, T. (2023). Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces..
- Gu, J., Xiang, F., Li, X., Ling, Z., Liu, X., Mu, T., Tang, Y., Tao, S., Wei, X., Yao, Y., et al. (2023). Maniskill2: A unified benchmark for generalizable manipulation skills..
- Guan, L., Zhou, Y., Liu, D., Zha, Y., Amor, H. B., & Kambhampati, S. (2024). ” task success” is not enough: Investigating the use of video-language models as behavior critics for catching undesirable agent behaviors..
- Gupta, A., Tian, S., Zhang, Y., Wu, J., Martín-Martín, R., & Fei-Fei, L. (2022). Maskvit: Masked visual pre-training for video prediction..
- Ha, H., Florence, P., & Song, S. (2023). Scaling up and distilling down: Language-guided robot skill acquisition. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 3766–3777. PMLR.
- Haarnoja, T., Zhou, A., Hartikainen, K., Tucker, G., Ha, S., Tan, J., Kumar, V., Zhu, H., Gupta, A., Abbeel, P., et al. (2018). Soft actor-critic algorithms and applications..
- Hafner, D., Lee, K.-H., Fischer, I., & Abbeel, P. (2022). Deep hierarchical planning from pixels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *35*, 26091–26104.
- Hafner, D., Lillicrap, T. P., Fischer, I. S., Villegas, R., Ha, D. R., Lee, H., & Davidson, J. (2018). Learning latent dynamics for planning from pixels. *ArXiv, abs/1811.04551*.
- Hafner, D., Paukonis, J., Ba, J., & Lillicrap, T. P. (2023). Mastering diverse domains through world models. *ArXiv, abs/2301.04104*.

- Hawthorne, C., Jaegle, A., Cangea, C., Borgeaud, S., Nash, C., Malinowski, M., Dieleman, S., Vinyals, O., Botvinick, M., Simon, I., et al. (2022). General-purpose, long-context autoregressive modeling with percever ar. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8535–8558. PMLR.
- He, H., Bai, C., Pan, L., Zhang, W., Zhao, B., & Li, X. (2024). Large-scale actionless video pre-training via discrete diffusion for efficient policy learning..
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., & Sun, J. (2016). Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778.
- Ho, J., Chan, W., Saharia, C., Whang, J., Gao, R., Gritsenko, A., Kingma, D. P., Poole, B., Norouzi, M., Fleet, D. J., et al. (2022). Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models..
- Ho, J., & Ermon, S. (2016). Generative adversarial imitation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Ho, J., Jain, A., & Abbeel, P. (2020). Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *ArXiv, abs/2006.11239*.
- Ho, J., Salimans, T., Gritsenko, A., Chan, W., Norouzi, M., & Fleet, D. J. (2022). Video diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 8633–8646.
- Höppe, T., Mehrjou, A., Bauer, S., Nielsen, D., & Dittadi, A. (2022). Diffusion models for video prediction and infilling..
- Hu, A., Russell, L., Yeo, H., Murez, Z., Fedoseev, G., Kendall, A., Shotton, J., & Corrado, G. (2023). Gaia-1: A generative world model for autonomous driving. *ArXiv, abs/2309.17080*.
- Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., & Chen, W. (2021). Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models..
- Hu, Y., Xie, Q., Jain, V., Francis, J., Patrikar, J., Keetha, N., Kim, S., Xie, Y., Zhang, T., Zhao, Z., et al. (2023a). Toward general-purpose robots via foundation models: A survey and meta-analysis..
- Hu, Y., Wang, R., Li, L., & Gao, Y. (2023b). For pre-trained vision models in motor control, not all policy learning methods are created equal. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Huang, J., Chen, X., Mishra, S., Zheng, H. S., Yu, A. W., Song, X., & Zhou, D. (2023a). Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet..
- Huang, T., Jiang, G., Ze, Y., & Xu, H. (2023b). Diffusion reward: Learning rewards via conditional video diffusion..
- Huang, W., Xia, F., Xiao, T., Chan, H., Liang, J., Florence, P. R., Zeng, A., Tompson, J., Mordatch, I., Chebotar, Y., Sermanet, P., Brown, N., Jackson, T., Luu, L., Levine, S., Hausman, K., & Ichter, B. (2022). Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.

- Ibarz, J., Tan, J., Finn, C., Kalakrishnan, M., Pastor, P., & Levine, S. (2021). How to train your robot with deep reinforcement learning: lessons we have learned. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 40(4-5), 698–721.
- Jain, V., Attarian, M., Joshi, N. J., Wahid, A., Driess, D., Vuong, Q., Sanketi, P. R., Sermanet, P., Welker, S., Chan, C., et al. (2024). Vid2robot: End-to-end video-conditioned policy learning with cross-attention transformers..
- Jang, E. (2024). All neural networks, all autonomous, all 1x speed. <https://www.1x.tech/discover/all-neural-networks-all-autonomous-all-1x-speed>. Accessed: 2024-04-10.
- Janner, M., Fu, J., Zhang, M., & Levine, S. (2019). When to trust your model: Model-based policy optimization. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.08253.
- Jiang, A. Q., Sablayrolles, A., Roux, A., Mensch, A., Savary, B., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D. S., Casas, D. d. l., Hanna, E. B., Bressand, F., et al. (2024). Mixtral of experts..
- Jiang, J., Deng, F., Singh, G., & Ahn, S. (2023). Object-centric slot diffusion..
- Jin, Y., Xu, K., Chen, L., Liao, C., Tan, J., Chen, B., Lei, C., Liu, A., Song, C., Lei, X., et al. (2023). Unified language-vision pretraining with dynamic discrete visual tokenization..
- Jing, Y., Zhu, X., Liu, X., Sima, Q., Yang, T., Feng, Y., & Kong, T. (2023). Exploring visual pre-training for robot manipulation: Datasets, models and methods. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.03620.
- JyothirS, V., Jalagam, S., LeCun, Y., & Sobal, V. (2023). Gradient-based planning with world models. *ArXiv*, abs/2312.17227.
- Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., & Amodei, D. (2020). Scaling laws for neural language models..
- Karaev, N., Rocco, I., Graham, B., Neverova, N., Vedaldi, A., & Rupprecht, C. (2023). Cotracker: It is better to track together..
- Karamcheti, S., Nair, S., Chen, A. S., Kollar, T., Finn, C., Sadigh, D., & Liang, P. (2023). Language-driven representation learning for robotics. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.12766.
- Karnan, H., Warnell, G., Xiao, X., & Stone, P. (2021). Voila: Visual-observation-only imitation learning for autonomous navigation..
- Kaufmann, E., Bauersfeld, L., Loquercio, A., Müller, M., Koltun, V., & Scaramuzza, D. (2023a). Champion-level drone racing using deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 620(7976), 982–987.
- Kaufmann, T., Weng, P., Bengs, V., & Hüllermeier, E. (2023b). A survey of reinforcement learning from human feedback..
- Kay, W., Carreira, J., Simonyan, K., Zhang, B., Hillier, C., Vijayanarasimhan, S., Viola, F., Green, T., Back, T., Natsev, P., et al. (2017). The kinetics human action video dataset..
- Khazatsky, A., Pertsch, K., Nair, S., Balakrishna, A., Dasari, S., Karamcheti, S., Nasiriany, S., Srirama, M. K., Chen, L. Y., Ellis, K., Fagan, P., Hejna, J., Itkina, M., Lepert, M.,

- Ma, Y., Miller, P. T., Wu, J., Belkhale, S., Dass, S., Ha, H., Jain, A., Lee, A., Lee, Y., Memmel, M., Park, S. Y., & et. al., I. R. (2024). Droid: A large-scale in-the-wild robot manipulation dataset. *ArXiv, abs/2403.12945*.
- Kim, M. J., Wu, J., & Finn, C. (2023). Giving robots a hand: Learning generalizable manipulation with eye-in-hand human video demonstrations. *ArXiv, abs/2307.05959*.
- Kirillov, A., Mintun, E., Ravi, N., Mao, H., Rolland, C., Gustafson, L., Xiao, T., Whitehead, S., Berg, A. C., Lo, W.-Y., et al. (2023). Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 4015–4026.
- Kirk, R., Zhang, A., Grefenstette, E., & Rocktäschel, T. (2023). A survey of zero-shot generalisation in deep reinforcement learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 76, 201–264.
- Klissarov, M., D’Oro, P., Sodhani, S., Raileanu, R., Bacon, P.-L., Vincent, P., Zhang, A., & Henaff, M. (2023). Motif: Intrinsic motivation from artificial intelligence feedback..
- Ko, P.-C., Mao, J., Du, Y., Sun, S.-H., & Tenenbaum, J. (2023). Learning to act from actionless videos through dense correspondences. *ArXiv, abs/2310.08576*.
- Kober, J., Bagnell, J. A., & Peters, J. (2013). Reinforcement learning in robotics: A survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 32(11), 1238–1274.
- Kolve, E., Mottaghi, R., Han, W., VanderBilt, E., Weihs, L., Herrasti, A., Deitke, M., Ehsani, K., Gordon, D., Zhu, Y., et al. (2017). Ai2-thor: An interactive 3d environment for visual ai..
- Kondratyuk, D., Yu, L., Gu, X., Lezama, J., Huang, J., Hornung, R., Adam, H., Akbari, H., Alon, Y., Birodkar, V., et al. (2023). Videopoet: A large language model for zero-shot video generation..
- Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., & Hinton, G. E. (2012). Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25.
- Kroemer, O., Niekum, S., & Konidaris, G. (2021). A review of robot learning for manipulation: Challenges, representations, and algorithms. *Journal of machine learning research*, 22(30), 1–82.
- Krotkov, E., Hackett, D., Jackel, L., Perschbacher, M., Pippine, J., Strauss, J., Pratt, G., & Orłowski, C. (2018). The darpa robotics challenge finals: Results and perspectives..
- Kumar, A., Zhou, A., Tucker, G., & Levine, S. (2020). Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1179–1191.
- Kumar, S., Zamora, J., Hansen, N., Jangir, R., & Wang, X. (2022). Graph inverse reinforcement learning from diverse videos. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Kumar, V., Shah, R., Zhou, G., Moens, V., Caggiano, V., Gupta, A., & Rajeswaran, A. (2024). Robohive: A unified framework for robot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

- Küttler, H., Nardelli, N., Miller, A., Raileanu, R., Selvatici, M., Grefenstette, E., & Rocktäschel, T. (2020). The nethack learning environment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 7671–7684.
- Lanham, T., Chen, A., Radhakrishnan, A., Steiner, B., Denison, C., Hernandez, D., Li, D., Durmus, E., Hubinger, E., Kernion, J., et al. (2023). Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning..
- Laskin, M., Wang, L., Oh, J., Parisotto, E., Spencer, S., Steigerwald, R., Strouse, D., Hansen, S. S., Filos, A., Brooks, E. A., Gazeau, M., Sahni, H., Singh, S., & Mnih, V. (2022). In-context reinforcement learning with algorithm distillation. *ArXiv, abs/2210.14215*.
- LeCun, Y. (2022). A path towards autonomous machine intelligence version 0.9. 2, 2022-06-27. *Open Review*, 62(1).
- Lee, J., Xie, A., Pacchiano, A., Chandak, Y., Finn, C., Nachum, O., & Brunskill, E. (2023). Supervised pretraining can learn in-context reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2306.14892*.
- Levine, S., Kumar, A., Tucker, G., & Fu, J. (2020). Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *ArXiv, abs/2005.01643*.
- Li, B., Zhang, Y., Chen, L., Wang, J., Pu, F., Yang, J., Li, C., & Liu, Z. (2023). Mimic-it: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning..
- Li, C., Zhang, R., Wong, J., Gokmen, C., Srivastava, S., Martín-Martín, R., Wang, C., Levine, G., Ai, W., Martinez, B., et al. (2024). Behavior-1k: A human-centered, embodied ai benchmark with 1,000 everyday activities and realistic simulation..
- Li, J., Li, D., Xiong, C., & Hoi, S. (2022). Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 12888–12900. PMLR.
- Li, K., He, Y., Wang, Y., Li, Y., Wang, W., Luo, P., Wang, Y., Wang, L., & Qiao, Y. (2023). Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding..
- Li, K., Li, X., Wang, Y., He, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, L., & Qiao, Y. (2024). Videomamba: State space model for efficient video understanding..
- Li, K., Wang, Y., Li, Y., Wang, Y., He, Y., Wang, L., & Qiao, Y. (2023). Unmasked teacher: Towards training-efficient video foundation models..
- Li, P., Liu, T., Li, Y., Han, M., Geng, H., Wang, S., Zhu, Y., Zhu, S.-C., & Huang, S. (2024). Ag2manip: Learning novel manipulation skills with agent-agnostic visual and action representations..
- Li, S., Du, Y., Tenenbaum, J. B., Torralba, A., & Mordatch, I. (2022). Composing ensembles of pre-trained models via iterative consensus..
- Liang, J., Huang, W., Xia, F., Xu, P., Hausman, K., Ichter, B., Florence, P., & Zeng, A. (2023). Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 9493–9500. IEEE.



- Lifshitz, S., Paster, K., Chan, H., Ba, J., & McIlraith, S. A. (2023). Steve-1: A generative model for text-to-behavior in minecraft. *ArXiv, abs/2306.00937*.
- Lillicrap, T. P., Hunt, J. J., Pritzel, A., Heess, N., Erez, T., Tassa, Y., Silver, D., & Wierstra, D. (2015). Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning.
- Lin, B., Zhu, B., Ye, Y., Ning, M., Jin, P., & Yuan, L. (2023). Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection..
- Lin, H., Peng, S., Xu, Z., Yan, Y., Shuai, Q., Bao, H., & Zhou, X. (2022). Efficient neural radiance fields for interactive free-viewpoint video. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2022 Conference Papers*, pp. 1–9.
- Liu, B., Zhu, Y., Gao, C., Feng, Y., Liu, Q., Zhu, Y., & Stone, P. (2024a). Libero: Benchmarking knowledge transfer for lifelong robot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Liu, H., Yan, W., Zaharia, M., & Abbeel, P. (2024b). World model on million-length video and language with blockwise ringattention..
- Liu, H., Zaharia, M., & Abbeel, P. (2023a). Ring attention with blockwise transformers for near-infinite context..
- Liu, H., Zhuge, M., Li, B., Wang, Y., Faccio, F., Ghanem, B., & Schmidhuber, J. (2023b). Learning to identify critical states for reinforcement learning from videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 1955–1965.
- Liu, J., Yuan, Y., Hao, J., Ni, F., Fu, L., Chen, Y., & Zheng, Y. (2024). Enhancing robotic manipulation with ai feedback from multimodal large language models..
- Liu, M., Zhu, Z., Zhuang, Y., Zhang, W., Hao, J., Yu, Y., & Wang, J. (2022). Plan your target and learn your skills: Transferable state-only imitation learning via decoupled policy optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Loper, M., Mahmood, N., Romero, J., Pons-Moll, G., & Black, M. J. (2023). Smpl: A skinned multi-person linear model. In *Seminal Graphics Papers: Pushing the Boundaries, Volume 2*, pp. 851–866.
- Lotter, W., Kreiman, G., & Cox, D. (2016). Deep predictive coding networks for video prediction and unsupervised learning..
- Lynch, C., Khansari, M., Xiao, T., Kumar, V., Tompson, J., Levine, S., & Sermanet, P. (2020). Learning latent plans from play. In *Conference on robot learning*, pp. 1113–1132. PMLR.
- Lynch, C., Wahid, A., Tompson, J., Ding, T., Betker, J., Baruch, R., Armstrong, T., & Florence, P. (2023). Interactive language: Talking to robots in real time..
- Ma, Y. J., Liang, W. J., Som, V., Kumar, V., Zhang, A., Bastani, O., & Jayaraman, D. (2023). Liv: Language-image representations and rewards for robotic control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Ma, Y. J., Sodhani, S., Jayaraman, D., Bastani, O., Kumar, V., & Zhang, A. (2022). Vip: Towards universal visual reward and representation via value-implicit pre-training. *ArXiv, abs/2210.00030*.

- Maaz, M., Rasheed, H., Khan, S., & Khan, F. S. (2023). Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models..
- Mack, C. A. (2011). Fifty years of moore’s law. *IEEE Transactions on semiconductor manufacturing*, 24(2), 202–207.
- Madan, N., Moegelmose, A., Modi, R., Rawat, Y. S., & Moeslund, T. B. (2024). Foundation models for video understanding: A survey..
- Majumdar, A., Yadav, K., Arnaud, S., Ma, Y. J., Chen, C., Silwal, S., Jain, A., Berges, V.-P., Abbeel, P., Malik, J., Batra, D., Lin, Y., Maksymets, O., Rajeswaran, A., & Meier, F. (2023). Where are we in the search for an artificial visual cortex for embodied intelligence?. *ArXiv, abs/2303.18240*.
- Makoviychuk, V., Wawrzyniak, L., Guo, Y., Lu, M., Storey, K., Macklin, M., Hoeller, D., Rudin, N., Allshire, A., Handa, A., et al. (2021). Isaac gym: High performance gpu-based physics simulation for robot learning..
- Mandikal, P., & Grauman, K. (2022). Dexvip: Learning dexterous grasping with human hand pose priors from video. *ArXiv, abs/2202.00164*.
- Mees, O., Hermann, L., Rosete-Beas, E., & Burgard, W. (2022). Calvin: A benchmark for language-conditioned policy learning for long-horizon robot manipulation tasks. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(3), 7327–7334.
- Mendonca, R., Bahl, S., & Pathak, D. (2023). Structured world models from human videos. *ArXiv, abs/2308.10901*.
- Miech, A., Zhukov, D., Alayrac, J.-B., Tapaswi, M., Laptev, I., & Sivic, J. (2019). Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips..
- Ming, R., Huang, Z., Ju, Z., Hu, J., Peng, L., & Zhou, S. (2024). A survey on video prediction: From deterministic to generative approaches. *ArXiv, abs/2401.14718*.
- Moore, G. E. (1998). Cramming more components onto integrated circuits. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(1), 82–85.
- Mu, Y., Zhang, Q., Hu, M., Wang, W., Ding, M., Jin, J., Wang, B., Dai, J., Qiao, Y., & Luo, P. (2023). Embodiedgpt: Vision-language pre-training via embodied chain of thought. *ArXiv, abs/2305.15021*.
- Nagarajan, T., & Grauman, K. (2021). Shaping embodied agent behavior with activity-context priors from egocentric video. *ArXiv, abs/2110.07692*.
- Nagrani, A., Seo, P. H., Seybold, B., Hauth, A., Manen, S., Sun, C., & Schmid, C. (2022). Learning audio-video modalities from image captions. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 407–426. Springer.
- Nair, S., Rajeswaran, A., Kumar, V., Finn, C., & Gupta, A. (2022). R3m: A universal visual representation for robot manipulation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Narang, S., & Chowdhery, A. (2022). Pathways language model (palm): Scaling to 540 billion parameters for breakthrough performance..

- Nasiriany, S., Xia, F., Yu, W., Xiao, T., Liang, J., Dasgupta, I., Xie, A., Driess, D., Wahid, A., Xu, Z., Vuong, Q. H., Zhang, T., Lee, T.-W. E., Lee, K.-H., Xu, P., Kirmani, S., Zhu, Y., Zeng, A., Hausman, K., Heess, N. M. O., Finn, C., Levine, S., & Ichter, B. (2024). Pivot: Iterative visual prompting elicits actionable knowledge for vlms. *ArXiv, abs/2402.07872*.
- Nauman, M., Bortkiewicz, M., Ostaszewski, M., Milo’s, P., Trzeciński, T., & Cygan, M. (2024). Overestimation, overfitting, and plasticity in actor-critic: the bitter lesson of reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2403.00514*.
- Oord, A. v. d., Li, Y., & Vinyals, O. (2018). Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding..
- OpenAI (2020). Faulty reward functions. <https://openai.com/index/faulty-reward-functions/>. Accessed: 2024-05-23.
- OpenAI (2023). Gpt-4 technical report. *ArXiv, abs/2303.08774*.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems, 35*, 27730–27744.
- Padalkar, A., Pooley, A., Jain, A., Bewley, A., Herzog, A., Irpan, A., Khazatsky, A., Rai, A., Singh, A., Brohan, A., et al. (2023). Open x-embodiment: Robotic learning datasets and rt-x models..
- Papalampidi, P., Koppula, S., Pathak, S., Chiu, J., Heyward, J., Patraucean, V., Shen, J., Miech, A., Zisserman, A., & Nematzdeh, A. (2023). A simple recipe for contrastively pre-training video-first encoders beyond 16 frames. *ArXiv, abs/2312.07395*.
- Parisi, S., Rajeswaran, A., Purushwalkam, S., & Gupta, A. K. (2022). The unsurprising effectiveness of pre-trained vision models for control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Park, J. S., O’Brien, J., Cai, C. J., Morris, M. R., Liang, P., & Bernstein, M. S. (2023). Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 1–22.
- Park, S., Ghosh, D., Eysenbach, B., & Levine, S. (2024). Hiql: Offline goal-conditioned rl with latent states as actions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36*.
- Pathak, D., Agrawal, P., Efros, A. A., & Darrell, T. (2017). Curiosity-driven exploration by self-supervised prediction..
- Pavlakos, G., Choutas, V., Ghorbani, N., Bolkart, T., Osman, A. A., Tzionas, D., & Black, M. J. (2019). Expressive body capture: 3d hands, face, and body from a single image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 10975–10985.
- Peng, X. B., Coumans, E., Zhang, T., Lee, T.-W., Tan, J., & Levine, S. (2020). Learning agile robotic locomotion skills by imitating animals..
- Peng, X. B., Kanazawa, A., Malik, J., Abbeel, P., & Levine, S. (2018). Sfv: Reinforcement learning of physical skills from videos. *ACM Trans. Graph., 37*, 178.

- Peri, S., Lee, I., Kim, C., Fuxin, L., Hermans, T., & Lee, S. (2024). Point cloud models improve visual robustness in robotic learners..
- Pertsch, K., Desai, R., Kumar, V., Meier, F., Lim, J. J., Batra, D., & Rai, A. (2022). Cross-domain transfer via semantic skill imitation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Pertsch, K., Rybkin, O., Yang, J., Zhou, S., Derpanis, K. G., Daniilidis, K., Lim, J. J., & Jaegle, A. (2019). Keyframing the future: Keyframe discovery for visual prediction and planning. In *Conference on Learning for Dynamics & Control*.
- Peters, J., Lee, D. D., Kober, J., Nguyen-Tuong, D., Bagnell, J. A., & Schaal, S. (2016). Robot learning..
- Popov, I., Heess, N., Lillicrap, T., Hafner, R., Barth-Maron, G., Vecerik, M., Lampe, T., Tassa, Y., Erez, T., & Riedmiller, M. (2017). Data-efficient deep reinforcement learning for dexterous manipulation..
- Prudencio, R. F., Maximo, M. R., & Colombini, E. L. (2023). A survey on offline reinforcement learning: Taxonomy, review, and open problems..
- Puig, X., Undersander, E., Szot, A., Cote, M. D., Yang, T.-Y., Partsey, R., Desai, R., Clegg, A. W., Hlavac, M., Min, S. Y., et al. (2023). Habitat 3.0: A co-habitat for humans, avatars and robots..
- Pumacay, W., Singh, I., Duan, J., Krishna, R., Thomason, J., & Fox, D. (2024). The colosseum: A benchmark for evaluating generalization for robotic manipulation..
- Qin, Y., Su, H., & Wang, X. (2022). From one hand to multiple hands: Imitation learning for dexterous manipulation from single-camera teleoperation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7, 10873–10881.
- Qin, Y., Wu, Y.-H., Liu, S., Jiang, H., Yang, R., Fu, Y., & Wang, X. (2021). Dexmv: Imitation learning for dexterous manipulation from human videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al. (2021). Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. (2019). Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8), 9.
- Radosavovic, I., Xiao, T., James, S., Abbeel, P., Malik, J., & Darrell, T. (2022). Real-world robot learning with masked visual pre-training. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Radosavovic, I., Zhang, B., Shi, B., Rajasegaran, J., Kamat, S., Darrell, T., Sreenath, K., & Malik, J. (2024). Humanoid locomotion as next token prediction..
- Ranasinghe, K., Li, X., Kahatapitiya, K., & Ryoo, M. S. (2024). Understanding long videos in one multimodal language model pass..
- Ravichandar, H., Polydoros, A. S., Chernova, S., & Billard, A. (2020). Recent advances in robot learning from demonstration. *Annu. Rev. Control. Robotics Auton. Syst.*, 3, 297–330.

- Reed, S., Zolna, K., Parisotto, E., Colmenarejo, S. G., Novikov, A., Barth-Maron, G., Gimenez, M., Sulsky, Y., Kay, J., Springenberg, J. T., Eccles, T., Bruce, J., Razavi, A., Edwards, A. D., Heess, N. M. O., Chen, Y., Hadsell, R., Vinyals, O., Bordbar, M., & de Freitas, N. (2022). A generalist agent. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2022.
- Romero, J., Tzionas, D., & Black, M. J. (2022). Embodied hands: Modeling and capturing hands and bodies together..
- Rong, Y., Shiratori, T., & Joo, H. (2020). Frankmocap: Fast monocular 3d hand and body motion capture by regression and integration..
- Rosete-Beas, E., Mees, O., Kalweit, G., Boedecker, J., & Burgard, W. (2022). Latent plans for task-agnostic offline reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Rybkin, O., Pertsch, K., Derpanis, K. G., Daniilidis, K., & Jaegle, A. (2018). Learning what you can do before doing anything. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Saxena, V., Ba, J., & Hafner, D. (2021). Clockwork variational autoencoders. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 29246–29257.
- Schiappa, M. C., Rawat, Y. S., & Shah, M. (2023). Self-supervised learning for videos: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(13s), 1–37.
- Schmeckpeper, K., Rybkin, O., Daniilidis, K., Levine, S., & Finn, C. (2020). Reinforcement learning with videos: Combining offline observations with interaction. *ArXiv, abs/2011.06507*.
- Schmeckpeper, K., Xie, A., Rybkin, O., Tian, S., Daniilidis, K., Levine, S., & Finn, C. (2019). Learning predictive models from observation and interaction. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Schmidt, D., & Jiang, M. (2023). Learning to act without actions. *ArXiv, abs/2312.10812*.
- Schonberger, J. L., & Frahm, J.-M. (2016). Structure-from-motion revisited. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 4104–4113.
- Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Hubert, T., Simonyan, K., Sifre, L., Schmitt, S., Guez, A., Lockhart, E., Hassabis, D., Graepel, T., Lillicrap, T. P., & Silver, D. (2019). Mastering atari, go, chess and shogi by planning with a learned model. *Nature*, 588, 604 – 609.
- Schuhmann, C., Beaumont, R., Vencu, R., Gordon, C., Wightman, R., Cherti, M., Coombes, T., Katta, A., Mullis, C., Wortsman, M., et al. (2022). Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 25278–25294.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., & Klimov, O. (2017). Proximal policy optimization algorithms..
- Seo, Y., Lee, K., James, S., & Abbeel, P. (2022a). Reinforcement learning with action-free pre-training from videos. *ArXiv, abs/2203.13880*.
- Seo, Y., Lee, K., Liu, F., James, S., & Abbeel, P. (2022b). Harp: Autoregressive latent video prediction with high-fidelity image generator..

- Sermanet, P., Ding, T., Zhao, J., Xia, F., Dwibedi, D., Gopalakrishnan, K., Chan, C., Dulac-Arnold, G., Maddineni, S., Joshi, N. J., et al. (2023). Robovqa: Multimodal long-horizon reasoning for robotics..
- Sermanet, P., Lynch, C., Chebotar, Y., Hsu, J., Jang, E., Schaal, S., Levine, S., & Brain, G. (2018). Time-contrastive networks: Self-supervised learning from video. In *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pp. 1134–1141. IEEE.
- Shafiullah, N. M. M., Rai, A., Etukuru, H., Liu, Y., Misra, I., Chintala, S., & Pinto, L. (2023). On bringing robots home..
- Shah, D., Osiński, B., Levine, S., et al. (2023). Lm-nav: Robotic navigation with large pre-trained models of language, vision, and action. In *Conference on robot learning*, pp. 492–504. PMLR.
- Shan, D., Geng, J., Shu, M., & Fouhey, D. F. (2020). Understanding human hands in contact at internet scale..
- Shang, C., You, A., Subramanian, S., Darrell, T., & Herzig, R. (2024). Traveler: A multi-lmm agent framework for video question-answering..
- Shang, J., & Ryoo, M. S. (2021). Self-supervised disentangled representation learning for third-person imitation learning..
- Shao, L., Migimatsu, T., Zhang, Q., Yang, K., & Bohg, J. (2020). Concept2robot: Learning manipulation concepts from instructions and human demonstrations. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 40, 1419 – 1434.
- Shaw, K., Bahl, S., & Pathak, D. (2022). Videodex: Learning dexterity from internet videos. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Shi, L. X., Hu, Z., Zhao, T. Z., Sharma, A., Pertsch, K., Luo, J., Levine, S., & Finn, C. (2024). Yell at your robot: Improving on-the-fly from language corrections..
- Sieb, M., Xian, Z., Huang, A., Kroemer, O., & Fragkiadaki, K. (2020). Graph-structured visual imitation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 979–989. PMLR.
- Silwal, S., Yadav, K., Wu, T., Vakil, J., Majumdar, A., Arnaud, S., Chen, C., Berges, V.-P., Batra, D., Rajeswaran, A., Kalakrishnan, M., Meier, F., & Maksymets, O. (2023). What do we learn from a large-scale study of pre-trained visual representations in sim and real environments?. *ArXiv, abs/2310.02219*.
- Simonyan, K., & Zisserman, A. (2014). Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27.
- Singer, U., Polyak, A., Hayes, T., Yin, X., An, J., Zhang, S., Hu, Q., Yang, H., Ashual, O., Gafni, O., et al. (2022). Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data..
- Sivakumar, A., Shaw, K., & Pathak, D. (2022). Robotic telekinesis: Learning a robotic hand imitator by watching humans on youtube. *ArXiv, abs/2202.10448*.
- Sjöberg, A. (2023). How many videos are there on youtube?. <https://www.dexerto.com/entertainment/how-many-videos-are-there-on-youtube-2197264/>.

- Smith, L., Dhawan, N., Zhang, M., Abbeel, P., & Levine, S. (2019). Avid: Learning multi-stage tasks via pixel-level translation of human videos. *ArXiv, abs/1912.04443*.
- Sohn, A., Nagabandi, A., Florensa, C., Adelberg, D., Wu, D., Farooq, H., Clavera, I., Welborn, J., Chen, J., Mishra, N., Chen, P., Qian, P., Abbeel, P., Duan, R., Vijay, V., & Liu, Y. (2024). Introducing rfm-1: Giving robots human-like reasoning capabilities. <https://covariant.ai/insights/introducing-rfm-1-giving-robots-human-like-reasoning-capabilities/>. Accessed: 2024-03-29.
- Song, W., Zhao, H., Ding, P., Cui, C., Lyu, S., Fan, Y., & Wang, D. (2024). Germ: A generalist robotic model with mixture-of-experts for quadruped robot..
- Sontakke, S. A., Zhang, J., Arnold, S. M. R., Pertsch, K., Biyik, E., Sadigh, D., Finn, C., & Itti, L. (2023). Roboclip: One demonstration is enough to learn robot policies. *ArXiv, abs/2310.07899*.
- Srivastava, N., Mansimov, E., & Salakhudinov, R. (2015). Unsupervised learning of video representations using lstms. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 843–852. PMLR.
- Stadie, B. C., Abbeel, P., & Sutskever, I. (2017). Third-person imitation learning..
- Stroud, J. C., Lu, Z., Sun, C., Deng, J., Sukthankar, R., Schmid, C., & Ross, D. A. (2020). Learning video representations from textual web supervision..
- Struckmeier, O., & Kyrki, V. (2022). Preventing mode collapse when imitating latent policies from observations..
- Sutton, R. (2019). The bitter lesson..
- Sutton, R. S. (1990). Integrated architectures for learning, planning, and reacting based on approximating dynamic programming. In *Machine learning proceedings 1990*, pp. 216–224. Elsevier.
- Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- Tam, A. C., Rabinowitz, N. C., Lampinen, A. K., Roy, N. A., Chan, S. C. Y., Strouse, D., Wang, J. X., Banino, A., & Hill, F. (2022). Semantic exploration from language abstractions and pretrained representations. *ArXiv, abs/2204.05080*.
- Tang, Y., Bi, J., Xu, S., Song, L., Liang, S., Wang, T., Zhang, D., An, J., Lin, J., Zhu, R., et al. (2023). Video understanding with large language models: A survey..
- Tassa, Y., Doron, Y., Muldal, A., Erez, T., Li, Y., Casas, D. d. L., Budden, D., Abdolmaleki, A., Merel, J., Lefrancq, A., et al. (2018). Deepmind control suite..
- Team, G., Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Wu, Y., Alayrac, J.-B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A. M., Hauth, A., et al. (2023). Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models..
- Team, G., Mesnard, T., Hardin, C., Dadashi, R., Bhupatiraju, S., Pathak, S., Sifre, L., Rivière, M., Kale, M. S., Love, J., et al. (2024). Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology..

- Team, O. M., Ghosh, D., Walke, H., Pertsch, K., Black, K., Mees, O., Dasari, S., Hejna, J., Xu, C., Luo, J., et al. (2023). Octo: An open-source generalist robot policy..
- Templeton, A., Conerly, T., Marcus, J., Lindsey, J., Bricken, T., Chen, B., Pearce, A., Citro, C., Ameisen, E., Jones, A., Cunningham, H., Turner, N. L., McDougall, C., MacDiarmid, M., Freeman, C. D., Sumers, T. R., Rees, E., Batson, J., Jermyn, A., Carter, S., Olah, C., & Henighan, T. (2024). Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from claude 3 sonnet..
- Thomas, G., Cheng, C.-A., Loynd, R., Vineet, V., Jalobeanu, M., & Kolobov, A. (2023). Plex: Making the most of the available data for robotic manipulation pretraining. *ArXiv, abs/2303.08789*.
- Tirumala, D., Galashov, A., Noh, H., Hasenclever, L., Pascanu, R., Schwarz, J., Desjardins, G., Czarnecki, W. M., Ahuja, A., Teh, Y. W., et al. (2022). Behavior priors for efficient reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research, 23*(221), 1–68.
- Tobin, J., Fong, R., Ray, A., Schneider, J., Zaremba, W., & Abbeel, P. (2017). Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world..
- Todorov, E., Erez, T., & Tassa, Y. (2012). Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, pp. 5026–5033. IEEE.
- Tomar, M., Ghosh, D., Myers, V., Dragan, A., Taylor, M. E., Bachman, P., & Levine, S. (2023). Video-guided skill discovery. In *ICML 2023 Workshop The Many Facets of Preference-Based Learning*.
- Tong, Z., Song, Y., Wang, J., & Wang, L. (2022). Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training. *ArXiv, abs/2203.12602*.
- Torabi, F., Warnell, G., & Stone, P. (2018a). Behavioral cloning from observation. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Torabi, F., Warnell, G., & Stone, P. (2018b). Generative adversarial imitation from observation. *ArXiv, abs/1807.06158*.
- Torabi, F., Warnell, G., & Stone, P. (2019). Recent advances in imitation learning from observation. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. (2023). Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models..
- Tulyakov, S., Liu, M.-Y., Yang, X., & Kautz, J. (2018). Mocogan: Decomposing motion and content for video generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 1526–1535.
- van den Oord, A., Vinyals, O., & Kavukcuoglu, K. (2017). Neural discrete representation learning. *ArXiv, abs/1711.00937*.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems, 30*.



- Villegas, R., Babaeizadeh, M., Kindermans, P.-J., Moraldo, H., Zhang, H., Saffar, M. T., Castro, S., Kunze, J., & Erhan, D. (2022). Phenaki: Variable length video generation from open domain textual description. *ArXiv, abs/2210.02399*.
- Villegas, R., Pathak, A., Kannan, H., Erhan, D., Le, Q. V., & Lee, H. (2019). High fidelity video prediction with large stochastic recurrent neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 32*.
- Vondrick, C., Pirsiaavash, H., & Torralba, A. (2016). Generating videos with scene dynamics. *Advances in neural information processing systems, 29*.
- Wang, C., Luo, X., Ross, K. W., & Li, D. (2022). Vrl3: A data-driven framework for visual deep reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2202.10324*.
- Wang, C., Fan, L. J., Sun, J., Zhang, R., Fei-Fei, L., Xu, D., Zhu, Y., & Anandkumar, A. (2023a). Mimicplay: Long-horizon imitation learning by watching human play. *ArXiv, abs/2302.12422*.
- Wang, J., Dasari, S., Srirama, M. K., Tulsiani, S., & Gupta, A. (2023b). Manipulate by seeing: Creating manipulation controllers from pre-trained representations. *ArXiv, abs/2303.08135*.
- Wang, L., Huang, B., Zhao, Z., Tong, Z., He, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, Y., & Qiao, Y. (2023c). Videomae v2: Scaling video masked autoencoders with dual masking..
- Wang, R., Chen, D., Wu, Z., Chen, Y., Dai, X., Liu, M., Yuan, L., & Jiang, Y.-G. (2022). Masked video distillation: Rethinking masked feature modeling for self-supervised video representation learning..
- Wang, T., Torralba, A., Isola, P., & Zhang, A. (2023). Optimal goal-reaching reinforcement learning via quasimetric learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 36411–36430. PMLR.
- Wang, X., Yuan, H., Zhang, S., Chen, D., Wang, J., Zhang, Y., Shen, Y., Zhao, D., & Zhou, J. (2024). Videocomposer: Compositional video synthesis with motion controllability. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36*.
- Wang, X., Zhu, Z., Huang, G., Chen, X., & Lu, J. (2023a). Drivedreamer: Towards real-world-driven world models for autonomous driving..
- Wang, Y., He, Y., Li, Y., Li, K., Yu, J., Ma, X. J., Chen, X., Wang, Y., Luo, P., Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Wang, L., & Qiao, Y. (2023b). Internvid: A large-scale video-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. *ArXiv, abs/2307.06942*.
- Wang, Z., Hunt, J. J., & Zhou, M. (2022). Diffusion policies as an expressive policy class for offline reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2208.06193*.
- Wayve (2024). Lingo-1: Exploring natural language for autonomous driving. <https://wayve.ai/thinking/lingo-natural-language-autonomous-driving/>. Accessed: 2024-04-04.
- Weissenborn, D., Täckström, O., & Uszkoreit, J. (2019). Scaling autoregressive video models..
- Wen, C., Lin, X., So, J., Chen, K., Dou, Q., Gao, Y., & Abbeel, P. (2023). Any-point trajectory modeling for policy learning. *ArXiv, abs/2401.00025*.

- Whitney, W. F., Lopez-Guevara, T., Pfaff, T., Rubanova, Y., Kipf, T., Stachenfeld, K., & Allen, K. R. (2023). Learning 3d particle-based simulators from rgb-d videos..
- Wu, B., Nair, S., Martin-Martin, R., Fei-Fei, L., & Finn, C. (2021). Greedy hierarchical variational autoencoders for large-scale video prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 2318–2328.
- Wu, H., Jing, Y., Cheang, C.-H., Chen, G., Xu, J., Li, X., Liu, M., Li, H., & Kong, T. (2023a). Unleashing large-scale video generative pre-training for visual robot manipulation. *ArXiv, abs/2312.13139*.
- Wu, J., Ma, H., Deng, C., & Long, M. (2023b). Pre-training contextualized world models with in-the-wild videos for reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2305.18499*.
- Wu, Z., Dvornik, N., Greff, K., Kipf, T., & Garg, A. (2022). Slotformer: Unsupervised visual dynamics simulation with object-centric models..
- Wulfmeier, M., Abdolmaleki, A., Hafner, R., Springenberg, J. T., Neunert, M., Hertweck, T., Lampe, T., Siegel, N., Heess, N. M. O., & Riedmiller, M. A. (2019). Compositional transfer in hierarchical reinforcement learning..
- Wulfmeier, M., Byravan, A., Bechtle, S., Hausman, K., & Heess, N. (2023). Foundations for transfer in reinforcement learning: A taxonomy of knowledge modalities..
- Xian, Z., Gervet, T., Xu, Z., Qiao, Y.-L., Wang, T.-H., & Wang, Y. (2023). Towards generalist robots: A promising paradigm via generative simulation..
- Xie, A., Lee, L., Xiao, T., & Finn, C. (2023). Decomposing the generalization gap in imitation learning for visual robotic manipulation..
- Xing, J., Xia, M., Liu, Y., Zhang, Y., He, Y., Liu, H., Chen, H., Cun, X., Wang, X., Shan, Y., et al. (2024). Make-your-video: Customized video generation using textual and structural guidance...
- Xiong, H., Fu, H., Zhang, J., Bao, C., Zhang, Q., Huang, Y., Xu, W., Garg, A., & Lu, C. (2022). Robotube: Learning household manipulation from human videos with simulated twin environments. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Xiong, H., Li, Q., Chen, Y.-C., Bharadhwaj, H., Sinha, S., & Garg, A. (2021). Learning by watching: Physical imitation of manipulation skills from human videos..
- Xu, H., Zhang, J., Cai, J., Rezatofighi, H., & Tao, D. (2022). Gmflow: Learning optical flow via global matching. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 8121–8130.
- Xu, H., Ghosh, G., Huang, P.-Y. B., Okhonko, D., Aghajanyan, A., & Feichtenhofer, F. M. L. Z. C. (2021). Videoclip: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Xu, M., Xu, Z., Chi, C., Veloso, M. M., & Song, S. (2023). Xskill: Cross embodiment skill discovery. *ArXiv, abs/2307.09955*.
- Xu, M., Dai, W., Liu, C., Gao, X., Lin, W., Qi, G.-J., & Xiong, H. (2020). Spatial-temporal transformer networks for traffic flow forecasting. *ArXiv, abs/2001.02908*.

- Xue, H., Hang, T., Zeng, Y., Sun, Y., Liu, B., Yang, H., Fu, J., & Guo, B. (2022). Advancing high-resolution video-language representation with large-scale video transcriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 5036–5045.
- Yan, S., Zhu, T., Wang, Z., Cao, Y., Zhang, M., Ghosh, S., Wu, Y., & Yu, J. (2022). Videococa: Video-text modeling with zero-shot transfer from contrastive captioners..
- Yan, W., Hafner, D., James, S., & Abbeel, P. (2023). Temporally consistent transformers for video generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 39062–39098. PMLR.
- Yan, W., Zhang, Y., Abbeel, P., & Srinivas, A. (2021). Videogpt: Video generation using vq-vae and transformers. *ArXiv, abs/2104.10157*.
- Yang, J., Mark, M. S., Vu, B., Sharma, A., Bohg, J., & Finn, C. (2023a). Robot fine-tuning made easy: Pre-training rewards and policies for autonomous real-world reinforcement learning..
- Yang, M., Du, Y., Dai, B., Schuurmans, D., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Abbeel, P. (2023b). Probabilistic adaptation of text-to-video models. *ArXiv, abs/2306.01872*.
- Yang, M., Du, Y., Ghasemipour, K., Tompson, J., Schuurmans, D., & Abbeel, P. (2023c). Learning interactive real-world simulators. *ArXiv, abs/2310.06114*.
- Yang, M., Schuurmans, D., Abbeel, P., & Nachum, O. (2022). Dichotomy of control: Separating what you can control from what you cannot. *ArXiv, abs/2210.13435*.
- Yang, S., Nachum, O., Du, Y., Wei, J., Abbeel, P., & Schuurmans, D. (2023). Foundation models for decision making: Problems, methods, and opportunities. *ArXiv, abs/2303.04129*.
- Yang, S., Walker, J., Parker-Holder, J., Du, Y., Bruce, J., Barreto, A., Abbeel, P., & Schuurmans, D. (2024). Video as the new language for real-world decision making..
- Yang, T., Zhu, Y., Xie, Y., Zhang, A., Chen, C., & Li, M. (2023). Aim: Adapting image models for efficient video action recognition. *ArXiv, abs/2302.03024*.
- Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K., & Cao, Y. (2022). React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models..
- Yarats, D., Fergus, R., Lazaric, A., & Pinto, L. (2021). Mastering visual continuous control: Improved data-augmented reinforcement learning. *ArXiv, abs/2107.09645*.
- Yarats, D., Zhang, A., Kostrikov, I., Amos, B., Pineau, J., & Fergus, R. (2019). Improving sample efficiency in model-free reinforcement learning from images. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Ye, W., Zhang, Y., Wang, M., Wang, S., Gu, X., Abbeel, P., & Gao, Y. (2023). Foundation reinforcement learning: towards embodied generalist agents with foundation prior assistance. *ArXiv, abs/2310.02635*.
- Young, S., Gandhi, D., Tulsiani, S., Gupta, A. K., Abbeel, P., & Pinto, L. (2020). Visual imitation made easy. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.

- Yu, L., Cheng, Y., Sohn, K., Lezama, J., Zhang, H., Chang, H., Hauptmann, A. G., Yang, M.-H., Hao, Y., Essa, I., & Jiang, L. (2022). Magvit: Masked generative video transformer..
- Yu, L., Lezama, J., Gundavarapu, N. B., Versari, L., Sohn, K., Minnen, D. C., Cheng, Y., Gupta, A., Gu, X., Hauptmann, A. G., Gong, B., Yang, M.-H., Essa, I., Ross, D. A., & Jiang, L. (2023). Language model beats diffusion – tokenizer is key to visual generation..
- Yu, T., Quillen, D., He, Z., Julian, R., Hausman, K., Finn, C., & Levine, S. (2020). Meta-world: A benchmark and evaluation for multi-task and meta reinforcement learning. In *Conference on robot learning*, pp. 1094–1100. PMLR.
- Yu, T., Xiao, T., Stone, A., Tompson, J., Brohan, A., Wang, S., Singh, J., Tan, C., Peralta, J., Ichter, B., et al. (2023a). Scaling robot learning with semantically imagined experience..
- Yu, W., Gileadi, N., Fu, C., Kirmani, S., Lee, K.-H., Arenas, M. G., Chiang, H.-T. L., Erez, T., Hasenclever, L., Humplik, J., et al. (2023b). Language to rewards for robotic skill synthesis..
- Yuan, C., Wen, C., Zhang, T., & Gao, Y. (2024). General flow as foundation affordance for scalable robot learning. *ArXiv, abs/2401.11439*.
- Yuan, H., Wu, R., Zhao, A., Zhang, H., Ding, Z., & Dong, H. (2021). Dmotion: Robotic visuomotor control with unsupervised forward model learned from videos..
- Zakka, K., Zeng, A., Florence, P. R., Tompson, J., Bohg, J., & Dwibedi, D. (2021). Xirl: Cross-embodiment inverse reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Zellers, R., Lu, X., Hessel, J., Yu, Y., Park, J. S., Cao, J., Farhadi, A., & Choi, Y. (2021). Merlot: Multimodal neural script knowledge models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 23634–23651.
- Zeng, A., Attarian, M., Ichter, B., Choromanski, K., Wong, A., Welker, S., Tombari, F., Purohit, A., Ryoo, M., Sindhwani, V., et al. (2022). Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language..
- Zhang, D. J., Wu, J. Z., Liu, J.-W., Zhao, R., Ran, L., Gu, Y., Gao, D., & Shou, M. Z. (2023). Show-1: Marrying pixel and latent diffusion models for text-to-video generation..
- Zhang, D., Yu, Y., Li, C., Dong, J., Su, D., Chu, C., & Yu, D. (2024). Mm-llms: Recent advances in multimodal large language models..
- Zhang, H., Li, X., & Bing, L. (2023). Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding..
- Zhang, L., Zhou, S., Stent, S., & Shi, J. (2022). Fine-grained egocentric hand-object segmentation: Dataset, model, and applications. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 127–145. Springer.
- Zhao, L., Gundavarapu, N. B., Yuan, L., Zhou, H., Yan, S., Sun, J. J., Friedman, L., Qian, R., Weyand, T., Zhao, Y., Hornung, R., Schroff, F., Yang, M., Ross, D. A., Wang, H., Adam, H., Sirotenko, M., Liu, T., & Gong, B. (2024). Videoprism: A foundational visual encoder for video understanding..

- Zhao, T., Karamcheti, S., Kollar, T., Finn, C., & Liang, P. (2022). What makes representation learning from videos hard for control?..
- Zhao, W., Queralta, J. P., & Westerlund, T. (2020). Sim-to-real transfer in deep reinforcement learning for robotics: a survey. In *2020 IEEE symposium series on computational intelligence (SSCI)*, pp. 737–744. IEEE.
- Zhen, H., Qiu, X., Chen, P., Yang, J., Yan, X., Du, Y., Hong, Y., & Gan, C. (2024). 3d-vla: A 3d vision-language-action generative world model..
- Zhou, D., Wang, W., Yan, H., Lv, W., Zhu, Y., & Feng, J. (2022). Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models..
- Zhou, S., Du, Y., Chen, J., Li, Y., Yeung, D.-Y., & Gan, C. (2024). Robodreamer: Learning compositional world models for robot imagination..
- Zhou, T., Tucker, R., Flynn, J., Fyffe, G., & Snavely, N. (2018). Stereo magnification. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 37, 1 – 12.
- Zhou, W., Bajracharya, S., & Held, D. (2021). Plas: Latent action space for offline reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 1719–1735. PMLR.
- Zhu, D., Wang, Y., Schmidhuber, J., & Elhoseiny, M. (2023). Guiding online reinforcement learning with action-free offline pretraining. *ArXiv*, *abs/2301.12876*.
- Zhuang, Z., Fu, Z., Wang, J., Atkeson, C., Schwertfeger, S., Finn, C., & Zhao, H. (2023). Robot parkour learning..
- Zou, A., Phan, L., Chen, S., Campbell, J., Guo, P., Ren, R., Pan, A., Yin, X., Mazeika, M., Dombrowski, A.-K., et al. (2023). Representation engineering: A top-down approach to ai transparency..