

# Can video generation replace cinematographers? Research on the cinematic language of generated video

Xiaozhe Li<sup>1,\*</sup>, Kai Wu<sup>2,\*</sup>, Siyi Yang<sup>1</sup>, Yizhan Qu<sup>1</sup>, Guohua Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Zhiyu Chen<sup>1</sup>,  
 Jiayao Li<sup>1</sup>, Jiangchuan Mu<sup>1</sup>, Xiaobin Hu<sup>3</sup>, Wen Fang<sup>1</sup>,  
 Mingliang Xiong<sup>1</sup>, Hao Deng<sup>1,†</sup>, Qingwen Liu<sup>1,†</sup>, Gang Li<sup>1</sup>, Bin He<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tongji University   <sup>2</sup>ByteDance   <sup>3</sup>Technical University of Munich

{Lxxxxx, 2253110, 2251645, 2151368, 2354271, 2351405, 2411941}@tongji.edu.cn

{wen.fang, denghao1984, qliu, lig, hebin}@tongji.edu.cn

wukaiwork@outlook.com   xiaobin.hu@tum.de   xiongml@foxmail.com

## Abstract

Recent advancements in text-to-video (T2V) generation have leveraged diffusion models to enhance the visual coherence of videos generated from textual descriptions. However, most research has primarily focused on object motion, with limited attention given to cinematic language in videos, which is crucial for cinematographers to convey emotion and narrative pacing. To address this limitation, we propose a threefold approach to enhance the ability of T2V models to generate controllable cinematic language. Specifically, we introduce a cinematic language dataset that encompasses shot framing, angle, and camera movement, enabling models to learn diverse cinematic styles. Building on this, to facilitate robust cinematic alignment evaluation, we present CameraCLIP, a model fine-tuned on the proposed dataset that excels in understanding complex cinematic language in generated videos and can further provide valuable guidance in the multi-shot composition process. Finally, we propose CLIPLoRA, a cost-guided dynamic LoRA composition method that facilitates smooth transitions and realistic blending of cinematic language by dynamically fusing multiple pre-trained cinematic LoRAs within a single video. Our experiments demonstrate that CameraCLIP outperforms existing models in assessing the alignment between cinematic language and video, achieving an  $R@1$  score of 0.81. Additionally, CLIPLoRA improves the ability for multi-shot composition, potentially bridging the gap between automatically generated videos and those shot by professional cinematographers.<sup>1</sup>

\*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding authors.

<sup>1</sup>Codes, data, and model weights will be open-sourced after the paper is accepted.

## 1. Introduction

Recent advancements in text-to-video (T2V) generation have leveraged diffusion models to enhance the visual coherence of videos generated from textual descriptions [2, 3, 10, 11, 21, 23, 31]. However, most T2V research has primarily focused on object motion, emphasizing content alignment and visual coherence. Moreover, due to the high labor costs associated with data collection from real-world scenarios, text-controlled cinematic language video generation remains largely unexplored.

Current T2V models cannot replace skilled cinematographers due to their limited ability to generate complex cinematic language in videos. Previous works, such as AnimateDiff [9], introduced motion priors to enhance animation fluidity and used MotionLoRA to efficiently fine-tune new motion patterns. However, these approaches restricted camera motion to basic operations, such as zooming and rotating. MotionCtrl [33] added modules for independently controlling camera and object motion, while Direct-a-Video [36] aimed to simulate real-world video shooting by decoupling object and camera motion, allowing users to control camera translation, zoom, and directional movement. Despite these advancements, both MotionCtrl and Direct-a-Video are limited in generating a full range of cinematic styles and require additional camera parameter inputs, making flexible camera control challenging.

While these advancements have laid the groundwork for camera control in T2V models, significant limitations remain in generating various cinematic language styles. The challenges are threefold: 1) the lack of a high-quality cinematic language dataset, 2) the absence of an evaluation model to assess cinematic language alignment between videos and their descriptions, which also results in a lack of guidance for optimizing generation methods, and 3) the absence of a method for multi-cinematic language compo-

<i>Long shot, low angle, panning left and tilt down</i>	<i>Long shot, high level, zoom in and panning right</i>	<i>Long shot, eye level, zoom out and panning left</i>	<i>Full shot, eye level, zoom in, panning right and tilt up</i>	<i>Long shot, low angle, zoom out, panning left and tilt down</i>
---	---	--	---	---

Figure 1. The results of cinematic language composition using CLIPLoRA, with specific cinematic language details provided below each figure. *Best viewed in Acrobat Reader. Click images to play animations.*

sition to flexibly generate multi-shot videos, such as a "long shot, eye-level, panning right, zoom-in, and tilt-up view of a bear walking in the snow near a lake". To address these challenges, we propose a threefold solution to enhance T2V models' ability to generate high-quality, controllable cinematic language.

Firstly, we introduce a comprehensive video cinematic language dataset that includes shot framing, shot angles, and camera movements. This dataset can be used to fine-tune T2V models to thoroughly learn cinematic language patterns. It consists of video-text pairs representing various shot types recorded from real-world scenarios. Additionally, we perform fine-grained manual annotation on the data to ensure high quality.

Secondly, we propose CameraCLIP, which enhances the CLIP [19] model's ability to recognize and understand complex cinematic language in video content by fine-tuning it on the curated cinematic language dataset. CameraCLIP can evaluate the camera control capabilities of T2V models and further provide valuable guidance for optimizing the cinematic video composition process.

Finally, we propose a cost-guided dynamic LoRA composition method to optimize the fusion of multiple cinematic language styles within a single video. This dynamic composition approach enables the model to select the most suitable LoRA based on the current state during the diffusion denoising stage, facilitating smoother transitions and more realistic cinematic language blending.

Our specific contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We first introduce a cinematic language video dataset that includes shot framing, shot angle and camera movement. Using this dataset, we fine-tune the T2V model to learn cinematic patterns with LoRA, and further propose a cost-guided LoRA composition method to achieve the fusion of multiple cinematic language.
- We introduce CameraCLIP, a model fine-tuned on the cinematic language dataset, which possesses a strong ability to recognize and understand complex cinematic language in video and further provides valuable guidance for opti-

mizing the cinematic video composition process.

- Our experiments show that CameraCLIP outperforms popular models in accurately measuring alignment between a video and its cinematic language description, achieving an R@1 score of 0.81. Additionally, our cost-guided LoRA composition method (CLIPLoRA) excels at compositing multiple LoRAs, effectively fusing various cinematic elements.

## 2. Related Works

### 2.1. Image/Video CLIP Models

CLIP [19] is a multi-modal model based on contrastive learning, widely used to assess image-text similarity. Trained on large-scale text-image pairs, CLIP demonstrates strong zero-shot generalization, making it applicable across tasks like detection [8, 15], segmentation [14, 35], image and video understanding [17, 34], retrieval [29], and image generation [5, 6, 20, 27]. For video analysis, ViCLIP [32] incorporates spatio-temporal attention and partial random patch masking. Long-CLIP [37] addresses embedding length limitations through positional embedding interpolation, while VideoCLIP-XL [30] enhances alignment for long-form video descriptions using text-similarity-guided primary component matching.

While these models advance multi-modal learning and video-text alignment, they primarily focus on overall video semantics or handling long-text inputs. None are specifically designed to understand cinematic language, such as shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement, in video content. To bridge this gap, we introduce CameraCLIP, aimed at enhancing the model's understanding and alignment with detailed cinematic language.

### 2.2. Text-to-Video Generation for Camera Control

Early research in video generation primarily utilized Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) [24–26, 28]. Following the success of diffusion models in high-fidelity image generation [10, 21,

23], researchers have increasingly adopted diffusion-based approaches for video generation, achieving improved visual coherence in text- or image-guided content [1–3, 11, 31].

Recent efforts have enhanced T2V models’ camera control. AnimateDiff [9] introduced motion priors to improve animation fluidity and utilized MotionLoRA for efficient fine-tuning of new motion patterns. MotionCtrl [33] added modules for independent control over camera and object motion, while Direct-a-Video [36] further decoupled these motions, enabling control over camera translation, zoom, and direction, similar to live-action guidance. Despite these advancements, AnimateDiff limits camera movement to basic operations, and MotionCtrl and Direct-a-Video rely on additional camera parameters, restricting flexible control in T2V models.

At the same time, research on high-quality datasets [4, 13, 18] has proposed resources for T2V model training. However, these datasets lack comprehensive cinematic language coverage, limiting their effectiveness for training models on expressive cinematic video generation.

### 2.3. Multi-LoRA Composition

Recently, Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [12] has demonstrated significant potential in text-to-image/video generation, allowing users to bring their imagination to life in high-quality images or videos at an affordable computational cost. Building on this foundation, researchers have begun exploring various style composition methods. LoRA Merge [22] was introduced to create diverse styles by linearly combining multiple LoRAs into a unified LoRA for diffusion models. Zhong [38] further expanded LoRA’s capabilities with LoRA Switch and LoRA Composite, which focus on the diffusion denoising stage. LoRA Switch alternates between different LoRAs at specific denoising steps, while LoRA Composite combines multiple LoRAs by averaging their guidance scores, thereby enhancing composition quality and robustness in multi-element scenarios.

Despite these advancements, current methods remain limited by their static nature, as they lack the ability to dynamically select LoRAs based on intermediate denoising results, especially in complex cinematic language fusion. To address these limitations, we propose a reward-guided LoRA composition approach (CLIPLoRA), which employs an evaluator to assess LoRA fidelity and applies a greedy search algorithm to optimize LoRA selection throughout the diffusion process, enhancing the realism of camera motion in video generation.

## 3. Method

### 3.1. Cinematic Language Dataset Construction

We need to construct a cinematic language dataset, as existing datasets are not systematically organized or specifically

classified for cinematic language. We used video sources from Pexels<sup>1</sup> and Videvo<sup>2</sup>, two websites offering free high-quality video data. As shown in Figure 2, the dataset construction process was divided into three steps.

**Step I: Cinematic Language Classification and Video Data Collection.** We categorized cinematic language into three primary types: shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement. To efficiently build a high-quality cinematic language dataset on a large scale, we employed automated tools to extract content descriptions and cinematic language annotations for each video. In total, we gathered approximately 1800 video samples. The detailed data distribution of the cinematic language dataset is shown in Figure 3.<sup>1</sup>




Figure 2. The process of building the cinematic language dataset involves three steps. First, we collect cinematic language data by category. Next, we manually check the each video’s content and enrich the cinematic language labels. Finally, we perform fine-grained annotation on the camera movement intervals to minimize noise interference.

**Step II: Manual Proofreading and Supplementation of the Cinematic Language Video Data.** Since each video’s cinematic language includes shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement, automatically generated descriptions from online sources often contain inaccuracies or lack certain shot types. To address these issues, after completing the data collection in Step I, we manually proofread and supplement the data by adding missing shot types, ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the cinematic language annotations. Detailed information on the cinematic language dataset, after verification, is provided in the Supplementary Material.

**Step III: Fine-grained camera movement interval annotation.** Since the collected data comes from real-world scenarios, it may contain noise, such as inconsistent camera movements or transitions for certain shot types like ‘rack focus’, which typically occur over a few seconds. To enhance the data quality, we manually annotated each video after Step II, precisely marking the start and end intervals of these fine-grained camera movement transitions.

### 3.2. CameraCLIP

Our CameraCLIP extends the capabilities of the pre-trained CLIP model [19] to the domain of cinematic language video-text alignment. Figure 4 presents the architecture of

<sup>1</sup><https://www.pexels.com>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.videvo.net>

<sup>1</sup>Detailed descriptions of these 20 cinematic language types are provided in the Supplementary Material.




Figure 3. This dataset contains three categories of cinematic language: shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement. It consists of 20 subclasses and contains approximately 1,800 entries, systematically covering all classifications of cinematic language.

our model, with its key components described in detail below.

**Text Encoder.** To adapt the CLIP model to our task while preserving the strong generalization capabilities of the pre-trained model, we fine-tune only the last two layers (layers 10 and 11) and freeze all earlier layers. This selective fine-tuning approach enables the text encoder to effectively capture the cinematic language, avoiding overfitting while retaining its general linguistic representations.

**Vision Transformer (ViT) Encoder.** We aggregate the features of the images sampled from the video to represent the features of the entire video. After resizing and embedding these sampled frames, we aggregate their features using mean pooling to produce a compact video representation:

$$V = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N I_i$$

where  $N$  denotes the number of sampled frames. To strike a balance between video information coverage and computational efficiency, we sample 8 frames per video. Here,  $I_i$  represents the feature of the  $i$ -th frame. To adapt the ViT encoder to our task, we fine-tune its higher layers (layers 20 to 23), allowing the model to refine its visual representations for cinematic language tasks while maintaining its pre-trained generalization ability.

**Loss Calculation.** We employ contrastive learning with the InFoNEC loss to align video and text features in a joint embedding space. To compute the similarity logits, we first apply  $L_2$ -normalization to both the video features  $V$  and the text features  $T$ , as follows:

$$\hat{V} = \frac{V}{\|V\|_2}, \quad \hat{T} = \frac{T}{\|T\|_2},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the  $L_2$ -norm. The similarity logits are then computed as:

$$L_{\text{video}} = \frac{\hat{V} \cdot \hat{T}^\top}{\tau}, \quad L_{\text{text}} = L_{\text{video}}^\top,$$

where  $\tau$  is the temperature parameter that controls the sharpness of the distribution. The cross-entropy loss for video-to-text and text-to-video matching is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{video}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N -\log \frac{\exp(L_{\text{video}}(i, i))}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(L_{\text{video}}(i, j))},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{txt}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N -\log \frac{\exp(L_{\text{text}}(i, i))}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(L_{\text{text}}(i, j))}.$$

The final loss function is the average of the video-to-text and text-to-video losses:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}_{\text{video}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{txt}}).$$

This contrastive loss function effectively aligns the video and text modalities by maximizing the similarity between matching pairs and minimizing the similarity between non-matching pairs, thus ensuring accurate alignment of video and cinematic language text in our task.

### 3.3. Cost-Guided Dynamic LoRA Composition

Previous multi-LoRA composition methods, such as LoRA Merge, LoRA Switch, and LoRA Composite, rely on static, hand-crafted strategies, which struggle to capture dynamic interactions between multiple LoRAs, particularly in complex cinematic language composition tasks. To address this limitation, we introduce a cost-guided dynamic LoRA composition approach, as shown in Figure 6. This method enhances smooth transitions and realistic blending of cinematic language by dynamically selecting which LoRA to activate during the diffusion denoising process.

Our goal is to select the optimal LoRA to activate at each diffusion step  $T$  during the denoising stage. To achieve the most effective LoRA activation, we employ a genetic algorithm [7], which iteratively refines candidate solutions. Each individual in the population represents a set of LoRA parameters sampled from the search space  $P$ , where  $P$  denotes the set of LoRAs to be composited.

In each generation, the cost score of an individual  $X_T$  is evaluated based on its proximity to the target cinematic quality score:

$$\text{Cost}(X_T) = |\text{CameraCLIP}(X_T) - \text{target}|$$

Here, CameraCLIP is used to evaluate the cinematic quality of the current solution, where *target* refers to the desired alignment score, representing the ideal CameraCLIP score value. By computing the cost score, we guide






Figure 4. The structure design and training strategy of CameraCLIP. For the text encoder, we train the last two layers, while for the image encoder, we train the last four layers. Each video is uniformly sampled to extract eight frames, which are then encoded through the image encoder. Mean pooling is applied to obtain video features. These video features, along with the text features, are subsequently input into the joint space for contrastive learning to enhance the similarity between them.

a greedy search to evaluate sequences of LoRA activations. We optimize towards a lower cost score, which indicates that the quality of the current generation is approaching the *target*, ensuring better alignment with the intended cinematic effect.

In contrast to LoRA Composite, which activates all LoRAs during denoising, our approach uses a greedy search algorithm to activate a single LoRA at each diffusion step  $T$ , preserving the distinctiveness of each cinematic style. The activation at each step is represented as:

$$W'_T = W + w_i \times B_i A_i$$

where  $W$  is the original weight matrix,  $W'_T$  is the updated weight,  $w_i$  is the weight for the  $i$ -th LoRA, and  $B_i, A_i$  are the low-rank matrices of the activated LoRA.

## 4. Experiment

In this section, we evaluate the performance of CameraCLIP and CLIPLoRA. We begin by introducing the models, dataset, and LoRA composition baselines used in our experiments. First, we assess CameraCLIP’s video-text retrieval accuracy on the validation dataset derived from the cinematic language dataset (see Section 4.2). Next, we present the results of multi-camera motion composition using CLIPLoRA (see Section 4.3). Finally, we conduct an ablation study to analyze our approach to temporal modeling

of video features (see Section 4.4).

### 4.1. Setup

**Video CLIP Models.** We evaluate four representative models in video-text alignment: CLIP4CLIP [17], ViCLIP [32], LongCLIP [37], and VideoCLIP-XL [30]. CLIP4CLIP introduces three similarity matching strategies (meanP, seqLSTM, and seqTransf) to optimize the alignment between video frames and textual descriptions. ViCLIP incorporates spatio-temporal attention within the video encoder and applies partial random patch masking during training to improve robustness. LongCLIP uses primary component matching of CLIP features, enhancing the model’s ability to understand lengthy textual descriptions associated with video content. VideoCLIP-XL builds upon LongCLIP by implementing text-similarity-guided primary component matching, encouraging nuanced distribution learning within the feature space and expanding the model’s capacity for handling long descriptions.

**Dataset.** The cinematic language dataset consists of 20 categories based on shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement, totaling 1831 instances of cinematic language data. A detailed description of these categories is provided in Figure 2, and the number of instances in each category after data supplementation is listed in the Supplementary Material. Each entry in the dataset includes a video, a de-

*close up shot*

*medium shot*

*full shot*

*long shot*

*low angle*

*eye level*

*high angle*

*dutch angle*

*bird angle*

*dolly in*

*dolly out*

*panning left*

*panning right*

*rack focus*

*still*

*tilt up*

*tilt down*

*tracking shot*

*zoom in*

*zoom out*

Figure 5. We use LoRA to fine-tune the T2V model on the cinematic language dataset, enabling it to master the motion patterns of the single type. The first and second rows demonstrate control over shot framing and shot angle, respectively, while the third and fourth rows show control over camera movement. Each cinematic type is listed below the figure. *Best viewed in Acrobat Reader. Click images to play animations.*

scription of this video, and a description of the cinematic language used in the video. We divided the dataset into a training set with 1471 instances and a test set with 360 instances. During the training and validation stages, we calculate the similarity between each video and its cinematic description. The cinematic description is structured as follows: "[video description]." + "The shot type is:" + "[shot framing, shot angle, camera movement]."

**LoRA Composition Baselines.** We compare our CLIPLoRA method with several LoRA composition baselines

for generating cinematic language patterns using AnimateDiff as the backbone model. LoRA Merge creates different styles by linearly combining multiple LoRAs into a single unified LoRA, which is subsequently integrated into the diffusion model. LoRA Switch alternates between different LoRA modules at various denoising steps, while LoRA Composite generates styles by averaging the guidance scores of all LoRAs.




Figure 6. Comparison of different LoRA composition methods during the diffusion denoising stage. (a) LoRA Switch: Each LoRA module is used evenly throughout the denoising process, with only one LoRA active at each denoising step. (b) LoRA Composite: Multiple LoRA modules are combined and applied simultaneously at each denoising step. (c) CLIPLoRA: By computing the cost score, it guides the denoising process and dynamically selects the optimal LoRA module for each timestep.

## 4.2. CameraCLIP Performance Evaluation

In this section, we analyze the performance of our proposed CameraCLIP by comparing it with several representative models: CLIP [19], CLIP4CLIP [17], ViCLIP [32], LongCLIP [37], and VideoCLIP-XL [30]. We conduct experiments across different models and resolutions to evaluate the accuracy, with a primary focus on R@1 score, in tasks related to understanding cinematic language in videos.

Recall at 1 (R@1) represents the proportion of queries for which the correct answer is found within the top 1 returned result. The formula for calculating R@1 is as follows:

$$R@1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(\text{rank}_i \leq 1) \quad (1)$$

where  $N$  denote the total number of queries, and  $\text{rank}_i$  represent the rank position of the correct answer for the  $i$ -th query. The indicator function  $\delta(\text{rank}_i \leq 1)$  equals 1 if the correct answer for the  $i$ -th query is ranked within the top 1 position, and 0 otherwise.

Consequently, we use the R@1 metric to evaluate the model’s ability to retrieve the correct text description for a given video input, assessing whether the model accurately aligns the video’s cinematic language with the corresponding text descriptions. Table 1 presents R@1 scores for various models. Traditional CLIP models with different Vision Transformer (ViT) size and input resolutions demonstrate moderate accuracy, with larger model sizes or higher resolutions yielding better performance (e.g., ViT-B/32-224px achieves 0.63, while ViT-L/14-336px reaches 0.71). CLIP4CLIP and ViCLIP, which incorporate additional layers or sequence models, show slight improvements, with a maximum accuracy of 0.72. LongCLIP achieves an R@1 score of 0.75, highlighting the benefits of the extended input length. The latest VideoCLIP-XL model achieves 0.77, leveraging a text-similarity-guided primary component matching mech-

Models	Different Types	R@1 ↑
CLIP [19]	ViT-B/32-224px	0.63
	ViT-B/16-224px	0.64
	ViT-L/14-224px	0.68
	ViT-L/14-336px	0.71
CLIP4CLIP [17]	ViT-B/32 meanP	0.71
	ViT-B/32 seqLSTM	0.69
	ViT-B/32 seqTransf	0.66
	ViT-B/16 meanP	0.72
	ViT-B/16 seqLSTM	0.70
ViCLIP [32]	ViT-B/16 seqTransf	0.72
	ViCLIP-B-16	0.64
LongCLIP [37]	ViCLIP-L-14	0.68
	LongCLIP-B	0.55
VideoCLIP-XL [30]	LongCLIP-L	0.75
	VideoCLIP-XL	0.77
CameraCLIP (Ours)	VideoCLIP-XL-V2	0.76
	ViT-B/32-224px	0.69
	ViT-B/16-224px	0.73
	ViT-L/14-224px	0.77
	ViT-L/14-336px	<b>0.81</b>

Table 1. CameraCLIP outperforms other models on the validation set derived from the cinematic language dataset, achieving the best performance. The best-performing result is highlighted in bold.

anism.

Our proposed CameraCLIP outperforms all baseline models, achieving R@1 score of 0.81 with the ViT-L/14-336px configuration. This demonstrates its superior ability to recognize and understand cinematic lan-

guage, including shot framing, shot angles, and camera movement. Furthermore, CameraCLIP consistently surpasses the traditional CLIP models across all configurations, validating that fine-tuning the model on a specialized cinematic language dataset significantly enhances its understanding of video-specific linguistic elements. These experimental results confirm the efficacy of CameraCLIP, particularly in aligning cinematic language descriptions with video content.

### 4.3. Result on CLIPLoRA

To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed CLIPLoRA method, we compare it against other LoRA composition approaches, including LoRA Merge, LoRA Composite, LoRA Switch, and the direct generation method (origin). CameraCLIP is used to measure the quality of T2V-generated videos by evaluating the consistency between the generated videos and cinematic language. We present the composition results of CLIPLoRA in Figure 1 and provide quantitative comparisons with other baselines in Figure 7.




Figure 7. The LoRA composition results demonstrate that our method outperforms all baseline methods and maintains stable performance as the number of LoRAs increases.

Notably, as the number of LoRAs composition increases, CLIPLoRA consistently outperforms all baselines while maintaining stable performance. In contrast, traditional methods like LoRA Merge, LoRA Switch, and LoRA Composite suffer from issues such as detail loss and disjointed transitions, particularly as the number of LoRAs increases. These findings highlight the superiority of CLIPLoRA for multi-shot integration.

### 4.4. Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of the mean pooling approach for modeling video frames, we conducted an ablation study comparing various temporal modeling methods, including Transformer, LSTM, MLP, Multi-Head Attention, and Transformer+LSTM. As shown in Table 2, Transformer

achieved the second-best R@1 score of 0.43, while mean pooling significantly outperformed it with an accuracy of 0.81. This suggests that, for our task, mean pooling provides a more robust frame representation, especially when the training dataset is small, as complex models tend to overfit and reduce generalization, consistent with prior work’s conclusion [17].

Temporal Modeling Methods	R@1 ↑
Transformer	0.43
LSTM	0.34
MLP	0.29
Multi-Head Attention	0.39
Transformer+LSTM	0.32
Mean Pooling(Ours)	<b>0.81</b>

Table 2. We use mean pooling and various other temporal modeling methods for video frames to train CameraCLIP. We evaluate their performance on the cinematic validation set using the R@1 score, with the highest accuracy highlighted in bold.

## 5. Conclusion

In this work, we focus on enhancing T2V models’ ability to generate cinematic language videos. To address this, we propose a threefold solution. We first introduce a comprehensive cinematic language dataset encompassing shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement, enabling T2V models to learn diverse cinematic patterns. Building on this, we further propose CameraCLIP, a model fine-tuned on this dataset, designed to evaluate the alignment between generated video content and cinematic language descriptions, thereby providing valuable guidance for optimizing video generation. Finally, we propose CLIPLoRA, a cost-guided dynamic LoRA composition method that facilitates smooth transitions and realistic blending of cinematic styles within a single video.

Our experiments demonstrate that CameraCLIP achieves an R@1 score of 0.81, outperforming other models in measuring cinematic alignment. Additionally, CLIPLoRA effectively combines multiple LoRAs, enabling T2V models to generate videos with complex cinematic compositions. These contributions provide a solid foundation for controllable cinematic language generation in T2V models, potentially bridging the gap between automated video generation and expert cinematographers.



## References

- [1] Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Sumith Kulal, Daniel Mendelevitch, Maciej Kilian, Dominik Lorenz, Yam Levi, Zion English, Vikram Voleti, Adam Letts, et al. Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15127*, 2023. 3
- [2] Andreas Blattmann, Robin Rombach, Huan Ling, Tim Dockhorn, Seung Wook Kim, Sanja Fidler, and Karsten Kreis. Align your latents: High-resolution video synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22563–22575, 2023. 1
- [3] Haoxin Chen, Menghan Xia, Yingqing He, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Shaoshu Yang, Jinbo Xing, Yaofang Liu, Qifeng Chen, Xintao Wang, et al. Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19512*, 2023. 1, 3
- [4] Lin Chen, Xilin Wei, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Bin Lin, Zhenyu Tang, et al. Sharegpt4video: Improving video understanding and generation with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04325*, 2024. 3
- [5] Katherine Crowson, Stella Biderman, Daniel Kornis, Dashiell Stander, Eric Hallahan, Louis Castricato, and Edward Raff. Vqgan-clip: Open domain image generation and editing with natural language guidance. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 88–105. Springer, 2022. 2
- [6] Kevin Frans, Lisa Soros, and Olaf Witkowski. Clipdraw: Exploring text-to-drawing synthesis through language-image encoders. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 2
- [7] David E Goldberg. Genetic algorithms in search, optimization, and machine learning. *Addison Wesley*, 1989(102):36, 1989. 4
- [8] Xiuye Gu, Tsung-Yi Lin, Weicheng Kuo, and Yin Cui. Open-vocabulary object detection via vision and language knowledge distillation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 2
- [9] Yuwei Guo, Ceyuan Yang, Anyi Rao, Zhengyang Liang, Yaohui Wang, Yu Qiao, Maneesh Agrawala, Dahua Lin, and Bo Dai. Animatediff: Animate your personalized text-to-image diffusion models without specific tuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 3, 2
- [10] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 1, 2
- [11] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P Kingma, Ben Poole, Mohammad Norouzi, David J Fleet, et al. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022. 1, 3
- [12] Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 3, 2
- [13] Xuan Ju, Yiming Gao, Zhaoyang Zhang, Ziyang Yuan, Xintao Wang, Ailing Zeng, Yu Xiong, Qiang Xu, and Ying Shan. Miradata: A large-scale video dataset with long durations and structured captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06358*, 2024. 3
- [14] Boyi Li, Kilian Q Weinberger, Serge Belongie, Vladlen Koltun, and Rene Ranftl. Language-driven semantic segmentation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2
- [15] Liunian Harold Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Haotian Zhang, Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Yiwu Zhong, Lijuan Wang, Lu Yuan, Lei Zhang, Jenq-Neng Hwang, et al. Grounded language-image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10965–10975, 2022. 2
- [16] I Loshchilov. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017. 2
- [17] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning. *Neurocomputing*, 508:293–304, 2022. 2, 5, 7, 8
- [18] Kepan Nan, Rui Xie, Penghao Zhou, Tiehan Fan, Zhenheng Yang, Zhijie Chen, Xiang Li, Jian Yang, and Ying Tai. Openvid-1m: A large-scale high-quality dataset for text-to-video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02371*, 2024. 3
- [19] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, A. Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 2, 3, 7
- [20] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022. 2
- [21] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 1, 2
- [22] S. Ryu. Merging loras. <https://github.com/cloneofsimo/lora>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-11-06. 3
- [23] Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, Saurabh Saxena, Lala Li, Jay Whang, Emily L Denton, Kamyar Ghasemipour, Raphael Gontijo Lopes, Burcu Karagol Ayan, Tim Salimans, et al. Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:36479–36494, 2022. 1, 3
- [24] Masaki Saito, Eiichi Matsumoto, and Shunta Saito. Temporal generative adversarial nets with singular value clipping. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2830–2839, 2017. 2
- [25] Ivan Skorokhodov, Sergey Tulyakov, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Stylegan-v: A continuous video generator with the price, image quality and perks of stylegan2. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3626–3636, 2022.

- [26] Sergey Tulyakov, Ming-Yu Liu, Xiaodong Yang, and Jan Kautz. Mocogan: Decomposing motion and content for video generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1526–1535, 2018. [2](#)
- [27] Yael Vinker, Ehsan Pajouheshgar, Jessica Y Bo, Roman Christian Bachmann, Amit Haim Bermano, Daniel Cohen-Or, Amir Zamir, and Ariel Shamir. Clipasso: Semantically-aware object sketching. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 41(4):1–11, 2022. [2](#)
- [28] Carl Vondrick, Hamed Pirsiavash, and Antonio Torralba. Generating videos with scene dynamics. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016. [2](#)
- [29] Jiapeng Wang, Chengyu Wang, Xiaodan Wang, Jun Huang, and Lianwen Jin. Cocaclip: Exploring distillation of fully-connected knowledge interaction graph for lightweight text-image retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 5: Industry Track)*, pages 71–80, 2023. [2](#)
- [30] Jiapeng Wang, Chengyu Wang, Kunzhe Huang, Jun Huang, and Lianwen Jin. Videoclip-xl: Advancing long description understanding for video clip models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16061–16075, 2024. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [31] Xiang Wang, Hangjie Yuan, Shiwei Zhang, Dayou Chen, Jiniu Wang, Yingya Zhang, Yujun Shen, Deli Zhao, and Jingren Zhou. Videocomposer: Compositional video synthesis with motion controllability. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. [1](#), [3](#)
- [32] Yi Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Kunchang Li, Jiashuo Yu, Xin Ma, Xinhao Li, Guo Chen, Xinyuan Chen, Yaohui Wang, et al. Internvid: A large-scale video-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [33] Zhouxia Wang, Ziyang Yuan, Xintao Wang, Yaowei Li, Tianshui Chen, Menghan Xia, Ping Luo, and Ying Shan. Motionctrl: A unified and flexible motion controller for video generation. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2024 Conference Papers*, pages 1–11, 2024. [1](#), [3](#)
- [34] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metze, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Videoclip: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6787–6800, 2021. [2](#)
- [35] Jiarui Xu, Shalini De Mello, Sifei Liu, Wonmin Byeon, Thomas Breuel, Jan Kautz, and Xiaolong Wang. Groupvit: Semantic segmentation emerges from text supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18134–18144, 2022. [2](#)
- [36] Shiyuan Yang, Liang Hou, Haibin Huang, Chongyang Ma, Pengfei Wan, Di Zhang, Xiaodong Chen, and Jing Liao. Direct-a-video: Customized video generation with user-directed camera movement and object motion. In *Special Interest Group on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Conference Conference Papers '24*, page 1–12. ACM, 2024. [1](#), [3](#)
- [37] Beichen Zhang, Pan Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, and Jiaqi Wang. Long-clip: Unlocking the long-text capability of clip. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 310–325. Springer, 2025. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [38] Ming Zhong, Yelong Shen, Shuohang Wang, Yadong Lu, Yizhu Jiao, Siru Ouyang, Donghan Yu, Jiawei Han, and Weizhu Chen. Multi-lora composition for image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16843*, 2024. [3](#)

# Can video generation replace cinematographers? Research on the cinematic language of generated video

## Supplementary Material

### A. Detailed Data Description

To provide a more comprehensive introduction to the cinematography dataset, we further elaborate on the meanings of the 20 types of cinematic language in Section A.1 and describe the data distribution in Section A.2.

#### A.1. Meanings of 20 Types of Cinematic Language

- **Long Shot:** Shows the entire subject within its surroundings.
- **Medium Shot:** Captures the subject from the waist up, focusing on body language.
- **Close Up Shot:** Highlights a specific part of the subject, often the face, for detail.
- **Full Shot:** Frames the whole subject, providing context without much background.
- **Low Angle:** Camera positioned below the subject, making it appear powerful or imposing.
- **High Angle:** Camera positioned above the subject, making it seem smaller or vulnerable.
- **Bird Angle:** Overhead view, offering a comprehensive look at the scene from above.
- **Eye Level:** Camera is at the subject’s eye height, creating a neutral perspective.
- **Dutch Angle:** Tilted camera angle, used to create tension or unease.
- **Rack Focus:** Shifts focus between subjects at different distances to guide viewer attention.
- **Panning Left:** Horizontal movement of the camera to the left, capturing a scene’s width.
- **Panning Right:** Horizontal movement of the camera to the right, capturing a scene’s width.
- **Tilt Up:** Vertical movement of the camera upwards, usually to reveal height.
- **Tilt Down:** Vertical movement of the camera downwards, often to show depth.
- **Dolly In:** Camera moves closer to the subject, creating an immersive effect.
- **Dolly Out:** Camera moves away from the subject, broadening the scene’s context.
- **Tracking Shot:** Camera follows the subject, maintaining focus while moving.
- **Zoom In:** Camera lens zooms in, bringing the subject closer without physical movement.
- **Zoom Out:** Camera lens zooms out, showing more of the surroundings.
- **Still:** The camera remains fixed, with no movement, offering a steady view.

### A.2. Data Distribution

Table A1 presents the distribution of types across the categories of shot framing, shot angle, and camera movement in our cinematic language dataset, providing a detailed breakdown of the number of different cinematic elements within each category.

Shot Type	Specific Types	Data Size
Shot framing	Long Shot	634
	Medium Shot	356
	Close Up Shot	437
	Full Shot	404
Shot Angle	Low Angle	238
	High Angle	310
	Bird Angle	170
	Eye Level	1033
	Dutch Angle	80
Camera Movement	Rack Focus	98
	Panning Left	119
	Panning Right	144
	Tilt Up	96
	Tilt Down	85
	Dolly In	127
	Dolly Out	113
	Tracking Shot	129
	Zoom In	102
	Zoom Out	100
Still	718	

Table A1. The distribution of cinematic language types in the dataset after the supplementation of manual labels is presented.

### B. Experiment Detailed Settings

We provide the detailed description of the experimental settings in Section B.1 for CameraCLIP and in Section B.2 for CLIPLoRA.

#### B.1. CameraCLIP

We trained the proposed CameraCLIP on a single NVIDIA A6000 Ada GPU (48GB). The specific training hyperparameters are detailed as follows:

- **Batch size:** We set the batch size to 16.
- **Number of epochs:** The model was trained for 2 epochs.

- **Learning rate:** We used an initial learning rate of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ , which was linearly increased during the first 10% of training steps (warmup phase), followed by cosine annealing for the remaining steps. The final learning rate decayed to  $10^{-6}$ .
- **Optimizer:** We employed the AdamW optimizer [16] with a weight decay of 0.2 to improve generalization.
- **Max length:** The maximum input length for text was set to 77 tokens, which is the default limit for the CLIP model.
- **Temperature parameter:** We set the temperature for the softmax operation to 0.01 to appropriately scale the logits during contrastive learning.

## B.2. CLIPLoRA

This section outlines the experimental setup for training specific cinematic language patterns using LoRA and multi LoRA composition, as detailed in B.2.1. Additionally, we describe the 26 text prompts used in this experiment for T2V generation in B.2.2.

### B.2.1 Training Details

The training configuration for training specific cinematic language patterns using LoRA [12] is based on the setting of AnimateDiff [9]. We set both the LoRA rank and alpha to 32, as this configuration provides performance comparable to increasing the rank and alpha to 128 while requiring less training time. Each LoRA requires between 30 minutes and 1 hour of training on a single A100 with a learning rate of  $1e-5$  and a batch size of 4. The sample stride and number of frames are set to 4 and 16, respectively. Training is conducted for a maximum of 10 epochs per LoRA, and the best epoch is selected using our proposed CameraCLIP method to prevent overfitting.

For the LoRA composition search in CLIPLoRA, we set the population size to 100 with 15 iterations, a mutation probability of 0.2, and a crossover probability of 0.5. We select the top 10% as elite children. The search is a discrete optimization process, determining which LoRA is used at each of the 50 steps. The entire search takes approximately two days; however, a satisfactory result is often achieved after 12 hours.

### B.2.2 Prompts Used in Text-to-Video Generation

- Cricket still life with close up of ball and bat lying in the grass in front of stumps.
- A man is skiing.
- A rabbit is eating a watermelon on the table.
- A car is moving on the road.
- Bear playing guitar happily, snowing.
- Boy walking on the street.
- Ball And Bat Lying In Grass In Front Of Stumps.

- A black swan swims on the pond.
- A girl is riding a horse fast on grassland.
- A boy sits on a chair facing the sea.
- Two galleons moving in the wind at sunset.
- Cinematic photo melting pistachio ice cream dripping down the cone. 35mm photograph, film, bokeh.
- Large motion, surrounded by butterflies, a girl walks through a lush garden.
- An astronaut is waving his hands on the moon.
- A man cruises through the city on a motorcycle, feeling the adrenaline rush.
- A monkey eating a pizza in central park, GoPro film style
- A cyberpunk city street.
- A bird sits on a branch.
- A rabbit, forest, haze, halation, bloom, dramatic atmosphere, centered, rule of thirds, 200mm 1.4f macro shot.
- B&W photo of a young man in black clothes, bald, face, body, high detailed skin, skin pores, coastline, overcast weather, wind, waves, 8k UHD, DSLR, soft lighting, high quality, film grain, Fujifilm XT3.
- Photo of coastline, rocks, storm weather, wind, waves, lightning, 8k UHD, DSLR, soft lighting, high quality, film grain, Fujifilm XT3.
- Night, B&W photo of old house, post-apocalypse, forest, storm weather, wind, rocks, 8k UHD, DSLR, soft lighting, high quality, film grain.
- Pacific coast, Carmel by the sea ocean and waves.
- Robot dancing in Times Square.
- The Golden Temple in India.
- Flowers in Garden.

## C. Multi LoRAs Composition Results

In this section, we present the results of our proposed CLIPLoRA method and other baseline methods, as shown in Figure C1. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of CLIPLoRA in comparison to the baselines under various cinematic conditions.

The experiment evaluates the performance of various LoRA composition methods in generating cinematic videos under complex camera movements, such as panning, tilting, and zooming. In the first row, which depicts a long shot at a high level with a panning right movement, CLIPLoRA demonstrates the most consistent and realistic camera control. The second row illustrates a long shot at a high level with panning left and tilting up. In this scenario, the origin and LoRA Merge methods fail to generate combined movements, LoRA Switch and LoRA Composite handle only the panning left movement, whereas CLIPLoRA successfully integrates both panning left and tilting up movements. The third row introduces a scenario involving camera zoom—a long shot at a high level with zooming in and panning right. In this case, CLIPLoRA excels in cohesively fusing multiple cinematic movements, while the baseline methods are



*Long shot, high level,  
panning right*

*Long shot, high level,  
panning left, tilt up*

*Long shot, high level,  
zoom in, panning  
right*

<i>origin</i>	<i>LoRA Merge</i>	<i>LoRA Switch</i>	<i>LoRA Composite</i>	<i>CLIPLoRA</i>
---------------	-------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Figure C1. The results of the LoRA composition methods for multi-shot integration are generated using the prompt: "Photo of coastline, rocks, storm weather, wind, waves, lightning, 8k UHD, DSLR, soft lighting, high quality, film grain, Fujifilm XT3." Each row illustrates the results of LoRA compositions, with the corresponding cinematic language described alongside the figures. The specific LoRA composition method employed for each figure is listed directly below it. *Best viewed in Acrobat Reader. Click images to play animations.*

limited to generating a single movement and fail to achieve multi-shot integration.

In summary, as the number of LoRA composition increases, CLIPLoRA consistently outperforms all baselines by maintaining stable cinematic control and enabling precise multi-shot integration. In contrast, methods like LoRA Merge, LoRA Switch, and LoRA Composite exhibit instability in generating complex camera movements, often failing to synthesize multiple movements. These results highlight the superiority of CLIPLoRA, demonstrating its potential to bridge the gap between the capabilities of T2V models and the expertise of professional cinematographers.