
Learning World Models for Interactive Video Generation

Taiye Chen^{1*} Xun Hu^{2*} Zihan Ding^{3*} Chi Jin^{3†}
¹Peking University ²University of Oxford ³Princeton University
yeyutaihan@stu.pku.edu.cn
{xh4421,zihand,chi.jin}@princeton.edu

Abstract

Foundational world models must be both interactive and preserve spatiotemporal coherence for effective future planning with action choices. However, present models for long video generation have limited inherent world modeling capabilities due to two main challenges: compounding errors and insufficient memory mechanisms. We enhance image-to-video models with interactive capabilities through additional action conditioning and autoregressive framework, and reveal that compounding error is inherently irreducible in autoregressive video generation, while insufficient memory mechanism leads to incoherence of world models. We propose video retrieval augmented generation (VRAG) with explicit global state conditioning, which significantly reduces long-term compounding errors and increases spatiotemporal consistency of world models. In contrast, naive autoregressive generation with extended context windows and retrieval-augmented generation prove less effective for video generation, primarily due to the limited in-context learning capabilities of current video models. Our work illuminates the fundamental challenges in video world models and establishes a comprehensive benchmark for improving video generation models with internal world modeling capabilities.

Project page: <https://sites.google.com/view/vrag>.

1 Introduction

Foundational world models capable of simulating future outcomes based on different actions are crucial for effective planning and decision-making [1, 2, 3]. To achieve this, these models must exhibit both interactivity, allowing for action conditioning, and spatiotemporal consistency over long horizons. While recent advancements in video generation, particularly diffusion models [4, 5, 6, 7], have shown promise, extending them to generate long, interactive, and consistent videos remains a significant challenge [8, 9, 10].

Autoregressive approaches [11, 12, 13, 14], which generate videos frame by frame or chunk by chunk conditioned on previous outputs, are a




Figure 1: A world model possesses memory capabilities and enables faithful long-term future prediction by maintaining awareness of its environment and generating predictions based on the current state and actions. Example is in Minecraft game.

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding Author

natural fit for modeling long temporal dependencies and incorporating interactivity. However, these methods face significant challenges stemming from two fundamental, often coupled, limitations: **compounding errors** and **insufficient memory mechanisms**. Compounding errors arise as small inaccuracies in early predictions accumulate over time, leading to significant divergence from plausible future states. Our analysis suggests this may be inherent to current autoregressive paradigms. Insufficient memory mechanisms hinder the models’ ability to maintain consistent object identities, spatial layouts, and world states over extended durations, resulting in inconsistent world models. These two issues often exacerbate one another, making long-term consistent generation difficult.

Inspired by the success of large language models (LLMs) [15][16] in handling long sequences, we investigate analogous techniques for video generation. Extending the context window, while potentially alleviating compounding errors to some degree, introduces substantial computational and memory overhead. More critically, we find that unlike LLMs, current video generation models exhibit weaker in-context learning capabilities, making longer context less effective in resolving fundamental consistency issues. Similarly, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [17][18], a powerful technique for incorporating external knowledge in LLMs, shows limited benefits in our experiments with video models. Neither static retrieval with heuristic sampling nor dynamic retrieval based on similarity search significantly improved world model consistency.

These findings suggest that implicitly learning world consistency solely from autoregressive prediction on pixel or latent representations is insufficient. We argue that explicit **global state conditioning** is necessary. Incorporating explicit representations like world maps, object states, or coordinate systems as conditioning information could provide the necessary grounding for generating consistent long-term interactive simulations.

Furthermore, evaluating the specific failure modes of long video generation demands appropriate metrics. Existing metrics often conflate the distinct issues of compounding errors and long-term consistency (memory faithfulness), providing a coupled assessment that obscures the underlying problems. To enable a clearer analysis, we advocate for and introduce a decoupled evaluation strategy by separately quantify the severity of compounding errors and the faithfulness of memory retrieval in long interactive video generation.

Our main contributions are: (1). We systematically decouple and analyze the challenges of compounding errors and insufficient memory in autoregressive video generation for interactive world modeling. (2). We propose video retrieval augmented generation (VRAG) with explicit global state conditioning, which significantly improves long-term spatiotemporal coherence and reduces compounding errors for interactive video generation. (3). We conduct a comprehensive comparison with various long-context methods adapted from LLM techniques, including position interpolation, neural memory augmentation, and historical frame retrieval, demonstrating their limited effectiveness due to the inherent weak in-context learning capabilities of video diffusion models. This work sheds light on the fundamental obstacles in building consistent, interactive video world models and provides a benchmark and evaluation framework for future research in this direction.

2 Related Works

Video Diffusion Models Diffusion generative modeling has significantly advanced the fields of image and video generation [19, 12, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. Latent video diffusion models [21] operate on video tokens within a latent space derived from a variational auto-encoder (VAE) [30], building upon prior work in latent image diffusion models [31]. The Diffusion Transformer (DiT) [32] introduced the Transformer [33] backbone as an alternative to the previously prevalent U-Net architecture [23, 21, 22] in diffusion models.

Long Video Generation Autoregressive video generation [11, 12, 13, 14, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39] represents a natural approach for long video synthesis by conditioning on preceding frames, drawing inspiration from successes in large language models. This can be implemented using techniques such as masked conditional video diffusion [40, 34] or Diffusion Forcing [41]. Diffusion Forcing introduces varying levels of random noise per frame to facilitate autoregressive generation conditioned on frames at inference time. Furthermore, the autoregressive framework naturally supports interactive world simulation by allowing action inputs at each step to influence future predictions. Nevertheless,

compounding errors remain a significant challenge in long video generation, particularly within the autoregressive paradigm, as will be discussed subsequently.

Interactive Video World Models World models [1, 2, 3] are simulation systems designed to predict future trajectories based on the current state and chosen actions. Diffusion-based world models [42, 43, 10] facilitate the modeling of high-dimensional distributions, enabling high-fidelity prediction of diverse trajectories, even directly in pixel space. The Sora model [8] introduced the concept of leveraging video generation models as world simulators. Extending video generation models with interactive capabilities has led to promising applications in diverse domains, including game simulation like Genie [9], GameNGen [10], Oasis [44], Gamegen-x [45], The Matrix [37], Mineworld [46], GameFactory [47] and so on [43], autonomous driving [48], robotic manipulation [35, 49], and navigation [50]. While existing work on interactive video world models has made significant engineering advances, there remains a notable gap in systematically analyzing and addressing the fundamental challenges underlying long-term consistency and compounding errors.

A lack of spatiotemporal consistency is a primary bottleneck for developing internal world models using current video generation techniques. One line of research addressing this involves predicting the underlying 3D world structure like Genie2 [51], Aether [52], Gen3C [53] and others [54, 55, 56]; however, these approaches often suffer from lower resolution compared to direct video generation due to the complexity of 3D representations, exhibit limited interaction capabilities, and typically operate only within localized regions. Consequently, our work focuses on enhancing the consistency of video-based world models [10, 34, 57]. SlowFast-VGen [34] employs a dual-speed learning system to progressively trained LoRA modules for memory recall, utilizing semantic actions but offering limited interactivity. Concurrent work [57] explores interactive world simulation through the integration of supplementary memory blocks.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preliminary: Latent Video Diffusion Model

Video diffusion models have emerged as a powerful framework for video generation. We adopt a latent video diffusion model [21] that operates in a compressed latent space rather than pixel space for computational efficiency. Specifically, given an input video sequence $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times H \times W \times 3}$, we first encode it into a latent representation $\mathbf{z} = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x})$ using a pretrained variational autoencoder (VAE). The forward process gradually adds Gaussian noise to the latent according to a variance schedule $\{\beta_t\}_{t=1}^T$:

$$q(\mathbf{z}_t | \mathbf{z}_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t} \mathbf{z}_{t-1}, \beta_t \mathbf{I}) \quad (1)$$

The model learns to reverse this process by predicting the noise ϵ_θ at each step:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{t, \epsilon, \mathbf{z}} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, t)\|_2^2] \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{z}_t = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} \mathbf{z}_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \epsilon$ with $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$.

At inference time, we can sample new videos by starting from random noise $\mathbf{z}_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$ and iteratively denoising:

$$\mathbf{z}_{t-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t}} \left(\mathbf{z}_t - \frac{\beta_t}{\sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t}} \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, t) \right) + \sigma_t \epsilon \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha_t = 1 - \beta_t$ and $\bar{\alpha}_t = \prod_{s=1}^t \alpha_s$. The final latent sequence \mathbf{z}_0 is decoded back to pixel space using the decoder \mathcal{D} to obtain the generated video.

3.2 Interactive Long Video Generation

To enable interactive long video generation conditioned on action sequences, we augment the base diffusion model with two techniques: (1) additional action condition with adaptive layer normalization (AdaLN), and (2) random frame noise for autoregressive modeling, as shown in diagram Fig. 2.

Action Conditioning To enable interactive video generation conditioned on action sequences, we augment the base diffusion model with adaptive layer normalization (AdaLN). Given an action sequence $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times A}$ where A is the action dimension, we first embed it into a latent space using a




Figure 2: Overview of our VRAG framework for interactive video generation. The framework incorporates global state conditioning and memory retrieval mechanisms to ensure spatiotemporal consistency and mitigate error accumulation. During both training and inference, retrieved memory serves as context for joint self-attention in spatiotemporal DiT blocks. The model employs per-frame noise injection during training to facilitate autoregressive sampling at inference time.

learnable embedding layer: $e_a = \text{Embed}(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D_e}$ where D_e is the embedding dimension. For each normalization layer in the diffusion model, we learn action-dependent scale and shift parameters through linear projections: $\gamma_a = e_a W_\gamma + b_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D_h}$, $\beta_a = e_a W_\beta + b_\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D_h}$, where D_h matches the hidden dimension of the feature maps. We have $\text{AdaLN}(h) = \gamma_a \odot \text{LayerNorm}(h) + \beta_a$, where $h \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D_h}$ represents the intermediate feature maps and \odot denotes dot production.

Autoregressive Video Generation To enable long video generation, we adopt an autoregressive approach where we generate frames sequentially. At each step, we condition on a fixed-length context window L_c of previously generated frames. However, naive autoregressive generation with teacher forcing can suffer from large compounding errors where mistakes accumulate over time. We apply the Diffusion Forcing [41] technique during training.

Specifically, during training, we randomly add noise to each frame in the entire input video sequence according to the diffusion schedule: $z_t^i = \sqrt{\alpha_t} z_0^i + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t} \epsilon^i$, $\epsilon^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$, where z_t^i represents the noised latent of the i -th frame. This forces the model to be robust to noise in the conditioning frames and prevents it from relying too heavily on the context. With above two techniques, the training objective for action-conditioned autoregressive video models become:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DF}} = \mathbb{E}_{[t], \epsilon, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}} [\|\epsilon_{[t]} - \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{z}_{[t]}, [t], \mathbf{a})\|_2^2], \quad \epsilon_{[t]} = \{\epsilon_t^i\}_{i=1}^L, \mathbf{z}_{[t]} = \{z_t^i\}_{i=1}^L \quad (4)$$

where $[t]$ is vector of L timesteps with different $t \in [T]$ for each frame. The noise prediction model ϵ_θ conditioned on both the action sequence \mathbf{a} and noised frames \mathbf{z}_t .

Architecture We apply diffusion transformer (DiT) for video generation modeling. We adopt spatiotemporal DiT block with separate spatial and temporal attention modules. Rotary Position Embedding (RoPE) [58] is applied for both attention modules, and temporal attention is implemented with causal masking.

3.3 Retrieval Augmented Video World Model with Global State

While the vanilla model in Sec. 3.2 provides a foundation for interactive video generation, it lacks robust mechanisms for maintaining long-term consistency and world model coherence. To address these limitations, we integrate memory retrieval and context enhancement with inspiration from LLMs, and incorporate video-specific approaches such as historical frame buffer and global state conditioning. These enhancements enable more consistent and coherent autoregressive video generation by providing the model with better access to historical context and spatial awareness.

Global State Conditioning To enhance spatial consistency in video generation, we incorporate global state information—specifically the character’s current coordinates and pose—as an additional conditioning signal. The global state vector $s \in \mathbb{R}^S$ consists of two key components: s_{pos} representing 3D position coordinates and s_{ori} capturing orientation angles. Given an action sequence $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times A}$ and the global state sequence $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times S}$, both are transformed by a learnable embedding layer, $e_c = \text{Embed}_c(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{s})$, to produce conditioning features. These features are then fed into AdaLN layers within the diffusion model. This mechanism allows the model to modulate its generation process, adapting to both the input actions and the character’s spatial context, thereby improving overall coherence.

Video Retrieval Augmented Generation (VRAG) Beyond global state conditioning, we propose memory retrieval augmented generation to enhance the model’s ability to leverage historical context while maintaining temporal coherence, namely video retrieval augmented generation (VRAG). For VRAG, we combine the concatenated historical and current frames with their corresponding action sequences $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times A}$ and global state sequences $\tilde{\mathbf{s}} = [s_{\text{hist}}, \mathbf{s}] \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times S}$ as conditional inputs to the model. The historical frames are retrieved from a fixed-length buffer \mathcal{B} , which stores previously generated frames. The per-frame retrieval process is based on a heuristic sampling strategy, where we select the most relevant historical frames based on similarity search to concatenate with the current context. The similarity score based on global state is defined as:

$$r(\hat{s}) = f_{\text{sim}}(\hat{s} \odot w, s_{L-1} \odot w), \hat{s} \in \mathcal{B} \quad (5)$$

where f_{sim} is a distance metric (e.g., Euclidean distance) between the history frame and the last frame to be predicted s_{L-1} , and $w \in \mathbb{R}^S$ is a weight vector that modulates the importance of different state components. The top L_h most similar historical states and frames are selected and sorted to form the retrieved context. Unlike RAG in LLMs which leverages strong in-context learning capabilities, **video diffusion models exhibit weak in-context learning abilities, making direct inference with historical frames as context ineffective**, as demonstrated later in our experiments. To address this limitation, we propose VRAG training with key modifications to the standard RAG approach, enabling effective memory-augmented video generation.

During training, we retrieve historical frames $\mathbf{z}_{\text{hist}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_h \times D}$ and concatenate them with the current context window $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_c \times D}$ to form the extended context $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = [\mathbf{z}_{\text{hist}}, \mathbf{z}]$. For effective VRAG, we make several key modifications: (1). To distinguish retrieved frames from normal context frames, we modify the RoPE embeddings by adding a temporal offset Δt to the retrieved frames’ position indices. (2). Additionally, we apply lower noise levels $\beta_{t'} < \beta_t$ to the retrieved frames \mathbf{z}_{hist} to simulate partially denoised historical frames during inference. This enhances the robustness of the model with imperfect historical frames generated previously during the autoregressive process. The model is trained to denoise for the entire context $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ including both retrieved and current frames. (3). To ensure the model focuses on denoising the current context while leveraging historical information, we mask the diffusion loss \mathcal{L}_{DF} for retrieved frames. (4). Furthermore, for retrieved frames, we only condition on their global states $\mathbf{s}_{\text{hist}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_h \times S}$, masking out action conditions $\mathbf{a}_{\text{hist}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_h \times A}$ to avoid temporal discontinuity in action sequences. This selective conditioning approach helps maintain spatial consistency while preventing action-related artifacts from propagating through the generation process. Overall, the training objective of VRAG on diffusion models is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{VRAG}} = \mathbb{E}_{[t],[t'],\epsilon,\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\tilde{\mathbf{a}},\tilde{\mathbf{s}}} [\|\epsilon_t - \epsilon_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{\tilde{t}}, \tilde{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \tilde{\mathbf{s}})\|_2^2 \odot \mathbf{m}], \quad (6)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{\tilde{t}} = [\mathbf{z}_{\text{hist},[t']}, \mathbf{z}_{[t]}], \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}} = [\emptyset_{L_h}, \mathbf{a}], \quad \tilde{\mathbf{s}} = [s_{\text{hist}}, \mathbf{s}], \quad \mathbf{m} = [\mathbf{0}_{L_h}, \mathbf{1}_{L_c}], \quad (7)$$

where \tilde{t} is a concatenation of $[t']$ and $[t]$, with $t' < t$ and $t', t \in [T]$.

3.4 Long-context Extension Baselines

To investigate whether established long-context extension techniques from LLMs can effectively enhance video generation models, we design three complementary approaches that leverage either explicit frame context or neural memory hidden states, based on vanilla models in Sec. 3.2. These methods serve as baseline comparisons to our main approach, specifically targeting the model’s ability to maintain spatial coherence and temporal consistency in long video generation. Through these baselines, we aim to verify the in-context learning capabilities of video diffusion models and assess their effectiveness in handling extended sequences.

Long-context Enhancement We extend the temporal context window using YaRN [59] modification for RoPE in temporal attention. RoPE encodes relative positions via complex-valued rotations, where the inner product between query \mathbf{q}_m and key \mathbf{k}_n depends on relative distance $(m - n)$. YaRN extends the context window by applying a frequency transformation to the rotary position embeddings. This transformation scales the rotation angles in a way that preserves the relative positioning information while allowing the model to handle longer video sequences, after small-scale fine-tuning on longer video clips.

Frame Retrieval from History Buffer We implement a fixed-length buffer \mathcal{B} storing historical latent frames with a heuristic sampling strategy. The buffer is partitioned into $N_S = 5$ exponentially decreasing segments G_j , where $L_j = L_1 \cdot \alpha^{j-1}$. From each segment G_j , we sample k frames to form subset F_j . The retrieved memory $\mathbf{z}_{\text{mem}} = [F_1, \dots, F_{N_S}]$ is concatenated with current frame window \mathbf{z} as additional context: $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = [\mathbf{z}_{\text{mem}}, \mathbf{z}]$, which is then passed into the spatiotemporal DiT blocks. This design ensures higher sampling density for recent frames, emphasizing recent visual information while maintaining access to historical context for temporal consistency.

Neural Memory Augmented Attention Instead of using explicit frames as context in above two methods, we explore a neural memory mechanism to store and retrieve hidden states. This approach is inspired by the success of Infini-attention [60] in LLMs, which utilizes a compressed memory representation to enhance attention mechanisms. The model processes video in overlapping segments to maintain temporal continuity. For each video segment \mathbf{z}_s , we compute query \mathbf{q}_s , key \mathbf{k}_s and value \mathbf{v}_s matrices. The model retrieves hidden state \mathbf{A}_{mem} from compressive memory \mathbf{M}_{s-1} : $\mathbf{A}_{\text{mem}} = \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{q}_s)\mathbf{M}_{s-1}}{\sigma(\mathbf{q}_s)\mathbf{n}_{s-1}}$. Memory \mathbf{M}_{s-1} and normalization vector \mathbf{n}_{s-1} are then updated. The final attention output combines retrieved hidden state \mathbf{A}_{mem} and standard attention using learnable gating to maintain visual consistency across the long video sequence.

Frame Pack As another baseline, we follow the Frame Pack [61] to compress historical frames as context. Three input compression kernels with different kernel sizes-(2, 4, 4), (4, 8, 8), and (8, 16, 16)-are employed to condense the historical frames into a fixed-length context. This approach essentially achieves frame compression through importance sampling with recency bias, which enables a larger field of view while maintaining lower computational costs. However, the prioritization of most recent frames can be suboptimal in many cases for long video generation especially when considering the memory issue. Our VRAG based on frame relevance provides theoretically better historical information retrieval. Moreover, our method is actually orthogonal to the frame compression technique in Frame Pack. We leave the combined methods as future work.

More details of the above methods can be found in the supplementary material.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets and Evaluation Protocol

For training, we collected 1000 long Minecraft gameplay videos (17 hours total) using MineRL [62]. All videos have a fixed resolution of 640×360 pixels. Each sequence spans 1200 frames, annotated with action vectors (forward/backward movement, jumping, camera rotation) and world coordinates (x, y, z positions and yaw angle).

For evaluation, we assembled two distinct test sets: (1) for compounding error evaluation, we use 20 long videos of 1200 frames with randomized actions and locations, and (2) for world coherence, we use 60 carefully curated 300-frame video sequences designed to systematically assess spatiotemporal consistency. These curated sequences feature controlled motion patterns including in-place rotation, direction reversal, and circular trajectory following. The first 100 frames of each sequence serve as initialization buffer for methods requiring buffer frames or are excluded from evaluation for others. Each model autoregressively generates next single frame with stride 1 until the desired length.

We evaluate the models against ground-truth test sets using several metrics: Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) [63] to measure spatial consistency, Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) for pixel-level reconstruction quality, Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS) [64] to assess perceptual similarity. For the compounding error evaluation, we find SSIM more accurately reflect the faithfulness of frames over long sequences.




Figure 3: Visual comparison of VRAG with ground truth videos on world coherence evaluation. With 100 initial frames as history buffer, VRAG predicts 200 subsequent frames.

4.2 Training Details

A consistent window size of 20 frames is applied for both model training and evaluation for fair comparison. For vanilla Diffusion Forcing, we additionally train a variant with window sizes of 10 frame for context length evaluation. For our VRAG method, we combine 10 retrieved frames with 10 current frames for both training and inference. We represent the agent’s state using a global state vector $s = [x, y, z, \text{yaw}]$ during training, which can be extended to incorporate a full 3D pose representation when needed. To facilitate training convergence, these values are normalized relative to the initial state, thereby reducing the complexity of the diffusion process. The YaRN implementation extends the vanilla model (window size 20) by replacing position embeddings with YaRN and stretching factor 4, followed by fine-tuning for 10^4 steps on 80-frame sequences. During evaluation of Yarn, we use a 40-frame window. The Infinitention with neural memory employs a sliding window size 20 and stride 10, using the first 10 frames for memory state updates and the last 10 for local attention computation. The History Buffer method maintains a 124-frame buffer partitioned into 5 exponentially decreasing segments ($L_1 = 2, \alpha = 2$), sampling 2 frames per segment to form 10 historical frames that are concatenated with the 10 current frames. All models are trained for 3 epochs on the dataset, with a batch size of 32 across 8 A100 GPUs.




Figure 4: Visual comparison of different methods, evaluated for world coherence analysis.

4.3 World Coherence Results

We investigate the spatiotemporal consistency of internal world models by evaluating the predicted videos given initial frames and action sequences. As visualized in Fig. 4, our VRAG provides an effective approach to enhance the model’s ability to leverage historical context for improving world coherence. Fig. 3 shows more visual comparison of VRAG with ground truth videos. We evaluate the world coherence of different methods using multiple metrics. Fig. 5 shows the SSIM scores over time, while Tab. 1 presents a comprehensive comparison across all metrics. Our VRAG method achieves the best performance across all metrics, demonstrating its superior ability to maintain world coherence in generated videos. Our experimental results demonstrate that expanding the window size from 10 to 20 frames in the baseline DF model improves world coherence, indicating that longer context windows enhance consistency. However, further context extension using YaRN shows no improvement over the vanilla DF model. This suggests that YaRN’s context extension capabilities, while effective in language models, do not transfer effectively to video generation for maintaining world coherence. Similarly, the History Buffer method fails to effectively utilize historical frames for spatiotemporal consistency without explicit in-context training. These findings from both YaRN and History Buffer approaches reveal that video diffusion models at the current scale possess limited in-context learning capabilities, preventing them from effectively leveraging historical frames for maintaining long-term consistency. The Neural Memory method performs poorly due to its instability in model training.





Figure 5: SSIM scores over time for different methods on world coherence evaluation.

Method	SSIM \uparrow	PSNR \uparrow	LPIPS \downarrow
DF (window 10)	0.455	16.161	0.509
DF (window 20)	0.466	16.643	0.538
YaRN	0.462	16.567	0.532
History Buffer	0.459	16.922	0.543
Frame Pack	0.421	16.372	0.574
VRAG	0.506	17.097	0.506

Table 1: Quantitative comparison of world coherence across different methods, evaluated on videos with 300 frames.

4.4 Compounding Error Results

We evaluate the compounding error in long video generation across different methods using the SSIM metric. As shown in Fig. 7 and Tab. 2, our VRAG method achieves superior performance with an SSIM score of 0.349, demonstrating better structural similarity preservation compared to baseline methods. Increasing the window size in DF from 10 to 20 frames improves SSIM, indicating that longer context helps mitigate compounding errors. However, this improvement is still inferior to



VRAG’s performance, suggesting that our retrieval-augmented approach provides more effective long-term consistency. As visualized in Fig. 6, our VRAG method generates more coherent and consistent frames over long sequences, while other methods exhibit noticeable artifacts and inconsistencies. The History Buffer method performs poorly, with an SSIM score of 0.188, indicating that naive historical frame retrieval without effective in-context training fails to maintain long-term

Figure 6: Visual comparison of long-term video prediction (1200 frames) across different methods, evaluated for compounding error analysis.

consistency. Given its limited performance in the world coherence experiments (Sec. 4.3), we exclude the Neural Memory method from visualization in this longer video prediction visualization.




Figure 7: SSIM scores over time for compounding error evaluation

Method	SSIM \uparrow
DF (window 10)	0.297
DF (window 20)	0.321
YaRN	0.316
History Buffer	0.188
Neural Memory	0.283
VRAG	0.349

Table 2: Average SSIM scores across all frames in compounding error evaluation

4.5 VBench Evaluation

We evaluate the long video generation with five Video Quality metrics in VBench [65] for generated videos in Sec. 4.4. The evaluation results on VBench (higher is better) are shown in the Tab. 3. As demonstrated in the results, our method outperforms all other baselines across all metrics in both temporal quality and video frame quality. The Neural Memory baseline has Aesthetic Quality 0.343 and Imaging Quality score 0.3597 respectively, which are significantly lower than other baselines, therefore not listed here. Our VRAG shows better temporal consistency compared with all baseline methods, and the high video frame quality indicates the results are not over-smoothed.

4.6 Extension: Real World Setting

Method	Background Consistency	Temporal Flickering	Motion Smoothness	Aesthetic Quality	Imaging Quality
DF20	0.9668	0.9485	0.9582	0.5272	0.6058
YaRN	0.9686	0.9401	0.9523	0.5252	0.6323
History Buffer	0.9664	0.9475	0.9579	0.5167	0.6253
VRAG	0.9686	0.9511	0.9603	0.5295	0.6444

Table 3: Evaluation results on five Video Quality metrics in VBench.

Metric	DFoT	VRAG
SSIM \uparrow	0.4436	0.9116
PSNR \uparrow	13.03	32.21
LPIPS \downarrow	0.4469	0.1146
FVD \downarrow	337.5	221

Table 4: Quantitative comparison on RealEstate10K dataset.

We conduct additional experiments in real-world setting beyond Minecraft simulation to show generalization of our approach. Specifically, following the experimental setup of Diffusion Forcing Transformer (DFoT) [66], our VRAG model is initialized from pre-trained DFoT and finetuned on the RealEstate10K dataset [67] with additionally retrieved historical context, as described in Sec. 3.3.

After fine-tuning for just 2 epochs (10% of the original training steps), our method significantly outperforms the DFoT baseline in terms of memorization capability. The visualized frames are presented in Fig. 8 and quantitative results are summarized in Tab. 4. The results effectively demonstrate the generalization of our approach beyond Minecraft for solving the memory issue in long video prediction.




Figure 8: Visualized video frames on RealEstate10K dataset. Red blocks indicate the ground-truth frames.

4.7 Ablation: Memory and Training of VRAG




Figure 9: Comparison of SSIM scores over time for VRAG variants.

Method	SSIM \uparrow	PSNR \uparrow	LPIPS \downarrow
VRAG	0.506	17.097	0.506
VRAG (no training)	0.455	16.670	0.528
VRAG (no memory)	0.436	16.372	0.547

Table 5: Ablation study of VRAG components. We compare the full model with variants that remove either the memory component (additional global state conditioning only) or training component (in-context learning only).

We ablate the key designs for VRAG methods, including the memory and training components. The ablation results are shown in Fig. 9 and Tab. 5. We compare the full VRAG model with two variants: (1) VRAG without the memory component, which only uses additional global state conditioning, and (2) VRAG without the training component, i.e., vanilla model with retrieval augmented generation for in-context learning at inference. The ablation study is conducted on the world coherence evaluation dataset.

The ablation results reveal several key insights about VRAG components. First, removing the memory component leads to the largest performance drop across all metrics, with SSIM decreasing by 13.8% and LPIPS increasing by 8.1%. This demonstrates that the memory mechanism is crucial for maintaining spatiotemporal consistency and quality. Second, removing the training component also causes significant degradation, with SSIM dropping by 10.1% and LPIPS increasing by 4.3%, highlighting the weak capabilities of in-context learning for current video models. The full VRAG model achieves the best performance across all metrics, showing that both components work synergistically to improve video generation quality.

5 Conclusions and Discussions

In conclusion, VRAG tackles the fundamental challenge of maintaining long-term consistency in interactive video world models through an innovative combination of memory retrieval-augmented generation and global state conditioning. By maintaining a buffer of past frames associated with spatial information, VRAG effectively recalls relevant context and preserves coherent dynamics across extended sequences. Its memory mechanism with explicit in-context training process substantially mitigates compounding errors and improves spatiotemporal consistency. Extensive experiments on long-horizon interactive tasks demonstrate the superior performance of VRAG over both long-context and memory-based baselines, establishing a scalable framework for faithful video-based world modeling. Notably, we discovered that context enhancement techniques from LLMs fail to transfer effectively to the video generation domain, even with shared transformer backbones, due to the inherent limitations of in-context learning capabilities for video models. This finding underscores the critical importance of VRAG’s in-context training approach. We hope our work will inspire further exploration into memory retrieval mechanisms for long video generation and interactive simulation.

Limitations. We acknowledge the current computational limitations preventing effective scaling to longer sequences or larger architectures. GPU memory constraints severely restricted memory buffer size and training sequence length, potentially impacting long-horizon consistency and model performance. The higher computational cost of memory retrieval-augmented generation may further limit deployment in resource-constrained settings such as edge devices. Future work could explore more efficient memory mechanisms, adaptive optimization strategies, and hardware-aware algorithms.

Broader Impacts. We acknowledge serious ethical concerns regarding the potential misuse of such technology for creating highly convincing misleading or manipulated video content in games or simulation systems. We strongly encourage responsible development and deployment of video generation technologies, with appropriate technical and ethical safeguards, clear accountability frameworks, and transparency measures in place to mitigate risks.

References

- [1] Manuel Watter, Jost Springenberg, Joschka Boedecker, and Martin Riedmiller. Embed to control: A locally linear latent dynamics model for control from raw images. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [2] David Ha and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Recurrent world models facilitate policy evolution. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [3] Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Mohammad Norouzi, and Jimmy Ba. Mastering atari with discrete world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02193*, 2020.
- [4] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric A. Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2256–2265, 2015.
- [5] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [6] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- [7] Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P. Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [8] Tim Brooks, Bill Peebles, Connor Holmes, Will DePue, Yufei Guo, Li Jing, David Schnurr, Joe Taylor, Troy Luhman, Eric Luhman, Clarence Ng, Ricky Wang, and Aditya Ramesh. Video generation models as world simulators. 2024.
- [9] Jake Bruce, Michael D Dennis, Ashley Edwards, Jack Parker-Holder, Yuge Shi, Edward Hughes, Matthew Lai, Aditi Mavalankar, Richie Steigerwald, Chris Apps, et al. Genie: Generative interactive environments. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [10] Dani Valevski, Yaniv Leviathan, Moab Arar, and Shlomi Fruchter. Diffusion models are real-time game engines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14837*, 2024.
- [11] Dirk Weissenborn, Oscar Täckström, and Jakob Uszkoreit. Scaling autoregressive video models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02634*, 2019.
- [12] William Harvey, Søren Nørskov, Niklas Kölch, and George Vogiatzis. Flexible diffusion modeling of long videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11495*, 2022.
- [13] Zongyi Li, Shujie Hu, Shujie Liu, Long Zhou, Jeongsoo Choi, Lingwei Meng, Xun Guo, Jinyu Li, Hefei Ling, and Furu Wei. Arlon: Boosting diffusion transformers with autoregressive models for long video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20502*, 2024.
- [14] Desai Xie, Zhan Xu, Yicong Hong, Hao Tan, Difan Liu, Feng Liu, Arie Kaufman, and Yang Zhou. Progressive autoregressive video diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08151*, 2024.
- [15] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [16] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [17] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yixin Dai, Jiawei Sun, Haofen Wang, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2:1, 2023.

- [18] Penghao Zhao, Hailin Zhang, Qinhan Yu, Zhengren Wang, Yunteng Geng, Fangcheng Fu, Ling Yang, Wentao Zhang, Jie Jiang, and Bin Cui. Retrieval-augmented generation for ai-generated content: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19473*, 2024.
- [19] 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.
- [20] Patrick Esser, Johnathan Chiu, Parmida Atighehchian, Jonathan Granskog, and Anastasis Germanidis. Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models. In *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 7312–7322, 2023.
- [21] 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.
- [22] Haoxin Chen, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Menghan Xia, Xintao Wang, Chao Weng, and Ying Shan. Videocrafter2: Overcoming data limitations for high-quality video diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7310–7320, 2024.
- [23] Jonathan Ho, Tim Salimans, Alexey Gritsenko, William Chan, Mohammad Norouzi, and David J. Fleet. Video diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03458*, 2022.
- [24] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Eliya Nachmani, Guy Dahan, Eli Shechtman, and Haggai Hachohen. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022.
- [25] Yu Hong, Jing Wei, Xing Liu, Xiaodi Wang, Yutong Bai, Haitao Li, Ming Zhang, and Hao Xu. Cogvideo: Large-scale pretraining for text-to-video generation with transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15868*, 2022.
- [26] Zhuoyi Yang, Jiayan Teng, Wendi Zheng, Ming Ding, Shiyu Huang, Jiazheng Xu, Yuanming Yang, Wenyi Hong, Xiaohan Zhang, Guanyu Feng, et al. Cogvideox: Text-to-video diffusion models with an expert transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06072*, 2024.
- [27] Jiuniu Wang, Hangjie Yuan, Dayou Chen, Yingya Zhang, Xiang Wang, and Shiwei Zhang. Modelscope text-to-video technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06571*, 2023.
- [28] Zihan Ding, Chi Jin, Difan Liu, Haitian Zheng, Krishna Kumar Singh, Qiang Zhang, Yan Kang, Zhe Lin, and Yuchen Liu. Dollar: Few-step video generation via distillation and latent reward optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15689*, 2024.
- [29] Zangwei Zheng, Xiangyu Peng, Tianji Yang, Chenhui Shen, Shenggui Li, Hongxin Liu, Yukun Zhou, Tianyi Li, and Yang You. Open-sora: Democratizing efficient video production for all. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20404*, 2024.
- [30] Diederik P Kingma, Max Welling, et al. Auto-encoding variational bayes, 2013.
- [31] 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.
- [32] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4195–4205, 2023.
- [33] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [34] Yining Hong, Beide Liu, Maxine Wu, Yuanhao Zhai, Kai-Wei Chang, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Chung-Ching Lin, Jianfeng Wang, Zhengyuan Yang, et al. Slowfast-vgen: Slow-fast learning for action-driven long video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23277*, 2024.

- [35] Jialong Wu, Shaofeng Yin, Ningya Feng, Xu He, Dong Li, Jianye Hao, and Mingsheng Long. *ivideopt: Interactive videopts are scalable world models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:68082–68119, 2024.
- [36] Jihwan Kim, Junoh Kang, Jinyoung Choi, and Bohyung Han. *Fifo-diffusion: Generating infinite videos from text without training. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11473*, 2024.
- [37] Ruili Feng, Han Zhang, Zhantao Yang, Jie Xiao, Zhilei Shu, Zhiheng Liu, Andy Zheng, Yukun Huang, Yu Liu, and Hongyang Zhang. *The matrix: Infinite-horizon world generation with real-time moving control. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03568*, 2024.
- [38] Sand-AI. *Magi-1: Autoregressive video generation at scale*, 2025.
- [39] Roberto Henschel, Levon Khachatryan, Daniil Hayrapetyan, Hayk Poghosyan, Vahram Tadevosyan, Zhangyang Wang, Shant Navasardyan, and Humphrey Shi. *Streamingt2v: Consistent, dynamic, and extendable long video generation from text. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14773*, 2024.
- [40] Vikram Voleti, Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau, and Chris Pal. *Mcvd-masked conditional video diffusion for prediction, generation, and interpolation. Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23371–23385, 2022.
- [41] Boyuan Chen, Diego Martí Monsó, Yilun Du, Max Simchowitz, Russ Tedrake, and Vincent Sitzmann. *Diffusion forcing: Next-token prediction meets full-sequence diffusion. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:24081–24125, 2024.
- [42] Zihan Ding, Amy Zhang, Yuandong Tian, and Qingqing Zheng. *Diffusion world model: Future modeling beyond step-by-step rollout for offline reinforcement learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03570*, 2024.
- [43] Eloi Alonso, Adam Jelley, Vincent Micheli, Anssi Kanervisto, Amos J Storkey, Tim Pearce, and François Fleuret. *Diffusion for world modeling: Visual details matter in atari. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:58757–58791, 2024.
- [44] Decart, Etched, Julian Quevedo, Quinn McIntyre, Spruce Campbell, Xinlei Chen, and Robert Wachen. *Oasis: A universe in a transformer*. 2024.
- [45] Haoxuan Che, Xuanhua He, Quande Liu, Cheng Jin, and Hao Chen. *Gamegen-x: Interactive open-world game video generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00769*, 2024.
- [46] Junliang Guo, Yang Ye, Tianyu He, Haoyu Wu, Yushu Jiang, Tim Pearce, and Jiang Bian. *Mineworld: a real-time and open-source interactive world model on minecraft. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08388*, 2025.
- [47] Jiwen Yu, Yiran Qin, Xintao Wang, Pengfei Wan, Di Zhang, and Xihui Liu. *Gamefactory: Creating new games with generative interactive videos. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08325*, 2025.
- [48] Anthony Hu, Lloyd Russell, Hudson Yeo, Zak Murez, George Fedoseev, Alex Kendall, Jamie Shotton, and Gianluca Corrado. *Gaia-1: A generative world model for autonomous driving. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17080*, 2023.
- [49] Alisson Azzolini, Hannah Brandon, Prithvijit Chattopadhyay, Huayu Chen, Jinju Chu, Yin Cui, Jenna Diamond, Yifan Ding, Francesco Ferroni, Rama Govindaraju, et al. *Cosmos-reason1: From physical common sense to embodied reasoning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.15558*, 2025.
- [50] Amir Bar, Gaoyue Zhou, Danny Tran, Trevor Darrell, and Yann LeCun. *Navigation world models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03572*, 2024.
- [51] Jack Parker-Holder, Philip Ball, Jake Bruce, Vibhavari Dasagi, Kristian Holsheimer, Christos Kaplanis, Alexandre Moufarek, Guy Scully, Jeremy Shar, Jimmy Shi, Stephen Spencer, Jessica Yung, Michael Dennis, Sultan Kenjeyev, Shangbang Long, Vlad Mnih, Harris Chan, Maxime Gazeau, Bonnie Li, Fabio Pardo, Luyu Wang, Lei Zhang, Frederic Besse, Tim Harley, Anna Mitenkova, Jane Wang, Jeff Clune, Demis Hassabis, Raia Hadsell, Adrian Bolton, Satinder Singh, and Tim Rocktäschel. *Genie 2: A large-scale foundation world model*. 2024.

- [52] Aether Team, Haoyi Zhu, Yifan Wang, Jianjun Zhou, Wenzheng Chang, Yang Zhou, Zizun Li, Junyi Chen, Chunhua Shen, Jiangmiao Pang, et al. Aether: Geometric-aware unified world modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.18945*, 2025.
- [53] Xuanchi Ren, Tianchang Shen, Jiahui Huang, Huan Ling, Yifan Lu, Merlin Nimier-David, Thomas Müller, Alexander Keller, Sanja Fidler, and Jun Gao. Gen3c: 3d-informed world-consistent video generation with precise camera control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.03751*, 2025.
- [54] Fangfu Liu, Wenqiang Sun, Hanyang Wang, Yikai Wang, Haowen Sun, Junliang Ye, Jun Zhang, and Yueqi Duan. Reconx: Reconstruct any scene from sparse views with video diffusion model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16767*, 2024.
- [55] Ruiqi Gao, Aleksander Holynski, Philipp Henzler, Arthur Brussee, Ricardo Martin-Brualla, Pratul Srinivasan, Jonathan T Barron, and Ben Poole. Cat3d: Create anything in 3d with multi-view diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10314*, 2024.
- [56] Haoyu Zhen, Qiao Sun, Hongxin Zhang, Junyan Li, Siyuan Zhou, Yilun Du, and Chuang Gan. Tesseract: Learning 4d embodied world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.20995*, 2025.
- [57] Zeqi Xiao, Yushi Lan, Yifan Zhou, Wenqi Ouyang, Shuai Yang, Yanhong Zeng, and Xingang Pan. Worldmem: Long-term consistent world simulation with memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.12369*, 2025.
- [58] Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024.
- [59] Bowen Peng, Jeffrey Quesnelle, Honglu Fan, and Enrico Shippole. Yarn: Efficient context window extension of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00071*, 2023.
- [60] Tsendsuren Munkhdalai, Manaal Faruqui, and Siddharth Gopal. Leave no context behind: Efficient infinite context transformers with infini-attention, 2024.
- [61] Lvmin Zhang and Maneesh Agrawala. Packing input frame context in next-frame prediction models for video generation, 2025.
- [62] William H Guss, Brandon Houghton, Nicholay Topin, Phillip Wang, Cayden Codel, Manuela Veloso, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Minerl: A large-scale dataset of minecraft demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.13440*, 2019.
- [63] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.
- [64] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 586–595, 2018.
- [65] Ziqi Huang, Yinan He, Jiashuo Yu, Fan Zhang, Chenyang Si, Yuming Jiang, Yuanhan Zhang, Tianxing Wu, Qingyang Jin, Nattapol Chanpaisit, Yaohui Wang, Xinyuan Chen, Limin Wang, Dahua Lin, Yu Qiao, and Ziwei Liu. Vbench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models. In *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 21807–21818, 2024.
- [66] Kiwhan Song, Boyuan Chen, Max Simchowitz, Yilun Du, Russ Tedrake, and Vincent Sitzmann. History-guided video diffusion, 2025.
- [67] Google. Realestate10k. <https://google.github.io/realestate10k/index.html>, 2018. Accessed: 2025-07-27.
- [68] Jianwen Jiang, Chao Liang, Jiaqi Yang, Gaojie Lin, Tianyun Zhong, and Yanbo Zheng. Loopy: Taming audio-driven portrait avatar with long-term motion dependency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02634*, 2024.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The abstract clearly identifies spatiotemporal consistency and compounding error as key challenges, and the paper directly addresses them through the proposed VRAG model, with improvements demonstrated using a comprehensive set of evaluation metrics.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss in Sec.5 the computational limitations of our work that the higher computational cost of memory retrieval-augmented generation may limit deployment in resource-constrained settings.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory assumptions and proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: No theoretical results are provided in the paper.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental result reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have provided relevant details on the methodology and experiment setups as seen in Section 3.3 and Section 4.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Code will be available later on Github with sufficient instructions to reproduce the results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental setting/details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have described all relevant training and evaluation details in Section 4. More details will be provided in appendix.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment statistical significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [No]

Justification: The error bars are not reported in paper due to heavy computation for each model training. However, we report the average scores across whole test sets for each method.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.

- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments compute resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The detailed computational resources are reported in Sec. 4.2.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code of ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics [https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?](https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines)

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our paper does not involve human or animal subjects, and all data are collected from openly available sources.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The broader social impacts are discussed in Section 5 and we acknowledge the potential misuse of the video generation technology for creating misleading or manipulated video content in games or simulation systems.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our video generation models are trained from scratch, with self-collected datasets in Minecraft simulation games, therefore does not pose such risks.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All code and data are cited explicitly and used within the scope of the license.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.

- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. **New assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We will release our code on Github with a detailed documentation.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

16. Declaration of LLM usage

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does not impact the core methodology, scientific rigorousness, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our core method does not involve LLMs, and the entire content of this paper is written by the authors.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy (<https://neurips.cc/Conferences/2025/LLM>) for what should or should not be described.

Appendix

A Baseline Method Details

For the baseline methods in Sec. 3.4, we implemented the following techniques to enhance the temporal context window of our video generation model.

Long-context Enhancement To extend the temporal context window of our video generation model, we apply the YaRN [59] modification for ROPE in temporal attention module for improved extrapolation. RoPE encodes relative position via complex-valued rotations, such that the inner product between the m -th query \mathbf{q}_m and n -th key \mathbf{k}_n depends only on the relative distance ($m - n$):

$$\langle \mathbf{q}_m, \mathbf{k}_n \rangle = \langle f_{\mathbf{W}_q}(\mathbf{z}_m, m), f_{\mathbf{W}_k}(\mathbf{z}_n, n) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}} \quad (8)$$

$$= \text{Re} \left(\langle (\mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{z}_m) e^{im\theta}, (\mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{z}_n) e^{in\theta} \rangle \right) \quad (9)$$

$$= \text{Re} \left((\mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{z}_m) (\mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{z}_n)^* \cdot e^{i(m-n)\theta} \right) \quad (10)$$

$$= g(\mathbf{z}_m, \mathbf{z}_n, m - n) \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Re}[\cdot]$ is real part of complex values and $(\cdot)^*$ represents conjugate of complex numbers, $\mathbf{z}_m, \mathbf{z}_n \in \mathbb{R}^D$ are input vectors, $\mathbf{W}_q, \mathbf{W}_k$ are learned projections, and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^D$ encodes rotation frequencies per dimension: $\theta_d = b^{-2d/D}$, with $b = 10000$.

YaRN modifies the rotated input vector $f_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{z}_m, m, \theta_d)$ by applying a frequency transformation:

$$f'_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{z}_m, m, \theta_d) = f_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{z}_m, g(m), h(\theta_d)) \quad (12)$$

with $g(m) = m$ and frequency warping function:

$$h(\theta_d) = (1 - \gamma(r_d)) \cdot \frac{\theta_d}{s} + \gamma(r_d) \cdot \theta_d \quad (13)$$

Here, s is a stretching factor and $r_d = L_c/\lambda_d$ is the context-to-wavelength ratio with $\lambda_d = 2\pi/\theta_d = 2\pi(b')^{2d/D}$ and $b' = bs^{\frac{D}{D-2}}$. The ramp function $\gamma(\cdot)$ interpolates low-frequency dimensions to improve extrapolation while preserving high-frequency components.

Frame Retrieval from History Buffer We also experimented with a fixed-length buffer \mathcal{B} that stores a history of previously generated latent frames, employing a heuristic sampling strategy for retrieval. Following [68], this strategy involves partitioning \mathcal{B} into $N_S = 5$ segments G_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, N_S\}$, ordered from oldest (G_1) to most recent (G_{N_S}). The total number of frames in the buffer is $N_B = \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} |G_j|$. The lengths of these segments, $L_j = |G_j|$, decrease exponentially (e.g., $L_j = L_1 \cdot \alpha^{j-1}$ for a base $\alpha < 1$ and L_1 being the length of the oldest segment G_1), ensuring that more recent segments are shorter. From each segment G_j , k frames are randomly sampled to form a subset $F_j \subseteq G_j$ (where $|F_j| = k$). The retrieved memory \mathbf{z}_{mem} is constructed as the concatenation of these sampled frames, $\mathbf{z}_{\text{mem}} = [F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{N_S}]$, totaling $N_S \cdot k$ frames. This design with recency bias implies that the sampling density k/L_j is higher for more recent segments, thereby placing greater emphasis on recent information. This retrieved information \mathbf{z}_{mem} is concatenated with current frame window \mathbf{z} along temporal dimension as additional context: $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = [\mathbf{z}_{\text{mem}}, \mathbf{z}]$, which is then passed as input to the spatiotemporal DiT blocks, enabling the model to jointly attend to both recent and historical frames.

Neural Memory Augmentation To extend video generation capabilities to longer sequences beyond a fixed attention window while retaining memory of past scenes, we adapt Infini-attention [60] as a neural memory mechanism for our video diffusion model. Infini-attention is a recurrent mechanism that augments standard dot-product attention (local context) with a compressed summary of past context (global context) stored in an evolving memory.

The model processes the video in segments using a sliding window. To maintain the high degree of temporal continuity crucial for video generation, we employ overlapping segments. This is a modification from the original Infini-attention, which typically processes non-overlapping segments. The input latent video segment $\mathbf{z}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ (s is segment index) is processed to derive query \mathbf{q}_s ,

key \mathbf{k}_s and value \mathbf{v}_s matrices using standard attention mechanisms. Key-value pairs from processed segments are incrementally summarized and stored in a compressive memory \mathbf{M} , which can be efficiently queried by subsequent segments using their query vectors. After each slide, the model first retrieves a hidden state \mathbf{A}_{mem} by querying the compressive memory \mathbf{M}_{s-1} :

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{mem}} = \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{q}_s)\mathbf{M}_{s-1}}{\sigma(\mathbf{q}_s)\mathbf{n}_{s-1}} \quad (14)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is an element-wise nonlinear activation function (e.g., $\text{ELU}(\cdot) + 1$) and \mathbf{n}_{s-1} is a normalization vector (accumulated up to segment $s - 1$).

Next, the compressive memory \mathbf{M}_s and normalization vector \mathbf{n}_s are updated using the KV entries of the current segment s :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_s &= \mathbf{M}_{s-1} + \sigma(\mathbf{k}_s)^T \left(\mathbf{v}_s - \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{k}_s)\mathbf{M}_{s-1}}{\sigma(\mathbf{k}_s)\mathbf{n}_{s-1}} \right) \\ \mathbf{n}_s &= \mathbf{n}_{s-1} + \sigma(\mathbf{k}_s)^T \mathbf{1}_N \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Here, N is the length of the current segment s . $\sigma(\cdot)$ is applied element-wise, and $\mathbf{1}_N$ is an $N \times 1$ vector of ones.

The final attention output for segment s , denoted \mathbf{A}_s , combines the standard dot-product attention output $\mathbf{A}_{\text{local}}$ (local context from the current segment) with the retrieved memory state \mathbf{A}_{mem} (global context from past segments) using a learnable gating scalar $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathbf{A}_s = \text{sigmoid}(\beta) \odot \mathbf{A}_{\text{mem}} + (1 - \text{sigmoid}(\beta)) \odot \mathbf{A}_{\text{local}} \quad (16)$$

As in standard multi-head attention, a final linear projection is applied to \mathbf{A}_s to produce the output of the Infini-attention layer.

B Implementation Details

The VAE compresses each input frame of size $3 \times 640 \times 360$ into a latent representation of size $16 \times 32 \times 18$ before processing by the diffusion model. All diffusion models employ a hidden size of 1024 and depth of 16, with one temporal and one spatial attention modules in each spatialtemporal DiT block. We use a uniform learning rate of 8×10^{-5} during training. For Infini-Attention, we apply a learning rate of 3×10^{-3} specifically to the global weight parameter to effectively balance global and local attention contributions while maintaining stable convergence. In VRAG, we set the weights as $[10.0, 10.0, 10.0, 3.0]$ across the global state dimensions ($[x, y, z, \text{yaw}]$) in the similarity function, to accommodate the wider range of yaw values. To differentiate retrieved historical frames from current context frames along the temporal dimension, we incorporate a temporal offset of 100 in the rotary position embeddings of temporal attentional for retrieved frames.

C Additional Experiments

C.1 Analysis of Compounding Error Evaluation Metrics

Traditional metrics like SSIM, PSNR, and LPIPS measure pixel-level or feature-level differences between original and generated images. However, these metrics lose effectiveness when the generated video sample deviates significantly from the original video sample, especially for the compounding error evaluation, even if they falls in the same distribution and are visually reasonable. As shown in Figure 10, we normalize all metrics to a 0-1 scale where higher values indicate better generation quality (with SSIM score flipped). While all metrics perform well on the initial frame (index 0), assigning high scores to ground truth, their values begin to deteriorate after frame 100.

To address this limitation, we developed a discriminator-based evaluation metric. We train a discriminator using 1000 videos from the vanilla DF model (window size 20), with each video containing 1000 frames. This yielded a dataset of 10^6 ground truth frames and 10^6 generated frames as fake ones. We implemented the discriminator as a binary classifier using a lightweight architecture with 4 ResNet blocks. Too large discriminator architecture will lead to less meaningful discriminative signals. Each block contains two convolutional layers with batch normalization and activation functions. This design provides discriminative outputs while maintains computational efficiency.




Figure 10: Comparison of SSIM, PSNR, LPIPS, and discriminator metrics. All metrics are normalized to the $[0,1]$ range, where higher values indicate better performance for all scores. The discriminator score can accurately capture variations in generated image quality, while the other metrics are affected by distribution shift and fail to properly reflect compounding errors.

As shown in Fig. 10, the decrease of discriminator value faithfully reflects the distortions in generated images, while other metrics decline for two reasons: image quality degradation and distributional shift from the original video. This shift prevents traditional metrics from accurately assessing generation performance in terms of the compounding error. For instance, while the 270th frame shows significantly better generation quality than the 1080th frame, SSIM, PSNR, and LPIPS assign similar scores to both. This indicates that the distribution shift has become the dominant factor in lowering the metric scores, making these metrics unreliable for evaluating compounding error in long-range video generation.

Unlike traditional metrics, the discriminator’s evaluation remains robust to distribution shifts since it doesn’t depend on the original image, but rather depending only on the distortion of the generated images. This makes the discriminator score a more reliable metric for evaluating compounding errors in this case. However, the discriminator approach has several limitations. First, training requires sampling from a pre-trained diffusion model, which incurs computational overhead. Second, the training of the discriminator heavily depends on human judgment. We find that even a shallow ResNet architecture can effectively distinguish between ground truth and generated images. This suggests that an overly complex model might assign uniformly low scores to all generated content, making the discriminator metric less meaningful to look at. Finally, the discriminator shows limited generalization capability. When evaluating videos generated by new methods or datasets, the discriminator may be deceived into assigning inappropriately high scores. Therefore we do not report the discriminator score in the main paper, and advocate more investigation into faithful evaluation of compounding error in future work.

C.2 Vanilla Long-context Extension vs. YaRN

To ensure a fair comparison, we evaluate YaRN against a baseline that directly extrapolates the vanilla model’s window size from 20 during training to 40 at inference, to match the inference window length as YaRN in our experiments as Sec. 4. Evaluation of quantitative metrics LPIPS, SSIM and PSNR shown in Figures 11, 12, and 13 indicates that, YaRN maintains lower compounding error for long video generation (1100 frames). This demonstrates YaRN’s effectiveness in extending the context window of diffusion video models to 40 frames after minimal fine-tuning. Vanilla extension of context length on DF models performs poorly due to out-of-distribution window size at inference.

While YaRN effectively extends the context window, its performance improvements are constrained by the inherent limitations of diffusion models in in-context learning. As demonstrated in Figure 14, the model exhibits difficulties in effectively leveraging long-range dependencies, leading to suboptimal spatialtemporal consistency against the ground truth. In addition, YaRN also requires greater

computational overheads during inference as it has a larger window size compared with other methods in our experiments in Sec. 4, making it less suitable for real-time gameplay applications.




Figure 11: Comparison of vanilla long-context extension for DF model and YaRN with window length of 40 frames at inferences. Lower is better for LPIPS score.




Figure 12: Comparison of vanilla long-context extension for DF model and YaRN with window length of 40 frames at inferences. Higher is better for SSIM score.




Figure 13: Comparison of vanilla long-context extension for DF model and YaRN with window length of 40 frames at inferences. Higher is better for PSNR score.

C.3 More Discussions on Main Results

For the main results in Sec. 4.3 and Sec. 4.4, we provide more discussions here. The Infini-attention model faces significant training challenges due to its global attention mechanism. As evidenced in Figure 15, the model struggles to converge during training. For VRAG without memory component, we incorporated global state conditioning (specifically $[x, y, z, \text{yaw}]$) into the input. However,




Figure 14: Visual comparison of vanilla long-context extension for DF model and YaRN. Both models are inferred with 40 frames window.

compared to the vanilla diffusion model, the training process becomes significantly more difficult. This may be due to the higher dimensionality and larger ranges of the spatial condition, whereas the action condition mostly consists of binary states $([0, 1])$, making it harder for the model to learn and increasing perplexity.




Figure 15: Training Loss Curves

C.4 Predicted Global State

In the paper, our main experiments are conducted with the access to the ground-truth global state as conditions during training and inference. However, the practical usage may require the global state to be also predicted based on historical states and actions. To ablate this effect, we trained a pose (global state) prediction model that takes the current frame and action as inputs and outputs the predicted pose change. The next pose can be derived by adding the predicted pose change to the current pose. Its architecture consists of only a few convolutional layers and fully connected layers, with a very small inference time overhead. At evaluation, we apply this trained predictor to predict the global state at next step, and generate videos based on the predicted global state. Following the same setting as in Sec. 4.3, the experimental results (for 300 frames prediction) are summarized in Table 6.

Method	SSIM \uparrow	PSNR \uparrow	LPIPS \downarrow
DF20	0.466	16.643	0.538
VRAG (predicted pose)	0.500	17.116	0.506
VRAG	0.506	17.097	0.506

Table 6: Ablation study of replacing the ground-truth global state with predicted ones by a trained pose predictor.

As shown in the table, the evaluation results are nearly identical with or without the pose prediction, since the pose prediction is a relatively simple task compared with the video generation. This proves the feasibility of using the predicted global state without significant video performance degradation.

C.5 Memory and Time Overhead

We also compare the memory usage and inference time of VRAG against several baselines: diffusion forcing with 10 and 20 context frames, and YaRN with 40 context frames.

Method	DF10	DF20	YaRN	VRAG
Context length (Frame)	10	20	40	20
Memory usage (MB)	4420	4448	4543	4452
Inference Time (min)	9	12	23	12

Table 7: Memory usage and inference-time of different methods

As demonstrated in the Table 7, VRAG’s GPU memory usage and inference time overhead are nearly identical to DF20. The inference time is derived for autoregressive generation over 600 frames. Meanwhile, the computation for the retrieval operations can be entirely performed on the CPU, with its memory footprint being only $\text{num_frame} \times \text{action_dim} \times 4 \text{ Bytes} = 9.4 \text{ KB}$ in our experiments, which is almost negligible.

In summary, VRAG incurs almost no additional inference-time overhead compared to standard diffusion forcing. The memory and computational cost introduced by the retrieval mechanism are negligible, as it only involves similarity calculations between a set of vectors.

D More Results

Method	SSIM \uparrow	PSNR \uparrow	LPIPS \downarrow
VRAG	0.349	12.039	0.654
VRAG (no training)	0.218	11.588	0.712
VRAG (no memory)	0.205	11.367	0.746

Table 8: Ablation study of VRAG components for compounding error on long video generation. We compare the full model with variants that remove either the memory component (additional global state conditioning only) or training component (in-context learning only).




Figure 16: World coherence evaluation on all methods for PSNR (left) and LPIPS (right).




Figure 17: Compounding error evaluation on all methods for PSNR (left) and LPIPS (right).




Figure 18: Ablation study of VRAG components for world coherence (left) and compounding error (right), with PSNR metric. We compare the full model with variants that remove either the memory component (additional global state conditioning only) or training component (in-context learning only).




Figure 19: Ablation study of VRAG components for world coherence (left) and compounding error (right), with LPIPS metric. We compare the full model with variants that remove either the memory component (additional global state conditioning only) or training component (in-context learning only).




Figure 20: Ablation study of VRAG components for world coherence (left) and compounding error (right), with SSIM metric. We compare the full model with variants that remove either the memory component (additional global state conditioning only) or training component (in-context learning only).