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Abstract

We propose novel neural temporal models for short-term motion prediction and long-term human motion synthesis, achieving state-of-art predictive performance while being computationally less expensive compared to previously proposed approaches. Key aspects of our proposed system include: 1) a novel, two-level processing architecture that aids in generating planned trajectories, 2) a simple set of easily computable features that integrate simple derivative information into the model, and 3) a novel multi-objective loss function that helps the model to slowly progress from the simpler task of next-step prediction to the harder task of multi-step closed-loop prediction. Our results demonstrate that these innovations are shown to facilitate improved modeling of long-term motion trajectories. Finally, we propose a novel metric called Power Spectrum Similarity (NPSS) to evaluate the long-term predictive ability of our trained motion synthesis models, circumventing many of the shortcomings of the popular mean-squared error measure of the Euler angles of joints over time.

Introduction

We address the problem of building predictive models of human motion using motion capture data. Specifically, the models we explore can be successfully used in forecasting the 3D pose of a human subject conditioned on a small, initial history, or a set of priming frames. Current work on this problem has focused on two separate but complementary sub-tasks: 1) short-term motion prediction, where models are generally evaluated quantitatively by measuring mean squared error over a short horizon, and 2) long-term motion prediction, where models are evaluated qualitatively by manual, visual inspection of samples to see if they are able to generate plausible trajectories of human motion over long durations of time. Short term models are useful in applications of motion tracking while long term models are useful as motion generation tools for computer graphics (Sidenbladh, Black, and Sigal 2002; Levine et al. 2012; Kovar, Gleich, and Pighin 2002). Models successful in these sub-tasks are also valuable for human gait analysis, studies in the kinematics of human motion and in human-computer interaction applications (Boullic, Thalmann, and Thalmann 1990; Song, Demirdjian, and Davis 2012).

Solving the above two sub-problems in motion prediction is challenging given the high dimensionality of the input data as well as the difficulty in capturing the non-linear dynamics and stochasticity inherent in human motion from observations. Furthermore, human motion, in strong contrast to the motion of other objects, depends on the subject’s underlying intent and high-level semantic concepts which are tremendously difficult to model computationally. Traditionally, models were built in the framework of expert systems and made use of strong simplifying assumptions, such as treating the underlying process as if it was Markovian and smooth or using low-dimensional embeddings (Wang, Fleet, and Hertzmann 2008; Pavlovic, Rehg, and MacCormick 2001). Such approaches often led to less-than-satisfactory performance. With the modern successes of artificial neural networks (LeCun, Bengio, and Hinton 2015) in a variety of application domains, ranging from computer vision (Krizhevsky, Sutskever, and Hinton 2012) to machine translation (Bahdanau, Cho, and Bengio 2014) and language modeling (Ororbia II, Mikolov, and Reitter 2017), many current newer models of motion have been become increasingly based on neural architectures.

In this paper, we attack the above two sub-problems in a variety of ways. First, we augment the joint angle feature vector typically fed into predictive neural models with motion derivative information, which can be easily computed using a finite-difference approximation, which naturally contains (temporally) local information that is crucial when generating smooth and consistent motion trajectories. Furthermore, our results demonstrate that the popular approach of training recurrent neural networks (RNNs) in an open loop, where ground truth data frames are fed in at every time step, is insufficient when using these models for closed-loop test scenarios, where the model fails to generate predictions over long time horizons due to drifting and an accumulation of next-step error. We introduce a simple, novel multi-objective loss function that balances the goals of effective next-step prediction with generating good long-term, closed-loop predictions, which we find greatly alleviates model drifting. The neural architectures, which make use of a novel, differentiable backward-planning mechanism, our proposed model are computationally less expensive and far simpler than competing alternatives.

Finally, we address the dearth of effective quantita-
tive methods for evaluating long-term motion synthesis by proposing a novel metric we call the Normalized Power Spectrum Similarity (NPSS), which addresses some drawbacks of the mean squared error. Our measure is designed to capture the difference in the power spectrum of the ground truth frames and the model’s predicted joint angles.

The key contributions of this work include 1) a novel, two-stage processing architecture, 2) augmenting the input space with easily computable features useful for the domain of motion, and 3) development of a novel loss function that can help guide the model towards generating longer-term motion trajectories.

Related Work

Research in motion synthesis has a long history, with many models proposed over the years. Only in recent times have neural architectures come to the forefront of this domain, quickly supplanting classical statistical learning approaches and hand-crafted methods. (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015) proposed two architectures: 1) the LSTM-3LR and 2) the ERD (Encoder-Recurrent Decoder). The LSTM-3LR consists of 3 layers of 1000 Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) units stacked whereas the ERD model uses 2 layers of 1000 LSTM units and non-linear multi-layer feedforward networks for encoding and decoding. However, the authors observed that, during inference, the models would quickly diverge and produce unrealistic motion. They alleviate this by gradually adding noise (noise scheduling) to the input during training which helps the models generate plausible motion over longer horizons. (Jain et al. 2016) proposed Structural-RNNs (SRNN), which take a manually designed spatio-temporal graph and convert it into a multi-layer RNN architecture with body RNNs being assigned to model specific body parts and edge-RNNs to model interactions between body parts. This work also uses the noise scheduling technique employed earlier by (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015) to alleviate drifting. They show that their network outperforms previous methods in both short-term motion prediction as well as long-term qualitative motion. More recently, (Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017) proposed simple but hard-to-beat baselines on short-term motion prediction as well as a single-layer seq2seq model (Sutskever, Vinyals, and Le 2014)—with 1024 Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) units—with a linear output decoder for short-term and long-term motion prediction. Additionally, they trained their long-term model using a sampling-loss as a simpler alternative to noise scheduling in order to alleviate drifting.

A Neural Motion Synthesizer

In this section, we will describe our neural system for motion synthesis, which integrates a novel architecture with a novel loss function and useful, easily computable features. Since our focus is on a specific problem, i.e., that of motion synthesis, we will start by first detailing the benchmark we will test our models against.

Data and Preprocessing

Staying consistent with previous work on human motion synthesis (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016), we use the Human 3.6 Million (h3.6m) dataset (Ionescu et al. 2014), which is currently the largest publicly available motion capture database. The h3.6m dataset consists of 7 actors performing 15 different actions. Previous work (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016; Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017) has been particularly focused on 4 out of these 15 categories, e.g., walking, eating, smoking, and discussion when evaluating model performance. To create the test-set, 8 motion sequences per action type are extracted from subject #5, yielding the exact same 32 test sequences as used in (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016), and the remaining sequences for subject #5 are then placed into validation subset used for tuning hyper-parameters. The data of the other six subjects is then used as a training set. We furthermore adopt the pose representation and evaluation metrics as used previously in (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016) to allow for experimental comparability. Pose is represented as an exponential map of each joint (refer to (Taylor, Hinton, and Roweis 2007) for further details).

To evaluate our models, we measure the Euclidean distance between predictions and ground-truth in Euler angle-space at various time slices along the predicted sequence.

Architecture

The proposed Verso-Time Label Noise-RNN model (VTLN-RNN) consists of 2 RNNs, each designed to serve a different purpose. The top-level RNN is meant to serve as a learnable noise process inspired by the work of (II and Mali 2018), which runs backwards in time, starting from a sampled initial hidden state (zφ) and is conditioned on the one-hot encoding of the action label. This noise process is used to generate a sequence of K “guide vectors” (where K is the number of future frames we want to predict, or the prediction horizon) that will be subsequently used by the lower-level RNN. The lower-level RNN, or the Body-RNN, runs forward in time, taking in as input at each time step the joint angle vector xt as well as the corresponding guide vector pt to generate a prediction of the mocap angles for time-step t + 1. In essence, running the VTLN-RNN entails using the top-level noise process RNN to generate the guide vectors and then using the Body-RNN to integrate both the bottom-up mocap input vectors and the top-down guide vectors to compute the final hidden states hi and the next-step predictions xt+1. The unrolled model is depicted in Figure 1. The loss is computed using the Body-RNN’s predicted outputs and the corresponding ground-truth mocap vectors.

In order to sample the initial hidden state of the top-level noise process, we first structure it to work like a multivariate Gaussian distribution, drawing inspiration from the re-parameterization trick (Kingma, Salimans, and Welling 2015) and the adaptive noise scheme proposed in (II and Mali 2018). The initial state zφ of the top-level noise process is computed as follows:

\[ zφ = μ + Σ ⊗ ε \]  (1)

\( \mu \) and \( \Σ \) are the mean and covariance of the Gaussian distribution, respectively.
where \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \), \( \mu \) the mean of the random variable, and \( \Sigma \) is its covariance, specifically a diagonal covariance matrix. \( \mu \) and \( \Sigma \) are parameters that are learned along with the rest of the neural network weights using back-propagated gradients during training. This formulation of the hidden state allows the designer to simply input samples from a simple base distribution, e.g., a standard Gaussian, instead of having to tune the parameters of the noise, such as its variance, by hand.

In this paper, we use the Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) (Chung et al. 2014) to instantiate both the top-level and bottom-level RNNs of the VTLN-RNN due to its simplicity, competitive performance and ease of training compared to LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber 1997). The cell update equations for top-level GRU remain the same as described in (Chung et al. 2014) except that we note its non-state input is the action label (which remains the same over the length of the sequence). However, the cell update equations for the Body-GRU are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_j & = \sigma ([W_r x_t]_j + [U_r h_{t-1}]_j + [V_r p_t]_j) \\
    z_j & = \sigma ([W_z x_t]_j + [U_z h_{t-1}]_j + [V_z p_t]_j) \\
    \tilde{h}^t_j & = \phi ([W_x x_t]_j + [U (r \otimes h_{t-1})]_j + [V_p p_t]_j) \\
    h^t_j & = z_j h_{t-1}^t + (1 - z_j) \tilde{h}^t_j .
\end{align*}
\]

The original motivation behind the VTLN-RNN structure was to hierarchically decompose the motion synthesis problem into a two-level process, much as it has been successfully done in neural-based dialogue modeling (Serban et al. 2017b; 2017a). The top-level RNN would serve to roughly sketch out a course trajectory that the lower-level RNN would take, further conditioned on actual data and its own internal state. However, unlike the hierarchical neural dialogue models that served as inspiration, our top-level process runs in the opposite (temporal) direction of the data itself, i.e., backwards. We chose to do this considering gradient flow in the unrolled computation graph. If the top-level process starts at time \( t = K \) and works backward to time \( t = 1 \), the parameter updates of the top-level model will depend more heavily on information from the future (or from far later on in a sequence) and this information would be encoded in the synaptic weights related to a specific action type/label. When the top-level process is used to generate the sequence of guide vectors, it creates “hints” or coarsely defined states that the lower-level Body-RNN can then refine based on actual input data or its own closed-loop predictions. While it is hard to argue that the top-level RNN is truly “planning” out the ultimate trajectory of the model predictions, our experiments will show that our two-level process at least appears to offer some useful regularization, improving model generalization over simpler mechanisms such as drop-out.

**Incorporating Derivative Information**

Motion derivatives contain crucial feature information used to model local (near past) motion information. These features are cheap to compute and do not require any additional model parameters. Using this as our motivation we extract motion derivatives by using a finite backward difference approximation, calculated as follows:

\[
\nabla^h_R[f(x)] = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^n \binom{n}{i} f(x - ih)
\]

where \( i \) indexes the order of the derivative we would like to approximate, up to \( n \), and \( h \) is a non-zero spacing constant.

We extract the \( n = \{1, 2, 3\} \) motion derivatives with \( h = 1 \) using the above equation and append these vectors to the vector of joint angles. The linear decoder of our recurrent model outputs only joint angles for the next timestep. During closed loop iterative multi-step prediction we calculate these motion derivatives manually on-the-fly.

**Facilitating Closed-Loop Prediction**

The standard way to train RNNs for sequence prediction tasks is to feed the ground-truth inputs at every timestep during training and then, at test time, when making a prediction at \( t + 1 \), we feed in the model’s previous prediction at \( t \), treating it as it were ground-truth input. This known as closed-loop (or iterative) prediction. However, a key issue with this method is that RNN predictions degrade significantly over time and, often, the model is unable to recover from accumulation of errors created by its predictions. This is due to the significant mismatch in the inputs it receives during train and test time. This causes synthesized long-term motion trajectories to quickly diverge from the manifold of plausible motion trajectories. As mentioned earlier (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015) and (Jain et al. 2016) alleviate this issue by injecting gradually increasing magnitudes of Gaussian noise to inputs during training. (Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017) used a sampling loss where during training the model outputs are fed back to itself. Professor Forcing (Goyal et al. 2016) addresses this issue by using an adversarial training regime to ensure the hidden states of the RNN are constrained to be similar during training and test time. However, this method is computationally expensive, needs careful hyperparameter tuning, and suffers from stability issues normally encountered in the training of Generative Adversarial Networks. More recently, (Zhou et al. 2018) showed that their method, or auto-conditioning, helps the RNN models produce good qualitative long-term motion by alternating between feeding in ground-truth samples and the model’s own outputs during training.
We view this problem of using the RNN for multi-step iterative prediction at test time from the perspective of multi-task and curriculum learning. We ultimately require the RNNs to achieve good performance on the hard-task of multi-step iterative prediction starting from the simple task of one-step prediction. An intuitive way to achieve this would be to gradually make the RNN progress from being able to only predict one-step ahead to becoming fully capable of full, multi-step iterative prediction during the course of the training cycle. This intuition forms the basis of our multi-objective loss function defined as follows,

$$L(y, \hat{y}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T} (\hat{y}_{o,t} - y_t)^2 + \frac{1}{T'} \sum_{t_1=0}^{T'} (\hat{y}_{c,t_1} - y_{t_1})^2 \quad (7)$$

where $y_t$ = ground-truth output at $t$, $\hat{y}_{o,t}$ = model output in open-loop mode at $t$, $\hat{y}_{c,t_1}$ = model output in closed-loop mode at $t_1$. Open-loop mode refers to feeding ground-truth inputs at every timestep to the RNN in order to produce outputs and closed-loop mode refers to feeding the model’s own output at $t$ as input to it at $t + 1$. For every input sequence of data this loss requires us to run the forward pass twice, i.e., i) to compute $\hat{y}_{o,t}$ in open-loop mode and ii) to compute $\hat{y}_{c,t}$ in closed-loop mode. We gradually increase $\lambda$ using a step schedule over the training cycle starting with a zero value at the beginning. This schedule therefore gradually places greater importance to the loss-term contributed by making closed-loop predictions as the network has learned to make better one-step predictions. From our long-term motion synthesis experiments, we show that our multi-objective loss function outperforms noise scheduling (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016), auto-conditioning (Zhou et al. 2018) and sampling loss employed by (Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017).

### Better Evaluation Metrics for Long-Term Motion

The use of mean-squared error (mse) as an evaluation metric for models has been the standard practice (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016; Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017) on both the short-term motion prediction and long-term motion synthesis tasks. In short-term motion prediction the evaluation metric needs to capture how well various models are able to mimic the ground-truth data over short-term horizons (i.e 0-500 milliseconds) as these models are used for motion tracking applications.

However in the long-term motion synthesis task, models need to be evaluated on how well they generate plausible future motion over long-term horizons given some seed frames of motion. Since human motion is inherently stochastic over long time horizons, models can significantly deviate from the ground-truth trajectories and have a large mse despite producing qualitatively good human motion. For example: if the predictions correspond to walking at a slower pace, the joint angles will be misaligned (frequency-shift) and will diverge over time. In the short term, the joint angles may still be similar enough for mse to meaningfully capture similarity, but in the long term they will become significantly different. Similarly, if a few extra frames of motion are added or removed (phase-shift) compared to ground-truth sequence will result in high mse values because frames are again misaligned. Therefore the use of mse as an evaluation metric is not appropriate in the long-term task as has also been noted in previous works of (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016; Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017). However, no attempt was made to suggest an alternative metric to mse for evaluation of long-term motion synthesis models. We can say that a qualitative essence of any action such as walking, eating, running etc. can be captured through the frequency signature of joint angles of the body while performing that action. For the walking at a slower pace example, the power spectrum (obtained from a discrete Fourier transform) would show spikes at a slightly lower frequency and addition or removal of few frames would show up as a phase-shift in the frequency domain. The examples of slow/fast or phase-shifted walking involve periodic sub-actions, whereas aperiodic actions such as discussion will show a more uniform spread of power in the frequency domain. This indicates a lack of periodicity in the action which is also being picked up by the power spectrum. Measuring similarity of power spectrum would account for these phenomena and correlate better with the visual quality of samples compared to mse. The field of content-based image retrieval have used EMD (Rubner, Tomasi, and Guibas 2000; Grauman and Darrell 2004) to quantify perceptual similarity of images using the EMD distance between their color histograms. Using the intuitions from above examples and inspired by this success, we propose an EMD-based metric over the power spectrum that overcomes many of the shortcomings of mean-squared loss as an evaluation metric on the long-term task.

For a given action class in the test set, let there be $k$ sequences each of $T$ length and output vector of joint angles at each time-step be $D$ dimensional. We define $x_{i,j}[t]$ to be the ground-truth feature value at time $t$ for $i^{th}$ feature dimension of $j^{th}$ sequence and $y_{i,j}[t]$ to be the corresponding model prediction. Also, let $X_{i,j}[f]$ and $Y_{i,j}[f]$ be the squared magnitude spectrum of Discrete Fourier Transform coefficients (per sequence $i$ per feature dimension $j$ ) of $x_{i,j}[t]$ and $y_{i,j}[t]$ respectively. First we normalize $X_{i,j}[f]$ and $Y_{i,j}[f]$ w.r.t $f$ as,

$$X_{i,j}^{\text{norm}}[f] = \frac{X_{i,j}[f]}{\sum_f X_{i,j}[f]}; Y_{i,j}^{\text{norm}}[f] = \frac{Y_{i,j}[f]}{\sum_f Y_{i,j}[f]} \quad (8)$$
We then compute,
\[
\text{emd}_{i,j} = || \sum_{f=0}^{l} (X_{i,j}^{\text{norm}}[f]) - \sum_{f=0}^{l} (Y_{i,j}^{\text{norm}}[f]) ||
\]
(9)
where, \(||||\) is the L1-norm. Finally, we use a power weighted average over all \(i\) and \(j\) of 1-D EMD distances computed in (9) as shown below,
\[
\text{NPSS} = \frac{\sum_{i} \sum_{j} p_{i,j} \cdot \text{emd}_{i,j}}{\sum_{i} \sum_{j} p_{i,j}} = \sum_{f} Y_{i,j}^{\text{norm}}[f]
\]
(10)
where \(p_{i,j}\) is the total power of \(i^{th}\) feature in \(j^{th}\) sequence to arrive at our scalar evaluation metric for an evaluation set of sequences for a given action class. We refer to our metric as normalized power spectrum similarity (NPSS).
An alternative interpretation is that, we can view the long-term motion synthesis as a generative modeling task. By this interpretation, the evaluation metric must capture the difference in distribution between the ground-truth and predicted motion samples. Our evaluation metric captures difference in distribution of power spectrum of joint angles of the ground-truth and predicted motion sequences and is thereby better equipped to model differences in visual quality of motion trajectories.

**Experiments**

**Short-Term Motion Prediction Performance**

**Training Details:** We train our short-term model (VGRU-r1 (MA) in 3) on all action classes using a minibatch size of 32, L2-norm of gradients clipped at 5 for 100,000 iterations using RMSProp (Tieleman and Hinton 2012) with initial learning rate = 0.0001 and decay by 0.8 every 5000 iterations till 60,000 iterations. Dropout (Zaremba, Sutskever, and Vinyals 2014; Pham et al. 2014) of 0.3 is applied only on the Body-RNN. We modify the Body-RNN with skip input-output connections as in (Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017). The model is fed 50 seed frames and is made to predict 10 future frames (400 milliseconds). In this case the VTLN-RNN is unrolled backwards and Body-RNN unrolled forwards in time over 60 steps and we train it using our proposed multi-objective loss function described earlier.

**Long-Term Motion Synthesis Performance**

**Training Details:** We train the VTLN-RNN model using a mini-batch size of 32, L2 norm of gradients clipped at 1 for 10,000 iterations using RMSProp (Tieleman and Hinton 2012) with initial learning rate = 0.0002 and decay by 0.6 every 2,000 iterations. The long-term models are trained on single-action data. The model is fed 50 seed frames and is made to predict 100 future frames (4 sec). In this case the VTLN-RNN is unrolled backwards and Body-RNN unrolled forwards in time over 150 steps. The input vector to the Body-RNN consists of the joint angles appended with motion derivatives. Again we use our multi-objective loss function described earlier to train our long-term model.

**Results and Discussion**

In all tables, VGRU-d refers to our proposed VTLN-RNN architecture where VTLN-RNN and Body-RNN are both 1 layer 512 unit GRUs. GRU-d refers to a regular 2-layer 512 unit GRU model. Both VGRU-d and GRU-d models are trained with our proposed multi-objective loss along with inputs appended with motion derivatives. VGRU-ac refers to our VTLN-RNN architecture trained with auto-conditioning (Zhou et al. 2018) using recommended auto-conditioning.

For compatibility with prior work, Table 4 compares mae of Euler angles at time slices on test set sequences with competing methods such as LSTM-3LR and ERD by (Fragkiadaki et al. 2015), SRNN by (Jain et al. 2016) and Julietta-long by (Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017). Our short-term model VGRU-r1 (SA) displays the best perfor-
Table 2: NPSS at 3 different time scales i.e 1) short-term: 0-1 second 2) medium-term: 1-2 seconds 3) long-term: 2-4 seconds along prediction on test set sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Walking</th>
<th>Eating</th>
<th>Smoking</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero-velocity</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta unsup (MA)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta sup (MA)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-r1 (MA)</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.0025</td>
<td>0.72 ± 0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-d</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta unsup (MA)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta sup (MA)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-r1 (MA)</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.002</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.002</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-d</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta unsup (MA)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta sup (MA)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-r1 (MA)</td>
<td>0.35 ± 0.0008</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.0001</td>
<td>0.85 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.92 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-d</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta unsup (MA)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julietta sup (MA)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRU-r1 (MA)</td>
<td>0.46 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.003</td>
<td>0.95 ± 0.005</td>
<td>1.21 ± 0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Mse on test set sequences for short-term motion prediction. All models in this Table are trained on multiple actions (MA = multi-action)

For human motion prediction we introduced the VTLN-RNN architecture with motion derivative features and proposed a multi-objective loss function to achieve state-of-art performance on long-term motion synthesis. The proposed framework also achieves competitive performance on the short-term motion prediction task thereby showing its general applicability. We also designed and demonstrated a new Power Spectrum Similarity (NPSS) metric that addresses and alleviates the key drawbacks of using the mean square error as an evaluation metric for long-term motion synthesis models. Future directions include incorporating the NPSS metric into the training process and building a single model trained on multi-action data for long-term motion synthesis.

In order to discern the strengths and weaknesses of short-term and long-term models, we computed the NPSS metric on evaluation sequences at 3 timescales i.e 1) short-term: 0-1 second 2) medium-term: 1-2 second 3) long-term: 2-4 second along the prediction timeline for test set sequences as shown in Table 2. We can see that the short-term models (Top set) VGRU-r1 (SA) and Julietta-unsup (SA) perform competitively with long-term models (Bottom set) in the short-term window. In the medium-term horizon of 1-2 second before the prediction, the short-term models degrade slightly more than the long-term models as evidenced by only a small gap in NPSS values observed. However in the long-term horizon of 2-4 second of prediction, the short-term models degrade significantly in comparison with long-term models as evidenced by wider gaps in NPSS metric values. GRU-d and VGRU-d models achieve best performance across all actions and time-horizons outperforming Julietta-long and VGRU-ac.

Further, Table 3 shows mse results for short-term motion prediction experiments on multi-action data on test set sequences. Zero-velocity is a simple but hard-to-beat baseline introduced in (Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017) which constantly predicts the previous frame as the prediction. We can see that VGRU-r1 model is competitive with Julietta’s state-of-art short-term model as well the really strong zero-velocity baseline. These results show that our proposed VTLN-RNN architecture, simple motion-derivative features and along with novel multi-objective loss function can achieve good performance on short-term motion prediction as well long-term motion synthesis tasks.

Conclusions and Future Work

For human motion prediction we introduced the VTLN-RNN architecture with motion derivative features and proposed a multi-objective loss function to achieve state-of-art performance on long-term motion synthesis. The proposed framework also achieves competitive performance on the short-term motion prediction task thereby showing its general applicability. We also designed and demonstrated a new Power Spectrum Similarity (NPSS) metric that addresses and alleviates the key drawbacks of using the mean square error as an evaluation metric for long-term motion synthesis models. Future directions include incorporating the NPSS metric into the training process and building a single model trained on multi-action data for long-term motion synthesis.
Table 4: Long-term motion synthesis results: All models in this table are trained on single-action data (SA = single-action). Top set show short-term models by Julietta and ours sampled for longer durations to match long-term durations. Bottom set shows long-term models by [Martinez, Black, and Romero 2017; Fragkiadaki et al. 2015; Jain et al. 2016], our GRU-d and VGRU-d and VGRU-ac. Since the VTLN-RNN architecture samples from a noise distribution for each forward pass, the table shows mean and standard deviation in predictions over 30 trials.
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