arXiv:2211.13887v1 [cs.AI] 25 Nov 2022

TPA-Net: Generate A Dataset for Text to Physics-based Animation♡

Yuxing Qiu[1] Feng Gao[1] Minchen Li[1] Govind Thattai Yin Yang[2] Chenfanfu Jiang[1]
[1] University of California, Los Angeles [2] University of Utah
{yxqiu,f.gao}@ucla.edu, gowin.thattai@gmail.com, yin.yang@utah.edu,
{minchen,cffjiang}@math.ucla.edu

Abstract

Recent breakthroughs in Vision-Language (V&L) joint research have achieved remarkable results in various text-driven tasks. High-quality Text-to-video (T2V), a task that has been long considered mission-impossible, was proven feasible with reasonably good results in latest works. However, the resulting videos often have undesired artifacts largely because the system is purely data-driven and agnostic to the physical laws. To tackle this issue and further push T2V towards high-level physical realism, we present an autonomous data generation technique and a dataset, which intend to narrow the gap with a large number of multi-modal, 3D Text-to-Video/Simulation (T2V/S) data. In the dataset, we provide high-resolution 3D physical simulations for both solids and fluids, along with textual descriptions of the physical phenomena. We take advantage of state-of-the-art physical simulation methods (i) Incremental Potential Contact (IPC) and (ii) Material Point Method (MPM) to simulate diverse scenarios, including elastic deformations, material fractures, collisions, turbulence, etc. *Additionally, high-quality, multi-view rendering videos are supplied for the benefit of T2V, Neural Radiance Fields (NeRF), and other communities. This work is the first step towards fully automated Text-to-Video/Simulation (T2V/S). Live examples and subsequent work are at https://sites.google.com/view/tpa-net.*

1. Introduction

In the past years, we have witnessed the blooming of the Vision-Language (V&L) community in solving diverse daily-life tasks [1, 8, 11, 20, 25, 29, 40, 42, 43, 61]. Particularly, multi-modal V&L models have achieved remarkable performances on various conventional V&L tasks thanks to the availability of an enormous amount of V&L data and rapidly developing Large-scale Language Model (LLM) [4, 10, 24, 41, 55]. With those handy tools, researchers took on more generative problems, such as Text-to-Image (T2I), and came up with impressive solutions [42, 43]. Here, three key facts jointly contribute to these Text-to-Image (T2I) successes: (i) self-supervised learning techniques and self-attention deep learning architectures are fully explored [4, 10, 24, 41, 55]; (ii) Vision-Language (V&L) generative models and learning paradigms are well studied [12, 15, 46, 63]; (iii) a large volume of image-text pairs are available on the internet [6, 28, 35, 37, 48, 51] to enable (i) and (ii) to capture the correlations between vision features and language representations.

However, Text-to-video (T2V) research is more challenging. First, due to the lack of data, it is much harder to train Text-to-video (T2V) models from scratch [49], even though both (i) and (ii) could be applied to T2V. With no efficient data generation and labeling methods, researchers have to explore other alternatives for T2V solutions (using, for example, pre-trained T2I models, diffusion-based models, and image priors [14, 49]). Second, unlike Text-to-Image (T2I), we cannot make the assumption in Text-to-video (T2V) that the descriptive text contains equal amounts of information as the generative image. The accompanying video text oftentimes cannot prescribe enough interactions, fine dynamics, and causality, because of the lack of high-quality data with precise descriptive labels and captions. Third and most importantly, T2V is more "fragile" than T2I in terms of end-user perception. In T2I, users seem to be tolerant of novel (but less realistic) static results. However, they are more sensitive to flaws or artifacts in T2V results [23], especially when generated videos display ill-posed dynamics. Without cherry-picking, it is challenging to ensure that T2V-generated videos follow human perceptions of the physical dynamics of the real world.

Similar to researches in Text-to-Image (T2I), there are also large quantities of high-quality data [40, 42, 43] that play key roles in the advanced Text-to-video (T2V) state-of-the-art. But in comparison to T2I cases, such data are, unfortunately, much less readily available on the internet. Existing public datasets are either of low quality or of lim-

♡ Work in Progress.



Figure 1. Examples of animation in TPA-Net datase. The animations cover a wide range of physical phenomenons, such as **deformation**, **fraction**, **collision** and **turbulence** *etc*. Each physically realistic animation is described by human readable text.

ited number, whereas high-quality video-text sets are generally privately owned by commercial organizations. This fact necessitates the development of computational methods and tools capable of producing high-quality labeled video-text data that follows human intuition in the (semi-) automatic manner. Since it is hard, if not impossible, to directly enforce physical rules in the space of the projected image (video), we make the data generation 3D. Then, advanced 3D simulation techniques could be leveraged. Additionally, offline rendering makes it possible to further obtain photo-realistic videos captured from multiple viewpoints. We believe it would potentially extend Text-to-video (T2V) to Text-to-3D (T2-3D), Text-to-Simulation (T2S) and Text-to-Animation (T2A) domains.

To this end, we propose an automatic pipeline to generate high-resolution, physically realistic animation with descriptive texts. Our method involves state-of-the-art physical simulation frameworks for producing accurate 3D real-world dynamics. To cover a wider range of physical phenomena, we use: (i) Incremental Potential Contact (IPC) [26], a robust solid simulation framework that can accurately resolve the intricate contact dynamics for both rigid bodies and deformable objects with guaranteed intersection-free results; (ii) Material Point Method (MPM) [52, 53], a multi-physics simulation framework that is capable of simulating versatile solid, fluid, and granular materials and multi-physics procedures. We generate various real-world dynamics, such as **deformations**, **fractures**, **collisions**, **turbulence**, *etc*. With commercial-level rendering tools, we also produce high-resolution multi-view videos. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a method to automatically generate high-quality 3D physical-realistic animations along with sentences describing the physical phenomena, including a wide spectrum of commonly seen real-world dynamics.
- With state-of-the-art physical simulation methods and rendering tools, we are the first to provide high-quality Text-to-video (T2V) and 3D Text-to-Simulation (T2S) datasets, which will widely benefit Text-to-Image (T2I), Text-to-video (T2V), Text-to-3D (T2-3D), Text-to-Simulation (T2S), and Text-to-Animation (T2A) research.

2. Related Work

Text-to-Image and Text-to-Video Generation [44] is recognized as the pioneer in Text-to-Image (T2I) which extends Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) [12] to multi-modal generation. Similarly, [59, 60] apply GAN variants and further enhance the quality of the generated images with improved image-text alignments. Other works, such as DALL-E [43], formulate the T2I problem as a sequence-to-sequence transfer, and incorporate both Transformer and

VQVAE for solutions. Some follow-up studies show that the results could be further improved by replacing DALL-E components with other deep modules, such as the CLIP latent space in DALLE2 [42]. Moreover, the recent success of Denoising Diffusion Models (DDM) [15, 46] also improves the generation quality with cascading up-sampling diffusion decoder. Text-to-video (T2V), on the other hand, falls much behind Text-to-Image (T2I) largely due to the lack of T2V datasets. To address this issue, most previous works [27, 36] produce relatively low-resolution videos in simplified domains. Some works also attempt to make use of VAE with attention and extend GAN to achieve T2V generation [34]. Latest research [14, 17, 49, 57] extends the T2I framework to T2V by improving modules in diffusion-based T2I framework, adding additional attention modules, and making use of both image-text and video-text data.

Text-to-3D and Text-to-Animation Generation As extensions of T2I, DreamFusion [38] and [31] synthesize 3D meshes from texts. Moreover, DreamField [18] generates radiance field with NeRF. [9] uses texts to control lighting conditions in rendering. Besides, several works use CLIP to enable text-to-3D representations. For example, [21] generates mesh and texture in CLIP space; [56] incorporates CLIP with NeRF, enabling simple text-editable 3D object manipulation; [54] generates human motion from text. [16] further applies text-to-3D generation to Avatar.

Vision-Language Datasets Microsoft COCO [28], Google concept caption [6, 48], WIT [51], and VisualGenome [22] *etc*. are most popular fine-labeled image-based V&L datasets. CLVER [19] is one of the iconic synthetic V&L datasets. Besides, there are billions of image-text pairs [35, 37, 47] available on the internet. However, high-quality video-text datasets are much less available. Existing work includes HowTo100M [32], which mainly focuses on instructional descriptions, and WebViD [2], which contains high-quality daily activity video clips. Additionally, MSRVTT [58], MSVD [7], DiDeMo [13], and ActivityNet [5] are commonly used, especially for video-language pre-training. Most of them only contain daily human activity without detailed physical dynamics.

3. Automatic TPA-Net Generation

As shown in Figure 2, our work uses a structured representation to construct the physically realistic animation. In particular, we use attributed stochastic grammar to represent the space of all possible animation setup. Physics attributes required by physical simulators and renderer are associated as attributes at node-level in the grammatical representation. Each unique animation setting is a parse tree sampled from the attributed grammar. It contains couples nodes for a set of object-of-interest, a set of collision objects, an environment and a renderer. Different sets of attributes are associated with a node according to the node type. The value for each attribute is sampled with certain type of restrictions. Particularly, the sampling process is guided by a randomly selected dynamics model that describes the relationship and mobility of the objects. First, labels and values of environmental and object-related `attributes` are sampled based on their intrinsic physical interdependence. Second, relation and motion constraints are applied according to the dynamic model. After settling all `attributes`, we dump this data instance to a JSON file and load it to IPC or MPM simulators, respectively, to simulate elastic or plastic materials. Later we render the physical simulation results in the renderer to generate photo-realistic videos based on the rendering configurations recorded in the `JSON` file. Parallel to the simulation process, a stochastic language model is constructed based on the animation representation. A collection of sentences that describe the animation using different descriptors is sampled accordingly. The subsequent subsections provide additional details.

3.1. Attributed Scene Grammar

We use an attributed stochastic grammar as a hierarchical and structured representation to characterize and sample the initial states of a data point in the temporal direction. Specifically, the stochastic grammar consists of four components: `Target Object Set`, `Collision Object Set`, `Environment` and `Render`. In detail, `Environment` *nodes* represent environmental setups such as boundary conditions, temporal stepping size, external forces, *etc*.; `Target Object Set` represents the object-of-interest, and `Collision Object Set` represents the collision objects. The material behavior and physical motion of these objects are simulated by the physical simulator; and `Render` *node* contains all the rendering information. Additionally, each *node* is associated with several `attributes`, which consist of multiple semantically-related or physically-dependent `features`. Here, the `feature`, expressed by a qualitative label and a quantitative value, is the atomic semantic model that represents a particular simulation or rendering parameter. Note that all objects, including collision objects and object-of-interests, have the same `attributes` to define their shape, mobility, friction, and appearance. The distinction is that collision objects are treated as boundary conditions with no material type and are configured to remain static (velocity value = zero) over the entire simulation.

3.2. Dynamic Model

To capture the characteristics of object motion and the interaction/collisions between specific objects, we provide a dynamic model that determines the type of motion and



Figure 2. Attributed Scene Grammar define all available setups of the animations. The parse tree of the grammar represents one animation including object-of-interests, dynamics models, simulation environment and renderer. A physical simulation of the sampled animation starts from the pre-processed 3-D object representation, initial motion and physics attributes associated with each object. The attributes of the renderer set up the lightroom, producing multi-view video of the animation.

generates constraints between `features`. Each dynamic model includes a motion type that, semantically speaking, imposes constraints on the velocity value and direction, as well as the initial position of a single or multiple objects. Different types of motion require varying numbers of objects, based on user specifications, and may be expanded using prepositions such as "towards" to incorporate more objects and collision boundaries.

For instance, the dynamic model `JUMP` depicts a single item with a non-zero velocity and a mostly upward-pointing direction; its initial position should be on top of certain boundaries, such as the floor. This dynamic model could be extended by adding characteristics such as "towards" and "from" to introduce a new relationship between the object's motion and other objects or collisions. Here, the former constrains the velocity direction to point toward additional objects or directions, whereas the latter restricts the initial position to be above the target of "from". Another example is `STRIKE`, which semantically entails the participation of at least two objects with non-zero velocities heading towards some contact center. Similarly, the `PUSH` model considers two initially close-by objects, one of which has more kinetic energy and is traveling towards the other.

In practice, dynamic models are manually defined. Our dataset generator currently supports several unique models, with `JUMP`, `DROP`, `FLY`, `THROW`, and `SLIDE` describing the motion of at least one object, and `PUSH` and `STRIKE` depicting the action and relationship of several objects.

3.3. Scenario Sample Process

To build a concrete scenario, it is necessary to sample 1) the parse tree that represents the simulation components in the domain, 2) the labels and values of `features` that characterize the object or environmental properties, and 3) the dynamic model that depicts the motion and relationship of objects and collisions in the simulation domain. These three stages will be discussed further in depth in the following paragraphs.

Sample parse tree. At this stage, the number of object-of-interest and collision objects used to sample the stochastic grammar is chosen at random. Each sampled object node will contain four `attributes` that, respectively, describe the object's rendering style, shape, motion, and physical properties. Then, the components of the simulation domain are decided, and the parse tree will serve as a guide for the dynamic model sampling and language model generation processes. The sampling results are then output into `JSON` files, with both labels and values recorded, as a general representation of a data point.

Sample `features`. As previously described, each node in the parse tree contains a number of `attributes`, each of which is comprised of multiple `features` that determine a specific simulation or rendering parameter. In this step, `features` are sampled in order to finalize the language and simulation configuration. We first employ a top-down sampling strategy to collect samples of each feature's label. Furthermore, label dependencies will be imposed by the semantic relationships between `features` managed by identical `attributes`. In the physical property attribute,

for instance, we have `features` representing the material type, the Young's modulus, and the Poisson ratio separately to depict the object's deformation characteristics. The ranges of values for features such as Young's modulus and Poisson ratio are determined by the material type. In general, the Young's modulus of elastic bodies is less than that of rigid materials. Throughout the top-down sampling, all label dependencies are applied. The feature values are then sampled according to the semantic meaning of the label.

After sampling dynamic models (next paragraph), constraints describing the motion and relationship of the object-of-interest and collision objects are sampled. Consequently, the corresponding `features` require updates and resamples. This time, the constraints are applied to the feature values before the corresponding label is assigned.

Sample dynamic models. As indicated in §3.2, each dynamic model has a minimum need for associated objects. In this step, a dynamic model is picked at random to guarantee that the total number of simulation and collision objects is sufficient to accommodate the motion and relationship portrayed by the current model. Then, we randomly choose objects from the scenario parse tree and determine the subjective or objective of the motion. Note that the subjective can only be the object-of-interest, while the objective can be any types of objects. If there are additional free objects or collision items in the scene, we will decide whether to include them as the prepositional characters. If this is the case, the current dynamic model will be adjusted to include additional restrictions.

3.4. Simulation and Rendering

As previously proposed, once the scene parse tree structure and associated `feature` values have been determined, the data point is captured in `JSON` format. This output `JSON` file is provided to Incremental Potential Contact (IPC) [26] and Material Point Method (MPM) [39] simulators according to the material of simulated objects. The physical simulators first set the necessary parameters based on the corresponding `feature` values, and then simulate motion and material behaviors such as deformation and fractures until the maximum frame number is reached. The output results are then collected by the renderer for high-fidelity rendering using the predefined parameters in the `JSON` file. Our pipeline employs Blender [3] for the automatic rendering process.

Using the intermediate `JSON` description of the scenario, the scene construction and sample, simulation, rendering, and the sentence generation (§3.5 & 3.6) phrases can be connected. Since the `JSON` file eliminates the data reliance, which is the only dependency among these stages, the methods used at each stage are interchangeable. As an alternative to our in-house Incremental Potential Contact (IPC) and Material Point Method (MPM) simulators, for instance, we can use simulators like NVIDIA's FleX [30]; similarly, any commercial or non-commercial rendering engine can be utilized for rendering.

3.5. Language Generation Model

We construct a tree-structured language model that summarizes the scene parse tree using natural language syntax components. Here, we investigate the most typical linguistic instance where, in each phrase or sentence, the subjective and objective refer, respectively, to an identical noun word specifying the corresponding scene objects. As shown in Figure 3, sentences are decomposed into multiple sub-sentences, and each sub-sentence consists of three basic components: a noun-phrase for subjective, a verb-phrase for verb and objective, and a global preposition that describes the high-level environmental characteristics. Noun-phrases delineate a sort of object in the scenario, with a noun and many descriptors pointing to `feature` labels in the parse tree. In this instance, the noun-phrase object must act as subjective in some dynamic models. The verb-phrase, on the other hand, consists of a verb indicating the motion of the subjective according to the associated dynamic model and a noun phrase summarizing the objective, if any.

When constructing language model, we examine all of the `features` in the parse tree and dynamic model and assign them to language components if they merit being stated in sentences. Specifically, the shape `feature` of an object is collected by some noun-phrases as the noun part; the type of dynamic model is mapped to verb in verb-phrases; and the `features` linked to the environment node will function as global prepositions. Other `features` are regarded as adjective descriptors in noun-phrases, with the following exceptions: 1) Motion `attribute features` are processed individually. The velocity value and velocity direction are collected as auxiliaries by the verb-phrase, while the position is stored in noun-phrase as a complement. 2) Young's Modulus and Poisson Ratio are neglected since they are too specific to be incorporated into the linguistic model.

3.6. Generating Random Sentences

Along with having a structured language model introduced above, the next step is to generate random sentences to describe the scenario accordingly. We divide the problem into several steps which are introduced in the following paragraphs, separately.

Sample Sentence Structure. To form the entire sentence, we can finalize the content of each sub-sentence first and connect them with conjunctions such as "and". Here, we consider the case, according to the language model, where sub-sentences consists of subjective, verb, objective and a



Figure 3. Sentence generation process of animation in TPA-Net. Each object in the animation is associated with a noun phrase. Attributes of the objects determine the adjectives which describe appearance, material, shape *etc*. The verb phrase is generated according to the dynamic model. Each pre-defined dynamics has it unique motion and it correspond to a specific text description. A simple grammar is used to compose the sentence. In order to make the generated sentences as diverse as possible, we make use of Natural Language Processing (NLP) tools, incorporating synonym replacements and neural machine translation.

global preposition. These components can be connected in multiple ways, i.e., we can choose different component combinations and arrange them in different orders to form the final sentence pattern. For instance, SVOP is the most traditional English sentence structure, while OVS order creates a passive voice (S:subject,V:verb, O:object, P:preposition). The sentence structure is sampled first when generating concrete clauses.

Sample Components. With structure defined, we will independently sample each sentence component. Generally speaking, it is unnecessary or cumbersome for a natural language sentence to describe every single relevant aspects of a scenario. Taking this into account, we select a confined number of descriptors at random to present when producing the final clause.

In noun-phrases, descriptors might come ahead of the noun as adjectives or after as clauses. To choose the candidates for these two portions, we sample two non-overlapping descriptor sets with an arbitrary number of labels from the noun-phrase structure and connect them using commas or conjunctions. Note that the complement descriptors can only occur in the clause portion, and the descriptor size can be sampled as zero to indicate that there is no such description portion in the final clause. The noun-phrase template will be formed by connecting the adjectives-, noun-, and clauses-portion together. For example, we may sample two adjectives and three clause-descriptors from the subjective noun-phrase in Figure 3 to create a noun-phrase-template as "a blue and matte cube that is small, elastic and rough". Here the blue, green and brown words refers to the adjective-, noun- and clauses-portion, respectively.

Similar strategies are employed in the verb-phrase case to handle descriptors. To boost the variety of sentences, we further sample the verb's tense when generating the verb-phrase template. The verb's objective is also sampled as a noun-phrase. As for the preposition portion, a random number of labels coupled by conjunctions are sampled.

Synonym Replaced	A modest flying saucer which is mediumweight and even surface on the ground, sets down to a mediumweight and pliable receptacle on the ground.
Generated	A small flying saucer that is mediumweight and even surface on the ground drops to an elastic and mediumweight receptacle on the ground.
Translation	A small flight rescue aircraft, medium and even surface above the ground, to be dropped on a ground elastic receptacle and medium weight receptacle.

Figure 4. An example of generated sentence, synonym replaced sentence, and translated sentence.

Sentence Diversity To maximize the variability of the sampled sentences, multiple Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques are applied to the clause template. We begin by substituting *nouns*, *verbs*, *adjectives* and *adverbs* with their corresponding synonyms using WordNet [33] and ConceptNet [50], two of the most widely used lexical knowledge-graphs in NLP, to search for synonyms. To ensure that the replaced words retain the original semantics, we measure the similarity between the original template sentence and the replacements. We encode two sentences using a BERT model and then compute the cosine similarity of the CLS embeddings. [45]. Multiple levels of semantic



Figure 5. **Drop dynamics.** A sand *flying_saucer* (alien) is dropped onto an elastic *receptacle* (something like a vase).

analysis are performed to guarantee that the replacement of words does not alter the meaning of the original sentence template.

Second, we deploy techniques for machine translation to further enhance the sentence variety. We deploy a neural machine translation (NMT) model based on a transformer to translate the generated sentence into another language and then back to English. Incorporating grammars and words from various languages in this manner increases the diversity of the generated sentences. In practice, we choose French, German, and Chinese as three alternate languages. Figure 4 shows an example of diverse sentences.

4. Data Processing

3-D Object Representation We use Thingi10K [62] as the 3-D object library for the animation generation. Preprocesses are needed to fit the input format requirements of Incremental Potential Contact (IPC) and Material Point Method (MPM). Specifically, IPC takes a tetrahedral mesh (4 vertices per face) while a 3D volumetric signed distance field is fed into MPM simulator.

Vocabulary In order to get the *nouns* that specify the simulated objects, we pre-process the tags and titles of each data point in Thingi10k to construct the object vocabulary. Since the provided labels are unstructured and sometimes customized, we use tools from Natural Language Processing (NLP) to detect the tags and titles. Only those that are *noun*s can be attached to the object vocabulary. Besides, `feature` labels, are used as the base for constructing the adjective set. As for *verbs*, we explicitly define several dynamics, `JUMP`, `DROP`, `FLY`, `THROW`, `SLIDE`, `PUSH` and `STRIKE` (see §3.2). These words forms the basic *verb* vocabulary. Except for `PUSH` and `STRIKE`, all *verbs* verbs describe the motion of a single subjective object, with keyword "to" or "from" indicating the relationship between the subjective and the corresponding objective, if any. `PUSH` and `STRIKE`, on the other hand, intrinsically require at least one objective following the *verb*. In this instance, "to" and "from" will include the third object to indicate additional relationships. To better illustrate the motions in natural language, we use an adverbial vocabulary and a postposition to enhance the verb with extra information such as the speed of motion, *etc*.

5. Results

5.1. Qualitative Results of Text and Animations

In this section, we show examples and explain the detailed constraints applied for each dynamic case introduced in §3.2. In practice, we design eight constraints to depict the relationship among an object's features. *I.e.*, *less_eq* and *less* constraints requiring ascending and restrict ascending sequential of involved operands; *larger_eq* and *larger* in the opposite; *eq* constrain to ensure all operands has the same value; and *same_dir*, *oppo_dir* and *similar_dir* to make the vector operands has the same/opposite/similar direction. All these constraints take constant values, or vectors, as well as the object and its constrained `feature` as operands, and constraints are applied during the sampling process.

Single-object Dynamic. As introduced before, we support `JUMP`, `DROP`, `FLY`, `THROW`, `SLIDE` for single-object dynamics. Each of them imposes a different set of constraints. For example, `Jump` dynamic describes that the subjective object contains a velocity component pointing upwards in the beginning, thus invoking two constraints in our model, *i.e.*, 1) similar velocity direction to the *up* vector, and 2) non-zero velocity value. `Jump` with a single subjective is sufficient enough to generate sentences with SV sentence structure.

In addition to that, we use "to" and "from" to involve an objective. As shown in Figure 6, "to" semantically means the subjective is moving towards the objective. We have two ways to depict this relationship in constraints: 1) the objective is placed at the position where, roughly, the sub-



Figure 6. **Jump dynamics.** The first line depicts the "to" relation between subjective and objective, while the second illustrate "from". Here we show some example of generated sentences. The sentence template is first generated based on `feature` labels; then the words are substituted by synonyms from WordNet and ConceptNet; at last, the sentence are translated to other languages and translated back to get the final descriptive text. Note there can be multiple sentences to describe the same scenario, and not all the descriptors are required to appear in the generated text.

jective is moving towards; and 2) the subjective should have velocity components pointing to the objective's position. In practice, we randomly choose one constraint to satisfy in the sampling process. Similarly, "from" relation constrains the initial position of either the subjective or the objective, to ensure they are placed closely without overlap.

Another example is `DROP`, where it requires the subjective to be placed in the sky, and contains little or no initial velocity value. If there are any objectives, their initial position should be constrained by the position of the subjective object. An example is shown in Figure 5.

Similarly, `FLY` and `THROW` impose constraints on the subjective to have non-zero horizontal velocities, while `FLY` further requires the subjective to have positive $y-$ coordinates in the initial position. `SLIDE`, on the other hand, requires subjective to be placed on top of the ground or attached to some objective objects if there are any.

Multi-object Dynamic. `PUSH` and `STRIKE`, as multi-object dynamics, requires at least one subjective and one objective object, where the verb, or say the action, will be placed from the subjective to the objective. In this case, "to" and "from" introduce further objects to indicate the velocity direction and initial position settings of the subjective and the objective. More implementation details and corresponding examples are in the supplementary.

5.2. Qualitative Results of T2I Generation

In this section, we show some qualitative results of the available T2I model in our setting. We would like to emphasize that there are no open-accessible Text-to-video (T2V) models for us to evaluate the generated data, therefore, we choose to use the open-source Text-to-Image (T2I) model,



Figure 7. Side-by-side comparison of TBA data and mini-DALLE generated images.

DALLE-mini, to generate images given the texts. One important thing is that we are not focusing on where the model can perfectly generate the image but where it can produce physically realistic images.

As shown in Figure 7, although DALLE-mini can generate images according to the sentence, it is far from physical realism. As mentioned in the §1, since the all V&L data do not focus on fine physical details, it is hard for models to capture such subtle but perceivable differences.

6. Conclusion

We propose a method to automatically generate text for the physical-based animation method. We show the analysis and qualitative results of our data generation method. Qualitative experiments are also carried out to demonstrate the critical importance of proposing a physically realistic dataset to the multi-modal generation research community.

References

[1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.14198*, 2022. 1

[2] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1728–1738, 2021. 3

[3] O Blender. Blender—a 3d modelling and rendering package. *Retrieved. represents the sequence of Constructs1 to*, 4, 2018. 5

[4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 1

[5] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the ieee conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 961–970, 2015. 3

[6] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3558–3568, 2021. 1, 3

[7] David Chen and William B Dolan. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 190–200, 2011. 3

[8] Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 104–120. Springer, 2020. 1

[9] Zhaoxi Chen, Guangcong Wang, and Ziwei Liu. Text2light: Zero-shot text-driven hdr panorama generation. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 41(6):1–16, 2022. 3

[10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. 1

[11] Feng Gao, Qing Ping, Govind Thattai, Aishwarya Reganti, Ying Nian Wu, and Prem Natarajan. Transform-retrieve-generate: Natural language-centric outside-knowledge visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5067–5077, 2022. 1

[12] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144, 2020. 1, 2

[13] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Oliver Wang, Eli Shechtman, Josef Sivic, Trevor Darrell, and Bryan Russell. Localizing moments in video with temporal language. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2018. 3

[14] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P Kingma, Ben Poole, Mohammad Norouzi, David J Fleet, et al. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022. 1, 3

[15] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 1, 3

[16] Fangzhou Hong, Mingyuan Zhang, Liang Pan, Zhongang Cai, Lei Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Avatarclip: Zero-shot text-driven generation and animation of 3d avatars. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 41(4):1–19, 2022. 3

[17] Wenyi Hong, Ming Ding, Wendi Zheng, Xinghan Liu, and Jie Tang. Cogvideo: Large-scale pretraining for text-to-video generation via transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15868*, 2022. 3

[18] Ajay Jain, Ben Mildenhall, Jonathan T Barron, Pieter Abbeel, and Ben Poole. Zero-shot text-guided object generation with dream fields. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 867–876, 2022. 3

[19] Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens Van Der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. Clevr: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2901–2910, 2017. 3

[20] Aishwarya Kamath, Mannat Singh, Yann LeCun, Gabriel Synnaeve, Ishan Misra, and Nicolas Carion. Mdetr-modulated detection for end-to-end multi-modal understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1780–1790, 2021. 1

[21] Nasir Mohammad Khalid, Tianhao Xie, Eugene Belilovsky, and Popa Tiberiu. Clip-mesh: Generating textured meshes from text using pretrained image-text models. December 2022. 3

[22] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *International journal of computer vision*, 123(1):32–73, 2017. 3

[23] James R Kubricht, Keith J Holyoak, and Hongjing Lu. Intuitive physics: Current research and controversies. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 21(10):749–759, 2017. 1

[24] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*, 2019. 1

[25] Liunian Harold Li, Mark Yatskar, Da Yin, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Kai-Wei Chang. Visualbert: A simple and performant baseline for vision and language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03557*, 2019. 1

[26] Minchen Li, Zachary Ferguson, Teseo Schneider, Timothy R Langlois, Denis Zorin, Daniele Panozzo, Chenfanfu Jiang, and Danny M Kaufman. Incremental potential contact: intersection-and inversion-free, large-deformation dynamics. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 39(4):49, 2020. 2, 5

[27] Yitong Li, Martin Min, Dinghan Shen, David Carlson, and Lawrence Carin. Video generation from text. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018. 3

[28] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 1, 3

[29] Jiasen Lu, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Stefan Lee. Vilbert: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019. 1

[30] Miles Macklin, Matthias Müller, Nuttapong Chentanez, and Tae-Yong Kim. Unified particle physics for real-time applications. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 33(4):1–12, 2014. 5

[31] Oscar Michel, Roi Bar-On, Richard Liu, Sagie Benaim, and Rana Hanocka. Text2mesh: Text-driven neural stylization for meshes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13492–13502, 2022. 3

[32] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2630–2640, 2019. 3

[33] George A Miller. *WordNet: An electronic lexical database*. MIT press, 1998. 6

[34] Gaurav Mittal, Tanya Marwah, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Sync-draw: Automatic video generation using deep recurrent attentive architectures. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1096–1104, 2017. 3

[35] Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011. 1, 3

[36] Yingwei Pan, Zhaofan Qiu, Ting Yao, Houqiang Li, and Tao Mei. To create what you tell: Generating videos from captions. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1789–1798, 2017. 3

[37] Bryan A Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M Cervantes, Juan C Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2641–2649, 2015. 1, 3

[38] Ben Poole, Ajay Jain, Jonathan T Barron, and Ben Mildenhall. Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14988*, 2022. 3

[39] Yuxing Qiu, Samuel Temple Reeve, Minchen Li, Yin Yang, Stuart R Slattery, and Chenfanfu Jiang. A sparse distributed gigascale resolution material point method. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 2022. 5

[40] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1

[41] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 1

[42] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022. 1, 3

[43] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8821–8831. PMLR, 2021. 1, 2

[44] Scott Reed, Zeynep Akata, Xinchen Yan, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Bernt Schiele, and Honglak Lee. Generative adversarial text to image synthesis. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1060–1069. PMLR, 2016. 2

[45] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*, 2019. 6

[46] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 1, 3

[47] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08402*, 2022. 3

[48] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2556–2565, 2018. 1, 3

[49] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Thomas Hayes, Xi Yin, Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Qiyuan Hu, Harry Yang, Oron Ashual, Oran Gafni, et al. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022. 1, 3

[50] Robyn Speer, Joshua Chin, and Catherine Havasi. Conceptnet 5.5: An open multilingual graph of general knowledge. In *Thirty-first AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2017. 6

[51] Krishna Srinivasan, Karthik Raman, Jiecao Chen, Michael Bendersky, and Marc Najork. Wit: Wikipedia-based image

text dataset for multimodal multilingual machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2443–2449, 2021. 1, 3

[52] Alexey Stomakhin, Craig Schroeder, Lawrence Chai, Joseph Teran, and Andrew Selle. A material point method for snow simulation. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 32(4):1–10, 2013. 2

[53] Deborah Sulsky, Shi-Jian Zhou, and Howard L Schreyer. Application of a particle-in-cell method to solid mechanics. *Computer physics communications*, 87(1-2):236–252, 1995. 2

[54] Guy Tevet, Brian Gordon, Amir Hertz, Amit H Bermano, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Motionclip: Exposing human motion generation to clip space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08063*, 2022. 3

[55] 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. 1

[56] Can Wang, Menglei Chai, Mingming He, Dongdong Chen, and Jing Liao. Clip-nerf: Text-and-image driven manipulation of neural radiance fields. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3835–3844, 2022. 3

[57] Chenfei Wu, Lun Huang, Qianxi Zhang, Binyang Li, Lei Ji, Fan Yang, Guillermo Sapiro, and Nan Duan. Godiva: Generating open-domain videos from natural descriptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14806*, 2021. 3

[58] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. 3

[59] Tao Xu, Pengchuan Zhang, Qiuyuan Huang, Han Zhang, Zhe Gan, Xiaolei Huang, and Xiaodong He. Attngan: Fine-grained text to image generation with attentional generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1316–1324, 2018. 2

[60] Han Zhang, Tao Xu, Hongsheng Li, Shaoting Zhang, Xiaogang Wang, Xiaolei Huang, and Dimitris N Metaxas. Stackgan: Text to photo-realistic image synthesis with stacked generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5907–5915, 2017. 2

[61] Pengchuan Zhang, Xiujun Li, Xiaowei Hu, Jianwei Yang, Lei Zhang, Lijuan Wang, Yejin Choi, and Jianfeng Gao. Vinvl: Making visual representations matter in vision-language models. *CVPR 2021*, 2021. 1

[62] Qingnan Zhou and Alec Jacobson. Thingi10k: A dataset of 10,000 3d-printing models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.04797*, 2016. 7

[63] Jun-Yan Zhu, Taesung Park, Phillip Isola, and Alexei A Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2223–2232, 2017. 1

A. Examples

Please visit the following site for live examples:
https://sites.google.com/view/tpa-net

B. Scene Grammar Productions

We use an attributed stochastic grammar as a hierarchical and structured representation that determines the scenario's content with initial physical parameters and appearance settings. The grammar is decomposed into multiple levels of components which are sampled according to the production rules defined in Table 1. The tree structure itself describes the scenario's content, while the related `attributes`, which contain numerous `features`, specialize the content's characteristics. Table 2 presents a list of the `attributes` and `features` designed for each *node*.

C. Dynamic Model and Constraints

C.1. Constraints

In practice, we design the eight constraints listed below to reveal the relationship among `features` of objects. Every constraint consists of a list of operands "$[o_0, o_1, ..., o_N]$" for the involved `features` and/or constants and a list of ID number s"$[n_0, .., n_M]$" to represent the unalterable criteria operand. Specifically, operand o_i refers a constant value or vector, or a *node*-`attribute-feature` pair, in which case the value of the corresponding feature is fetched for computation.

- *less_eq*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0, ..., n_M])$: $o_0 \leq ... \leq o_N$, with $o_{n_0}, ...o_{n_M}$ stays unchanged during resampling.
- *less*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0, ..., n_M])$: $o_0 < ... < o_N$, with $o_{n_0}, ...o_{n_M}$ stays unchanged during resampling.
- *larger_eq*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0, ..., n_M])$: $o_0 \geq ... \geq o_N$, with $o_{n_0}, ...o_{n_M}$ stays unchanged during resampling.
- *larger*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0, ..., n_M])$: $o_0 > ... > o_N$, with $o_{n_0}, ...o_{n_M}$ stays unchanged during resampling.
- *eq*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0, ..., n_M])$: $o_0 = ... = o_N$, with $o_{n_0}, ...o_{n_M}$ stays unchanged during resampling.
- *same_dir*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0])$: o_i must be vectors, and for $\forall i \in [0, ..., N]$ the angle between o_i and o_{n_0} is zero. Note that only one criteria operand is present in this constraint.
- *oppo_dir*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0])$: o_i must be vectors, and for $\forall i \in [0, ..., N]$ the angle between o_i and o_{n_0} is $180°$. Note that only one criteria operand is present in this constraint.

Label	Production Rules
Scene	Scene $\rightarrow$ TarObjSet $\oplus$ Env
Component-0	TarObjSet $\rightarrow$ TargetObj^{+} $\odot$ TarObjSet* Env $\rightarrow$ ColObjSet $\oplus$ Render
Component-$\star$	ColObjSet $\rightarrow$ CollisionObj* $\odot$ ColObjSet* TarObjSet* $\rightarrow$ TargetObj* $\odot$ TarObjSet*

Table 1. **Production rule of the scenario stochastic grammar.** Here, TarObjSet is short for Target Object Set which includes a set of simulated object (TargetObj) with potential relationships; ColObjSet represents a set of non-movable collision objects (CollisionObj) serving as boundary conditions; and Env is short for Environment. Moreover, $\oplus$ represents *and* relation, making the child elements mandatory; while $\odot$ refers to *or* relation to connect optional child nodes; $^{+}$ means one or more and * means zero or more.

Node	Attribute	Feature	Label Candidates
Environment	Boundary Condition	Boundary	Box, Floor
		Type	Sticky, Slip
		Friction Factor	Smooth, Even Surface, Rough, Extremely rough
	External Force	Force type	Gravity, Wind
		Force value	*Dependent on Force type*
	Temporal	Total Frame	Short, Medium, Long
Object	Appearance	Color	White, Red, Blue, Green, Lime, Orange, Yellow, Pink, Purple ...
		Material	Glossy, Matte
	Shape	Shape	Cube, Sphere, Cylinder, Mesh
		Size	Small, Medium-sized, Large, Super large
	Motion	Velocity value	Slow, Medium-speed, Fast
		Velocity direction	Up, Down, Right, Left, Forward, Backward, Horizontal, Vertical
		Initial position	On the ground, In the sky
	Physics	Material	Elastic, Rigid, Fluid, Snow, Mud, Sand, Granular
		Young's Modulus	*Dependent on Material*; Soft, Moderate-hardness, Hard, Rigid
		Poisson Ratio	*Dependent on Material* Elastic, Rigid
		density	Light, Medium-weight, Heavy
		Friction factor	Smooth, Even Surface, Rough, Extremely rough
Render	Background	Light	Bright, Dark
		Texture	Preset texture list
	Camera	Viewpoint	Preset camera viewpoints
		Camera	*Dependent on Viewpoint*

Table 2. Attributes **with** features **associated for each scene *node*.** In the table, independent features are highlighted with the sens serif font, whereas dependent features are labeled with *italic*. The final column lists examples of candidate labels for each feature. Each label is mapped to a specific value or range of values based on its semantic.

- *similar_dir*$([o_0, ..., o_N], [n_0, ..., n_M], \theta)$: o_i must be vectors, and for $\forall i \in [0, ..., N]$, $\forall j \in [0, ..., M]$ the angle between o_i and o_j is less or equal to θ. Here, $o_{n_0}, ...o_{n_M}$ stays unchanged during resampling.

The constrains are validated after a random sample of features. The non-criteria operands that violate the constraints will be resampled to guarantee the correctness of the relation. If the criteria operands themselves violate the constraint, the resample process will be terminated and errors will be reported.

C.2. Dynamic Model

As introduced in the main paper, we have the following dynamic models: JUMP, DROP, FLY, THROW, SLIDE, PUSH and STRIKE. We summarize the basic constraints required for each single-object dynamic model in Table 3 and multi-object dynamics in Table 4. We use "sub" to denote the subjective object on which the dynamic model focuses. In addition, as shown in the last two columns of the table, objective objects (represented by "obj") are introduced with "from" and "to" relations.

Dynamic Model	Type	Constraint
JUMP	Basic	*similar_dir*($[[0,1,0],$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_0$)
		less_eq($[v_{min},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity value)$]$, $[0]$) (v_{min} defined by user)
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$), with $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = [p_0^{\text{gt}}, p_1^{\text{gt}}, p_2^{\text{gt}}]$ Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{obj}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$
	"to"	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{d}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_1$) Here, $\mathbf{d}^{\text{gt}} = (\mathbf{p}^{\text{obj}} - \mathbf{p}^{\text{sub}}) + \alpha \cdot [0,1,0]$ (α defined by user)
DROP	Basic	*similar_dir*($[[0,-1,0],$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_0$)
		larger_eq($[v_{\text{small}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity value)$]$, $[0]$) (v_{small} defined by user)
		less_eq($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$), with $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = [p_0^{\text{gt}}, p_1^{\text{gt}}, p_2^{\text{gt}}]$ p_1^{gt} is user-defined threshold; p_0^{gt} and p_2^{gt} are the global minimum position
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{sub}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$
	"to"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{sub}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i = 0, 2$; $p_1^{\text{gt}} = s_1^{\text{obj}} + C$
FLY	Basic	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_0$), $\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}} = [C_0, 0, C_1]$
		less_eq($[v_{\text{large}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity value)$]$, $[0]$) (v_{large} defined by user)
		less_eq($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$), with $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = [p_0^{\text{gt}}, p_1^{\text{gt}}, p_2^{\text{gt}}]$ p_1^{gt} is user-defined threshold, p_0^{gt} and p_2^{gt} are the global minimum position
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{sub}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$
	"to"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = \mathbf{p}^{\text{sub}} + \mathbf{s}^{\text{sub}} + v_{value}^{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{sub}} \cdot C$
THROW	Basic (Throw UP)	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_0$), $\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}} = [C_0, 1, C_1]$
	Basic (Throw DOWN)	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_0$), $\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}} = [C_0, -1, C_1]$
		eq($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$). Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{sub}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{sub}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$
	"to"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = \mathbf{p}^{\text{sub}} + \mathbf{s}^{\text{sub}} + v_{value}^{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{sub}} \cdot C$
SLIDE	Basic	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Velocity direction)$]$, $[0], \theta_0$), $\mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{gt}} = [C_0, 0, C_1]$
	Basic (Not "from")	*less_eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-min}},$ (sub, Motion, Initial position), $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-max}}]$, $[0, 2]$) Here $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-*}} = [p_0^{\text{gt-*}}, p_1^{\text{gt-*}}, p_2^{\text{gt-*}}]$, $p_1^{\text{gt-min}} = s_1^{\text{sub}}$, $p_1^{\text{gt-max}} = s_1^{\text{sub}} + C_{\text{small}}$ $p_i^{\text{gt-*}}$ refers to global * position for $i = 0, 2$ and * refers to min/max
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (sub, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$), with $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = [p_0^{\text{gt}}, p_1^{\text{gt}}, p_2^{\text{gt}}]$ Here, $p_1^{\text{gt}} = p_1^{\text{obj}} + (s_1^{\text{sub}} + s_1^{\text{obj}} + C_{small}) * 0.5$ Random sample $p_i^{\text{gt}} \in [p_i^{\text{obj}} - s_i^{\text{obj}} * 0.5, p_i^{\text{obj}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} * 0.5]$ for $i = 0, 2$
	"to"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}},$ (obj, Motion, Initial position)$]$, $[0]$) Here, $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}} = \mathbf{p}^{\text{sub}} + \mathbf{s}^{\text{sub}} + v_{value}^{\text{sub}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{dir}^{\text{sub}} \cdot C$

Table 3. **Constraints in each single-object dynamic model.** In the table, $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{p}$, v_{value} and $\mathbf{v}_{dir}$ refers to object size, initial position, velocity value and velocity direction, separately; $C \geq 0, C_0 \in [-1, 1], C_1 \in [-1, 1], C_{small} \in [0, 0.1 * s_{max}^{sub}]$ represents random noise, and $\pm$ means +/- are chosen randomly in practice. All the dynamic model has the basic constraints applied to the objects, with randomly sampled "from", "to", or NONE relation. Note that "from" and "to" relation will be chosen only when there are enough objects in the scenario. Specially, for THROW model, we will first sample to decide if it is "Throw UP" or "Throw DOWN" before defining the basic constraints.

Dynamic Model	Type	Constraint
PUSH	Basic	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{v}^{\text{gt}}_{dir}, (\text{sub, Motion, Velocity direction})], [0], \theta_0$) Here $\mathbf{v}^{\text{gt}}_{dir} = \mathbf{p}^{obj} - \mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-sub}}$
		less_eq($[v_{\text{large}}, (\text{sub, Motion, Velocity value})], [0]$) ($v_{\text{large}}$ defined by user)
		larger_eq($[v_{\text{small}}, (\text{obj, Motion, Velocity value})], [0]$) ($v_{\text{small}}$ defined by user)
	Basic (Not "from")	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-sub}}, (\text{sub, Motion, Initial position})], [0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt-sub}} = p_i^{\text{obj}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-sub}}, (\text{sub, Motion, Initial position})], [0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt-sub}} = p_i^{\text{obj-extra}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj-extra}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$
		eq($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-obj}}, (\text{obj, Motion, Initial position})], [0]$) Here, $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-obj}} = \mathbf{p}_i^{\text{gt-sub}} + K * \frac{\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-sub}} - \mathbf{p}^{\text{obj-extra}}}{\|\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-sub}} - \mathbf{p}^{\text{obj-extra}}\|}$ $K = 0.5 \cdot \max_{i=0,1,2}(s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}}) + C$
	"to"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-obj-extra}}, (\text{obj-extra, Motion, Initial position})], [0]$) Here, $\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt-obj-extra}} = \mathbf{p}^{\text{obj}} + K * \mathbf{v}^{\text{sub}}_{dir}$ $K = 0.5 \cdot \max_{i=0,1,2}(s_i^{\text{obj}} + s_i^{\text{obj-extra}}) + C$
STRIKE	"to"	$\mathbf{p}^{to} = \mathbf{p}^{\text{obj-extra}}$
	Not "to"	Random sample $\mathbf{p}^{to}$
	Basic	*similar_dir*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{to}} - \mathbf{p}^{\text{sub}}, (\text{sub, Motion, Velocity direction})], [0], \theta_0$) *similar_dir*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{to}} - \mathbf{p}^{\text{obj}}, (\text{obj, Motion, Velocity direction})], [0], \theta_0$) *less_eq*($[v_{\text{large}}, (\text{sub, Motion, Velocity value})], [0]$) ($v_{\text{large}}$ defined by user) *less_eq*($[v_{\text{large}}, (\text{obj, Motion, Velocity value})], [0]$) ($v_{\text{large}}$ defined by user)
	"from"	*eq*($[\mathbf{p}^{\text{gt}}, (\text{obj, Motion, Initial position})], [0]$) Here, $p_i^{\text{gt}} = p_i^{\text{sub}} \pm (s_i^{\text{sub}} + s_i^{\text{obj}} + C) * 0.5$ for $i \in [0, 2]$

Table 4. **Constraints in each multiple-object dynamic model.** These dynamic models are applied to at least two objects, one representing the subjective and the other representing the objective ("sub" and "obj" in the table). "From" and "to" relation will include another objective object, named "obj-extra" in the table. $C \geq 0$ represents random noise, and $\pm$ means +/- are chosen randomly in practice.