Abstract. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models are a promising new class of generative models that are competitive with GANs on perceptual metrics. In this paper, we explore their potential for sequentially generating video. Inspired by recent advances in neural video compression, we use denoising diffusion models to stochastically generate a residual to a deterministic next-frame prediction. We compare this approach to two sequential VAE and two GAN baselines on four datasets, where we test the generated frames for perceptual quality and forecasting accuracy against ground truth frames. We find significant improvements in terms of perceptual quality on all data and improvements in terms of frame forecasting for complex high-resolution videos.
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1 Introduction

The two most popular approaches to video generation rely on sequential variational autoencoders [4,14,8] and generative adversarial networks [2,27,28]. The advantage of VAEs is their probabilistic nature, which allows for the assessment of their forecasting ability in terms of a tractable lower bound to the model’s likelihood [55]. On the downside, these models have a tendency to produce blurry predictions. The other prominent class of models is GANs which lead to better perceptual qualities, but these methods are usually not evaluated for probabilistic forecasting.

Stochastic video generation and forecasting is important in various contexts; prominent examples include model-based reinforcement learning [18], data-driven weather prediction [39], and neural video compression [51,52,53,1,30,54]. Recently, diffusion probabilistic models [45,21,46] have achieved considerable progress in image generation, leading to perceptual qualities comparable to GANs while having the benefit of being likelihood-based [21,44]. However, none of these models have been extended to the video domain.

In this paper, we extend diffusion probabilistic models for stochastic video generation. Our ideas are inspired by the principles of predictive coding [37,32] and neural compression algorithms [53] that suggests that in high-dimensional
sequences, residual errors are oftentimes the better quantity to compress compared to separately compressing future observations. By turning compression into generation, this results in a generative process of the data [33].

Our ablation studies strongly suggest that predicting video frame residuals as opposed to naively predicting next frames leads to a considerable improvement in generative performance. By investigating our architecture on various datasets and by comparing it against various baselines, we furthermore achieve a new state-of-the-art in video generation that scales to higher-resolution videos. In more detail, our achievements are as follows:

1. We show how to use diffusion probabilistic models to generate videos. This enables a new path towards probabilistic video forecasting while achieving perceptual qualities comparable with likelihood-free methods.
2. Inspired by ideas of predictive coding, we show that employing the diffusion architecture to model residuals from the predicted next frame yields better results than when directly modeling the next frames. This observation is consistent with recent findings in neural video compression. Figure 1 summarizes the main idea of our approach (Figure 2 has more details).
3. We provide a rigorous evaluation based on four data sets of various complexities and resolutions, studying both probabilistic as well as perceptual metrics. Our method performs best on a majority of datasets in both aspects.

The structure of our paper is as follows. In Section 2, we discuss related work. Then we move on to describe our method in Section 3. Section 4 discusses our experimental findings along with ablation studies, and finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and addresses future directions.

2 Related Work

Our paper combines ideas from video generation, diffusion probabilistic models, and predictive coding. As follows, we discuss related work along these lines.
Video Generation Models. Video generation can be deterministic or stochastic; the former is often conceptually easier. Some models aim at predicting the most likely future frames in terms of classical metrics such as PSNR and SSIM [29,7,16]. In contrast, stochastic generation accounts for future uncertainty and tends to model conditional likelihood or frame realism.

Most of the video generation research relies on sequential variational autoencoders and their relatives [4,26,47,12]. Bayer et al. [5] and Babaeizadeh et al. [4] leveraged variational inference to build stochastic video generation models by incorporating a recurrent network with a factorized Gaussian prior. Later work [14] extended the sequential VAE by incorporating a learnable prior model conditioned on history frames to obtain a more accurate prediction. IVRNN [8] further enhanced the generation quality by designing a hierarchical latent variable model, which is the state-of-the-art end-to-end sequential VAE model. [50] proposed an involved approach to further optimize this model greedily after training. Other sequential VAE works [9,41,22] try to extract critical information from the video sequences to detect state transition, which can be potentially deployed on some robotic control tasks. VideoFlow [26] proposed normalizing flows for video generation, but the approach is hard to scale up to high-resolution videos due to its expensive memory and computation demands that are required to maintain invertibility. While some GAN-based models can generate clear samples without blurry artifacts, they suffer from severe underfitting in complex, high-resolution data [49,2,27,50], which is also observed in our baseline comparison experiment.

Diffusion Probabilistic Models have recently shown impressive performance on high-fidelity image generation. In 2015, Sohl-Dickstein et al. [43] introduced a thermodynamic perspective to prescribe a diffusion process that transforms samples to noise; a parameterized function then learns the reverse process using deep neural networks. Song et al. [45] proposed a single-network model for score estimation, using annealed Langevin dynamics for sampling. Furthermore, Song et al. [46] used stochastic differential equations (related to diffusion processes) to train a network to transform random noise into the data distribution.

DDPM by Ho et al. [21] is the first instance of diffusion models for high-resolution image generation and a certain parameterization, showing the equivalence of DDPM and denoising score-matching. The follow-up work [40] leverages a conditional generation scheme to iteratively refine the interpolated low-resolution image to high-resolution (super-resolution). Besides the traditional computer vision tasks, diffusion models are proven to be effective on audio synthesis [10,25]. Additionally, Luo et al. [31] hybridizes normalizing flow and diffusion model to generative 3D point cloud samples. To the best of our knowledge, TimeGrad [38] is the first sequential diffusion model for time-series forecasting. Their architecture was not designed for video but for traditional time series datasets of much lower dimension.

Neural Video Compression Models. Video compression models typically employ frame prediction methods optimized for minimizing code length and dis-
In recent years, sequential generative models were proven to be effective on video compression tasks [19,51,1,52,53,30,54]. Some of these models show impressive rate-distortion performance with hierarchical structures that separately encode the prediction and error residual. While compression models have different goals than generative models, both model families benefit from good sequential priors. Although some works [57,17,32] tried to exploit how residuals can help improve video generation, their evaluations are limited to domain-specific tasks or small-scale datasets with only sequential VAE models.

3 Method

We begin by reviewing the relevant background on denoising diffusion probabilistic models that form the basis of our approach. We then discuss our design choices for extending these models to sequential models for generating video, where we use diffusion models to model residuals of the most likely next frame prediction. We thereby discuss connections to autoregressive flows, predictive coding, and neural video compression.

![Architecture overview](image)

Fig. 2: Architecture overview. A frame sequence \(x_{0:t-1}\) gets fed into two sequential models to predict the next frame \(\mu_t\) (blue box) as well as to create a context (in red lines) for a residual diffusion model. During training, the scaled residual \(y_0^t = (x^t - \mu^t)/\sigma\) gets successively diffused and subsequently denoised. During generation, a Gaussian noise variable \(y_N^t\) (orange circle) gets denoised conditioned on the temporal context. The resulting residual \(\hat{y}_0^t\) gets scaled by \(\sigma\) and then added to \(\mu^t\) to generate \(\hat{x}^t\).

3.1 Background on Diffusion Probabilistic Models

Denoising diffusion probabilistic models (DDPMs) [21] are a recent class of generative models with promising properties. Besides being probabilistic, they are shown to generate sample qualities comparable to recent GAN approaches [6].
Diffusion Probabilistic Modeling for Video Generation

Similar to variational autoencoders (VAEs) [23], DDPMs are deep latent variable models that model data \( x_0 \) in terms of an underlying sequence of latent variables \( x_1:N \) such that \( p_\theta(x_0) = \int p_\theta(x_{0:N})dx_{1:N} \), where every \( x_n \) has the same dimension as the data. While the generative process \( p_\theta(x_{0:N}) \) will be explained below, it is simpler to start with the model’s forward, or diffusion process,

\[
q(x_{1:N}|x_0) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} q(x_n|x_{n-1}); \quad q(x_n|x_{n-1}) = \mathcal{N}(x_n|\sqrt{1-\beta_n}x_{n-1}, \beta_n I). \tag{1}
\]

Besides a predefined incremental variance schedule defined by \( \beta_n \in (0, 1) \forall n \), this process is parameter-free and successively diffuses the data [45, 21]. The reverse of the diffusion process is called denoising process (or reverse process),

\[
p_\theta(x_{0:N}) = p(x_N) \prod_{n=1}^{N} p_\theta(x_{n-1}|x_n); \quad p_\theta(x_{n-1}|x_n) = \mathcal{N}(x_{n-1}|M_\theta(x_n, n), \gamma I). \tag{2}
\]

Above, \( p(x_N) = \mathcal{N}(0, I) \) is the prior distribution and \( \gamma \) is a fixed hyperparameter. The reverse process can be thought of as approximating the posterior of the diffusion process; it has learnable parameters \( \theta \). These parameters can be optimized by maximizing a variational lower bound to the marginal likelihood,

\[
L_{\text{variational}} = \mathbb{E}_q[-\log \frac{p_\theta(x_{0:N})}{q(x_{1:N}|x_0)}].
\]

This bound can be efficiently estimated by stochastic gradients by subsampling time steps \( n \) at random, owing to the fact that the marginal distributions \( q(x_n|x_0) \) can be computed in closed form [21].

In this paper, we use a simplified loss akin to Ho et al. [21], who showed that the variational bound could be simplified to the following denoising score matching loss,

\[
L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0, n, \epsilon}||\epsilon - f_\theta(x_n, n)||^2, \quad \text{where } x_n = \sqrt{\alpha_n}x_0 + \sqrt{1-\alpha_n}\epsilon. \tag{3}
\]

We thereby define \( \bar{\alpha}_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - \beta_i) \). The intuitive explanation of this loss is that \( f_\theta \) tries to predict the noise \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \) at the denoising step \( n \). We refer to Ho et al. [21] for the detailed derivation. Once the model is trained, it can be used to generate data by ancestral sampling, starting with a draw from the prior \( p(x_N) \) and successively generating more and more structure through an annealed Langevin dynamics procedure [45, 46].

### 3.2 Residual Video Diffusion Model

In many situations, it is simpler to model or communicate differences from our predictions than the predictions themselves. For example, masked autoregressive flows [36] iteratively generate a residual to the most likely next observation. More generally, residual errors play a central role in modern theories of the brain. For example, predictive coding [37] postulates that neural circuits estimate probabilistic models of other neural activity, iteratively exchanging information about error residuals. This theory has interesting connections to variational autoencoders [32, 33] and neural video compression [1, 52], where one also compresses the residuals to the most likely next-frame predictions.
Based on these inspirations, we design a sequential diffusion probabilistic model that corrects for the next frame prediction. We call our approach "Residual Video Diffusion" (RVD). We start from a deterministic autoregressive model for frame sequences and use the diffusion model to generate residuals, generating a stochastic frame sequence.

**Notation.** We consider a video frame sequence $x_{0:T}$ that we model in terms of a set of latent variables $y_{1:T} \equiv y_{0:1:T}$ specified by a diffusion process over the lower indices. We will refer to $y_{0:T}$ as the (scaled) frame residuals.

**Autoregressive Base Model.** Our first step is to incorporate an autoregressive transform, allowing us to invertibly go back and forth between $x_{1:T}$ and $y_{1:T}$, defined below. Our base architecture relies on a Masked Autoregressive Flow (MAF) [36] applied to frame sequences, involving a autoregressive prediction network that outputs $\mu_\phi$ and a scale parameter $\sigma$. Conditioned on the residuals, this defines a generative process of the frames:

$$x^t = \mu_\phi(x^{<t}) + \sigma \odot y^t_0 \iff y^t_0 = \frac{x^t - \mu_\phi(x^{<t})}{\sigma}. \tag{4}$$

As discussed above, the forward MAF transform ($y \rightarrow x$) converts residual into data sequence, the inverse transform ($x \rightarrow y$) removes temporal correlations. Modeling residuals instead of entire frames is a simpler task since residuals are typically sparse, and sparse data has a lower intrinsic dimensionality. Another benefit is that the residuals $y_{0:T}$ are less temporally correlated than the frames themselves and hence easier to generate without inducing temporal inconsistencies in the generated video. The scaling term $\sigma$ can either be a fixed parameter or a learnable function, but in this project, we did not find benefit in conditioning it on past frames.

The autoregressive transform in Equation 4 has also been adapted in a VAE model [33] as well as in neural video compression architectures [1,51,52,53]. These approaches separately compress latent variables that govern the next-frame prediction as well as frame residuals, thereby achieving state-of-the-art rate-distortion performance on high-resolution video content. While these works focused on compression, this paper focuses on generation.

**Reverse Process** Our model is defined in terms of a joint distribution over $x_{0:T}$ and $y_{1:T}$. This joint distribution is given by

$$p(x_{0:T}, y_{1:T}) = p(x_0) \prod_{t=1}^{T} p(x^t|y^t, x^{<t})p(y^t|y^{<t}). \tag{5}$$

While the autoregressive model $p(x^t|y^t, x^{<t})$ is defined by Eq. 4, it remains to define the generative process of the residual variables:

$$p_\theta(y^t_0:N|x^{<t}) = p(y^t_N) \prod_{n=1}^{N} p_\theta(y^t_{n-1}|y^t_n, x^{<t}). \tag{6}$$
We fix the top-level prior distribution to be a multivariate Gaussian with identity covariance, that is, we do not condition it on the past frames. In contrast, all other denoising factors are conditioned on past frames,

$$p_{\theta}(y_{n-1}|y_n, x^{<t}) = \mathcal{N}(y_{n-1}|M_{\theta}(y_n, n, x^{<t}), \gamma I).$$

(7)

As Eq. 2, $\gamma$ is a hyperparameter, and our goal is to learn the parameters $\theta$.

**Forward Process** Having specified the generative process, we next specify the diffusion process conditioned on the observed sequence $x^{0:T}$:

$$q_{\phi}(y^t_{0:N}|x^{\leq t}) = q_{\phi}(y^t_0|x^{\leq t}) \prod_{n=1}^N q(y^t_n|y^t_{n-1})$$

(8)

The first factor is deterministic and can be formally expressed in terms of a delta distribution, $q_{\phi}(y^t_0|x^{\leq t}) = \delta(y^t_0 - x_{t} - \mu_{\phi}(x^{<t})/\sigma)$. The remaining $N$ factors are identical to Eq. 1 with $x_n$ being replaced by $y_n$. Following Nichol et al. [35], we use a cosine schedule to define the variance $\beta_n \in (0, 1)$ for a smoother diffusion transition and an improved generation quality. We set $\sigma = 2$ in all experiments. The full architecture is summarized in Figure 2.

Equations 7 and 8 generalize and improve the previously proposed TimeGrad [38] method. This approach showed promising performance in forecasting time series of comparatively smaller dimensions such as electricity prices or taxi trajectories and not video. Besides differences in architecture, this method neither models residuals nor considers the temporal dependency in posterior, which we identify as a crucial aspect to make the model competitive with strong VAE and GAN baselines (see Section 4.6 for an ablation).

**Optimization and Sampling** In analogy to time-independent diffusion models, we can derive a variational lower bound that we can optimize using stochastic gradient descent. In analogy to the derivation of Eq. 3 [21] and using the same definitions of $\bar{\alpha}_n$ and $\epsilon$, this results in the following conditional denoising score matching loss:

$$L(\theta, \phi) = \mathbb{E}_{x, n, \epsilon} \sum_{t=1}^T ||\epsilon - f_{\theta}(y^t_n(\phi), n, x^{<t})||^2;$$

(9)

$$y^t_n(\phi) = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_n}y^t_0(\phi) + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_n}\epsilon; \quad y^t_0(\phi) = \frac{x^t - \mu_{\phi}(x^{<t})}{\sigma}. $$

(10)

We can optimize this function using the reparameterization trick [23], i.e., by randomly sampling $\epsilon$ and $n$, and taking stochastic gradients with respect to $\phi$ and $\theta$. For a practical scheme involving multiple time steps, we also employ teacher forcing [24]. See Algorithm 1 for the detailed training and sampling procedure, where we abbreviated $f_{\theta, \phi}(y^t_n, n, x^{<t}) \equiv f_{\theta}(y^t_n(\phi), n, x^{<t})$. 

Algorithm 1: Training (left) and Langevin Dynamics Sampling (right)

```
while not converged do
    Sample \( x^0:T \sim q(x^0:T) \);
    \( n \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1, 2, \ldots, N) \);
    \( L = 0 \);
    for \( t = 1 \) to \( T \) do
        \( \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \);
        \( y^t_0 = (x^t - \mu_\phi(x^{<t}))/\sigma \);
        \( y^t_n = \sqrt{\alpha_n} y^t_0 + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_n} \epsilon \);
        \( L = L + ||\epsilon - f_{\theta, \phi}(y^t_n, n, x^{<t})||^2 \)
    end
    \( (\theta, \phi) = (\theta, \phi) - \nabla_{\theta, \phi} L \)
end

Get initial context frame \( x^0 \sim q(x^0) \);
for \( t = 1 \) to \( T \) do
    \( y^t_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \);
    for \( n = N \) to \( 1 \) do
        \( z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \);
        \( \epsilon_{\theta} = f_{\theta, \phi}(y^t_n, n, x^{<t}) \);
        \( \tilde{y}^t_n = y^t_n - \frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{1 - \alpha_n}} \epsilon_{\theta} \);
        \( y^t_{n-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_n}} \tilde{y}^t_n + \frac{1 - \alpha_{n-1}}{1 - \alpha_n} \beta_n z \);
    end
    \( x^t = \sigma \odot y^t_0 + \mu_\phi(x^{<t}) \)
end
```

**Architecture** The backbone architecture design of the proposed model follows a modified Recurrent-ResNet-UNet \cite{3,20,21} with 2 downsample encoders side by side. The first encoder recurrently encodes the context information \( x^{<t} \) and the second one encodes the noisy residual \( y^t_n \). The encoded features are concatenated after each ResNet block to merge the information. The merged feature maps will be skip-connected to a decoder, which is symmetric to the encoder. For the autoregressive invertible transform, we leverage a much simpler Recurrent-ResNet-UNet architecture with only one encoder and fewer layers than the conditional denoising model to predict \( \mu_t \). Empirically, we find that \( \mu_t \) tends to produce a crude prediction with the most likely texture, while the diffusion model complements the details and corrects the misprediction that could be influenced by the stochasticity. See detailed neural network implementation in our supplemental materials.

### 4 Experiments

We compare Residual Video Diffusion model (RVD) against four strong baselines, including two GAN-based models and two VAEs, one of them being the current state of the art. We consider four different video datasets and consider both probabilistic and perceptual metrics. Our model achieves a new state of the art in terms of perceptual quality while being comparable with or better than the best-performing VAE in its forecasting ability.

#### 4.1 Datasets

We consider four video datasets of varying complexities and resolutions. Among the simpler datasets of frame dimensions of \( 64 \times 64 \), we consider the BAIR Robot Pushing arm dataset \cite{15} and KTH Actions \cite{42}. Amongst the high-resolution datasets (frame sizes of \( 128 \times 128 \)), we use Cityscape \cite{13}, a dataset involving urban street scenes, and a two-dimensional Simulation dataset for turbulent
flow of our own making that has been computed using the Lattice Boltzmann Method [11]. These datasets cover various complexities and dynamics, which can provide strong support to our evaluation results.

**Preprocessing.** For the KTH and BAIR datasets, we preprocess the videos as commonly proposed [14,33]. For Cityscape, we download the portion titled leftImg8bit_sequence_trainvaltest from their official website\(^1\). Each video is a 30-frame sequence from which we randomly select a sub-sequence. All the videos are center-cropped and downsampled to 128x128. For the simulation dataset, we use an LBM solver to simulate the flow of a fluid (with pre-specified bulk and shear viscosity and rate of flow) interacting with a solid circular object (with a given radius, located at a specific position within our viewing frame). We extract 10000 frames sampled every 128 ticks, using 8000 for training and 2000 for testing.

### 4.2 Training and Testing Details

The diffusion models are trained with 8 consecutive frames for all the datasets. The first 2 frames are used as context and the loss averaged over the remaining 6 frames. We set the batchsize to 4 for all high-resolution and 8 for all low-resolution datasets. The pixel values of all the video frames are normalized to \([-1, 1]\). The models are optimized using the Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of \(5 \times 10^{-5}\), which decays to \(2 \times 10^{-5}\) after 500,000 steps. All the models are trained with 800,000 gradient steps on NVIDIA RTX Titan. The number of diffusion and denoising steps is fixed to \(N = 1600\). In order to evaluate, we use 4 context frames for all methods and predict 16 future frames. Wherever applicable, these frames are recursively generated from the models.

### 4.3 Baseline Models

**SVG-LP** [14] is an established sequential VAE baseline. It leverages recurrent architectures in all of encoder, decoder, and prior to capture the dynamics in videos. We adapt the official implementation from the authors while replacing all the LSTM with ConvLSTM layers, which helps the model scale to different video resolutions.

**IVRNN** [8] is currently the state-of-the-art video-VAE model trained end-to-end from scratch. The model improves SVG by involving a hierarchy of latent variables. We use the official codebase to train the model.

**FutureGAN** [2] relies on an *encoder-decoder* GAN model that uses spatio-temporal 3D convolutions to process video tensors. In order to make the quality of the output more perceptually appealing, the paper employs the concept of progressively growing GANs. We use the official codebase to train the model.

\(^1\) [https://www.cityscapes-dataset.com/downloads/]
Retrospective Cycle GAN [27] employs a single generator that can predict both future and past frames given a context and enforces retrospective cycle constraints. Besides the usual discriminator that can identify fake frames, the method also introduces sequence discriminators to identify sequences containing the said fake frames. We used an available third-party implementation\(^{2}\).

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

We address two key aspects for determining the quality of generated sequences: perceptual quality and the models’ probabilistic forecasting ability. For the former, we adopt FVD [48] and LPIPS [56], while the latter is evaluated using a new extension of CRPS [34] that we propose for video evaluation.

Fréchet Video Distance (FVD) compares sample realism by calculating 2-Wasserstein distance between the ground truth video distribution and the distribution defined by the generative model. Typically, an I3D network pretrained on an action-recognition dataset is used to capture low dimensional feature representations, the distributions of which are used in the metric. Learned Per-

\(^{2}\)https://github.com/SaulZhang/Video_Prediction_ZOO/tree/master/RetrospectiveCycleGAN
ceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS), on the other hand, computes the L2 distance between deep embeddings across all the layers of a pretrained network which are then averaged spatially. The LPIPS score is calculated on the basis of individual frames and then averaged.

Apart from realism, it is also important that the generated sequence covers the full distribution of possible outcomes. Given the multi-modality of future video outcomes, such an evaluation is challenging. In this paper, we draw inspiration from Continuous Ranked Probability Score (CRPS), a forecasting metric typically associated with time-series data. We calculate CRPS for each pixel in every generated frame and then take an average both spatially and temporally. This results in a CRPS metric on marginal (i.e., pixel-level) distributions that scale well to high-dimensional data. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to suggest this metric for video. We also visualize this quantity spatially.

CRPS measures the agreement of a cumulative distribution function (CDF) \( F \) with an observation \( x \), \[ \text{CRPS}(F, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (F(z) - I\{x \leq z\})^2 \, dz, \] where \( I \) is the indicator function. In the context of our evaluation task, \( F \) is the CDF of a single pixel within a single future frame assigned by the generation model. CRPS measures how well this distribution matches the empirical CDF of the data, approximated by a single observed sample. The involved integral can be well approximated by a finite sum since we are dealing with standard 8-bit frames. We approximate \( F \) by an empirical CDF \( \hat{F}(z) = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} I\{X_s \leq z\} \); we stress that this does not require a likelihood model but only a set of \( S \) stochastically generated samples \( X_s \sim F \) from the model.

### 4.5 Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

Using the perceptual and probabilistic metrics mentioned above, we compare test set predictions of our video diffusion architecture against a wide range of baselines, which model underlying data density both explicitly and implicitly.

Table 1 lists all the metric scores for our model and the baselines. Our model performs best in all cases in terms of FVD. For LPIPS, our model also performs best in 3 out of 4 datasets. The perceptual performance is also verified visually in Figure 3, where RVD shows higher clarity on the generated frames and shows less blurriness in regions that are less predictable due to the fast motion.

For a more quantitative assessment, we reported CRPS scores in Table 1. These support that the proposed model can predict the future with higher accuracy on high-resolution videos than other models. Besides, we compute CRPS on the basis of individual frames. Figure 4 shows \( 1/\text{CRPS} \) (higher is better) as a function of the frame index, revealing a monotonically decreasing trend along the time axis. This follows our intuition that long-term predictions become worse over time for all models. Our method performs best in 3 out of 4 cases. We can resolve this score also spatially in the images, as we do in Figure 5. Areas of distributional disagreement within a frame are shown in blue (right). See supplemental materials for the generated videos on other datasets.
Fig. 4: Inverse CRPS scores (higher is better), measuring agreement between the predictive and empirical distributions of future frames as a function of the frame index. The best performances are obtained by RVD (proposed) and IVRNN. Scores also monotonically decrease as the predictions worsen over time.

4.6 Ablation Studies

We consider two ablations of our model. The first one studies the impact of applying the diffusion generative model for modeling residuals as opposed to directly predicting the next frames. The second ablation studies the impact of the number of frames that the model sees during training.

Modeling Residuals vs. Frames Our proposed method uses a denoising diffusion generative model to generate residuals to a deterministic next-state prediction (see Figure 2). A natural question arises whether this architecture is necessary or whether it could be simplified by directly generating the next frame \(x_t^0\) instead of the residual \(y_t^0\). To address this, we make the following adjustment. Since \(y_t^0\) and \(x_t^0\) have equal dimensions, the ablation can be realized by setting \(\mu^t = 0\) and \(\sigma = 1\). To distinguish from our proposed “Residual Video Diffusion” (RVD), we call this ablation “Video Diffusion” (VD). Note that this ablation can be considered a version of TimeGrad [38] applied to video.

Table 2 shows the results. Across all perceptual metrics, the residual model performs better on all data sets. In terms of CRPS, VD performs slightly better.
Fig. 5: Spatially-resolved CRPS metric (higher is better, see Section 4). We compare the performance of RVD (proposed) against IVRNN on predicting the 10th future frame of a video from CityScape. The right two images show the spatially-resolved CRPS scores. Darker areas point to larger disagreements. Our model exhibits less statistical disagreement with respect to the ground truth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FVD ↓</th>
<th>LPIPS ↓</th>
<th>CRPS ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>BAIR</td>
<td>Sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVD (ours)</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVRNN</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVG-LP</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RetroGAN</td>
<td>2503</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FutureGAN</td>
<td>4111</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Test set perceptual (FVD, LPIPS) and forecasting (CRPS) metrics, lower is better (see Section 4 for details).

on the simpler KTH and Bair datasets, but worse on the more complex Simulation and Cityscape data. We, therefore, confirm our earlier claims that modeling residuals over frames is crucial for obtaining good performance, especially on more complex high-resolution video.

**Influence of Training Sequence Length** We train both our diffusion model and IVRNN on video sequences of varying lengths. As Table 3 reveals, we find that the diffusion model maintains a robust performance, showing only a small degradation on significantly shorter sequences. In contrast, the performance of IVRNN seems to be more sensitive to the sequence length. We note that in most experiments, we outperform IVRNN even though we trained our model on shorter sequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FVD</th>
<th>LPIPS</th>
<th>CRPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>BAIR</td>
<td>Sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VD</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVD</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ablation study on the effects of modeling residuals (RVD, proposed) versus directly modeling future frames (VD). See Section 4.6 for more details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FVD</th>
<th>LPIPS</th>
<th>CRPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>BAIR</td>
<td>Sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVD(2+3)</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVD(2+6)</td>
<td><strong>1351</strong></td>
<td><strong>1272</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVRNN(4+4)</td>
<td>2754</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVRNN(4+8)</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Training with different sequence lengths, comparing RVD(proposed) and IVRNN. \((p+q)\) denotes \(p\) context frames and \(q\) future frames for prediction.

## 5 Discussion

We proposed “Residual Video Diffusion”, an extension of denoising diffusion probabilistic models to stochastically generating video. Drawing on insights from predictive coding and masked autoregressive flows, we introduced a temporally-conditioned diffusion probabilistic model to generate a residual to a deterministic next-frame prediction. We showed in our ablations that such residual prediction yields better results than directly predicting the next frame.

To demonstrate the power of our approach, we studied a variety of datasets of different degrees of complexity and resolution, including higher-dimensional and more complex ones than commonly used, such as Cityscape and a physics simulation dataset involving turbulent flow. We compared against two state-of-the-art VAE and two GAN baselines in terms of both perceptual and probabilistic forecasting metrics. We find that our method leads to a new state of the art in perceptual quality while being competitive with or better than state-of-the-art hierarchical VAEs in terms of probabilistic forecasting. Our results provide several promising directions and could improve world model-based RL approaches as well as neural video codecs.
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Appendix

A Optimization Objective Derivation

The following derivation closely follows Ho et al. [21] to derive the variational lower bound objective for our sequential generative model.

As in the main paper, let $x^{0:T}$ denote observed frames, and $y^{1:T}_{0:N}$ the variables associated with the diffusion process. Among them, only $y^{1:T}_{1:N}$ are latent variables, while $y^{1:T}_{0}$ are the observed scaled residuals, given by $y^{t}_{0} = \frac{x^{t} - \mu_{\theta}(x^{<t})}{\sigma}$ for $t = 1, ..., T$. The variational bound is as follows:

$$L = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}_{y^{t}_{1:N} \sim q(y^{t}_{0})}[ - \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y^{t}_{0} | x^{<t})}{q(y^{t}_{1:N} | y^{t}_{0}, x^{<t})}] = \mathbb{E}_{D} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}_{q}[ - \log \frac{p(y^{t}_{N})}{q(y^{t}_{N} | x^{t})} - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, x^{<t})}{q(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, x^{t})} - \log p_{\theta}(y^{t}_{0} | y^{t}_{1}, x^{<t})].$$ (11)

As follows, we will discuss the three terms in Eq. 11 separately.

The first term in Eq. 11, $- \log \frac{p(y^{t}_{N})}{q(y^{t}_{N} | x^{<t})}$, tries to match the $q(y^{t}_{N} | x^{<t})$ to the prior $p(y^{t}_{N}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$. The prior has a fixed variance and is centered around zero, while $q(y^{t}_{N} | x^{<t}) = \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{n}}y^{t}_{0}, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_{n})\mathbf{I})$. Because the variance of $q$ is also fixed, the only effect of the the first term is to pull $\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{n}}y^{t}_{0}$ towards zero. However, in practice, $\bar{\alpha}_{n} = \prod_{i=0}^{N}(1 - \beta_{i}) \approx 0$, and hence the effect of this term is very small. For simplicity, we therefore drop it.

To understand the third term in Eq. 11, we simplify

$$- \log p_{\theta}(y^{t}_{0} | y^{t}_{1}, x^{<t}) = \frac{1}{2\sigma_{1}}||x^{t} - \mu(x^{<t}) - \sigma M_{\theta}(y^{t}_{1}, x^{<t}, 1)||^2 + \text{const.},$$ (12)

Hence, this term matches the diffusion model’s output to the frame residual, which is also a special case of $L_{\text{mid}}$ we elaborate below.

It remains to simplify the second term in Eq. 11. To derive a parameterization for $L_{\text{mid}} := - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, x^{<t})}{q(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, x^{t})}$, we recognize that it is a KL divergence between two Gaussians with fixed variances:

$$q(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, x^{<t}) = q(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, y^{0}_{0}) = \mathcal{N}(y^{t}_{n-1}; M(y^{t}_{n}, y^{t}_{0}), \gamma_{n}\mathbf{I}),$$ (13)

$$p_{\theta}(y^{t}_{n-1} | y^{t}_{n}, x^{<t}) = \mathcal{N}(y^{t}_{n-1}; M_{\theta}(y^{t}_{n}, x^{<t}, n), \gamma_{n}\mathbf{I}).$$ (14)

Above we defined $M(y^{t}_{n}, y^{0}_{n}) = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{n-1} - \beta_{n}}}{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{n}}y^{t}_{0} + \frac{\sqrt{1 - \beta_{n}(1 - \alpha_{n-1})}}{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{n}}y^{t}_{n}$. The KL divergence can therefore be simplified as the L2 distance between the means of these two Gaussians:

$$L_{n}^{\text{mid}} = \frac{1}{2\gamma_{n}}||M(y^{t}_{n}, y^{0}_{n}) - M_{\theta}(y^{t}_{n}, x^{<t}, n)||^2$$ (15)
As $y^t_n$ always has a closed form when $y^t_0$ is given: $y^t_n = \sqrt{\alpha_n} y^t_0 + \sqrt{1-\alpha_n} \epsilon$ (See Section 3.1), we parameterize Eq 15 to the following form:

$$L_{mid}^n = \frac{1}{2\gamma_n} \| \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta_n}}(y^t_n - \frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_n}} \epsilon) - M_\theta(y^t_n, x^{<t}, n) \|^2. \quad (16)$$

It becomes apparent that $M_\theta$ is trying to predict $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta_n}}(y^t_n - \frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_n}} \epsilon)$. Equivalently, we can therefore predict $\epsilon$. To this end, we replace the parameterization $M_\theta$ by the following parameterization involving $f_\theta$:

$$L_{mid}^n = \frac{1}{2\gamma_n} \| \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta_n}}(y^t_n - \frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_n}} \epsilon) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta_n}}(y^t_n - \frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_n}} f_\theta(y^t_n, x^{<t}, n)) \|^2 \quad (17)$$

The resulting stochastic objective can be simplified by dropping all untrainable parameters, as suggested in [21]. As a result, one obtains the simplified objective

$$L_{mid}^n \equiv \| \epsilon - f_\theta(y^t_n(\phi), n, x^{<t}) \|^2, \quad (18)$$

which is the denoising score matching objective revealed in Eq. 9 of our paper.

**B Architecture**

Figure 6a shows the downsampling and a upsampling layers of the denoising module; Figure 6b shows the downsampling and upsampling layers of the transform module. In Table 4, Channel Dim is the dimension of the components in first downsampling layer of U-Net, while Denoising Multipliers are the channel dimension multipliers for subsequent downsampling layers (including the first layer). Channel Dim for the upsampling layer follows the reverse sequence. The detailed configurations of the network components are listed as follow:

- Each ResBlock leverages a standard implementation of the ResNet block with 3x3 kernel, LeakyReLU activation and Group Normalization.
- All ConvGRU modules use 3x3 kernel to deal with temporal information.
- We use 16 dimension 4 heads self-attention for each LinearAttention module.
- The denoising step $n$ is preprocessed with positional encoding and then added to ResBlocks (as in Figure 6a).

**C Additional Generated Samples**

In this section, we present some qualitative results from our study for some additional datasets apart from CityScape. More specifically, we present some
Table 4: Configuration Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolutions</th>
<th>Channel Dim</th>
<th>Denoising Multipliers</th>
<th>Transform Multipliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64×64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,2,4,8</td>
<td>1,2,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128×128</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,1,2,2,4,4</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6: Architectures. $L$ denotes the number of U-Net downsampling/upsampling layers, which is equal to the length of the Multipliers sequences in Table 4.

examples from our Simulation data, BAIR Robot Pushing data and KTH Actions data. In the following figures, the top row consists of ground truth frames, both contextual and predictive, while the subsequent rows are the generated frames from our method and some other VAE and GAN baselines. It is quite
evident that our method and IVRNN are the strongest contenders. Perceptually, the FVD metric indicates that we outperform on every dataset, whereas statistically, the CRPS metric shows our top performance on high-resolution datasets and competitive performance against IVRNN on the other two datasets.

Fig. 7: Prediction Quality for Simulation data. Top row indicates the ground truth, wherein we feed 4 frames as context (from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$) and predict the next 16 frames (from $t = 4$ to $t = 19$). This is a high-resolution dataset ($128 \times 128$) which we generated using a Lattice Boltzmann Solver. It simulates the von Kármán vortex street using Navier-Stokes equations. A fluid (with pre-specified viscosity) flows through a 2D plane interacting with a circular obstacle placed at the center-left. This leads to the formation of a repeating pattern of swirling vortices, caused by a process known as vortex shedding, which is responsible for the unsteady separation of flow of fluid around blunt bodies. Colors indicate the vorticity of the solution to the simulation.
Fig. 8: Prediction Quality for BAIR Robot Pushing. As seen before, the top row indicates the ground truth, wherein we feed 4 frames as context (from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$) and predict the next 16 frames (from $t = 4$ to $t = 19$). This is a low-resolution dataset ($64 \times 64$) that captures the motion of a robotic hand as it manipulates multiple objects. Temporal consistency and occlusion handling are some of the big challenges for this dataset.
Fig. 9: Prediction Quality for KTH Actions. As seen before, the top row indicates the ground truth, wherein we feed 4 frames as context (from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$), but unlike other datasets, we only predict the next 12 frames (from $t = 4$ to $t = 15$).