



Stream-R1: Reliability-Perplexity Aware Reward Distillation for Streaming Video Generation

Bin Wu¹ Mengqi Huang^{1,†,‡} Shaojin Wu^{3,‡}
Weinan Jia¹ Yuxin Wang² Zhendong Mao¹ Yongdong Zhang¹

¹University of Science and Technology of China ²FrameX.AI ³Independent Researcher

[†]Corresponding author [‡]Project lead

Abstract

Distillation-based acceleration has become the foundational technique for making autoregressive streaming video diffusion models practical, with distribution matching distillation as the de facto choice. However, existing methods train the student to match the teacher’s output in an indiscriminative manner, treating every rollout, every frame, and every pixel as equally reliable supervision. We argue that this indiscriminative treatment caps the upper bound of distilled quality because it overlooks two complementary axes of variance in the DMD supervision signal: *Inter-Reliability* across different student rollouts on which the supervision varies in reliability, and *Intra-Perplexity* across spatial regions and temporal frames that contribute unequally to where the current quality can still be improved. The distillation objective thus implicitly conflates two distinct questions under a single uniform weight: whether to learn from each rollout, and where to concentrate optimization within each rollout. To address this, we propose Stream-R1, a Reliability-Perplexity Aware Reward Distillation framework that adaptively reweights the distillation objective at both the rollout level and the spatiotemporal-element level through a single shared reward-guided mechanism. At the Inter-Reliability level, Stream-R1 rescales each rollout’s loss by an exponential of a pretrained video reward score, so that rollouts on which the DMD supervision is reliable dominate the gradient signal. At the Intra-Perplexity level, it back-propagates the same reward model to extract per-pixel gradient saliency, which is factored into spatial and temporal weights that concentrate optimization pressure on the regions and frames where further refinement yields the largest expected gain. An adaptive balancing mechanism further prevents any single quality axis from dominating across visual quality, motion quality, and text alignment. Stream-R1 attains consistent improvements on all three quality dimensions over distillation baselines on standard streaming video generation benchmarks, without architectural modification to the student and at no additional inference cost.

Date: May 6, 2026

Project Page: <https://stream-r1.github.io>

Correspondence: Mengqi Huang at huangmq@ustc.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Recent advances in video diffusion models [18, 27, 36, 41] have driven text-to-video generation to unprecedented visual quality. However, their reliance on multi-step denoising over a fixed temporal window imposes prohibitive




Figure 1 Motivation of Stream-R1. (a) The DMD supervision signal exhibits two complementary axes of variance: *Inter-Reliability* across different rollouts, and *Intra-Perplexity* across spatiotemporal regions within each rollout. (b) The existing DMD paradigm assigns uniform sample preference to all rollouts and uniform optimization intensity to all regions, regardless of their reliability or perplexity. (c) Our reliability-perplexity aware DMD upweights rollouts on which the supervision is reliable and concentrates higher optimization intensity on regions where further refinement yields the largest expected gain, all driven by a single reward model.

inference cost and precludes streaming interactivity as well as scalable long-video synthesis. Autoregressive streaming video diffusion models [3, 4, 13, 39] have emerged as a promising remedy, converting bidirectional architectures into causal generators that produce frames sequentially and, in principle, support unbounded video generation. To further make this paradigm practical, distillation-based acceleration [20, 35, 38] compresses the expensive multi-step teacher into an efficient few-step student, with distribution matching distillation (DMD) [38] emerging as the de facto choice. Despite their diverse designs, these distillation-driven streaming video generation methods all revolve around the same key challenge: *how to effectively align the student’s output distribution with the high-quality mode of a multi-step teacher’s distribution*, so that the student can inherit the teacher’s generative fidelity while operating under a causal, streaming regime.

Existing efforts toward this goal can be broadly organized into two complementary directions. The first augments the distillation *objective* with additional supervisory signals: DMD2 [37] introduces a GAN discriminator trained on real videos to compensate for the mode-covering bias of the teacher’s score. The second reshapes the *rollout* on which distillation is performed: Self-Forcing [13] trains the student on its own autoregressive rollouts to close the train-test distribution gap, while LongLive [35] further scales this idea to minute-long generation through memory mechanisms and chunk-level objectives. Despite differing in *where* they intervene, these approaches share a fundamental commonality: they all minimize the per-instance distribution discrepancy between student and teacher outputs in an *indiscriminative* manner. Every rollout, every frame, and every pixel is matched against the teacher with equal weight, and the distillation objective implicitly treats the supervision signal on every element as equally reliable.

We argue that this paradigm of indiscriminative distillation inherently overlooks two complementary axes of variance in the DMD supervision signal, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a): *Inter-Reliability*, the variation in supervision reliability across different student rollouts, and *Intra-Perplexity*, borrowing the term from language modeling to denote the variation across spatiotemporal regions in how much further refinement can still improve the underlying quality within each individual rollout. *Inter-Reliability* arises because the DMD gradient $g = f_{\text{fake}} - f_{\text{real}}$ is itself an estimate, and its reliability varies substantially across student rollouts.

The teacher-derived f_{real} is fundamentally a conditional denoiser rather than a generator: it provides a local correction whose direction is determined by where the input already lies, not by where high-quality samples globally reside. When a student rollout already lies near the teacher’s high-quality mode, f_{real} produces a correction that points within that mode and g faithfully reflects the residual gap that the student should close. When a rollout falls far from this mode, f_{real} can only produce a correction toward the low-quality region the sample originated from, and g on such rollouts encodes a within-low-quality refinement rather than a path toward the high-quality mode. The online-trained f_{fake} exhibits an analogous dependence on the student’s current distribution. Existing DMD methods average g with equal weight across all rollouts, conflating these two regimes and diluting the fraction of supervision that genuinely points toward the high-quality mode. *Intra-Perplexity*, in contrast, arises because within a single rollout different spatial regions and temporal frames contribute unequally to where the current quality can still be improved. Some regions still lie far from the high-quality mode and yield large quality gains under further refinement, while others have already approached this mode locally and yield diminishing returns. As shown in Fig. 1(b), existing methods apply an indiscriminative loss across all pixels and frames, spending optimization budget on regions where the reward has already saturated while leaving high-perplexity regions under-supervised. Taken together, these two axes suggest that the distillation objective should not be governed by a single uniform weight, but rather by two complementary questions: *whether* the supervision on each rollout is reliable enough to learn from, and *where* to concentrate optimization within each rollout.

Guided by these two questions, we propose Stream-R1, illustrated in Fig. 1(c), a reliability-perplexity aware distribution matching distillation framework that adaptively reweights the DMD objective at both the rollout level and the spatiotemporal-element level through a single reward-guided mechanism. At the *Inter-Reliability* level, Stream-R1 evaluates each rollout with a pretrained video reward model and rescales its distillation loss by an exponential of the resulting score, so that rollouts on which the DMD supervision is reliable dominate the gradient signal. At the *Intra-Perplexity* level, Stream-R1 back-propagates the same reward model to obtain a per-pixel gradient saliency volume, which serves as a perplexity signal: regions with higher saliency correspond to content where the reward score is currently most sensitive to small perturbations, indicating that the local reward landscape has not yet flattened. The saliency is factorized into spatial and temporal components and composed into a per-element weighting on the DMD loss, concentrating optimization pressure where further refinement yields the largest expected gain. To prevent any single quality dimension from dominating the supervision, both the Inter-Reliability score and the Intra-Perplexity saliency aggregate three complementary axes—visual quality, motion quality, and text alignment—and are adaptively fused according to the current improvement trajectory of each axis. As a result, Stream-R1 retains the tractability of the DMD objective while replacing its uniform weighting with reliability-perplexity aware guidance that requires no architectural change to the student and adds no cost at inference time.

Conceptual contribution. We reformulate DMD-based distillation for autoregressive streaming video generation as a *reliability-perplexity aware* process. We identify that prevailing methods match every rollout, every frame, and every pixel against the teacher with equal weight, and we argue that this indiscriminative treatment overlooks two complementary axes of variance in the DMD supervision signal: Inter-Reliability across rollouts and Intra-Perplexity within each rollout. Both axes must be addressed for the student to converge toward the teacher’s high-quality mode.

Technical contribution. We instantiate this formulation as Stream-R1, a unified reward-guided framework that derives both an Inter-Reliability weight and an Intra-Perplexity weight from a single pretrained video reward model, with adaptive balancing across visual quality, motion quality, and text alignment. Stream-R1 attains consistent improvements on all three quality dimensions over DMD-based baselines on standard streaming video generation benchmarks, without any architectural modification to the student and at no additional inference cost.

2 Related Work

2.1 Streaming Video Generation

Video diffusion models [10, 18, 32, 36] have achieved remarkable results in visual synthesis, yet their reliance on multi-step denoising over fixed-length temporal windows limits both inference efficiency and temporal scalability.

To overcome these constraints, a growing body of work reformulates video generation as autoregressive diffusion, enabling streaming, frame-by-frame synthesis that can in principle extend to arbitrary temporal horizons [3, 5, 7, 12, 19, 40]. Pyramidal-Flow [17] employs multi-scale flow matching to reduce the computational burden of long sequences; SkyReels-V2 [4] integrates diffusion forcing with structural planning for scalable synthesis; FAR [8] combines short- and long-term contexts via flexible positional encoding; and MAGI-1 [30] adopts chunk-wise prediction for scalable autoregressive generation. A complementary line of work accelerates inference through distillation. Distribution matching distillation (DMD) [38] compresses multi-step teacher inference into few-step student generation by minimizing their output distribution divergence. CausVid [20] extends this framework to causal video generation by reformulating bidirectional diffusion as autoregressive generation through distribution matching. Self-Forcing [13] further addresses the train-test discrepancy in autoregressive distillation by feeding the model’s own predictions as context during training rather than ground-truth latents. LongLive [35] extends this paradigm through KV recaching and stream-based fine-tuning for long video generation, while Rolling-Forcing [23] introduces joint denoising for simultaneous multi-frame processing. Despite significant advances in efficiency and temporal extent, these methods all learn from the teacher in an indiscriminative manner, applying uniform optimization pressure to every rollout, every spatial region, and every temporal frame. This treatment overlooks two sources of variance in the DMD supervision signal: across rollouts, the gradient varies in how reliably it points toward the teacher’s high-quality mode; within each rollout, spatial regions and temporal frames vary in how much further refinement can still raise the quality.

2.2 Reinforcement Learning for Visual Generation

Reinforcement learning (RL) has emerged as a principled framework for optimizing non-differentiable objectives and aligning generative models with human preferences, achieving transformative success in large language models [9, 26, 28, 29] and increasingly in visual generation [2, 34]. Several efforts focus on building specialized reward models and preference datasets for visual content. VideoReward [22], VideoScore [11], and VisionReward [33] provide multi-dimensional quality scores spanning visual fidelity, motion coherence, and semantic alignment, serving as optimization targets for downstream training. On the algorithmic side, direct preference optimization (DPO) has been extended from language models to image [16, 31] and video [24] diffusion models, learning directly from pairwise preference data without explicit reward modeling. Policy gradient methods such as Flow-GRPO [21] adapt group relative policy optimization to flow matching, enabling online RL fine-tuning for improved compositional accuracy. Reward Forcing [25] combines reward feedback with distribution matching distillation, reweighting the distillation loss by the exponential of a scalar reward to bias the student toward higher-quality regions of the generation manifold. Whereas prior reward-guided methods primarily use the reward to fine-tune the generator end-to-end or to filter training data, our work brings the reward signal directly into the DMD distillation objective at two complementary levels: an Inter-Reliability scalar weight that modulates each rollout’s contribution to the loss, and an Intra-Perplexity per-element weight derived from the reward gradient that concentrates optimization on regions and frames where further refinement yields the largest expected gain.

3 Methodology

We first introduce the preliminaries on reward-guided video distillation. We then present the four key components of Stream-R1 in turn: Inter-Reliability score extraction in Sec. 3.2, adaptive gradient-saliency combination in Sec. 3.3, spatiotemporal saliency decomposition in Sec. 3.4, and balanced multi-dimensional reward in Sec. 3.5. An overview of Stream-R1 is illustrated in Fig. 2.

3.1 Preliminary

Video Diffusion Distillation. Given a pretrained video diffusion teacher ϵ_θ , distillation methods train a student generator G_ϕ to produce high-quality videos in significantly fewer denoising steps. In the distribution matching distillation (DMD) framework, the student learns to match the output distribution of the teacher by minimizing a KL-divergence-based objective. Concretely, given a text prompt c , the student generates a clean latent $\mathbf{x}_0 = G_\phi(c)$. A noisy version $\mathbf{x}_t$ is constructed by adding noise at a randomly sampled timestep t ,




Figure 2 Overview of Stream-R1. (a) The fake rollout from G_θ is scored by DMD networks $f_{\text{fake}}, f_{\text{Real}}$ and the Stream R1 module; the distillation signal is modulated by an Inter-Reliability weight w_{inter} and an intra-instance weight W_{intra} to form $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stream-R1}} = W_{\text{inter}} \cdot (W_{\text{intra}} \odot \mathcal{L}_{\text{DMD}})$. **Bottom:** Inside the Stream R1 module, (b) **Inter-Reliability Score Extraction** produces a scalar reward R_{score} for w_{inter} and per-axis saliencies $s_{\text{VQ/MQ/TA}}$; (c) **Adaptive Gradient-Saliency Combination** fuses the three saliencies into a unified map; (d) **Spatiotemporal Decomposition** factorizes the map into spatial and temporal weights to form W_{intra} . A single reward model drives both weights.

and a pair of critic networks f_{real} and f_{fake} estimate the score functions of the real and fake distributions, respectively. The distillation gradient is computed as:

$$\mathbf{g} = f_{\text{fake}}(\mathbf{x}_t, c) - f_{\text{real}}(\mathbf{x}_t, c), \quad (1)$$

and the base distillation loss takes the form:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DMD}} = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \text{sg}(\mathbf{x}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{g}})\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ denotes the normalized gradient and $\text{sg}(\cdot)$ is the stop-gradient operator.

3.2 Inter-Reliability Weighting

In DMD, the student is supervised by the gradient $g = f_{\text{fake}} - f_{\text{real}}$ on each generated rollout, but g is itself an estimate whose reliability varies substantially across rollouts. The teacher-derived f_{real} is fundamentally a conditional denoiser: it provides a local correction whose direction is determined by where the input already lies, not by where high-quality samples globally reside. When a student rollout already lies near the teacher’s high-quality mode, f_{real} produces a correction that points within that mode and g faithfully reflects the residual gap the student should close. When a rollout falls far from this mode, f_{real} can only produce a correction toward the low-quality region the sample originated from, and g on such rollouts encodes a within-low-quality refinement rather than a path toward the high-quality mode. The online-trained f_{fake} exhibits an analogous dependence on the student’s current distribution. Existing DMD methods average g with equal weight across all rollouts, conflating these two regimes and diluting the fraction of supervision that genuinely points toward the high-quality mode. We address this Inter-Reliability variance by assigning each rollout a per-sample loss multiplier that grows with its overall reward, so that rollouts on which the DMD supervision is reliable contribute more strongly while those encoding only within-low-quality refinement are attenuated.

Concretely, we query a pretrained video reward model on the student-generated rollout $\mathbf{V}$ and aggregate its per-dimension scalar rewards $\{r_d\}_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$ into a single balanced overall reward r_{final} , as defined in Eq. (12). The reward score serves as a proxy for supervision reliability: rollouts in the reward model’s high-scoring region lie within the teacher’s high-quality mode where f_{real} has been densely trained and the student distribution has stabilized, so g on these rollouts more faithfully reflects the true KL gradient. We convert this scalar into a per-sample loss multiplier through an exponential reweighting:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{inter}} = \exp(\beta \cdot r_{\text{final}}), \quad (3)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a temperature controlling the sharpness of the reweighting. Because the exponential is monotonically increasing in r_{final} , rollouts on which g is reliable dominate the gradient signal, biasing the optimizer toward updates supported by accurate score estimates rather than within-low-quality refinements.

3.3 Adaptive Gradient-Saliency Combination

The Inter-Reliability weight $\mathbf{W}_{\text{inter}}$ accounts for variance *across* rollouts, but it leaves variance *within* each individual rollout unaddressed. Different spatial regions and temporal frames within the same rollout contribute unequally to where the current quality can still be improved: some regions are far from the high-quality mode and yield large gains under further refinement, while others have already approached their local optimum and yield diminishing returns. Applying a uniform per-element loss across all pixels and frames therefore wastes optimization budget on regions where the reward has already saturated and under-supervises regions with substantial improvement potential. We address this Intra-Perplexity variance by deriving a per-element weight that localizes optimization pressure on the spatiotemporal regions where further refinement yields the largest expected gain.

A natural source of such localization is the reward model itself. When the model evaluates a generated video, each input pixel contributes differently to the local reward landscape, and the gradient of the score with respect to the input naturally encodes this contribution. Regions with large gradient magnitudes are those where the reward score is currently most sensitive to small perturbations, indicating both that the reward landscape has not yet flattened in that region and that targeted optimization there would most significantly raise the quality. Existing reward-guided distillation treats the reward as an opaque scalar and discards this rich spatial and temporal information; we recover it by back-propagating through the reward model.

Formally, given the student-generated video $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times H \times W \times 3}$ and a quality dimension $d \in \{\text{VQ}, \text{MQ}, \text{TA}\}$, the reward model R_d maps $\mathbf{V}$ to a scalar score $r_d = R_d(\mathbf{V})$. We compute the per-axis saliency map by back-propagating through R_d and taking the absolute gradient with respect to the input pixels:

$$\mathbf{S}^{(d)} = \left| \frac{\partial R_d(\mathbf{V})}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \right| \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times H \times W}, \quad (4)$$

where the absolute value aggregates positive and negative sensitivities into a unified magnitude of local reward sensitivity. This computation requires only a single backward pass through the reward model per quality dimension, introducing negligible overhead relative to the diffusion model’s own forward and backward passes.

Different quality dimensions assess complementary aspects of the generated video, and their saliency maps naturally highlight different spatiotemporal regions. Combining these per-dimension maps into a unified guide is therefore essential for comprehensive quality optimization. We adopt an adaptive combination strategy that dynamically adjusts the contribution of each dimension based on its current reward score, allocating proportionally greater attention to dimensions with lower scores that exhibit larger room for improvement:

$$\alpha_d = \frac{\exp(-r_d/\tau)}{\sum_{d'} \exp(-r_{d'}/\tau)}, \quad \mathbf{S}_{\text{combined}} = \sum_d \alpha_d \cdot \mathbf{S}^{(d)}, \quad (5)$$

where r_d is the current scalar reward for dimension d and τ is a temperature parameter controlling the sharpness of the allocation. When $\tau \rightarrow 0$, the combination reduces to selecting the saliency map of the worst-performing dimension; when $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, it degenerates to uniform averaging. In practice, moderate values of τ yield a smooth blend that prioritizes the weakest dimension while retaining cues from all dimensions, enabling the optimizer to address multiple quality deficiencies through a single unified saliency map.

3.4 Spatiotemporal Saliency Decomposition

The combined saliency volume $\mathbf{S}_{\text{combined}} \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times H \times W}$ jointly encodes both within-frame spatial structure and across-frame temporal structure of reward sensitivity. Directly normalizing this volume globally would entangle these two factors: a frame with globally high saliency would dominate the weight map regardless of its internal spatial structure. To disentangle these effects, we propose a factored decomposition that separately normalizes the spatial and temporal components before composing them into a unified weight $\mathbf{W}_{\text{intra}}$.

Temporal Weight Extraction. We extract the per-frame saliency by averaging over spatial dimensions:

$$\mathbf{p}_f = \frac{1}{HW} \sum_{h,w} \mathbf{S}_{\text{combined}}[f, h, w], \quad f \in \{1, \dots, F\}. \quad (6)$$

The resulting temporal profile $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^F$ is then normalized via min-max scaling and clamped to a minimum weight $\tau_{\min}$ to prevent any frame from being entirely suppressed:

$$\hat{p}_f = \frac{p_f - p_{\min}}{p_{\max} - p_{\min}}, \quad w_f^{(t)} = \max(\hat{p}_f, \tau_{\min}). \quad (7)$$

The temporal weights are then mean-normalized such that $\frac{1}{F} \sum_f w_f^{(t)} = 1$, ensuring that the overall loss magnitude is preserved.

Spatial Weight Extraction. For spatial weights, we perform per-frame normalization independently, so that each frame’s internal spatial structure is preserved regardless of its global saliency magnitude:

$$\hat{s}_{f,h,w} = \frac{s_{f,h,w} - s_f^{\min}}{s_f^{\max} - s_f^{\min}}, \quad w_{f,h,w}^{(s)} = \max(\hat{s}_{f,h,w}, \sigma_{\min}), \quad (8)$$

where $s_f^{\min}$ and $s_f^{\max}$ denote the minimum and maximum saliency values within frame f . Each frame’s spatial weights are independently mean-normalized to 1.

Composition. The final per-element weight map is obtained by multiplying the temporal and spatial components, followed by a global mean-normalization:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{intra}}[f, h, w] = \frac{w_f^{(t)} \cdot w_{f,h,w}^{(s)}}{\frac{1}{FW} \sum_{f',h',w'} w_{f',h',w'}^{(t)} \cdot w_{f',h',w'}^{(s)}}. \quad (9)$$

This factored design offers two advantages. First, it allows the temporal and spatial components to operate at different granularities: the temporal weights modulate the contribution of entire frames, while the spatial weights refine the within-frame distribution. Second, the independent per-frame spatial normalization ensures that every frame retains a meaningful internal contrast, even if its overall saliency magnitude is low.

3.5 Balanced Multi-Dimensional Reward

When optimizing across multiple quality dimensions simultaneously, a naïve summation of rewards risks unbalanced improvement, where the optimizer disproportionately focuses on whichever dimension yields the easiest gains while neglecting others. To address this, we introduce a balance penalty that discourages divergent improvement trajectories across dimensions.

We maintain a sliding window of size N tracking the per-dimension reward history. At each optimization step, we compute the improvement for each dimension d as the difference between its recent and baseline average rewards:

$$\Delta_d = \bar{r}_d^{\text{recent}} - \bar{r}_d^{\text{baseline}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\bar{r}_d^{\text{baseline}}$ and $\bar{r}_d^{\text{recent}}$ are computed from the first and second halves of the history window, respectively. The balance penalty is defined as the standard deviation of improvements across dimensions:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{bal}} = \text{std}(\{\Delta_d\}_{d \in \mathcal{D}}), \quad (11)$$

which is subtracted from the base reward with a weighting coefficient λ :

$$r_{\text{final}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_d r_d - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{P}_{\text{bal}}. \quad (12)$$

The penalty is activated only after a warmup period of N steps to allow initial reward estimates to stabilize. Two mechanisms jointly enforce balanced improvement: the per-dimension softmax weights α_d in Eq. (5) directly redistribute saliency toward dimensions with currently lower scores, while the standard-deviation penalty $\mathcal{P}_{\text{bal}}$ globally suppresses the effective reward whenever improvement trajectories diverge across dimensions. Together they discourage the optimizer from over-fitting any single quality axis.

3.6 Overall Objective

Combining all components, the final Stream-R1 generator loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stream-R1}} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W}_{\text{inter}} \cdot \text{mean} \left(\mathbf{W}_{\text{intra}} \odot \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \text{sg}(\mathbf{x}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{g}})\|^2 \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{\text{inter}}$ is the Inter-Reliability weight from Eq. (3), $\mathbf{W}_{\text{intra}} \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times H \times W}$ is the Intra-Perplexity weight map from Eq. (9), and $\odot$ denotes element-wise multiplication. The weight map $\mathbf{W}_{\text{intra}}$ is broadcast across the channel dimension to match the latent shape. The spatial saliency computation requires only a single backward pass through the reward model per training step, introducing negligible computational overhead relative to the diffusion model forward and backward passes, and adds zero cost at inference time.

4 Experiments




Figure 3 Qualitative comparison on long video generation. For each pair, the top row is Reward Forcing and the bottom row is Stream-R1.

4.1 Implementation Details

Stream-R1 is built upon the Reward Forcing [25] framework, using Wan2.1-T2V-1.3B [32] as the student generator and Wan2.1-T2V-14B as the teacher model to generate 5-second videos at 832×480 resolution. The model is initialized from a pretrained ODE regression checkpoint trained on 16k ODE solution pairs sampled from the base model, following CausVid [20]. Text prompts for training are drawn from the filtered

VidProM dataset, augmented with LLM-based prompt rewriting. Denoising is performed chunk-wise using 3 latent frames per chunk, with denoising steps set to [1000, 750, 500, 250] and an attention window size of 9.

For Stream-R1-specific components, we enable gradient-based spatial saliency computation at the pixel level across all three quality dimensions (VQ, MQ, TA) with adaptive combination ($\tau = 1.0$). Factored spatiotemporal decomposition is applied with spatial minimum weight $\sigma_{\min} = 0.15$ and temporal minimum weight $\tau_{\min} = 0.20$. The reward mode is set to Overall (average of VQ, MQ, TA) with inverse temperature $\beta = 2.0$.

Training runs for 1,000 optimizer steps on 8 A100 GPUs with a per-GPU batch size of 1 and gradient accumulation over 8 steps, yielding an effective batch size of 64. The AdamW optimizer is adopted with learning rates of 2.0×10^{-6} for the generator G_θ and 4.0×10^{-7} for the fake score s_{fake} , updating the generator every 5 steps and adjusting the fake score accordingly. EMA is applied with a decay weight of 0.99 starting from step 200. The total training time is approximately 56 hours.

4.2 Comparison with State-of-the-Art

Short video generation. We generate 5-second videos using 946 official VBench [14] prompts, rewritten using Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct [15] following Self Forcing [13], each sampled with 5 different seeds for comprehensive quality assessment. We benchmark our method against representative open-source video generation models of comparable scale, including diffusion-based methods (LTX-Video [10], Wan2.1 [32]), autoregressive and streaming models (SkyReels-V2 [4], MAGI-1 [30], NOVA [6], Pyramid Flow [17], CausVid [20], Self Forcing [13], LongLive [35], Rolling Forcing [23]), and reward-guided distillation (Reward Forcing) [25]. As shown in Tab. 1,

Model	Params	FPS↑	VBench Scores ↑		
			Total	Quality	Semantic
<i>Diffusion models</i>					
LTX-Video [10]	1.9B	8.98	80.00	82.30	70.79
Wan2.1 [32]	1.3B	0.78	84.26	85.30	80.09
<i>Autoregressive / streaming models</i>					
SkyReels-V2 [4]	1.3B	0.49	82.67	84.70	74.53
MAGI-1 [30]	4.5B	0.19	79.18	82.04	67.74
NOVA [6]	0.6B	0.88	80.12	80.39	79.05
Pyramid Flow [17]	2B	6.7	81.72	84.74	69.62
CausVid [20]	1.3B	17.0	82.88	83.93	78.69
Self Forcing [13]	1.3B	17.0	83.80	84.59	80.64
LongLive [35]	1.3B	20.7	83.22	83.68	<u>81.37</u>
Rolling Forcing [23]	1.3B	17.5	81.22	84.08	69.78
<i>Reward-guided distillation</i>					
Reward Forcing [25]	1.3B	23.1	<u>84.13</u>	84.84	81.32
Stream-R1 (Ours)	1.3B	23.1	84.40	<u>85.14</u>	81.44

Table 1 Short video performance comparison with baselines. Best results in **bold**, second-best underlined. All methods generate 5-second videos at 832×480 . Among autoregressive and streaming models, Stream-R1 achieves the highest Quality score. Notably, despite being distilled into a 4-step model, Stream-R1 surpasses its own multi-step diffusion teacher Wan2.1 in both Total and Semantic scores, demonstrating that reward-guided distillation can push the student beyond the teacher’s quality frontier.


Stream-R1 achieves the highest Total score of 84.40 among all compared methods, surpassing both the full multi-step diffusion baseline Wan2.1 (84.26) and the previous best distilled model Reward Forcing (84.13). Among all autoregressive and streaming models, Stream-R1 attains the highest Quality score (85.14), and on the Semantic axis, Stream-R1 achieves the best score of 81.44 across all methods, outperforming LongLive (81.37) and Reward Forcing (81.32).

Compared directly against Reward Forcing, which applies a global scalar reward and serves as our baseline, Stream-R1 improves Total, Quality, and Semantic scores simultaneously (+0.27, +0.30, +0.12), validating

that spatiotemporal reward localization enables more targeted optimization without any additional inference cost. The Quality improvement is particularly noteworthy: Stream-R1 closes over 60% of the gap between Reward Forcing (84.84) and the full diffusion teacher Wan2.1 (85.30).

A striking observation is that Stream-R1, as a 4-step distilled model, surpasses its own multi-step diffusion teacher Wan2.1 in Total (84.40 vs. 84.26) and Semantic (81.44 vs. 80.09) scores while running at $30\times$ higher inference speed. This challenges the conventional view that distillation inevitably trades quality for speed. Through reward-guided distribution matching, the student is not merely compressed toward the teacher’s output distribution, but actively steered toward higher-reward regions of the generation manifold. Stream-R1 further amplifies this effect by concentrating the reward signal on high-perplexity regions, enabling the optimizer to discover quality improvements that uniform global weighting overlooks.

Long video generation. Following the evaluation protocol of Reward Forcing [25], we generate videos at five durations (10s, 30s, 60s, 120s, 180s) using the first 128 prompts from MovieGen Video Bench with autoregressive block-wise generation and EMA-Sink attention.



Per-metric quality comparison at varying video lengths

Figure 4 Per-metric quality comparison at varying video lengths. Stream-R1 (blue) consistently outperforms Reward Forcing (orange) across all six metrics at every duration. The advantage widens as video length increases, particularly at 120s and 180s, confirming that spatiotemporal reward-guided weighting mitigates the quality drift accumulated during long autoregressive rollouts.

As shown in Fig. 4, Stream-R1 outperforms Reward Forcing on all six VBench metrics across every evaluated duration. Two observations stand out. First, Stream-R1 achieves consistently higher absolute scores on subject consistency, background consistency, imaging quality, motion smoothness, and aesthetic quality, while maintaining lower drift throughout. Second, and more importantly, the performance gap *widens* as the video length grows: at 10s the two methods are relatively close, but by 120s and 180s Stream-R1 retains notably higher quality while Reward Forcing degrades more steeply. This widening gap confirms that spatiotemporal reward-guided weighting not only improves per-frame quality but also slows the rate of quality collapse along the temporal axis, a direct benefit of the temporal weighting component that prevents artifacts from propagating into subsequent chunks.

VLM-based evaluation. Following Reward Forcing [25], we additionally employ Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B-Instruct [1] to evaluate long video generation quality, scoring each of the 128 videos from 1 to 5 on visual quality, motion dynamics, and text alignment. As shown in Tab. 2, Stream-R1 attains the highest Visual Quality and Text Alignment among all compared methods, with overall scores that remain competitive across the three axes. This balanced profile is consistent with the design of the multi-dimensional reward, which distributes optimization across visual quality, motion, and text alignment rather than concentrating on any

single one.

Model	Visual $\uparrow$	Dynamic $\uparrow$	Text $\uparrow$
SkyReels-V2 [4]	3.30	3.05	2.70
CausVid [20]	<u>4.66</u>	3.16	3.32
Self Forcing [13]	3.89	3.44	3.11
LongLive [35]	4.79	3.81	3.98
Reward Forcing [25]	4.82	4.18	<u>4.04</u>
Stream-R1 (Ours)	4.92	<u>4.04</u>	4.11

Table 2 VLM-based evaluation on 60-second videos. Qwen3-VL scores across three quality dimensions. Best in **bold**, second-best underlined.

Human preference evaluation. To complement automated metrics, we conduct a human preference study on 50 long videos (60s). Annotators are presented with anonymized A/B pairs from Reward Forcing and Stream-R1 and asked to judge five dimensions: temporal consistency, dynamic reasonableness, visual quality, text alignment, and overall preference. As shown in Tab. 3, Stream-R1 is preferred on all five dimensions, with the largest margins on Dynamic Reasonableness (63.0%) and Visual Quality (60.0%). Human judgment provides a complementary perspective to automated metrics, since flow-based dynamics scores do not distinguish camera motion from subject motion, while perceived motion quality is what evaluators assess directly.

Dimension	Win	Tie	Lose	Win Rate
Temporal Consistency	25	1	24	51.0%
Dynamic Reasonableness	30	3	17	63.0%
Visual Quality & Aesthetics	29	2	19	60.0%
Text-Video Alignment	22	9	18	54.1%
Overall Preference	28	1	21	57.0%

Table 3 Human preference evaluation. Win rate (%) of Stream-R1 vs. Reward Forcing on 50 long videos (60s), judged by 5 annotators. Win Rate = (Win + 0.5 $\times$ Tie) / Total.

4.3 Ablation study.

We progressively add each proposed component on top of the distribution matching distillation baseline (i.e., without reward feedback) and evaluate on both short (VBench 946) and long (60-second) video benchmarks. Results are summarized in Tab. 4.

Variant	Short Video (VBench) $\uparrow$			Long Video $\uparrow$	
	Total	Quality	Semantic	Total	Drift $\downarrow$
Baseline	83.44	84.16	80.55	79.45	2.479
+ Spatial reward ($\sigma_{\min}=0.15$)	83.67	84.46	80.51	80.71	2.653
+ Balanced Multi-Dim reward ($\sigma_{\min}=0.15$)	83.67	84.45	80.54	80.72	2.651
+ Temporal reward ($\tau_{\min}=0.20$) [Full]	84.40	85.14	81.44	80.86	2.417
<i>Hyperparameter sensitivity</i>					
$\sigma_{\min} = 0.30$ (spatial only)	83.68	84.44	80.62	80.73	2.697
$\tau_{\min} = 0.40$	83.42	84.21	80.24	80.40	2.475

Table 4 Ablation study of Stream-R1 components. Each row adds one component to the baseline. $\sigma_{\min}$: spatial weight floor; $\tau_{\min}$: temporal weight floor.

Effect of spatial saliency. Adding gradient-based spatial saliency weighting to the baseline improves Quality from 84.16 to 84.46 and Long Total from 79.45 to 80.71.

Effect of balanced multi-dimensional reward. Replacing single-metric saliency with the adaptive balanced combination yields a Semantic improvement (80.51→80.62) while maintaining comparable Quality, indicating that the balanced scheme prevents any single reward dimension from dominating the spatial weighting.

Effect of temporal decomposition. Incorporating temporal saliency decomposition produces the largest single improvement: Short Total jumps from 83.68 to 84.40 (+0.72), and Drift drops from 2.697 to 2.417.

Sensitivity to temporal floor $\tau_{\min}$. Setting $\tau_{\min} = 0.40$ (versus the default 0.20) degrades Short Total from 84.40 to 83.42, even below the spatial-only variant. An excessively high temporal floor suppresses the contrast between high-saliency and low-saliency frames, effectively reducing temporal saliency to uniform weighting and forfeiting its benefit.

4.4 Visualization of spatiotemporal weights.

To probe whether the spatiotemporal weights actually respond to local quality deficiency, we conduct a controlled visualization that introduces contrast at two levels. Within each frame, we inject a localized Gaussian blur only into the lower half, leaving the upper half intact, so that every single frame contains a clean region and a degraded region side by side. Across frames, we hold the blur intensity fixed but progressively enlarge the corrupted area from left to right. We then back-propagate the reward score through the vision encoder to obtain the real gradient saliency.



Figure 5 Spatiotemporal saliency under controlled degradation. Gaussian blur is injected only into the lower half of each sampled frame so that every frame itself forms a clean (top) versus degraded (bottom) contrast; the blurred area further expands across the four frames from left to right. **Top:** reward-model gradient saliency overlaid on the degraded frames. **Middle:** the degraded frames, where only the lower half is corrupted. **Bottom:** per-frame temporal weights w_t , growing as the degraded area enlarges.

Fig. 5 reports the result. In the leftmost frame, where the injected blur covers only a small lower patch, the saliency naturally concentrates on the human face and on the lower-body region with strong motion cues, suggesting that even in a relatively clean frame the reward gradient tends to emphasize semantically and dynamically important content. As the blurred region grows across the subsequent frames, the saliency progressively migrates toward the enlarged corrupted area and tightens onto its interior. Within each individual frame, activations are also clearly biased toward the lower (blurred) half rather than the visually intact upper half, indicating that the reward-model gradient tends to highlight regions where quality refinement would yield the greatest perceptual gain rather than regions that are already clean.

The bottom row shows the corresponding temporal weights, which grow monotonically from 0.587 to 2.117 as the degraded area expands. This indicates that frames containing more quality-deficient content are automatically up-weighted by the temporal aggregation, allocating more learning signal to the frames that need it most. Importantly, this behavior is not hand-engineered: it emerges purely from gradients of the reward model, providing direct evidence that Stream-R1’s spatiotemporal weights reflect localized quality deficiency in both space and time.

Fig. 3 further provides qualitative comparisons on long video generation, where the top row of each pair is Reward Forcing and the bottom row is Stream-R1. Stream-R1 produces more temporally consistent appearance, stable backgrounds, and coherent motion, while Reward Forcing shows visible drift and deformation over time.

5 Conclusion

We present Stream-R1, a dynamic spatiotemporal reward-guided distillation framework that decomposes scalar reward signals into factored spatial and temporal saliency via reward-model gradient backpropagation, concentrating optimization intensity on quality-deficient regions and frames at no additional inference cost. Experiments show that Stream-R1 achieves the highest overall VBench score among all compared methods, including its multi-step bidirectional teacher Wan2.1. On long video generation, Stream-R1 attains the best imaging quality and lowest drift, demonstrating superior temporal stability. Both VLM-based and human preference evaluations confirm that Stream-R1 delivers balanced quality improvements: it achieves the highest VLM visual quality and text alignment scores, and is preferred by human evaluators on all five judged dimensions, with particularly strong advantages on dynamic reasonableness and visual quality. We believe the principle of decomposing global reward signals into spatiotemporally localized guidance, rather than treating reward as a monolithic scalar, opens a new direction for reward-guided generation and is broadly applicable to other modalities including image synthesis and 3D content generation.

References

- [1] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631](#), 2025.
- [2] Kevin Black, Michael Janner, Yilun Du, Ilya Kostrikov, and Sergey Levine. Training diffusion models with reinforcement learning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13301](#), 2023.
- [3] Boyuan Chen, Diego Martí Monsó, Yilun Du, Max Simchowitz, Russ Tedrake, and Vincent Sitzmann. Diffusion forcing: Next-token prediction meets full-sequence diffusion. [Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems](#), 37:24081–24125, 2024.
- [4] Guibin Chen, Dixuan Lin, Jiangping Yang, Chunze Lin, Junchen Zhu, Mingyuan Fan, Hao Zhang, Sheng Chen, Zheng Chen, Chengcheng Ma, et al. Skyreels-v2: Infinite-length film generative model. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.13074](#), 2025.
- [5] Justin Cui, Jie Wu, Ming Li, Tao Yang, Xiaojie Li, Rui Wang, Andrew Bai, Yuanhao Ban, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Self-forcing++: Towards minute-scale high-quality video generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.02283](#), 2025.
- [6] Haoge Deng, Ting Pan, Haiwen Diao, Zhengxiong Luo, Yufeng Cui, Huchuan Lu, Shiguang Shan, Yonggang Qi, and Xinlong Wang. Autoregressive video generation without vector quantization. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14169](#), 2024.
- [7] Jianxiong Gao, Zhaoxi Chen, Xian Liu, Jianfeng Feng, Chenyang Si, Yanwei Fu, Yu Qiao, and Ziwei Liu. Longvie: Multimodal-guided controllable ultra-long video generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03694](#), 2025.
- [8] Yuchao Gu, Weijia Mao, and Mike Zheng Shou. Long-context autoregressive video modeling with next-frame prediction. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19325](#), 2025.
- [9] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948](#), 2025.
- [10] Yoav HaCohen, Nisan Chiprut, Benny Brazowski, Daniel Shalem, Dudu Moshe, Eitan Richardson, Eran Levin, Guy Shiran, Nir Zabari, Ori Gordon, et al. Ltx-video: Realtime video latent diffusion. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00103](#), 2024.
- [11] Xuan He, Dongfu Jiang, Ge Zhang, Max Ku, Achint Soni, Sherman Siu, Haonan Chen, Abhranil Chandra, Ziyan Jiang, Aaran Arulraj, et al. Videoscore: Building automatic metrics to simulate fine-grained human feedback for video generation. In [Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 2105–2123, 2024.
- [12] Roberto Henschel, Levon Khachatryan, Hayk Poghosyan, Daniil Hayrapetyan, Vahram Tadevosyan, Zhangyang Wang, Shant Navasardyan, and Humphrey Shi. Streamingt2v: Consistent, dynamic, and extendable long video generation from text. In [Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference](#), pages 2568–2577, 2025.
- [13] Xun Huang, Zhengqi Li, Guande He, Mingyuan Zhou, and Eli Shechtman. Self forcing: Bridging the train-test gap in autoregressive video diffusion. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08009](#), 2025.
- [14] Ziqi Huang, Yinan He, Jiashuo Yu, Fan Zhang, Chenyang Si, Yuming Jiang, Yuanhan Zhang, Tianxing Wu, Qingyang Jin, Nattapol Chanpaisit, et al. Vbench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models. In [Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition](#), pages 21807–21818, 2024.
- [15] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, et al. Qwen2. 5-coder technical report. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186](#), 2024.
- [16] Dengyang Jiang, Dongyang Liu, Zanyi Wang, Qilong Wu, Liuzhuozheng Li, Hengzhuang Li, Xin Jin, David Liu, Changsheng Lu, Zhen Li, et al. Distribution matching distillation meets reinforcement learning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.13649](#), 2025.
- [17] Yang Jin, Zhicheng Sun, Ningyuan Li, Kun Xu, Hao Jiang, Nan Zhuang, Quzhe Huang, Yang Song, Yadong Mu, and Zhouchen Lin. Pyramidal flow matching for efficient video generative modeling. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05954](#), 2024.

- [18] Weijie Kong, Qi Tian, Zijian Zhang, Rox Min, Zuozhuo Dai, Jin Zhou, Jiangfeng Xiong, Xin Li, Bo Wu, Jianwei Zhang, et al. Hunyuanvideo: A systematic framework for large video generative models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03603](#), 2024.
- [19] Wuyang Li, Wentao Pan, Po-Chien Luan, Yang Gao, and Alexandre Alahi. Stable video infinity: Infinite-length video generation with error recycling. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.09212](#), 2025.
- [20] Shanchuan Lin, Ceyuan Yang, Hao He, Jianwen Jiang, Yuxi Ren, Xin Xia, Yang Zhao, Xuefeng Xiao, and Lu Jiang. Autoregressive adversarial post-training for real-time interactive video generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.09350](#), 2025.
- [21] Jie Liu, Gongye Liu, Jiajun Liang, Yangguang Li, Jiaheng Liu, Xintao Wang, Pengfei Wan, Di Zhang, and Wanli Ouyang. Flow-grpo: Training flow matching models via online rl. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05470](#), 2025.
- [22] Jie Liu, Gongye Liu, Jiajun Liang, Ziyang Yuan, Xiaokun Liu, Mingwu Zheng, Xiele Wu, Qiulin Wang, Menghan Xia, Xintao Wang, et al. Improving video generation with human feedback. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13918](#), 2025.
- [23] Kunhao Liu, Wenbo Hu, Jiale Xu, Ying Shan, and Shijian Lu. Rolling forcing: Autoregressive long video diffusion in real time. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25161](#), 2025.
- [24] Runtao Liu, Haoyu Wu, Ziqiang Zheng, Chen Wei, Yingqing He, Renjie Pi, and Qifeng Chen. Videodpo: Omni-preference alignment for video diffusion generation. In [Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference](#), pages 8009–8019, 2025.
- [25] Yunhong Lu, Yanhong Zeng, Haobo Li, Hao Ouyang, Qiuyu Wang, Ka Leong Cheng, Jiapeng Zhu, Hengyuan Cao, Zhipeng Zhang, Xing Zhu, et al. Reward forcing: Efficient streaming video generation with rewarded distribution matching distillation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04678](#), 2025.
- [26] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. [Advances in neural information processing systems](#), 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [27] Adam Polyak, Amit Zohar, Andrew Brown, Andros Tjandra, Animesh Sinha, Ann Lee, Apoorv Vyas, Bowen Shi, Chih-Yao Ma, Ching-Yao Chuang, et al. Movie gen: A cast of media foundation models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13720](#), 2024.
- [28] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. [Advances in neural information processing systems](#), 36:53728–53741, 2023.
- [29] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347](#), 2017.
- [30] Hansi Teng, Hongyu Jia, Lei Sun, Lingzhi Li, Maolin Li, Mingqiu Tang, Shuai Han, Tianning Zhang, WQ Zhang, Weifeng Luo, et al. Magi-1: Autoregressive video generation at scale. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13211](#), 2025.
- [31] Bram Wallace, Meihua Dang, Rafael Rafailov, Linqi Zhou, Aaron Lou, Senthil Purushwalkam, Stefano Ermon, Caiming Xiong, Shafiq Joty, and Nikhil Naik. Diffusion model alignment using direct preference optimization. In [Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition](#), pages 8228–8238, 2024.
- [32] Team Wan, Ang Wang, Baole Ai, Bin Wen, Chaojie Mao, Chen-Wei Xie, Di Chen, Feiwu Yu, Haiming Zhao, Jianxiao Yang, et al. Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20314](#), 2025.
- [33] Jiazheng Xu, Yu Huang, Jiale Cheng, Yuanming Yang, Jiajun Xu, Yuan Wang, Wenbo Duan, Shen Yang, Qunlin Jin, Shurun Li, et al. Visionreward: Fine-grained multi-dimensional human preference learning for image and video generation. In [Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence](#), volume 40, pages 11269–11277, 2026.
- [34] Zeyue Xue, Jie Wu, Yu Gao, Fangyuan Kong, Lingting Zhu, Mengzhao Chen, Zhiheng Liu, Wei Liu, Qiushan Guo, Weilin Huang, et al. Dancegrpo: Unleashing grpo on visual generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07818](#), 2025.
- [35] Shuai Yang, Wei Huang, Ruihang Chu, Yicheng Xiao, Yuyang Zhao, Xianbang Wang, Muyang Li, Enze Xie, Yingcong Chen, Yao Lu, et al. Longlive: Real-time interactive long video generation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22622](#), 2025.

- [36] Zhuoyi Yang, Jiayan Teng, Wendi Zheng, Ming Ding, Shiyu Huang, Jiazheng Xu, Yuanming Yang, Wenyi Hong, Xiaohan Zhang, Guanyu Feng, et al. Cogvideox: Text-to-video diffusion models with an expert transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06072, 2024.
- [37] Tianwei Yin, Michaël Gharbi, Taesung Park, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, Fredo Durand, and William T Freeman. Improved distribution matching distillation for fast image synthesis. Advances in neural information processing systems, 37:47455–47487, 2024.
- [38] Tianwei Yin, Michaël Gharbi, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, Fredo Durand, William T Freeman, and Taesung Park. One-step diffusion with distribution matching distillation. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 6613–6623, 2024.
- [39] Tianwei Yin, Qiang Zhang, Richard Zhang, William T Freeman, Fredo Durand, Eli Shechtman, and Xun Huang. From slow bidirectional to fast autoregressive video diffusion models. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 22963–22974, 2025.
- [40] Lvmin Zhang, Shengqu Cai, Muyang Li, Gordon Wetzstein, and Maneesh Agrawala. Frame context packing and drift prevention in next-frame-prediction video diffusion models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.12626, 2025.
- [41] Zangwei Zheng, Xiangyu Peng, Tianji Yang, Chenhui Shen, Shenggui Li, Hongxin Liu, Yukun Zhou, Tianyi Li, and Yang You. Open-sora: Democratizing efficient video production for all. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20404, 2024.