MotionMix: Weakly-Supervised Diffusion for Controllable Motion Generation

Nhat M. Hoang¹, Kehong Gong², Chuan Guo², Michael Bi Mi² ¹Nanyang Technological University, ²Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.



Methodology Overview Controllable generation of 3D human motions becomes an (a) Training: Separate the diffusion steps into two distinct ranges regarding (b) Inference (two stages): important topic as the world embraces digital transformation. the data type. Clean samples are guided by an empty condition. Ground-truth Stage 1: generate rough motion guided by the conditional input. • Existing methods heavily rely on costly, annotated high-quality s_{x} refers to both x-prediction and epsilon-prediction, two fundamental ٠ Stage 2: refine these rough motions to high-quality ones while the motion data. objective of diffusion models. conditional input is masked. • We propose MotionMix, a simple yet effective weakly-supervised $|\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{T-1}|$ $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{T-2}$ \mathbf{x}_0 $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{T^*}$ approach for diffusion model to utilize both noisy and unannotated Clean $c = \emptyset$ Motion motion sequences. Supervision $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ \mathbf{x} $t \in [1, T^*]$ $\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{x}}$ MotionMix MotionMix MotionMix MotionMix [Noisy Annotated Data] [Clean Unannotated Data] MotionMix c T-1 0 1 Supervision Noisy $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}$ $c \in \{\emptyset, a, w, m\}$ $\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{\tilde{x}}}$ Motion $\mathbf{x}_T \in \mathcal{N}(0,\mathbf{I})$ \mathbf{x}_{T-} \mathbf{X}_{T^*} \mathbf{x}_1 $t \in [T^* + 1, T]$ <empty_strir $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ —Stage 1: Conditional Denoising —> —Stage 2: Unconditional Denoising — **MotionMix** Evaluation Results **Text-to-Motion** Action-to-Motion Method FID ⊥ MultiModality → Accuracy ↑ $Diversity \rightarrow$ Method R Precision (top 3)[↑] FID↓ Multimodal Dist.↓ Diversity→ Multimodality[↑] $6.835^{\pm.045}$ $2.604^{\pm.040}$ Real Motion $0.053^{\pm.00}$ $0.995^{\pm.00}$ @ Real Motion $0.797^{\pm.002}$ $0.002^{\pm.000}$ $2.974^{\pm.008}$ $9.503^{\pm.065}$ $6.850^{\pm.050}$ $2.511^{\pm.023}$ rowing motion his left hand. $0.338^{\pm.015}$ $0.917^{\pm.001}$ Action2Motion $0.544^{\pm.440}$ $5.566^{\pm.027}$ $9.559^{\pm.860}$ $2.799^{\pm.072}$ ₽ MDM $0.611^{\pm.007}$ 0.338 $0.120^{\pm.000}$ 0.917 $0.955^{\pm.008}$ $6.840^{\pm.030}$ $2.530^{\pm.020}$ ACTOR 0.381^{±.042} (†30.0%) $5.325^{\pm.026}$ (14.3%) $2.718^{\pm.019}$ ($\downarrow 2.9\%$) MLD $0.077^{\pm.004}$ $0.964^{\pm.002}$ $6.831^{\pm.050}$ $2.824^{\pm.038}$ MDM (MotionMix) $0.632^{\pm.006}$ (†3.4%) $9.520^{\pm.090}$ ($\uparrow 69.6\%$) $0.100^{\pm.00}$ $6.860^{\pm.050}$ MDM $0.990^{\pm.00}$ $2.520^{\pm.0}$ $0.779^{\pm.006}$ $0.031^{\pm.004}$ $2.788^{\pm.012}$ $11.080^{\pm .097}$ Setup Real Motion 0.196^{±.007} (196%) 0.930 ±.003 (46.1% 6.836^{±.062} (†96%) 3.043 ±.054 (1422.6%) MDM (MotionMix $0.396^{\pm.004}$ $0.497^{\pm.021}$ $9.191^{\pm.022}$ $10.847^{\pm.109}$ $1.907^{\pm.214}$ MDM Real Motio 2.790 0.988 33.349^{\pm} 14.160 0.322^{±.020} (†35.2%) 1.946^{±.019} (†2.0%) MDM (MotionMix) $0.404^{\pm.005}$ (†2.0%) 9.068^{±.019} (†1.3%) 10.781^{±.098} (↓28.3%) $0.911^{\pm.003}$ Motion generation tasks and benchmarks: $23.430^{\pm 2.200}$ $31.960^{\pm.330}$ ACTOR 14.520^{\pm} $0.739^{\pm.004}$ $0.742^{\pm.005}$ (†0.4% $1.954^{\pm.062}$ $1.192^{\pm.073}$ (†39.0%) $2.958^{\pm.005}$ $0.730^{\pm.013}$ MLD $15.790^{\pm.079}$ $0.954^{\pm.001}$ $33.520^{\pm.140}$ $13.570^{\pm.060}$ $11.100^{\pm.143}$ MotionDiffuse $12.810^{\pm 1.460}$ $0.950^{\pm.000}$ $33.100^{\pm.290}$ $14.260^{\pm.120}$ $14.277^{\pm.094}$ ($\downarrow 17\%$) $1.391^{\pm.111}$ (†90.5%) MDM $3.066^{\pm.018}$ (13.6% Text-to-Motion (T2M): HumanML3D and KIT-ML datasets MotionDiffuse (MotionMix) $10.008 \pm .072$ MDM (MotionMix) 11.400^{±.393} (†11% 0.960^{±.003} (±1.1% 32.806^{±.176} (↓118% Action-to-Motion (A2M): HumanAct12 and UESTC datasets Real MDM MDM(MotionMix) MotionDiffuse MotionDiffuse (MotionMix) Music-to-Dance "a man mimics a throwing motion with his left hand." • Music-to-Dance (M2D): AIST++ dataset Method $PFC \downarrow$ Beat Align. $Dist_k \rightarrow$ $\text{Dist}_g \rightarrow$ Real Motion 1.380 0.314 9.545 7.766 MotionMix was applied to sota diffusion model of different designs: Bailando 1.754 0.23 10.58 7.72 6.14 2.2543 0.22 FACT 10.85 • MDM for T2M, A2M: x0-parameterization, classifier-free guidance. $0.224^{\pm.025}$ $1.605^{\pm .224}$ $5.549^{\pm.783}$ $4.831^{\pm.752}$ EDGEt $1.988^{\pm.120}_{(\downarrow 21.32\%)}$ $0.256^{\pm.013}$ 10.103^{±2.039} (†95.0%) $6.595^{\pm.173}$ EDGE (MotionMix) • MotionDiffuse for T2M : epsilon-parameterization. (†13.3%) (†15.1%)

Qualitative samples from HumanML3D test set. Please view videos on our webpage

						Ablation Sti	laies											
R Precision (top 3)↑	FID↓	Multimodal Dist.↓	$Diversity \rightarrow$	Multimodality↑			R Precision		Multimodal				Method	R Precision (top 3)↑	FID↓	Dist.↓		Multimodality↑
0.797 ^{±.002} 0.		$2.974^{\pm.008}$		I	Ablation on	Method	(top 3)↑	FID↓	Dist.↓	Diversity→	Multimodality↑	Ablation on	Real Motion MDM	$0.797^{\pm.002}$ $0.611^{\pm.007}$	$0.002^{\pm.000}$ $0.544^{\pm.440}$		$9.503^{\pm.065}$ $9.559^{\pm.860}$	$2.799^{\pm.072}$
$0.611^{\pm .007}$ 0.	.544 ^{±.440}	5.566 ^{±.027}	$9.559^{\pm.860}$	2.799 ^{±.072}	Noisy Ratio	Real Motion MDM	$0.797^{\pm.002}$ $0.611^{\pm.007}$			$9.503^{\pm.065}$ $9.559^{\pm.860}$	2.799 ^{±.072}	Noisy Range	50% noisy, $T^* = T_2$ MDM (MotionMix) (T_1 =20, T_2 =40) MDM (MotionMix) (T_1 =20, T_2 =60)	$\frac{0.616^{\pm.006}}{0.632^{\pm.006}}$	0.451 ^{±.033}	5.459 ^{±.027}	9.585 ^{±.101} 9.520 ^{±.090}	2.585 ^{±.076} 2.718 ^{±.019}
$0.598^{\pm.006}$ 0.	$1.714^{\pm.045}$		$9.750^{\pm.123}$			$T_1=20, T_2=60, T^*=60$	007	+ 045	+ 020	± 002	+ 074		MDM (MotionMix) ($T_1=20, T_2=80$)	$0.604^{\pm.004}$	$0.614^{\pm.060}$	5.540 ^{±.024}	$9.554^{\pm.104}$	$2.768^{\pm.095}$
0) $0.632^{\pm .006}$ 0	$0.402^{\pm.032}$ $0.381^{\pm.042}$	5.524 ^{±.033} 5.325 ^{±.026}	$\begin{array}{c} 9.414^{\pm.092} \\ 9.396^{\pm.094} \\ \textbf{9.520}^{\pm.090} \\ 9.242^{\pm.086} \end{array}$	$\frac{2.935^{\pm.059}}{2.747^{\pm.070}}$ $\frac{2.718^{\pm.019}}{2.602^{\pm.057}}$	→ More clean data ≠ better, more annotated data (even noisy) = better	MDM (MotionMix) (50% noisy)	$\frac{0.601^{\pm.006}}{0.632^{\pm.006}}$	$0.381^{\pm.042}$	$5.325^{\pm.026}$	$9.520^{\pm.090}$	$\frac{2.856^{\pm.074}}{2.718^{\pm.019}}$ 2.867 ^{±.107}	→ MotionMix is robust on different levels of corrupted motions	$\begin{array}{l} {\rm 50\% \ noisy, \ T^* = T_2} \\ {\rm MDM \ (MotionMix) \ (T_1 = 10, \ T_2 = 30)} \\ {\rm MDM \ (MotionMix) \ (T_1 = 20, \ T_2 = 40)} \\ {\rm MDM \ (MotionMix) \ (T_1 = 40, \ T_2 = 60)} \\ {\rm MDM \ (MotionMix) \ (T_1 = 60, \ T_2 = 80)} \end{array}$	$0.616^{\pm.006}$ $0.598^{\pm.004}$	$\frac{0.451^{\pm.033}}{0.554^{\pm.076}}$	$5.459^{\pm.027}$ $5.600^{\pm.031}$	$9.585^{\pm.101}$ $9.479^{\pm.100}$	$2.585^{\pm.076}$ $2.815^{\pm.094}$
					1													

EDGE for M2D : x0-parameterization with classifier-free guidance.

Method

MDM

Real Motion

50% noisy, T1=20, T2=60

MDM (MotionMix) $(T^*=0)$

MDM (MotionMix) $(T^*=20)$

MDM (MotionMix) $(T^*=40)$

MDM (MotionMix) $(T^*=60)$

MDM (MotionMix) $(T^*=80)$

Ablation on

Denoising Pivot

→ More clean data

does not lead to better

performance while

more annotated data

u mumes	a the officer of the	
	<u>i</u>	Ě