

Long-Context Autoregressive Video Modeling with Next-Frame Prediction

Yuchao Gu, Weijia Mao, Mike Zheng Shou

Abstract—Long-context autoregressive modeling has significantly advanced language generation, but video generation still struggles to fully utilize extended temporal contexts. To investigate long-context video modeling, we introduce **Frame AutoRegressive (FAR)**, a strong baseline for video autoregressive modeling. Just as language models learn causal dependencies between tokens (*i.e.*, Token AR), FAR models temporal causal dependencies between continuous frames, achieving better convergence than Token AR and video diffusion transformers. Building on FAR, we observe that long-context video modeling faces challenges due to visual redundancy. Training on long videos is computationally expensive, as vision tokens grow much faster than language tokens. To tackle this issue, we propose balancing locality and long-range dependency through long short-term context modeling. A high-resolution short-term context window ensures fine-grained temporal consistency, while an unlimited long-term context window encodes long-range information using fewer tokens. With this approach, we can train on long video sequences with a manageable token context length, thereby significantly reducing training time and memory usage. Furthermore, we propose a multi-level KV cache designed to support the long short-term context modeling, which accelerating inference on long video sequences. We demonstrate that FAR achieves state-of-the-art performance in both short- and long-video generation, providing a simple yet effective baseline for video autoregressive modeling. The code is released at <https://github.com/showlab/FAR>.

Index Terms—Video Generation, Autoregressive Video Modeling, Diffusion Model.

1 INTRODUCTION

Advanced long-context autoregressive language models have demonstrated remarkable capabilities, enabling various applications that require test-time scaling, such as extended conversations [1], chain-of-thought reasoning [2]–[4], in-context learning [5], and retrieval-augmented generation [6]. However, video modeling has not achieved comparable progress. Recent video autoregressive modeling [7] directly adapts the paradigm of language models [8], where frames are factorized into discrete [9], [10] codes for next-token prediction (denoted as Token-AR). However, Token-AR still fails to achieve comparable quality to video diffusion transformers [11] due to the unidirectional modeling of visual tokens [12] and the irreparable information loss caused by vector quantization. On the other hand, video diffusion models [13]–[16], which generate long videos using a progressive sliding window, struggle to effectively use earlier context.

In this paper, we introduce **Frame AutoRegressive (FAR)** model, specifically designed for video autoregressive modeling. FAR is trained using a frame-wise flow matching objective with autoregressive contexts. Unlike Token-AR, which learn causal dependencies between discrete tokens, FAR captures causal dependencies between continuous frames while still allowing full attention modeling within each frame. However, as a hybrid AR-Diffusion model [17]–[19], FAR also encounters a common issue observed in such models, namely, the discrepancy in observed contexts be-




Fig. 1: **Evaluation on Long Video Prediction.** FAR effectively exploits long video contexts and achieves accurate prediction.

tween training and inference. During training, later frames are exposed only to noised context frames due to diffusion objective, whereas inference relies on clean context frames. Recent methods [20], [21] mitigate this issue by appending a clean copy of the noised sequence during training, but this approach doubles the training cost.

To address the discrepancy of observed context, we propose training FAR with *stochastic clean context*. During training, we randomly replace a portion of noisy frames with clean frames and assign them a unique timestep embedding beyond the diffusion schedule to indicate representation extraction from clean context. During inference, this

- Corresponding author: Mike Zheng Shou (E-mail: mikeshou@nus.edu.sg)
- Yuchao Gu, Weijia Mao and Mike Zheng Shou are with the Showlab, National University of Singapore.

special embedding guides the model to effectively utilize clean context frames. We demonstrate FAR with stochastic clean context achieve same training efficiency to video diffusion transformers while achieving better convergence, served as a strong autoregressive video generation baseline.

Building on FAR, we investigate how to train on long video sequences to enable long-context video modeling. Unlike language modeling, long-context video modeling suffers from visual redundancy, as vision tokens grow significantly faster than language tokens when context increases. To address this challenge, we propose to balance the locality and long-range dependency with *long short-term context modeling*. Specifically, we maintain a high-resolution short-term context window to ensure fine-grained temporal consistency, while using a unlimited long-term context window with aggressive patchification to reduce redundant context tokens. This strategy enables efficient training on long video sequences with a manageable token context length. To speed up the proposed long short-term context modeling during inference, we introduce a multi-level KV cache to enhance inference efficiency.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- 1) We introduce FAR, an strong autoregressive video generation baseline, combined with stochastic clean context to bridge the training-inference gap in observed context.
- 2) Building on FAR, we introduce long short-term context modeling for efficient long-video training, as well as multi-level KV cache for faster inference.
- 3) FAR enables significantly lower training costs on long videos and achieves state-of-the-art performance in both short- and long-video generation.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Video Generation

Video Diffusion Models. Recent advances in video generation have led to the scaling of video diffusion transformers [11], [22], [23] for text-to-video generation, resulting in superior visual quality. Pretrained text-to-video models are subsequently fine-tuned to incorporate images as conditions for image-to-video generation [22], [24], [25]. The trained image-to-video models can be utilized for autoregressive long-video generation using a sliding window [15], [16], but their ability to leverage visual context is limited by the sliding window’s size. In this work, we show that FAR achieves better convergence than video diffusion transformers for short-video generation while naturally supporting variable-length visual context.

Token Autoregressive Models. Video generation based on token autoregressive models (*i.e.*, Token AR) aims to follow the successful paradigm of large language models. These models typically quantize continuous frames into discrete tokens [10], [26] and learn the causal dependencies between tokens using language models [7], [27]. While they achieve plausible performance, their generation quality remains inferior to that of video diffusion transformers due to information loss from vector quantization. Additionally, unidirectional visual token modeling may be suboptimal [12]. Subsequent studies have explored continuous tokens [28]

TABLE 1: **Model Variants of FAR.** We follow the model size configurations of DiT [39] and SiT [40].

Models	#Layers	Hidden Size	MLP	#Heads	Params
FAR-B	12	768	3072	12	130M
FAR-M	12	1024	4096	16	230M
FAR-L	24	1024	4096	16	457M
FAR-XL	28	1152	4608	18	674M
FAR-B-Long	12	768	3072	12	150M
FAR-M-Long	12	1024	4096	16	280M

without vector quantization but have not demonstrated their effectiveness in video generation. In this work, we show that FAR can learn causal dependencies from continuous frames and achieve better performance than Token AR in both short- and long-video modeling.

Hybrid AR-Diffusion Models. To leverage the strengths of both continuous latent spaces and autoregressive modeling, recent studies [19], [29], [30] have explored hybrid AR-Diffusion models. These models typically employ a diffusion objective for image-level modeling with autoregressive contexts. Hybrid AR-Diffusion models are widely applicable to both visual [17]–[19] and language generation [31], [32]. Recent research has also applied it in frame-level autoregressive modeling [17], [18] for video generation. However, they suffer from a training-inference discrepancy in the observed context. Some studies [20], [21] have attempted to mitigate this issue by maintaining a clean copy of the noised sequence during training, but this approach doubles the training cost. Among these methods, FAR efficiently addresses the training-inference gap through the proposed stochastic clean context, demonstrating its superior performance in long-context video modeling.

2.2 Long-Context Language Modeling

A straightforward approach to improving long-context ability in language modeling is to directly fine-tune the model on longer sequences. Recent work [33], [34] has explored efficient long-sequence fine-tuning with position interpolation. However, training on long videos leads to prohibitive computational costs, as vision tokens scale much faster than language tokens with increasing context length. To address this issue, we introduce long short-term context modeling to reduce visual redundancy in long-video training.

2.3 Long-Context Video Modeling

Recent advancements in video generation models have enabled their use as interactive world simulators [35]–[37], which require the ability to exploit long-range context and memorize the observed environment. However, existing video diffusion transformers lack effective mechanism to utilize long-range context. Although early work [38] has explored long-context video prediction, it has been limited in visual quality and long-range consistency. In this work, we introduce FAR, a efficient framework for both short- and long-context autoregressive video modeling.

3 PRELIMINARY

3.1 Flow Matching

Flow Matching [41]–[43] is a simple alternative objective for training diffusion models. Rather than modeling the reverse




Fig. 2: **Illustration of FAR's Training and Inference Pipeline.** In short-video training, a portion of frames is randomly replaced with clean context frames, marked with a unique timestep embedding (e.g., -1) beyond the flow-matching scheduler. In long-video training, we adopt long short-term context modeling. A long-term context window with aggressive patchification is adopted to reduce redundant vision tokens, while a short-term context window is used to model fine-grained temporal consistency.




Fig. 3: **Visualization of Attention Mask.** FAR enables full attention within a frame while maintaining causality at the frame level. In long-context training, we adopt aggressive patchification for long-term context frames to reduce tokens.

process with stochastic differential equations, Flow Matching learns a continuous vector field that deterministically connect two distribution.

Specifically, given a data sample $x_0 \sim p_{\text{data}}(x)$ and a noise sample $x_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, we construct a continuous trajectory connecting them via linear interpolation:

$$x(t) = (1 - t)x_0 + tx_1, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (1)$$

This formulation implies a constant velocity:

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = v^* = x_1 - x_0. \quad (2)$$

To enable the model to learn the optimal transport between the data and noise distributions, we introduce a learnable time-dependent velocity field $v_\theta(x, t)$. During training, a random time $t \sim U(0, 1)$ is sampled, and the model is optimized by minimizing the following objective:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0, x_1, t} [\|v_\theta(x(t), t) - v^*\|^2]. \quad (3)$$




Fig. 4: **Effect of Stochastic Clean Context.** This technique eliminate training-inference gap in observed context.

3.2 Autoregressive Models

Autoregressive models are a class of probabilistic models where each element in a sequence is conditioned on its preceding elements, denote as context. Formally, given a sequence of tokens $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, an autoregressive model assumes that each token x_i is generated based on its previous tokens $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1})$. The generative process can be expressed as a factorization of the joint probability:

$$p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i | x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}). \quad (4)$$

By modeling each token conditioned on its preceding tokens, autoregressive models naturally capture the sequential dependencies inherent in data.

4 FAR

In this section, we first present the framework of FAR in Sec. 4.1. Then, we discuss the difficulties and solutions in training FAR in Sec. 4.2. In Sec. 4.3, we analyze the key design that enables FAR for long-context video modeling.




Fig. 5: Comparison of FAR and video diffusion transformer. FAR achieves better convergence than video diffusion transformer in unconditional video generation on UCF-101.

4.1 Framework Overview

Architecture. As shown in Fig. 2 (a), FAR is built upon the diffusion transformer [39], [40]. We adopt the model configuration of DiT [39] and Latte [44], as listed in Table. 1. The key architectural difference between FAR and video diffusion transformers (e.g., Latte [44]) lies in the attention mechanism. As shown in Fig. 3(a), for each frame, we apply causal attention at the frame level while maintaining full attention within each frame. We adopt this causal spatiotemporal attention for all layers, instead of the interleaved spatial and temporal attention used in Latte. In FAR, image generation and image-conditioned video generation are jointly learned thanks to the causal mask, whereas video diffusion transformer [44] requires additional image-video co-training.

Basic Training Pipeline. The training pipeline of FAR is illustrated in Fig. 2 (a). Given a video sequence $\mathbf{X}$, we first employ a pretrained VAE to compress it into the latent space $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times H \times W}$, where T , H , and W denote the number of frames, height, and width of the latent features, respectively. Note that although we primarily adopt an image VAE in this work, FAR can also be trained with a video VAE since our autoregressive unit is the latent frame. Following diffusion forcing [17], we independently sample a timestep for each frame. We then interpolate between the clean latent and the sampled noise using Eq. Eq. 1 and apply the frame-wise flow matching objective in Eq. Eq. 3 for learning. The key difference between FAR and image flow matching lies in that we adopt causal spatiotemporal attention, allowing each frame to access previous context frames during denoising.

4.2 Short-Video Modeling

Training-Inference Gap in Observed Context. As a hybrid AR-diffusion model, FAR also encounters a training-inference gap in the observed context. As illustrated in Fig. 2(a), each clean latent is fused with sampled noise for the flow matching objective, as defined in Eq. Eq. 1. Consequently, later frames can only access the noised version of previous frames during training. However, during inference, this leads to a distribution shift when clean context frames is used.




Fig. 6: KV Cache for Short-Video Modeling in FAR. We additionally add a caching step to encode current decoded frame into the KV cache for autoregressive generation.

As shown in the example in Fig. 4(a), the training-inference gap in the observed context leads to a distribution shift when inferring with a clean context. Although adding mild noise to the context during inference can help mitigate this effect, it still causes low-level flickering, degrading the quality of the generated video. Recent works [20], [21] attempt to address this issue by maintaining a clean copy of the noised sequence during training. However, this approach doubles the training costs.

Our Solution: Stochastic Clean Context. To bridge the gap in observed context, we introduce stochastic clean context for training FAR. As illustrated in Fig. 2(a), we randomly replace a portion of the noised frames with their corresponding clean context and assign them a unique timestep embedding (e.g., -1) beyond the flow-matching timestep scheduler. These clean context frames are excluded from loss computation and are implicitly learned through later frames that use them as context. During inference, this unique timestep embedding guides the model to use clean context effectively.

Training FAR with stochastic clean context does not add extra computation and does not conflict with different timestep sampling strategies during training (e.g., logit-normal sampling [45]). It effectively resolves the training-inference discrepancy, as exemplified in Fig. 4(b).

FAR vs. Video Diffusion Transformer. FAR and video diffusion transformer differ only in their training schemes. FAR is trained with independent noise and causal attention, while the video diffusion transformer is trained with uniform noise and full attention. This raises an interesting question: *Can FAR surpass video diffusion transformers?* To explore this, we convert FAR to video diffusion transformer as a baseline, denoted as Video DiT. We align the training settings to compare the two paradigms. As shown in Fig. 5, FAR achieves better convergence than the Video DiT, demonstrating its potential to become a strong baseline for autoregressive video modeling.

4.3 Long-Context Video Modeling

Token Redundancy in Long Video. Visual data contains spatial redundancy, causing vision tokens to expand much faster than language tokens as context increases. For example, a video sequence of 128 frames requires more than 8K




Fig. 7: **Relation between Token Context Length and Vision Context Length.** With the proposed long short-term context modeling, the token context length scales more slowly with increasing vision context length compared to uniform context modeling. When training on long videos, the reduced number of tokens leads to significantly lower training costs and memory usage.




Fig. 8: **Multi-Level KV Cache for Long-Context Video Modeling in FAR.** When a frame leaves the short-term context window, we encode it to the L2 cache and re-encode the L1 cache in the window. We then use those encoded KV cache for decoding the current frame. Note that we divide the process into three steps for better illustration, though it can be merged into a single forward pass in implementation.

tokens, as illustrated in Fig. 7(a). Consequently, training on long videos becomes computationally prohibitive, as shown in Fig. 7(b, c).

Our Solution: Long Short-Term Context Modeling. To address the token redundancy in video, we introduce long short-term context modeling, which exploits the spatial and temporal locality in video data. As illustrated in Fig. 2(b), we maintain a high-resolution short-term context window to learn fine-grained temporal consistency and a low-resolution long-term context window, where we adopt aggressive patchification to reduce the number of context tokens. During training, given that the data has a maximum sequence length of m frames, we fix the short-term context window to n frames and randomly sample the long-term context frames from the range $[0, m - n]$. The attention mask with long short-term context modeling is shown in Fig. 3(b), where the long-term context uses fewer tokens. As demonstrated in Fig. 7(a), this strategy ensures that increasing the vision context length maintains a manageable token context length. With long short-term context modeling, we can reduce the cost and memory usage of the long-video training significantly, as shown in Fig. 7(b, c). To prevent interference between long-term and short-term contexts, we adopt separate projection layers for each context, inspired by MM-DiT [45]. This approach results in a slightly larger number of parameters, referred to as FAR-Long in Table. 1.

4.4 Inference-Time KV Cache

KV Cache for Short-Video Modeling. Due to the autoregressive nature of FAR, we can leverage KV-Cache to accelerate inference. As illustrated in Fig. 6, for each frame, we first use the flow-matching schedule to decode it into the clean latent frame. We then introduce an additional caching step to encode the clean latent frame into the KV cache. As discussed in Sec. 4.2, we use timestep $t = -1$ to denote the clean context frame in the caching step. These KV caches are subsequently used for autoregressive decoding of subsequent frames.

Multi-Level KV Cache for Long-Video Modeling. In long-context video modeling, we employ long short-term context to reduce redundant visual tokens. To accommodate this, we introduce a multi-level KV cache. As illustrated in Fig. 8, the frames in long-term context window is encoded into L2 cache (4 tokens per frame), while the frames in short-term context window is encoded into L1 cache. When decoding current frame but exceed the short-term context window, the earliest frame in the short-term context window is moved to the long-term context window and encode it into the L2 cache. Since this modifies the cache state, we subsequently re-encode the L1 cache of the frames in the short-term context window. The encoded cache is then used to decode the current frame. Note that in practice, these three steps can be merged into a single forward pass for efficiency.

TABLE 2: **Experimental Configurations of FAR.** We follow the evaluation settings from Latte [44], MCVD [46], and TECO [38].

Hyperparameters	Short-Video Generation Cond. UCF-101	Uncond. UCF-101	Short-Video Prediction BAIR	UCF-101	Long-Video Prediction Minecraft	DMLab
Dataset Configuration						
Resolution	256/128	256/128	64	64	128	64
Total Training Samples	13,320	13,320	43,264	9,624	194,051	39,375
Training Configuration						
Batch Size	32	32	32	32	32	32
Latent Size	8×8 (DC-AE [47])	8×8 (DC-AE [47])	8×8 (DC-AE [47])	8×8 (DC-AE [47])	8×8 (DC-AE [47])	8×8 (DC-AE [47])
Training Sequence Length	16	16	32	16	300	300
LR	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}
LR Schedule	constant	constant	constant	constant	constant	constant
Warmup Steps	-	-	-	-	10K	10K
Total Training Steps	400K	400K	200K	200K	1M	1M
Stochastic Clean Context	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Short-Term Context Window	16	16	32	16	16	16
Long-Term Context Resolution	-	-	-	-	2×2	2×2
Evaluation Configuration						
Samples	4×2048	4×2048	100×256	100×256	4×256	4×256
Guidance Scale	2.0	-	-	-	1.5	1.5
Reference Work	Latte [44]	Latte [44]	MCVD [46]	MCVD [46]	TECO [38]	TECO [38]

5 EXPERIMENT

5.1 Implementation Details

We follow the DiT’s structure [39] to implement FAR. To compress video latents, we train a series of image DC-AE [47] on the corresponding dataset, resulting in 64 tokens per frame. All models are trained from scratch without image pretraining. We provide detailed training hyperparameters and evaluation setting in Table. 2.

5.2 Quantitative Comparison

5.2.1 Video Generation

Dataset and Evaluation Settings. We benchmark both unconditional and conditional video generation on the UCF-101 dataset [48], which consists of approximately 13,000 videos. Following Latte [44], we use the entire dataset for training. For evaluation, we randomly sample 2,048 videos to compute FVD [49] against the ground-truth videos. For conditional video generation, we set the guidance scale to 2.0 during inference.

Main Results. From the results listed in Table. 3, we achieve state-of-the-art performance in both unconditional and conditional video generation. Specifically, Latte [44] is based on video diffusion transformer, while OmniTokenizer [50] is based on Token AR. Our method significantly outperforms both. Furthermore, compared to recent frame-autoregressive models [20], [21], which require twice the training cost, FAR achieves superior performance without any additional training cost.

5.2.2 Short-Video Prediction

Dataset and Evaluation Settings. We evaluate FAR on the UCF-101 [48] and BAIR [60] datasets, following the evaluation settings in MCVD [52] and ExtDM [46]. We randomly sample 256 videos based on provided context frames, each with 100 different trajectories, and select the best trajectory to compute pixel-wise metrics. For FVD, we report the average over all trajectories.

TABLE 3: **Quantitative Comparison of Conditional and Unconditional Video Generation on UCF-101.** We follow the evaluation setup of Latte [44]. † denotes FVD reported on 10,000 videos.

Methods	Type	Params	Double Train Cost	Cond. Gen FVD ₂₀₄₈ ↓	Uncond. Gen FVD ₂₀₄₈ ↓
Resolution-128×128					
MAGVITv2-MLM [10]	Non-AR	307 M	✗	58†	-
MAGVITv2-AR [10]	Token-AR	840 M	✗	109†	-
TATS [51]	Token-AR	331 M	✗	332	420
FAR-L (Ours)	Frame-AR	457 M	✗	99 (57†)	280
Resolution-256×256					
LVDM [14]	Video-DiT	437 M	✗	-	372
Latte [44]	Video-DiT	674 M	✗	-	478
CogVideo [27]	Token-AR	9.4 B	✗	626	-
OmniTokenizer [50]	Token-AR	650 M	✗	191	-
ACDIT [20]	Frame-AR	677 M	✓	111	-
MAGI [21]	Frame-AR	850 M	✓	-	421
FAR-L (Ours)	Frame-AR	457 M	✗	113	303
FAR-XL (Ours)	Frame-AR	674 M	✗	108	279

Main Results. We summarize the results in Table. 4. Unlike previous works such as MCVD [52] and ExtDM [46], which introduce complex multi-scale fusion strategies and optical flow, FAR achieves superior results on both datasets without requiring additional design.

5.2.3 Long-Video Prediction

Dataset and Evaluation Settings. We benchmark long-context video modeling results on action-conditioned video prediction using the Minecraft and DMLab datasets [38]. The Minecraft dataset contains approximately 200K videos, while the DMLab dataset contains about 40K videos. Each video consists of 300 frames with action annotations. We follow the evaluation setup in TECO [38], which uses 144 observed context frames to predict 156 future frames and compute pixel metrics. Additionally, we compute FVD on 264 generated frames based on 36 context frames.

Main Results. We summarize the results in Table. 5. The previous work, TECO [38], adopts aggressive downscaling for all frames to reduce tokens for temporal modeling, creating a trade-off between training efficiency and prediction accuracy. In contrast, FAR employs long short-term context

TABLE 4: **Quantitative Comparison on Short Video Prediction.** We follow the evaluation setup of MCVD [52] and ExtDM [46], where c denotes the number of context frames and p denotes the number of predicted frames.

Methods	Params	$c = 4, p = 12$				Methods	Params	$c = 2, p = 14$				$c = 2, p = 28$			
		SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$			SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$	SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$
RaMViD [53]	235 M	0.639	21.37	0.090	396.7	RaMViD [53]	235 M	0.758	17.55	0.085	166.5	0.691	16.51	0.109	238.7
LFDM [54]	108 M	0.627	20.92	0.098	698.2	LFDM [54]	108 M	0.770	17.45	0.084	167.6	0.730	16.68	0.106	276.8
MCVD-cp [52]	565 M	0.658	21.82	0.088	468.1	VIDM [55]	194 M	0.763	16.97	0.080	131.7	0.728	16.20	0.096	194.6
ExtDM-K2 [46]	119 M	0.754	23.89	0.056	394.1	MCVD-cp [52]	565 M	0.838	19.10	0.075	87.8	0.797	17.70	0.078	119.0
						ExtDM-K4 [46]	121 M	0.845	20.04	0.053	81.6	0.814	18.74	0.069	102.8
FAR-B (Ours)	130 M	0.818	25.64	0.037	194.1	FAR-B (Ours)	130 M	0.849	20.87	0.038	99.3	0.819	19.40	0.049	144.3

(a) Evaluation on UCF-101 (64×64)

(b) Evaluation on BAIR (64×64)

TABLE 5: **Quantitative Comparison on Long-Context Video Prediction.** We follow the evaluation setup of TECO [38], where c denotes the number of context frames and p denotes the number of predicted frames.

Methods	Params	$c = 144, p = 156$				Methods	Params	$c = 144, p = 156$				Methods	Params	$c = 36, p = 264$			
		SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$			SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$			SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$
FitVid [56]	165 M	0.356	12.0	0.491	176	FitVid [56]	176 M	0.343	13.0	0.519	956	FitVid [56]	176 M	0.343	13.0	0.519	956
CW-VAE [57]	111 M	0.372	12.6	0.465	125	CW-VAE [57]	140 M	0.338	13.4	0.441	397	CW-VAE [57]	140 M	0.338	13.4	0.441	397
Perceiver AR [58]	30 M	0.304	11.2	0.487	96	Perceiver AR [58]	166 M	0.323	13.2	0.441	76	Perceiver AR [58]	166 M	0.323	13.2	0.441	76
Latent FDM [59]	31 M	0.588	17.8	0.222	181	Latent FDM [59]	33 M	0.349	13.4	0.429	167	Latent FDM [59]	33 M	0.349	13.4	0.429	167
TECO [38]	169 M	0.703	21.9	0.157	48	TECO [38]	274 M	0.381	15.4	0.340	116	TECO [38]	274 M	0.381	15.4	0.340	116
FAR-B-Long (Ours)	150 M	0.687	22.3	0.104	64	FAR-M-Long (Ours)	280 M	0.448	16.9	0.251	39	FAR-M-Long (Ours)	280 M	0.448	16.9	0.251	39

(a) Evaluation on DMLab (64×64)

(b) Evaluation on Minecraft (128×128)




Fig. 9: **Ablation Study of the KV Cache.** FAR-Long with proposed multi-level KV cache achieves the best speedup on long videos.

modeling, effectively achieving the lowest prediction error (*i.e.*, LPIPS) without prohibitive computation cost.

5.3 Qualitative Comparison

We present a qualitative comparison of long-video prediction in Fig. 10. Compared to previous methods, FAR effectively utilizes the observed context and generates predictions that most closely resemble the ground truth, demonstrating its ability to leverage long-range context.

5.4 Ablation Study

Stochastic Clean Context. We have visualized the effectiveness of stochastic clean context in Fig. 4. Based on the quantitative evaluation of video prediction in Table. 6, FAR with stochastic clean context achieves significantly improved performance.

Multi-Level KV Cache. We evaluate the inference speed of FAR in Fig. 9. FAR without the KV cache incurs the highest inference cost, while the KV cache significantly reduces it.

TABLE 6: **Ablation Study of Stochastic Clean Context on UCF-101.** Stochastic clean context mitigates the training-inference discrepancy in observed context, leading to improved performance.

Methods	$c = 1, p = 15$			
	SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$
FAR w/o. Stochastic Clean Context	0.540	16.42	0.211	399
FAR w/. Stochastic Clean Context	0.596	18.46	0.187	347

TABLE 7: **Ablation Study on the Resolution of Long-Term Context.** The speed is averaged over the generation of 300 frames.

Context Resolution	SSIM $\uparrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FVD $\downarrow$	Speed (fps)
1×1	0.411	15.25	0.312	40	2.94
2×2	0.423	15.84	0.291	40	2.88
4×4	0.433	16.26	0.276	37	1.42

For long videos, FAR-Long with proposed multi-level KV cache achieves the lowest inference cost.

Long-Term Context Resolution. We investigate the impact of long-term context resolution on prediction accuracy and inference speed. As the context resolution increases, pixel-level metrics improve; however, the overall video quality remains similar. Nonetheless, inference speed significantly degrades at higher context resolutions due to the increased number of tokens involved in computation. Therefore, we select a 2×2 resolution for the long-term context as a balance between computational efficiency and long-term context performance.

Short-Term Context Window Size. We evaluate the impact of the short-term context window size on performance. As shown in Fig. 11, video quality (FVD) quickly saturates as the short-term context window size increases, while pixel-level metrics continue to improve but also approach saturation at a window size of 16. Therefore, we set the short-term context window size to 16 by default.




Fig. 10: **Qualitative Comparison of Long-Context Video Prediction on DMLab.** FAR fully utilizes the long-range context (144 frames), resulting in more consistent prediction (156 frames) compared to previous methods.




Fig. 11: **Ablation Study of the Short-Term Context Window Size.** Performance saturates as the window size increases.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce FAR for long-context video modeling. FAR effectively learns causal dependencies across continuous frames and demonstrates faster convergence compared to video diffusion transformers. To address visual redundancy in long-video training, we further propose a long short-term context modeling strategy, which encodes both remote and nearby visual contexts using asymmetric patchification. This approach enables a manageable token length as context frames increase, reducing both time and memory costs during long-video training. FAR achieves state-of-the-art performance on both short- and long-video modeling tasks, underscoring its potential as a new foundation model for video generation.

Limitations. The primary limitation lies in the lack of

scaled-up experiments. Although FAR demonstrates great potential, we still lack large-scale training on text-to-video generation datasets. Additionally, restricted by the available datasets, we only experiment with FAR on up to 300 frames (about 20 seconds), not fully investigating its ability on minute-level videos.

Future Work. One future direction is to scale up FAR and benchmark it against video diffusion transformers on large-scale text-to-video generation tasks. Additionally, we plan to simulate a longer video dataset (on the minute level) to better evaluate the model’s long-context capabilities. Finally, it would be interesting to explore whether FAR’s long-context modeling can enable video-level in-context learning.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, “Gpt-4 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. **1**
- [2] OpenAI, “Learning to reason with llms,” September 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/index/learning-to-reason-with-llms/> **1**
- [3] N. Muennighoff, Z. Yang, W. Shi, X. L. Li, L. Fei-Fei, H. Hajishirzi, L. Zettlemoyer, P. Liang, E. Candès, and T. Hashimoto, “s1: Simple test-time scaling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19393*, 2025. **1**
- [4] D. Guo, D. Yang, H. Zhang, J. Song, R. Zhang, R. Xu, Q. Zhu, S. Ma, P. Wang, X. Bi *et al.*, “Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025. **1**
- [5] Q. Dong, L. Li, D. Dai, C. Zheng, J. Ma, R. Li, H. Xia, J. Xu, Z. Wu, T. Liu *et al.*, “A survey on in-context learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*, 2022. **1**
- [6] Y. Gao, Y. Xiong, X. Gao, K. Jia, J. Pan, Y. Bi, Y. Dai, J. Sun, H. Wang, and H. Wang, “Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, vol. 2, 2023. **1**

- [7] D. Kondratyuk, L. Yu, X. Gu, J. Lezama, J. Huang, G. Schindler, R. Hornung, V. Birodkar, J. Yan, M.-C. Chiu *et al.*, "Videopoet: A large language model for zero-shot video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14125*, 2023. **1, 2**
- [8] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020. **1**
- [9] P. Esser, R. Rombach, and B. Ommer, "Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 12 873–12 883. **1**
- [10] L. Yu, J. Lezama, N. B. Gundavarapu, L. Versari, K. Sohn, D. Minnen, Y. Cheng, V. Birodkar, A. Gupta, X. Gu *et al.*, "Language model beats diffusion-tokenizer is key to visual generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05737*, 2023. **1, 2, 6**
- [11] T. Brooks, B. Peebles, C. Holmes, W. DePue, Y. Guo, L. Jing, D. Schnurr, J. Taylor, T. Luhman, E. Luhman, C. Ng, R. Wang, and A. Ramesh, "Video generation models as world simulators," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/research/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators> **1, 2**
- [12] L. Fan, T. Li, S. Qin, Y. Li, C. Sun, M. Rubinstein, D. Sun, K. He, and Y. Tian, "Fluid: Scaling autoregressive text-to-image generative models with continuous tokens," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13863*, 2024. **1, 2**
- [13] J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet, "Video diffusion models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 8633–8646, 2022. **1**
- [14] Y. He, T. Yang, Y. Zhang, Y. Shan, and Q. Chen, "Latent video diffusion models for high-fidelity long video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13221*, 2022. **1, 6**
- [15] Y. Lu, Y. Liang, L. Zhu, and Y. Yang, "Freelong: Training-free long video generation with spectralblend temporal attention," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19918*, 2024. **1, 2**
- [16] F.-Y. Wang, W. Chen, G. Song, H.-J. Ye, Y. Liu, and H. Li, "Genl-video: Multi-text to long video generation via temporal cdenoising," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18264*, 2023. **1, 2**
- [17] B. Chen, D. Martí Monsó, Y. Du, M. Simchowitz, R. Tedrake, and V. Sitzmann, "Diffusion forcing: Next-token prediction meets full-sequence diffusion," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 24 081–24 125, 2025. **1, 2, 4**
- [18] Y. Jin, Z. Sun, N. Li, K. Xu, H. Jiang, N. Zhuang, Q. Huang, Y. Song, Y. Mu, and Z. Lin, "Pyramidal flow matching for efficient video generative modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05954*, 2024. **1, 2**
- [19] J. Xie, W. Mao, Z. Bai, D. J. Zhang, W. Wang, K. Q. Lin, Y. Gu, Z. Chen, Z. Yang, and M. Z. Shou, "Show-o: One single transformer to unify multimodal understanding and generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12528*, 2024. **1, 2**
- [20] J. Hu, S. Hu, Y. Song, Y. Huang, M. Wang, H. Zhou, Z. Liu, W.-Y. Ma, and M. Sun, "Acddit: Interpolating autoregressive conditional modeling and diffusion transformer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07720*, 2024. **1, 2, 4, 6**
- [21] D. Zhou, Q. Sun, Y. Peng, K. Yan, R. Dong, D. Wang, Z. Ge, N. Duan, X. Zhang, L. M. Ni *et al.*, "Taming teacher forcing for masked autoregressive video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12389*, 2025. **1, 2, 4, 6**
- [22] Z. Yang, J. Teng, W. Zheng, M. Ding, S. Huang, J. Xu, Y. Yang, W. Hong, X. Zhang, G. Feng *et al.*, "Cogvideox: Text-to-video diffusion models with an expert transformer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06072*, 2024. **2, 11**
- [23] W. Kong, Q. Tian, Z. Zhang, R. Min, Z. Dai, J. Zhou, J. Xiong, X. Li, B. Wu, J. Zhang *et al.*, "Hunyuanvideo: A systematic framework for large video generative models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03603*, 2024. **2**
- [24] Y. Guo, C. Yang, A. Rao, Z. Liang, Y. Wang, Y. Qiao, M. Agrawala, D. Lin, and B. Dai, "Animatediff: Animate your personalized text-to-image diffusion models without specific tuning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04725*, 2023. **2**
- [25] J. Xing, M. Xia, Y. Zhang, H. Chen, W. Yu, H. Liu, G. Liu, X. Wang, Y. Shan, and T.-T. Wong, "Dynamicrafter: Animating open-domain images with video diffusion priors," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 399–417. **2**
- [26] Y. Gu, X. Wang, Y. Ge, Y. Shan, and M. Z. Shou, "Rethinking the objectives of vector-quantized tokenizers for image synthesis," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 7631–7640. **2**
- [27] W. Hong, M. Ding, W. Zheng, X. Liu, and J. Tang, "Cogvideo: Large-scale pretraining for text-to-video generation via transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15868*, 2022. **2, 6**
- [28] T. Li, Y. Tian, H. Li, M. Deng, and K. He, "Autoregressive image generation without vector quantization," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 56 424–56 445, 2025. **2**
- [29] C. Zhou, L. Yu, A. Babu, K. Tirumala, M. Yasunaga, L. Shamsi, J. Kahn, X. Ma, L. Zettlemoyer, and O. Levy, "Transfusion: Predict the next token and diffuse images with one multi-modal model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11039*, 2024. **2**
- [30] Y. Ma, X. Liu, X. Chen, W. Liu, C. Wu, Z. Wu, Z. Pan, Z. Xie, H. Zhang, L. Zhao *et al.*, "Janusflow: Harmonizing autoregression and rectified flow for unified multimodal understanding and generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07975*, 2024. **2**
- [31] L. Barrault, P.-A. Duquenne, M. Elbayad, A. Kozhevnikov, B. Alastruey, P. Andrews, M. Coria, G. Couairon, M. R. Costa-jussà, D. Dale *et al.*, "Large concept models: Language modeling in a sentence representation space," *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2412, 2024. **2**
- [32] T. Wu, Z. Fan, X. Liu, H.-T. Zheng, Y. Gong, J. Jiao, J. Li, J. Guo, N. Duan, W. Chen *et al.*, "Ar-diffusion: Auto-regressive diffusion model for text generation," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 39 957–39 974, 2023. **2**
- [33] S. Chen, S. Wong, L. Chen, and Y. Tian, "Extending context window of large language models via positional interpolation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15595*, 2023. **2**
- [34] Y. Chen, S. Qian, H. Tang, X. Lai, Z. Liu, S. Han, and J. Jia, "Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12307*, 2023. **2**
- [35] D. Valevski, Y. Leviathan, M. Arar, and S. Fruchter, "Diffusion models are real-time game engines," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14837*, 2024. **2**
- [36] J. Bruce, M. D. Dennis, A. Edwards, J. Parker-Holder, Y. Shi, E. Hughes, M. Lai, A. Mavalankar, R. Steigerwald, C. Apps *et al.*, "Genie: Generative interactive environments," in *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. **2**
- [37] J. Parker-Holder, P. Ball, J. Bruce, V. Dasagi, K. Holsheimer, C. Kaplanis, A. Moufarek, G. Scully, J. Shar, J. Shi, S. Spencer, J. Yung, M. Dennis, S. Kenjeyev, S. Long, V. Mnih, H. Chan, M. Gazeau, B. Li, F. Pardo, L. Wang, L. Zhang, F. Besse, T. Harley, A. Mitenkova, J. Wang, J. Clune, D. Hassabis, R. Hadsell, A. Bolton, S. Singh, and T. Rocktäschel, "Genie 2: A large-scale foundation world model," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/genie-2-a-large-scale-foundation-world-model/> **2**
- [38] W. Yan, D. Hafner, S. James, and P. Abbeel, "Temporally consistent transformers for video generation," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 39 062–39 098. **2, 6, 7**
- [39] W. Peebles and S. Xie, "Scalable diffusion models with transformers," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2023, pp. 4195–4205. **2, 4, 6**
- [40] N. Ma, M. Goldstein, M. S. Albergo, N. M. Boffi, E. Vanden-Eijnden, and S. Xie, "Sit: Exploring flow and diffusion-based generative models with scalable interpolant transformers," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 23–40. **2, 4**
- [41] X. Liu, C. Gong, and Q. Liu, "Flow straight and fast: Learning to generate and transfer data with rectified flow," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.03003*, 2022. **2**
- [42] Y. Lipman, R. T. Chen, H. Ben-Hamu, M. Nickel, and M. Le, "Flow matching for generative modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02747*, 2022. **2**
- [43] M. S. Albergo and E. Vanden-Eijnden, "Building normalizing flows with stochastic interpolants," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15571*, 2022. **2**
- [44] X. Ma, Y. Wang, G. Jia, X. Chen, Z. Liu, Y.-F. Li, C. Chen, and Y. Qiao, "Latte: Latent diffusion transformer for video generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03048*, 2024. **4, 6**
- [45] P. Esser, S. Kulal, A. Blattmann, R. Entezari, J. Müller, H. Saini, Y. Levi, D. Lorenz, A. Sauer, F. Boesel *et al.*, "Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis," in *Forty-first international conference on machine learning*, 2024. **4, 5**
- [46] Z. Zhang, J. Hu, W. Cheng, D. Paudel, and J. Yang, "Extedm: Distribution extrapolation diffusion model for video prediction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 19 310–19 320. **6, 7**

- [47] J. Chen, H. Cai, J. Chen, E. Xie, S. Yang, H. Tang, M. Li, Y. Lu, and S. Han, "Deep compression autoencoder for efficient high-resolution diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10733*, 2024. 6
- [48] K. Soomro, A. R. Zamir, and M. Shah, "Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012. 6
- [49] T. Unterthiner, S. Van Steenkiste, K. Kurach, R. Marinier, M. Michalski, and S. Gelly, "Fvd: A new metric for video generation," 2019. 6
- [50] J. Wang, Y. Jiang, Z. Yuan, B. Peng, Z. Wu, and Y.-G. Jiang, "Omitokenizer: A joint image-video tokenizer for visual generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09399*, 2024. 6
- [51] S. Ge, T. Hayes, H. Yang, X. Yin, G. Pang, D. Jacobs, J.-B. Huang, and D. Parikh, "Long video generation with time-agnostic vqgan and time-sensitive transformer," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 102–118. 6
- [52] V. Voleti, A. Jolicoeur-Martineau, and C. Pal, "Mcvd-masked conditional video diffusion for prediction, generation, and interpolation," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 23 371–23 385, 2022. 6, 7
- [53] T. Höppe, A. Mehrjou, S. Bauer, D. Nielsen, and A. Dittadi, "Diffusion models for video prediction and infilling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07696*, 2022. 7
- [54] H. Ni, C. Shi, K. Li, S. X. Huang, and M. R. Min, "Conditional image-to-video generation with latent flow diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2023, pp. 18 444–18 455. 7
- [55] K. Mei and V. Patel, "Vidm: Video implicit diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 8, 2023, pp. 9117–9125. 7
- [56] M. Babaeizadeh, M. T. Saffar, S. Nair, S. Levine, C. Finn, and D. Erhan, "Fitvid: Overfitting in pixel-level video prediction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13195*, 2021. 7
- [57] V. Saxena, J. Ba, and D. Hafner, "Clockwork variational autoencoders," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 29 246–29 257, 2021. 7
- [58] C. Hawthorne, A. Jaegle, C. Cangea, S. Borgeaud, C. Nash, M. Malinowski, S. Dieleman, O. Vinyals, M. Botvinick, I. Simon *et al.*, "General-purpose, long-context autoregressive modeling with perceiver ar," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 8535–8558. 7
- [59] W. Harvey, S. Naderiparizi, V. Masrani, C. Weillbach, and F. Wood, "Flexible diffusion modeling of long videos," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 27 953–27 965, 2022. 7
- [60] F. Ebert, C. Finn, A. X. Lee, and S. Levine, "Self-supervised visual planning with temporal skip connections." *CoRL*, vol. 12, no. 16, p. 23, 2017. 6
- [61] J. Su, M. Ahmed, Y. Lu, S. Pan, W. Bo, and Y. Liu, "Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 568, p. 127063, 2024. 11
- [62] O. Press, N. A. Smith, and M. Lewis, "Train short, test long: Attention with linear biases enables input length extrapolation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12409*, 2021. 11
- [63] B. Peng, J. Quesnelle, H. Fan, and E. Shippole, "Yarn: Efficient context window extension of large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00071*, 2023. 11
- [64] bloc97, "NTK-Aware Scaled RoPE allows LLaMA models to have extended (8k+) context size without any fine-tuning and minimal perplexity degradation." 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.reddit.com/r/LocalLLaMA/comments/14lz7j5/ntkaware_scaled_rope_allows_llama_models_to_have/ 11

7 APPENDIX

In this section, we first discuss another line of research in long-context video modeling (*i.e.*, test-time lengthy extrapolation) in Sec. 7.1. We then provide additional visualizations of FAR on long-context video prediction.

7.1 Test-Time Lengthy Extrapolation

7.1.1 Related Work

Lengthy extrapolation is an appealing characteristic of autoregressive models, allowing them to be trained on short sequences while performing inference on longer ones. However, extrapolation performance primarily depends on the characteristics of the position embedding. Two common relative position embeddings that support extrapolation are RoPE [61] and ALiBi [62]. RoPE encodes relative distance through dot-product operations, while ALiBi achieves this using attention bias. Subsequent studies [63], [64] have further advanced RoPE to enhance extrapolation performance. In this work, we introduce FlexRoPE and demonstrate its superior performance compared to RoPE and ALiBi in temporal extrapolation for video modeling.

7.1.2 Weak Temporal Decay

An appealing characteristic of autoregressive models is their potential to be trained on short sequences while being tested on long sequences, enabling lengthy extrapolation at inference time. This capability relies on effective positional embedding. Following 3D-RoPE [22] for video data, the spatial and temporal dimensions (*i.e.*, height, width, and frame) are treated as independent 1D-RoPE embeddings. Consequently, we keep RoPE positional embedding for height and width unchanged while focusing only on the temporal position embedding. In this study, we examine RoPE [61] and ALiBi [62], two common positional embedding methods for capturing temporal relative distances. From the visualization in Fig. 12(a), RoPE does not impose sufficient temporal decay, leading to accumulated redundant visual context. Similarly, ALiBi exhibits this issue in parts of attention heads with small slopes.

To evaluate extrapolation performance, we gradually increase the number of context frames in inference and measure the resulting improvement in predictions. From Fig. 12(b), position interpolation of RoPE performs slightly better than position extrapolation. Additionally, we retrain the model using ALiBi as temporal position embedding. ALiBi applies a linear decay based on temporal relative distance, with different decay rates assigned to each attention head. Our results suggest that ALiBi achieves slightly better extrapolation than RoPE due to its explicit temporal decay mechanism. However, all solutions exhibit performance degradation as vision context increases. Therefore, we aim to develop a more effective temporal position embedding method to improve temporal extrapolation.

7.1.3 Our Solution: FlexRoPE

To address this problem, we propose FlexRoPE, which explicitly controls temporal decay to suppress redundant

visual context while still allowing the model to capture long-range dependencies using RoPE. The FlexRoPE is defined as:

$$\text{Attention}(q_i, k_j) = \text{Softmax} \left(\underbrace{\text{RoPE}(q_i, k_j)}_{\text{FlexRoPE, used in inference}} - \lambda \cdot |i - j| \right), \quad (5)$$

where the temporal decay is flexibly controlled by the slope λ , and i and j represent the temporal indices of the frame. We visualize FlexRoPE with $\lambda = 0.2$ in Fig. 12(a). FlexRoPE is inference-compatible with models trained using RoPE since it does not modify the dot-product computation but instead compensates for RoPE’s temporal decay.

7.1.4 Ablation Study

We compare FlexRoPE with RoPE in Fig. 12(b). FlexRoPE effectively balances locality and long-range correspondence, leading to improved performance as the context frame increases, whereas RoPE interpolation and extrapolation exhibit poorer extrapolation performance.

We compare different position embeddings on $16\times$ temporal extrapolation. We focus on two settings: The first is unique in video generation, where we directly unroll a $16\times$ longer sequence from 1 context frame. Second, we follow the long-context language model [62], gradually adding more context frames and comparing the last 16-frame predictions. **$16\times$ Extrapolation: $c = 1$, $p = 255$.** In this evaluation, we directly generate videos that are $16\times$ longer than the training sequence length (*i.e.*, 16 frames), using only the first frame as a condition. As shown in Fig. 13, while RoPE extrapolation can adapt to periodic motion extrapolation, our proposed FlexRoPE achieves superior results in both periodic and non-periodic extrapolation.

$16\times$ Extrapolation: $c = 240$, $p = 16$. Following the common practice to evaluate long-context ability in language models, we collect 256 frames, use different context frames [0, 240], and allow the model to infer the last 16 frames to test performance. The quantitative results are demonstrated in Fig. 12 in the main paper. In Fig. 14, we visualize the $16\times$ temporal extrapolation inference results. We can see that RoPE [61] (PE, position extrapolation) at test time results in the worst performance, accumulating redundant context and failing to extrapolate. Meanwhile, RoPE (PI, positional interpolation) breaks the learned video speed, resulting in poor motion. Although ALiBi [62] performs better than RoPE (PI and PE), it still influences the learned motion distribution and falls far from the GT. Compared to these methods, FlexRoPE achieves the best temporal extrapolation results.

7.2 Qualitative Comparison

We provide additional visualization of long-video prediction results on DMLab and Minecraft in Fig. 15 and Fig. 16. From the results, FAR better exploits the provided context and provides more consistent results in later predictions compared to previous works.




Fig. 12: **Visualization and Comparison of Various Temporal Position Embeddings.** The proposed FlexRoPE incorporates a linear bias to induce controllable temporal decay during inference, enhancing extrapolation performance as context increases. In contrast, other methods degrade when the inference context exceeds the training window.




Fig. 13: **Comparison of Position Embeddings for 16 $\times$ Temporal Extrapolation.** We leverage the model (trained on 16 frames) to infer 255 future frames based on the provided 1 context frames. PE denotes position extrapolation. We encourage readers to [click and play](#) the video clips in this figure using Adobe Acrobat.




Fig. 14: **Comparison of Position Embeddings for $16\times$ Temporal Extrapolation.** We leverage the model (trained on 16 frames) to infer 16 future frames based on the provided 240 context frames. PI denotes position interpolation, and PE denotes position extrapolation. We encourage readers to [click](#) and [play](#) the video clips in this figure using Adobe Acrobat.




Fig. 15: **Qualitative Comparison of Long-Context Video Prediction on DMLab.** FAR fully utilizes the long-range context (144 frames), resulting in more consistent prediction (156 frames) compared to previous methods.




Fig. 16: **Qualitative Comparison of Long-Context Video Prediction on Minecraft.** FAR fully utilizes the long-range context (144 frames), resulting in more consistent prediction (156 frames) compared to previous methods.