

EasyControl: Transfer ControlNet to Video Diffusion for Controllable Video Generation and Interpolation

Cong Wang, Jiaxi Gu, Panwen Hu, Haoyu Zhao, Yuanfan Guo, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Xiaodan Liang*

Abstract—Following the advancements in text-guided image generation technology exemplified by Stable Diffusion, video generation is gaining increased attention in the academic community. However, relying solely on text guidance for video generation has serious limitations, as videos contain much richer content than images, especially in terms of motion. This information can hardly be adequately described with plain text. Fortunately, in computer vision, various visual representations can serve as additional control signals to guide generation. With the help of these signals, video generation can be controlled in finer detail, allowing for greater flexibility for different applications. Integrating various controls, however, is nontrivial. In this paper, we propose a universal framework called *EasyControl*. By propagating and injecting condition features through condition adapters, our method enables users to control video generation with a single condition map. With our framework, various conditions including raw pixels, depth, HED, etc., can be integrated into different Unet-based pre-trained video diffusion models at a low practical cost. We conduct comprehensive experiments on public datasets, and both quantitative and qualitative results indicate that our method outperforms state-of-the-art methods. *EasyControl* significantly improves various evaluation metrics across multiple validation datasets compared to previous works. Specifically, for the sketch-to-video generation task, *EasyControl* achieves an improvement of 152.0 on FVD and 19.9 on IS, respectively, in UCF101 compared with VideoComposer. For fidelity, our model demonstrates powerful image retention ability, resulting in high FVD and IS in UCF101 and MSR-VTT compared to other image-to-video models.

Index Terms—Video Generation, Video Interpolation, Controllable Video Generation, Diffusion Model.

I. INTRODUCTION

DUE to its potential applications in artistic creation, entertainment, and beyond, image and video generation have garnered significant attention. Text-guided image generation has witnessed explosive growth, with numerous excellent works published, such as GLIDE [1], Imagen [2], Stable Diffusion [3], among others. Building on existing text-guided image synthesis technologies, text-to-video (T2V) generation [4] has also made strides. T2V generation can be viewed as a

straightforward extension of text-to-image synthesis into the video domain, achieved by incorporating temporal layers into the network while keeping spatial layers frozen. However, the ability of text-guided video generation is limited in real-world applications. Describing content-rich videos with language is often challenging, rendering text unable to provide precise control over video content. One reason for this limitation is that text struggles to capture the dynamic nature of video content. Additionally, complex textual descriptions pose a significant challenge to the representational capabilities of the generation model, increasing the likelihood of generation failure. To address this, various methods have been proposed for generating videos guided by different conditions, including optical flows [5], depth sequences [6], dragging strokes [7], and et al.




Fig. 1. The architecture illustrations of a multi-condition model, VideoComposer [6], and our framework, EasyControl. Compared with VideoComposer which takes as input temporally dense conditions and injects the conditions in a concatenation manner, our EasyControl uses only a single frame of condition and injects the condition embeddings through residual summation, thereby increasing the flexibility of the framework to combine different pre-trained T2V models.

Among all the conditions, using images as a condition is a natural and intuitive way to guide video generation. Images provide substantial visual details, while text prompts can still play a role in controlling the diversity of video generation. Therefore, research on image-to-video generation with text guidance, such as [8]–[10], has attracted extensive attention. However, conditioning solely on images presents challenges

* Xiaodan Liang is the corresponding author.

Cong Wang is with the School of Intelligent Systems Engineering, Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China (e-mail: wangc39@mail2.sysu.edu.cn).

Panwen Hu is with the School of Science and Engineering at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen (e-mail: panwenhu@link.cuhk.edu.cn).

Haoyu Zhao is with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Fudan University, Shanghai, China (e-mail: hyzhao22@m.fudan.edu.cn)

Jiaxi Gu, Yuanfan Guo, Jianhua Han, and Hang Xu are with Huawei Noah’ark Lab, Shanghai 201206, China (e-mail: imjiaxi@gmail.com; han-jianhua4@huawei.com; chromexbjxh@gmail.com).

Xiaodan Liang is with the School of Intelligent Systems Engineering, Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China, DarkMatter AI Research, Guangzhou 511458, China and Pengcheng Lab, Shenzhen 518000 (e-mail: liangxd9@mail.sysu.edu.cn).

due to the higher demand for fidelity and the risk of conflict between static details and smooth motion. Therefore, purely conditioning on images may lack flexibility and generalization. Hence, exploring multiple condition modalities, such as depth and sketches, is worth investigating.

Various methods have been proposed for generating videos guided by different conditions. For instance, some works introduce a sequence of condition maps [11]–[13], like depth map sequences, as structural guidance to enhance temporal consistency. Moreover, a few works propose combinations of multiple conditions, such as camera and object trajectory [14], image and optical flow [5], image and trajectory [7], [15], [16], and object layout and trajectory [17], [18], to control both static visual elements and dynamic motion. By utilizing additional control signals, these methods achieve enhanced control capabilities. However, existing methods either require dense temporal condition sequences, meaning users have to provide a condition map for each frame, or they need to redesign the architecture to integrate additional condition inputs, thereby increasing practical costs. The high demand for dense condition input, the limited exploration of condition modalities, and the lack of feasibility in incorporating new control modalities result in a gap between these methods and real-world content creation processes. Hence, a question arises from these limitations: How can a method allow users to control video generation using different temporally sparse conditions, i.e., a single condition map, while lowering the training cost for each condition modality with the available well-trained text-to-video (T2V) models?

Considering the aforementioned challenges, we propose a universal framework called EasyControl for text-guided video generation with various condition modalities. In addition to the image modality, other modalities such as sketch, depth, HEDs, segmentation mask, and canny edge can be easily integrated into our framework to control video generation. Fig 2 showcases some generation cases from various condition modalities, illustrating the different degrees of flexibility each condition provides for controllable video generation. Despite the varied conditions, text guidance retains its ability to influence the motion of the resulting video, enabling users to generate videos with varying degrees of control strength.

While existing work like VideoComposer [6] also focuses on controlling video generation with multiple conditions, it still has two main drawbacks. First, similar to previous methods [12], [13], VideoComposer maintains temporal consistency by requiring a dense condition sequence as input, limiting its practical application feasibility. Second, its condition injection method, i.e., concatenation with latent noise, struggles to propagate control signals to all frames during generation, necessitating a redesign of the model architecture to accommodate the increased channel number resulting from concatenation injection when combined with another basic model. In contrast, our framework follows the philosophy of ControlNet [19] and mainly comprises a condition adapter and an interchangeable pre-trained text-to-video (T2V) model. This design enables the incorporation of an additional condition modality by simply training the condition adapter, eliminating the need to train the entire model comprehensively. Moreover,

to lower the entry barrier and allow users to control video synthesis by inputting a single condition map, we propose to propagate the condition by addition to the latent noise after extracting condition features. Subsequently, we inject the condition embedding outputted from the condition adapter through multi-layer residual summation. Experimental results also demonstrate the effectiveness of our method compared to simple concatenation.

For a comprehensive evaluation of our proposed method, we conduct extensive experiments on multiple benchmarks. In addition to assessing our method’s ability to generate high-quality videos, we validate its generalization and feasibility by applying the image condition adapter on two text-to-video (T2V) models. We also investigate the results of different trained adapters for various condition modalities. On the UCF101 benchmark for image-to-video generation, we achieve a notable Fréchet Video Distance (FVD) score of 197.66, signifying a significant improvement over most existing methods (VideoCrafter1, 297.62). Moreover, we conduct comparisons with other methods from multiple perspectives, including user studies.

The contributions of our work can be summarized as follows:

- We propose that EasyControl unifies both controllable video generation and video interpolation tasks in a single framework. Additionally, EasyControl is suitable for any U-Net-based video diffusion model.
- We design VideoInit, a noise initialization strategy that introduces the low-frequency band from input images for stable video generations.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate that our proposed method achieves superior quantitative results and exhibits better control capabilities compared to alternative methods.

We propose that EasyControl unifies both controllable video generation and video interpolation tasks in a single framework by residual conditions injection and reuses the low-frequency information of input images.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Video diffusion models

Diffusion Models (DMs) [20] have demonstrated remarkable results in image synthesis, leading to the development of various methods such as GLIDE [21], Imagen [1], and Stable Diffusion [3], among others. As the field progresses, attention has shifted towards video generation, with a prevalent approach involving the integration of temporal layers into image DMs to enable temporal representation. Numerous video diffusion models have emerged, including Make-A-Video [4], CogVideo [22], Imagen Video [2], MagicVideo [23], and VidRD [24], among others. Regarding training data, recent works [25], [26] have demonstrated that combining both image and video data can significantly enhance appearance details and mitigate catastrophic forgetting. Recognizing the complexity of video data, PVDM [27] introduces an image-like 2D latent space for efficient parameterization. Moreover, studies on the impact of initial noise priors in video DMs have




Fig. 2. EasyControl is capable of generating user-defined videos by inputting any condition. Any U-Net-based text-video model can incorporate various types of input conditions through the condition adapter, such as canny, sketches, images, segment masks, and more. Users only need to provide one condition and text, and EasyControl will take care of the rest. On the left is the input condition, and on the right are the frames 1,4,5,8 of the generated videos.

been conducted. VideoFusion [28] reveals that image priors from pre-trained models can be efficiently shared across all frames, facilitating the learning process. PYoCo [29] devises a video noise prior to achieving improved temporal consistency. Additionally, some works leverage additional DMs for tasks such as frame interpolation, prediction, and super-resolution to enhance performance. Align Your Latent [25] and LAVIE [26] are two comprehensive pipelines for generating high-quality videos. They both employ a basic video DM to generate initial video frames and incorporate additional modules for temporal interpolation and Video Super Resolution (VSR).

B. Controllable video generation

Earlier video generation works based on image diffusion models have predominantly relied on text guidance. While text prompts can lead to creative video generation, they lack precise control over appearance, layout, or motion. Consequently, recent efforts have focused on integrating other conditions or controls into video DMs. One such approach involves using an initial image to guide video generation, also known as image animation, which has garnered significant attention. Recent advancements [8]–[10] in this direction suggest encoding the image condition with a separate branch [30] or concatenating the image latent with the noise input [31]. However, generating

high-fidelity videos with image control remains challenging due to static visual details in the image. Additionally, other low-level representations for dense spatial structure control have been introduced. Gen-1 pioneered the use of depth map sequences as structural guidance [11]. Similarly, ControlVideo [12] and Control-A-video [13] attempt to generate videos conditioned on sequences of dense control signals such as edge or depth maps. VideoComposer [6] devises a unified interface for multiple conditions, leveraging temporally and spatially dense control signals to achieve fine-grained controllability. However, obtaining dense guidance signals in real-world applications is challenging and not user-friendly. Recently, several works have begun leveraging object and layout trajectory information to control the dynamic motion of synthesized videos. For instance, DragNUWA [7] encodes sparse strokes into dense flow, which is then utilized to control the motion of objects. Similarly, motionCtrl [14] encodes the trajectory coordinates of objects into a vector map, which guides the motion of the objects. Another line of research [17], [18], [32] focuses on achieving object motion control by encoding provided object layouts, typically represented as bounding boxes, and their corresponding trajectories.

While existing work has explored various control conditions for controllable generation, they often require strict condition inputs or necessitate redesigning model structures and train-




Fig. 3. The EasyControl architecture encompasses the condition adapter Module, where a feature extractor block is employed to process a singular condition map, extracting pertinent condition features. These features are subsequently extended to the temporal dimension via broadcast mechanism and addition operations, incorporating noise as necessary. The integration of condition information into the generation process is achieved by augmenting the latent representations of the U-Net with multi-layer condition latents derived from the condition adapter.

ing to adapt to different condition modalities. Therefore, we propose EasyControl, a unified controllable video generation framework. This framework requires minimal overhead to train different condition adapters with pre-trained T2V models, enabling users to generate high-quality videos controllably using various accessible conditions.

III. METHOD

The proposed framework designs an auxiliary condition embedding module, called the condition adapter, whose hidden latents can be injected into any text-to-video generation model for control purposes. This endows the model with the capability to generate videos from any given condition, including but not limited to canny-to-video, sketch-to-video, and image-to-video. For illustrative purposes, we apply our approach to a primary Text-to-Video (T2V) model named VdRid. The controllable video generation model consists of two different networks: a primary Text-to-Video (T2V) model and our Condition Adapter. The T2V model provides the basic text-to-video generation capability, while the Condition Adapter fuses conditional control signals into the U-Net. Consequently, the model possesses the capability to generate tailored videos by harmoniously merging text and various control signal inputs, thereby enabling support for a diverse array of downstream tasks. The forthcoming sections will introduce some preliminary knowledge about the diffusion model, explain the meaning of various conditions and extraction methods, elaborate on the design of the Condition

Injection block, and elucidate how to integrate the control signals into the U-Net.

A. Preliminary

Diffusion models (DMs) [20] is a probabilistic generative model that learns the underlying data distribution through two steps: diffusion and denoising. Specifically, during the diffusion process, given an input data \mathbf{z} , the model gradually adds random noise $\mathbf{z}_t = \alpha_t \mathbf{z} + \sigma_t \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$. The magnitudes of noise addition are controlled by α_t and σ_t as the denoising steps t progress. In the following denoising stage, the model takes the diffused sample \mathbf{z}_t as input and minimizes the mean squared error loss to learn a denoising function ϵ_θ as follows:

$$E_{\mathbf{z}, \epsilon, t} = \|\epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, t) - \epsilon\| \quad (1)$$

Latent Diffusion Models (LDMs) [33] utilize the architecture of Variational Autoencoders (VAEs). Unlike Diffusion Models (DMs), LDMs can compress the input data into a latent variable $\epsilon(\mathbf{z})$ by encoder ϵ , and then perform denoising truncation by decoding $D(\mathbf{z}_0)$ by the decoder D . LDMs significantly reduce the training and inference time as the diffusion and denoising are performed in the latent space rather than the data space. The objective of LDMs can be formulated as follows:

$$E_{\mathbf{z}, \epsilon, t} = \|\epsilon_\theta(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{z}_t), t) - \epsilon\| \quad (2)$$

Video Latent Diffusion Models (VLDMs) build upon LDMs by incorporating a temporal module to capture the temporal

continuity in video data. VLDMs typically add a temporal attention module to the U-Net architecture, enabling attention in the temporal dimension. Additionally, the 2d convolutions are modified to 3d convolutions to accommodate video data. Given the impressive capabilities of VLDMs in video generation, the T2V model used in our framework follows the principles of VLDMs, which encodes video into latent variables $\mathcal{E}(z)$ and leverages U-Net to learn the spatio-temporal characteristics of the video data.

B. Model architecture

Our model architecture, depicted in Fig. 3, is rooted in a latent diffusion framework fine-tuned from a pre-trained T2V model. This foundation incorporates text guidance via cross-attention layers. To imbue our model with enhanced generation control capabilities, we introduce a Condition Adapter Module for the integration of diverse conditions into the core model. Regardless of the controlling condition, whether it be raw pixels or canny edges, a universal feature extractor, implemented with multi-scale convolutions, is employed to extract features from the input condition. Within the Condition Adapter, we devise a latent-aware condition propagation mechanism, i.e., adding the representations of noisy latents to the condition features, to facilitate the incorporation of feature conditions into noisy latents. Subsequently, these conditioned latents are input into a spatial-aware block, initiated by the encoder of the diffusion model. The resultant output from the Condition Adapter is then injected into the decoder segment of the diffusion model in a residual fashion.

C. Versatile Conditions

In EasyControl, the flexibility of video generation is facilitated by supporting various conditions through a unified structure. This approach diverges from previous methodologies, such as VideoComposer [6], which rely on multiple conditions simultaneously. Instead, each control can operate independently through a condition adapter, thus allowing for greater flexibility. The specific conditions supported by EasyControl are enumerated below.

- **Raw pixels:** This represents the most fundamental form of an image, comprising a matrix of pixel values. For the purpose of implementing image-to-video generation, we opt to utilize the initial frame of the provided video as the image condition.
- **Canny edges [34]:** By detecting regions with rapid changes in intensity, it can capture both prominent and subtle edges while simultaneously minimizing noise.
- **HED (Holistically-Nested Edge Detection) [35]:** By detecting the edges of an image, HED aims to capture both low-level and high-level image features. We extract the HED condition of the video frames using the HED edge detection model [35].
- **Midas [36]:** The Midas information of the image represents the image depth information and can predict the distance of the image object from the camera.
- **Sketch:** A sketch serves as a simplified depiction of an image, emphasizing its primary contours and outlines.

Our approach involves obtaining the HED boundaries of the video frames initially. Subsequently, we utilize a sketch simplification method, as outlined in previous works [37], [38], to generate the sketches required for model training.

- **Segmentation mask:** A segmentation mask is an image wherein each pixel is assigned a label corresponding to the object or region it pertains to. To streamline the generation of mask labels necessary for training, we employ the method proposed by Uniformer [39] to label the video frames efficiently.

These controlling conditions address various aspects of the visual modality. When used as inputs to the model, they can be standardized into a unified format, such as the RGB color space. Furthermore, to incorporate features from the input controlling conditions, we employ a feature extractor.

D. Condition Adapter

For our condition adapter, we take inspiration from ControlNet [19]. Specifically, we copy the spatial structure and initial the weights of the condition adapter from the encoder and middle block in the diffusion model U-Net. Subsequently, we gradually integrate condition information into the decoder block in U-Net during the denoising process. To achieve this, we keep the spatial structure in the U-Net fixed and add the zero convolution layers at the final of the condition adapter. The output of the condition adapter is injected into the decoder block gradually. For brevity, we denote the encoder as E , the middle block as M , and the decoder as D , with e_i and d_i denoting the output of the i -th block in the encoder and decoder, and m denotes the output of the middle block, respectively. It is important to note that, due to the adoption of skip connections in UNet, the input for the i -th block in the decoder is given by:

$$\begin{cases} \text{concat}(m + m', e_j + \text{zero}(e'_j)) & \text{where } i = 1, i + j = 13. \\ \text{concat}(d_{i-1}, e_j + \text{zero}(e'_j)) & \text{where } 2 \leq i \leq 12, i + j = 13. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where zero represents the zero convolution layer whose weights increase from zero to gradually integrate control information into the main diffusion model. In order to extract the input condition information, we design a feature extractor block consisting of multi-convolution layers, which will increase the channel and decrease the size of the input condition denoted as H . The noisy latents z will add the extracted condition features directly and broadcast in the time dimension:

$$z' = \text{conv}(z) + \text{zero}(H(c)) \quad (4)$$

where c denotes the input condition.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental setup

Implementation Details We apply EasyControl to two open-source Text-to-Video (T2V) generation models: VidRD [24] and ModelScope [40]. To integrate EasyControl, we freeze the self-attention and cross-attention in the U-Net of

TABLE I

COMPARISON WITH VIDEOCOMPOSER, I2VGEN-XL, VIDEOCRAFTER1 AND SVD FOR ZERO-SHOT TEXT-TO-VIDEO GENERATION ON UCF101 AND MSR-VTT. '-' INDICATES THAT NO MEASUREMENT IS REQUIRED AS THE MODEL GENERATES VIDEO WITHOUT TEXT INPUT.

Methods	#Videos	UCF101				MSR-VTT			
		FVD↓	IS↑	CLIP Score↑	Avg-Flow↑	FVD↓	IS↑	CLIP Score↑	Avg-Flow↑
VideoComposer [6]	10M	383.87	34.23	29.60	14.09	331.15	12.33	27.03	12.39
I2VGen-XL [8]	10M	526.94	18.90	-	14.43	341.72	10.52	-	12.49
VideoCrafter1 [49]	10.3M	297.62	50.88	24.49	11.45	201.46	14.41	21.57	10.04
SVD [41]	9.8M ¹	399.59	45.65	-	7.43	209.74	13.44	-	6.94
Ours	5.3M+340k ²	197.66	54.39	30.29	16.40	149.18	15.25	27.33	13.25

each T2V model and train the temporal layer and the Condition Adapter, whose weights are initialized from the spatial layers in the downsample blocks of the U-Net. Our training process involves fine-tuning the T2V models on high-quality text video paired datasets to enhance video quality [41]. For this purpose, we utilize the Pexels 300K dataset [42], comprising 340K video-caption pairs obtained from pexels.com without watermarks. To ensure the model’s generative capability with only one input condition, we introduce a 10% probability of replacing the condition with an empty image and a 10% probability of empty text. During training, we conduct three epochs for each condition-to-video generation model and set 1000 warmup steps. Further training details can be found in the appendix.

Evaluation The evaluation datasets are UCF101 [43] with prompts sourced from VidRD [24] and MSR-VTT [44]. Following previous works [4], [28], we employ the following evaluation metrics: i) **Fréchet Video Distance (FVD)** [45], computed by a trained I3D model [46], as established in the Make-A-Video study [4]. ii) **Inception Score (IS)** [47]. Following previous studies [4], [22], [28], we utilize a trained C3D model to compute the video version of the IS. iii) **CLIP Score** measures the semantic similarity between the generated video and the corresponding prompt, where the video feature is passed through the CLIP visual encoder and the text feature is passed through the CLIP text encoder. iv) **Average Flow (Avg-Flow)** denotes the video motion strength. We extract optional flow by [48] and calculate the average flow over frames.

TABLE II

COMPARISON WITH VIDEOCOMPOSER, I2VGEN-XL, VIDEOCRAFTER1 AND SVD FOR ZERO-SHOT TEXT-TO-VIDEO GENERATION ON UCF101 AND MSR-VTT. '-' INDICATES THAT NO MEASUREMENT IS REQUIRED AS THE MODEL GENERATES VIDEO WITHOUT TEXT INPUT.

Methods	Davis-7			UCF101-7		
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
AMT [6]	21.09	0.5443	0.254	xxx	xxx	xxx
RIFE [8]	20.48	0.5112	0.258	xxx	xxx	xxx
FILM [49]	20.71	0.5282	0.2707	xxx	xxx	xxx
LDMVFI [41]	19.98	0.4794	0.2764	xxx	xxx	xxx
VIDIM [41]	19.62	0.4709	0.2578	xxx	xxx	xxx
Ours	19.97	0.5486	0.2506	xxx	xxx	xxx

¹The 9.8M training data is filtered from the 500M data.

²340k refers to the amount of training data, while 5.3 M pertains to the training data used for the pre-training model.

TABLE III
DAVIS-7

Methods	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
AMT [6]	21.09	0.5443	0.254
RIFE [8]	20.48	0.5112	0.258
FILM [49]	20.71	0.5282	0.2707
LDMVFI [41]	19.98	0.4794	0.2764
VIDIM [41]	19.62	0.4709	0.2578
Ours	19.97	0.5486	0.2506

B. Qualitative evaluation

We performed a qualitative comparison of our approach against VideoComposer [6] on both the image-to-video and sketch-to-video tasks. Specifically, we applied our method to the T2V models VidRD [24] and ModelScope [40], denoted as EasyControl(VidRD) and EasyControl(ModelScope) respectively.

Image-to-video task From Fig. 4, we observed that the videos generated by VideoComposer exhibit a sudden change, wherein the frames of the initial segment align with the provided text prompt and image, but subsequently transition to unrelated content, such as "A bowl of noodles". In contrast, the videos generated by EasyControl(VidRD) demonstrate a high fidelity to the first frame and overall exhibit superior quality. Both EasyControl(VidRD) and EasyControl(ModelScope) consistently maintain strong continuity and align with the action described in the text prompt when generating videos from images. However, it’s worth noting that the generated video quality of EasyControl(ModelScope) appears to be slightly inferior to EasyControl(VidRD), which we attribute to the differences in training hyperparameter and training data scales of different I2V basic models. Specifically, this may be due to the fact that the amount of training data provided for EasyControl(ModelScope) is insufficient for ModelScope, but may be sufficient for VidRD. As far as we know, the two models differ greatly in terms of the type and size of training data. Alternatively, it could be due to the influence of hyperparameters such as learning rate.

Sketch-to-video task As illustrated in Fig. 4, both EasyControl (ModelScope) and EasyControl (VidRD) produce videos of higher quality and demonstrate a high level of alignment with the provided sketch condition. Moreover, the videos generated by EasyControl exhibit superior continuity compared to those generated by VideoComposer, which manifest noticeable



Fig. 4. The comparison in image-to-video and sketch-to-video of VideoComposer, EasyControl(VidRD) and EasyControl(ModelScope). *ACtrl.*, *Msp.* and *Vid.Composer* denotes EasyControl, ModelScope and VideoComposer.

flickering and lower quality. Notably, the outline of the man depicted in VideoComposer’s video fails to accurately conform to the sketch, particularly overlooking the shape of the man’s necktie. We believe that this may be due to the weakness of the condition extractor network and condition feature inject block in VideoComposer, which is unable to extract texture information from image details and integrate the condition with noisy latents well.

C. Quantitative evaluation

Comparison on image-to-video generation We conducted a quantitative comparison between the image-to-video generation model of EasyControl and recent I2V generation models, notably VideoComposer [6], I2VGen-XL [8], VideoCrafter1 [49], and SVD [41]. The I2V models primarily achieve image-to-video generation through two main approaches. One involves directly incorporating image information into the input of the U-Net. However, this approach risks losing rich visual information present in the input image. I2VGen-XL, VideoCrafter1, SVD, and VideoComposer adopt this method to preserve image visual details, resulting in weaker performance in metrics such as FVD and IS compared to our approach. Our method injects image information into the U-Net throughout the network architecture. This gradual

injection of image information enables the model to learn more comprehensive image details.

As shown in Tab. III, our model outperforms VideoComposer across all metrics. We attribute this superiority to the limitations of VideoComposer in representing comprehensive image information. Additionally, the simple incorporation of multiple conditions in VideoComposer may lead to confusion in handling certain scenarios, whereas we employ a latent-aware condition propagation mechanism, enhancing the model’s performance.

Comparison on sketch-to-video generation Simultaneously, we assessed the capability to generate videos from sketch conditions using our method. We evaluated the FVD and IS metrics on the UCF101 and MSR-VTT datasets compared to VideoComposer, as illustrated in Tab. IV. We observed that the quality and continuity of the generated videos by our method significantly surpassed those generated by VideoComposer, as evident in Fig. 4. We attribute this performance enhancement to the design of the condition adapter in our method, which provides a more effective mechanism compared to the STC-encoder utilized in VideoComposer.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF OUR MODEL WITH VIDEOCOMPOSER IN SKETCH-TO-VIDEO GENERATION ON UCF101 AND MSR-VTT.

Methods	UCF101		MSR-VTT	
	FVD↓	IS↑	FVD↓	IS↑
VideoComposer	538.76	26.43	558.50	14.02
Ours	386.76	46.33	306.29	16.61




Fig. 5. Image and sketch are employed for ablation studies, corresponding to the upper and lower parts of this figure, respectively. For each part, three sets of experiments are conducted using text only, condition only, and text with condition. Given frames 1,4,5,8 of the generated videos.

D. Ablation study

Given the support for various conditions within our framework, conducting ablation studies on controllable video generation becomes essential. We conducted a series of ablation studies utilizing image and sketch conditions as examples. For these studies, we utilized VidRD as the foundational T2V model in both tasks. Specifically, in line with the training set, when only the input text is provided, we set the condition as a black image. Similarly, when lacking text inputs, we set the text as empty. This experimental setup allows us to independently control the conditions and text guidance, enabling us to discern their individual effects on video generation.

Fig. 5 illustrates the outcomes of two experiments conducted with image and sketch conditions, presented in the upper and lower sections of the figure respectively. In the absence of a provided condition, video synthesis solely guided by text yields a varied array of generated video content. This variability is attributed to the limited information contained within the text for effectively controlling the generation of visual data, particularly in the context of videos. Conversely, when excluding text guidance, utilizing only an image or sketch as a condition results in high-fidelity but low-diversity outcomes in terms of actions. The generated frames exhibit remarkable similarity regardless of whether an image or sketch

is employed. This uniformity arises from the static nature of the visual condition, which inadequately captures dynamic motion. Optimal generation results are achieved when both text guidance and visual conditions are utilized. While the image or sketch condition offers a static global appearance, it lacks the capacity for motion control. The integration of text signals introduces greater flexibility to the generated outcomes, particularly in terms of actions.

E. User Study

Base model setting We perform a user study to evaluate the performance of our EasyControl framework in the tasks of image-to-video and sketch-to-video generation. We employ VidRD as the foundational Text-to-Video (T2V) model, capable of generating 8-frame videos upon receiving conditions or text prompts at a resolution of 256×256 .

Comparison fairness It’s worth noting that, considering the varying sizes of videos generated by SVD, VideoCrafter1, and I2Vgen-XL in the Text-to-Video (T2V) task, while most evaluation condition data extracted from Midjourney [50] maintain equal width and height, we adjust the width and height of the generation model to match the smaller side. Additionally, we maintain the number of video frames generated by each model at the original default.

User study setting For the Image-to-Video (I2V) task, we curated 24 distinct text-image pairs, and for the Sketch-to-Video (S2V) task, we compiled 20 unique text-sketch pairs. We engaged 30 participants to evaluate the output based on predefined metrics. Utilizing Likert scale surveys [51], participants rated the generated content on a scale of 1 (Extremely Dissatisfied) to 5 (Extremely Satisfied). Additional details of our user study methodology are provided in the appendix.

Evaluation metrics i) **C-Match**: The alignment between the input conditions and the generated video. ii) **P-Match**: The alignment between the input prompt the the generated video. iii) **Consistency**: The temporal consistency of the generated video. iv) **Quality**: Overall visual quality of the generated video.

Results of Image-to-video task The I2V user study results are presented in Tab V, where our EasyControl achieves superior performance on each criterion against compared baselines. VideoComposer performs poorly in all metrics, particularly in the temporal consistency metric. This aligns with the findings in Sec IV-B, where we observe that videos generated by VideoComposer frequently suffer from flickering issues. VideoCrafter1 and SVD exhibit greater temporal consistency than I2VGen-XL, which is in line with our conclusion from Tab. III. We attribute I2VGen-XL’s lower performance in C-Match and P-Match metrics compared to VideoCrafter1 and SVD to the absence of text guidance, which prevents the input of text prompts. Despite not being able to input text prompts, SVD generates videos with high fidelity and quality, resulting in high metrics for SVD.

Results of Sketch-to-video task The Tab VI clearly shows a significant gap between VideoComposer and our method in terms of video quality, continuity, and match degree with conditions. This conclusion is further supported in Tab IV,

TABLE V

THE RESULT OF THE USER STUDY OF IMAGE-TO-VIDEO TASK CONDUCTED ON 24 TEXT-IMAGE PAIRS GENERATED VIDEOS ASSESSED BY 20 HUMAN EVALUATORS.

	C-Match	P-Match	Consistency	Quality
VideoComposer	2.97	2.93	2.43	2.80
I2VGen-XL	3.28	3.31	3.29	3.09
VideoCrafter1	3.35	3.31	3.28	3.28
SVD	3.38	3.37	3.37	3.28
Ours	3.90	3.89	3.80	3.71

which demonstrates that the FVD and IS performance of VideoComposer on two datasets is significantly weaker than our model. We suspect that this may be due to the unstable control signal integrated with VideoComposer.

TABLE VI

THE RESULT OF THE USER STUDY OF SKETCH-TO-VIDEO TASK CONDUCTED ON 20 TEXT-IMAGE PAIRS GENERATED VIDEOS ASSESSED BY 20 HUMAN EVALUATORS.

	C-Match	P-Match	Consistency	Quality
VideoComposer	2.35	2.93	1.69	1.44
Ours	4.42	4.19	4.26	4.14

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we introduce EasyControl, a versatile framework for controllable video generation. EasyControl accommodates diverse condition modalities such as image, canny edge, HED boundary, depth, sketch, and mask through training an additional condition adapter. This enhances control flexibility significantly. Leveraging our proposed condition propagation and injection schemes, our framework enables precise control using just a single condition map. Moreover, it facilitates training condition adapters with various pre-trained T2V models at a minimal cost. Extensive experimentation demonstrates the effectiveness and generalizability of our framework across diverse condition modalities and pre-trained T2V models. Results from quantitative analysis, qualitative assessments, and user studies collectively indicate that our approach surpasses existing state-of-the-art controllable video generation models in terms of both video quality and controllability. Notably, our method excels even in the image-to-video generation sub-task when compared to exclusive methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Saharia, W. Chan, S. Saxena, L. Li, J. Whang, E. L. Denton, K. Ghasemipour, R. Gontijo Lopes, B. Karagol Ayan, T. Salimans *et al.*, “Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 36 479–36 494, 2022.
- [2] J. Ho, W. Chan, C. Saharia, J. Whang, R. Gao, A. Gritsenko, D. P. Kingma, B. Poole, M. Norouzi, D. J. Fleet *et al.*, “Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022.
- [3] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 10 684–10 695.
- [4] U. Singer, A. Polyak, T. Hayes, X. Yin, J. An, S. Zhang, Q. Hu, H. Yang, O. Ashual, O. Gafni *et al.*, “Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022.
- [5] 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.
- [6] X. Wang, H. Yuan, S. Zhang, D. Chen, J. Wang, Y. Zhang, Y. Shen, D. Zhao, and J. Zhou, “Videocomposer: Compositional video synthesis with motion controllability,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02018*, 2023.
- [7] S. Yin, C. Wu, J. Liang, J. Shi, H. Li, G. Ming, and N. Duan, “Dragnuwa: Fine-grained control in video generation by integrating text, image, and trajectory,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08089*, 2023.
- [8] S. Zhang, J. Wang, Y. Zhang, K. Zhao, H. Yuan, Z. Qin, X. Wang, D. Zhao, and J. Zhou, “I2vgen-xl: High-quality image-to-video synthesis via cascaded diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04145*, 2023.
- [9] X. Guo, M. Zheng, L. Hou, Y. Gao, Y. Deng, C. Ma, W. Hu, Z. Zha, H. Huang, P. Wan *et al.*, “I2v-adapter: A general image-to-video adapter for video diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16693*, 2023.
- [10] W. Ren, H. Yang, G. Zhang, C. Wei, X. Du, S. Huang, and W. Chen, “Consistiv: Enhancing visual consistency for image-to-video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04324*, 2024.
- [11] P. Esser, J. Chiu, P. Atighehchian, J. Granskog, and A. Germanidis, “Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 7346–7356.
- [12] Y. Zhang, Y. Wei, D. Jiang, X. Zhang, W. Zuo, and Q. Tian, “Controlvideo: Training-free controllable text-to-video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13077*, 2023.
- [13] W. Chen, J. Wu, P. Xie, H. Wu, J. Li, X. Xia, X. Xiao, and L. Lin, “Control-a-video: Controllable text-to-video generation with diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13840*, 2023.
- [14] Z. Wang, Z. Yuan, X. Wang, T. Chen, M. Xia, P. Luo, and Y. Shan, “Motionctrl: A unified and flexible motion controller for video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03641*, 2023.
- [15] T.-S. Chen, C. H. Lin, H.-Y. Tseng, T.-Y. Lin, and M.-H. Yang, “Motion-conditioned diffusion model for controllable video synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14404*, 2023.
- [16] W. Wu, Z. Li, Y. Gu, R. Zhao, Y. He, D. J. Zhang, M. Z. Shou, Y. Li, T. Gao, and D. Zhang, “Draganything: Motion control for anything using entity representation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07420*, 2024.
- [17] W.-D. K. Ma, J. Lewis, and W. B. Kleijn, “Trailblazer: Trajectory control for diffusion-based video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00896*, 2023.
- [18] C. Chen, J. Shu, L. Chen, G. He, C. Wang, and Y. Li, “Motion-zero: Zero-shot moving object control framework for diffusion-based video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10150*, 2024.
- [19] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, “Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models,” in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2023, Paris, France, October 1-6, 2023*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3813–3824. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV51070.2023.00355>
- [20] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denosing diffusion probabilistic models,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/4c5bcfec8584af0d967f1ab10179ca4b-Abstract.html>
- [21] A. Nichol, P. Dhariwal, A. Ramesh, P. Shyam, P. Mishkin, B. McGrew, I. Sutskever, and M. Chen, “Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10741*, 2021.
- [22] 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.
- [23] D. Zhou, W. Wang, H. Yan, W. Lv, Y. Zhu, and J. Feng, “Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11018*, 2022.
- [24] J. Gu, S. Wang, H. Zhao, T. Lu, X. Zhang, Z. Wu, S. Xu, W. Zhang, Y.-G. Jiang, and H. Xu, “Reuse and diffuse: Iterative denoising for text-to-video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03549*, 2023.
- [25] A. Blattmann, R. Rombach, H. Ling, T. Dockhorn, S. W. Kim, S. Fidler, and K. Kreis, “Align your latents: High-resolution video synthesis with latent diffusion models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 22 563–22 575.
- [26] Y. Wang, X. Chen, X. Ma, S. Zhou, Z. Huang, Y. Wang, C. Yang, Y. He, J. Yu, P. Yang *et al.*, “Lavie: High-quality video generation with cascaded latent diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15103*, 2023.
- [27] S. Yu, K. Sohn, S. Kim, and J. Shin, “Video probabilistic diffusion models in projected latent space,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 18 456–18 466.
- [28] Z. Luo, D. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Huang, L. Wang, Y. Shen, D. Zhao, J. Zhou, and T. Tan, “Videofusion: Decomposed diffusion models for high-quality video generation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 10 209–10 218.
- [29] S. Ge, S. Nah, G. Liu, T. Poon, A. Tao, B. Catanzaro, D. Jacobs, J.-B. Huang, M.-Y. Liu, and Y. Balaji, “Preserve your own correlation: A noise prior for video diffusion models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 22 930–22 941.
- [30] J. Xing, M. Xia, Y. Zhang, H. Chen, X. Wang, T.-T. Wong, and Y. Shan, “Dynamicrafter: Animating open-domain images with video diffusion priors,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12190*, 2023.
- [31] X. Chen, Y. Wang, L. Zhang, S. Zhuang, X. Ma, J. Yu, Y. Wang, D. Lin, Y. Qiao, and Z. Liu, “Seine: Short-to-long video diffusion model for generative transition and prediction,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [32] J. Wang, Y. Zhang, J. Zou, Y. Zeng, G. Wei, L. Yuan, and H. Li, “Boximator: Generating rich and controllable motions for video synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01566*, 2024.
- [33] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 10 674–10 685. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.01042>
- [34] A. D. Sappa and F. Dornaika, “An edge-based approach to motion detection,” in *Computational Science - ICCS 2006, 6th International Conference, Reading, UK, May 28-31, 2006, Proceedings, Part I*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, V. N. Alexandrov, G. D. van Albada, P. M. A. Sloot, and J. J. Dongarra, Eds., vol. 3991. Springer, 2006, pp. 563–570. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/11758501_76
- [35] S. Xie and Z. Tu, “Holistically-nested edge detection,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2015, Santiago, Chile, December 7-13, 2015*. IEEE Computer Society, 2015, pp. 1395–1403. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.164>
- [36] R. Ranftl, K. Lasinger, D. Hafner, K. Schindler, and V. Koltun, “Towards robust monocular depth estimation: Mixing datasets for zero-shot cross-dataset transfer,” *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 1623–1637, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2020.3019967>
- [37] E. Simo-Serra, S. Iizuka, K. Sasaki, and H. Ishikawa, “Learning to simplify: fully convolutional networks for rough sketch cleanup,” *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 121:1–121:11, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2897824.2925972>
- [38] E. Simo-Serra, S. Iizuka, and H. Ishikawa, “Mastering sketching: Adversarial augmentation for structured prediction,” *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 37, no. 1, p. 11, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132703>
- [39] T. Xiao, Y. Liu, B. Zhou, Y. Jiang, and J. Sun, “Unified perceptual parsing for scene understanding,” in *Computer Vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th European Conference, Munich, Germany, September 8-14, 2018, Proceedings, Part V*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, V. Ferrari, M. Hebert, C. Sminchisescu, and Y. Weiss,

- Eds., vol. 11209. Springer, 2018, pp. 432–448. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01228-1_26
- [40] J. Wang, H. Yuan, D. Chen, Y. Zhang, X. Wang, and S. Zhang, “Modelscope text-to-video technical report,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2308.06571, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.06571>
- [41] A. Blattmann, T. Dockhorn, S. Kulal, D. Mendelevitch, M. Kilian, D. Lorenz, Y. Levi, Z. English, V. Voleti, A. Letts, V. Jampani, and R. Rombach, “Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2311.15127, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.15127>
- [42] Pexels, “Corran/pixelvideos,” <https://huggingface.co/datasets/Corran/pixelvideos>, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/Corran/pixelvideos>
- [43] 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.
- [44] J. Xu, T. Mei, T. Yao, and Y. Rui, “Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 5288–5296.
- [45] T. Unterthiner, S. van Steenkiste, K. Kurach, R. Marinier, M. Michalski, and S. Gelly, “FVD: A new metric for video generation,” in *Deep Generative Models for Highly Structured Data, ICLR 2019 Workshop*, 2019.
- [46] J. Carreira and A. Zisserman, “Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017, pp. 6299–6308.
- [47] M. Saito, S. Saito, M. Koyama, and S. Kobayashi, “Train sparsely, generate densely: Memory-efficient unsupervised training of high-resolution temporal GAN,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 128, no. 10, pp. 2586–2606, 2020.
- [48] H. Xu, J. Zhang, J. Cai, H. Rezatofighi, F. Yu, D. Tao, and A. Geiger, “Unifying flow, stereo and depth estimation,” *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 13 941–13 958, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2023.3298645>
- [49] H. Chen, M. Xia, Y. He, Y. Zhang, X. Cun, S. Yang, J. Xing, Y. Liu, Q. Chen, X. Wang *et al.*, “Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19512*, 2023.
- [50] J. Oppenlaender, “The creativity of text-to-image generation,” in *25th International Academic Mindtrek conference, Academic Mindtrek 2022, Tampere, Finland, November 16-18, 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 192–202. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3569219.3569352>
- [51] R. Likert, “A technique for the measurement of attitudes.” *Archives of psychology*, 1932.