

Learning How the World Evolves: Extrapolative Video World Models via Latent Dynamics Reasoning

Haodong Li^{1,2} Shaoteng Liu^{2*} Tianyu Wang² Chongjian Ge² Sihui Ji² Jiahan Zhang² Xin Lin^{1,2}
Haolin Lu¹ Zhe Lin² Manmohan Chandraker¹
¹UCSD ²Adobe




Figure 1: **Learning how the world evolves.** (A) Baseline method directly regresses the future, whereas our method regresses latent dynamics and reasons the future via kinematic integration. (B) Both match the ground truth (GT) in-distribution (ID), but only ours stays close to GT out-of-distribution (OOD). (C) Trained only on red balls moving left to right, LDR extrapolates the learned dynamics to a Pikachu and to a blue square moving right to left, while the baseline fails.

Abstract

The world evolves following its dynamics, i.e., its laws of motion. However, leading video diffusion models largely fit the pixels without modeling how the pixels transit over time. Thus, they render visually plausible frames but may not accurately obey the laws. To capture the dynamics purely from pixels, we introduce Latent Dynamics Reasoning (LDR). LDR casts the latent transition as an explicit kinematic integration, where the lower-order dynamics are integrated numerically and the model regresses only the third- and higher-order residual that drives the rollout. For this integration to extrapolate better, LDR runs it on a structured latent rather than dense convolutional features. Following PhyWorld (Kang et al. 2025),

we validate LDR on a controlled white-box physics benchmark spanning five tasks (uniform motion, parabola, collision, bouncing, looming), focusing on out-of-distribution scenarios that reveal whether a model has truly learned the underlying dynamics. LDR extrapolates the learned dynamics far better: the gap between its in- and out-of-distribution error is over $20\times$ smaller than the video diffusion baseline’s, under both single- and joint-task training at 256^2 resolution, while using $26\times$ fewer parameters and running $143\times$ faster. LDR can even generalize under severe shift: for example, trained only on red balls moving left-to-right, it correctly predicts the motion of a blue square moving right-to-left. To our knowledge, this is the first video world model that extrapolates learned dynamics beyond its training distribution. Project page: <https://lat-dyn-reason.github.io/>.

*Project lead.

Introduction

The world evolves following its dynamics, i.e., the laws of motion that govern how its state changes over time. However, leading video diffusion models mainly learn “what the world looks like”, without capturing “how it evolves”, i.e., the underlying dynamics that drive the transitions of pixels. Thus, they render visually plausible frames but may not accurately obey the laws. We argue that capturing the underlying dynamics from pixels is one of the most fundamental differences that distinguish video world models from video generators. A video world model should capture how the world evolves and accurately extrapolate the learned dynamics to unseen scenarios.

We introduce Latent Dynamics Reasoning (LDR), which predicts future frames by reasoning about the latent dynamics rather than regressing them directly (Fig. 1A). Specifically, LDR casts the latent transition as an explicit kinematic integration (Fig. 2B). From the structured latent (SL) of each conditioning frame, LDR starts by forming the first two time derivatives to initialize the rollout. It then rolls out step by step: the model regresses only the third- and higher-order residual, then numerically integrates the second-, first-, and zero-order SL in turn. This forces the model to learn the underlying dynamics, i.e., how the latent evolves over time, rather than merely what the next latent is. The SL gives a compact, structured representation free of the redundant semantic and appearance information carried by dense convolutional features, which makes the differentiation and integration of the dynamics more stable and more reliable when extrapolating (Fig. 2A). Finally, LDR decodes each future frame from its SL by warping the conditioning frame (Fig. 2C).

We build our benchmark using the simulator of PhyWorld (Kang et al. 2025), a clean and controlled testbed, and validate LDR on five tasks: uniform motion, parabola, collision, bouncing, and looming. For each task, we define in-distribution (ID) ranges of the initial conditions and out-of-distribution (OOD) ranges that share the same laws of motion. The model is trained only on ID samples. In ID testing, the model only needs to reproduce motions it has seen. But in OOD testing, the model is required to extrapolate the learned dynamics beyond the training distribution, which cleanly distinguishes capturing the dynamics from merely memorizing the pixels. In addition, because the simulator is white-box, we can directly measure the accuracy of the learned dynamics by parsing each object’s position and size from the predicted pixels and comparing them against the ground truth (GT).

Compared with PhyWorld’s standard video diffusion baseline (a DiT, for which we choose DiT-S), LDR extrapolates the learned dynamics to OOD samples far better while being much smaller and faster. Averaged over the five tasks at 256^2 resolution, LDR’s gap between ID and OOD error is over $20\times$ smaller than the baseline’s under both single-task and joint five-task training, while using $26\times$ fewer parameters and running $143\times$ faster. This efficiency comes from predicting future frames in a single forward pass, without iterative sampling or test-time optimization. We further ablate LDR’s two components by removing the dynamics reasoning or replacing SL with dense convolutional features. Either

ablation widens the ID-OOD gap several-fold, confirming that both are necessary. Qualitatively, LDR tracks the true motion under both single-task and joint training where the DiT baseline and ablated variants drift (Fig. 3, 4). LDR can also generalize the learned dynamics under large OOD shifts (Fig. 1, 5). Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- To learn the dynamics behind the pixels and extrapolate them to unseen scenarios, we propose Latent Dynamics Reasoning (LDR). To our knowledge, this is the first video world model that extrapolates learned dynamics beyond its training distribution.¹
- We instantiate LDR as a model that reasons about latent dynamics through kinematic integration in structured latent space. On a controlled benchmark of five physics tasks, LDR extrapolates far better than the video diffusion baseline while being much smaller and faster.

Related Works

Video Generation and Video World Models. Video generation models synthesize realistic frames via latent diffusion modeling (Ho, Jain, and Abbeel 2020; Song, Meng, and Ermon 2021; Song et al. 2021; Rombach et al. 2022; Peebles and Xie 2023; Blattmann et al. 2023; Brooks et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2025; Li et al. 2026a). Some of them are regarded as video world models (Ha and Schmidhuber 2018; Hafner et al. 2025; Bruce et al. 2024; Alonso et al. 2024; Agarwal et al. 2025, 2026). Realism, though, does not imply that the underlying dynamics is captured: the latent transition is a black box fit to the training distribution, and Cosmos (Agarwal et al. 2025, 2026) also reports that physical accuracy remains unsolved. Both JEPA (Bardet et al. 2024; Assran et al. 2025) and our LDR can be categorized as “next-latent prediction”, but like DiT, JEPA regresses the future latents directly without reasoning about the dynamics. We argue that capturing and extrapolating the learned dynamics is what should distinguish video world models from video generation models, and that is the capability LDR provides.

Learning and Extrapolating the Laws of Motion. Learning the laws of motion has been studied extensively. One route captures dynamics accurately but relies on external signals: some integrate dynamics over known states (Battaglia et al. 2016; Sanchez-Gonzalez et al. 2020; Liu et al. 2024; Kipf et al. 2018; Lam et al. 2023; Yin et al. 2023; Cachay et al. 2023), some under conservation or PDE priors (Greydanus, Dzamba, and Yosinski 2019; Cranmer et al. 2020; Guen and Thome 2020; Alet et al. 2021), while others draw supervision from physics engines or physical laws (Xue et al. 2025; Lin et al. 2025; Li et al. 2026b). Another route learns dynamics purely from pixels via neural ODE modeling (Chen et al. 2018; Rubanova, Chen, and Duvenaud 2019; Park et al. 2021; Watter et al. 2015; Krishnan, Shalit, and Sontag 2015; Çağatay Yıldız, Heinonen, and Lähdesmäki 2019), yet these are validated only within the training regime, leaving extrapolation of the learned dynamics largely unexplored.

¹Scope: We validate LDR as a principle on simulated scenarios with simple objects. Scaling to richer, even real-world scenes with larger models is future work.




Figure 2: **Overview of LDR.** Given three conditioning frames I_0, I_1, I_2 , LDR predicts the future frames $\hat{I}_3, \hat{I}_4, \dots, \hat{I}_T$ in three stages. (A) LDR first encodes each input frame into a structured latent (SL). (B) LDR measures the low-order time derivatives of the given SL, then rolls out by regressing only the high-order residual with f_θ and numerically integrating the lower orders to the next latent $\hat{s}_t$ ($t \in \{3, 4, \dots, T\}$). (C) LDR finally decodes each predicted latent to an RGB frame $\hat{I}_t$.

Beyond its training distribution, a neural network extrapolates according to the inductive bias of its architecture rather than the data it has seen (Xu et al. 2021). A model therefore extrapolates dynamics only when the reasoning of dynamics is built into its architecture rather than fit directly from data. Following this principle, LDR reasons about the underlying dynamics through kinematic integration in a structured latent space, aiming not only to capture the dynamics purely from pixels but also to extrapolate the learned dynamics beyond the training distribution. To our knowledge, LDR is the first video world model that extrapolates learned dynamics beyond its training distribution.

Structured Representation. As mentioned, LDR reasons about the dynamics in a structured latent space. This choice is motivated by (Jakab et al. 2018; Kulkarni et al. 2019; Minderer et al. 2019; Daniel and Tamar 2024; Locatello et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2023; Kipf, van der Pol, and Welling 2020; Jiang et al. 2024), where structured representations (e.g., geometric coordinates or object-centric slots) outperform unstructured features (e.g., convolutional features) in sequential modeling. For more stable reasoning and more reliable extrapolation, LDR follows (Jakab et al. 2018; Kulkarni et al. 2019; Minderer et al. 2019) to represent each frame as the geometric coordinates of its convolutional feature.

Method

Latent Dynamics Reasoning (LDR) predicts future frames by reasoning about the dynamics behind the pixels (Fig. 2). It first encodes each input frame into a structured latent (SL) (Fig. 2A). It then reasons about how this latent evolves via explicit kinematic integration (Fig. 2B). Finally, it decodes each predicted latent back to a frame (Fig. 2C). Although LDR consists of three conceptual stages, it predicts in a single feed-forward pass, without test-time optimization or iterative solvers.

Latent Dynamics Reasoning

From the conditioning latents, LDR first measures their first- and second-order time derivatives to initialize the rollout. It then regresses only the third- and higher-order residual, and rolls out the future latents by kinematic integration.

Initialization. Because LDR regresses only the third- and higher-order residual, it initializes the rollout only up to the second-order derivative. A second-order finite difference is fixed by three points, so LDR conditions on three frames. It forms the initial dynamics from the conditioning latents by finite differences:

$$\dot{s}_0 = \frac{s_1 - s_0}{\Delta t}, \quad \dot{s}_1 = \frac{s_2 - s_1}{\Delta t}, \quad \ddot{s}_0 = \frac{\dot{s}_1 - \dot{s}_0}{\Delta t}, \quad (1)$$

with $\Delta t = 1$. If we consider s itself as “position”, $\dot{s}$ and $\ddot{s}$ are its “velocity” and “acceleration”, both derivatives of the latent trajectory.

Kinematics Integration. LDR then rolls out the next latent one at a time, regressing the third- and higher-order residual and integrating the lower orders, $\forall t \in \{3, \dots, T\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{s}_{t-2} &= \ddot{s}_{t-3} + \ddot{s}_{t-3}\Delta t \approx \ddot{s}_{t-3} + f_\theta(\dot{s}_{t-3}, \dot{s}_{t-3}), \\ \dot{s}_{t-1} &= \dot{s}_{t-2} + \ddot{s}_{t-2}\Delta t, \quad \hat{s}_t = \hat{s}_{t-1} + \dot{s}_{t-1}\Delta t. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The rollout is initiated by the conditioning latents, i.e., $\hat{s}_i = s_i$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Here $f_\theta(\cdot) = \tanh(\text{MLP}(\cdot))$ regresses the third- and higher-order residual, i.e., the change in the second-order latent, approximating $\ddot{s}_{t-3}\Delta t$. The integration then propagates this residual down through the second- and first-order latents to produce the next latent. Only f_θ is learned; the integration chain is fixed (Alg. 1).

Why LDR Extrapolates? When tested beyond the training distribution, a network follows the inductive bias of its architecture rather than the data it was trained on, and a plain regressor with no such bias flattens toward the training mean off-support (Xu et al. 2021). In OOD video prediction, this

Algorithm 1: Latent Dynamics Reasoning

Require: conditioning frames I_0, I_1, I_2 ; horizon T ; encoder E_ϕ ; decoder D_ψ ; high-order (≥ 3) dynamics residual regressor f_θ ; $\Delta t = 1$

```

1: for  $i = 0$  to  $2$  do
2:    $s_i \leftarrow E_\phi(I_i)$  // encode
3: end for
4:  $\dot{s}_0 \leftarrow \frac{s_1 - s_0}{\Delta t}$ ;  $\dot{s}_1 \leftarrow \frac{s_2 - s_1}{\Delta t}$  // first order
5:  $\ddot{s}_0 \leftarrow \frac{\dot{s}_1 - \dot{s}_0}{\Delta t}$  // second order
6: for  $t = 3$  to  $T$  do
7:    $\ddot{s}_{t-2} \leftarrow \ddot{s}_{t-3} + f_\theta(\dot{s}_{t-3}, \ddot{s}_{t-3})$ 
   // regress high-order residual, get next 2-order latent
8:    $\dot{s}_{t-1} \leftarrow \dot{s}_{t-2} + \ddot{s}_{t-2}\Delta t$ 
9:    $\hat{s}_t \leftarrow \hat{s}_{t-1} + \dot{s}_{t-1}\Delta t$ 
   // integrate to next latent (zero-order)
10:   $\hat{I}_t \leftarrow D_\psi(\hat{s}_t, s_2, I_2)$  // decode
11: end for
Ensure: predicted frames  $\hat{I}_3, \dots, \hat{I}_T$ 

```

manifests as reproducing the closest training example instead of accurately obeying the underlying dynamics (Kang et al. 2025). LDR instead casts the state transition as an explicit kinematic integration, forcing the model to learn the abstract pattern of the state’s motion, i.e., “how the state evolves” rather than merely “what the next state is”. This architecturally builds an inductive bias toward capturing the underlying dynamics behind the pixels, letting LDR extrapolate them well beyond the training distribution.

Structured Latent

The more the latent state entangles with dynamics-irrelevant details, the harder the dynamics is to reason (i.e., differentiation and integration) and to extrapolate. LDR thus reasons in the SL space, a compact representation free of the dynamics-irrelevant detail (e.g., appearance and semantics) carried by dense convolutional features, which makes the dynamics reasoning more stable and more reliable when extrapolating.

Encoding. Before dynamics reasoning, LDR first encodes each input frame into a structured latent, $\forall i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$:

$$s_i = E_\phi(I_i) = \text{Struct}(\mathcal{C}_\phi(I_i)) = (\mu_i, \sigma_i). \quad (3)$$

A convolutional network $\mathcal{C}_\phi$ maps the frame I_i to a feature map z_i . A marginal soft-argmax then turns each channel of z_i into a spatial distribution, from which LDR extracts the geometric coordinate (i.e., the centroid μ_i and extent σ_i) and forms the structured latent s_i (Jakab et al. 2018; Kulkarni et al. 2019; Minderer et al. 2019).

Decoding. After dynamics reasoning, LDR decodes each predicted latent back to an RGB frame by warping the conditioning frame, following (Siarohin et al. 2019, 2021; Gao et al. 2019), $\forall t \in \{3, \dots, T\}$:

$$\hat{I}_t = D_\psi(\hat{s}_t, s_2, I_2) = \mathcal{R}_\psi(I_2, \mathcal{T}_\psi(\hat{s}_t, s_2)). \quad (4)$$

A learned transformation module $\mathcal{T}_\psi$ predicts a dense warping flow from the conditioning latent s_2 to the predicted one




Figure 3: **Qualitative OOD comparison under single-task training.** For each task and each method, we show a predicted frame and its error map (darker is better). LDR stays close to the GT, while the baseline and both ablations drift.

$\hat{s}_t, \mathcal{R}_\psi$ then predicts the conditioning frame I_2 along this flow and renders frame $\hat{I}_t$.

Optimization

We train all components of LDR (the encoder E_ϕ , the decoder D_ψ , and the high-order dynamics residual predictor f_θ) jointly and from scratch: the model carries no pretrained weights or modules. Three terms supervise the training. An RGB reconstruction term optimizes the encoder and decoder: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ae}}^{\text{rgb}} = \sum_{t=0}^T \|\Phi(D_\psi(E_\phi(I_t), s_2, I_2)) - \Phi(I_t)\|_1$, where Φ is a multi-scale image feature extractor (Johnson, Alahi, and Fei-Fei 2016). An RGB rollout term optimizes the entire model: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{roll}}^{\text{rgb}} = \sum_{t=3}^T \|\Phi(\hat{I}_t) - \Phi(I_t)\|_1$. A latent rollout term primarily optimizes f_θ : $\mathcal{L}_{\text{roll}}^{\text{SL}} = \sum_{t=3}^T \|\hat{s}_t - \text{sg}(s_t)\|_2^2$. The full objective is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LDR}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{roll}}^{\text{rgb}} + \lambda_{\text{ae}}^{\text{rgb}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ae}}^{\text{rgb}} + \lambda_{\text{roll}}^{\text{SL}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{roll}}^{\text{SL}}. \quad (5)$$

In training, we grow the rollout horizon from short to full, which stabilizes long-horizon backpropagation. In testing, we always roll out the full horizon.

Experiments

Experimental Setup

Benchmark. For validating LDR, we build a controlled benchmark on the PhyWorld simulator (Kang et al. 2025), spanning five physics tasks involving one or two moving balls: *uniform motion* (a ball translating at a constant velocity); *parabola* (a projectile under gravity); *collision* (two balls colliding elastically head-on); *bouncing* (a projectile rebounding off the ground, losing energy at each bounce); *looming* (a ball translating while growing or shrinking). In

Task	Metric	DiT-S (PhyWorld Baseline)			LDR w/o Dyn. Reasoning			LDR w/o Struct. Latent			LDR (Ours)		
		ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap
Uniform	pos	0.081	0.705	0.624	<u>0.066</u>	0.297	0.232	0.082	<u>0.107</u>	<u>0.025</u>	0.044	0.046	0.003
	rad	0.015	<u>0.026</u>	<u>0.011</u>	0.018	0.045	0.027	0.011	0.064	0.053	<u>0.014</u>	<u>0.020</u>	<u>0.006</u>
Parabola	pos	0.076	0.459	0.383	0.134	<u>0.191</u>	<u>0.057</u>	<u>0.054</u>	0.200	0.146	0.031	0.040	0.009
	rad	0.009	0.040	0.031	0.024	<u>0.024</u>	<u>0.000</u>	<u>0.013</u>	0.084	0.071	0.019	<u>0.024</u>	<u>0.005</u>
Collision	pos _F	0.057	0.191	0.134	0.126	0.327	0.201	0.049	<u>0.106</u>	<u>0.057</u>	<u>0.051</u>	0.078	0.027
	rad _F	0.062	<u>0.069</u>	<u>0.007</u>	0.066	0.107	0.041	<u>0.052</u>	<u>0.107</u>	<u>0.055</u>	<u>0.053</u>	<u>0.078</u>	<u>0.025</u>
	pos _P	0.070	0.333	0.263	0.176	0.521	0.345	0.053	<u>0.151</u>	<u>0.098</u>	<u>0.063</u>	0.104	0.041
	rad _P	0.071	<u>0.079</u>	<u>0.008</u>	0.079	0.132	0.053	<u>0.061</u>	0.125	0.064	<u>0.061</u>	<u>0.094</u>	<u>0.033</u>
Bouncing	pos	<u>0.064</u>	0.243	0.179	0.093	0.439	0.346	0.070	<u>0.180</u>	<u>0.110</u>	0.057	0.075	0.018
	rad	0.020	<u>0.043</u>	<u>0.023</u>	0.029	0.083	0.054	<u>0.013</u>	0.099	0.086	0.015	<u>0.024</u>	<u>0.009</u>
Looming	pos	0.067	0.246	0.179	0.104	<u>0.109</u>	0.005	<u>0.053</u>	0.163	0.110	0.040	0.046	<u>0.006</u>
	rad	0.029	0.169	0.140	0.021	<u>0.062</u>	0.041	<u>0.020</u>	<u>0.047</u>	<u>0.027</u>	0.015	0.029	<u>0.014</u>
Avg	pos	0.069	0.369	0.300 (23.9 $\times$)	0.104	0.273	0.168 (13.4 $\times$)	<u>0.062</u>	<u>0.151</u>	<u>0.090</u> (7.2 $\times$)	0.044	0.057	0.013
Avg	rad	0.027	0.069	0.042 (3.6 $\times$)	0.032	<u>0.064</u>	<u>0.032</u> (2.8 $\times$)	<u>0.022</u>	0.080	<u>0.058</u> (4.9 $\times$)	<u>0.023</u>	<u>0.035</u>	<u>0.012</u>

Table 1: **Quantitative comparison under single-task training at 256²**. We report position (pos) and radius (rad) errors on both ID and OOD splits, extracted from the predicted frames, and the ID-OOD gap: $\max(0, \text{OOD} - \text{ID})$. For collision, we report both full-window (F) and post-collision (P) results. The **Avg** rows average results across the five tasks (use only the full-window result for collision), and each competitor’s gap is annotated with its ratio to LDR’s ($\times$). Per split, the best number is in **bold** and the second best is underlined. Gray rows mark numbers that do not reflect the motion: looming’s rad reflects the growing or shrinking motion of the ball, but in the other tasks the ball’s radius is physically constant, so rad there reflects primarily rendering fidelity rather than dynamics.

Task	Metric	DiT-S (PhyWorld Baseline)			LDR w/o Dyn. Reasoning			LDR w/o Struct. Latent			LDR (Ours)		
		ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap
Uniform	pos	0.078	0.615	0.537	0.885	0.993	0.108	<u>0.056</u>	<u>0.101</u>	<u>0.045</u>	0.044	0.046	0.002
	rad	<u>0.017</u>	<u>0.048</u>	<u>0.031</u>	0.036	0.080	0.044	0.019	0.051	0.032	<u>0.017</u>	<u>0.023</u>	<u>0.006</u>
Parabola	pos	0.075	0.978	0.903	0.193	<u>0.279</u>	<u>0.086</u>	<u>0.060</u>	0.321	0.261	0.050	0.067	0.017
	rad	<u>0.015</u>	0.038	0.023	0.027	<u>0.037</u>	<u>0.010</u>	<u>0.016</u>	0.050	0.034	<u>0.016</u>	<u>0.025</u>	<u>0.009</u>
Collision	pos _F	0.090	0.235	0.145	0.202	0.392	0.190	<u>0.055</u>	<u>0.112</u>	<u>0.057</u>	0.051	0.073	0.022
	rad _F	<u>0.052</u>	<u>0.067</u>	<u>0.015</u>	0.085	0.174	0.089	<u>0.055</u>	0.097	0.042	0.078	<u>0.079</u>	<u>0.001</u>
	pos _P	0.121	0.431	0.310	0.277	0.664	0.387	<u>0.062</u>	<u>0.153</u>	<u>0.091</u>	0.060	0.112	0.052
	rad _P	<u>0.061</u>	<u>0.078</u>	<u>0.017</u>	0.104	0.214	0.110	<u>0.064</u>	0.111	0.047	0.095	<u>0.096</u>	<u>0.001</u>
Bouncing	pos	0.101	0.780	0.679	0.279	0.626	0.347	<u>0.074</u>	<u>0.240</u>	<u>0.166</u>	0.063	0.107	0.044
	rad	<u>0.012</u>	<u>0.036</u>	<u>0.024</u>	0.024	0.068	0.044	<u>0.016</u>	0.056	0.040	0.022	<u>0.042</u>	<u>0.020</u>
Looming	pos	0.087	0.351	0.265	0.909	0.828	0.000	<u>0.051</u>	<u>0.188</u>	0.137	0.041	0.048	<u>0.007</u>
	rad	0.027	0.138	0.111	0.166	0.306	0.140	<u>0.019</u>	<u>0.054</u>	<u>0.035</u>	0.018	0.032	0.014
Avg	pos	0.086	0.592	0.506 (27.7 $\times$)	0.494	0.624	0.146 (8.0 $\times$)	0.059	0.192	<u>0.133</u> (7.3 $\times$)	0.050	0.068	0.018
Avg	rad	<u>0.025</u>	0.065	0.040 (4.1 $\times$)	0.068	0.133	0.065 (6.5 $\times$)	<u>0.025</u>	<u>0.062</u>	<u>0.037</u> (3.7 $\times$)	0.030	<u>0.040</u>	<u>0.010</u>

Table 2: **Quantitative comparison under joint five-task training at 256²**. Same organization, metrics, and notations as Tab. 1.

every task, the balls share the same ID range of initial conditions: a speed $v \in [1, 4]$ and a radius $r \in [0.7, 1.4]$ in a world of scale 10 (looming further fixes the growing or shrinking rate $|\dot{r}| \in [0, 0.03]$). OOD test samples push these conditions beyond both ends of the ID range: the speed to $v \in [0.05, 6]$, the radius to $r \in [0.6, 2]$, and the scale rate to $|\dot{r}| \in [0.05, 0.09]$. Since the same motion laws hold on both splits, OOD testing effectively evaluates the model’s capability in extrapolating the learned underlying dynamics in unseen scenarios.

Training protocols. We train all methods (the DiT-S baseline, LDR, and its ablated variants) from scratch. Single-task training fits one model per task. Joint training fits one model on all five tasks at once, which is a harder setting. Every model conditions on three frames, predicts the next 29 (i.e., $T = 31$), and trains only on ID samples.

Metrics. Because the simulator is white-box and each object in our benchmark is a ball, to directly evaluate the dynamics, we extract each object’s center and radius from the

predicted frames and compare them against the GT, giving position error (pos) and radius error (rad). We report numbers tested on both ID and OOD splits and the ID-OOD gap: $\max(0, \text{OOD} - \text{ID})$.

Baselines and ablated variants. We compare against the DiT-S baseline of PhyWorld, which represents the standard video diffusion solution of the community, and two ablations each remove one LDR component. Removing dynamics reasoning replaces the kinematic integration with a direct residual regression of the next latent (i.e., regressing $s_{t+1} - s_t$). Removing the structured latent (SL) runs the same dynamics reasoning but on a dense convolutional latent instead.

Implementation details. We train every model from scratch with AdamW (learning rate 10^{-4} , weight decay 0.01, gradient clipping 1.0) and a global batch size of 256, for 10K steps by default and 20K for collision, bouncing, and joint training. LDR uses a three-layer MLP of width 256 for f_θ and weights the losses by $\lambda_{\text{ae}}^{\text{rgb}} = 1.0$ and $\lambda_{\text{roll}}^{\text{SL}} = 0.5$. The training rollout gradually grows to the full 29 frames by step 8K. All

Task	Metric	DiT-S (PhyWorld Baseline)			LDR w/o Dyn. Reasoning			LDR w/o Struct. Latent			LDR (Ours)		
		ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap
Uniform	pos	0.148	0.381	0.233	0.136	0.414	0.278	<u>0.128</u>	<u>0.137</u>	<u>0.009</u>	0.088	0.087	0.000
	rad	0.018	0.040	0.022	0.013	0.053	0.040	0.031	0.091	0.060	0.008	0.016	0.008
Parabola	pos	0.166	0.388	0.222	<u>0.086</u>	<u>0.203</u>	<u>0.117</u>	0.091	0.301	0.210	0.081	0.080	0.000
	rad	0.011	0.038	0.027	0.013	0.040	0.027	0.018	0.128	0.110	0.020	0.026	0.006
Collision	pos _F	0.104	0.240	0.136	0.078	0.205	0.127	0.086	<u>0.161</u>	<u>0.075</u>	0.085	0.100	0.015
	rad _F	0.059	0.081	0.022	0.050	0.109	0.059	<u>0.053</u>	0.125	0.072	0.054	0.084	0.030
	pos _P	0.119	0.370	0.251	0.090	0.312	0.222	0.090	<u>0.218</u>	<u>0.128</u>	0.092	0.128	0.036
	rad _P	0.067	0.090	0.023	0.059	0.132	0.073	0.060	0.142	0.082	0.063	0.101	0.038
Bouncing	pos	0.114	0.308	0.194	0.181	0.471	0.290	0.098	<u>0.261</u>	<u>0.163</u>	<u>0.102</u>	0.114	0.012
	rad	0.013	0.051	0.038	0.015	0.089	0.074	0.015	0.143	0.128	0.024	0.043	0.019
Looming	pos	0.097	0.249	0.152	0.148	0.317	0.169	<u>0.088</u>	<u>0.240</u>	<u>0.152</u>	0.074	0.095	0.021
	rad	0.035	0.166	0.131	0.041	0.148	0.107	0.023	<u>0.053</u>	<u>0.030</u>	<u>0.029</u>	0.045	0.016
Avg	pos	0.126	0.313	0.187 (19.6 $\times$)	0.126	0.322	0.196 (20.5 $\times$)	<u>0.098</u>	<u>0.220</u>	<u>0.122</u> (12.7 $\times$)	0.086	0.095	0.010
Avg	rad	<u>0.027</u>	<u>0.075</u>	<u>0.048</u> (3.0 $\times$)	0.026	0.088	0.062 (3.9 $\times$)	0.028	0.108	0.080 (5.1 $\times$)	<u>0.027</u>	0.043	0.016

Table 3: **Quantitative comparison under single task training at 128²**. Same organization, metrics, and notations as Tab. 1.

Task	Metric	DiT-S (PhyWorld Baseline)			LDR w/o Dyn. Reasoning			LDR w/o Struct. Latent			LDR (Ours)		
		ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap	ID	OOD	Gap
Uniform	pos	0.094	<u>0.172</u>	<u>0.078</u>	0.800	0.927	0.127	0.090	0.193	0.103	<u>0.091</u>	0.089	0.000
	rad	0.027	<u>0.035</u>	<u>0.008</u>	0.033	0.098	0.065	<u>0.020</u>	0.067	0.047	<u>0.016</u>	0.022	0.006
Parabola	pos	0.086	0.358	0.272	0.169	<u>0.294</u>	<u>0.125</u>	0.091	0.383	0.292	0.083	0.125	0.042
	rad	0.014	<u>0.041</u>	0.027	0.036	0.062	<u>0.026</u>	0.017	0.075	0.058	<u>0.017</u>	0.030	0.013
Collision	pos _F	0.102	0.179	0.077	0.151	0.285	0.134	<u>0.093</u>	<u>0.162</u>	<u>0.069</u>	0.086	0.106	0.020
	rad _F	0.050	0.064	0.014	0.057	0.125	0.068	0.059	0.131	0.072	<u>0.056</u>	0.079	0.023
	pos _P	0.130	0.288	0.158	0.203	0.462	0.259	<u>0.101</u>	<u>0.218</u>	<u>0.117</u>	0.094	0.132	0.038
	rad _P	0.060	<u>0.074</u>	<u>0.014</u>	0.069	0.155	0.086	<u>0.068</u>	0.147	0.079	<u>0.066</u>	<u>0.094</u>	<u>0.028</u>
Bouncing	pos	0.104	0.226	0.122	0.180	0.471	0.291	0.105	0.369	0.264	0.100	0.162	0.062
	rad	0.014	0.030	0.016	0.032	0.087	0.055	0.020	0.079	0.059	<u>0.011</u>	0.046	0.035
Looming	pos	<u>0.086</u>	<u>0.172</u>	0.086	0.852	0.809	0.000	0.085	0.260	0.175	0.090	0.090	0.000
	rad	0.035	0.113	0.078	0.172	0.309	0.137	<u>0.022</u>	<u>0.058</u>	<u>0.036</u>	0.016	0.037	0.021
Avg	pos	0.094	<u>0.222</u>	<u>0.127</u> (5.1 $\times$)	0.430	0.557	0.135 (5.5 $\times$)	<u>0.093</u>	0.273	0.181 (7.3 $\times$)	0.090	0.114	0.025
Avg	rad	<u>0.028</u>	<u>0.057</u>	<u>0.029</u> (1.5 $\times$)	0.066	0.136	0.070 (3.6 $\times$)	<u>0.028</u>	0.082	0.054 (2.8 $\times$)	<u>0.023</u>	0.043	0.020

Table 4: **Quantitative comparison under joint five-task training at 128²**. Same organization, metrics, and notations as Tab. 1.

runs use seed 42 and report a single run on 8 $\times$ 8 NVIDIA A100-80G GPUs with PyTorch 2.4 and CUDA 12.1. Each model is trained in both 128² and 256² resolution.

Experimental Results

Quantitative Comparison. We report the full quantitative comparison at both resolutions in Tab. 1, 2, 3, 4. At 256², LDR’s averaged ID-OOD gap in position error is over 20 $\times$ smaller than the DiT-S baseline’s, under both single-task (23.9 $\times$) and joint five-task (27.7 $\times$) training. The baseline reproduces ID motion accurately, yet its OOD error explodes, rising from an average of 0.086 to 0.592 under joint training, while LDR holds OOD close to ID (0.050 to 0.068). This is how a regressor with no dynamics bias behaves off the training distribution: it reverts toward the closest training sample (Xu et al. 2021; Kang et al. 2025), while LDR reliably extrapolates the learned dynamics to unseen scenarios.

Higher resolution strengthens LDR’s performance gain. From 128² to 256², the DiT-S baseline’s average OOD position error grows (joint 0.222 to 0.592) while LDR’s shrinks (joint 0.114 to 0.068), and the same directions hold under single-task training (Tab. 1, 3). The two methods scale in opposite directions. A capacity-driven regressor fits the training distribution more tightly at higher resolution, so it collapses harder OOD. LDR instead captures more precise dynamics from higher-resolution frames, so its ID and OOD error

improve together. Explicit dynamics reasoning makes OOD error track ID error: LDR captures the underlying dynamics instead of memorizing the training distribution.

Ablation Study. Dynamics reasoning is the decisive component. Removing dynamics reasoning is the most damaging ablation. This variant regresses the residual to the next latent ($\mathbf{s}_{t+1} - \mathbf{s}_t$) directly instead of integrating the dynamics, similar to the DiT-S baseline that regresses the entire future clip ($I_3, I_4, \dots, I_T$). Under single-task training its averaged ID-OOD gap in position error is several times LDR’s, 0.168 against LDR’s 0.013 at 256². Under joint five-task training it fails even within the training range: unable to disambiguate the five regimes, it misapplies one task’s dynamics to another, for example a downward pull on the horizontal uniform motion task, so its averaged ID position error (0.494) is an order of magnitude above LDR’s (0.050) while its OOD error stays large (0.624).² Without an inductive bias toward the dynamics, a direct regressor cannot capture the motion even within the training range.

The SL is a strong complement. Because LDR’s decoding is tightly coupled to the SL, we cannot cleanly remove

²This variant fails on uniform motion and looming in both ID and OOD under joint training. Thus, its near-zero ID-OOD gap on these two tasks mainly reflects ID failure rather than robust OOD extrapolation.

	DiT-S (PhyWorld Baseline)	LDR (Ours)
Params (M)	106.1114	4.0933
Ratio to LDR ($\times$)	25.9	1.0
Latency @ 128 ² (s)	0.7451	0.0174
Ratio to LDR ($\times$)	42.8	1.0
Latency @ 256 ² (s)	5.2069	0.0363
Ratio to LDR ($\times$)	143.4	1.0

Table 5: **Efficiency study** measured on one NVIDIA A100-80G on 32-frame clips. The DiT-S baseline uses 50 DDIM steps following (Kang et al. 2025).

only the ‘‘Structuralize’’ operation shown in Fig. 2A. Instead, we replace LDR’s whole encoding (Fig. 2A) and decoding (Fig. 2C) with the same frozen VAE as the DiT-S baseline (Romach et al. 2022; Kang et al. 2025), while keeping the dynamics reasoning unchanged. This variant extrapolates position far better than the baseline and stays second best overall (Tab. 1, 2), with an average position gap of 0.133 against the baseline’s 0.506 at 256² joint training, and 0.090 against 0.300 under single-task training. In summary, removing either component widens the gap, so both are necessary to LDR.

Qualitative Comparison. Across both the single-task training and joint five-task training, LDR follows the true motion while the DiT-S baseline and both ablations drift (Fig. 3, 4 report the qualitative comparison at 256²). On the OOD cases, LDR’s error map stays dark while others’ are visibly lighter.




Figure 4: **Qualitative OOD comparison under joint five-task training.** A single model holds all five tasks, yet LDR still stays close to GT while the others drift.

Efficiency Study

Though it consists of three conceptual stages (Fig. 2), LDR predicts in a single feed-forward pass, using 26 $\times$ fewer parameters than the DiT-S baseline and running up to 143 $\times$




Figure 5: **Stress test under severe OOD shift.** Trained only on red balls but tested on an unseen object (e.g., ‘‘earth’’), LDR still predicts the correct motion, while the others fail.

faster at 256² (Tab. 5). It carries only 4.1M parameters against the baseline’s 106.1M, with no iterative diffusion sampling and no test-time optimization. The DiT-S baseline instead runs 50 denoising steps following (Kang et al. 2025), each a full transformer forward whose cost grows quadratically with token count, plus a heavy VAE encoding and decoding. LDR’s extrapolation is thus not simply a matter of scale or compute: it is at once more extrapolative and one to two orders of magnitude smaller and faster. This is consistent with (Kang et al. 2025): scaling neither the model nor the data helps a model extrapolate the underlying dynamics.

Stress Test

LDR can also generalize under shifts far larger than the OOD ranges defined in our benchmark. Although it sees only red balls in training, we test it on unseen earth-textured balls (Fig. 5). Together with Fig. 1, these illustrations show that LDR still predicts motion that accurately obeys the dynamics even under large OOD shifts, where the DiT-S baseline fails. This robustness draws on both components of LDR. The SL encodes each frame as a geometric structure and decodes it by warping the conditioning frame, which grants robustness to unseen appearances. The dynamics reasoning learns only the high-order dynamics residual, leaving the low-order dynamics measured rather than learned, which grants robustness to unseen initial low-order dynamics.

Summary

We introduced Latent Dynamics Reasoning (LDR), an extrapolative video world model that predicts by reasoning about the latent dynamics rather than regressing future frames directly. Reasoning about the dynamics lets a video world model learn how the world evolves and carry that

knowledge beyond what it has seen. To our knowledge, LDR is the first video world model that extrapolates learned dynamics beyond its training distribution.

Limitation. The dynamics reasoning of LDR is content-agnostic: the kinematic integration makes no assumption about what the latent encodes or which laws of motion govern the pixels. However, the latent representation it reasons over limits the practical universality of LDR. First, the SL encodes only the “structure” of the image feature rather than the “content” itself, so LDR may not model dynamics that live in the appearance, such as color evolving over time. Second, the SL, implemented as a geometric coordinate, handles simple scenes but may not be expressive enough for richer scenes. Finally, we validate LDR as a principle on simulated scenes with simple objects, and scaling it to richer, even real-world scenes with larger models remains future work. Strengthening the latent representation while keeping the general reasoning core is a promising path toward true video world models that learn how the world evolves.

References

- Agarwal, N.; Ali, A.; Allen, J.; Antolini, M.; Aubame, A.; Azzolini, A.; Bai, J.; Bala, M.; Balaji, Y.; Bapst, J.; et al. 2026. Cosmos 3: Omnimodal World Models for Physical AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.02800*.
- Agarwal, N.; Ali, A.; Bala, M.; Balaji, Y.; Barker, E.; Cai, T.; Chattopadhyay, P.; Chen, Y.; Cui, Y.; Ding, Y.; et al. 2025. Cosmos World Foundation Model Platform for Physical AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.03575*.
- Alet, F.; Doblar, D. D.; Zhou, A.; Tenenbaum, J.; Kawaguchi, K.; and Finn, C. 2021. Noether Networks: Meta-Learning Useful Conserved Quantities. In *NeurIPS*.
- Alonso, E.; Jelley, A.; Micheli, V.; Kanervisto, A.; Storkey, A.; Pearce, T.; and Fleuret, F. 2024. Diffusion for World Modeling: Visual Details Matter in Atari. In *NeurIPS*.
- Assran, M.; Bardes, A.; Fan, D.; Garrido, Q.; Howes, R.; Muckley, M.; Rizvi, A.; Roberts, C.; Sinha, K.; Zholus, A.; et al. 2025. V-JEPA 2: Self-Supervised Video Models Enable Understanding, Prediction and Planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.09985*.
- Bardes, A.; Garrido, Q.; Ponce, J.; Chen, X.; Rabbat, M.; LeCun, Y.; Assran, M.; and Ballas, N. 2024. Revisiting Feature Prediction for Learning Visual Representations from Video. *TMLR*.
- Battaglia, P. W.; Pascanu, R.; Lai, M.; Rezende, D.; and Kavukcuoglu, K. 2016. Interaction Networks for Learning about Objects, Relations and Physics. In *NeurIPS*.
- Blattmann, A.; Dockhorn, T.; Kulal, S.; Mendelevitch, D.; Kilian, M.; Lorenz, D.; Levi, Y.; English, Z.; Voleti, V.; Letts, A.; Jampani, V.; and Rombach, R. 2023. Stable Video Diffusion: Scaling Latent Video Diffusion Models to Large Datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15127*.
- Brooks, T.; Peebles, B.; Holmes, C.; DePue, W.; Guo, Y.; Jing, L.; Schnurr, D.; Taylor, J.; Luhman, T.; Luhman, E.; Ng, C.; Wang, R.; and Ramesh, A. 2024. Video generation models as world simulators.
- Bruce, J.; Dennis, M. D.; Edwards, A.; Parker-Holder, J.; Shi, Y.; Hughes, E.; Lai, M.; Mavalankar, A.; Steigerwald, R.; Apps, C.; et al. 2024. Genie: Generative Interactive Environments. In *ICML*.
- Cachay, S. R.; Zhao, B.; Joren, H.; and Yu, R. 2023. DYffusion: A Dynamics-informed Diffusion Model for Spatiotemporal Forecasting. In *NeurIPS*.
- Chen, R. T. Q.; Rubanova, Y.; Bettencourt, J.; and Duvenaud, D. 2018. Neural Ordinary Differential Equations. In *NeurIPS*.
- Cranmer, M.; Greydanus, S.; Hoyer, S.; Battaglia, P.; Spergel, D.; and Ho, S. 2020. Lagrangian Neural Networks. In *ICLR Workshop*.
- Daniel, T.; and Tamar, A. 2024. DDLP: Unsupervised Object-Centric Video Prediction with Deep Dynamic Latent Particles. *TMLR*.
- Gao, H.; Xu, H.; Cai, Q.-Z.; Wang, R.; Yu, F.; and Darrell, T. 2019. Disentangling Propagation and Generation for Video Prediction. In *ICCV*.
- Greydanus, S.; Dzamba, M.; and Yosinski, J. 2019. Hamiltonian Neural Networks. In *NeurIPS*.
- Guen, V. L.; and Thome, N. 2020. Disentangling Physical Dynamics from Unknown Factors for Unsupervised Video Prediction. In *CVPR*.
- Ha, D. R.; and Schmidhuber, J. 2018. Recurrent World Models Facilitate Policy Evolution. In *NeurIPS*.
- Hafner, D.; Pasukonis, J.; Ba, J.; and Lillicrap, T. 2025. Mastering diverse control tasks through world models. *Nature*.
- Ho, J.; Jain, A.; and Abbeel, P. 2020. Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models. In *NeurIPS*.
- Jakab, T.; Gupta, A.; Bilen, H.; and Vedaldi, A. 2018. Unsupervised Learning of Object Landmarks through Conditional Image Generation. In *NeurIPS*.
- Jiang, J.; Deng, F.; Singh, G.; Lee, M.; and Ahn, S. 2024. Slot State Space Models. In *NeurIPS*.
- Johnson, J.; Alahi, A.; and Fei-Fei, L. 2016. Perceptual Losses for Real-Time Style Transfer and Super-Resolution. In *ECCV*.
- Kang, B.; Yue, Y.; Lu, R.; Lin, Z.; Zhao, Y.; Wang, K.; Huang, G.; and Feng, J. 2025. How Far is Video Generation from World Model: A Physical Law Perspective. In *ICML*.
- Kipf, T.; Fetaya, E.; Wang, K.-C.; Welling, M.; and Zemel, R. 2018. Neural Relational Inference for Interacting Systems. In *ICML*.
- Kipf, T.; van der Pol, E.; and Welling, M. 2020. Contrastive Learning of Structured World Models. In *ICLR*.
- Krishnan, R. G.; Shalit, U.; and Sontag, D. 2015. Deep Kalman Filters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05121*.
- Kulkarni, T.; Gupta, A.; Ionescu, C.; Borgeaud, S.; Reynolds, M.; Zisserman, A.; and Mnih, V. 2019. Unsupervised Learning of Object Keypoints for Perception and Control. In *NeurIPS*.
- Lam, R.; Sanchez-Gonzalez, A.; Willson, M.; Wirnsberger, P.; Fortunato, M.; Alet, F.; Ravuri, S.; Ewalds, T.; Eaton-Rosen, Z.; Hu, W.; et al. 2023. Learning skillful medium-range global weather forecasting. *Science*.

- Li, H.; Liu, S.; Lin, Z.; and Chandraker, M. 2026a. Rolling sink: Bridging limited-horizon training and open-ended testing in autoregressive video diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.07775*.
- Li, H.; Shao, L.; Lu, H.; Fu, Y.; Chen, Y.-R.; Jain, S.; and Chandraker, M. 2026b. ϕ -Scene: Physically Grounded Image-to-3D Scene Reconstruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.21596*.
- Lin, W.; Jia, L.; Hu, W.; Pan, K.; Yue, Z.; Zhao, W.; Chen, J.; Wu, F.; and Zhang, H. 2025. Reasoning Physical Video Generation with Diffusion Timestep Tokens via Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15932*.
- Liu, Y.; Cheng, J.; Zhao, H.; Xu, T.; Zhao, P.; Tsung, F.; Li, J.; and Rong, Y. 2024. SEGNO: Generalizing Equivariant Graph Neural Networks with Physical Inductive Biases. In *ICLR*.
- Locatello, F.; Weissenborn, D.; Unterthiner, T.; Mahendran, A.; Heigold, G.; Uszkoreit, J.; Dosovitskiy, A.; and Kipf, T. 2020. Object-Centric Learning with Slot Attention. In *NeurIPS*.
- Minderer, M.; Sun, C.; Villegas, R.; Cole, F.; Murphy, K.; and Lee, H. 2019. Unsupervised Learning of Object Structure and Dynamics from Videos. In *NeurIPS*.
- Park, S.; Kim, K.; Lee, J.; Choo, J.; Lee, J.; Kim, S.; and Choi, E. 2021. Vid-ODE: Continuous-Time Video Generation with Neural Ordinary Differential Equation. In *AAAI*.
- Peebles, W.; and Xie, S. 2023. Scalable Diffusion Models with Transformers. In *ICCV*.
- Rombach, R.; Blattmann, A.; Lorenz, D.; Esser, P.; and Ommer, B. 2022. High-Resolution Image Synthesis with Latent Diffusion Models. In *CVPR*.
- Rubanova, Y.; Chen, R. T. Q.; and Duvenaud, D. 2019. Latent Ordinary Differential Equations for Irregularly-Sampled Time Series. In *NeurIPS*.
- Sanchez-Gonzalez, A.; Godwin, J.; Pfaff, T.; Ying, R.; Leskovec, J.; and Battaglia, P. 2020. Learning to Simulate Complex Physics with Graph Networks. In *ICML*.
- Siarohin, A.; Lathuilière, S.; Tulyakov, S.; Ricci, E.; and Sebe, N. 2019. First Order Motion Model for Image Animation. In *NeurIPS*.
- Siarohin, A.; Woodford, O. J.; Ren, J.; Chai, M.; and Tulyakov, S. 2021. Motion Representations for Articulated Animation. In *CVPR*.
- Song, J.; Meng, C.; and Ermon, S. 2021. Denoising Diffusion Implicit Models. In *ICLR*.
- Song, Y.; Sohl-Dickstein, J.; Kingma, D. P.; Kumar, A.; Ermon, S.; and Poole, B. 2021. Score-Based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Differential Equations. In *ICLR*.
- Watter, M.; Springenberg, J.; Boedecker, J.; and Riedmiller, M. 2015. Embed to Control: A Locally Linear Latent Dynamics Model for Control from Raw Images. In *NeurIPS*.
- Wu, Z.; Dvornik, N.; Greff, K.; Kipf, T.; and Garg, A. 2023. SlotFormer: Unsupervised Visual Dynamics Simulation with Object-Centric Models. In *ICLR*.
- Xu, K.; Zhang, M.; Li, J.; Du, S. S.; Kawarabayashi, K.-i.; and Jegelka, S. 2021. How Neural Networks Extrapolate: From Feedforward to Graph Neural Networks. In *ICLR*.
- Xue, Q.; Yin, X.; Yang, B.; and Gao, W. 2025. PhyT2V: LLM-Guided Iterative Self-Refinement for Physics-Grounded Text-to-Video Generation. In *CVPR*.
- Yang, Z.; Teng, J.; Zheng, W.; Ding, M.; Huang, S.; Xu, J.; Yang, Y.; Hong, W.; Zhang, X.; Feng, G.; et al. 2025. CogVideoX: Text-to-Video Diffusion Models with An Expert Transformer. In *ICLR*.
- Yin, Y.; Kirchmeyer, M.; Franceschi, J.-Y.; Rakotomamonjy, A.; and Gallinari, P. 2023. Continuous PDE Dynamics Forecasting with Implicit Neural Representations. In *ICLR*.
- Çağatay Yıldız; Heinonen, M.; and Lähdesmäki, H. 2019. ODE²VAE: Deep generative second order ODEs with Bayesian neural networks. In *NeurIPS*.