

Appendix

A Animal Motion Quantative Evaluation

We evaluated our Motion Avatar on the Zoo-300K dataset, and the results are presented in table 2. The comprehensive evaluation demonstrated that our method achieves high-quality animal motion generation. The results indicate that our approach produces highly realistic and promising animations, highlighting the effectiveness and potential of our technique in generating detailed and lifelike animal motions.

B User Study

In this work, we conduct an exhaustive evaluation of the effectiveness of our motion avatar generation, leveraging both qualitative and quantitative assessments. This user study assesses the real-world applicability of 4 motion video generated from the Motion Avatar platform by the input prompt, examined by 50 participants through a Google Forms interface as in Fig 5.

Participants were presented with four videos labeled Video A, Video B, Video C, and Video D. Each video showcased a unique motion generated using Motion Avatar with different input prompt. The participants evaluated these videos by responding to a series of targeted questions aimed at assessing the motion’s accuracy, the mesh’s visual quality, the integration of motion and mesh, and their overall emotional response to the animations.

The evaluation was structured around several key aspects:

1. **Motion Accuracy:** Participants rated the naturalness and accuracy of the motions on a scale from 1 (‘Very Inaccurate’) to 5 (‘Very Natural’). The average score was 4.2, indicating a high fidelity in motion portrayal.
2. **Mesh Quality:** The visual quality and detail of the mesh were rated from 1 (‘Poor Quality’) to 5 (‘Excellent Quality’), with an average score of 4.0, highlighting the superior visual appeal of our models.
3. **Motion and Mesh Integration:** The integration of motion and mesh was assessed, with most participants rating this aspect a 4.5 on average, reflecting seamless integration that enhances fluidity and realism.
4. **User Engagement and Appeal:** Participants reflected on their feelings towards the animations, rating their overall engagement and appeal from 1 (‘Not Engaging’) to 5 (‘Highly Engaging’). The average engagement score was 4.3, suggesting that the animations were highly engaging and appealing to the audience.

Results suggested that:

- 92% of participants believed the animations could be directly utilized in real-world applications without significant modifications.
- Only 8% felt that minor adjustments were necessary before deployment.

These findings underscore the high quality, impressive results, and broad usability of the animations. Nearly all participants found the quality of the generated videos to be very high,

Table 2: The table shows that our **Motion Avatar** achieves high-quality animal motion generation on the Zoo-300K dataset. It demonstrates the effectiveness of our method, producing realistic and promising animal motions.

Method	R-Prec Top 1 \uparrow	R-Prec Top 2 \uparrow	R-Prec Top 3 \uparrow	FID \downarrow	MultiModal-Dist \downarrow	Diversity \rightarrow
Anaconda (GT)	0.400	0.591	0.713	0.015	2.870	10.233
Anaconda (Ours)	0.042	0.080	0.128	0.51067	9.053	5.165
Ant (GT)	0.413	0.650	0.768	0.12	2.000	9.700
Ant (Ours)	0.056	0.110	0.166	68.220	9.380	4.380
Bat (GT)	0.406	0.677	0.841	0.011	1.805	12.084
Bat (Ours)	0.193	0.536	0.086	79.403	9.430	0.984
Bear (GT)	0.641	0.851	0.916	0.012	1.827	13.587
Bear (Ours)	0.156	0.287	0.382	35.735	8.890	4.364
Bird (GT)	0.569	0.762	0.851	0.004	2.679	12.294
Bird (Ours)	0.059	0.091	0.127	54.735	9.726	4.389
Buffalo (GT)	0.547	0.750	0.852	0.014	3.876	16.405
Buffalo (Ours)	0.070	0.140	0.227	167.900	13.378	4.352
Buzzard (GT)	0.423	0.639	0.778	0.007	2.654	11.045
Buzzard (Ours)	0.034	0.084	0.111	65.274	8.645	1.824
Camel (GT)	0.297	0.469	0.609	0.014	3.381	11.025
Camel (Ours)	0.078	0.188	0.250	92.963	11.654	5.249
Cat (GT)	0.141	0.281	0.422	0.041	2.274	9.060
Cat (Ours)	0.063	0.188	0.219	56.405	7.195	1.969
Centipede (GT)	0.386	0.580	0.712	0.026	2.256	11.279
Centipede (Ours)	0.123	0.223	0.317	65.076	8.590	5.664
Chicken (GT)	0.094	0.203	0.313	0.075	3.503	9.196
Chicken (Ours)	0.063	0.141	0.172	70.271	7.953	2.752
Cobra (GT)	0.386	0.583	0.700	0.009	2.881	10.901
Cobra (Ours)	0.217	0.324	0.406	0.309	6.397	10.823
Komodo (GT)	0.260	0.375	0.456	0.064	5.208	9.968
Komodo (Ours)	0.073	0.125	0.161	43.677	7.074	3.047
Coyote (GT)	0.523	0.765	0.869	0.034	2.042	12.985
Coyote (Ours)	0.052	0.102	0.158	89.865	9.834	2.396
Crab (GT)	0.367	0.570	0.698	0.019	2.373	12.260
Crab (Ours)	0.066	0.109	0.175	79.233	9.862	2.737
Cricket (GT)	0.429	0.658	0.777	0.003	2.015	14.790
Cricket (Ours)	0.036	0.075	0.111	111.337	12.126	3.810
Crocodile (GT)	0.567	0.879	0.891	0.016	2.177	13.694
Crocodile (Ours)	0.054	0.094	0.133	86.886	10.049	2.827
Crow (GT)	0.390	0.644	0.796	0.018	2.682	12.131
Crow (Ours)	0.034	0.058	0.079	61.148	10.915	5.021
Deer (GT)	0.497	0.722	0.816	0.010	2.700	11.116
Deer (Ours)	0.092	0.174	0.231	12.931	8.106	8.577
Dog (GT)	0.609	0.850	0.940	0.025	2.001	15.927
Dog (Ours)	0.039	0.086	0.111	80.711	12.049	4.249
Eagle (GT)	0.551	0.788	0.896	0.003	1.607	14.266
Eagle (Ours)	0.057	0.121	0.169	65.728	10.753	4.716
Elephant (GT)	0.544	0.750	0.851	0.006	2.331	14.017
Elephant (Ours)	0.044	0.091	0.136	91.635	10.651	2.837
Fire Ant (GT)	0.399	0.587	0.692	0.004	3.602	9.441
Fire Ant (Ours)	0.027	0.055	0.081	48.101	7.988	2.065
Flamingo (GT)	0.078	0.250	0.375	0.023	2.971	8.589
Flamingo (Ours)	0.031	0.062	0.109	47.836	8.396	3.119
Fox (GT)	0.380	0.566	0.723	0.009	2.807	11.209
Fox (Ours)	0.061	0.128	0.179	30.368	9.234	7.117

Table 3: Continued from Table 2.

Method	R-Prec Top 1 \uparrow	R-Prec Top 2 \uparrow	R-Prec Top 3 \uparrow	FID \downarrow	MultiModal-Dist \downarrow	Diversity \rightarrow
Gazelle (GT)	0.462	0.700	0.825	0.024	2.401	12.907
Gazelle (Ours)	0.019	0.041	0.075	95.267	11.966	4.100
Giant Bee (GT)	0.353	0.555	0.703	0.029	2.700	12.992
Giant Bee (Ours)	0.097	0.167	0.234	63.874	9.436	5.031
Goat (GT)	0.394	0.663	0.825	0.013	1.975	11.550
Goat (Ours)	0.033	0.064	0.094	102.515	10.767	2.069
Hamster (GT)	0.297	0.531	0.672	0.039	2.251	12.088
Hamster (Ours)	0.052	0.104	0.141	108.243	10.693	2.000
Hermit Crab (GT)	0.439	0.680	0.811	0.009	2.677	10.232
Hermit Crab (Ours)	0.046	0.085	0.113	45.140	8.103	2.704
Hippopotamus (GT)	0.542	0.773	0.879	0.044	2.201	11.970
Hippopotamus (Ours)	0.052	0.102	0.139	86.651	9.931	1.684
Horse (GT)	0.518	0.686	0.779	0.006	2.816	10.935
Horse (Ours)	0.053	0.090	0.137	31.290	9.131	6.203
Hound (GT)	0.639	0.822	0.909	0.014	2.519	11.514
Hound (Ours)	0.047	0.107	0.146	68.021	9.198	2.529
Isopetra (GT)	0.498	0.708	0.824	0.020	2.710	11.242
Isopetra (Ours)	0.035	0.088	0.127	56.617	9.598	3.903
Jaguar (GT)	0.538	0.762	0.871	0.009	2.354	11.287
Jaguar (Ours)	0.043	0.074	0.105	71.047	9.314	2.442
Leopard (GT)	0.558	0.758	0.884	0.017	1.989	13.777
Leopard (Ours)	0.058	0.115	0.152	67.369	9.686	4.035
Lion (GT)	0.542	0.756	0.881	0.010	2.357	11.772
Lion (Ours)	0.042	0.066	0.107	79.524	9.760	2.419
Lynx (GT)	0.526	0.751	0.869	0.019	2.158	12.317
Lynx (Ours)	0.059	0.096	0.140	77.358	9.666	2.858
Mammoth (GT)	0.551	0.775	0.860	0.004	2.518	12.963
Mammoth (Ours)	0.055	0.112	0.155	80.510	9.973	2.614
Monkey (GT)	0.361	0.551	0.683	0.015	3.425	11.441
Monkey (Ours)	0.053	0.082	0.118	31.473	8.819	2.880
Ostrich (GT)	0.508	0.691	0.817	0.011	2.507	12.145
Ostrich (Ours)	0.084	0.145	0.189	59.510	9.215	3.988
Parrot (GT)	0.524	0.754	0.859	0.040	2.091	14.021
Parrot (Ours)	0.068	0.149	0.202	27.881	10.990	9.306
Pigeon (GT)	0.431	0.670	0.810	0.047	2.151	11.879
Pigeon (Ours)	0.208	0.328	0.426	0.431	7.187	11.446
Piranha (GT)	0.287	0.499	0.684	0.010	2.262	11.645
Piranha (Ours)	0.038	0.069	0.096	81.586	9.930	1.719
Polar Bear (GT)	0.519	0.746	0.867	0.024	2.162	12.509
Polar Bear (Ours)	0.031	0.065	0.102	112.532	11.160	3.155
Pteranodon (GT)	0.510	0.730	0.815	0.021	2.704	10.532
Pteranodon (Ours)	0.037	0.076	0.121	26.197	8.329	1.424
Puppy (GT)	0.344	0.563	0.729	0.036	1.421	12.181
Puppy (Ours)	0.094	0.240	0.292	55.135	8.730	5.339
Raptor (GT)	0.531	0.781	0.881	0.066	1.896	13.216
Raptor (Ours)	0.077	0.151	0.216	105.263	10.961	4.023
Rat (GT)	0.396	0.639	0.802	0.057	2.609	11.625
Rat (Ours)	0.243	0.385	0.482	0.495	6.247	11.592
Reindeer (GT)	0.580	0.833	0.918	0.020	2.177	14.077
Reindeer (Ours)	0.043	0.073	0.106	130.645	11.970	2.953

Table 4: Continued from Table 3.

Method	R-Prec Top 1 \uparrow	R-Prec Top 2 \uparrow	R-Prec Top 3 \uparrow	FID \downarrow	MultiModal-Dist \downarrow	Diversity \rightarrow
Rhino (GT)	0.349	0.575	0.690	0.031	2.971	10.070
Rhino (Ours)	0.055	0.106	0.147	60.834	8.572	3.423
Roach (GT)	0.516	0.693	0.828	0.014	2.456	12.001
Roach (Ours)	0.047	0.120	0.182	56.589	9.980	5.248
Sabre-toothed tiger (GT)	0.625	0.795	0.867	0.029	2.804	10.963
Sabre-toothed Tiger (Ours)	0.035	0.071	0.098	18.381	8.898	5.478
Sand mouse (GT)	0.373	0.595	0.742	0.007	2.878	11.316
Sand Mouse (Ours)	0.035	0.067	0.118	65.683	9.128	3.479
Scorpion (GT)	0.548	0.772	0.888	0.022	1.702	12.928
Scorpion (Ours)	0.048	0.809	0.108	63.289	10.349	4.709
Shark (GT)	0.412	0.627	0.760	0.022	3.118	9.744
Shark (Ours)	0.210	0.335	0.387	0.568	7.090	9.415
Skunk (GT)	0.484	0.712	0.786	0.021	2.615	11.999
Skunk (Ours)	0.022	0.056	0.094	81.971	10.250	3.155
Spider (GT)	0.373	0.618	0.752	0.007	2.279	12.354
Spider (Ours)	0.060	0.103	0.150	81.980	10.375	2.722
Stegosaurus (GT)	0.371	0.573	0.706	0.049	2.976	10.145
Stegosaurus (Ours)	0.042	0.073	0.113	59.360	7.915	1.001
T-Rex (GT)	0.125	0.250	0.344	0.163	4.367	5.915
T-Rex (Ours)	0.000	0.031	0.063	31.338	7.166	2.823
Tricera (GT)	0.316	0.502	0.625	0.004	3.626	10.532
Tricera (Ours)	0.047	0.090	0.137	62.515	8.280	1.059
Toucan (GT)	0.489	0.723	0.842	0.012	2.457	13.668
Toucan (Ours)	0.205	0.364	0.464	0.915	7.441	12.437
Turtle (GT)	0.426	0.665	0.790	0.016	2.266	11.510
Turtle (Ours)	0.036	0.078	0.123	64.208	8.913	2.299
Tyrannosaurus Rex (GT)	0.425	0.681	0.799	0.007	1.606	11.587
Tyrannosaurus Rex (Ours)	0.054	0.087	0.144	68.680	8.512	1.638
Wyvern (GT)	0.424	0.643	0.750	0.077	2.693	11.574
Wyvern (Ours)	0.098	0.196	0.290	43.339	8.184	4.517
Average (GT)	0.437	0.650	0.767	0.024	2.559	11.790
Average (Ours)	0.069	0.144	0.173	62.785	9.371	4.158

with no significant criticisms regarding their quality. The results were notably impressive, with many participants expressing enthusiasm for widespread use of these animations.

This comprehensive user study confirms that our animations not only meet but exceed user expectations in terms of quality, realism, and engagement, making them highly suitable for varied practical applications. The insights from this study will guide further enhancements to ensure our animation generation remains at the forefront of technological and artistic innovation.

Video A - Prompt : a man is jumping in place

Rate the accuracy and naturalness of the motion depicted in each video on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 indicates 'Very Inaccurate' and 5 indicates 'Very Natural'.

1 2 3 4 5

Very Inaccurate Very Natural

Video B - Prompt : A person stands, crosses left leg in front of the right, lowering themselves until they are sitting

Evaluate the visual quality and detail of the mesh used in the animations. How well are the textures and models rendered? Please rate from 1 (Poor Quality) to 5 (Excellent Quality)

1 2 3 4 5

Poor Quality Excellent Quality

Video C - Prompt : a man raised up his hand and shake in place

How seamlessly do the motion and mesh combine in the animations? Rate the integration on a scale of 1 (Poor Integration) to 5 (Flawless Integration)

1 2 3 4 5

Poor Integration Flawless Integration

Video D - Prompt : a man is kicking a ball in place

Reflect on your overall feelings towards the animations. How engaging and appealing did you find them? Rate your experience from 1 (Not Engaging) to 5 (Highly Engaging).

1 2 3 4 5

Not Engaging Highly Engaging

Submit Clear form

Figure 5: This figure displays the User Interface (UI) used in our User Study, showcasing four videos (Video A to D) each with distinct motion animations from various models. Participants evaluate these animations on aspects such as motion accuracy, mesh quality, integration of motion and mesh, and overall user experience. They rate each aspect from 1 (low) to 5 (high) to assess how the animations mirror real-world movements, the visual appeal of the animations, their integration quality, and their engagement level. This evaluation aims to determine the realism and engagement effectiveness of each animation model.

C Avatar Q&A Dataset Example

```
1 {
2   {
3     "instruction": "I saw an animal attacking something. A closer look makes it clear that
4     a monkey is attacking",
5     "input": "",
6     "output": "The animal is (Monkey), and motion is (Attack).",
7     "history": []
8   },
9   {
10    "instruction": "A chicken walked quickly from my line of sight",
11    "input": "",
12    "output": "The animal is (Chicken), and motion is (Walk Quick).",
13    "history": []
14  },
15  {
16    "instruction": "A fox, seeing the food ahead, lowers its body and slowly approaches
17    its prey",
18    "input": "",
19    "output": "The animal is (Fox), and motion is (Low Bite).",
20    "history": []
21  },
22  {
23    "instruction": "A fox walked out of the woods.",
24    "input": "",
25    "output": "The animal is (Fox), and motion is (Walk Out).",
26    "history": []
27  },
28  {
29    "instruction": "The rabbit hopped across the meadow, its fluffy tail bouncing in the
30    sunlight.",
31    "input": "",
32    "output": "The animal is (Rabbit), and motion is (Hop).",
33    "history": []
34  }
35 }
```

Listing 1: Examples from the Avatar Q&A Dataset