

PhyDetEx: Detecting and Explaining the Physical Plausibility of T2V Models

Zeqing Wang^{1,3} Keze Wang^{1†} Lei Zhang^{2,3†}

¹Sun Yat-sen University

²Hong Kong Polytechnic University

³OPPO Research Institute

wangzq73@mail2.sysu.edu.cn, kezewang@gmail.com, cslzhang@comp.polyu.edu.hk

Abstract

Driven by the growing capacity and training scale, Text-to-Video (T2V) generation models have recently achieved substantial progress in video quality, length, and instruction-following capability. However, whether these models can understand physics and generate physically plausible videos remains a question. While Vision-Language Models (VLMs) have been widely used as general-purpose evaluators in various applications, they struggle to identify the physically impossible content from generated videos. To investigate this issue, we construct a **PID (Physical Implausibility Detection)** dataset, which consists of a test split of 500 manually annotated videos and a train split of 2,588 paired videos, where each implausible video is generated by carefully rewriting the caption of its corresponding real-world video to induce T2V models producing physically implausible content. With the constructed dataset, we introduce a lightweight fine-tuning approach, enabling VLMs to not only detect physically implausible events but also generate textual explanations on the violated physical principles. Taking the fine-tuned VLM as a physical plausibility detector and explainer, namely **PhyDetEx**, we benchmark a series of state-of-the-art T2V models to assess their adherence to physical laws. Our findings show that although recent T2V models have made notable progress toward generating physically plausible content, understanding and adhering to physical laws remains a challenging issue, especially for open-source models. Our dataset, training code, and checkpoints are available at <https://github.com/Zeqing-Wang/PhyDetEx>.

1. Introduction

Recent advances in Text-to-Video (T2V) generation models have significantly improved the visual quality, temporal consistency, *etc.*, of the generated videos [15, 23, 24, 30, 42, 55]. With the rapid scaling of model capacity and multimodal training data, these models are increasingly




Figure 1. Illustration of the physical implausibility detection task. Given a video where water is poured into a bottle, but the water level remains static and the cup passes through the bottle, humans can easily identify the violation of physical laws. However, current powerful VLMs (e.g., QwenVL and InternVL) incorrectly judge the motion as physically plausible, highlighting their difficulty in recognising implausible dynamics that are trivial for humans.

viewed as promising candidates toward realising a world model [19, 22, 44], which can describe the dynamics and causality of the physical world. However, despite impressive progress, existing T2V models often produce physically implausible content that contradicts basic real-world principles [4, 5, 48]. Detecting and explaining these violations is crucial to measure how well current T2V models can understand the physical world.

Several studies attempt to assess the physical plausibility of generated videos using either pre-defined prompts [4, 5, 31, 54] or detectors trained with extensive human annotations [4, 5, 46]. However, the first kind of methods are inherently restricted by their reliance on carefully designed prompts, while the second suffer from poor transferability and limited interpretability, which often produce only coarse plausibility scores without revealing why physical laws are violated. Consequently, these approaches remain narrow in scope and generality, underscoring the need for a more generalizable and interpretable evaluation framework

[†]Corresponding author

that can handle a wide range of generated videos.

A natural approach to evaluate the physical plausibility of the generated videos with an explanation is to leverage Vision-Language Models (VLMs), which have achieved remarkable success across diverse perception and reasoning tasks [2, 8, 9, 11, 28, 43, 50, 51]. VLMs are trained on massive visual-text corpora [12] and possess strong generalization and interpretability through textual reasoning [21, 58]. It is intuitive to use them as general evaluators to identify physically implausible content in videos. However, recent evidence shows that even the most capable VLMs struggle to recognise physically implausible content generated by T2V models [3, 48]. As shown in Fig. 1, VLMs often fail to detect implausible content that is easy for humans to perceive. This motivates us to investigate whether we can endow VLMs, which have shown strong capability in many downstream visual tasks, with the ability to detect and explain the physical implausibility in generated videos.

To answer the above question, we first conduct a preliminary experiment by prompting several state-of-the-art VLMs to detect the physical plausibility in videos with varying degrees of prior information, without any additional training. We observe that their detection accuracy changes substantially depending on the given priors, suggesting that VLMs may possess certain physical knowledge, yet they struggle to apply this knowledge to unseen implausible cases without proper training. Therefore, we first construct a **Physical Implausibility Detection (PID)** dataset, which includes a *train split* and a *test split*. The **train split** consists of 2,588 paired videos, where each pair consists of a physically plausible (positive) video and an implausible (negative) counterpart. The implausible videos are generated by carefully rewriting captions to induce T2V models to produce physically impossible videos. The **test split** consists of 500 videos, including 250 physically implausible videos with manually annotated content of physical violations and 250 physically plausible counterparts. The implausible videos are collected from various T2V models that unintentionally generate abnormal content under normal prompts, while the plausible ones are drawn from both real-world videos and high-quality T2V generations.

Using the PID train split, we propose a lightweight fine-tuning approach that requires only minimal computational cost (via LoRA-based parameter-efficient tuning). The resulting model, namely **PhyDetEx (Physical Plausibility Detector and Explainer)**, empowers VLMs to (i) accurately identify physically implausible events and (ii) produce textual explanations of the violated physical principles. Our experiments demonstrate that PhyDetEx achieves significant improvements in detecting physical implausibility, validating that VLMs indeed possess an implicit understanding of physics that can be unlocked with a small number of contrastive examples. Finally, we apply PhyDetEx as

an evaluation tool to benchmark the physical plausibility of current T2V models. Our results reveal that while recent closed-source models have made remarkable strides toward generating physically consistent videos, understanding and adhering to physical laws remain a substantial challenge, especially for open-source models. These findings highlight both the progress and the limitations of current T2V systems in genuine world modeling.

In summary, our contributions are as follows. First, we introduce **PID**, a comprehensive benchmark for physical implausibility detection of T2V models, which includes a *test split* of 500 annotated videos (250 physically plausible and 250 implausible) and a *train split* of 2,588 plausible/implausible paired videos. Second, we reveal the reasons behind VLMs’ poor performance on physical implausibility based on comprehensive experiments. Third, we propose a lightweight contrastive fine-tuning strategy, which enables VLMs to detect and explain physical implausibility in generated videos. Finally, we employ the fine-tuned PhyDetEx to evaluate the physical plausibility of mainstream T2V models, providing new insights on their progress and challenges toward world modeling.

2. Related Work

Text-to-Video (T2V) Models. Recent large-scale T2V models have demonstrated significantly improved video fidelity, motion coherence, and instruction following capability [23, 24, 26, 33, 35, 42, 53, 55], making them a promising path toward building world models [10, 36, 52] that can capture the causal dynamics of the real world. However, despite the impressive improvement in video quality, these models often violate basic physical laws [22, 49, 60, 62], such as object penetration, momentum inconsistency, or energy non-conservation. Such implausible generations even under semantically normal prompts are typically unacceptable for practical applications, which necessitates the need to evaluate the physical plausibility beyond visual quality.

Physical Implausibility Detection. Given the prevalence of physically implausible content in T2V outputs, several approaches have been proposed for detecting it. One line of work trains end-to-end detectors with annotated datasets [4, 5, 14, 18, 46], assigning a physical plausibility score to generated videos. Another direction defines a set of rule-based prompts with known physical attributes and checks whether the generated content satisfies these predefined conditions [6, 32, 49, 54, 61]. However, both paradigms face key limitations: end-to-end detectors often lack interpretability, while rule-based methods are restricted to predefined prompt scenarios. Hence, a more generalizable and interpretable method is required to measure models’ adherence to physical laws. In contrast, Vision-Language Models [2, 8, 9, 28], which are trained on massive multimodal data [12, 27] and are capable of producing

textual explanations [17, 29, 38, 39], offer a promising alternative for interpretable and generalizable detection.

Vision-Language Models (VLMs). VLMs have achieved remarkable progress in recent years [2, 8, 25, 28], excelling not only at traditional vision tasks such as visual question answering [16, 20, 38] and captioning [41] but also at more complex reasoning tasks like visual grounding and generation [13, 47, 57, 59]. Nonetheless, prior studies reveal that even strong VLMs struggle to detect physically implausible events in generated content [3, 48]. Impossible Videos [3] is the first work to evaluate VLMs’ understanding of such implausibility, establishing a benchmark to assess their detection ability. However, it focuses solely on videos that are generated by implausible prompts and cannot reflect real-world T2V failures caused by normal prompts. These limitations motivate our study to explore how to equip VLMs with the capability to not only detect physically implausible events and explain the violated physical principles, but also identify real-world T2V failures, thereby benchmarking the physical plausibility of current T2V models.

3. Preliminary Investigation

As introduced in Sec. 1, prior studies [3, 48] have shown that even powerful VLMs struggle to detect physically impossible or implausible content generated by T2V models. However, it is unclear whether these failures stem from a lack of understanding of physical plausibility, or are caused by the biases caused by training predominantly on physically plausible real-world data. To find out the reason and provide guidance for future improvements, we conduct a series of preliminary analyses. Specifically, we evaluate VLMs under three different prompt configurations with progressively increasing prior information based on the Impossible Videos [3]. Since all implausible videos in Impossible Videos are generated, we define three conditions: (**C1**) the model is not informed that the video is generated (our primary evaluation setting); (**C2**) the VLMs are told that the video may be generated; and (**C3**) the VLMs are explicitly told that the video is generated by a T2V model.

As shown in Fig. 2, the detection performance varies substantially across these conditions. The accuracy of identifying physically implausible content consistently increases from **C1** to **C3**, whereas the accuracy for physically plausible videos decreases accordingly. Furthermore, VLMs not only improve in detection accuracy but also produce more precise explanations for the implausible events. These findings reveal that VLMs inherently possess a latent understanding of physical laws, but their reasoning is heavily influenced by the assumed authenticity of the input video. When VLMs presume the video is real (as most of their training data are), they tend to overlook violations of physical plausibility. Conversely, when explicitly informed that the video is generated, they adopt a more crit-




Figure 2. Results of preliminary experiments in the Impossible-Videos under three prompting conditions (**C1–C3**) based on InternVL2.5 26B. As the prompt provides progressively stronger hints that the video may be generated by an AIGC model, the VLM achieve notably higher accuracy in detecting *physically implausible* videos and generate more accurate reasoning (higher reasoning scores). However, their accuracy on *physically plausible* videos decreases accordingly. These trends indicate that VLMs possess an implicit understanding of physical plausibility, yet their judgments are strongly biased by the type of the input.

ical stance and successfully identify physical inconsistencies. We provide more details and results of our preliminary experiments in **Supplemental Material A**.

4. Methodology

4.1. Construction of PID

Building upon our preliminary findings, we observe that VLMs indeed possess the capability to understand physically implausible content in generated videos. However, because their training data predominantly consist of physically plausible, real-world content, they tend to assume that any given video is real, and thus free of anomalies. Conversely, they often over-associate generated videos with implausibility. To mitigate this bias, we build the **Physical Implausibility Detection (PID)** dataset to help VLMs detect implausible content within generated data rather than merely distinguishing between real and generated videos.

Training Split. As shown in Fig. 3(a), the training split of PID is built from the real-world T2V dataset, VIDGEN-1M [40]. The goal of PID’s training split is twofold: (1) it should not require a massive scale, since VLMs already exhibit a latent understanding of physical plausibility; and (2) it should explicitly expose the models to physical implausibility patterns that are absent from their pretraining data, but the overall content of the data should still be highly relevant to the real world, thereby breaking the shortcut that equates “generated videos” with “physically implausible videos”.

To construct the dataset, we first select videos from




Figure 3. Overview of the construction pipeline of the PID dataset and the training process of PhyDetEx. (a) The PID training split. The training split includes 2,588 paired videos, where each implausible video is generated by rewriting the caption of a real-world video to describe an implausible event while keeping other content unchanged. (b) The PID test split. The test set consists of physically implausible and physically plausible videos. The implausible subset is collected from videos generated by multiple T2V models based on physically plausible prompts, where human annotators identify implausible events and provide textual explanations. The plausible subset combines generated and real-world videos verified to contain no physical violations, thereby eliminating the shortcut of distinguishing between generated and real videos. (c) Training the PhyDetEx. Using the PID training split, we finetune the base VLM via LoRA adaptation to distinguish between physically plausible and implausible events within the same video contexts. The resulting model, PhyDetEx, achieves substantial improvements in detecting physically implausible content.

VIDGEN-1M that involve clear physical interactions with their corresponding captions. We then employ an LLM to rewrite each caption such that it contains a physically implausible description while preserving all other contextual elements. A T2V model is then used to generate videos based on these rewritten captions. This process produces video pairs where the physically plausible videos originate from VIDGEN-1M, and the corresponding physically implausible videos are generated from the modified caption. Based on the insights from our preliminary investigation that VLMs can reliably identify implausible content when provided with prior information, we then instruct the VLM that the videos are generated by a T2V model and use it to filter out pairs where the physically implausible content is accurately reflected in the generated video. Through this process, we obtain 2,588 paired videos.

This construction pipeline offers two major advantages. First, by generating physically implausible videos from the real-world ones, the PID training split closely mirrors the true distribution of physical content and avoids biases introduced by hand-defined “implausibility classes”. Second, as illustrated in Fig. 3(a), during caption rewriting, we modify only the physical aspect of the scene while keeping all other elements unchanged. Consequently, each video pair differs only in physical plausibility, forming a contrastive structure that isolates the target concept. This ensures that the generated videos remain semantically similar to their real counterparts, reducing the domain gap from the VLMs’ training data and eliminating the shortcut of detecting the physical

implausibility. The advantages of such a design are further analysed in **Supplemental Material B**.

Test Split. To verify whether the model truly acquires the ability to detect physically implausible content, we then introduce the test split of our PID. While the Impossible Videos [3] offers an initial benchmark for evaluating the physical implausibility detecting ability of VLMs, it suffers from two key limitations. First, most of its physically implausible videos are derived from explicitly physically implausible prompts, which diverge from realistic scenarios, where users typically input plausible prompts, but T2V models still produce physically implausible videos. Second, the physically plausible videos of Impossible Videos consist entirely of real-world videos, creating a shortcut: VLMs may simply distinguish between generated and real videos instead of genuinely reasoning about physical plausibility.

To address these issues, we construct the PID test split, specifically designed to remove such shortcuts and more faithfully assess VLMs’ understanding of physical laws. As illustrated in Fig. 3(b), the construction of test split involves several stages. We first sample prompts from VidProM [45], a large-scale prompts dataset crawled from the real user community, filtering out those containing inherently unrealistic or science fictional elements (*e.g.*, cartoon, futuristic, magical), as well as prompts lacking physical interactions (*e.g.*, static scenes). Using these filtered prompts, we generate videos via multiple T2V models and manually identify those exhibiting physical implausibility, accompa-

nied by textual explanations describing the physically implausible content. For the physically plausible subset, to eliminate the “generated vs. real” shortcut, we deliberately avoid relying solely on real-world videos. Instead, we combine physically plausible generated videos with real-world videos from VIDGEN-1M [40], filtered to be under 10 seconds and contain clear physical interactions. Following this pipeline, the PID test split comprises 250 physically plausible and 250 physically implausible videos, resulting in a total of 500 balanced test samples.

We provide detailed statistics and more details of the construction pipeline of our proposed PID train split and the test split in **Supplemental Material C**.

4.2. Tuning the VLM

With the constructed PID dataset, our objective is to tune the VLM so that it can accurately detect *physically implausible* content in the generated videos. As discussed in Sec. 3, VLMs tend to treat “real” as “physically plausible” and “generated” as “physically implausible”. Our tuning should remove this shortcut and enable the VLMs to reason about whether a video contains physically implausible content.

Notation. Let v_r denote a real-world video and t_r its corresponding caption with physically plausible events. We first rewrite the caption t_r using an LLM, producing a modified caption t_g where the physically plausible event is changed to a physically implausible event, while keeping all other contextual elements the same:

$$t_g = \mathcal{R}_{\text{phys}}(t_r), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\text{phys}}(\cdot)$ denotes the rewriting operation. Then, a physically implausible video v_g is generated from the rewritten caption t_g using a T2V model \mathcal{G} :

$$v_g = \mathcal{G}(t_g). \quad (2)$$

The content in videos v_r and v_g can be partitioned into two parts, one part about the physically plausible/implausible event, and another shared part with the same content (e.g., environment, background objects, scene layout), denoted by c_{share} . Then, we can express the content of the two videos as follows:

$$v_r = (c_{\text{phys}}^r, c_{\text{share}}), \quad v_g = (c_{\text{phys}}^g, c_{\text{share}}), \quad (3)$$

where c_{phys}^r and c_{phys}^g represent the content of the physically plausible and implausible events in the real and generated videos, respectively. The resulting paired samples can then be represented as:

$$(v_r, t_r), \quad (v_g, t_g), \quad (4)$$

where (v_r, t_r) represents a physically plausible video from the real world, and (v_g, t_g) represents the corresponding

physically implausible video generated from the modified caption while preserving the other content.

Training Objective. Given paired videos (v_r, v_g) , the goal of our training is to teach the VLM to correctly distinguish the content of each video as physically plausible or implausible. Let $f_{\theta}(\cdot)$ denote the prediction of a VLM model on the physical plausibility of a video:

$$y_r = f_{\theta}(v_r), \quad y_g = f_{\theta}(v_g), \quad (5)$$

where $y_r, y_g \in \{\text{physically plausible}, \text{physically implausible}\}$. The model is trained with the target such that, for each paired sample videos, the predicted labels should correctly reflect the plausibility of the physical content:

$$\begin{cases} y_r = \text{physically plausible}, \\ y_g = \text{physically implausible}. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

In other words, the VLM is encouraged to rely solely on the content c_{phys} to make its decision, while ignoring the shared content c_{share} . This ensures that the model does not exploit shortcuts based on background, environment, or other unrelated content of the underlying physical event. There are two key motivations for this design. First, physical event is a highly diverse and context-dependent phenomenon that is difficult to categorize explicitly. By generating physically implausible samples through caption modifications of real-world videos, the resulting content remains within the distribution of real-world motions, preserving meaningful context dependencies; for instance, surfing motions only make sense in scenes containing water. Second, as discussed in Sec. 3, our preliminary investigation indicates that VLMs may develop a shortcut correlating generated videos with physical implausibility and real-world videos with physical plausibility, rather than reasoning about the physics. Our design minimizes cues from generation artifacts and encourages the model to focus on the physical event itself, thereby mitigating such shortcuts.

Language Modeling Supervision. Because the physically implausible videos v_g are generated from rewritten captions t_g with known physical implausibility, the model can be directly supervised to predict both the correct plausibility label and its corresponding reasoning. Similar to the current training objective of VLMs and LLMs, the entire training can be unified under a single language modelling (LM) objective. For each video-caption pair (v, t) , the VLM is required to generate a textual sequence $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_T]$, where the first token s_1 represents the physical plausibility judgment ([YES] or [NO]), and the remaining tokens $\{s_2, \dots, s_T\}$ form a natural-language explanation supporting this judgment. Given the visual and textual inputs, the model is trained autoregressively using the standard negative log-likelihood loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LM}}(\mathbf{s} | v, t) = -\sum_{u=1}^T \log p_{\theta}(s_u | s_{<u}, v, t), \quad (7)$$

where θ denotes the trainable parameters of the VLM.

This unified LM-based supervision activates the VLM’s latent capability to detect physical implausibility and leverages its inherent strength in generating textual explanations, enabling the model to serve as both a reliable detector and an interpretable reasoner for physical plausibility.

5. Experiments

5.1. Experiments Setup

Training Details. We adopt QwenVL2.5-7B as the base model and fine-tune it using LoRA on our PID training split for three epochs. The learning rate is set to $1e-4$ with a cosine learning rate scheduler. We set the LoRA rank to 8 and apply it to all target modules to ensure comprehensive adaptation. To further validate the effectiveness of our PID train split and training strategy in enhancing the model’s understanding of physical plausibility, we conduct additional analyses and experiments in [Supplemental Material B](#).

Evaluation Datasets. We evaluate our proposed PhyDetEx on two datasets: Impossible Videos [3] and our PID test split. For Impossible Videos, to better align with our focus on physical plausibility detection, we select the videos under the **Physical Laws** category, comprising 535 physically implausible videos. For the physically plausible subset, we adopt all real-world videos, resulting in 650 physically plausible samples. Our PID test split contains 250 physically implausible and 250 physically plausible videos. More details are described in [Supplemental Material C](#).

Evaluation Metrics. We compare our PhyDetEx with several state-of-the-art VLMs using four metrics, specifically: (1) **Accuracy Implausible (Acc. Impl.)**: accuracy on physically implausible videos; (2) **Accuracy Plausible (Acc. Plaus.)**: accuracy on physically plausible videos; (3) the **F1 Score**: the overall detection performance balancing between the two accuracies; and (4) the **Reasoning Score**: the correctness and depth of the model’s explanation for the detected physical implausibility.

The inclusion of the F1 Score is crucial, as many VLMs tend to exploit shortcuts, achieving high accuracy on the physically plausible class while failing on the other. For instance, MiniCPM-V 4.5 attains an exceptionally high Accuracy Plausible of 98.9% on ImpossibleVideos, but this coincides with a very low Acc Implausible, indicating a strong bias toward assuming all videos are physically plausible. Thus, the F1 Score serves as a more reliable indicator of true detection capability. The Reasoning Score further evaluates whether the model genuinely understands the underlying physical inconsistency rather than relying on superficial correlations. Detailed metric definitions and evaluation protocols are provided in the [Supplemental Material D](#).

5.2. Experimental Results

As shown in Tab. 1, on both Impossible Videos and our PID test split, most VLMs exhibit a notable bias when detecting physically implausible videos. For example, MiniCPM-V 4.5 achieves 97.6% Acc. Plaus. but only 10.4% Acc. Impl. on the PID test split. Similarly, LLaVA-One-Vision shows a comparable bias, leading to high Acc. Impl. but low F1 Scores. It is worth noting that, the recent QwenVL3 8B and QwenVL3 30B-A3 models, although having smaller model sizes than QwenVL2.5 32B and 72B, achieve the highest F1 Scores among all baselines on both benchmarks. This observation suggests that current VLM models’ capacity is sufficient for physical implausibility detection, but the lack of implausible content in pretraining data prevents them from fully unlocking their potential in detecting physical implausibility. With architectural and training improvements, recent VLMs can demonstrate strong physical reasoning ability even at smaller scales.

Nevertheless, our tuned PhyDetEx substantially outperforms all competitors across Acc. Impl., F1 Score, and Reasoning Score on both datasets, achieving state-of-the-art results. PhyDetEx does not reach the highest Acc. Plaus., which is largely due to current VLMs’ strong bias toward predicting plausibility. Therefore, the F1 Score is the most appropriate and balanced measure for this task. Moreover, the superior Reasoning Score confirms that PhyDetEx can not only detect physical implausibility but also provide accurate, interpretable explanations leveraging the VLM’s inherent reasoning capabilities.

5.3. Case Study

In Fig. 4, we present two representative examples from our PID test split, comparing the outputs of PhyDetEx with several recent VLMs. The first case depicts a dolphin floating above the sea surface. LLaVA-OneVision and MiniCPM-V misinterpret this as a dolphin jumping out of the water, thus considering it physically plausible. They fail to recognize that the dolphin’s height remains nearly constant over time, showing no effect of gravity. In contrast, PhyDetEx correctly identifies the scene as physically implausible and explicitly reasons that the object does not fall under gravity.

The second case is more complex: a woman jumps from a jungle cliff toward a river’s surface but remains suspended above it without descending. Similar to the first example, MiniCPM-V again overlooks the implausibility and interprets the scene as a normal jumping motion, while QwenVL2.5-72B focuses on general scene description rather than the physical implausibility. In comparison, PhyDetEx successfully identifies the implausible subject and provides a concise, accurate explanation for its abnormality. Additional qualitative examples and failure cases are discussed in [Supplemental Material E](#).

Model	Impossible Video				PID Test			
	Acc. Impl.	Acc. Plaus.	F1 Score	Reasoning Score	Acc. Impl.	Acc. Plaus.	F1 Score	Reasoning Score
Random Guess	50.0	50.0	47.4	–	50.0	50.0	50.0	–
InternVL2.5 4B [7]	61.3	69.3	69.0	2.72	61.6	84.4	75.8	2.26
InternVL2.5 8B [7]	52.3	76.9	71.2	2.32	53.2	90.8	76.4	2.13
InternVL2.5 26B [7]	65.2	78.0	73.2	2.89	58.4	92.8	79.2	2.16
LLaVA One-Vision [25]	29.3	81.5	68.0	1.70	36.8	94.0	73.1	1.75
MiniCPM-V 4.5 8B [56]	21.3	98.9	75.0	1.91	10.4	97.6	68.0	1.52
Qwen2.5VL 3B [2]	38.7	84.3	71.8	2.36	45.2	88.0	72.5	2.30
Qwen2.5VL 7B [2]	64.9	69.8	70.3	1.73	57.2	86.4	75.4	1.66
Qwen2.5VL 32B [2]	63.2	84.5	78.7	1.84	35.6	96.4	73.9	1.70
Qwen2.5VL 72B [2]	51.2	88.5	77.4	3.22	54.0	91.2	76.9	3.13
Qwen3VL 8B [1]	47.3	97.8	81.1	3.20	51.6	93.6	77.4	3.13
Qwen3VL 30B A3 [1]	63.2	84.4	78.7	3.71	58.4	90.0	77.7	3.28
PhyDetEx (ours, 7B)	86.4	87.1	87.8	4.20	75.6	89.2	83.5	4.24

Table 1. Quantitative comparison of physical implausibility detection results across different VLMs on the Impossible Videos and our PID test split. The **bold** indicates the best performance. We report four metrics for each model: accuracy on implausible videos (**Acc. Impl.**), accuracy on plausible videos (**Acc. Plaus.**), overall detection performance (**F1 Score**), and explanation quality (**Reasoning Score**). Our proposed PhyDetEx achieves the best performance on both datasets, significantly surpassing existing VLMs in F1 Score and Reasoning Score, demonstrating its superior capability in detecting and reasoning about the physical implausibility in generated videos.

5.4. Benchmarking Modern T2V Models

Having validated that our PhyDetEx can effectively detect the physical implausibility in generated videos, we leverage it to assess the ability of recent state-of-the-art T2V models in generating physically plausible videos. Specifically, we first extract 50 prompts involving clear physical interactions from the VIDGEN-1M [40] dataset. These prompts are then used to generate videos with a variety of T2V models, including open-source mod-

els—*CogVideoX1.5 5B* [55], *HunyuanVideo* [24], *WanX2.1 5B*, *WanX2.1 14B*, and *WanX2.2 14B* [42]—as well as the powerful closed-source systems—*Ve3.1* [15] and *Sora2.0* [34]. Finally, we apply PhyDetEx to detect whether the generated videos exhibit physical implausibility.

Owing to its VLM-based architecture, PhyDetEx produces not only binary judgments but also token-level logits. Based on these outputs, we compute two complementary indicators: (1) the **Plausibility Rate**, defined as the proportion of videos judged to be physically plausible; and (2) a fine-grained **Plausibility Score** derived from the logits corresponding to the plausibility prediction, providing a continuous measure of physical realism. Detailed information on the benchmarking procedure for T2V models is provided in the **Supplemental Material F**. In particular, for videos judged as “Physically Plausible” by PhyDetEx, the corresponding logits are added to the score, whereas for videos judged as “Physical Implausible”, the logits are subtracted, resulting in an overall cumulative score.

The results are shown in Tab. 2. We see that the closed-source T2V system Sora2.0 achieves significantly higher *Rate* and *Score* than other models, demonstrating its superior understanding of physical laws. Veo3.1 is the second best but lags much behind Sora2.0. Among open-source models, *WanX2.1 1.3B* attains the same *Rate* as *WanX2.2 14B* and achieves the highest *Score*. Our analysis indicates that although *WanX2.1 1.3B* produces lower visual quality compared to larger models, this does not reflect a deficiency

T2V Model	Phy plausible Evaluation	
	Rate	Score
<i>Open-Source</i>		
CogVideoX1.5	52.0	5.35
HunyuanVideo	60.0	8.73
WanX2.1 1.3B	66.0	16.54
WanX2.1 14B	62.0	10.84
WanX2.2 14B	66.0	12.96
<i>Closed-Source</i>		
Veo3.1	72.0	12.98
Sora2.0	86.0	32.62

Table 2. Physical plausibility evaluation results of videos generated by various T2V models, benchmarked with our PhyDetEx. The closed-source model Sora2.0 shows the best performance, significantly higher than the second best player, Veo3.1.




Evaluate **whether** the depicted motion of objects or individuals adheres to the real world.



Implausible Content

The dolphin in the video is floating in the air without any external force



LLaVA-OneVision



Yes. The dolphins' motion in the video adheres to the real world as they are depicted leaping out of the water in a manner consistent with their natural behavior.



MiniCPM-V



Yes. The motion of the dolphin in these images adheres to real-world physics and natural behavior. Dolphins are known to leap out of the water, which is consistent with the sequence shown here where the dolphin appears progressively further along its path above the ocean waves.



PhyDetEx (Ours)




No. The dolphins' movement through the air without visible propulsion or support is implausible because they lack a means to generate lift or overcome gravity. The absence of a visible force acting on them makes their motion impossible according to physical principles



Implausible Content

..... the person floats from the woods to above the river without the help of any objects



MiniCPM-V



Yes. The motion of the girl jumping into the river and her subsequent descent towards the water adheres to real-world physics, depicting a natural fall under gravity's influence.



QwenVL2.5 72B



Yes. The motion of the individual in the video appears to adhere to the real world. The person is seen running along a fallen tree trunk over a stream, which is a plausible action given the natural setting. The movement is fluid and consistent with how a person would balance and run on such a surface



PhyDetEx (Ours)



No. The woman's floating above the water without touching it is implausible because she would be subject to gravity and buoyancy forces that should cause her to sink or float according to her density relative to water

Figure 4. Qualitative comparison between our PhyDetEx and recent VLMs on detecting physical implausibility. We illustrate two representative cases from our PID test split. In the first case (top), the dolphin remains floating above the sea surface without descending, violating gravity. LLaVA-OneVision and MiniCPM-V misinterpret the scene as a normal leap. Our PhyDetEx correctly identifies the physical implausibility and attributes it to the lack of gravitational influence. In the second case (bottom), a woman jumps from the woods toward the river but remains suspended midair. Other VLMs again regard this as plausible or irrelevant to physics, whereas PhyDetEx identifies the implausible subject and provides the correct reasoning that her motion defies gravity and buoyancy.

in its physical reasoning capability. Rather, its tendency to generate simpler actions naturally reduces the likelihood of producing physically implausible content.

Besides benchmarking existing T2V models, we also leverage PhyDetEx to generate positive and negative samples for these models, enabling physical awareness Direct Preference Optimization (DPO [37]) to improve the T2V models. Detailed implementation and results are provided in **Supplemental Material G**.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we first investigated why current VLMs struggled to identify physical implausibility in generated videos. Based on our investigation, we proposed to construct PID, a

dataset specifically designed for the physical implausibility detection task, consisting of a train and a test splits. Based on the train split, we developed PhyDetEx, a VLM-based detector capable of not only identifying but also explaining physical implausibility. PhyDetEx achieved SOTA performance on both our test split and the public Impossible Video benchmark. Furthermore, leveraging PhyDetEx, we evaluated a range of modern T2V models in terms of their ability to generate physically plausible videos. Our findings revealed that the powerful closed-source models have made significant progress in producing physically consistent videos, but the open-source models still lagged substantially behind.

Limitations. Although our tuned PhyDetEx model per-

forms well in detecting physical implausibility in generated videos, the diversity of physical events is vast. Thus, PhyDetEx still exhibits hallucinations in non-visual or complex physical events. We provide several failure cases of PhyDetEx in **Supplementary Material E**.

References

- [1] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023. 7
- [2] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 2, 3, 7
- [3] Zechen Bai, Hai Ci, and Mike Zheng Shou. Impossible videos, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 6
- [4] Hritik Bansal, Zongyu Lin, Tianyi Xie, Zeshun Zong, Michal Yarom, Yonatan Bitton, Chenfanfu Jiang, Yizhou Sun, Kai-Wei Chang, and Aditya Grover. Videophy: Evaluating physical commonsense for video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03520*, 2024. 1, 2
- [5] Hritik Bansal, Clark Peng, Yonatan Bitton, Roman Goldenberg, Aditya Grover, and Kai-Wei Chang. Videophy-2: A challenging action-centric physical commonsense evaluation in video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.06800*, 2025. 1, 2
- [6] Yubin Chen, Xuyang Guo, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Jiahao Zhang. T2vworldbench: A benchmark for evaluating world knowledge in text-to-video generation, 2025. 2
- [7] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Jinguo Zhu, Shenglong Ye, Hao Tian, Zhaoyang Liu, et al. Expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with model, data, and test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05271*, 2024. 7
- [8] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jiapeng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. How far are we to gpt-4v? closing the gap to commercial multimodal models with open-source suites. *Science China Information Sciences*, 67(12):220101, 2024. 2, 3
- [9] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24185–24198, 2024. 2
- [10] Joseph Cho, Fachrina Dewi Puspitasari, Sheng Zheng, Jingyao Zheng, Lik-Hang Lee, Tae-Ho Kim, Choong Seon Hong, and Chaoning Zhang. Sora as an agi world model? a complete survey on text-to-video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05131*, 2024. 2
- [11] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Noveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blistein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, and Luke Marris et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities, 2025. 2
- [12] Erfei Cui, Yanan He, Zheng Ma, Zhe Chen, Hao Tian, Weiyun Wang, Kunchang Li, Yi Wang, Wenhai Wang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Tong Lu, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. Sharegpt-4o: Comprehensive multimodal annotations with gpt-4o, 2024. 2
- [13] Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, Guang Shi, and Haoqi Fan. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025. 3
- [14] Haoyi Duan, Hong-Xing Yu, Sirui Chen, Li Fei-Fei, and Jiajun Wu. Worldscore: A unified evaluation benchmark for world generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.00983*, 2025. 2
- [15] Google DeepMind. Veo - google deepmind, 2025. <https://deepmind.google/models/veo/> [2025.09.08]. 1, 7
- [16] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6904–6913, 2017. 3
- [17] Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual programming: Compositional visual reasoning without training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14953–14962, 2023. 3
- [18] Xuan He, Dongfu Jiang, Ge Zhang, Max Ku, Achint Soni, Sherman Siu, Haonan Chen, Abhuranil Chandra, Ziyan Jiang, Aaran Arulraj, Kai Wang, Quy Duc Do, Yuansheng Ni, Bohan Lyu, Yaswanth Narsupalli, Rongqi Fan, Zhiheng Lyu, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Wenhui Chen. VideoScore: Building automatic metrics to simulate fine-grained human feedback for video generation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2105–2123, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [19] Siqiao Huang, Jialong Wu, Qixing Zhou, Shangchen Miao, and Mingsheng Long. Vid2world: Crafting video diffusion models to interactive world models, 2025. 1
- [20] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709, 2019. 3
- [21] Chaoya Jiang, Yongrui Heng, Wei Ye, Han Yang, Haiyang Xu, Ming Yan, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Shikun Zhang. Vlm-r 3: Region recognition, reasoning, and refinement for enhanced multimodal chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16192*, 2025. 2
- [22] Bingyi Kang, Yang Yue, Rui Lu, Zhijie Lin, Yang Zhao, Kaixin Wang, Gao Huang, and Jiashi Feng. How far is video generation from world model? – a physical law perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16860*, 2024. 1, 2

- [23] Kling. Klingai: Image to video. <https://app.klingai.com/global>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-09-08. 1, 2
- [24] Weijie Kong, Qi Tian, Zijian Zhang, Rox Min, Zuozhuo Dai, Jin Zhou, Jiangfeng Xiong, Xin Li, Bo Wu, Jianwei Zhang, et al. Hunyuanvideo: A systematic framework for large video generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03603*, 2024. 1, 2, 7
- [25] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 3, 7
- [26] Xuanyi Li, Daquan Zhou, Chenxu Zhang, Shaodong Wei, Qibin Hou, and Ming-Ming Cheng. Sora generates videos with stunning geometrical consistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17403*, 2024. 2
- [27] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European conference, zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, proceedings, part v 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 2
- [28] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023. 2, 3
- [29] Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Øyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:2507–2521, 2022. 3
- [30] Guoqing Ma, Haoyang Huang, Kun Yan, Liangyu Chen, Nan Duan, Shengming Yin, Changyi Wan, Ranchen Ming, Xiaoni Song, Xing Chen, Yu Zhou, Deshan Sun, Deyu Zhou, Jian Zhou, Kaijun Tan, Kang An, Mei Chen, Wei Ji, Qiling Wu, Wen Sun, Xin Han, Yanan Wei, Zheng Ge, Aojie Li, Bin Wang, Bizhu Huang, Bo Wang, Brian Li, Changxing Miao, Chen Xu, Chenfei Wu, Chenguang Yu, Dapeng Shi, Dingyuan Hu, Enle Liu, Gang Yu, Ge Yang, Guanzhe Huang, Gulin Yan, Haiyang Feng, Hao Nie, Haonan Jia, Hanpeng Hu, Hanqi Chen, Haolong Yan, Heng Wang, Hongcheng Guo, Huilin Xiong, Huixin Xiong, Jiahao Gong, Jianchang Wu, Jiaoren Wu, Jie Wu, Jie Yang, Jiashuai Liu, Jiashuo Li, Jingyang Zhang, Junjing Guo, Junzhe Lin, Kaixiang Li, Lei Liu, Lei Xia, Liang Zhao, Liguang Tan, Liwen Huang, Liying Shi, Ming Li, Mingliang Li, Muhua Cheng, Na Wang, Qiaohui Chen, Qinglin He, Qiuyan Liang, Quan Sun, Ran Sun, Rui Wang, Shaoliang Pang, Shiliang Yang, Sitong Liu, Siqi Liu, Shuli Gao, Tiancheng Cao, Tianyu Wang, Weipeng Ming, Wenqing He, Xu Zhao, Xuelin Zhang, Xianfang Zeng, Xiaojia Liu, Xuan Yang, Yaqi Dai, Yanbo Yu, Yang Li, Yineng Deng, Yingming Wang, Yilei Wang, Yuanwei Lu, Yu Chen, Yu Luo, Yuchu Luo, Yuhe Yin, Yuheng Feng, Yuxiang Yang, Zecheng Tang, Zekai Zhang, Zidong Yang, Binxing Jiao, Jiansheng Chen, Jing Li, Shuchang Zhou, Xiangyu Zhang, Xinhao Zhang, Yibo Zhu, Heung-Yeung Shum, and Daxin Jiang. Step-video-t2v technical report: The practice, challenges, and future of video foundation model, 2025. 1
- [31] Fanqing Meng, Jiaqi Liao, Xinyu Tan, Wenqi Shao, Quanfeng Lu, Kaipeng Zhang, Yu Cheng, Dianqi Li, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. Towards world simulator: Crafting physical commonsense-based benchmark for video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05363*, 2024. 1
- [32] Fanqing Meng, Jiaqi Liao, Xinyu Tan, Quanfeng Lu, Wenqi Shao, Kaipeng Zhang, Yu Cheng, Dianqi Li, and Ping Luo. Towards world simulator: Crafting physical commonsense-based benchmark for video generation. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. 2
- [33] MiniMax. Hailuo ai: Transform idea to visual with ai, 2025. <https://hailuoai.video/> [2025.09.08]. 2
- [34] OpenAI. Sora-2, 2025. <https://openai.com/index/sora-2/>. 7
- [35] Pika Lab. Pika, 2025. <https://pika.art/> [2025.09.09]. 2
- [36] Yiran Qin, Zhelun Shi, Jiwen Yu, Xijun Wang, Enshen Zhou, Lijun Li, Zhenfei Yin, Xihui Liu, Lu Sheng, Jing Shao, LEI BAI, and Ruimao Zhang. Worldsimbench: Towards video generation models as world simulators. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. 2
- [37] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 8
- [38] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. A-okvqa: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge. *arXiv*, 2022. 3
- [39] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08128*, 2023. 3
- [40] Zhiyu Tan, Xiaomeng Yang, Luo Zheng Qin, and Hao Li. Vidgen-1m: A large-scale dataset for text-to-video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02629*, 2024. 3, 5, 7
- [41] Oriol Vinyals, Alexander Toshev, Samy Bengio, and Dumitru Erhan. Show and tell: A neural image caption generator. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3156–3164, 2015. 3
- [42] Team Wan, Ang Wang, Baole Ai, Bin Wen, Chaojie Mao, Chen-Wei Xie, Di Chen, Fei Wu Yu, Haiming Zhao, Jianxiao Yang, Jianyuan Zeng, Jiayu Wang, Jingfeng Zhang, Jingren Zhou, Jinkai Wang, Jixuan Chen, Kai Zhu, Kang Zhao, Keyu Yan, Lianghua Huang, Mengyang Feng, Ningyi Zhang, Pandeng Li, Pingyu Wu, Ruihang Chu, Ruili Feng, Shiwei Zhang, Siyang Sun, Tao Fang, Tianxing Wang, Tianyi Gui, Tingyu Weng, Tong Shen, Wei Lin, Wei Wang, Wei Wang, Wenmeng Zhou, Wente Wang, Wenting Shen, Wenyuan Yu, Xianzhong Shi, Xiaoming Huang, Xin Xu, Yan Kou, Yangyu Lv, Yifei Li, Yijing Liu, Yiming Wang, Yingya Zhang, Yitong Huang, Yong Li, You Wu, Yu Liu, Yulin Pan, Yun Zheng, Yuntao Hong, Yupeng Shi, Yutong Feng, Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhen Han, Zhi-Fan Wu, and Ziyu Liu. Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20314*, 2025. 1, 2, 7
- [43] Wentao Wan, Nan Kang, Zeqing Wang, Zhuojie Yang, Liang Lin, and Keze Wang. A continual learning paradigm for non-differentiable visual programming frameworks on visual reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09809*, 2023. 2

- [44] Jing Wang, Ao Ma, Ke Cao, Jun Zheng, Zhanjie Zhang, Jiasong Feng, Shanyuan Liu, Yuhang Ma, Bo Cheng, Dawei Leng, et al. Wis: World simulator assistant for physics-aware text-to-video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08153*, 2025. 1
- [45] Wenhao Wang and Yi Yang. Vidprom: A million-scale real prompt-gallery dataset for text-to-video diffusion models. *Thirty-eighth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. 4
- [46] Yibin Wang, Zhiyu Tan, Junyan Wang, Xiaomeng Yang, Cheng Jin, and Hao Li. Lift: Leveraging human feedback for text-to-video model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04814*, 2024. 1, 2
- [47] Zeqing Wang, Wentao Wan, Qiqing Lao, Runmeng Chen, Minjie Lang, Keze Wang, and Liang Lin. Towards top-down reasoning: An explainable multi-agent approach for visual question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17331*, 2023. 3
- [48] Zeqing Wang, Qingyang Ma, Wentao Wan, Haojie Li, Keze Wang, and Yonghong Tian. Is this generated person existed in real-world? fine-grained detecting and calibrating abnormal human-body. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 21226–21237, 2025. 1, 2, 3
- [49] Zeqing Wang, Xinyu Wei, Bairui Li, Zhen Guo, Jinrui Zhang, Hongyang Wei, Keze Wang, and Lei Zhang. Video-verse: How far is your t2v generator from a world model? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.08398*, 2025. 2
- [50] Zeqing Wang, Shiyuan Zhang, Chengpei Tang, and Keze Wang. Timecausality: Evaluating the causal ability in time dimension for vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15435*, 2025. 2
- [51] Xinyu Wei, Jinrui Zhang, Zeqing Wang, Hongyang Wei, Zhen Guo, and Lei Zhang. Tiif-bench: How does your t2i model follow your instructions? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.02161*, 2025. 2
- [52] Jiannan Xiang, Guangyi Liu, Yi Gu, Qiyue Gao, Yuting Ning, Yuheng Zha, Zeyu Feng, Tianhua Tao, Shibo Hao, Yemin Shi, Zhengzhong Liu, Eric P. Xing, and Zhiting Hu. Pandora: Towards general world model with natural language actions and video states. 2024. 2
- [53] Junfei Xiao, Ceyuan Yang, Lvmin Zhang, Shengqu Cai, Yang Zhao, Yuwei Guo, Gordon Wetzstein, Maneesh Agrawala, Alan Yuille, and Lu Jiang. Captain cinema: Towards short movie generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.18634*, 2025. 2
- [54] Qiyao Xue, Xiangyu Yin, Boyuan Yang, and Wei Gao. Phyt2v: Llm-guided iterative self-refinement for physics-grounded text-to-video generation. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 18826–18836, 2025. 1, 2
- [55] Zhuoyi Yang, Jiayan Teng, Wendi Zheng, Ming Ding, Shiyu Huang, Jiazheng Xu, Yuanming Yang, Wenyi Hong, Xiaohan Zhang, Guanyu Feng, et al. Cogvideox: Text-to-video diffusion models with an expert transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06072*, 2024. 1, 2, 7
- [56] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, et al. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01800*, 2024. 7
- [57] Jun Zhan, Junqi Dai, Jiasheng Ye, Yunhua Zhou, Dong Zhang, Zhigeng Liu, Xin Zhang, Ruibin Yuan, Ge Zhang, Linyang Li, Hang Yan, Jie Fu, Tao Gui, Tianxiang Sun, Yugang Jiang, and Xipeng Qiu. AnyGPT: Unified multimodal LLM with discrete sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9637–9662, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [58] Renrui Zhang, Xinyu Wei, Dongzhi Jiang, Ziyu Guo, Yichi Zhang, Chengzhuo Tong, Jiaming Liu, Aojun Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. MAVIS: Mathematical visual instruction tuning with an automatic data engine. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. 2
- [59] Tao Zhang, Xiangtai Li, Hao Fei, Haobo Yuan, Shengqiong Wu, Shunping Ji, Change Loy Chen, and Shuicheng Yan. Omg-llava: Bridging image-level, object-level, pixel-level reasoning and understanding. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 3
- [60] Xiangdong Zhang, Jiaqi Liao, Shaofeng Zhang, Fanqing Meng, Xiangpeng Wan, Junchi Yan, and Yu Cheng. Videorepa: Learning physics for video generation through relational alignment with foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23656*, 2025. 2
- [61] Dian Zheng, Ziqi Huang, Hongbo Liu, Kai Zou, Yinan He, Fan Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Jingwen He, Wei-Shi Zheng, Yu Qiao, et al. Vbench-2.0: Advancing video generation benchmark suite for intrinsic faithfulness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.21755*, 2025. 2
- [62] Zheng Zhu, Xiaofeng Wang, Wangbo Zhao, Chen Min, Ni-an Chen Deng, Min Dou, Yuqi Wang, Botian Shi, Kai Wang, Chi Zhang, et al. Is sora a world simulator? a comprehensive survey on general world models and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03520*, 2024. 2

PhyDetEx: Detecting and Explaining the Physical Plausibility of T2V Models

Supplementary Material

We highly recommend watching the supplementary video, which comprehensively demonstrates our motivation and results, building a good starting point to understand our work.

A. Details of Preliminary Investigation

In Sec. 3 of the main paper, we present the preliminary investigation results on InternVL2.5-26B. This section provides additional details and extended results of these preliminary experiments.

Prompts under three conditions. Tab. S1 lists all prompts used in our preliminary investigation. The prompts under different conditions provide the VLM with varying degrees of information regarding whether the given video originates from an AIGC model.

Additional results of our preliminary investigation. Beyond the InternVL2.5-26B results shown in Fig. 2 of the main paper, we further evaluate several other VLMs, with results summarized in Tab. S2. The results show that across nearly all VLMs, the output changes substantially when provided with different prompts under conditions C1–C3: *Acc. Impl* and *Reasoning Score* increase markedly, while *Acc. Plaus* drops significantly. This suggests that VLMs generally tend to assume that a generated video is physically plausible, rather than leveraging their broad pretraining knowledge to assess the physical consistency of the video content. These observations further motivate the design and construction of our PID dataset.

B. Ablation Study

In this section, we examine whether the design of our PID training split and the training strategy effectively enhance the VLM’s ability to understand physical plausibility.

Tab. S3 reports the results. Specifically, we first randomly sample 2,000 paired videos from the PID training split and train a new baseline model (denoted as *Baseline**) using the same training configuration described in Sec. 5 of the main paper. Based on this randomly selected subset, we then construct two variants: (1) **w/o Balanced Data**, where we train the model using only the negative samples; and (2) **w/o Paired Data**, where part of the samples are replaced with non-paired videos. Note that the full PID training split contains 2,588 paired videos; we intentionally select only 2,000 videos here to isolate and validate the role of paired data in the training process.

The results show that removing either the balanced sampling or the paired design leads to a clear performance

degradation in F1 Score compared with *Baseline**. This demonstrates that learning from paired and balanced data is crucial for aligning the model with the distribution of physical plausibility in real world videos.

C. Details of PID

In this section, we provide the detailed statistics of our proposed PID dataset.

PID training split. The PID training split consists of two components: (1) positive videos extracted from VIDGEN-1M, which are real-world videos without any physical implausibility, and (2) negative videos generated from captions whose physical content has been intentionally modified to introduce physical implausibility. Specifically, we use HunyuanVideo to synthesize the negative videos from these edited captions. Leveraging our findings from the preliminary investigation, we additionally provide the VLM with the information that each generated video is produced by an AIGC model, and employ Qwen2.5-VL 72B to filter out any generated videos that fail to exhibit the intended physical implausibility.

PID test split. As described in Sec. 4 of the main paper, the construction of the PID test split is designed to more accurately evaluate a VLM’s ability to understand physical plausibility based on two key considerations.

First, all physically implausible samples (*i.e.*, negative samples) should originate from *normal prompts*. This design choice aligns with real-world scenarios, where detecting physical implausibility in generated videos typically does not come from the prompts with physical implausibility. Second, the physically plausible set should include both generated videos and real-world videos. If all physically plausible videos are sourced exclusively from real-world videos, as done in datasets such as Impossible Video, the test split would introduce a shortcut based on “generated vs. non-generated”, preventing a fair assessment of whether the VLM truly understands physical plausibility rather than merely detecting generation artefacts.

Following these principles, we manually select physically implausible videos from WanX2.1-1.3B and CogVideoX (2B, 5B) and annotate them accordingly. Similarly, we collect generated and real-world videos without physical implausibility to form the positive samples. Together, these constitute the PID test split. Detailed statistics are provided in Tab. S4. We also provide some samples from our PID test split in Fig. S1.

Prompts with Different Conditions

Prompt (C1)	Given the video content, evaluate whether the depicted motion of objects or individuals adheres to the real world. Start your answer with Yes. or No. and give the explanation.
Prompt (C2)	Given the video content, which may be generated by artificial intelligence , which is generated by artificial intelligence, evaluate whether the depicted motion of objects or individuals adheres to the real world. Start your answer with Yes. or No. and give the explanation.
Prompt (C3)	Given the video content, which is generated by artificial intelligence , evaluate whether the depicted motion of objects or individuals adheres to the real world. Start your answer with Yes. or No. and give the explanation.

Table S1. Prompts used under the preliminary investigation conditions. C1 provides no information about the video source, C2 weakly suggests that the video may be AI-generated, and C3 explicitly states that the video is AI-generated.

Model	C1			C2			C3		
	Acc. Impl	Acc. Plaus	Reasoning Score	Acc. Impl	Acc. Plaus	Reasoning Score	Acc. Impl	Acc. Plaus	Reasoning Score
InternVL2.5 8B	52.3	76.9	2.32	69.35	74.77	2.81	87.29	48.31	3.11
InternVL2.5 26B	65.23	78	2.9	81.87	60.15	3.62	90.47	51.54	3.76
Qwen2.5VL 7B	53.08	73.85	1.73	62.43	71.85	1.88	64.86	69.85	1.69
Qwen2.5VL 32B	45.98	94.62	1.84	52.52	86.92	2.04	60.75	82.46	2.06
Qwen2.5VL 72B	51.21	88.46	3.22	49.72	89.08	3.32	56.07	87.08	3.38

Table S2. Preliminary investigation results across different VLMs under conditions C1–C3. For each model, we report *Acc. Impl*, *Acc. Plaus*, and *Reasoning Score*. All models exhibit substantial performance shifts as the prompt condition changes.

D. Details of Evaluation

In this section, we describe the evaluation protocols for all metrics. For *Acc. Impl.*, *Acc. Plaus.*, and *F1 Score*, we extract the first token of each model’s response—either “Yes” or “No”—using regular expression matching, and use this predicted binary judgment to compute the corresponding classification metrics.

For the *Reasoning Score*, we employ an LLM (LLaMA-3.1 8B Instruct) as an automatic evaluator to assess the semantic alignment between the model’s explanation and the

ground-truth rationale. To ensure fairness, we remove the initial judgement token (“yes” or “no”) from the response before evaluation, so that the score reflects only the quality of the explanation rather than the predicted label, and the scores range from 0 to 5. The prompts used for this evaluation is provided in Tab. S5.

Method	Acc. Impl.	Acc. Plaus.	F1 Score
Base Model	64.9	69.8	70.3
Baseline*	98.3	70.8	82.2
w/o balanced Data	100.0	0.0	0.0
w/o paired Data	2.4	99.8	71.3
PhyDetEx	86.4	87.1	87.8

Table S3. Ablation study on data design and training strategy. We compare the base model, the reconstructed Baseline*, and variants without balanced data or paired data. Both balanced sampling and paired supervision are essential for achieving high physical plausibility detection performance, as reflected in the *F1 Score*.

Category	Source / Model	Count
Positive Samples	Real World	148
	Generated (General)	102
	<i>total</i>	250
Negative Samples	Wanx2.1 1.3B	195
	CogVideoX-5b	28
	CogVideoX-2b	27
	<i>total</i>	250
	<i>Avg. Explanation</i>	27.58 words
Total		500

Table S4. Statistics of the collected PID test split. The total number of videos is 500, evenly split into positive and negative samples. The average annotation length is 27.58 words.




Figure S1. Samples in our PID test split.

E. More Cases and Failure Cases

In this section, we present additional qualitative examples of PhyDetEx, along with failure cases that highlight its lim-

itations. Fig. S2 shows two representative cases correctly identified by our model. In the first video, a cookie spontaneously transforms its shape without any external force, which violates basic physical principles such as inertia and action–reaction. In the second example, a sheet of paper tears itself into smaller pieces without being touched and remains intact after flying apart—another scenario that is clearly physically implausible. PhyDetEx successfully identifies both cases as containing physical implausibility and gives the corresponding explanation.

Although PhyDetEx is effective in detecting physical implausibility in generated videos, it still exhibits certain limitations. This is largely due to the diverse ways in which physical content can manifest, and many cases remain inherently difficult to judge solely from visual cues. In Fig. S3, we present two representative failure cases. In the first example, PhyDetEx correctly identifies that the video contains physically implausible motion, but provides an incorrect explanation. The implausibility arises because the boat remains stationary despite the strong water current, yet PhyDetEx mistakenly states that the boat moves upstream. In the second example, the video is physically plausible, but PhyDetEx incorrectly predicts implausibility and provides an erroneous explanation, incorrectly assuming that the boat is moving across the field.


F. Benchmarking the T2V Models

F.1. Benchmarking Details

Using the tuned PhyDetEx, we evaluate a variety of current open-source and closed-source T2V models. For each video generated from prompts extracted from VIDGEN-1M, PhyDetEx determines whether the video contains physically implausible content. We extract the model’s binary judgment (*e.g.*, Yes or No) using a regular expression ap-


Prompt
<p>You will be given a ground truth and a model output couple.</p> <p>Your task is to provide a 'total rating' scoring how well the model output matches the semantic meaning of the ground truth.</p> <p>Give your answer as an integer on a scale of 0 to 5, where 0 means that the model output is completely unrelated to the ground truth, and 5 means that the model output perfectly matches the semantic meaning of the ground truth.</p> <p>Provide your feedback as follows:</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <p>Total rating: (your rating, as an integer between 0 and 5)</p> <p>Now here are the ground truth and model output.</p> <p>Ground Truth: {ground_truth}</p> <p>Model Output: {model_output}</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <p>Total rating:</p>

Table S5. Prompt used in the evaluation of *Reasoning Score*.

 Evaluate **whether** the depicted motion of objects or individuals adheres to the real world

 **Implausible Content**

The Cookie transforms itself




 
PhyDetEx (Ours)

No. The cookie's transformation into a perfect circle without any visible force acting on it is implausible. The cookie should remain in its original shape due to its inertia and the forces acting upon it. The scenario also lacks an action-reaction pair, as there is no visible force causing the cookie to change its shape.

 **Implausible Content**


The paper is torn into small pieces without touching, and kept intact.



 
PhyDetEx (Ours)

No. The paper tears into smaller pieces without any visible external force acting on it. This contradicts the principle that an object at rest remains at rest unless acted upon by an external force. The paper's change in state from intact to torn requires a force, which is not present in this scenario.

Figure S2. Qualitative examples of PhyDetEx on physically implausible video. Top: a cookie spontaneously transforms its shape without any external force. Bottom: a sheet of paper tears itself into multiple pieces without contact and remains intact afterwards. Both cases violate fundamental physical principles, and PhyDetEx correctly flags them as implausible and gives the corresponding explanation.

 Evaluate **whether** the depicted motion of objects or individuals adheres to the real world.

 **Implausible Content:** The boat remained stationary in the current.



 
PhyDetEx (Ours)

No. The boat **moves upstream** without any visible force being applied, contradicting the principle that an object requires a force to change its state of motion

 No Physical Plausibility



 
PhyDetEx (Ours)

No. The abnormal scenario is implausible because the ship moves through the field without any visible force acting on it

Figure S3. Representative failure cases of PhyDetEx. Top: the model correctly flags the video as implausible but produces an incorrect explanation, mistakenly claiming that the boat moves upstream rather than recognizing that it remains stationary despite the water current. Bottom: a physically plausible video that PhyDetEx incorrectly labels as implausible, accompanied by an incorrect explanation that the boat is moving through the field.

plied to the first token of its output, which forms the basis of the *Rate* metric. To obtain a more fine-grained assessment, we further leverage the VLM-based design of PhyDetEx and directly read the logits associated with its judgment, forming the *Score* metric. It is important to note that the two metrics are not strictly equivalent. For example, although WanX2.1-14B yields a much lower *Rate* compared with Veo-3.1, the difference between the two models becomes marginal under the *Score* metric. This phenomenon arises because some physical events in videos are inherently ambiguous, causing PhyDetEx to produce judgments with varying degrees of confidence.

F.2. Assessment of T2V Models

Open-Source T2V Models. All experiments involving open-source T2V models are conducted on servers equipped with NVIDIA A800 GPUs. The models evaluated in this work are obtained from the following sources:

- **CogVideoX-1.5**: downloaded from the official GitHub repository.¹
- **Wan2.1-14B and Wan2.1-1.3B**: accessed via the official GitHub repositories,² with checkpoints and inference scripts from Hugging Face.³
- **Wan2.2-14B**: accessed via the official GitHub repository,⁴ with checkpoints and inference scripts from Hugging Face.⁵
- **Hunyuan Video**: downloaded from the official GitHub repository.⁶

Closed-Source T2V Models. Closed-source models are accessed exclusively through their official APIs: Veo-3.1 via the Google Gemini API⁷ and Sora-2 via the OpenAI API.⁸

Due to the high cost of video generation for both Veo-3 and Sora-2, our experiments rely on the Veo-3.1-Fast and Sora-2-Standard versions.

G. Implementation of Physical-Aware DPO

Beyond using PhyDetEx as an evaluator for existing T2V models, we also employ it as a data generator for DPO training. Specifically, PhyDetEx provides comparative judgments across multiple videos generated from the same prompt, enabling us to construct positive–negative preference pairs for Direct Preference Optimization (DPO). Fine-tuning T2V models on such physically grounded preference

Method	PC	SA
Baseline	36.16	42.66
DPO	37.63	43.81

Table S6. Performance of the WanX2.1 1.3B before and after Physical-Aware DPO. DPO fine-tuning yields improvements across both metrics in the VideoPhy benchmark.

data improves their ability to produce physically plausible videos. The overall procedure is described below.

Collecting DPO Data. We begin by sampling a large set of prompts from the VidProM dataset, which is derived from real user communities. Low-quality prompts or those lacking meaningful physical interactions are filtered using an LLM. For each remaining prompt, the T2V model generates 12 videos, which are then evaluated by PhyDetEx. Because the 12 videos may contain multiple plausible samples or multiple implausible samples, we rely on the evaluation logits to determine the most confident positive and negative instances. If both positive and negative samples are present, we select the highest-logit plausible video as the positive sample, and the highest-logit implausible video as the negative sample. If one category is absent (*e.g.*, no plausible video), we use the lowest-logit video of the opposite category as a surrogate to ensure that each prompt yields a paired sample.

Fine-Tuning the T2V Model. With the DPO dataset, we conduct experiments using WanX2.1-1.3B. We implement the standard DPO loss and additionally incorporate an MSE reconstruction loss to preserve the model’s basic generation quality and prevent visual collapse. In our configuration, the DPO loss weight is set to 0.5 and the MSE loss weight to 1.0. We train the model for one epoch on 2,500 preference pairs generated by WanX2.1-1.3B itself, with a learning rate of $1e-5$ and a cosine Learning Rate scheduler.

Evaluation. Following fine-tuning, we evaluate the model on VideoPhy, which is external to the PhyDetEx training domain. As shown in Tab. S6, the model achieves consistent improvements on both evaluation dimensions, Physical Commonsense (PC) and Semantic Alignment (SA). Qualitative examples from VideoPhy are provided in Fig. S4. In the first case, a tyre previously rotated in place without moving downward along the slope; after DPO training, the tyre rolls naturally along the incline. In the second case, a foot produced a water splash despite not contacting the water surface—an obvious physical violation. After DPO training, the splash appears only upon actual contact, aligning with real-world physical behaviour. Together, these results demonstrate not only the reliability of PhyDetEx in detecting physical implausibilities but also its wide utility in downstream T2V model enhancement.

¹<https://github.com/THUDM/CogVideo>

²<https://github.com/Wan-Video/Wan2.1>

³<https://huggingface.co/Wan-AI>

⁴<https://github.com/Wan-Video/Wan2.2>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/Wan-AI/Wan2.2-T2V-A14B>


⁶<https://github.com/Tencent-HunyuanVideo>

⁷<https://developers.googleblog.com/en/veo-3-now-available-gemini-api/>


⁸<https://api.openai.com/v1/videos>

Prompt: A wheel continually rolling along the asphalt road. 🚗

Original Video: The **tire rotates in place** on the road. 😞




After DPO: 😊



Prompt: Feet kick and splash about in a rain puddle. 💧

Original Video: Water **splashed** but the feet **didn't touch it**. 😞



After DPO: 😊



Figure S4. Qualitative examples of results after DPO fine-tuning.