

Denoise to Track: Harnessing Video Diffusion Priors for Robust Correspondence

Tianyu Yuan¹, Yuanbo Yang², Lin-Zhuo Chen¹, Yao Yao^{1†}, Zhuzhong Qian^{1†}

¹NanJing University, ²ZheJiang University

yty@smail.nju.edu.cn




Figure 1. **HeFT**. Our zero-shot point tracking framework exploits the visual priors of pretrained VDiT. A head- and frequency-aware feature selection strategy further enhances tracking robustness and accuracy.

Abstract

In this work, we introduce *HeFT* (**Head-Frequency Tracker**), a zero-shot point tracking framework that leverages the visual priors of pretrained video diffusion models. To better understand how they encode spatiotemporal information, we analyze the internal representations of Video Diffusion Transformer (VDiT). Our analysis reveals that attention heads act as minimal functional units with distinct specializations for matching, semantic understanding, and positional encoding. Additionally, we find that the low-frequency components in VDiT features are crucial for establishing correspondences, whereas the high-frequency components tend to introduce noise. Building on these in-

sights, we propose a head- and frequency-aware feature selection strategy that jointly selects the most informative attention head and low-frequency components to enhance tracking performance. Specifically, our method extracts discriminative features through single-step denoising, applies feature selection, and employs soft-argmax localization with forward-backward consistency checks for correspondence estimation. Extensive experiments on TAP-Vid benchmarks demonstrate that *HeFT* achieves state-of-the-art zero-shot tracking performance, approaching the accuracy of supervised methods while eliminating the need for annotated training data. Our work further underscores the promise of video diffusion models as powerful foundation models for a wide range of downstream tasks, paving the way toward unified visual foundation models.

† corresponding author. Project Page: [HeFT](#)

1. Introduction

The Video Diffusion Transformer [29] (VDiT) is a recently proposed architecture that extends diffusion models to video generation through spatiotemporal attention mechanisms. VDiT exhibits a strong ability to produce temporally coherent videos, suggesting that it captures rich visual priors of real-world. These characteristics make VDiT not only a powerful generative model but also a promising foundation model for video perception tasks.

Motivated by these capabilities, we explore whether the priors learned by VDiT can be leveraged for point tracking. Current point tracking methods [17, 47, 62] are predominantly supervised, relying on large-scale annotated datasets which are costly and time-consuming. In contrast, video diffusion models are pretrained on massive and diverse video corpora, endowing them with strong generalization capabilities and making them well-suited as foundation models for perception tasks [20]. Despite this potential, the discriminative use of VDiT remains underexplored. Recent studies [26, 36] have attempted to repurpose VDiT for tracking, yet they typically treat its features as a black box. Consequently, they fail to systematically analyze how its spatiotemporal representations are encoded, particularly at the level of individual attention heads and frequency components. This limitation leads to lower performance in downstream tasks. This gap underscores the need for robust zero-shot point tracking approaches that explicitly leverage VDiT’s rich visual priors.

In this work, we propose **HeFT (Head-Frequency Tracker)**, a zero-shot point tracking framework that leverages the visual priors of pretrained video diffusion models. Our key insight is to build upon VDiT’s head-wise functional specification and RoPE-shaped frequency inductive bias to maximize correspondence quality. We first extract discriminative features from real videos via a single denoising step. To maximize correspondence quality, we select the most effective attention head, since heads are the minimal functional units that carry diverse visual priors. We then apply frequency-aware feature selection to retain low-frequency components that stabilize correspondence while suppressing high-frequency noise. Our approach achieves superior performance as demonstrated in Fig. 1.

In summary, our contributions are:

- We systematically analyze VDiT’s attention heads, uncovering a cooperative specialization that supports robust zero-shot point tracking and provides insights for future video understanding tasks.
- We find that low-frequency components encode correspondence while high-frequency components encode positional information, motivating our frequency-aware feature selection strategy.
- We propose **HeFT**, a novel zero-shot point tracking framework that leverages pretrained VDiT. Our method

achieves state-of-the-art performance across multiple benchmarks, providing a new paradigm for exploiting generative models in downstream perception tasks.

2. Related work

Diffusion Models for Perception: The success of diffusion-based generative models [14] has expanded beyond image and video generation to a wide range of visual perception tasks. Recent studies have shown that these models can be effectively adapted for semantic segmentation [51, 60], monocular depth estimation [8, 19, 28, 34, 59], and 3D reconstruction [40, 42, 48, 50, 64] by leveraging their learned visual priors. Moreover, Marigold [20] demonstrates that diffusion models can simultaneously tackle multiple perception tasks, including depth, surface normals, and material property estimation. Nevertheless, most existing approaches focus primarily on the generative process and require task-specific training or fine-tuning, while largely overlooking the internal features and structural properties of pretrained diffusion models.

Point Tracking: Point tracking aims to establish temporal correspondences by estimating the motion of physical points across video frames, which is fundamental for understanding object dynamics and scene structure. TAP-Vid [6] formulates temporal correspondence as point tracking in video sequences, estimating the motion of physical points across frames. PIPs [12] iteratively refine trajectories within temporal windows, while TAPIR [7] enhances performance using depthwise convolutions and improved initialization. OmniMotion [47] innovatively predicts trajectories in a normalized coordinate space. CoTracker [17] jointly tracks near-dense trajectories by exploiting spatial correlations. TAPNext [62] reformulates point tracking as a sequence-to-sequence mask token prediction problem, drawing inspiration from modern language models to simplify model architecture and improve performance. Due to the difficulty of annotating real-world videos, these methods often rely on synthetic datasets [6, 9]. To address this limitation, recent studies [35, 38] have explored self-supervised approaches. However, their performance still falls short of fully supervised methods, as self-supervised approaches rely on cycle consistency or other auxiliary signals that provide indirect and weak supervision, leading to instability. In contrast, our zero-shot approach benefits from the rich visual priors of pretrained video diffusion models, achieving performance comparable to supervised methods.

Diffusion Models for Correspondence: The remarkable success of diffusion models in various visual perception tasks has motivated researchers to explore their potential for correspondence estimation. DIFT [41] demonstrated that diffusion models can capture correspondence relationships in an unsupervised manner by analyzing internal representations during the denoising process. Building




Figure 2. **Layer vs Head Performance.** Performance comparison showing layer-level performance and the best, worst, and average performance of all heads within each layer.

on this, [13] showed that the internal semantic knowledge of diffusion models, can be leveraged to discover semantic correspondences without additional training. SD-DINO [57] further highlighted the complementary nature of different representations by combining Stable Diffusion [32] features with DINOv2 [27] features for semantic correspondence. However, these methods are limited to two-frame matching, as image diffusion models lack temporal modeling capabilities necessary for multi-frame correspondence. The emergence of video diffusion models has opened new avenues for temporal correspondence tasks. For instance, [21, 36] proposed optical flow extraction by perturbing input videos with visual markers at query points and analyzing the generated outputs. Yet, these approaches treat video diffusion models as black boxes and cannot achieve dense tracking across entire videos. DiffTrack [26] addresses this by leveraging VDiT to analyze query-key similarities in specific layers, demonstrating that certain attention layers are crucial for temporal matching. Despite these advances, existing methods largely treat diffusion features as monolithic representations, overlooking the fine-grained structures encoded within individual attention heads and the frequency components that facilitate cross-frame perception. Our work addresses this gap by conducting a detailed analysis of VDiT, revealing that attention heads exhibit distinct functional specializations and that low-frequency components contribute to establishing temporal correspondences.

3. Preliminaries

3.1. Video Diffusion Models

Video diffusion models [15, 16, 29, 61, 63] generate videos from various conditioning inputs (e.g., text, images, or videos) through an iterative denoising process. Given conditioning information, the model progressively removes noise from an initially random tensor, guided by the conditioning embeddings, to synthesize a video. In practice, video diffusion models typically operate in a compressed latent space using 3D Variational Autoencoders (VAEs)

[22, 23, 44]. A raw video tensor $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times H \times W \times 3}$ is encoded into a latent representation $\mathbf{z}_{\text{video}}$ of size $f \times h \times w$, where f, h, w denote the compressed temporal and spatial dimensions. Conditioning information is encoded into \mathbf{z}_{cond} and integrated into the denoising network through concatenation or cross-attention mechanisms. More specifically, the network $\epsilon_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{video},t}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{cond}}, t)$ predicts the velocity in flow-matching formulations at each timestep t , gradually refining the noisy latent $\mathbf{z}_{\text{video},t}$ toward the clean latent $\mathbf{z}_{\text{video},0}$. After T denoising steps, the latent is decoded by the VAE decoder to produce the final video.

Early video diffusion models [2–4, 10, 24, 32, 37, 53] primarily adopted U-Net-based architectures [33]. These methods extended pretrained image diffusion models [14, 30, 32] into the temporal domain by introducing separate spatial and temporal modules. While this design efficiently leveraged existing image priors, the decoupled structure limited direct spatiotemporal interaction, often leading to temporal inconsistency and reduced motion diversity.

To overcome these limitations, recent works introduce Video Diffusion Transformers (VDiTs) [11, 25, 31, 55, 61], which replace the convolutional backbone with a fully transformer-based architecture [45]. VDiTs employ 3D spatiotemporal attention to jointly model spatial and temporal dependencies. At each timestep t , layer l , video latents and conditioning embeddings are augmented with 3D positional embeddings [39] and processed through stacked transformer layers. The attention mechanism is defined as:

$$\text{Attn}(\mathbf{Q}_{t,l}, \mathbf{K}_{t,l}, \mathbf{V}_{t,l}) = \text{Softmax} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}_{t,l} \mathbf{K}_{t,l}^T}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \mathbf{V}_{t,l}. \quad (1)$$

By unifying spatial and temporal reasoning within attention, VDiTs achieve improved motion realism and temporal stability compared to U-Net-based models.

3.2. 3D Rotary Positional Embedding

Transformers are permutation-invariant over input tokens. Without positional embedding, attention cannot distinguish which tokens are adjacent in time or space. For video diffusion models, positions are inherently three-dimensional (time, height, width), so a 3D positional embedding is required to jointly model spatiotemporal relationships.

Most contemporary VDiTs adopt Rotary Positional Embeddings (RoPE) [39], which efficiently capture positional relationships through rotations while preserving relative positional information. Formally, let d be the per-head channel dimension. Channels are grouped into pairs, and a 2D rotation is applied to the i -th pair (x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}) , where $i = 0, 1, \dots, d/2 - 1$. For any angle θ , the rotation is

$$\mathbf{R}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$




Figure 3. **Head Specialization.** (a) Similarity heatmaps of three different attention heads across two frames. The blue hollow boxes indicate the query patches, while deeper red regions represent higher similarity scores. Different heads exhibit distinct cross-frame correspondence patterns, highlighting the diversity of attention heads. (b) Attention patterns for matching-head, semantic-head, and position-head.

In the 3D case, RoPE splits per-head channels into three groups corresponding to the temporal, vertical, and horizontal axes, denoted by d_t, d_h, d_w with $d_t + d_h + d_w = d$. Each group is further paired and assigned distinct frequencies. Rotations are applied independently per axis based on its discrete position. Concretely, let the temporal index be m_t , vertical index m_h , and horizontal index m_w . For the i -th pair within each axis group, use frequency

$$\omega_i = 10000^{-\frac{2i}{d_\bullet}}, \quad \bullet \in \{t, h, w\}, \quad (3)$$

and define the rotation angles as

$$\theta_i^{(t)} = \omega_i m_t, \quad \theta_i^{(h)} = \omega_i m_h, \quad \theta_i^{(w)} = \omega_i m_w. \quad (4)$$

The rotations $\mathbf{R}(\theta_i^{(t)})$, $\mathbf{R}(\theta_i^{(h)})$, and $\mathbf{R}(\theta_i^{(w)})$ are then applied to the corresponding channel pairs to obtain rotated queries and keys. Overall, 3D-RoPE offers an efficient mechanism for encoding spatiotemporal positions, allowing transformers to capture coherent temporal and spatial structure.

4. Method

In this section, we present HeFT, our VDiT-guided framework for zero-shot point tracking. The method is designed




Figure 4. **Temporal rotation angles across frequency bands.** High-frequency components (top 25%) exhibit significant rotations across frames, capturing fine-grained positional information, while low-frequency components (bottom 50%) remain nearly invariant, encoding stable semantic content.

to exploit the visual priors encoded in VDiT. In Sec. 4.1, we analyze feature granularity and discover head-level specialization. In Sec. 4.2, we study the frequency composition of attention heads and propose a frequency-aware feature selection strategy. In Sec. 4.3, we integrate these findings into a complete tracking framework, enabling robust and accurate tracking on real-world videos.

4.1. Head-Level Specialization

We begin our analysis by comparing the effectiveness of individual heads versus entire layers for tracking. Intuitively,

layers should be more effective since they operate over a larger feature dimensionality than individual heads, allowing for richer representations. However, our experiment reveal the opposite: as shown in Fig. 2, features from the best-performing head within a layer almost always outperform the aggregated features of the entire layer. Furthermore, the figure reveals substantial performance variation across different heads within each layer, highlighting significant differences between the best and the worst performances. This indicates that the heads exhibit heterogeneous behaviors rather than encoding redundant information, similar phenomenon also observed in many previous studies [1, 49, 52, 54, 56, 58]. Such a finding suggests that layers, despite being mixtures of different heads with more comprehensive representations, are not the optimal granularity for extracting correspondence.

To further investigate this phenomenon, we visualize the similarity heatmaps of different heads along with their corresponding attention maps. As shown in Fig. 3a, the heads exhibit highly diverse behaviors. We categorize them into three types: (1) matching-oriented heads, which capture precise correspondences across frames; (2) semantic-oriented heads, which attend to patches sharing similar semantic content; and (3) position-oriented heads, which focus on spatially adjacent patches.

Examining the attention maps more closely further validates this categorization. As illustrated in Fig. 3b, the matching-oriented heads display clear diagonal and off-diagonal stripes, indicating that they capture correspondences between the query patch and multiple temporally or spatially related patches across frames. The semantic-oriented heads exhibit similar but more diffuse stripe patterns, suggesting that they integrate semantically coherent regions rather than attending to specific corresponding patches. In contrast, the position-oriented heads show a single prominent main diagonal, reflecting that each patch primarily attends to spatially nearby patches. Importantly, these functional characteristics are task-agnostic, meaning that the roles and attention patterns of individual heads remain consistent across different videos, regardless of the specific content or motion dynamics.

Based on our analysis, we conclude that the attention head, rather than the entire layer, acts as the minimal functional unit of VDiT. This finding motivates us to select the most effective head for tracking, instead of aggregating features across all heads in a layer.

4.2. Frequency-Aware Feature Selection

Beyond head-level specialization, we further investigate the role of frequency components in VDiT features. As discussed in Sec. 3.2, VDiTs encode spatiotemporal positions using 3D-RoPE.

We observe that different frequencies exhibit distinct




Figure 5. **Norms of query and key across frequency bands.** matching-oriented head (L18H5) exhibits substantially larger norms in low-frequency components than in high-frequency ones, whereas the position-oriented head (L20H8) shows the opposite trend, with high-frequency components dominating




Figure 6. **Selective frequency filtering.** Low-frequency components demonstrate superior performance, achieving excellent results with only a minimal set of features compared to high-frequency ones.

behaviors. As shown in Fig. 4, High-frequency curves rise sharply with increasing positional differences, whereas low-frequency curves stay nearly flat. This frequency-dependent rotation pattern suggests a natural division of labor within RoPE representations. High-frequency features are position-sensitive, while low-frequency features are position-insensitive.

This naturally leads to the question of whether the functional roles of different heads are linked to their use of distinct frequency components. To examine this hypothesis, we analyze the matching-oriented head and the position-oriented head on the TAP-Vid, computing the average norms of queries and keys across different frequency bands along the temporal dimension. As shown in Fig. 5, an intriguing pattern emerges: the matching-oriented head is dominated by low-frequency components, and the position-oriented head by high-frequency ones. This finding is particularly insightful when considering that the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality bounds attention scores by a factor proportional to $|q| \cdot |k|$, the product of the query and key norms.




Figure 7. **Framework Overview.** Our Tracking Framework begins by extracting features from the VDiT. The most informative head and the optimal frequency band are selected to maximize performance. We determine trajectories from correlation maps by applying soft-argmax for robust localization. To mitigate appearance drift, query features are refined over time. Finally, a forward-backward consistency check is employed to estimate point visibility.

Consequently, larger norms in certain frequency bands indicate that a head relies more heavily on those frequencies when computing attention. Taken together, these results suggest that matching-oriented head primarily exploits low-frequency components to capture correspondence.

Furthermore, we perform selective frequency filtering experiments to investigate whether high-frequency information impacts tracking performance. Specifically, we design two complementary setups: one progressively adds higher frequencies starting from the lowest, while the other progressively adds lower frequencies starting from the highest. As shown in Fig. 6, retaining only the lowest 45% of frequencies yields performance comparable to that of the full feature set, while further removing the highest 15% frequencies even improves accuracy. In contrast, features beginning with high-frequency components consistently underperform. Notably, we conducted these experiments on other VDiT models and observed similar results. These findings indicate that VDiT features encode complementary information across frequency bands, with low-frequency components crucial for matching, and that carefully selecting the frequency range can enhance tracking performance.

4.3. VDiT-Guided Tracking Framework

Having identified both the optimal attention head and the most informative frequency components, we incorporate these insights into a practical tracking framework, *HeFT*, as illustrated in Fig. 7. To determine which denoising step provides the strongest perceptual cues, we first evaluate VDiT on synthetic videos. During generation, latent features are extracted at each diffusion step, and pseudo-labels are produced using CoTracker3 [18]. Our experiment shows that the final denoising step consistently yields the most reliable

features. Based on this observation, we perturb real-world videos with noise corresponding to the final diffusion step and perform a single-step denoising to extract features.

From the denoised latent features, we extract the representation from the best-performing head, which provides the most reliable correspondence priors. To minimize interference from positional information, we selectively remove high-frequency components. Notably, in current VDiTs, videos are compressed into a latent space via a VAE. To alleviate temporal information loss during this process, we set the VAE temporal scale to 1.

Trajectories are generated by applying a soft-argmax operation to the correlation maps, enhancing localization robustness across frames. To estimate point visibility, we employ a forward-backward consistency check: after computing a new point, a backward trajectory is traced from this point, and the deviation between the two trajectories is measured. Points whose deviations exceed a predefined threshold are considered occluded. To further improve tracking stability, we introduce a feature refinement mechanism. The query feature is refined using features from the newly tracked position so that the tracker remains robust to appearance variations and drift over long sequences.

By systematically leveraging VDiT’s visual priors, the proposed framework demonstrates strong and reliable performance across diverse real-world videos.

5. Experiment

We evaluate *HeFT* on two TAP-Vid benchmark splits: DAVIS and Kinetics. For efficiency, we sample 30 videos from the Kinetics dataset. We conduct quantitative experiments by comparing our method with a wide range of tracking approaches. We also provide qualitative results to

Method	Supervision	TAP-Vid DAVIS			TAP-Vid Kinetics		
		AJ \uparrow	$< \delta_{avg}^x \uparrow$	OA \uparrow	AJ \uparrow	$< \delta_{avg}^x \uparrow$	OA \uparrow
RAFT [43]	Supervised	25.06	43.64	74.69	21.52	44.01	59.78
TAP-Net [6]		32.05	48.42	77.35	34.59	48.42	80.88
TAPIR [7]		57.01	69.34	86.33	45.58	61.43	82.16
CoTracker3 [18]		64.45	77.13	90.90	54.35	65.99	89.43
TAPNext [62]		64.48	77.29	91.71	54.94	65.23	90.06
GMRW [35]	Self-Supervised	36.47	54.659	76.36	25.70	41.63	71.33
Opt-CWM [38]		47.53	64.83	80.87	44.85	57.74	84.12
DINOv2+NN [27]	Zero-Shot	15.19	31.19	61.81	12.69	24.22	62.45
DIFT [41]		21.51	39.55	69.71	15.10	25.56	63.17
SD-DINO [57]		29.68	50.54	69.71	16.47	28.37	62.79
DiffTrack [26]		-	46.21	-	-	46.13	-
Point-Prompting [36]		42.21	57.29	82.90	27.36	41.51	71.39
Ours(CogvideoX-2B)		24.72	31.18	71.87	17.29	31.86	66.22
Ours(Wan2.1-1.3B)		41.2	54.9	80.0	30.0	47.6	73.6
Ours(Cosmos-Predict2-2B)		48.61	63.50	82.47	36.64	54.47	78.60

Table 1. **TAP-Vid Benchmarks.** HeFT clearly surpasses all zero-shot and self-supervised tracking baselines and achieves performance comparable to supervised methods. We validate the generalization of our method across three different backbones.

demonstrate the visual quality of our method. Additionally, we perform comprehensive ablation studies to analyze the core tracking framework components and the impact of different attention-based feature descriptors.

5.1. Quantitative Comparison

Metrics: We evaluate tracking performance using three standard metrics. First, Occlusion Accuracy (OA) is the accuracy of classifying whether the point is visible or not. Second, coordinate accuracy (denoted δ_{avg}^x) is a fraction of points within a threshold of 1, 2, 4, 8, 16 pixels, averaged over all thresholds. Third, Average Jaccard (AJ) measures occlusion accuracy and coordinate accuracy together.

Quantitative Results: Tab. 1 presents a comprehensive comparison of HeFT against state-of-the-art point tracking methods across three paradigms: supervised, self-supervised, and zero-shot approaches. Our method demonstrates significant advantages over existing zero-shot baselines. The significant performance gains confirm the effectiveness of both the video diffusion priors and our feature selection strategy in enhancing zero-shot point tracking. While supervised methods still lead in absolute performance, our method eliminates the need for expensive annotated training data, making it highly practical for real-world applications.

5.2. Qualitative Comparison

Fig. 8 provides a qualitative comparison between our method and the most relevant baseline. Our method demonstrates superior tracking stability and accuracy, benefiting from the head-level and frequency-aware feature selection that extracts the most reliable correspondence priors from VDiT. The forward-backward consistency check enables accurate occlusion detection, preventing chaotic trajectories

Method	TAP-Vid DAVIS		
	AJ \uparrow	$< \delta_{avg}^x \uparrow$	OA \uparrow
full	48.61	63.50	82.47
w/o feature refinement	45.70	58.73	76.70
w/o frequency filtering	47.21	62.43	82.01
w/o soft-argmax	48.53	63.27	82.10
w/o forward-backward consistency check	39.53	59.56	78.02
w/o feature upsampling	40.25	54.42	80.07

Table 2. **Tracking Framework Ablations.** Evaluation of each stage’s impact in our framework. **full**: complete method with all components. **w/o feature refinement**: removes feature refinement module. **w/o frequency filtering**: removes frequency filtering. **w/o soft-argmax**: replaces soft-argmax with hard argmax. **w/o forward-backward consistency check**: removes bidirectional consistency validation. **w/o feature upsampling**: removes feature upsampling.

Feature Descriptor	TAP-Vid DAVIS		
	AJ \uparrow	$< \delta_{avg}^x \uparrow$	OA \uparrow
query-query	47.07	61.72	81.02
key-key	48.61	63.50	82.47
query-key	48.10	62.67	82.28
key-query	47.13	61.45	82.12
hidden state-hidden state	47.59	61.75	81.57

Table 3. **Feature Descriptor Ablations.** Comparison of attention-based feature descriptors on the TAP-Vid DAVIS. The notation "A-B" indicates using feature A for query and feature B for target, where features include query, key, and hidden state from self-attention.

when points become occluded. Please refer to the supplementary for more results.

5.3. Ablation Studies

Tracking Framework Ablations: Tab. 2 shows ablations of key components in our tracking framework. The first row




Figure 8. **Qualitative Results.** The top image shows the query points in the first frame, while the bottom images present their trajectories over time. Red circles mark regions with notable differences between methods. HeFT achieves higher accuracy and more stable tracking. In contrast, DiffTrack easily loses track of some points and, since it does not predict visibility, its trajectories become chaotic once points are occluded.

shows our full pipeline with all components enabled. Removing feature refinement causes query features to remain fixed across frames, leading to tracking failure when target appearance changes significantly over time. Disabling frequency filtering introduces high-frequency noise that interferes with robust feature matching between query and target points. Disabling soft-argmax operation results in a purely correlation-based approach, which is less robust to occlusion and noise. Removing forward-backward consistency check eliminates the ability to predict point visibility, causing incorrect occlusion detection and persistent tracking of invisible points. Disabling feature upsampling results in low-resolution predictions that lack sufficient spatial precision for accurate point localization.

Feature Descriptor Ablations: Tab. 3 presents ablations on different attention-based feature descriptors for point

tracking. Interestingly, all feature combinations achieve comparable performance across all metrics. This indicates that the video diffusion model provides robust representations for point correspondence, regardless of the specific feature descriptors.

6. Conclusion

We introduced HeFT, a zero-shot point tracking framework that repurposes VDiT. We show that attention heads are the minimal units for correspondence and that low-frequency components are key. On TAP-Vid, HeFT sets a new zero-shot state-of-the-art and underscores the promise of video diffusion models as powerful foundation models. Future work will move from offline to online tracking with real-time, streaming features and incremental head and frequency selection.

References

- [1] Donghoon Ahn, Jiwon Kang, Sanghyun Lee, Minjae Kim, Jaewon Min, Wooseok Jang, Sangwu Lee, Sayak Paul, Susung Hong, and Seungryong Kim. Where and how to perturb: On the design of perturbation guidance in diffusion and flow models, 2025. 5
- [2] Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Harry Yang, Sonal Gupta, Jia-Bin Huang, Jiebo Luo, and Xi Yin. Latent-shift: Latent diffusion with temporal shift for efficient text-to-video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08477*, 2023. 3
- [3] Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Sumith Kulal, Daniel Mendelevitch, Maciej Kilian, Dominik Lorenz, Yam Levi, Zion English, Vikram Voleti, Adam Letts, et al. Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15127*, 2023.
- [4] Haoxin Chen, Menghan Xia, Yingqing He, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Shaoshu Yang, Jinbo Xing, Yaofang Liu, Qifeng Chen, Xintao Wang, et al. Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19512*, 2023. 3
- [5] NVIDIA Cosmos. <https://github.com/nvidia-cosmos/cosmos-predict2>, 2025. 1
- [6] Carl Doersch, Ankush Gupta, Larisa Markeeva, Adria Recasens, Lucas Smaira, Yusuf Aytar, Joao Carreira, Andrew Zisserman, and Yi Yang. Tap-vid: A benchmark for tracking any point in a video. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:13610–13626, 2022. 2, 7
- [7] Carl Doersch, Yi Yang, Mel Vecerik, Dilara Gokay, Ankush Gupta, Yusuf Aytar, Joao Carreira, and Andrew Zisserman. Tapir: Tracking any point with per-frame initialization and temporal refinement. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 10061–10072, 2023. 2, 7
- [8] Yiquan Duan, Xianda Guo, and Zheng Zhu. Diffusiondepth: Diffusion denoising approach for monocular depth estimation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 432–449. Springer, 2024. 2
- [9] Klaus Greff, Francois Belletti, Lucas Beyer, Carl Doersch, Yilun Du, Daniel Duckworth, David J Fleet, Dan Gnanaprasam, Florian Golemo, Charles Herrmann, et al. Kubric: A scalable dataset generator. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3749–3761, 2022. 2
- [10] Yuwei Guo, Ceyuan Yang, Anyi Rao, Zhengyang Liang, Yaohui Wang, Yu Qiao, Maneesh Agrawala, Dahua Lin, and Bo Dai. Animatediff: Animate your personalized text-to-image diffusion models without specific tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04725*, 2023. 3
- [11] Yoav HaCohen, Nisan Chiprut, Benny Brazowski, Daniel Shalem, Dudu Moshe, Eitan Richardson, Eran Levin, Guy Shiran, Nir Zabari, Ori Gordon, et al. Ltx-video: Realtime video latent diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00103*, 2024. 3
- [12] Adam W Harley, Zhaoyuan Fang, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Particle video revisited: Tracking through occlusions using point trajectories. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 59–75. Springer, 2022. 2
- [13] Eric Hedlin, Gopal Sharma, Shweta Mahajan, Hossam Isack, Abhishek Kar, Andrea Tagliasacchi, and Kwang Moo Yi. Unsupervised semantic correspondence using stable diffusion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8266–8279, 2023. 3
- [14] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 2, 3
- [15] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P Kingma, Ben Poole, Mohammad Norouzi, David J Fleet, et al. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022. 3
- [16] Jonathan Ho, Tim Salimans, Alexey Gritsenko, William Chan, Mohammad Norouzi, and David J Fleet. Video diffusion models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:8633–8646, 2022. 3
- [17] Nikita Karaev, Ignacio Rocco, Benjamin Graham, Natalia Neverova, Andrea Vedaldi, and Christian Rupprecht. Co-tracker: It is better to track together. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 18–35. Springer, 2024. 2
- [18] Nikita Karaev, Yuri Makarov, Jianyuan Wang, Natalia Neverova, Andrea Vedaldi, and Christian Rupprecht. Co-tracker3: Simpler and better point tracking by pseudo-labelling real videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6013–6022, 2025. 6, 7
- [19] Bingxin Ke, Anton Obukhov, Shengyu Huang, Nando Metzger, Rodrigo Caye Daudt, and Konrad Schindler. Repurposing diffusion-based image generators for monocular depth estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9492–9502, 2024. 2
- [20] Bingxin Ke, Kevin Qu, Tianfu Wang, Nando Metzger, Shengyu Huang, Bo Li, Anton Obukhov, and Konrad Schindler. Marigold: Affordable adaptation of diffusion-based image generators for image analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09358*, 2025. 2
- [21] Seungwoo Kim, Khai Loong Aw, Klemen Kotar, Cristobal Eyzaguirre, Wanhee Lee, Yunong Liu, Jared Watrous, Stefan Stojanov, Juan Carlos Niebles, Jiajun Wu, et al. Taming generative video models for zero-shot optical flow extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09082*, 2025. 3
- [22] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013. 3
- [23] Anders Boesen Lindbo Larsen, Søren Kaae Sønderby, Hugo Larochelle, and Ole Winther. Autoencoding beyond pixels using a learned similarity metric. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1558–1566. PMLR, 2016. 3
- [24] Muyang Li, Ji Lin, Chenlin Meng, Stefano Ermon, Song Han, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Efficient spatially sparse inference for conditional gans and diffusion models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:28858–28873, 2022. 3
- [25] Yixin Liu, Kai Zhang, Yuan Li, Zhiling Yan, Chujie Gao, Ruoxi Chen, Zhengqing Yuan, Yue Huang, Hanchi Sun, Jianfeng Gao, et al. Sora: A review on background, technology,

- limitations, and opportunities of large vision models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17177*, 2024. 3
- [26] Jisu Nam, Soowon Son, Dahyun Chung, Jiyoung Kim, Siyoon Jin, Junhwa Hur, and Seungryong Kim. Emergent temporal correspondences from video diffusion transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.17220*, 2025. 2, 3, 7
- [27] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 3, 7
- [28] Suraj Patni, Aradhye Agarwal, and Chetan Arora. Ecodepth: Effective conditioning of diffusion models for monocular depth estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 28285–28295, 2024. 2
- [29] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4195–4205, 2023. 2, 3
- [30] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023. 3
- [31] Adam Polyak, Amit Zohar, Andrew Brown, Andros Tjandra, Animesh Sinha, Ann Lee, Apoorv Vyas, Bowen Shi, Chih-Yao Ma, Ching-Yao Chuang, et al. Movie gen: A cast of media foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13720*, 2024. 3
- [32] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 3
- [33] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*, pages 234–241. Springer, 2015. 3
- [34] Jiahao Shao, Yuanbo Yang, Hongyu Zhou, Youmin Zhang, Yujun Shen, Vitor Guizilini, Yue Wang, Matteo Poggi, and Yiyi Liao. Learning temporally consistent video depth from video diffusion priors. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 22841–22852, 2025. 2
- [35] Ayush Shrivastava and Andrew Owens. Self-supervised any-point tracking by contrastive random walks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 267–284. Springer, 2024. 2, 7
- [36] Ayush Shrivastava, Sanyam Mehta, Daniel Geng, and Andrew Owens. Point prompting: Counterfactual tracking with video diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.11715*, 2025. 2, 3, 7
- [37] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Thomas Hayes, Xi Yin, Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Qiyuan Hu, Harry Yang, Oron Ashual, Oran Gafni, et al. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022. 3
- [38] Stefan Stojanov, David Wendt, Seungwoo Kim, Rahul Venkatesh, Kevin Feigels, Jiajun Wu, and Daniel LK Yamins. Self-supervised learning of motion concepts by optimizing counterfactuals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19953*, 2025. 2, 7
- [39] Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024. 3
- [40] Stanislaw Szymanowicz, Christian Rupprecht, and Andrea Vedaldi. Viewset diffusion:(0-) image-conditioned 3d generative models from 2d data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 8863–8873, 2023. 2
- [41] Luming Tang, Menglin Jia, Qianqian Wang, Cheng Perng Phoo, and Bharath Hariharan. Emergent correspondence from image diffusion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:1363–1389, 2023. 2, 7
- [42] Shitao Tang, Jiacheng Chen, Dilin Wang, Chengzhou Tang, Fuyang Zhang, Yuchen Fan, Vikas Chandra, Yasutaka Furukawa, and Rakesh Ranjan. Mvdifffusion++: A dense high-resolution multi-view diffusion model for single or sparse-view 3d object reconstruction. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 175–191. Springer, 2024. 2
- [43] Zachary Teed and Jia Deng. Raft: Recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 402–419. Springer, 2020. 7
- [44] Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al. Neural discrete representation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 3
- [45] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 3
- [46] Team Wan, Ang Wang, Baole Ai, Bin Wen, Chaojie Mao, Chen-Wei Xie, Di Chen, Feiwei Yu, Haiming Zhao, Jianxiao Yang, et al. Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20314*, 2025. 1
- [47] Qianqian Wang, Yen-Yu Chang, Ruojin Cai, Zhengqi Li, Bharath Hariharan, Aleksander Holynski, and Noah Snavely. Tracking everything everywhere all at once. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 19795–19806, 2023. 2
- [48] Hao Wen, Zehuan Huang, Yaohui Wang, Xinyuan Chen, and Lu Sheng. Ouroboros3d: Image-to-3d generation via 3d-aware recursive diffusion. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 21631–21641, 2025. 2
- [49] Yuxin Wen, Jim Wu, Ajay Jain, Tom Goldstein, and Ashwinee Panda. Analysis of attention in video diffusion transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10317*, 2025. 5
- [50] Rundi Wu, Ben Mildenhall, Philipp Henzler, Keunhong Park, Ruiqi Gao, Daniel Watson, Pratul P Srinivasan, Dor Verbin, Jonathan T Barron, Ben Poole, et al. Reconfusion:

- 3d reconstruction with diffusion priors. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 21551–21561, 2024. 2
- [51] Weijia Wu, Yuzhong Zhao, Hao Chen, Yuchao Gu, Rui Zhao, Yefei He, Hong Zhou, Mike Zheng Shou, and Chunhua Shen. Datasetdm: Synthesizing data with perception annotations using diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:54683–54695, 2023. 2
- [52] Haocheng Xi, Shuo Yang, Yilong Zhao, Chenfeng Xu, Muyang Li, Xiuyu Li, Yujun Lin, Han Cai, Jintao Zhang, Dacheng Li, et al. Sparse videogen: Accelerating video diffusion transformers with spatial-temporal sparsity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01776*, 2025. 5
- [53] Jinbo Xing, Menghan Xia, Yong Zhang, Haoxin Chen, Wangbo Yu, Hanyuan Liu, Gongye Liu, Xintao Wang, Ying Shan, and Tien-Tsin Wong. Dynamicrafter: Animating open-domain images with video diffusion priors. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 399–417. Springer, 2024. 3
- [54] Shuo Yang, Haocheng Xi, Yilong Zhao, Muyang Li, Jintao Zhang, Han Cai, Yujun Lin, Xiuyu Li, Chenfeng Xu, Kelly Peng, et al. Sparse videogen2: Accelerate video generation with sparse attention via semantic-aware permutation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18875*, 2025. 5
- [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. 3, 1
- [56] Hanling Zhang, Rundong Su, Zhihang Yuan, Pengtao Chen, Mingzhu Shen, Yibo Fan, Shengen Yan, Guohao Dai, and Yu Wang. Ditfastattnv2: Head-wise attention compression for multi-modality diffusion transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 16399–16409, 2025. 5
- [57] Junyi Zhang, Charles Herrmann, Junhwa Hur, Luisa Polania Cabrera, Varun Jampani, Deqing Sun, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. A tale of two features: Stable diffusion complements dino for zero-shot semantic correspondence. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:45533–45547, 2023. 3, 7
- [58] Jintao Zhang, Chendong Xiang, Haofeng Huang, Jia Wei, Haocheng Xi, Jun Zhu, and Jianfei Chen. Spargeattention: Accurate and training-free sparse attention accelerating any model inference, 2025. 5
- [59] Xiang Zhang, Bingxin Ke, Hayko Riemenschneider, Nando Metzger, Anton Obukhov, Markus Gross, Konrad Schindler, and Christopher Schroers. Betterdepth: Plug-and-play diffusion refiner for zero-shot monocular depth estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.17952*, 2024. 2
- [60] Wenliang Zhao, Yongming Rao, Zuyan Liu, Benlin Liu, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Unleashing text-to-image diffusion models for visual perception. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5729–5739, 2023. 2
- [61] Zangwei Zheng, Xiangyu Peng, Tianji Yang, Chenhui Shen, Shenggui Li, Hongxin Liu, Yukun Zhou, Tianyi Li, and Yang You. Open-sora: Democratizing efficient video production for all. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20404*, 2024. 3
- [62] Artem Zhulus, Carl Doersch, Yi Yang, Skanda Koppula, Viorica Patraucean, Xu Owen He, Ignacio Rocco, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Sarath Chandar, and Ross Goroshin. Tapnext: Tracking any point (tap) as next token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.05579*, 2025. 2, 7
- [63] Daquan Zhou, Weimin Wang, Hanshu Yan, Weiwei Lv, Yizhe Zhu, and Jiashi Feng. Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11018*, 2022. 3
- [64] Zhizhuo Zhou and Shubham Tulsiani. Sparsefusion: Distilling view-conditioned diffusion for 3d reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12588–12597, 2023. 2

Denoise to Track: Harnessing Video Diffusion Priors for Robust Correspondence

Supplementary Material




Figure 9. **Attention patterns across all heads.** Visualization of attention maps from all attention heads in the Wan2.1-1.3B, revealing the diverse attention patterns exhibited by different heads. Each head displays distinct spatial and temporal attention characteristics, demonstrating that different heads serve specialized functions.

A. Head Specialization

As discussed in Fig. 3 of the main paper, we identified that the attention head, rather than the entire layer, serves as the minimal functional unit of VDiT. Here, we provide additional empirical evidence to support this finding.

This diversity in head behavior arises from the fundamental design of multi-head attention: each head applies an independent linear projection to queries and keys, effectively operating in a distinct subspace of the feature representation. Similarity is measured differently within these subspaces, naturally encouraging functional specialization across heads. Consequently, different heads capture complementary semantic, positional, and correspondence information, each contributing unique aspects to the overall representation.

To further illustrate this specialization, we visualize the attention patterns of all heads from Wan2.1-1.3B in Fig. 9. The figure clearly demonstrates the remarkable diversity in attention behaviors across different heads. This comprehensive visualization reinforces our conclusion that heads are highly specialized functional units, and aggregating them at the layer level dilutes the specialized information critical for correspondence matching. Taken together, both the empirical evidence and theoretical intuition suggest that the attention head, rather than the entire layer, serves as the minimal functional unit of VDiT, motivating our head-level feature

selection strategy.

B. More Qualitative Results

To demonstrate the robustness and generalization of HeFT across diverse scenarios, we provide additional qualitative results in Fig. 10. The figure showcases tracking performance on various challenging videos featuring different types of objects, motions, and environmental conditions. As illustrated, HeFT maintains accurate and stable trajectories across frames, even in the presence of significant appearance changes, partial occlusions, motion blur, and cluttered backgrounds. These results highlight the effectiveness of leveraging VDiT’s visual priors for robust correspondence tracking in real-world videos. The consistent performance across different scenarios further validates that the visual priors encoded in VDiTs are general and transferable, making our approach applicable to a wide range of practical tracking tasks.

C. Model Ablation

In Tab. 4, we present a model ablation study comparing the tracking performance of HeFT when applied to different VDiT architectures: CogVideoX-2B [55], Wan2.1-1.3B [46], and Cosmos-Predict2-2B [5]. The results reveal performance variations across models, which can be attributed to three key factors.




Figure 10. **More Qualitative Results.** Additional qualitative results across diverse video sequences. Each row represents a video, with the first image showing query points and subsequent images displaying their tracking trajectories over time. HeFT consistently demonstrates robust tracking performance with accurate correspondence and stable trajectories even under challenging conditions such as occlusions, fast motion, and appearance changes.

Model	Resolution	TAP-Vid DAVIS		
		AJ \uparrow	$< \delta_{\text{avg}}^x \uparrow$	OA \uparrow
CogvideoX-2B	480×720	24.72	31.18	71.87
Wan2.1-1.3B	480×832	41.2	54.9	80.0
osmos-Predict2-2B	704×1280	48.61	63.50	82.47

Table 4. **Model ablation.** Performance comparison across different models demonstrates that performance differences are primarily influenced by both input resolution and model capability. Higher resolution inputs and superior model performance lead to improved tracking accuracy.

Resolution: Input resolution plays a crucial role in tracking accuracy. Since our method performs tracking at the VDiT’s native resolution, models operating at higher resolutions naturally preserve finer spatial details, leading to more accurate correspondence matching.

Training Objective: Different models are trained with distinct objectives, which fundamentally affects the visual priors they encode. CogVideoX-2B and Wan2.1-1.3B are trained for text-to-video generation, focusing on creating visually plausible content from textual descriptions. In contrast, Cosmos-Predict2-2B is specifically designed for video prediction and continuation, requiring the model to faithfully preserve details from input frames while generating future content. This objective inherently encourages stronger correspondence modeling and temporal consistency, making Cosmos-Predict2-2B particularly well-suited for tracking tasks that rely on precise frame-to-frame matching.

Model Capacity: The intrinsic capabilities of different model architectures also contribute to performance differences. Different VDiTs vary in their ability to extract and encode visual priors, influenced by factors such as model size, architecture design, training data quality, and optimization strategies. These differences manifest in the quality of learned representations, with more capable models producing features that better capture correspondence information.

D. Long Video Inference

To enable HeFT to handle long videos, we implement a chunk-based processing strategy that maintains temporal consistency across segments.

Specifically, we partition a long video into N non-overlapping chunks, each containing a manageable number of frames that fits within the VDiT’s processing capacity. For each chunk i , we perform tracking independently using the framework described in Sec. 4.3 of the main paper. To ensure trajectory continuity across chunk boundaries, we use the tracked position in the final frame of chunk i as the initial query point for chunk $i + 1$. This temporal handoff mechanism allows trajectories to propagate seam-

lessly across chunk boundaries without introducing discontinuities.

After processing all chunks, we concatenate the per-chunk tracking results to form complete trajectories spanning the entire video duration. This approach effectively extends our method to arbitrarily long videos while maintaining tracking accuracy and temporal coherence.

E. Limitations and Future Works

While HeFT demonstrates strong performance on various tracking benchmarks, several limitations warrant discussion and point toward promising directions for future research.

A primary limitation is that our method currently relies on VDiT’s internal features, which necessitates processing the entire video (or video chunk) through the diffusion model before tracking can begin. This constraint makes our approach inherently offline, preventing real-time tracking applications where frames arrive sequentially. Future work could explore distillation techniques to transfer the correspondence priors learned by VDiTs into lightweight online tracking models, or investigate incremental processing strategies that enable frame-by-frame tracking with manageable latency.

Another limitation concerns computational resources. Since our method operates at the VDiT’s native resolution to preserve spatial details, processing high-resolution videos requires substantial GPU memory, particularly when handling dense query points. This memory footprint may limit accessibility on resource-constrained devices. Potential solutions include developing more memory-efficient feature extraction strategies, such as spatially-adaptive sampling, progressive resolution refinement, or compressed feature representations that retain correspondence information while reducing memory consumption.

Addressing these limitations would significantly broaden the applicability of VDiT-based tracking methods, enabling deployment in real-time systems and resource-limited environments while maintaining the strong correspondence priors that make diffusion models effective for tracking tasks.