

# Track and Caption Any Motion: Query-Free Motion Discovery and Description in Videos

Bishoy Galoaa, Sarah Ostadabbas  
Northeastern University  
Boston, MA, USA

{galoaa.b, s.ostadabbas}@northeastern.edu




Figure 1. TCAM (Track and Caption Any Motion) automatically discovers and describes motion patterns without user queries. Our framework retrieves relevant expressions from precomputed text banks and spatially grounds them through trajectory tracking. In challenging conditions: Even with camera shake and occlusion, TCAM maintains accurate motion understanding and predator-prey relationship detection. Colored trajectories and attention overlays show the spatial grounding for each discovered expression.

## Abstract

We propose *Track and Caption Any Motion (TCAM)*, a motion-centric framework for automatic video understanding that discovers and describes motion patterns without user queries. Understanding videos in challenging conditions like occlusion, camouflage, or rapid movement often depends more on motion dynamics than static appearance. TCAM autonomously observes a video, identifies multiple motion activities, and spatially grounds each natural language description to its corresponding trajectory through a motion-field attention mechanism. Our key insight is that motion patterns, when aligned with contrastive vision-language representations, provide powerful semantic signals for recognizing and describing actions. Through unified training that combines global video-text alignment with fine-grained spatial correspondence, TCAM enables query-free discovery of multiple motion expressions via multi-head cross-attention. On the MeViS benchmark, TCAM achieves 58.4% video-to-text retrieval, 64.9 J&F for spatial grounding, and discovers 4.8 relevant expressions per video with 84.7% precision, demonstrating strong cross-task generalization. Code is available at <https://github.com/ostadabbas/TCAM-Track-and->

*Caption-Any-Motion.*

## 1. Introduction

Imagine watching a wildlife video where a lion approaches a buffalo in tall grass. Without any prior knowledge or guidance, humans instantly recognize the predator-prey interaction, understand the lion’s stalking behavior and the buffalo’s alert response, and can describe the distinct motion patterns that define this encounter—the lion remaining stationary while watching, the buffalo initially standing still then running around—even with camera shake and partial occlusion, as shown in Figure 1. This ability to discover and understand actions from motion, without explicit instruction about what to look for, remains largely absent in current video understanding systems. While recent advances in video-language models have achieved impressive performance on retrieval tasks [19, 20, 29, 35], they require users to specify what they are searching for through text queries. This query-dependency creates a critical limitation: these systems cannot discover unexpected events, identify novel patterns, or help users explore videos when they do not know what to search for in advance. In this paper, we intro-

duce Track and Caption Any Motion (TCAM), a framework that automatically discovers and describes motion patterns in videos without any user queries or predefined annotations. TCAM learns to bridge precise motion tracking with semantic understanding, enabling it to watch a video and autonomously identify what is happening, retrieve relevant natural language descriptions, and spatially ground each description to the specific motion patterns that define it.

Recent advances in video understanding have largely evolved along two separate trajectories. On one hand, motion tracking methods such as CoTracker [15, 16], PIPs [10], TAPIR [7], and OmniMotion [30] have achieved exceptional precision in tracking points across frames, enabling dense and long-term correspondence estimation. More recent works like DELTA [21], SpatialTracker [33, 34], and TAPI3D [39] extend tracking to 3D space for richer spatial understanding. However, these approaches remain purely geometric, while they can track motion with high accuracy, they lack semantic grounding and cannot interpret or describe the meaning of the motion patterns they observe.

On the other hand, video-language models have made major strides in linking visual scenes with semantic understanding. Approaches such as CLIP4Clip [19], X-CLIP [20], and Frozen [2] leverage contrastive vision-language pretraining for zero-shot video retrieval, while spatio-temporal grounding methods like TubeDETR [37] and STCAT [14] localize described objects and actions within video sequences. Similarly, dense captioning and referring video segmentation frameworks [4, 31] generate temporal event descriptions with impressive precision. However, these systems remain (1) query-dependent as they rely on user-provided text prompts and/or (2) produce captions without explicitly linking actions to the entities performing them, limiting their ability to autonomously discover and describe new events.

This divide exposes a critical gap in current video understanding systems. Video-language models excel at retrieval and grounding but rely on explicit text queries to specify what to search for, while motion tracking methods achieve high-precision trajectory estimation yet lack semantic interpretation. In essence, existing systems can either track where things move or retrieve what users describe, but cannot autonomously discover what is happening in a scene. As highlighted by VideoRAG [13], most retrieval pipelines “assume relevant videos are already known,” limiting their ability to identify novel or unexpected events. Emerging self-supervised methods, such as V-JEPA [1] and CSVr [8], have made progress in unsupervised representation learning and temporal segmentation, yet they stop short of producing natural language descriptions or linking discovered motion patterns to interpretable trajectories.

To address this gap, we introduce Track and Caption

Any Motion (TCAM)—a unified, query-free framework that bridges precise motion tracking with semantic understanding through automatic motion discovery. TCAM departs from traditional query-driven paradigms by watching a video without prior guidance and autonomously identifying, describing, and spatially grounding motion patterns to the entities that produce them. It is characterized by three core principles: (1) a motion-centric design, where motion dynamics (not static appearance) serve as the foundation for semantic interpretation; (2) query-free discovery, enabling the system to recognize and describe activities without user prompts; and (3) multi-expression grounding, allowing simultaneous identification and spatial localization of multiple interacting motions within a scene. These capabilities are realized through three key technical contributions:

- We present the first motion-centric framework for automatic video understanding that can discover and describe motion patterns without user queries, addressing challenging conditions such as occlusion, fast motion, and complex multi-agent interactions where appearance cues alone are insufficient.
- We introduce a motion-field attention (MFA) mechanism that learns a dense representation of motion trajectories and bridges them with semantic understanding by aligning trajectory patterns to a multimodal embedding space, enabling the model to infer linguistic concepts directly from motion dynamics.
- We demonstrate query-free multi-expression discovery, where TCAM simultaneously identifies and spatially grounds multiple concurrent activities to specific motion trajectories, achieving 4.8 relevant expressions per video with 84.7% precision on MeViS.
- We show that motion patterns provide a robust bridge between vision and language for automatic video understanding, achieving 58.4% video-to-text retrieval and 62.3 AJ for spatial grounding on MeViS, and strong transferability on VidSTG [40] and HC-STVG [26].

Extensive experiments demonstrate that, unlike existing approaches requiring explicit queries, TCAM autonomously discovers and grounds motion-driven events, enabling true open-world video exploration where relevant content is unknown or emergent.

## 2. Related Works

Our work bridges the fundamental gap between precise motion tracking and semantic video understanding, enabling automatic discovery of motion patterns and their linguistic descriptions without user queries. We position TCAM against four key research areas that have approached this problem from different angles.

**Motion Tracking and Point Trajectories.** The field of dense point tracking has achieved remarkable precision in following pixels through video sequences. CoTracker [15,

16] revolutionized joint tracking using transformers, handling up to 70,000 points simultaneously through virtual tracks. PIPs [10] and PIPs++ [11] model pixels as independent particles with iterative refinement for long-term tracking. The TAP-Vid benchmark [6] standardized evaluation, with TAPIR [7] achieving 20% improvement through two-stage matching and TAPNext [43] reformulating tracking as token prediction. Recent advances include OmniMotion’s [30] dense pixel tracking via test-time optimization and DELTA’s [21] efficient 3D tracking. However, these methods operate purely in the visual domain; they excel at tracking points but cannot interpret what the tracked motion represents semantically or describe it in natural language.

**Video-Language Understanding with Queries.** Video-language models have demonstrated strong capabilities in connecting visual content with text but consistently require explicit user queries. CLIP-based methods including CLIP4Clip [19], X-CLIP [20], VideoCLIP [35], and ActionCLIP [29] achieve impressive zero-shot transfer across datasets. Beyond retrieval, spatio-temporal grounding approaches like TubeDETR [37], STCAT [14], and CG-STVG [9] localize text-described objects in videos with with transformer-based architectures. ReferFormer [32] reformulates referring video object segmentation as a query problem, while UNINEXT [36] unifies multiple perception tasks through object discovery and retrieval. Even weakly-supervised methods [17, 41] that reduce annotation requirements maintain query dependency. All these approaches require users to specify what they are searching for through text prompts.

**Dense Captioning and Temporal Localization.** Dense video captioning attempts automatic discovery by localizing and describing temporal events in videos. Vid2Seq [38] leverages 18M narrated videos with special time tokens for boundary prediction, while PDVC [31] formulates captioning as parallel set prediction using DETR-like architectures. Multi-modal methods like BMT [12] incorporate audio cues for enhanced captioning. However, these methods generate temporal segments and descriptions without establishing correspondence between specific motion patterns and their linguistic meanings, missing the fine-grained spatial grounding essential for understanding which objects perform which actions. Recent work on dense video object captioning [44] addresses this limitation through end-to-end detection, tracking, and captioning of object trajectories. While effective for general object understanding, detection-based tracking with RoI features treats motion as secondary to object identity, facing challenges with fast motion, occlusions, and temporal action boundaries as acknowledged by the authors.

**Unsupervised Discovery Methods.** Unsupervised approaches have demonstrated automatic pattern discovery but lack semantic interpretation. Early work by Brox and

Malik [3] segmented objects through long-term trajectory analysis, while [18] discovered dominant objects as spatio-temporal tubes. Motion-based methods recognized that movement patterns encode semantics, in which Dense Trajectories [28] and Two-Stream networks [24] showed motion’s importance for action recognition. Recent work achieves faster inference [42] or discovers atomic actions in instructional videos [22]. Yet, these methods either require predefined categories or produce clusters without natural language descriptions, failing to bridge the semantic gap between motion and language.

TCAM uniquely combines the precision of modern tracking [10, 15] with the semantic understanding of video-language models [19, 37]. While object-centric approaches [44] employ detection-based tracking and RoI features for general object understanding, TCAM takes a motion-centric approach where motion patterns serve as the primary semantic bridge. This design proves particularly effective in scenarios with occlusion, complex interactions, or fast motion, where motion descriptors provide robust discriminative signals when appearance is ambiguous.

### 3. TCAM: Track and Caption Any Motion

**Problem Formulation**—Given a video sequence  $\mathbf{V} = \{\mathbf{I}_t\}_{t=1}^T$  with  $T$  frames, where each frame  $\mathbf{I}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$  ( $H$  and  $W$  denote frame height and width), TCAM addresses automatic video understanding through three key characteristics: (1) motion-centric design using learned motion descriptors from dense point trajectories as the primary bridge to semantic understanding, (2) query-free operation that automatically retrieves multiple relevant descriptions  $\{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_d}$  from a precomputed text bank without user input, and (3) multi-expression discovery that simultaneously identifies activities and spatially grounds them by computing track relevance scores  $\mathbf{r}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}$  over  $N_t$  trajectories for each discovered description, where  $N_d$  denotes the number of discovered descriptions and  $N_t$  denotes the number of tracks. Figure 2 illustrates TCAM’s training and inference pipeline.

#### 3.1. Motion-Aware Video Encoding via Motion Field Attention

We employ a dual-stream architecture that captures both appearance and motion. For visual feature extraction, we use a frozen CLIP-ViT [23] model to extract frame-level visual features  $\mathbf{f}_t^{vis}$  for each frame, where the global token provides frame-level representation. For motion, we utilize CoTracker3 [16] to extract dense point trajectories  $\mathbf{T} = \{\mathbf{p}_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^{N_t}$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_{j,t} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  represents the 2D position of track  $j$  at time  $t$ .

**Motion Field Attention (MFA):** To encode motion patterns as the primary semantic representation, we introduce MFA, a novel mechanism that processes the trajectory sequences






Figure 2. TCAM pipeline overview. **Training:** Dense trajectories from the point tracker are processed by motion-field attention (MFA) and projected to CLIP space. CLIP Vision provides global features. Multi-head cross-attention aligns motion and text embeddings with unified loss (global InfoNCE + spatial BCE/diversity/sparsity). **Inference (query-free):** Motion descriptors and text embeddings share the joint 512D CLIP-aligned space (magnified view), enabling similarity-based retrieval from the precomputed text bank without user queries. Cross-attention computes track relevance scores for spatial grounding of discovered expressions.

$\mathbf{T}$  alongside visual features  $\{\mathbf{f}_t^{vis}\}$  to produce motion descriptors. For each track  $j$ , MFA computes:

$$\mathbf{m}_j = \text{MFA}(\mathbf{p}_{j,1:T}, \{\mathbf{f}_t^{vis}\}_{t=1}^T), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{p}_{j,1:T}$  denotes the full trajectory sequence for track  $j$  across all frames. Internally, MFA employs three MLPs to encode position, velocity, and visibility information, followed by dual transformer encoders that process spatial patterns and temporal dynamics separately. A CLIP-aligned projection layer then fuses these representations to produce  $\mathbf{m}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{512}$ , compatible with CLIP text embeddings for semantic matching.

### 3.2. Spatial Grounding via Cross-Attention

To achieve spatial grounding in TCAM, we compute track relevance scores for each discovered description. Given a text description  $\mathbf{d}_i$  embedded as  $\mathbf{e}_i^{text} \in \mathbb{R}^{512}$  using CLIP’s text encoder, and the motion descriptors  $\{\mathbf{m}_j\}_{j=1}^{N_t}$  computed by MFA, we employ cross-attention to determine which tracks correspond to the description as illustrated in Figure 3:

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \text{CrossAttention}(\mathbf{e}_i^{text}, \{\mathbf{m}_j\}_{j=1}^{N_t}), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}$  provides relevance scores for each of the  $N_t$  tracks. The cross-attention mechanism computes cosine similarity between the text embedding and each motion descriptor in the joint 512-dimensional CLIP space, determining which tracks are most relevant to the given description. This enables interpretable spatial localization of linguistic expressions to specific motion patterns in the video.

### 3.3. Query-Free Multi-Expression Discovery

To enable automatic discovery, we retrieve multiple relevant motion descriptions without user prompts or queries. During training, we precompute CLIP text embeddings for all unique descriptions in the dataset, creating a text bank

$\mathbf{B} = \{\mathbf{e}_k^{text}\}_{k=1}^{N_b}$ , where  $N_b$  is the total number of unique descriptions. At inference, given a video  $\mathbf{V}$ , we compute its global representation  $\mathbf{e}_{video}$  by temporally pooling the frame-level CLIP features  $\{\mathbf{f}_t^{vis}\}_{t=1}^T$  and compute similarity with each text embedding in the bank:

$$s_k = \frac{\mathbf{e}_{video}^T \mathbf{e}_k^{text}}{\|\mathbf{e}_{video}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{e}_k^{text}\|}. \quad (3)$$

### 3.4. Training Objective

To achieve joint optimization, we train with a batch of  $B$  videos, where each video has ground truth descriptions and object masks. We employ a unified loss combining global video-text alignment with spatial track supervision:

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = (1 - \lambda)\mathcal{L}_{global} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_{spatial}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\lambda = 0.1$  prioritizes global alignment while maintaining spatial grounding.

**Global Loss.** We use multi-positive InfoNCE loss [27], a loss function designed for unsupervised learning to handle multiple valid descriptions per video. For batch training, we compute pairwise similarities between each video  $b$ ’s global representation  $\mathbf{e}_{video}^{(b)}$  and each text embedding  $\mathbf{e}_k^{text}$  in the bank using the cosine similarity from Eq. 3, yielding  $s_{bk}$ . We then optimize:

$$\mathcal{L}_{global} = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \log \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}_b} \exp(s_{bk}/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N_b} \exp(s_{bk}/\tau)}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_b$  denotes the set of positive text indices for video  $b$ , and  $\tau = 0.1$  is the temperature parameter.

**Spatial Loss.** For each video-text pair with ground truth annotations, we compute track relevance scores  $\mathbf{r}_i$  using the cross-attention from Eq. 2 and supervise with three complementary terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_{spatial} = \mathcal{L}_{diversity} + \mathcal{L}_{sparsity} + \mathcal{L}_{alignment}, \quad (6)$$






Figure 3. Text-Track Cross-Attention mechanism across consecutive frames of a falling panda. Colored dots represent tracked points with corresponding motion descriptors below. TCAM automatically retrieves “panda falling from tree” from its precomputed text bank. Attention weights progressively focus on tracks exhibiting downward motion while suppressing other concurrent motions-panda climbing, panda rolling, and basket rolling. The attention intensity increases as the falling motion develops, demonstrating selective grounding of semantically matching motion patterns without user queries.

where diversity loss prevents collapse ( $\mathcal{L}_{diversity} = \max(0, 0.1 - \text{std}(\mathbf{r}_i))$ ), sparsity loss promotes selectivity ( $\mathcal{L}_{sparsity} = 0.01 \cdot \|\mathbf{r}_i\|_1$ ), and alignment loss uses a margin-based ranking loss that enforces tracks inside the ground truth mask to have higher relevance scores than tracks outside:

$$\mathcal{L}_{alignment} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}^+| \cdot |\mathcal{T}^-|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}^+} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{T}^-} \max(0, \gamma - \mathbf{r}_{i,j} + \mathbf{r}_{i,j'}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}^+ = \{j | y_{gt,j} = 1\}$  denotes tracks inside the ground truth object mask,  $\mathcal{T}^- = \{j | y_{gt,j} = 0\}$  denotes tracks outside the mask,  $\mathbf{r}_{i,j}$  is the relevance score for track  $j$ , and  $\gamma = 0.2$  is the margin parameter.

## 4. Experimental Results

### 4.1. Experimental Setup

We evaluate TCAM primarily on the MeViS dataset [5], which uniquely supports all our claimed capabilities: motion-based understanding, multi-expression retrieval, spatial grounding, and query-free discovery. MeViS contains 2,006 videos with 28,570 motion expressions and 443K segmentation masks. We measure performance using: (1) *retrieval metrics* (Video-to-Text and Text-to-Video R@1), (2) *segmentation quality* (J for region similarity, F for boundary accuracy), and (3) *discovery metrics* (coverage, precision, diversity of retrieved expressions).

To demonstrate cross-task generalization, we additionally evaluate on HC-STVG [25], which uses bounding box-based spatial grounding with IoU metrics (m\_vIoU, m\_tIoU,

Table 1. Comprehensive evaluation on MeViS [5]. TCAM uniquely supports query-free discovery without requiring user queries.

Method	Retrieval		Grounding		Query-free Discovery	Multi Expr
	V2T R@1↑	T2V R@1↑	J↑	F↑		
LMPM [5]	28.3	26.7	36.5	43.9	✗	✗
ReferFormer [32]	35.2	33.8	42.8	49.6	✗	✗
UNINEXT [36]	38.6	36.9	45.3	52.1	✗	✗
TCAM w/o MFA	51.7	49.2	59.9	64.8	✓	✓
TCAM w/o spatial loss	54.1	51.8	58.4	63.2	✓	✓
TCAM (Ours)	<b>58.4</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>67.5</b>	✓	✓

vIoU@0.5). While MeViS requires pixel-level segmentation masks, HC-STVG evaluates spatio-temporal tube localization, representing different task formulations that test TCAM’s versatility across output spaces.

### 4.2. Implementation Details

We implement our model using PyTorch with distributed training support. The video encoder uses  $d = 256$  dimensions with 16 attention heads. We employ a  $24 \times 24$  grid initialization for tracking, yielding  $N_t = 576$  tracks. We set temperature  $\tau = 0.1$  for contrastive learning and spatial loss weight  $\lambda = 0.1$  to prioritize global alignment while maintaining spatial grounding. For inference, we select multiple relevant expressions using percentile-based thresholding, typically retrieving the top 70th percentile of similarity scores. The model is trained end-to-end for 500 epochs using AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  and OneCycleLR scheduling on 4 NVIDIA V100 GPUs. To address DDP parameter reuse issues in distributed training, we employ a unified loss computation that processes video and text in a single forward pass, ensuring each parameter is used exactly once per backward pass.

### 4.3. Motion-Based Video Understanding on MeViS

**Comprehensive evaluation.** Table 1 presents our main results on MeViS [5], evaluating all aspects of TCAM’s capabilities. Unlike existing approaches requiring explicit queries, TCAM automatically discovers relevant expressions and grounds them to motion patterns. We evaluate both standard retrieval metrics (with provided queries) and our unique query-free discovery mode.

**Query-free discovery analysis.** Table 2 demonstrates TCAM’s ability to automatically retrieve relevant expressions from a precomputed text bank without user guidance. We measure discovery quality through coverage (percentage of ground truth expressions retrieved), precision (relevance of retrieved expressions), and diversity (variety of discovered patterns). Since no existing methods support this capability, we compare against ablated versions of our approach.

**Qualitative analysis.** Figure 4 demonstrates TCAM’s ability to discover and spatially ground multiple concurrent mo-



Figure 4. Qualitative results demonstrating TCAM’s query-free multi-expression discovery and spatial grounding. **Top:** Wildlife scenario with visually similar brown bears, where TCAM distinguishes distinct motion patterns; “Bear chasing another bear around in a circle” (red), “two baby bear in the distance moving to the left” (blue), and “a big bear and two baby bears in the distance moving to the left” (green); despite appearance ambiguity. **Bottom:** Rafting scene showing TCAM discovers both static descriptions (“Person sitting in raft,” “red and white boat”) and dynamic motion patterns (“Raft drifting forward from right to left,” “Lady in yellow helmet rowing with paddle”). Colored trajectory overlays show spatial grounding for each expression, demonstrating motion descriptors enable semantic discrimination when visual appearance is insufficient. Additional results in supplementary material.

Table 2. Query-free motion discovery on MeViS [5] without user queries.

Method	Coverage $\uparrow$	Precision $\uparrow$	Diversity $\uparrow$	Avg # $\uparrow$
Random Selection	32.5	48.3	1.2	2.8
Top-K Similarity	41.7	62.5	1.8	3.2
TCAM (percentile)	58.2	76.9	3.4	4.1
TCAM (threshold)	64.3	81.2	4.2	4.4
<b>TCAM (adaptive)</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>

tion expressions in challenging scenarios. In the wildlife scene with visually similar brown bears, TCAM distinguishes distinct motion patterns based on trajectory dynamics—identifying “Bear chasing another bear around in a circle” separately from “two baby bear in the distance moving to the left.” In the rafting scene, TCAM discovers both static descriptions (“Person sitting in raft”) and dynamic patterns (“Lady in yellow helmet rowing with paddle”), integrating appearance with motion dynamics.

#### 4.4. Spatial Grounding and Track Localization

**Cross-task spatial grounding.** Table 3 compares spatial grounding across different task formulations on MeViS [5]

and HC-STVG [25]. STVG methods (TubeDETR, STCAT, CG-STVG) predict bounding boxes for spatio-temporal grounding; R-VOS methods (ReferFormer, UNINEXT) predict pixel-level segmentation masks. These represent fundamentally different output spaces—STVG methods cannot produce segmentation masks without architectural redesign, while R-VOS methods are not designed for box prediction. TCAM uniquely bridges both paradigms: on MeViS segmentation, it achieves 62.3 J and 67.5 F, outperforming ReferFormer by 19.5 J points; on HC-STVG grounding, it reaches 42.3 m\_vIoU, surpassing CG-STVG (34.8) by 7.5 points. This cross-task capability stems from TCAM’s motion-centric design—motion descriptors provide task-agnostic representations that can be decoded into either masks or boxes through appropriate output heads. The consistent performance gains across both formulations validate that motion patterns serve as a robust intermediate representation for spatial grounding, generalizing beyond specific output formats. During training, the ranking loss progressively learns to assign higher relevance scores to tracks inside the target mask while suppressing background tracks, as illustrated in Figure 6.

**Multi-expression understanding.** Table 4 evaluates



Figure 5. Robust spatial grounding through occlusion. TCAM maintains accurate tracking and expression retrieval across five frames despite significant occlusion by the basket. The yellow trajectory tracks for "playful panda" remain consistent throughout the sequence, while colored attention overlays show coherent grounding to the panda's body regions. TCAM retrieves relevant expressions like "panda roll on the ground" and "panda climbing tree" based on motion patterns rather than visual appearance alone, demonstrating trajectory continuity through occlusions; critical for real-world scenarios where subjects move behind objects.

Table 3. Spatial grounding across task formulations. MeViS [5] requires segmentation masks (J&F), HC-STVG [25] evaluates bounding boxes (IoU). STVG methods<sup>†</sup> predict boxes and cannot produce masks; R-VOS methods<sup>‡</sup> predict masks and are not designed for box prediction.

Method	MeViS [5]			HC-STVG [25]		
	J $\uparrow$	F $\uparrow$	J&F $\uparrow$	m_vIoU $\uparrow$	m_tIoU $\uparrow$	vIoU@0.5 $\uparrow$
TubeDETR <sup>†</sup> [37]	–	–	–	28.5	41.3	25.8
STCAT <sup>†</sup> [14]	–	–	–	31.2	44.6	28.3
CG-STVG <sup>†</sup> [9]	–	–	–	34.8	47.2	31.5
ReferFormer <sup>‡</sup> [32]	42.8	49.6	46.2	–	–	–
UNINEXT <sup>‡</sup> [36]	45.3	52.1	48.7	–	–	–
<b>TCAM (Ours)</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>38.7</b>

Table 4. Multi-expression discovery on MeViS [5]. Vid2Seq and PDVC are dense captioning methods adapted for comparison.

Method	Avg # $\uparrow$	Precision $\uparrow$	Recall $\uparrow$
Vid2Seq [38]	2.9	58.3	42.1
PDVC [31]	3.2	62.7	48.5
TCAM (single-head)	3.8	81.4	61.8
<b>TCAM (multi-head)</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>68.5</b>

TCAM's multi-head attention for discovering multiple concurrent events. MeViS videos contain an average of 4.28 objects with expressions potentially referring to 1.59 objects simultaneously. TCAM's multi-head design discovers 4.6 relevant expressions per video with 84.7% precision, substantially outperforming adapted dense captioning methods.

#### 4.5. Ablation Studies

**Component analysis.** Table 5 systematically ablates key components of TCAM. The Motion Field Attention (MFA) proves critical for motion understanding, while the multi-positive contrastive loss enables handling multiple valid descriptions per video. The spatial loss weight  $\lambda = 0.1$  bal-

Table 5. Ablation study on MeViS [5] validation set.

Configuration	J&F $\uparrow$	Coverage $\uparrow$	V2T R@1 $\uparrow$	Time
w/o Motion Field Attention	59.9	62.4	51.7	0.82x
w/o temporal encoder	57.3	58.9	48.2	0.75x
w/o velocity encoding	61.2	65.7	53.6	0.91x
w/o multi-positive loss	60.7	68.3	54.3	1.0x
w/o spatial loss ( $\lambda = 0$ )	62.9	72.1	56.8	1.0x
spatial only ( $\lambda = 1$ )	58.1	63.5	49.7	1.0x
w/o cross-attention	56.8	60.2	46.9	0.88x
single attention head	61.5	69.4	55.1	0.94x
<b>TCAM (full)</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>58.4</b>	1.0x

Table 6. Spatial loss ablation on MeViS [5]. All variants use identical diversity and sparsity losses, differing only in  $\mathcal{L}_{alignment}$ .

Alignment Loss	J $\uparrow$	F $\uparrow$	J&F $\uparrow$
BCE	62.3	67.5	64.9
Weighted BCE	63.1	68.2	65.7
Focal Loss	63.8	68.9	66.4
<b>Ranking Loss</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>69.7</b>	<b>67.1</b>

ances global alignment with fine-grained grounding.

**Spatial loss design.** We investigate different loss functions for spatial grounding supervision. Table 6 compares various formulations for  $\mathcal{L}_{alignment}$  while keeping diversity and sparsity losses fixed. Binary Cross-Entropy (BCE) provides a strong baseline, but ranking loss proves most effective by directly optimizing the relative ordering of track relevance scores, which naturally complements the contrastive InfoNCE objective used in the global loss.

**Text bank composition.** TCAM's query-free discovery depends on the precomputed text bank quality. Table 7 analyzes how bank size and diversity affect discovery performance. Larger banks improve coverage but may reduce precision, requiring careful curation of expressions.






Figure 6. Training progression of spatial grounding for “a man shoveling the snow” (blue outline). Green points indicate tracks classified inside the mask, red points outside. The model learns to precisely discriminate relevant motion from other tracks during training.

Table 7. Text bank composition impact on discovery quality.

Bank Configuration	Size	Coverage $\uparrow$	Precision $\uparrow$	Time
MeViS expressions only	28K	52.3	71.8	1.0x
+ Ref-YouTube-VOS	43K	58.7	76.4	1.5x
+ ActivityNet	100K	64.2	81.3	3.6x
<b>+ Generated variations</b>	<b>150K</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>84.7</b>	5.4x



Figure 7. Failure case illustrating TCAM’s limitations during scene transitions. When subjects exit and re-enter the frame across multiple scene cuts (left to right), CoTracker3 cannot maintain track identity, causing TCAM to lose correspondence between motion descriptors and semantic descriptions. This inherited limitation from point tracking methods is particularly pronounced in cinematic content with frequent camera angle changes.

#### 4.6. Comparison with Video-Language Models

While TCAM focuses on motion understanding, we compare against general video-language models for completeness. Table 8 shows retrieval performance when queries are provided. TCAM maintains competitive performance despite its additional discovery capabilities, demonstrating that motion-focused design doesn’t compromise standard retrieval tasks.

#### 4.7. Failure Cases and Limitations

**Point tracking constraints.** While TCAM demonstrates robust motion understanding in continuous scenes, it inherits fundamental limitations from point tracking methods. Figure 7 illustrates challenging scenarios where TCAM’s performance degrades. The primary failure mode occurs during scene transitions, particularly in cinematic content with frequent cuts or POV changes. When subjects exit and re-enter the frame, CoTracker3 cannot maintain track

Table 8. Video-text retrieval on MeViS [5] with provided queries.

Method	Text-to-Video			Video-to-Text		
	R@1 $\uparrow$	R@5 $\uparrow$	R@10 $\uparrow$	R@1 $\uparrow$	R@5 $\uparrow$	R@10 $\uparrow$
CLIP4Clip [19]	38.9	62.1	71.4	41.2	65.8	75.3
X-CLIP [20]	40.6	64.7	74.8	43.7	68.9	78.2
Frozen [2]	37.2	59.8	69.5	39.6	63.4	73.1
TCAM (with query)	<b>56.8</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>90.4</b>	<b>59.2</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>92.6</b>
TCAM (query-free)	55.6	82.1	89.8	58.4	84.2	91.7

identity across the discontinuity, causing TCAM to lose correspondence between motion descriptors and semantic descriptions. This manifests in two specific scenarios: (1) *movie scene cuts*, where abrupt transitions between camera angles break trajectory continuity, and (2) *POV shifts*, where perspective changes from third-person to first-person (or vice versa) fundamentally alter the motion field structure. In these cases, TCAM must reinitialize tracking, potentially associating wrong descriptions with reappearing subjects. Future work could address this through temporal consistency modeling across scene boundaries or integration with object re-identification methods.

## 5. Conclusion

We presented TCAM, a motion-centric framework for automatic video understanding that discovers and describes motion patterns without user queries. Through our Motion Field Attention mechanism, TCAM bridges precise point tracking with semantic understanding, enabling query-free discovery of multiple motion expressions and their spatial grounding to corresponding trajectories.

On the MeViS benchmark, TCAM achieves 58.4% video-to-text retrieval, 64.9 J&F for spatial grounding, and discovers 4.8 relevant expressions per video with 84.7% precision—substantially outperforming existing methods. TCAM demonstrates strong cross-task generalization, achieving state-of-the-art performance on both segmentation-based (MeViS) and bounding box-based (HC-STVG) spatial grounding tasks. Extensive ablations validate that motion patterns, when aligned with vision-language representations, provide robust semantic signals for recognizing and describing actions even under challenging conditions like occlusion and camera motion.

While TCAM inherits limitations from point tracking methods—particularly during scene transitions with frequent cuts or perspective changes—it represents a significant step toward autonomous video exploration where systems can discover and understand events without knowing what to search for in advance. Future work will address temporal consistency across scene boundaries and integration with object re-identification methods to maintain track identity through discontinuities. Additionally, unfreezing the CLIP backbone for end-to-end training could enable better alignment with motion-specific vocabulary and open-

vocabulary generalization beyond pre-trained concepts.

## References

- [1] Mido Assran, Adrien Bardes, David Fan, Quentin Garrido, Russell Howes, Matthew Muckley, Ammar Rizvi, Claire Roberts, Koustuv Sinha, Artem Zholus, et al. V-jepa 2: Self-supervised video models enable understanding, prediction and planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.09985*, 2025. 2
- [2] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *ICCV*, 2021. 2, 8
- [3] Thomas Brox and Jitendra Malik. Object segmentation by long term analysis of point trajectories. In *ECCV*, 2010. 3
- [4] Henghui Chen, Tsun-Hsuan Liu, Yutong Hu, Kuanchih Lin, Xiao Liu, and Peng Gao. Mevis: A large-scale benchmark for video segmentation with motion expressions. *arXiv preprint*, 2024. 2
- [5] Henghui Ding, Chang Liu, Shuting He, Xudong Jiang, and Chen Change Loy. Mevis: A large-scale benchmark for video segmentation with motion expressions. In *ICCV*, 2023. 5, 6, 7, 8
- [6] Carl Doersch, Ankush Gupta, Larisa Markeeva, Adrià Recasens, Lucas Smaira, Yusuf Aytar, João Carreira, Andrew Zisserman, and Yi Yang. Tap-vid: A benchmark for tracking any point in a video. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 3
- [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 *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 3
- [8] Nikita Dvornik, Isma Hadji, Ran Zhang, Konstantinos G Derpanis, Richard P Wildes, and Allan D Jepson. Step-former: Self-supervised step discovery and localization in instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18952–18961, 2023. 2
- [9] Xin Gu, Heng Lan, and Jianzhuang Ma. Context-guided spatio-temporal video grounding. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3, 7
- [10] Adam W. Harley, Zhaoyuan Fang, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Particle video revisited: Tracking through occlusions using point trajectories. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2, 3
- [11] Adam W Harley, Zhaoyuan Fang, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Pips++: Improved tracking through occlusions via extended point trajectories. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3
- [12] Vladimir Iashin and Esa Rahtu. A better use of audio-visual cues: Dense video captioning with bi-modal transformer. In *BMVC*, 2020. 3
- [13] Soyeong Jeong, Kangsan Kim, Jinheon Baek, and Sung Ju Hwang. Videorag: Retrieval-augmented generation over video corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.05874*, 2025. 2
- [14] Rui Jin, Wenjun Zhao, Zhedong Zheng, and Yang Wu. Embracing consistency: A one-stage approach for spatio-temporal video grounding. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2, 3, 7
- [15] Nikita Karaev, Ignacio Rocco, Benjamin Graham, Natalia Neverova, Andrea Vedaldi, and Christian Rupprecht. Co-tracker: It is better to track together. In *ECCV*, 2023. 2, 3
- [16] Nikita Karaev, Ignacio Rocco, Benjamin Graham, Natalia Neverova, Andrea Vedaldi, and Christian Rupprecht. Co-tracker3: Simpler and better point tracking by pseudo-labelling real videos. In *ICCV*, 2024. 2, 3
- [17] Sachit Kumar, Haochen Wang, and Ming Tang. Cospal: Co-optimizing spatio-temporal context prompting and adapting for weakly supervised video grounding. *arXiv preprint*, 2025. 3
- [18] Suha Kwak, Minsu Cho, Ivan Laptev, Jean Ponce, and Cordelia Schmid. Unsupervised object discovery and tracking in video collections. In *ICCV*, 2015. 3
- [19] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning. *Neurocomputing*, 508:293–304, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 8
- [20] Yiwei Ma, Guohai Xu, Xiaoshuai Sun, Ming Yan, Ji Zhang, and Rongrong Ji. X-clip: End-to-end multi-grained contrastive learning for video-text retrieval. In *ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 638–647, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 8
- [21] Tuan Duc Ngo, Peiye Hua, Shangzhe Xue, Yunzhi Zhang, and Xiaoke Zhang. Delta: Dense efficient long-range 3d tracking for any video. In *ICLR*, 2025. 2, 3
- [22] AJ Piergiovanni, Anelia Angelova, Alexander Toshev, and Michael S Ryoo. Unsupervised discovery of actions in instructional videos. In *BMVC*, 2021. 3
- [23] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 3
- [24] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos. In *NeurIPS*, 2014. 3
- [25] Zongheng Tang, Yue Liao, Si Liu, Guanbin Li, Xiaojie Jin, Hongxu Jiang, Qian Yu, and Dong Xu. Human-centric spatio-temporal video grounding with visual transformers. In *TCSVT*, 2021. 5, 6, 7
- [26] Zongheng Tang, Yue Liao, Si Liu, Guanbin Li, Xiaojie Jin, Hongxu Jiang, Qian Yu, and Dong Xu. Human-centric spatio-temporal video grounding with visual transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(12):8238–8249, 2021. 2
- [27] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding, 2018. 4
- [28] Heng Wang and Cordelia Schmid. Action recognition with trajectories. In *CVPR*, 2013. 3
- [29] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, and Yong Liu. Actionclip: A new paradigm for video action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08472*, 2021. 1, 3
- [30] Qianqian Wang, Yen-Yu Chang, Ruojin Cai, Zhengqi Li, Bharath Hariharan, Aleksander Holynski, and Noah Snavely. Tracking everything everywhere all at once. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 3
- [31] Teng Wang, Ruimao Zhang, Zhichao Lu, Feng Zheng, Ran Cheng, and Ping Luo. End-to-end dense video captioning with parallel decoding. In *ICCV*, 2021. 2, 3, 7

- [32] Jiannan Wu, Yi Jiang, Peize Sun, Zehuan Yuan, and Ping Luo. Language as queries for referring video object segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2022. [3](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [33] Yuxi Xiao, Qianqian Wang, Shangzhan Zhang, Nan Xue, Sida Peng, Yujun Shen, and Xiaowei Zhou. Spatialtracker: Tracking any 2d pixels in 3d space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20406–20417, 2024. [2](#)
- [34] Yuxi Xiao, Jianyuan Wang, Nan Xue, Nikita Karaev, Yuri Makarov, Bingyi Kang, Xing Zhu, Hujun Bao, Yujun Shen, and Xiaowei Zhou. Spatialtrackerv2: 3d point tracking made easy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.12462*, 2025. [2](#)
- [35] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metze, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Videoclip: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *EMNLP*, 2021. [1](#), [3](#)
- [36] Bin Yan, Yi Jiang, Jiannan Wu, Dong Wang, Ping Luo, Zehuan Yuan, and Huchuan Lu. Universal instance perception as object discovery and retrieval. In *CVPR*, 2023. [3](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [37] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Tubedetr: Spatio-temporal video grounding with transformers. In *CVPR*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [7](#)
- [38] Antoine Yang, Arsha Nagrani, Paul Hongsuck Seo, Antoine Miech, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Ivan Laptev, Josef Sivic, and Cordelia Schmid. Vid2seq: Large-scale pretraining of a visual language model for dense video captioning. In *CVPR*, 2023. [3](#), [7](#)
- [39] Bowei Zhang, Lei Ke, Adam W Harley, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Tapip3d: Tracking any point in persistent 3d geometry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14717*, 2025. [2](#)
- [40] Zhu Zhang, Zhou Zhao, Yang Zhao, Qi Wang, Huasheng Liu, and Lianli Gao. Where does it exist: Spatio-temporal video grounding for multi-form sentences. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10668–10677, 2020. [2](#)
- [41] Mengyao Zhao, Yiming Li, and Zhenlin Zhang. Video-text prompting for weakly supervised spatio-temporal video grounding. In *EMNLP*, 2024. [3](#)
- [42] Nannan Zhao, Xuesheng Wen, and Jie Yang. Unsupervised learning from video to detect foreground objects in single images. In *Symmetry*, 2021. [3](#)
- [43] Ivan Zholus, Jia-Bin Yang, Tsung-Han Xue, and Yung-Yu Chuang. Tapnext: Tracking any point as next token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.05579*, 2025. [3](#)
- [44] Xingyi Zhou, Anurag Arnab, Chen Sun, and Cordelia Schmid. Dense video object captioning from disjoint supervision. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025. [3](#)