

# IRG-MotionLLM: Interleaving Motion Generation, Assessment and Refinement for Text-to-Motion Generation

Yuan-Ming Li<sup>1,2\*,4</sup> Qize Yang<sup>2</sup> Nan Lei<sup>1,4</sup> Shenghao Fu<sup>1,4</sup>

Ling-An Zeng<sup>1,4</sup> Jian-Fang Hu<sup>1,4</sup> Xihan Wei<sup>2</sup> Wei-Shi Zheng<sup>1,3,4†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sun Yat-sen University, China <sup>2</sup>Tongyi Lab, Alibaba Group <sup>3</sup>Peng Cheng Laboratory, China

<sup>4</sup>Key Laboratory of Machine Intelligence and Advanced Computing, Ministry of Education, China

## Abstract

Recent advances in motion-aware large language models have shown remarkable promise for unifying motion understanding and generation tasks. However, these models typically treat understanding and generation separately, limiting the mutual benefits that could arise from interactive feedback between tasks. In this work, we reveal that motion assessment and refinement tasks act as crucial bridges to enable bidirectional knowledge flow between understanding and generation. Leveraging this insight, we propose Interleaved Reasoning for Motion Generation (IRMoGen), a novel paradigm that tightly couples motion generation with assessment and refinement through iterative text-motion dialogue. To realize this, we introduce IRG-MotionLLM, the first model that seamlessly interleaves motion generation, assessment, and refinement to improve generation performance. IRG-MotionLLM is developed progressively with a novel three-stage training scheme, initializing and subsequently enhancing native IRMoGen capabilities. To facilitate this development, we construct an automated data engine to synthesize interleaved reasoning annotations from existing text-motion datasets. Extensive experiments demonstrate that: (i) Assessment and refinement tasks significantly improve text-motion alignment; (ii) Interleaving motion generation, assessment, and refinement steps yields consistent performance gains across training stages; and (iii) IRG-MotionLLM clearly outperforms the baseline model and achieves advanced performance on standard text-to-motion generation benchmarks. Cross-evaluator testing further validates its effectiveness. Code & Data: <https://github.com/HumanMLM/IRG-MotionLLM>.

## 1. Introduction

Text-to-motion generation [25, 32] has emerged as a cornerstone problem in computer vision, with transformative applications in virtual avatars, human–robot interaction, and

immersive AR/VR. To promote the development of this area, numerous methods [13, 15, 65, 82] have been proposed to generate motions with higher naturalness, and alignment level with the goal.

Inspired by the recent advances of multimodal large language models [21, 34, 35, 42, 68], efforts on Unified Motion-aware LLM (UniMoLM) [27, 28, 69, 71] propose to unify motion understanding and generation abilities within a single foundation model. While these models demonstrate remarkable versatility across various basic motion-related tasks (e.g., text-to-motion generation, motion-to-text caption, motion prediction), a critical limitation remains: motion understanding and generation are predominantly modeled in isolation without any explicit interactions, which probably leads to the marginal improvement from complementary learning on various tasks.

Most recently, some emerging works [5, 22, 58] propose to enhance the generation performance of the unified model by tightly coupling generation and understanding via *interleaved reasoning* across text and images. This observation naturally motivates us to ponder a question: ***Can we further improve UniMoLM’s motion generation capability by explicitly linking motion-related tasks through text-motion interleaved reasoning?***

In this work, we provide the first affirmative answer to this question by introducing Interleaved Reasoning for Motion Generation (IRMoGen), a novel paradigm that bridges motion understanding and generation via iterative text-motion dialogue. We argue that achieving this vision is non-trivial and entails three progressive challenges:

(1) **Task Gap**: Despite sharing latent representations, basic motion generation (e.g., text-to-motion) and understanding (e.g., motion caption) tasks remain disconnected in training and inference. There is no intermediate task that enables the model to leverage motion understanding to improve generation. (2) **Training Scheme**: Beyond the task gap, an advanced training strategy is required to initialize and further enhance IRMoGen’s capabilities. (3) **Data Absence**: There is a lack of an effective data engine to gen-

†: Corresponding author. \*: Work done during internship at Tongyi Lab.




Figure 1. **Illustration of our proposed IRG-MotionLLM.** Given a goal text and reasoning instruction as input, our IRG-MotionLLM is able to perform **Text-Motion Interleaved Reasoning** until a satisfactory motion is generated. The reasoning process includes multiple moves, *i.e.*, an initial analysis on the goal, followed by multiple rounds of motion *Generation, Assessment, and Refinement*. The model can also adaptively make plans for the next move.

erate text-motion interleaved reasoning annotations, which are necessary for training the model.

For the first challenge, we propose employing text-motion *assessment* and *refinement* tasks to bridge the gap between motion understanding and generation. The former requires evaluation of the alignment between the given motion and the goal text and refinement instructions. The latter asks the model to refine the initial motion based on the goal text and refinement instructions. These two tasks enable us to establish an IRMoGen process by *interleaving Motion Generation, Assessment, and Refinement*.

Based on this framework, we introduce IRG-MotionLLM, the first model designed to support native IRMoGen. As shown in Fig. 1, given a goal text and reasoning instruction as input, IRG-MotionLLM performs step-by-step reasoning, which contains initial goal analysis, generation, and multiple rounds of assessment and refinement until a satisfactory motion is generated. Beginning with a pre-trained Motion-aware LLM [73] as the base model, we propose a three-stage training scheme to imbue and enhance the ability required for IRMoGen.

In the first **IRMoGen Initialization** stage, we fine-tune the model on eight atomic sub-tasks, including 4 *basic* tasks (related to basic understanding and generation) and 4 *improving* tasks (assessment- and refinement-related tasks to implicitly bridge motion understanding and generation). In the second **IRMoGen-CoT Learning** stage, we design a reasoning CoT template to explicitly connect various motion-related knowledge, and train the model to automatically make a plan to interweave initial goal analysis, motion generation, together with multi-round motion assessment and refinement. In the final **IRMoGen Reinforcing** stage, we employ GRPO [62] to further unlock the reasoning potential of the model. With the carefully designed reward

functions, the model is able to freely explore multi-round IRMoGen and improve the final generated motion.

To facilitate our exploration, we further design an automated data engine to obtain IRMoGen annotations for the existing text-motion datasets (*e.g.*, HumanML3D[13], KIT-ML[57]). With the help of a pre-trained motion encoder and LLM, we are able to assign prompt analysis, multiple negative motions with various alignment levels, together with the text-motion evaluation and refinement instructions for each text-motion pair in the dataset.

Combining all of these, we conduct extensive experiments to showcase the properties and verify the effectiveness of IRG-MotionLLM. Our key findings include:

- *Introducing motion assessment and refinement tasks largely benefits text-motion alignment.* After Stage-1 training, IRG-MotionLLM not only achieves stable improvement on the text-to-motion generation task, but also outperforms existing methods on the motion-to-text caption task.
- *Interweaving Generation, Assessment, and Refinement into the generation process significantly improves generation performance.* This finding is consistent across all training stages. Surprisingly, our Stage-1 model emerges IRMoGen abilities even if it is not explicitly trained to perform IRMoGen. The Stage-2 and Stage-3 training bring further improvement. In addition, for the first time in this field, we observe the same trends as in [16] that the model responds with a longer reasoning process after RL tuning, and the alignment between generated motion and goal text benefits from more rounds of assessment and refinement.
- *IRG-MotionLLM clearly outperforms the base model and achieves advanced performance.* The results are consistent on different datasets [13, 57], different evaluators [13, 49].

We hope our exploration and findings will benefit the field of motion generation and UniMoLM.

## 2. Related Works

**Text-Driven Human Motion Generation** aims at generating 3D human motions based on text description. Most modeling paradigms in this field can be separated into three families, *i.e.*, diffusion modeling [4, 49, 65, 87], mask token modeling [15, 36, 55, 56], and autoregressive modeling [7, 45, 70, 82]. Based on their success, some other works explore better motion representations [29, 49, 50], detailed text prompts [18, 77, 86], RAG techniques [37, 39, 79, 85], lightweight motion models [81, 89], etc. Notably, with the belief that motion generation and understanding knowledge are complementary, works on Motion-aware LLM [3, 19, 20, 27, 46, 63, 69, 71, 91] propose to unify multiple abilities into a single model. Despite their versatility on various motion-related tasks, existing works in this line suffer from a fundamental limitation: *generation and understanding tasks are trained and executed in isolation without explicit cross-task interaction*, weakening the complementary role of understanding and generating knowledge. MotionChain [28] and MotionAgent [73] perform motion understanding and generation sequentially, but focus on multi-turn conversation rather than enhancing generation performance via motion understanding. Besides, they either require heavy human intervention or an extra LLM to connect motion generation and caption. Most recently, MotionR1 [51] explores the interaction between understanding and generation. However, it only performs motion-free text understanding before generation. In contrast, our work is the first to explore the native interaction loop across motion generation, assessment, and refinement.

**Multi-modal Interleaved Reasoning:** Inspired by the success of text-based reasoning models [9, 16, 23, 26], multi-modal interleaved reasoning [1, 2, 11] is proposed to solve complex problems, *i.e.*, incorporating non-text modalities into multi-turn reasoning processes. In the vision generation domain, recent works [6, 8, 30] explore improving generation performance with text-based reasoning. Emerging research [5, 22, 58, 72, 92] further shows that the generated image can better align with the text prompt via text-image interleaved reasoning, including self-assessment and refinement. However, this property has never been observed in human motion generation. In this work, we take the first step to bring UniMoLM to this frontier.

## 3. IRG-MotionLLM

In this work, we propose IRG-MotionLLM, the first motion-aware LLM that supports native interleaved reasoning across text and motion to enhance final generation performance. Our key idea is to interweave motion generation, assessment, and refinement into the IRMoGen reasoning process. To this end, we build our IRG-MotionLLM based on a pre-trained base model and propose a three-stage train-

ing scheme to initialize and further enhance the IRMoGen ability of the model. In the following sections, we first introduce the model pipeline and the base model in Sec. 3.1, then the Interleaving Reasoning Initialization (Stage-1) in Sec. 3.2, and finally the Interleaving Reasoning Enhancement (Stage-2 & 3) in Sec. 3.3.

### 3.1. Pipeline & Base Model

Our IRG-MotionLLM shares the same architecture with previous works on UniMoLM [27, 71, 73], which consists of a Motion VQVAE, and an LLM. Specifically, Motion VQVAE discretizes the motion sequence into  $K$  distinct motion tokens. These motion tokens are mapped to a motion token vocabulary based on their indices. We then extend the base LLM vocabulary with these motion-specific codes along with boundary tokens <Motion> and </Motion> to delineate motion sequence spans within the text (*i.e.*,  $K+2$  new tokens). This setup allows the model to be trained with a standard next-token prediction objective. During inference, the model can freely generate sequences that mix both text and motion tokens. The generated motion can be directly extracted by identifying the boundary tokens.

With this general architecture, it will be convenient to build our IRG-MotionLLM upon a base model, which can be initialized with the pre-trained weights or preliminary training strategies proposed in previous works.

### 3.2. IRMoGen Initialization (Stage-1)

As discussed in Sec. 1, although existing UniMoLMs show versatility on various motion-related tasks (*e.g.*, motion generation, caption, and prediction), these tasks can only be performed independently without interactions, limiting their ability to perform the IRMoGen as shown in Fig. 1.

To solve this, we propose to initialize the interleaved reasoning ability with eight related tasks, which are divided into two categories, shown in the upper part of Fig. 2:

- **Basic Text-Motion Tasks** require the model to perform basic translation between motion and text, including: (1) *Motion Caption*: Describe what is happening in the motion; (2) *Direct Motion Generation*: Generate motion based on the caption; (3) *Prompt Analysis*: Analyze the key factors that need to be focused on to generate the target motion; (4) *Analysis-guided Motion Generation*: Generate motion based on the results of prompt analysis. The former two tasks are widely used for training UniMoLM. Additionally, we further add the latter two tasks to preserve the language reasoning ability and enhance text-motion alignment.

- **Improving Tasks** ask the model to perform deeper reasoning across text and motion, including: (1) *Text-Motion Alignment Evaluation*: Analyze how well the given motion is aligned with the goal text; (2) *Motion Refinement Instructing*: Provide a refinement instruction based on the given motion and the goal text to improve alignment. (3)




Figure 2. A three-stage training scheme is proposed to build our IRG-MotionLLM. In the first stage (Upper), we endow the model with meta IRMoGen abilities via eight related tasks. In the second stage (Lower-Left), we define an IRMoGen-CoT template and train a model to explicitly couple motion understanding and generation knowledge and perform native interleaved reasoning. In the third stage (Lower-Right), we employ GRPO-based reinforcement learning to unleash the multi-round reasoning potential of the model.

**Direct Motion Refinement:** Refine the initial motion simply based on the goal text. (4) *Instruction-guided Motion Refinement:* Refine the given motion based on both the goal text and the refinement instructions. These tasks explicitly require the model to mine the differences between motions and texts, helping the model to construct a deeper alignment between these two modalities.

**Training:** By constructing task-specific instruction templates and annotations, we conduct supervised fine-tuning on the base model and obtain our Stage-1 model  $\mathcal{F}_{s1}$ . The annotation construction process and instruction templates are detailed in Sec. 4 and the Appendix.

**Inference:** Similar to previous UniMoLMs,  $\mathcal{F}_{s1}$  can be instructed to perform all learned tasks. More importantly,  $\mathcal{F}_{s1}$  emerges IRMoGen ability as we are able to manually perform multi-step interleaved reasoning across text and motion by sequentially using prompts for *generation*, *assessment*, and *refinement* tasks together with the outputs from the previous step.

### 3.3. IRMoGen Enhancement

While the first training stage preliminarily endows motion with IRMoGen ability, it still requires human intervention. Ideally, as shown in Fig. 1, given a text description for a goal motion, the model should be able to natively think step-by-step to interweave generation, assessment, and refinement until a satisfactory motion is obtained. During this process,

the model needs to plan to decide which action to take. We also believe that explicitly training the model to link the automated knowledge learned in Stage-1 can further enhance the interleaved reasoning ability and further benefit generation performance.

To this end, we first define an IRMoGen-CoT template to explicitly link knowledge learned in Stage-1. Subsequently, we propose IRMoGen-CoT learning and IRMoGen Reinforcing to enable and further unleash the structured IRMoGen ability of IRG-MotionLLM.

**IRMoGen-CoT Template:** To enable structured IRMoGen, we design a multi-step CoT template to accommodate Motion Generation, Assessment, and Refinement. As shown in Fig. 3, the template begins with goal-directed planning and analysis, followed by an iterative loop that tightly interleaves motion token generation with alignment assessment and targeted refinement until a satisfactory motion is obtained (*i.e.*, the assessment results indicate “*no refinement is needed*”). In addition, each step is connected with a pre-defined *plan making* template (*e.g.*, “*I need to generate a motion based on previous analysis.*” for <Plan-for-Generation>). Note that this CoT definition results in a multi-time generation reasoning trajectory. Suppose a trajectory contains  $n$ -time generations (*i.e.*,  $\{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n\}$ ), we note  $\{m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}\}$  as *intermediate motions* and  $m_n$  as *final motion*. More details about the CoT template and examples are shown in the Appendix.

```

<think>
// Initial Analysis
[Plan]<Plan-for-Goal-Analysis> [/Plan]
[Analysis]<Goal Analysis> [/Analysis]

// Generation + Multi-Rounds of Assessment & Refinement
[Plan]<Plan-for-Generation> [/Plan]
[Generation]<Generated-Motion-Tokens m1> [/Generation]
[Plan]<Plan-for-Assessment> [/Plan]
[Assessment]<Alignment Evaluation & Refinement Instructions> [/Assessment]
[Plan]<Plan-for-Generation> [/Plan]
[Generation]<Generated-Motion-Tokens m2> [/Generation]
...
[Generation]<Generated-Motion-Tokens mn> [/Generation]
[Assessment]<Alignment Evaluation & Refinement Instructions> [/Assessment]

// End thinking until satisfactory motion is obtained
[Plan]<Plan-for-Ending-Thinking> [/Plan]
</think>

```

Figure 3. The IRMoGen-CoT Template.

**IRMoGen-CoT Learning (Stage-2):** Enabled by the data engine introduced in Sec. 4, we organize dynamic reasoning trajectories to train  $\mathcal{F}_{s1}$  to perform native interleaved reasoning, and obtain our Stage-2 model  $\mathcal{F}_{s2}$  (shown in the lower-left part of Fig. 2). Each training data set is designed to match the IRMoGen-CoT. Additionally, the *intermediate motions*  $\{m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}\}$  are misaligned with the goal text but show progressive improvement (*i.e.*,  $m_1$  is more aligned with the goal than  $m_2$ ), while the *final motion*  $m_n$  is the ground-truth motion paired with the goal text.

While adopting vanilla next-token prediction objective can optimize the model to learn reasoning format, training the model to generate incorrect *intermediate motions* will significantly break the already learned alignment between motion and text. To address this, during training in this stage, we adopt an *Ignore Incorrect* strategy to mask the losses and gradients calculated on those incorrect intermediate motion tokens.

After training the model on the IRMoGen-CoT dataset,  $\mathcal{F}_{s2}$  is able to natively conduct interleaved reasoning across text and motion. However, the model tends to stop thinking at an early step (*i.e.*, more than 70% reasoning processes on test samples contain only 1-round generation with any refinement), suggesting the multi-round assessment and refinement ability may be limited. This observation motivates us to seek further improvement in Stage-3 training.

**IRMoGen Reinforcing (Stage-3):** To further unleash the multi-round interleaved reasoning potential, inspired by the success of reinforcement finetuning on (vision-)language tasks [16, 23], we conduct a GRPO[62]-based IRMoGen Reinforcing stage on  $\mathcal{F}_{s2}$  and obtain our stage-3 model  $\mathcal{F}_{s3}$ .

Specifically, as shown in the lower right part of Fig. 2, taking the reasoning instruction and motion text as input  $q$ , a group of  $G$  IRMoGen trajectories  $\{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_G\}$  are sampled from the model. After that, we assign each trajectory a scalar reward  $r(o_i)$ . Specifically, we employ reward functions comprising the following components:

**1) Format Reward** to encourage structured reasoning and easy answer extraction, responses must follow the IRMoGen-CoT template. Formally:

$$r_{\text{form}}(o) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } o \text{ follows the required format,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

**2) Text-Motion Alignment Reward** to improve alignment between the final generated motions in the reasoning trajectory and the goal text prompts. Formally:

$$r_{tm}(t, \mathbf{m}_{\text{final},i}) = -\|E_t(t) - E_m(\mathbf{m}_{\text{final},i})\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $t$  indicates goal text prompt,  $\mathbf{m}_{\text{final},i}$  denotes the final generated motion in the reasoning trajectory  $o_i$ .  $E_t$  and  $E_m$  indicate the paired text and motion encoders. Following previous works [44, 48, 51],  $E_t$  and  $E_m$  are chosen from paired text and motion encoders in [13].

**3) Motion-Motion Alignment Reward** to improve alignment between the final generated motions in the reasoning trajectory and the ground-truth motion. Formally:

$$r_{mm}(\mathbf{m}_{\text{gt}}, \mathbf{m}_{\text{final},i}) = -\|E_m(\mathbf{m}_{\text{gt}}) - E_m(\mathbf{m}_{\text{final},i})\|^2, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{m}_{\text{gt}}$  indicates ground-truth motion sequence. Note that  $r_{mm}$  will only be calculated for those data with a motion-text pair; otherwise set to 0.

Each of these rewards is pre-normed across the group into the same scale, and summed to calculate  $r(o_i)$ . After that, we employ the standard GRPO objective [62] to optimize our IRG-MotionLLM. See more details in Appendix.

## 4. Data Engine

To enable our exploration, we design a highly automated annotation pipeline to augment existing motion-text datasets  $D$  based on a pre-trained motion encoder [54] and frontier LLMs. With this annotation pipeline, for each text-motion pair in the dataset, we are able to assign it with: (1) Detailed analysis on the generation goal; (2) Negative text-motion pairs with various alignment levels, together with the text-motion alignment evaluations and refinement instructions.

**Detailed Goal Analysis:** For each text prompt  $t_i$  in dataset  $D$ , we employ GPT-4o [24] to *identify* the key factors to generation the motion aligned with  $t_i$ .

**Negative Text-Motion Pairs:** During practical inference, the generated motion can be aligned with the goal text at various levels (*e.g.*, highly different, moderate, highly similar). Hence, it is necessary to train a model to evaluate and refine the initial motions with various alignment levels, and our idea is to sample negative text-motion pairs with various alignment levels to the anchor pair. However, for a diverse text-motion dataset, simply random sampling negative pairs is not feasible, as there is an extremely high probability of selecting a text-motion that significantly differs from the anchor one. To address this, we design a ranking-based sampling strategy based on a pre-trained motion encoder [54], which is shown in the upper part of Fig. 4.




Figure 4. Negative text-motion pairs selection and annotation pipeline.

Suppose we attempt to sample  $N_{neg}$  text-motion pairs  $\{(t_i, m_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_{neg}}$  for an anchor pair  $(t_{anc}, m_{anc})$ . We first extract the motion embeddings for all motions in the dataset, compute the embedding distances across anchor motion  $m_{anc}$  and all other motions in the dataset, and rank the distance from high to low (*i.e.*, highly different to highly similar). By doing so, we obtain a ranked instance pool for the anchor motion. After that, for each time, we randomly sample a negative motion together with its text from the top  $p$  fraction of highest-distance instances in the instance pool, and remove all this fraction of instances from the pool.

**Text-Motion Alignment & Refinement Instructions:** After assigning negative samples for each text-motion pair in the dataset, as shown in the lower part of Fig. 4, we further instruct LLMs to perform alignment assessment (including the text-motion **alignment evaluations** and **refinement instructions** for improvement) based on the text descriptions of anchor and negative samples.

**Data Organization for Training:** For Stage 1, based on the augmented annotations mentioned above, we can construct training data for all tasks introduced in Sec. 3.2 with task-specific instructions. For Stage 2, we organize the CoT trajectories by concatenating the goal analysis, motions, assessment results, and pre-defined plans to match the CoT template. For the *intermediate motions*, we sort the selected negative text-motion pairs in an alignment-improving rank, and insert them into the reasoning trajectory. For Stage 3, the data can be directly selected from existing motion-text-paired or text-only datasets without further organization. Please refer to the Appendix for more details.

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Setups

**Dataset.** Following previous works on UniMoLM [27, 28, 71, 73], we mainly conduct experiments on HumanML3D

dataset [13], a large-scale benchmark for motion generation and understanding. We also compare our approach with existing methods on KIT-ML [57], another most popular Text-to-Motion dataset. For Stage-1 and Stage-2 training, we build the instruction tuning dataset by using the data engine introduced in Sec. 4. For Stage-3 training, we sample approximately 9k data for each dataset. Specifically, for experiments on the HumanML3D, we source data from the original [13] and InstructMotion [48] dataset. Note that prompts in the InstructMotion dataset are also sourced from HumanML3D but augmented by LLM. For experiments on the KIT-ML dataset, we source data from the original KIT-ML dataset and use GPT-4o to augment the original prompts. *We strictly ensure there are no identical prompts in Stage-3 data with those in the testing set for fair evaluation.* See Appendix for more details.

**Evaluation Metrics:** For the text-to-Motion task, we follow previous works to report metrics including R-Precision, FID, MM-Dist, and Diversity. For most of the evaluation, we adopt the official evaluators from [13]. We also employ a new evaluator from MARDM [49] for further evaluation. We conduct each evaluation 20 times, presenting the average metrics. Besides, as our stage-1 model can also perform motion understanding tasks, we also conduct experiments on the Motion-to-Text caption task and adopt NLP metrics including Bleu[52], Rouge-L[40], CIDEr[66], and BertScore[88] following previous works [27, 28, 73]. See Appendix for more details about the metrics.

**Implementation Details:** In experiments on the HumanML3D dataset, we initialize our base model with the official weights of MotionLLM [73], which is pre-trained on text-to-motion generation task. For experiments on the KIT-ML dataset, we train a base model based on the official implementation of [73] with text-to-motion generation task. Please refer to the Appendix for more details.

### 5.2. Diving Deeper into IRG-MotionLLM

**- Impacts of training tasks in IRMoGen-Initialization (Stage-1).** We ablate the training tasks and evaluate the stage-1 model on the text-to-motion generation task. As shown in Tab. 1 Row1-4, further fine-tuning the base model with dense motion token supervision consistently brings improvement on FID. However, with only the T2M task (Row 1 v.s. Row 2), the model suffers from deterioration on all other metrics. We hypothesize it is because the base model is already converged on the T2M task and tends to overfit the training data when further trained on the same task instead of learning new text-motion alignment knowledge. Introducing other basic tasks (Row 1 v.s. Row 3) slightly benefits Top-1 and Top-2 performance, but the limited improvement suggests that there exists a task gap limiting the complementary effects between learning basic motion understanding and generation tasks. By combining all tasks

	Methods	R-Precision↑		FID↓	MM-Dist↓	Diversity↑
		Top-1	Top-3			
<b>Baseline Model</b>						
1	MotionLLM* [73] ICLR'25	0.496	0.782	0.198	3.029	9.864
<b>IRMoGen-Initialization (Stage-1)</b>						
2	w/ T2M Task Only	0.495	0.778	0.185	3.072	9.734
3	w/ Basic Tasks Only	0.500	0.774	0.123	3.086	9.720
4	Ours-S1	0.504	0.785	0.141	3.018	9.814
<b>IRMoGen-CoT Learning (Stage-2)</b>						
5	w/o Asse.+Ref.	0.503	0.782	0.125	3.023	9.680
6	w/o I.I.	0.448	0.720	0.592	3.519	9.675
7	Ours-S2	0.526	0.810	0.111	2.885	9.819
<b>IRMoGen Reinforcing (Stage-3)</b>						
8	Ours-S3	0.535	0.820	0.242	2.785	9.900

Table 1. **Ablation studies of training stages on HumanML3D text-to-motion generation task.** \*: We use the official weights of MotionLLM [73] as our base model.

Methods	Bleu-1↑	Bleu-4↑	Rouge↑	CIDEr↑	BERT↑
w/ M2T Task Only	58.73	20.53	46.12	47.27	40.99
w/ Basic Tasks Only	59.77	21.07	46.50	48.94	41.46
Ours-S1	<b>62.05</b>	<b>22.53</b>	<b>47.51</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>42.68</b>

Table 2. **Ablation studies of training tasks on the HumanML3D motion caption task.** Combining both the basic and improving tasks brings stable improvement in text-motion alignment.

(Row 1 v.s. Row 4), consistent improvement on all metrics is observed. Not coincidentally, we also observe the same performance trend on the motion-to-text task (shown in Tab. 2). These phenomena suggest that ***Text-Motion Assessment and Refinement tasks are the key to connect basic motion generation and understanding tasks.***

**- Impacts of IRMoGen-CoT Learning (Stage2).** As shown in Tab. 1, training the model on IRMoGen-CoT explicitly connected motion understanding and generation knowledge, resulting in higher alignment between generated and goal text with only one-round input (Row 4 v.s. Row 7). We also compare two other variants: (1) w/o Asse.+Ref.: Building Stage-2 training data with initial goal analysis and one-round generation without multi-round assessment and refinement. (2) w/o I.I.: Ablating the “Ignore Incorrect” strategy discussed in Sec. 3.3. Comparisons between Row 5 and Row 7 further showcase the effectiveness of IRMoGen-CoT Learning. Comparison between Row 6 and Row 7 suggests that training the model to generate incorrect *intermediate motions* will significantly break the already learned alignment between motion and text.

**- Impacts of IRMoGen Reinforcing (Stage3).** As shown in the last two rows in Tab. 1, with GRPO-based IRMoGen reinforcement learning, our model achieves further improvement on text-motion alignment. While the model may suffer from deterioration on FID after RL due to the lack of dense supervision on generated motion tokens, it is still competitive with those motion-aware LLMs [27, 28, 71] that support both text and motion outputs. Furthermore, we visualize how IRMoGen Reinforcing influences the reasoning traces and text-motion alignment. As shown in Fig. 5, while our Stage-2 model learn to match the pattern of IR-




Figure 5. **Distributions of the number of generated motions in IRMoGen process.** IRG-MotionLLM responses with longer reasoning with more intermediate generated motions after RL-tuning.

Methods	R-Precision↑			FID↓	MM-Dist↓	Diversity↑
	Top-1	Top-2	Top-3			
Ours (S1) init-gen	0.504	0.693	0.785	0.141	3.018	9.814
Ours (S1) final-gen	0.522	0.711	0.805	0.135	2.906	9.740
Ours (S2) init-gen	0.497	0.686	0.782	0.136	3.052	9.825
Ours (S2) final-gen	0.526	0.717	0.810	0.111	2.885	9.819
Ours (S3) init-gen	0.503	0.687	0.782	0.221	3.006	9.853
Ours (S3) final-gen	0.535	0.725	0.820	0.242	2.785	9.900

Table 3. **Ablation Studies on IRMoGen on HumanML3D dataset.** We observe clear improvement after adopting Interleaved Reasoning with multi-round motion assessment and refinement.

MoGen CoT, we observe that for most of the cases (more than 75%), the model tends to end the reasoning process after initial goal analysis and once generation without further refinement. After RL tuning, the model learns to extend the length of reasoning traces and perform multi-round motion assessment and refinement.

**- Initial Generation v.s. Final Generation.** To evaluate the effectiveness of IRMoGen, we compare the initially and finally generated motions in parallel across all stages. Note that for the stage-1 model, we adopt the strategy discussed in Sec. 3.2 to perform IRMoGen. From Tab. 3, we have consistent observations: ***Interweaving motion generation, assessment, and refinement significantly benefits the motion generation performance.*** More surprisingly, manually connecting relevant tasks on our Stage1 model can already bring clear improvement (e.g., 0.504 to 0.522 on Top-1), even if it is not explicitly trained to perform IRMoGen.

**- More evaluations on IRG-MotionLLM** show that (1) Allowing the model to perform more rounds of refinement brings improvement on the alignment between generated results and the goal text. (2) IRG-MotionLLM goes far beyond relying on specific reasoning traces but performs robust IRMoGen even if we introduce perturbations to the native reasoning traces. (3) IRG-MotionLLM can also be functioned as a text-motion reward model and enhance existing motion generator with RLAIF training. Please refer to the Appendix for more details.

### 5.3. IRG-MotionLLM v.s. Existing Methods

**Comparisons with VQ-based Motion-aware LLMs.** In Tab. 4, we compare our IRG-MotionLLM with previous

Methods	Framework	w/ GRPO	R-Precision↑			FID↓	MM-Dist↓	Diversity↑
			Top-1	Top-2	Top-3			
<b>HumanML3D Dataset</b>								
T2M-GPT[82] CVPR'23	VQ+GPT2	×	0.492 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.679 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.775 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.141 <sup>±.005</sup>	3.121 <sup>±.009</sup>	9.722 <sup>±.082</sup>
MotionGPT♣ [27]NeurIPS'23	VQ+T5	×	0.492 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.681 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.733 <sup>±.006</sup>	0.232 <sup>±.008</sup>	3.096 <sup>±.008</sup>	9.528 <sup>±.071</sup>
MotionChain♣ [28]ECCV'24	VQ+T5	×	0.504 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.617 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.790 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.248 <sup>±.009</sup>	3.033 <sup>±.010</sup>	9.470 <sup>±.075</sup>
MG-MotionLLM♣[71]CVPR'25	VQ+T5	×	0.516 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.706 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.802 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.303 <sup>±.010</sup>	2.952 <sup>±.009</sup>	9.960 <sup>±.073</sup>
ViMoRAG[75] NeurIPS'25	VQ+Phi3-3.8B	×	0.452 <sup>±.014</sup>	0.655 <sup>±.014</sup>	0.764 <sup>±.013</sup>	0.131 <sup>±.073</sup>	3.146 <sup>±.015</sup>	9.424 <sup>±.001</sup>
MotionGPT-2♣ [69]ArXiv'24	VQ+LLaMA3.1-8B	×	0.496 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.691 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.782 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.191 <sup>±.004</sup>	3.080 <sup>±.013</sup>	9.860 <sup>±.026</sup>
MotionGPT-2♣ [69]ArXiv'24	VQ+Gemma-2B	×	0.436	0.600	0.697	0.228	3.589	<b>10.081</b>
MotionLLM [73]ICLR'25	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	0.515 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.691 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.801 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.230 <sup>±.009</sup>	2.967 <sup>±.020</sup>	9.908 <sup>±.102</sup>
MotionLLM* [73]ICLR'25	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	0.496 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.684 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.782 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.198 <sup>±.006</sup>	3.029 <sup>±.007</sup>	9.864 <sup>±.007</sup>
Ours (S1, w/ IRMoGen)♣	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	0.522 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.711 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.805 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.135 <sup>±.005</sup>	2.906 <sup>±.009</sup>	9.740 <sup>±.080</sup>
Ours (S2, w/ IRMoGen)♣	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	0.526 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.717 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.810 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.111 <sup>±.005</sup>	<b>2.885</b> <sup>±.008</sup>	9.819 <sup>±.088</sup>
Motion-R1♣ [51]ArXiv'25	VQ+Qwen2.5-3B	✓	0.515 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.719 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.818 <sup>±.002</sup>	<b>0.201</b> <sup>±.004</sup>	2.854 <sup>±.010</sup>	<b>10.026</b> <sup>±.075</sup>
Ours (S3, w/ IRMoGen)♣	VQ+Gemma2-2B	✓	<b>0.535</b> <sup>±.002</sup>	<b>0.725</b> <sup>±.002</sup>	<b>0.820</b> <sup>±.002</sup>	0.242 <sup>±.006</sup>	<b>2.785</b> <sup>±.006</sup>	9.900 <sup>±.094</sup>
<b>KIT-ML Dataset</b>								
T2M-GPT[82] CVPR'23	VQ+GPT2	×	0.416 <sup>±.006</sup>	0.627 <sup>±.006</sup>	0.745 <sup>±.006</sup>	0.514 <sup>±.029</sup>	3.007 <sup>±.023</sup>	10.921 <sup>±.108</sup>
MotionGPT♣ [27]NeurIPS'23	VQ+T5	×	0.366 <sup>±.005</sup>	0.558 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.680 <sup>±.005</sup>	0.510 <sup>±.016</sup>	3.527 <sup>±.021</sup>	10.350 <sup>±.084</sup>
MotionGPT-2♣ [69]ArXiv'24	VQ+Gemma-2B	×	0.364	0.581	0.699	1.063	3.424	10.603
MotionLLM§ [73] ICLR'25	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	0.416 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.637 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.746 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.560 <sup>±.025</sup>	3.001 <sup>±.011</sup>	<b>11.209</b> <sup>±.135</sup>
Ours (S1, w/ IRMoGen)♣	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	<b>0.425</b> <sup>±.005</sup>	0.640 <sup>±.004</sup>	0.754 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.497 <sup>±.021</sup>	<b>2.877</b> <sup>±.010</sup>	11.114 <sup>±.095</sup>
Ours (S2, w/ IRMoGen)♣	VQ+Gemma2-2B	×	0.419 <sup>±.006</sup>	<b>0.642</b> <sup>±.006</sup>	<b>0.763</b> <sup>±.005</sup>	<b>0.389</b> <sup>±.014</sup>	2.908 <sup>±.026</sup>	11.096 <sup>±.121</sup>
Motion-R1♣ [51]ArXiv'25	VQ+Qwen2.5-3B	✓	0.431 <sup>±.003</sup>	0.638 <sup>±.002</sup>	0.761 <sup>±.003</sup>	<b>0.287</b> <sup>±.004</sup>	3.196 <sup>±.040</sup>	10.875 <sup>±.052</sup>
Ours (S3, w/ IRMoGen)♣	VQ+Gemma2-2B	✓	<b>0.445</b> <sup>±.005</sup>	<b>0.681</b> <sup>±.003</sup>	<b>0.781</b> <sup>±.004</sup>	0.432 <sup>±.013</sup>	<b>2.740</b> <sup>±.017</sup>	<b>11.115</b> <sup>±.086</sup>

Table 4. **Compared with existing VQ-based Motion-aware LLMs on Text-to-Motion task.** \*: We use the official weights of MotionLLM [73] as our base model on the HumanML3D dataset. §: We train the base model following the official implementation of MotionLLM [73] on the KIT-ML dataset. Models with ♣ support both text and motion outputs. We also report 95% confidence intervals.

Methods	R-Precision↑			FID↓	MM-Dist↓
	Top-1	Top-2	Top-3		
<b>Mask-Modeling-based Models</b>					
MMMI[56]CVPR'24	0.487	0.683	0.782	0.132	3.359
MoMask[15]CVPR'24	0.490	0.687	0.786	0.116	3.353
<b>Diffusion-based Models</b>					
MDM[65]ICLR'23	0.440	0.636	0.742	0.518	3.640
MotionDiffuse[87]TPAMI'24	0.450	0.641	0.753	0.778	3.490
MLD[4]CVPR'23	0.461	0.651	0.750	0.431	3.455
ReMoDiffuse[85]ICCV'23	0.468	0.653	0.754	0.883	3.414
MARDM-SIT[49]CVPR'25	0.500	0.695	0.795	<b>0.114</b>	3.270
<b>LLM-based Models</b>					
T2M-GPT[82]CVPR'23	0.487	0.659	0.758	0.335	3.505
MotionLLM* [73]ICLR'25	0.470	0.664	0.771	0.240	3.377
Ours (S1, w/ IRMoGen)♣	0.507	0.696	0.791	0.161	3.234
Ours (S2, w/ IRMoGen)♣	0.503	0.698	0.796	0.185	3.212
Ours (S3, w/ IRMoGen)♣	<b>0.509</b>	<b>0.701</b>	<b>0.802</b>	0.259	<b>3.166</b>

Table 5. **Compared with existing Text-to-Motion methods with a recently proposed evaluator [49] on the HumanML3D dataset.** \*: We use the official weights of MotionLLM [73] as our base model. Models with ♣ support both text and motion outputs.

methods with a similar framework on the HumanML3D and KIT-ML datasets. **First**, compared with our base model MotionLLM [73], our training scheme brings stable improvement. **Second**, our Stage-1 and Stage-2 models outperform GRPO-free methods on most of the metrics. **Third**, equipped with GRPO-base RL, our Stage-3 model achieves further improvement on text-motion alignment and outperforms Motion-R1. While the model suffers from deterioration on FID due to the lack of dense supervision on the output motion tokens, it is still competitive with methods that support both text and motion outputs.

**Comparisons with another Evaluator.** We evaluate our method with a recently proposed evaluator [49], which is

more robust to the redundant factors in motion representation. As shown in Tab. 5, a similar improvement trend is observed. Our model achieves advanced performance compared with existing methods built on various frameworks.

**Comparisons on Motion Understanding Task.** Our Stage-1 model also achieves SoTA performance in the Motion-to-Text Caption task without task-specific finetuning. Due to the space limit, **we provide these results together with more comparisons in Appendix**.

#### 5.4. Qualitative Results

In Fig. 6, we provide qualitative results of our method alongside SoTA motion generation methods. IRG-MotionLLM is able to natively perform interleaved reasoning across motion and text to improve the generation result. More visualizations are provided in the Supplementary.

#### 6. Conclusions

We believe that beyond simply training models on various independent tasks, leveraging motion understanding to enhance generation holds vast research potential. To facilitate future exploration in this direction, we introduce Interleaved Reasoning for Motion Generation(IRMoGen), a novel paradigm that enhances final motion quality by seamlessly interleaving motion generation, assessment, and refinement within a unified reasoning process. We propose a three-stage training scheme to endow and further enhance the model's capacity for native interleaved reasoning. Extensive experiments evaluate the effectiveness and showcase the emerged properties of our IRG-MotionLLM. In Appendix, we further discuss the limitations of our work




Figure 6. **Visualization results.** Native interleaved reasoning enables IRG-MotionLLM to: (1) recognize the misalignment between previously generated motion and the goal text and provide proper refinement instructions; (2) refine the motion based on previous reasoning. Such characteristics help our method more accurately follow the details of the goal text than existing methods. The human figures are colored from light to dark to indicate the progression of time. Zoom in for the best view.

and outline future research directions. We expect our exploration and findings to offer fresh perspectives and inspire new advances in motion generation and motion-aware LLMs.

## References

- [1] Wenxuan huang. interleaving reasoning: Next-generation reasoning systems for agi. github repository, 2025. 3
- [2] Openai. introducing openai o3 and o4-mini. openai blog, 2025b. 3
- [3] Bin Cao, Sipeng Zheng, Ye Wang, Lujie Xia, Qianshan Wei, Qin Jin, Jing Liu, and Zongqing Lu. Being-m0. 5: A real-time controllable vision-language-motion model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.07863*, 2025. 3, 6, 7
- [4] Xin Chen, Biao Jiang, Wen Liu, Zilong Huang, Bin Fu, Tao Chen, and Gang Yu. Executing your commands via motion diffusion in latent space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 18000–18010, 2023. 3, 8, 6
- [5] Ethan Chern, Zhulin Hu, Steffi Chern, Siqi Kou, Jiadi Su, Yan Ma, Zhijie Deng, and Pengfei Liu. Thinking with generated images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22525*, 2025. 1, 3
- [6] Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, et al. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025. 3
- [7] Ke Fan, Shunlin Lu, Minyue Dai, Runyi Yu, Lixing Xiao, Zhiyang Dou, Junting Dong, Lizhuang Ma, and Jingbo Wang. Go to zero: Towards zero-shot motion generation with million-scale data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13336–13348, 2025. 3, 9
- [8] Rongyao Fang, Chengqi Duan, Kun Wang, Linjiang Huang, Hao Li, Shilin Yan, Hao Tian, Xingyu Zeng, Rui Zhao, Jifeng Dai, et al. Got: Unleashing reasoning capability of
- [9] Shenghao Fu, Qize Yang, Yuan-Ming Li, Xihan Wei, Xiaohua Xie, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Love-r1: Advancing long video understanding with an adaptive zoom-in mechanism via multi-step reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.24786*, 2025. 3
- [10] Esther Gan, Yiran Zhao, Liying Cheng, Mao Yancan, Anirudh Goyal, Kenji Kawaguchi, Min-Yen Kan, and Michael Shieh. Reasoning robustness of llms to adversarial typographical errors. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10449–10459, 2024. 7
- [11] Jiawei Gu, Yunzhuo Hao, Huichen Will Wang, Linjie Li, Michael Qizhe Shieh, Yejin Choi, Ranjay Krishna, and Yu Cheng. Thinkmorph: Emergent properties in multimodal interleaved chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.27492*, 2025. 3
- [12] Chuan Guo, Xinxin Zuo, Sen Wang, Shihao Zou, Qingyao Sun, Annan Deng, Minglun Gong, and Li Cheng. Action2motion: Conditioned generation of 3d human motions. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 2021–2029, 2020. 3
- [13] Chuan Guo, Shihao Zou, Xinxin Zuo, Sen Wang, Wei Ji, Xingyu Li, and Li Cheng. Generating diverse and natural 3d human motions from text. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5152–5161, 2022. 1, 2, 5, 6, 3, 7, 9
- [14] Chuan Guo, Xinxin Zuo, Sen Wang, and Li Cheng. Tm2t: Stochastic and tokenized modeling for the reciprocal generation of 3d human motions and texts. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 580–597. Springer, 2022. 7
- [15] Chuan Guo, Yuxuan Mu, Muhammad Gohar Javed, Sen Wang, and Li Cheng. Momask: Generative masked modeling of 3d human motions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1900–1910, 2024. 1, 3, 8, 6, 9, 12

multimodal large language model for visual generation and editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10639*, 2025. 3

[16] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025. 2, 3, 5

[17] Haonan Han, Xiangzuo Wu, Huan Liao, Zunnan Xu, Zhongyuan Hu, Ronghui Li, Yachao Zhang, and Xiu Li. Atom: Aligning text-to-motion model at event-level with gpt-4vision reward. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 22746–22755, 2025. 2, 8, 9

[18] Xin He, Shaoli Huang, Xiaohang Zhan, Chao Weng, and Ying Shan. Semanticboost: Elevating motion generation with augmented textual cues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20323*, 2023. 3

[19] Fangzhou Hong, Vladimir Guzov, Hyo Jin Kim, Yuting Ye, Richard Newcombe, Ziwei Liu, and Lingni Ma. Egolm: Multi-modal language model of egocentric motions. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 5344–5354, 2025. 3

[20] Ruibing Hou, Mingshuang Luo, Hongyu Pan, Hong Chang, and Shiguang Shan. Motionverse: A unified multimodal framework for motion comprehension, generation and editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23635*, 2025. 3

[21] Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Wenhui Wang, Yaru Hao, Saksham Singhal, Shuming Ma, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Owais Khan Mohammed, Barun Patra, et al. Language is not all you need: Aligning perception with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:72096–72109, 2023. 1

[22] Wenxuan Huang, Shuang Chen, Zheyong Xie, Shaosheng Cao, Shixiang Tang, Yufan Shen, Qingyu Yin, Wenbo Hu, Xiaoman Wang, Yuntian Tang, et al. Interleaving reasoning for better text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.06945*, 2025. 1, 3

[23] Wenxuan Huang, Bohan Jia, Zijie Zhai, Shaosheng Cao, Zheyu Ye, Fei Zhao, Zhe Xu, Yao Hu, and Shaohui Lin. Vision-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.06749*, 2025. 3, 5, 2

[24] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024. 5, 9

[25] Muhammad Islam, Tao Huang, Euijoon Ahn, and Usman Naseem. Multimodal generative ai with autoregressive llms for human motion understanding and generation: A way forward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03191*, 2025. 1

[26] Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*, 2024. 3

[27] Biao Jiang, Xin Chen, Wen Liu, Jingyi Yu, Gang Yu, and Tao Chen. Motiongpt: Human motion as a foreign language. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:20067–20079, 2023. 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 4, 9

[28] Biao Jiang, Xin Chen, Chi Zhang, Fukun Yin, Zhuoyuan Li, Gang Yu, and Jiayuan Fan. Motionchain: Conversational motion controllers via multimodal prompts. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 54–74. Springer, 2024. 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 4

[29] Biao Jiang, Xin Chen, Ailing Zeng, Xinru Sun, Fukun Yin, Xianfang Zeng, Xuanyang Zhang, Gang Yu, and Tao Chen. Causal motion tokenizer for streaming motion generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2024–2034, 2025. 3

[30] Dongzhi Jiang, Ziyu Guo, Renrui Zhang, Zhuofan Zong, Hao Li, Le Zhuo, Shilin Yan, Pheng-Ann Heng, and Hongsheng Li. T2i-r1: Reinforcing image generation with collaborative semantic-level and token-level cot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00703*, 2025. 3, 2

[31] Yang Jiao, Haibo Qiu, Zequn Jie, Shaoxiang Chen, Jingjing Chen, Lin Ma, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Unitoken: Harmonizing multimodal understanding and generation through unified visual encoding. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 3600–3610, 2025. 7

[32] Aliasghar Khani, Arianna Rampini, Bruno Roy, Larasika Nadela, Noa Kaplan, Evan Atherton, Derek Cheung, and Jacky Biblio. Motion generation: A survey of generative approaches and benchmarks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05419*, 2025. 1

[33] Man Ho Lam, Chaozheng Wang, Jen-tse Huang, and Michael R. Lyu. Codecrash: Exposing llm fragility to misleading natural language in code reasoning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2025. 7

[34] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. 1

[35] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. 1

[36] Zhe Li, Weihao Yuan, Yisheng He, Lingteng Qiu, Shen-hao Zhu, Xiaodong Gu, Weichao Shen, Yuan Dong, Zilong Dong, and Laurence T Yang. Lamp: Language-motion pretraining for motion generation, retrieval, and captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07093*, 2024. 3, 6, 7

[37] Zhengdao Li, Siheng Wang, Zeyu Zhang, and Hao Tang. Remomask: Retrieval-augmented masked motion generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02605*, 2025. 3

[38] Weixin Liang, LILI YU, Liang Luo, Srini Iyer, Ning Dong, Chunting Zhou, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Xi Victoria Lin. Mixture-of-transformers: A sparse and scalable architecture for multi-modal foundation models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2025. 9

[39] Zhouyingcheng Liao, Mingyuan Zhang, Wenjia Wang, Lei Yang, and Taku Komura. Rmd: A simple baseline for more general human motion generation via training-free retrieval-augmented motion diffuse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04343*, 2024. 3

[40] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation

of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004. 6, 4, 5

[41] Jing Lin, Rui Wang, Junzhe Lu, Ziqi Huang, Guorui Song, Ailing Zeng, Xian Liu, Chen Wei, Wanqi Yin, Qingping Sun, et al. The quest for generalizable motion generation: Data, model, and evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26794*, 2025. 9

[42] Kun-Yu Lin, Hongjun Wang, Weining Ren, and Kai Han. Panoptic captioning: An equivalence bridge for image and text. 2025. 1

[43] Zhiqiu Lin, Deepak Pathak, Baiqi Li, Jiayao Li, Xide Xia, Graham Neubig, Pengchuan Zhang, and Deva Ramanan. Evaluating text-to-visual generation with image-to-text generation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 366–384. Springer, 2024. 8

[44] Xiaoyang Liu, Yunyao Mao, Wengang Zhou, and Houqiang Li. Motionrl: Align text-to-motion generation to human preferences with multi-reward reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06513*, 2024. 5, 2

[45] Shunlin Lu, Jingbo Wang, Zeyu Lu, Ling-Hao Chen, Wenxun Dai, Junting Dong, Zhiyang Dou, Bo Dai, and Ruimao Zhang. Scamo: Exploring the scaling law in autoregressive motion generation model. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 27872–27882, 2025. 3

[46] Mingshuang Luo, Ruibing Hou, Zhuo Li, Hong Chang, Zimo Liu, Yaowei Wang, and Shiguang Shan. M3gpt: An advanced multimodal, multitask framework for motion comprehension and generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:28051–28077, 2024. 3

[47] Naureen Mahmood, Nima Ghorbani, Nikolaus F. Troje, Gerard Pons-Moll, and Michael J. Black. Amass: Archive of motion capture as surface shapes. In *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. 3

[48] Yunyao Mao, Xiaoyang Liu, Wengang Zhou, Zhenbo Lu, and Houqiang Li. Learning generalizable human motion generator with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15541*, 2024. 5, 6, 7

[49] Zichong Meng, Yiming Xie, Xiaogang Peng, Zeyu Han, and Huaizu Jiang. Rethinking diffusion for text-driven human motion generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16575*, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 8, 4, 7, 9, 12

[50] Zichong Meng, Zeyu Han, Xiaogang Peng, Yiming Xie, and Huaizu Jiang. Absolute coordinates make motion generation easy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.19377*, 2025. 3

[51] Runqi Ouyang, Haoyun Li, Zhenyuan Zhang, Xiaofeng Wang, Zheng Zhu, Guan Huang, and Xingang Wang. Motion-r1: Chain-of-thought reasoning and reinforcement learning for human motion generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.10353*, 2025. 3, 5, 8, 2, 6, 7

[52] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002. 6, 4, 5

[53] Massimiliano Pappa, Luca Collorone, Giovanni Ficarra, Indero Spinelli, and Fabio Galasso. Modipo: text-to-motion alignment via ai-feedback-driven direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03803*, 2024. 2, 8

[54] Mathis Petrovich, Michael J. Black, and G  l Varol. TMR: Text-to-motion retrieval using contrastive 3D human motion synthesis. In *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023. 5

[55] Ekkasit Pinyoanuntapong, Muhammad Usama Saleem, Pu Wang, Minwoo Lee, Srijan Das, and Chen Chen. Bamm: Bidirectional autoregressive motion model. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 172–190. Springer, 2024. 3, 6, 7

[56] Ekkasit Pinyoanuntapong, Pu Wang, Minwoo Lee, and Chen Chen. Mmm: Generative masked motion model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1546–1555, 2024. 3, 8, 6

[57] Matthias Plappert, Christian Mandery, and Tamim Asfour. The kit motion-language dataset. *Big data*, 4(4):236–252, 2016. 2, 6, 3, 9

[58] Luozheng Qin, Jia Gong, Yuqing Sun, Tianjiao Li, Mengping Yang, Xiaomeng Yang, Chao Qu, Zhiyu Tan, and Hao Li. Uni-cot: Towards unified chain-of-thought reasoning across text and vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05606*, 2025. 1, 3

[59] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:53728–53741, 2023. 2

[60] Jaechul Roh, Varun Gandhi, Shivani Anilkumar, and Arin Garg. BREAK-THE-CHAIN: Adversarial Prompting in Code Generation, 2025. UMass Amherst CS685 Advanced NLP Project. 7

[61] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017. 2

[62] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024. 2, 5

[63] Shinichi Tanaka, Zhao Wang, Yoichi Kato, and Jun Ohya. Unlocking pretrained llms for motion-related multimodal generation: A fine-tuning approach to unify diffusion and next-token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.06119*, 2025. 3

[64] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, L  onard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ram  , et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*, 2024. 2

[65] Guy Tevet, Sigal Raab, Brian Gordon, Yonatan Shafir, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Amit H Bermano. Human motion diffusion model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14916*, 2022. 1, 3, 8, 6

[66] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer*

*vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575, 2015. 6, 4, 5

[67] Haoru Wang, Wentao Zhu, Luyi Miao, Yishu Xu, Feng Gao, Qi Tian, and Yizhou Wang. Aligning human motion generation with human perceptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02272*, 2024. 9

[68] Wenhui Wang, Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Johan Bjorck, Zhiliang Peng, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Owais Khan Mohammed, Saksham Singh, Subhrojit Som, et al. Image as a foreign language: Beit pretraining for vision and vision-language tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19175–19186, 2023. 1

[69] Yuan Wang, Di Huang, Yaqi Zhang, Wanli Ouyang, Jile Jiao, Xuetao Feng, Yan Zhou, Pengfei Wan, Shixiang Tang, and Dan Xu. Motiongpt-2: A general-purpose motion-language model for motion generation and understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21747*, 2024. 1, 3, 8, 6, 7

[70] Ye Wang, Sipeng Zheng, Bin Cao, Qianshan Wei, Weishuai Zeng, Qin Jin, and Zongqing Lu. Scaling large motion models with million-level human motions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03311*, 2024. 3, 6, 7

[71] Bizhu Wu, Jinheng Xie, Keming Shen, Zhe Kong, Jianfeng Ren, Ruibin Bai, Rong Qu, and Linlin Shen. Mg-motionllm: A unified framework for motion comprehension and generation across multiple granularities. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 27849–27858, 2025. 1, 3, 6, 7, 8

[72] Chenyuan Wu, Pengfei Zheng, Ruiran Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyan Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, et al. Omnigen2: Exploration to advanced multimodal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.18871*, 2025. 3

[73] Qi Wu, Yubo Zhao, Yifan Wang, Xinhang Liu, Yu-Wing Tai, and Chi-Keung Tang. Motion-agent: A conversational framework for human motion generation with llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17013*, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 1, 4, 5, 9, 12

[74] Yiming Wu, Wei Ji, Kecheng Zheng, Zicheng Wang, and Dong Xu. Mote: Learning motion-text diffusion model for multiple generation tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.19786*, 2024. 7

[75] Haidong Xu, Guangwei Xu, Zhedong Zheng, Xiatian Zhu, Wei Ji, Xiangtai Li, Ruijie Guo, Meishan Zhang, Hao Fei, et al. Vimorag: Video-based retrieval-augmented 3d motion generation for motion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.12081*, 2025. 8, 6

[76] Sheng Yan, Yang Liu, Haoqiang Wang, Xin Du, Mengyuan Liu, and Hong Liu. Cross-modal retrieval for motion and text via droptriple loss. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM International Conference on Multimedia in Asia*, pages 1–7, 2023. 3

[77] Payam Jome Yazdian, Eric Liu, Rachel Lagasse, Hamid Mommadi, Li Cheng, and Angelica Lim. Motionscript: Natural language descriptions for expressive 3d human motions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12634*, 2023. 3

[78] Qing Yu, Mikihiro Tanaka, and Kent Fujiwara. Exploring vision transformers for 3d human motion-language models with motion patches. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 937–946, 2024. 9

[79] Qing Yu, Mikihiro Tanaka, and Kent Fujiwara. Remogpt: Part-level retrieval-augmented motion-language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9635–9643, 2025. 3

[80] Weihao Yuan, Weichao Shen, Yisheng HE, Yuan Dong, Xiaodong Gu, Zilong Dong, Liefeng Bo, and Qixing Huang. Mogents: Motion generation based on spatial-temporal joint modeling. *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. 6, 7

[81] Ling-An Zeng, Guohong Huang, Gaojie Wu, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Light-t2m: A lightweight and fast model for text-to-motion generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9797–9805, 2025. 3

[82] Jianrong Zhang, Yangsong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Shaoli Huang, Yong Zhang, Hongwei Zhao, Hongtao Lu, and Xi Shen. T2m-gpt: Generating human motion from textual descriptions with discrete representations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023. 1, 3, 8, 6

[83] Jihai Zhang, Tianle Li, Linjie Li, Zhengyuan Yang, and Yu Cheng. Are unified vision-language models necessary: Generalization across understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23043*, 2025. 7

[84] Lunjun Zhang, Arian Hosseini, Hritik Bansal, Mehran Kazemi, Aviral Kumar, and Rishabh Agarwal. Generative verifiers: Reward modeling as next-token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15240*, 2024. 8

[85] Mingyuan Zhang, Xinying Guo, Liang Pan, Zhongang Cai, Fangzhou Hong, Huirong Li, Lei Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Remodiffuse: Retrieval-augmented motion diffusion model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 364–373, 2023. 3, 8, 6

[86] Mingyuan Zhang, Huirong Li, Zhongang Cai, Jiawei Ren, Lei Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Finemogen: Fine-grained spatio-temporal motion generation and editing. *NeurIPS*, 2023. 3

[87] Mingyuan Zhang, Zhongang Cai, Liang Pan, Fangzhou Hong, Xinying Guo, Lei Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Motiondiffuse: Text-driven human motion generation with diffusion model. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 46(6):4115–4128, 2024. 3, 8, 6

[88] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019. 6, 4, 5

[89] Zeyu Zhang, Akide Liu, Ian Reid, Richard Hartley, Bohan Zhuang, and Hao Tang. Motion mamba: Efficient and long sequence motion generation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 265–282. Springer, 2024. 3

[90] Dian Zheng, Manyuan Zhang, Hongyu Li, Kai Zou, Hongbo Liu, Ziyu Guo, Kaituo Feng, Yexin Liu, Ying Luo, Yan Feng, Peng Pei, Xunliang Cai, and Hongsheng Li. Architecture decoupling is not all you need for unified multimodal model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.22663*, 2025. 7

[91] Bingfan Zhu, Biao Jiang, Sunyi Wang, Shixiang Tang, Tao Chen, Linjie Luo, Youyi Zheng, and Xin Chen. Mo-

tiongpt3: Human motion as a second modality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.24086*, 2025. [3](#), [7](#), [9](#)

[92] Le Zhuo, Liangbing Zhao, Sayak Paul, Yue Liao, Renrui Zhang, Yi Xin, Peng Gao, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Hongsheng Li. From reflection to perfection: Scaling inference-time optimization for text-to-image diffusion models via reflection tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15329–15339, 2025. [3](#)

# IRG-MotionLLM: Interleaving Motion Generation, Assessment and Refinement for Text-to-Motion Generation

## Supplementary Material

### 7. Appendix Introduction

This appendix includes more details and analysis of our works:

**In Sec. 8**, we provide more preliminaries about: (1) Text-to-Motion Generation task definition; (2) Motion VQVAE; (3) Motion-aware LLM; (4) GRPO-based Reinforcement Learning.

**In Sec. 9**, we provide more details of our IRG-MotionLLM, including: (1) Base Model; (2) Inference with IRMoGen.

**In Sec. 10**, we provide more details of the data engine, including more information about: (1) Annotation Pipeline; (2) Training data organization.

**In Sec. 11**, we provide more details about the experiment setups, including: (1) Dataset; (2) Evaluation Metrics; (3) Implementation.

**In Sec. 12**, we provide more experiment results and analysis. the breakdowns are as follows:

- More Comparisons and Discussions on Text- to-Motion Generation Task. (Sec. 12.1)
- Comparisons on Motion Caption Task. (Sec. 12.2)
- Impact of Multiple Round of Refinement. (Sec. 12.3)
- Stage-3 Training: Unleashing the capacity or Hacking the evaluator? (Sec. 12.4)
- Robust IRMoGen or Trajectory Dependency? (Sec. 12.5)
- Functioning IRG-MotionLLM as a Text-Motion Reward Model. (Sec. 12.6)
- More Qualitative Results. (Sec. 12.7)

**In Sec. 13**, we discuss the limitations and the potential research directions.

## 8. Preliminaries

### 8.1. Text-to-Motion Generation Task Definition

Text-to-Motion Generation aims at generating 3D human motion aligned with the goal text. In this work, we follow [13, 65] to represent the human motion sequence as  $m_{1:T} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$ , where  $T$  is the length (number of frames) of the motion sequence. Each human pose  $m_i$  in the human motion sequence is a  $D$ -dimension vector, which includes the root angular velocity along the Y-axis, root linear velocities on the XZ-plane, root height, and local joint positions, velocities, and rotations relative to the root space. Please refer to [13] for more detailed information on human pose representation.

### 8.2. Motion VQVAE

To align better with LLM’s next-token prediction mechanism, a Motion VQ-VAE [27, 71, 73] is adopted to encode motions into discrete representations and also decode these representations back to continuous motions.

**Quantization:** Given a motion sequence  $m_{1:T} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$ , an encoder  $\mathcal{E}$  first encodes it into a sequence of latent embeddings  $z_{1:T/S} \in \mathbb{R}^{T/S \times d}$ , where  $S$  denotes the downsampling rate on temporal dimension and  $d$  is the hidden dimensions. After that, the latent embeddings are quantized by a quantizer with a codebook  $C = \{c_k\}_1^K$ , which can be represented as:

$$\hat{z}_t = \arg \min_{C_k \in C} \|Z_t - C_k\|_2,$$

where  $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $K$  is the size of the codebook, and  $\hat{z}_{1:T/S}$  are the quantization results.

**De-quantization:** Given the quantization results, a decoder  $\mathcal{D}$  can de-quantize them back to the motion sequence:  $\hat{m}_{1:T} = \mathcal{D}(\hat{z}_{1:T/S})$

**Training:** We share the same strategy as previous works [73] to optimize the VQVAE. The training loss is written as:

$$L_{\text{VQVAE}} = \|m - \hat{m}\|_1 + \alpha \|p - \hat{p}\|_1 + \beta \|z - sg[\hat{z}]\|_2.$$

The first item is the motion reconstruction loss, the second item is a regularization on the joint positions  $p$ , the third item is the commitment loss.  $sg[.]$  denotes the stop-gradient operation,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are the hyper-parameters. After training, we keep the Motion VQVAE frozen for further usage.

### 8.3. Motion-aware LLM

Based on the Motion VQVAE, the motion sequence can be discretized into  $K$  distinct motion tokens. We map these motion tokens to the motion token vocabulary  $V_m = \{<Motion.i>\}_{i=1}^K$  based on their indices. After that, we extend the base LLM vocabulary with these motion-specific codes alone with boundary tokens  $<Motion>$  and  $</Motion>$  to delineate motion sequence spans within the text (*i.e.*,  $K+2$  new tokens). After that, given prompt  $q$  and target token sequence  $x_{1:T}$ , we can train a motion-aware LLM with standard next-token prediction objective via negative log-likelihood:

$$L_{LLM} = - \sum \log p_\theta(x_t | x_{t-1:T}, q).$$




Figure 7. **The inference pipeline for performing IRMoGen on our Stage-1 model.** Our Stage-1 model can perform interleaved reasoning across generation, assessment and refinement tasks by sequentially using prompts of different tasks together with the outputs from previous steps. To determine when to stop, extra scripts or manual interventions are needed to check the refinement instruction. D.M.G: Direct Motion Generation. M.R.I: Motion Refinement Instructing. I.M.R: Instruction-guided Motion Refinement.

During inference, the model is able to freely mix token sequence (with both text and motion tokens). We can directly extract the generated motion by matching the boundary tokens  $\langle Motion \rangle$  and  $\langle /Motion \rangle$ .

#### 8.4. GRPO-based Reinforcement Tuning

GRPO is initially proposed to enhance the reasoning capacity of LLM [16, 62], and proven to have promising potential for enhancing Multi-modal LLM [23, 30, 51]. The core mechanism of GRPO [62] is to leverages intra-group ranking feedback to optimize the policy (*i.e.*, our IRG-MotionLLM) by encouraging better samples within each group, which eliminates the need of an additional critic model [44, 61] or pair-wise preference data [17, 53, 59].

Specifically, taken the reasoning instruction  $q$ , a group of  $G$  trajectories  $\{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_G\}$  are sampled from the model. After that, each trajectory is assigned with a scalar reward  $r(o_i)$ . GRPO then standardizes these scores within the group and optimizes a weighted objective:

$$R(o) = \sum_{i=1}^G \frac{\pi_\theta(o_i|q)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_i|q)} \cdot \frac{r(o_i) - \text{mean}(\{r(o_i)\}_{i=1}^G)}{\text{std}(\{r(o_i)\}_{i=1}^G)}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\pi_\theta$  indicates the current policy and  $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$  is the previous policy. Based on  $R(o)$ , the objective is written as:

$$\max_{\pi_\theta} \mathbb{E}_{o \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}(p)} [R(o) - \beta_{kl} D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\theta \| \pi_{\text{ref}})], \quad (5)$$

where  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$  is indicates initial policy and  $\beta_{kl}$  is a hyper-parameter.

### 9. More Details about IRG-MotionLLM

#### 9.1. Base Model

In our work, we mainly use the MotionLLM from the T2M part of MotionAgent [73] as our base model. The size of

codebook is 512, and the LLM part is build on Gemma2-2B [64]. Based on the training strategy introduced in Sec. 8, the base model is trained on text-to-motion generation task. During training, only the LoRA adapter is trainable while the other parameters are frozen. Please refer to the original paper [73] for more details.

#### 9.2. More details about Inference with IRMoGen

Prompted with reasoning instruction and goal text, our Stage-2 and Stage-3 models can natively perform IRMoGen, and adaptively stop reasoning when a satisfactory motion is obtained (*i.e.*, the assessment results indicate “*no refinement is needed*”). Notably, our Stage-1 model can also perform interleaved generation, assessment and refinement by sequentially using prompts for different tasks together with the outputs from previous steps. To know when to stop reasoning, extra scripts or manual interventions are needed to check the refinement instruction. The this inference pipeline is shown in Fig. 7.

Additionally, to avoid endless reasoning, we introduce the maximum refinement constraint  $N_{\text{max}}$ , *i.e.*, the model can perform at most  $N_{\text{max}}$  rounds of refinement. If the rounds of refinement reach  $N_{\text{max}}$ , the later reasoning will be pruned and use the last generated motion as the output.

## 10. More Details about Data Engine

### 10.1. Details of Annotation Pipeline

As discussed in Sec. 4, for each anchor text-motion pair, we progressively sample  $N_{\text{neg}}$  negative text-motion pairs from the ranked instance pool with a portion  $p$ . In our work,  $N_{\text{neg}}$  is set to 4, and  $p$  is set to 90% for the HumanML3D dataset and 87.5% for the KIT-ML dataset.

Additionally, we prompt GPT-4o to obtain the goal analysis and the text-motion alignment assessment annotations. The detailed prompts are shown in Fig. 8 and Fig. 9.

After collecting the LLM-generated annotations, we further conduct a double-check on the generated annotations. We filter out those goal analysis and text-motion assessment annotations with invalid responses from LLM.

Note that this annotation pipeline is scalable as we can perform this pipeline multiple times to obtain dynamic sets of negative text-motion pairs (each set includes  $N_{neg}$  negative pairs) for each anchor text-motion pair. In our work, for Stage-1 training, we run our annotation pipeline for one time to build the annotations for the eight related tasks. For Stage-2 training, we further run the annotation pipeline one more time to obtain another set of negative pairs for each anchor pair. The purpose is to prevent our model from overfitting to the assessment and refinement pattern already seen in Stage-1.

## 10.2. Training data organization for Stage-1

Based on the annotation pipeline introduced in Sec. 4 and Sec. 10.1, we construct training data for eight tasks in Stage-1 with task-specific instructions and response templates. Fig. 10 shows the examples of task-specific instructions and response templates.

## 10.3. Training data organization for Stage-2

As discussed in Sec. 10.1, each set of negative motion-text pairs includes  $N_{neg}$  negative motion-text pairs for each anchor motion-text pair. Based on this, we can build reasoning trajectories that match the IRMoGen-CoT template shown in Fig. 3 for the Stage-2 training. Each reasoning trajectories may include at most  $N_{neg}$  *intermediate motions* and one *final motion*. During training, we remove a random number (0 to 4) of the *intermediate motions* together with the corresponding assessment results to ensure the diversity of lengths of reasoning trajectories. We also filter out those intermediate motions with refinement instruction of “*No refinements needed*” to ensure only the final motion is perfectly aligned with the goal. We also provide an example of the Stage-2 training data Fig. 13 (including once initial generation and three rounds of refinement).

# 11. More about Experiment Setups

## 11.1. More about Dataset

Following previous works [27, 28, 71, 73, 91] on UniMoLM, we mainly conduct experiments on HumanML3D dataset [13], one of the largest motion-text pair datasets. It contains 14,616 motion sequences from AMASS [47] and HumanAct12 [12], along with 44,970 sequence-level textual descriptions. These descriptions capture the semantic meaning of each motion, making HumanML3D widely used for motion generation and understanding tasks. To evaluate the generalizability of our approach, we further compare IRG-MotionLLM with other methods on the KIT-

ML [57] dataset, which contains 3911 motion sequences and 6,278 text descriptions. The motion sequences are selected from the KIT [57] and CMU [76] datasets. We follow the official splitting strategy to split the dataset into training, validation and test set. For Stage3 training, we keep the ratio of text mode paired data to text only data to be approximately 1:1. For fair evaluation, we filter out those prompts that also exist in the testing set (considering them identical after converting to lowercase and removing punctuation).

## 11.2. More about Evaluation Metrics

**For the Text-to-Motion Generation task**, we follow previous works [13, 73] to report metrics including R-Precision, FID, MM-Dist, and Diversity. Given the ground-truth motion features  $f_{gt}$ , generated motion features  $f_{pred}$ , and text features  $f_{text}$ . Here are details about metrics.

- **Multimodal Distance** (MM-Dist) is utilized to measure the feature-level distance between the text features and the generated motion feature:

$$\text{MM-Dist} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|f_{pred,i} - f_{text,i}\|, \quad (6)$$

where  $f_{pred,i}$  and  $f_{text,i}$  denote the features of the  $i$ -th generated motion and the corresponding text.

- **Frechet Inception Distance** (FID) measures the distance of motion features distribution between ground-truth and generated motions, which is calculated FID by

$$\text{FID} = \|\mu_{gt} - \mu_{pred}\|^2 - \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{gt} + \Sigma_{pred} - 2(\Sigma_{gt}\Sigma_{pred})^{1/2}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mu_{gt}$  and  $\mu_{pred}$  are the means of  $f_{gt}$  and  $f_{pred}$ .  $\Sigma$  is the covariance matrix and Tr denotes the trace of a matrix.

- **R-Precision** (Top-k) is a text-motion retrieval metric. Given the generated motion and a mini-batch of text descriptions (one ground-truth and others are randomly selected from mismatched descriptions), we rank the distances between the motion and text features to get Top-k accuracy of motion-text. Following the official evaluation protocol [13], the mini batch size is set to 32, Euclidean distance is adopted, and we report Top-1, Top-2 and Top-3 results.

- **Diversity** measures the variance of the whole motion sequences across the dataset. We randomly sample  $N_{div}$  pairs of motion and each pair of motion features is denoted by  $f_{pred,i}$  and  $f'_{pred,i}$ . The diversity can be calculated by

$$\text{Diversity} = \frac{1}{N_{div}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{div}} \|f_{pred,i} - f'_{pred,i}\|. \quad (8)$$

Following official evaluation protocol[13],  $N_{div}$  is set to 300.

For most of the evaluation, we adopt the official evaluator from HumanML3D [13]. As this evaluator can be influenced by redundant motion representation [49], we also

### The Prompt for Generating Annotations of Goal Analysis

You are an expert in motion analysis. Given the text description of a goal motion, you need to identify the key elements related to the goal. Your response should be a paragraph of brief analysis.

## Example:

[Goal Text]: Humanoid is acting like a chicken with their arms pointed up and their hands on their chest area, they also were pecking at something.

[Response]: The goal is to generate a motion where a person imitates a chicken. The key elements are a specific upper-body posture with arms pointed up and hands on the chest to mimic wings, combined with a pecking motion involving the head and upper torso bending forward.

Figure 8. The prompts for generating annotations of Goal Analysis.

### The Prompt for Generating Annotations of Text-Motion Alignment Assessment

You are an expert in understanding human motion. Your task is to assess how well the motion generation result aligned with the goal/prompt text, and provide instructions on how to refine.

# INPUT

1. Goal Text Prompt: The text description for the goal human motion.
2. Text Description for Generated Motions.

# Your Task

Generate a clean, logical assessment results and refinement instructions as \*\*plain text\*\*.

# OUTPUT FORMAT

You MUST generate the formatted results with the following json-style structure:

{

  "assessment": "<Assess how well the generation result aligned with the text>",  
  "refinement": "<provide actionable instructions to improve the alignment>"

}

# Examples

[Goal/prompt]:

"a man full-body sideways jumps to his left."

[Generated\_Motion]:

"a person does one jump forward."

[Response]:

{

  "assessment": "The generated motion involves a forward jump with both feet, which partially matches the jumping action but fails to capture the sideways direction to the left and the full-body emphasis.",

  "refinement": "Adjust the jump direction from forward to sideways left, ensure full-body involvement and emphasize lateral movement."

}

[Goal/prompt]:

"a person appears to be playing the violin."

[Generated\_Motion]:

"a person holding a violin with their left arm and playing."

[Response]:

{

  "assessment": "The motion shows a person playing a violin, holding it with the left arm, which fully aligns with appearing to play the violin.",

  "refinement": "No refinements needed."

}

# Other Guidelines

1. Keep the assessment result and refinement instructions brief.

2. Do NOT provide any other response other than the json-style response

3. Please assume that you are watching the motion, instead of the description, which means you should NOT response with words like "the description".

Figure 9. The prompts for generating annotations of Text-Motion Alignment Assessment.

employ a recently proposed evaluator [49] for further evaluation.

28, 73], we adopt NLP metrics including Bleu[52], Rouge-L[40], CIDEr[66], and BertScore[88]. Here are details about metrics.

**For the Motion-to-Text Caption task**, following [27],

Stages	Tasks	Task Instructions	Response Templates
Stage-1	Goal Analysis	Identify the essential components related to the objective before creating a motion for <Motion_Caption>	<Goal_Analysis>
	Motion Caption	<Goal_Motion> Provide a detailed description of the motion.	<Motion_Caption>
	Direct Motion Generation	Generate a motion that depicts <Motion_Caption>	<Goal_Motion>
	Analysis-Guided Motion Generation	Generate a motion that aligns with the goal <Goal_Analysis>	<Goal_Motion>
	Text-Motion Alignment Evaluation	Motion: <Initial_Motion> Goal text: <Motion_Caption>. Assess the alignment between the motion and the goal.	<Alignment_Evaluation>
	Motion Refinement Instructing	Motion: <Initial_Motion> Goal text: <Motion_Caption>. Determine how to refine the generated motion for better alignment.	<Refinement_Instruction>
	Direct Motion Refinement	Motion: <Initial_Motion> Target caption: <Motion_Caption> Please adjust the motion to better match the caption's intent.	<Goal_Motion>
	Instruction-Guided Motion Refinement	Motion: <Initial_Motion>. Goal text: <Motion_Caption>. Refine the motion according to the instruction: <Refinement_Instruction>.	<Goal_Motion>
Stage-2&3	IRMoGen	Given a text outlining a human motion objective, employ a step-by-step thought process to realize the motion: (1) analyze the text, providing a clear explanation of the reasoning to identify essential elements; (2) conduct several rounds of motion generation and self-assessment until the motion is satisfactory. Goal Text: <Motion_Caption>	<IRMoGen-CoT>

Figure 10. **The task instructions and response templates.** The fields between “<” and “>” indicate the placeholders.

IRG-MotionLLM	Stage-1	Stage-2	Stage-3
<i>General Hyper-parameters</i>			
Batch Size	128	32	32
# GPUs (Nvidia L20s)	32	32	32
Learning Rate	1e-5	1e-5	1e-6
Epochs / Steps (H3D)	10 epochs	10 epochs	900 steps
Epochs / Steps (KIT)	4 epochs	4 epochs	300 steps
<i>GRPO Hyper-parameters</i>			
KL weight ( $\beta_{kl}$ )	-	-	0.01
Group size ( $G$ )	-	-	4
Max completion length	-	-	1024

Table 6. **Hyper-parameters for training IRG-MotionLLM.**

Since the KIT-ML dataset (KIT) contains fewer motions than the HumanML3D (H3D) dataset, we correspondingly reduced the training epochs / steps for each stage but keep other hyper-parameters the same.

- **BLEU** [52] quantifies the overlap between the generated sentences and the reference sentences by comparing n-grams (contiguous word sequences) shared between them. In this work, we compute the 1-gram- and 4-gram-based BLEU score to evaluate the models.

- **CIDEr** [66] is originally proposed for image captioning task. It measures the similarity between generated and reference texts using n-gram overlap weighted by TF-IDF. This ensures important but less common phrases are emphasized, rewarding consensus among references while penalizing overly generic outputs.

- **ROUGE-L** [40] measures the longest common subse-

quence (LCS) between the generated caption and the reference captions. Unlike n-gram-based metrics that only consider exact matches of contiguous words, ROUGE-L captures sentence-level structure similarity and allows for non-consecutive word matches as long as they preserve relative order, making it particularly suitable for evaluating fluency and structural consistency in generated text.

- **BERTScore** [88] evaluates natural language generation by comparing the semantic similarity between generated and reference texts using contextual embeddings from pre-trained BERT-like models. Unlike traditional metrics that rely on n-gram overlap, BERTScore computes token-level similarity based on meaning, capturing nuances like synonyms and paraphrasing.

### 11.3. More Implementation Details

For experiments on the HumanML3D dataset, we build our base model based on the official weights of MotionLLM [73]. For experiments on the KIT-ML dataset, we follow the official implementation (see Sec. 9 and the original paper [73]) of MotionLLM [73] to train the base model for 100 epochs. The main hyper-parameters for training our IRG-MotionLLM are shown in Tab. 6. During inference, the Maximum Refinement Constraint  $N_{max}$  is set to 4 (see discussions in Sec. 9.2). Note that with proper maximum completion length, after Stage-3 training, only 0.2% test reasoning trajectories exceed this constraint. All our experiments are conducted on NVIDIA L20 GPUs.

Methods	w/ GRPO	R-Precision↑			FID↓	MM-Dist↓	Diversity↑				
		Top-1	Top-2	Top-3							
<b>HumanML3D Dataset</b>											
<b>Diffusion-based Motion Generator</b>											
MDM[65]ICLR'23	×	0.320 $\pm$ .005	0.498 $\pm$ .004	0.611 $\pm$ .007	0.544 $\pm$ .044	5.566 $\pm$ .027	9.559 $\pm$ .086				
MLD[4]CVPR'23	×	0.481 $\pm$ .003	0.673 $\pm$ .003	0.772 $\pm$ .002	0.473 $\pm$ .013	3.196 $\pm$ .010	9.724 $\pm$ .082				
MotionDiffuse[87]TPAMI'24	×	0.491 $\pm$ .001	0.681 $\pm$ .001	0.782 $\pm$ .001	0.630 $\pm$ .001	3.113 $\pm$ .001	9.410 $\pm$ .049				
ReMoDiffuse[85]ICCV'23	×	0.510 $\pm$ .005	0.698 $\pm$ .006	0.795 $\pm$ .004	0.103 $\pm$ .004	2.974 $\pm$ .016	9.018 $\pm$ .075				
MARDM[49]CVPR'25	×	<b>0.523</b>	<b>0.715</b>	<b>0.810</b>	<b>0.061</b>	-	-				
<b>Mask-Modeling-based Motion Generator</b>											
MoMask[15]CVPR'24	×	0.521 $\pm$ .002	0.713 $\pm$ .002	0.807 $\pm$ .002	0.045 $\pm$ .002	2.958 $\pm$ .008	-				
MMM[56]CVPR'24	×	0.515 $\pm$ .002	0.708 $\pm$ .002	0.804 $\pm$ .002	0.089 $\pm$ .005	2.926 $\pm$ .007	9.577 $\pm$ .050				
BAMM[55]ECCV'24	×	0.525 $\pm$ .002	0.720 $\pm$ .003	0.814 $\pm$ .003	0.055 $\pm$ .002	2.919 $\pm$ .008	<b>9.717</b> $\pm$ .089				
MoGenST[80]NeurIPS'24	×	0.529 $\pm$ .003	0.719 $\pm$ .002	0.812 $\pm$ .002	0.033 $\pm$ .001	2.867 $\pm$ .006	9.570 $\pm$ .077				
LAMP[36]ICLR'25	×	<b>0.557</b> $\pm$ .003	<b>0.751</b> $\pm$ .002	<b>0.843</b> $\pm$ .001	<b>0.032</b> $\pm$ .002	<b>2.759</b> $\pm$ .007	9.571 $\pm$ .069				
<b>Motion-aware LLM</b>											
Being-M0[70]ICML'25	×	0.519	-	0.803	0.166	2.964	-				
Being-M0.5♣[3]ICCV'25	×	0.528	-	0.815	0.141	2.953	-				
T2M-GPT[82]CVPR'23	×	0.492 $\pm$ .003	0.679 $\pm$ .002	0.775 $\pm$ .002	0.141 $\pm$ .005	3.121 $\pm$ .009	9.722 $\pm$ .082				
MotionGPT♣[27]NeurIPS'23	×	0.492 $\pm$ .003	0.681 $\pm$ .003	0.733 $\pm$ .006	0.232 $\pm$ .008	3.096 $\pm$ .008	9.528 $\pm$ .071				
MotionChain♣[28]ECCV'24	×	0.504 $\pm$ .003	0.617 $\pm$ .002	0.790 $\pm$ .003	0.248 $\pm$ .009	3.033 $\pm$ .010	9.470 $\pm$ .075				
MG-MotionLLM♣[71]CVPR'25	×	0.516 $\pm$ .002	0.706 $\pm$ .002	0.802 $\pm$ .003	0.303 $\pm$ .010	2.952 $\pm$ .009	9.960 $\pm$ .073				
ViMoRAGI[75]NeurIPS'25	×	0.452 $\pm$ .014	0.655 $\pm$ .014	0.764 $\pm$ .013	0.131 $\pm$ .073	3.146 $\pm$ .015	9.424 $\pm$ .001				
MotionGPT-2(8B)♣[69]ArXiv'24	×	0.496 $\pm$ .002	0.691 $\pm$ .003	0.782 $\pm$ .004	0.191 $\pm$ .004	3.080 $\pm$ .013	9.860 $\pm$ .026				
MotionGPT-2(2B)♣[69]ArXiv'24	×	0.436	0.600	0.697	0.228	3.589	<b>10.081</b>				
MotionLLM [73]ICLR'25	×	0.515 $\pm$ .004	0.691 $\pm$ .003	0.801 $\pm$ .004	0.230 $\pm$ .009	2.967 $\pm$ .020	9.908 $\pm$ .102				
MotionLLM* [73]ICLR'25	×	0.496 $\pm$ .002	0.684 $\pm$ .002	0.782 $\pm$ .002	0.198 $\pm$ .006	3.029 $\pm$ .007	9.864 $\pm$ .007				
Ours (S1, w/ IRMoGen)♣	×	0.522 $\pm$ .003	0.711 $\pm$ .002	0.805 $\pm$ .002	0.135 $\pm$ .005	2.906 $\pm$ .009	9.740 $\pm$ .080				
Ours (S2, w/ IRMoGen)♣	×	0.526 $\pm$ .002	0.717 $\pm$ .002	0.810 $\pm$ .002	<b>0.111</b> $\pm$ .005	2.885 $\pm$ .008	9.819 $\pm$ .088				
Motion-R1♣[51]ArXiv'25	✓	0.515 $\pm$ .003	0.719 $\pm$ .002	0.818 $\pm$ .002	0.201 $\pm$ .004	2.854 $\pm$ .010	10.026 $\pm$ .075				
Ours (S3, w/ IRMoGen)♣	✓	<b>0.535</b> $\pm$ .002	<b>0.725</b> $\pm$ .002	<b>0.820</b> $\pm$ .002	0.242 $\pm$ .006	<b>2.785</b> $\pm$ .006	9.900 $\pm$ .094				
<b>KIT-ML Dataset</b>											
<b>Diffusion-based Motion Generator</b>											
MDM[65]ICLR'23	×	-	-	0.396 $\pm$ .004	0.497 $\pm$ .021	9.191 $\pm$ .022	10.85 $\pm$ .109				
MLD[4]CVPR'23	×	0.390 $\pm$ .008	0.609 $\pm$ .008	0.734 $\pm$ .007	0.404 $\pm$ .027	3.204 $\pm$ .027	10.800 $\pm$ .117				
MotionDiffuse[87]TPAMI'24	×	0.417 $\pm$ .004	0.621 $\pm$ .004	0.739 $\pm$ .004	1.954 $\pm$ .062	2.958 $\pm$ .005	<b>11.100</b> $\pm$ .143				
ReMoDiffuse[85]ICCV'23	×	<b>0.427</b> $\pm$ .014	<b>0.641</b> $\pm$ .004	<b>0.765</b> $\pm$ .055	<b>0.155</b> $\pm$ .006	<b>2.814</b> $\pm$ .012	10.800 $\pm$ .105				
<b>Mask-Modeling-based Motion Generator</b>											
MoMask[15]CVPR'24	×	0.433 $\pm$ .007	0.656 $\pm$ .005	0.781 $\pm$ .005	0.204 $\pm$ .011	2.779 $\pm$ .022	-				
MMM[56]CVPR'24	×	0.404 $\pm$ .005	0.621 $\pm$ .005	0.744 $\pm$ .004	0.316 $\pm$ .028	2.977 $\pm$ .019	10.910 $\pm$ .101				
BAMM[55]ECCV'24	×	0.438 $\pm$ .009	0.661 $\pm$ .009	0.788 $\pm$ .005	0.183 $\pm$ .013	2.723 $\pm$ .026	<b>11.008</b> $\pm$ .094				
MoGenST[80]NeurIPS'24	×	0.445 $\pm$ .006	0.671 $\pm$ .006	0.797 $\pm$ .005	0.143 $\pm$ .004	2.711 $\pm$ .024	10.918 $\pm$ .090				
LAMP[36]ICLR'25	×	<b>0.479</b> $\pm$ .006	<b>0.691</b> $\pm$ .005	<b>0.826</b> $\pm$ .005	<b>0.141</b> $\pm$ .013	<b>2.704</b> $\pm$ .018	10.929 $\pm$ .101				
<b>Motion-aware LLM</b>											
T2M-GPT[82]CVPR'23	×	0.416 $\pm$ .006	0.627 $\pm$ .006	0.745 $\pm$ .006	0.514 $\pm$ .029	3.007 $\pm$ .023	10.921 $\pm$ .108				
MotionGPT♣[27]NeurIPS'23	×	0.366 $\pm$ .005	0.558 $\pm$ .004	0.680 $\pm$ .005	0.510 $\pm$ .016	3.527 $\pm$ .021	10.350 $\pm$ .084				
MotionGPT-2(2B)♣[69]ArXiv'24	×	0.364	0.581	0.699	1.063	3.424	10.603				
MotionLLM§ [73]ICLR'25	×	0.416 $\pm$ .004	0.637 $\pm$ .004	0.746 $\pm$ .003	0.560 $\pm$ .025	3.001 $\pm$ .011	<b>11.209</b> $\pm$ .135				
Ours (S1, w/ IRMoGen)♣	×	0.425 $\pm$ .005	0.640 $\pm$ .004	0.754 $\pm$ .002	0.497 $\pm$ .021	2.877 $\pm$ .010	11.114 $\pm$ .095				
Ours (S2, w/ IRMoGen)♣	×	0.419 $\pm$ .006	0.642 $\pm$ .006	0.763 $\pm$ .005	0.389 $\pm$ .014	2.908 $\pm$ .026	11.096 $\pm$ .121				
Motion-R1♣[51]ArXiv'25	✓	0.431 $\pm$ .003	0.638 $\pm$ .002	0.761 $\pm$ .003	<b>0.287</b> $\pm$ .004	3.196 $\pm$ .040	10.875 $\pm$ .052				
Ours (S3, w/ IRMoGen)♣	✓	<b>0.445</b> $\pm$ .005	<b>0.681</b> $\pm$ .003	<b>0.781</b> $\pm$ .004	0.432 $\pm$ .013	<b>2.740</b> $\pm$ .017	11.115 $\pm$ .086				

Table 7. **Compared with existing methods on Text-to-Motion task.** Without specific noted, we use the results reported in the original papers. \*: We use the official weights of MotionLLM [73] as our base model for experiments on the HumanML3D dataset. §: We train our base model following the official codebase of MotionLLM [73] on the KIT-ML dataset. Models with ♣ support both text and motion outputs. We also report 95% confidence intervals if it is available in the original paper. We gray out results from models trained with much larger close-sourced dataset for fair comparisons.

## 12. More Experiment Results and Discussions

### 12.1. More Comparisons and Discussions on Text-to-Motion Generation Task.

In Tab. 7, we further compare our IRG-MotionLLM with methods with other frameworks on Text-to-Motion Genera-

Methods	Bleu-1↑	Bleu-4↑	Rouge↑	CIDEr↑	BERT↑
<i>w/ Task Specific Tuning</i>					
TM2T[14]	48.90	8.27	38.10	15.80	32.20
MG-MotionLLM[71]	-	8.06	-	-	36.70
LaMP[36]	47.80	13.04	37.10	28.90	32.70
MotionLLM[73]	54.53	17.65	<b>48.70</b>	33.74	42.63
MoTe[74]	46.70	11.15	37.40	31.50	30.30
MotionGPT3[91]	56.36	17.66	45.00	30.98	35.85
<i>w/o Task Specific Tuning</i>					
MotionGPT [27]	48.2	12.47	37.4	29.2	32.4
MotionChain [28]	48.1	12.56	33.9	33.7	36.9
MG-MotionLLM [71]	-	-	-	-	38.6
MotionGPT3[91]	59.08	19.41	46.17	28.72	35.23
Being-M0.5[3]	-	-	-	26.78	-
Ours (S1)	<b>62.05</b>	<b>22.53</b>	47.51	<b>52.4</b>	<b>42.68</b>

Table 8. **Compared with existing methods on Motion-to-Text Caption task on the HumanML3D dataset.** We follow the evaluation protocol as discussed in [27, 73] Our Stage-1 model outperforms other methods on most of the metrics.

tion task. **First**, IRG-MotionLLM significantly narrows the gap between UniMoLMs [27, 51, 69, 71] and generation-specific models (e.g., [36, 49]), achieving comparable results with the advanced mask-modeling-based motion generator (e.g., BAMM [55], MoGenST [80]). While there exists a gap between our approach and the most recent generation-specific method (*i.e.*, LAMP [36]), we note that it is not a challenge only in UniMoLM research [51, 71, 73]. In image generation and understanding domain [31, 83, 90], current unified VLMs also do not exhibit clear superiority over separate models in either understanding or generation tasks. Even so, we still believe exploring how to deeply link motion understanding with generation beyond simply training model on various independent tasks is highly valuable for both the UniMoLM and motion generation domains. **Second**, IRG-MotionLLM achieves comparable performance compared with methods trained on much larger close-source datasets [3, 70]. We believe our IRG-MotionLLM can also benefit from larger training data and advanced architectures.

## 12.2. Comparisons on Motion Caption Task.

We compare our Stage-1 model with existing methods on Motion-to-Text Caption Task. As shown in Tab. 8, our Stage-1 model achieves SoTA performance on Motion-to-Text Caption task without task-specific fine-tuning.

## 12.3. Impact of multiple round of refinement.

We dive deeper into the multi-round refinement process to show how the round of refinement affects the generation performance. As shown in Fig. 11, we constrain the maximum refinement rounds (see discussion in Sec. 9.2) of our Stage-3 model and visualize the performance on text-motion alignment metrics. By performing more rounds of refinement, the alignment between the generated motion and the goal text is consistently improved.




Figure 11. **Ablation studies on the maximum rounds of refinement on the HumanML3D dataset.** Allowing model to perform more rounds of refinement brings improvement on the alignment between generated results and the goal text.

## 12.4. Stage-3 Training: Unleashing the capacity or Hacking the evaluator?

In our Stage-3 training stage, we conduct GRPO-based RL tuning to further enhance the generation performance of our method. We follow previous works [48, 51] to select the reward model and strictly ensure there are no identical prompts between the RL data and the test set. However, as we use the official evaluator [13] as the reward model, an extreme question may be raised: *Does GRPO-based RL tuning in Stage-3 unleash the potential capacity or simply hack the evaluator?*

To answer this question, as shown in Tab. 5 of the main paper, we further compare our IRG-MotionLLM with existing methods by using a newly proposed T2M evaluator [49]. By performing Stage-3 training, our method achieves the improvement consistent with the results with original evaluator [13], and achieves SoTA performance compared with existing methods with various frameworks. These results suggest that Stage-3 training goes far beyond hacking the evaluator and unleashes the potential capacity of our IRG-MotionLLM.

## 12.5. Robust IRMoGen or Trajectory Dependency?

Previous studies [10, 33, 60] reveal that reasoning LLMs show vulnerability under adversarial attacks, *i.e.*, the reasoning LLMs suffer from significantly performance drop when introducing small perturbations to the prompts or previous CoT. These studies motivate us to raise a question: *Does IRG-MotionLLM perform robust IRMoGen or only response along a fixed reasoning trajectory?*

To answer this question, as shown in Fig. 12 we introduce perturbations to the native interleaved reasoning trajectory by replacing the first generated motion with a random sampled one (noted as *perturbation motion*) from the dataset. After that, we feed the *reasoning instruction, goal text*, together with the initial reasoning trajectory (contain-




Figure 12. **Inference pipeline for robustness evaluation.** Given the reasoning instruction and a goal text, we first obtain the native reasoning trajectory of our IRG-MotionLLM. After that, we replace the first generated motion in the native reasoning trajectory to a random sampled perturbation motion, then feed the perturbed initial trajectory (containing only the goal analysis and perturbation motion) together with the instruction and goal back to the model for further reasoning.

Methods	R-Precision $\uparrow$			FID $\downarrow$	MM-Dist $\downarrow$	Diversity $\uparrow$
	Top-1	Top-2	Top-3			
perturb. only	0.029	0.056	0.084	-	9.957	9.815
Ours (S3) w/ perturb.	0.526	0.716	0.810	<b>0.227</b>	2.826	9.874
Ours (S3)	<b>0.535</b>	<b>0.725</b>	<b>0.820</b>	0.242	<b>2.785</b>	<b>9.900</b>

Table 9. **Robustness evaluation of Interleaved Reasoning on the HumanML3D dataset.** Introducing the *perturbation motions* into the reasoning trajectory (w/ perturb.) only brings slight performance drop, which showcases the robustness of IRMoGen performed by our method. “perturb. only”: use the *perturbation motions* for evaluation.

ing only the *goal analysis* and *perturbation motion*) back our IRG-MotionLLM to perform further reasoning. We evaluate how the *perturbation motion* could influence the generation performance of our Stage-3 model.

As shown in Tab. 9, introducing *perturbation motions* to the reasoning trajectories only brings slight performance drop to our IRG-MotionLLM, which showcases the robustness of IRMoGen performed by our method. We provide qualitative visualizations on this study in Sec. 12.7.

## 12.6. Functioning IRG-MotionLLM as a Text-Motion Reward Model.

So far, we have shown that IRG-Motion performs robust evaluation on the alignment between the generated motion and goal text. However, one more question remains unresolved: *How can IRG-MotionLLM benefit existing motion generator?*

To answer this question, inspired by existing works on Reinforcement Learning from AI Feedback (RLAIF) [17, 43, 53, 84], we function our IRG-MotionLLM as a new reward model to evaluate the alignment between generated motion and the goal text, and use it to further enhance the existing motion generator. We then compare IRG-MotionLLM on all stages with other possible reward mod-

els on AToM-general Benchmark [17].

**Text-Motion Alignment Score Calculation.** Inspired by VQAScore [43], we calculate the text-motion alignment score based on the output probability of tokens that contain evaluation signals.

- For our *Stage-1* model, given the generated motion and the goal text, we ask the model to perform Motion Refinement Instructing task. After that, we compute the output probability of “*No*” on the first output token, and use it as the alignment score. The reason behind this strategy is that the model is trained to output “*No refinements needed.*” only when the given motion and goal text are perfectly aligned.

- For our *Stage-2* and *Stage-3* model, we first ask the model to perform native interleaved reasoning. After that, we use the same strategy as introduced in Sec. 12.5 and Fig. 12 to insert the generated motion into the reasoning trajectory. After that, we feed the reasoning instruction, goal text goal analysis, perturbation motion together with step plans and assessment prefix (“*Evaluation: The generated motion*”) to the model. Finally, we compute the output probability of “*perfectly*” on the first output token, and use it as the alignment score. The reason behind this strategy is that in Stage-2, model is trained to respond with “*Evaluation: The generated motion perfectly aligns with ...*” only when the given motion and goal text are perfectly aligned.

**Building Preference Pairs & Optimization.** Following AToM [17], we use MotionGPT [27] as the base model. We use the same goal text prompts as provided in official repository of AToM [17] to generate motions and build 3600 preference pairs based on the text-motion alignment scores. The optimization details are kept the same as the official implementation of AToM [17].

**Comparisons.** We compare our IRG-MotionLLM with

Methods	Reward Model	R-Precision↑		FID↓	MM-Dist↓	Diversity↑
		Top-1	Top-3			
MotionGPT	-	0.407	0.661	0.188	3.998	<b>9.452</b>
MotionGPT + RLAIF	GPT4o[24]	0.410	0.669	0.177	3.943	9.401
	MotionPatch[78]	0.414	0.683	0.164	3.792	9.364
	Ours (S1)	0.427	0.695	0.125	3.732	9.348
	Ours (S2)	0.427	0.694	<b>0.116</b>	3.736	9.346
	Ours (S3)	<b>0.429</b>	<b>0.698</b>	0.127	<b>3.700</b>	9.401

Table 10. **Evaluations with other possible reward models on AToM-general benchmark [17].** Following [17], we use MotionGPT [27] (initialized with the official weights) as the base model, and modify AToM framework with different possible reward models.

GPT-4o [24] (the reward model used in AToM [17]) and MotionPatch [78] (a SoTA text-motion retrieval model). As shown in Tab. 10, functioning IRG-MotionLLM as a text-motion reward model clearly enhances the baseline model performance on text-to-motion generation. Additionally, IRG-MotionLLM outperforms other possible reward models regardless of the training stage.

## 12.7. More Qualitative Results

**More native reasoning trajectories.** Fig. 14 shows the native reasoning trajectories (the planning steps are removed) of IRMoGen performed by our IRG-MotionLLM, showcasing its capacities of performing multi-round interleaved reasoning to capture the mis-alignment of the previous generated motion and finally generating a satisfactory motion.

**More robustness analysis.** As discussed in Sec. 12.5, we insert *perturbation motions* into the native reasoning trajectory to evaluate the robustness of our IRG-MotionLLM. Here we provide more qualitative results on this study. As shown in Fig. 15, even break the native reasoning trajectory, our IRG-MotionLLM can still perform accurate assessment on the perturbation motion, and refine the motion until it has reached the goal.

**Failure analysis.** While our IRG-MotionLLM shows strong performance with extensive quantitative and qualitative results, it may fail on highly complex the goal text. Fig. 16 shows one of these cases. The goal text requires the model to generate a motion sequence including four sub-actions in a specific order. As shown in the upper part of Fig. 16, although our IRG-MotionLLM obtains a three-round refined motion which is much more aligned with the goal than previous generated motions, it still misses the action of “*scratching the head*”. However, we note that generating perfect motion to such complex goal text is also challenging for existing advanced methods [15, 49, 73].

## 13. Limitations and Future works

**IRMoGen with Advanced UniMoLM Frameworks.** In this work, we take the first step to explore the novel IRMoGen paradigm within a general VQ-based motion-aware

LLM framework. While this architecture elegantly supports IRMoGen via the LLM’s autoregressive nature and enables fair comparisons with existing UniMoLMs, it still has limitations. For example, the vanilla VQVAE may lose fine-grained motion details. To address this, building IRG-MotionLLM with advanced VQVAEs (e.g., RVQ [15]) can be valuable extension. On the other hand, a concurrent work MotionGPT3 [91] adopts a Mix-of-Transformers architecture [38] to learn modality-aware knowledge with separate branches, so that the gap between symbolic sequences and continuous trajectories can be bridged. We believe exploring IRMoGen on such novel architectures is also a valuable direction for future research.

**Motion Assessment Beyond Text-Motion Alignment.** Our primary focus is on linking generation with motion assessment and refinement to enhance alignment between motions and goal texts, and our experiments demonstrate the method’s effectiveness. However, beyond text-motion alignment, aspects like physical plausibility and smoothness are also crucial for motion generation. Recently, MotionCritic [67] proposes to train an additional model to provide quantitative scores for motion realism. However, how to endow UniMoLMs with native physical realism assessment to optimize the IRMoGen process remains a worthwhile avenue for exploration. Also, introducing rewards related to physical realism during the Stage-3 training of IRG-MotionLLM is a meaningful future endeavor.

**Scaling Up IRG-MotionLLM.** We build our IRG-MotionLLM using a 2B LLM and conduct extensive experiments on the popular motion-text datasets, HumanML3D [13] and KIT-ML [57], to thoroughly validate the model’s efficacy. Nevertheless, the limited dataset and model sizes may constrain generalization. We believe scaling up IRG-MotionLLM with larger foundation LLMs and training on larger text-motion datasets (e.g., MotionMillion [7], ViMoGen [41]) will further enhance its interleaved reasoning abilities across a wider variety of target texts. We leave these explorations for future work.

**SYSTEM\_PROMPT:**

You are an assistant who helps users understand or generate 3D human motion representations.

**USER\_PROMPT:**

Given a goal text describing a desired human motion, use a multi-step approach to accomplish the motion: (1) parse the goal text, articulating the reasoning to highlight key components; (2) iterate through motion generation and self-evaluation until the motion satisfies the goal. Include all responses within `<think>` and `</think>` tags, and prepare a plan before each step.

Goal Text: a person walks with both arms extended out in front of him in a near complete backward S pattern.

**RESPONSE:**

`<think>`

**[Plan]** I need to analyze the goal and identify the critical aspects to generate the motion. **[/Plan]**

**[Analysis]** The key aspects include maintaining a natural walking rhythm, holding the arms rigidly outstretched in front, and tracing a clear backward S-shaped path. **[/Analysis]**

**[Plan]** I need to generate a motion according to the previous analysis. **[/Plan]**

**[Generation]** <Intermediate-Motion-1> **[/Generation]**

**[Plan]** I need to assess the alignment between the generated motion and the goal text, then provide specific refinement instructions for improvement. **[/Plan]**

**[Assessment]** **Evaluation:** The generated motion is focused on sliding, dancing-like arm movements, and diagonal or lateral movement, which does not align with the goal of walking in a near complete backward 'S' pattern with both arms extended out in front. **Refinement:** Ensure the motion includes a clear walking sequence in a near complete backward 'S' pattern, and focus on having both arms consistently extended out in front during the entire motion. **[/Assess]**

**[Plan]** I need to generate a motion according to the previous analysis. **[/Plan]**

**[Generation]** <Intermediate-Motion-2> **[/Generation]**

**[plan]** I need to assess the alignment between the generated motion and the goal text, then provide specific refinement instructions for improvement. **[/plan]**

**[Assessment]** **Evaluation:** The generated motion involves walking in circles, often with arms raised or near the head, which does not align with walking in a near complete backward S pattern with both arms extended in front. **Refinement:** Modify the walking motion to follow a backward S-shaped path, ensure the arms are fully extended forward in front throughout the motion, and avoid circular or elevated arm gestures. **[/Assessment]**

**[Plan]** I need to generate a motion according to the previous analysis. **[/Plan]**

**[Generation]** <Intermediate-Motion-3> **[/Generation]**

**[Plan]** I need to assess the alignment between the generated motion and the goal text, then provide specific refinement instructions for improvement. **[/Plan]**

**[Assessment]** **Evaluation:** The generated motion features a person walking forward with raised or lifted arms but fails to include walking in a near complete backward S pattern, as well as the specific positioning of both arms extended directly out in front. **Refinement:** Ensure the motion incorporates walking along a backward S-shaped path, with both arms fully extended out in front and maintaining that position throughout the movement. **[/Assessment]**

**[Plan]** I need to generate a motion according to the previous analysis. **[/Plan]**

**[Generation]** <Final-Motion> **[/Generation]**

**[Plan]** I need to assess the alignment between the generated motion and the goal text, then provide specific refinement instructions for improvement. **[/Plan]**

**[Assessment]** **Evaluation:** The generated motion perfectly matches the prompt, depicting a person walking slowly in an elongated S-shape with straight legs and outstretched arms, accurately resembling a mummy or zombie walk. **Refinement:** No refinements needed. **[/Assessment]**

**[Plan]** I need to finish thinking as the satisfactory motion is generated. **[/Plan]**

`</think>`






Figure 13. Visualization of the IRMoGen-CoT data for Stage-2 training.

#### Goal Text: A person is walking straight backwards



#### Goal Text: person walks forward as though walking on a runway, turns and walks back



#### Goal Text: A person jumps up and down




Figure 14. More native interleaved reasoning trajectories of IRG-MotionLLM. Our method performs multi-round interleaved reasoning to capture the mis-alignment of the previous generated motion and finally generate a satisfactory motion. The planning steps are removed. Zoom in for best view.

### Goal Text: a man walks forward before stumbling backwards and the continues walking forward.

The motion should begin with a steady forward walk, followed by a noticeable stumble or loss of balance, and conclude with a recovery phase where the person resumes walking forward.



**Evaluation:** The generated motion involves actions such as **bending over**, **rubbing**, and **standing up**, which do not align with the goal of walking forward, stumbling backward, and continuing forward.

**Refinement:** Replace the bending and rubbing actions with a sequence where the person walks forward, stumbles slightly backward, and then continues walking forward in a natural manner.



**Evaluation:** The generated motion depicts a person walking forward and then being pushed to the left side, causing them to stumble and move backward. This does not align with the goal of stumbling backward while walking forward and then continuing to walk forward.

**Refinement:** Modify the motion to show the person walking forward, stumbling backward due to a loss of balance, and then continuing to walk forward.



Here we prune the original reasoning trajectory and insert a randomly sampled **perturbation motion**


### Goal Text: a person bends down, picks something up, then moves his hand around and sets the item down.

The motion should be a seamless sequence of four actions: bending down to reach the object, picking it up with a deliberate hand movement, performing a brief hand action to suggest interaction or examination, and finally placing the object down with care.



**Evaluation:** The generated motion involves **bending over and crawling on hands and knees**, which does not align with the goal of picking something up, moving the hand around, and setting the item down.

**Refinement:** Replace the crawling motion with a sequence where the person bends down, picks up an item with their hand, moves their hand around as if inspecting or handling it, and then sets the item down.



### Goal Text: a person is holding his arms straight out to the sides then lowers them, claps, and steps forward to sit in a chair.

The motion should be a sequence of four distinct actions: first, the arms are extended straight out to the sides; second, they are lowered; third, a clear clap is performed; and fourth, a forward step is taken to sit down, emphasizing a smooth and deliberate transition.



**Evaluation:** The generated motion involves **swaying, waving arms, and gestures**, but it does not align with the goal of holding arms straight out to the sides, lowering them, clapping, and stepping forward to sit in a chair.

**Refinement:** Replace the swaying and waving motions with a clear sequence where the person holds their arms straight out to the sides, lowers them, claps once, and then steps forward to sit down in a chair.




Figure 15. **Qualitative results on robustness evaluation.** Our IRG-MotionLLM can also perform accurate motion assessment on randomly sampled **perturbation motions**, and refine the motion until it has reached the goal.

### Goal Text: a man crouches, stands back up, scratches his head, and crouches again.






Figure 16. **Our IRG-MotionLLM may fail on highly complex goal text.** Although our IRG-MotionLLM produces a three-round refined motion which is much more aligned with the goal than previous generated motions, it still misses the action of “scratching his head”. However, we note that generating perfect motion to such complex goal text is also challenging for existing methods [15, 49, 73].