

# MoVer: Motion Verification for Motion Graphics Animations

JIAJU MA, Stanford University, USA

MANEESH AGRAWALA, Stanford University, USA

## Text prompt

```
<svg> ... </svg>
Move the orange circle above the rectangular shape.
In the meantime, rotate the letter H clockwise by 90 degrees.
```

## MoVer program

```
o1 =  $\tau$ .clr(o,"orange")\Ashp(o,"circle") # check for an orange circle
o2 =  $\tau$ .shp(o,"rectangle") # check for a rectangle
o3 =  $\tau$ .id(o,"H") # check for the id "H"
# check for a translation by the circle to the top of the rectangle
m1 =  $\tau$ .type(m,"trn")\Aagt(m,o1)\Apost(m,top(o1,o2))
# check for a clockwise rotation of 90 degrees by "H"
m2 =  $\tau$ .type(m,"rot")\Aagt(m,o3)\Adir(m,"cw")\Amag(m,90)
# assert that the translation and the rotation overlap in time
while(m1,m2)
```

## MoVer verification report

```
m1 =  $\tau$ .type(m,"trn")\Aagt(m,o1)\Apost(m,top(o1,o2)) false
top(o1,o2) false
post(m,top(o1,o2)) false
m2 =  $\tau$ .type(m,"rot")\Aagt(m,o3)\Adir(m,"cw")\Amag(m,90) true
while(m1,m2) false
```

## Generated motion graphics animation




Fig. 1. We present MoVer, a motion verification DSL, and apply it in an LLM-based motion graphics synthesis pipeline. Given a text prompt (top left) describing a desired animation (with a static SVG scene for context) our pipeline synthesizes both (1) an SVG motion graphics animation (right) and (2) a corresponding MoVer verification program (middle left) that captures spatio-temporal properties mentioned in the prompt as first-order logic predicates. Executing the MoVer program on the animation produces a verification report (bottom left) that specifies which motions and predicates the animation includes (marked true) and which it does not (marked false). Here,  $m_1$  is false because the circle motion does not end at the top of the rectangle. Motion  $m_2$  is true because the H correctly rotates 90 degrees counterclockwise. The `while()` predicate is false because  $m_1$  is invalid. Our pipeline can automatically feed the verification report back to the LLM-based animation synthesizer to iteratively correct the animation or users can examine the report to facilitate their debugging process.

While large vision-language models can generate motion graphics animations from text prompts, they regularly fail to include all spatio-temporal properties described in the prompt. We introduce MoVer, a motion verification DSL based on first-order logic that can check spatio-temporal properties of a motion graphics animation. We identify a general set of such properties that people commonly use to describe animations (e.g., the direction and timing of motions, the relative positioning of objects, etc.). We implement these properties as predicates in MoVer and provide an execution engine that can apply a MoVer program to any input SVG-based motion graphics animation. We then demonstrate how MoVer can be used in an LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline for iteratively refining motion graphics animations. Given a text prompt, our pipeline synthesizes a motion graphics animation and a corresponding MoVer program. Executing the verification program on the animation yields a report of the predicates that failed and the report can be automatically fed back to LLM to iteratively correct the animation. To evaluate our pipeline, we build a synthetic dataset of 5600 text prompts paired with ground truth MoVer verification programs. We find that while our LLM-based pipeline is able to automatically generate a correct motion graphics animation for 58.8% of the test prompts without

any iteration, this number raises to 93.6% with up to 50 correction iterations. Our code and dataset are at <https://mover-dsl.github.io>.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Graphics systems and interfaces**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: verification, iterative refinement, large language models, motion graphics, visual programs, SVG

## ACM Reference Format:

Jiaju Ma and Maneesh Agrawala. 2025. MoVer: Motion Verification for Motion Graphics Animations. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 44, 4 (August 2025), 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3731209>

## 1 Introduction

Advances in large vision-language models have yielded powerful tools for visual content creation via program synthesis. These models can take a natural language text prompt as input and generate program code in a domain specific language (e.g., SVG, CAD, etc.) that is then executed to produce visual output including images [Gupta and Kembhavi 2023], vector graphics [Polaczek et al. 2025; Xing et al. 2024a], 3D scenes and CAD [Hu et al. 2025; Khan et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2024], and animation [Gal et al. 2024; Liu et al. 2025; Tseng et al. 2024]. Yet, automatically verifying that the resulting program produces *correct* visual output—output that matches the specification given in the prompt—remains a challenging task.

In some visual domains like image generation, researchers have explored automatic verification via concept matching between the input prompt and the output image [Cho et al. 2024; Hessel et al.

Authors' Contact Information: Jiaju Ma, Stanford University, USA, [jiajuma@cs.stanford.edu](mailto:jiajuma@cs.stanford.edu); Maneesh Agrawala, Stanford University, USA, [maneesh@cs.stanford.edu](mailto:maneesh@cs.stanford.edu).

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. ACM 1557-7368/2025/8-ART <https://doi.org/10.1145/3731209>

2021; Hu et al. 2023; Johnson et al. 2017; Lee et al. 2023]. This approach relies on access to concept detectors for both the natural language prompt and for the output visual asset. More importantly, the detected concepts must be relevant to the desired properties of the generated content. Verifying the prompt “A horse sitting on an astronaut” might require concept detectors for the entities “horse” and “astronaut” and the spatial relationship “sitting on”.

Here we focus on such automated verification for 2D motion graphics animations. We first present **MoVer**, a **Motion Verification DSL**, that is based on first-order logic and can be used to check properties of the spatio-temporal trajectories of objects in an animation. More specifically, in MoVer, checks are written as logic statements constructed from predicates that verify the presence of specific spatio-temporal properties such as the direction, the magnitude, or the type (e.g., translation, rotation, scale) of motions of an object. We identify relevant spatio-temporal concepts based on prior work from cognitive psychology that has investigated how people think about relationships between objects and their motions in animation [Talmy 1975, 1983; Tversky and Lee 1998]. We show how to implement these concepts as MoVer predicates using Allen’s [1983] temporal interval algebra and its 2D spatial counterpart, the rectangle algebra [Balbiani et al. 1998; Navarrete et al. 2013].

We then demonstrate how MoVer can be applied in an LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline to iteratively produce motion graphics animation that accurately match an input text prompt. Given a text prompt specifying a desired animation (with a static SVG scene for context), we use in-context LLM-based program synthesis [Gupta and Kembhavi 2023; Surís et al. 2023] to produce (1) a motion graphics animation (as an SVG motion program) and (2) a corresponding MoVer verification program. Executing the MoVer program on the corresponding motion graphics animation results in a report pinpointing the spatio-temporal predicates the animation successfully passes and fails (Figure 1). Users can use the report to manually fix the animation program, or automatically feed it back to our LLM-based pipeline for iterative correction.

To evaluate our synthesis and verification pipeline, we build a synthetic text dataset of 5600 natural language text prompts describing motion graphics animations, paired with ground truth MoVer verification programs. We find that our LLM-based pipeline can synthesize correct MoVer programs for 95.1% of the test prompts. We also find that using the automatic correction iteration capability of our pipeline increases the number of correct animations from 58.8% (with no iterations) to 93.6% (up to 50 iterations). Our code and dataset are available at <https://mover-dsl.github.io>.

## 2 Related Work

**Text-to-animation.** Generating animations from a natural language prompt has been a long standing challenge in computer graphics [Bouali and Cavalli-Sforza 2023]. Early text-to-animation methods often used rule-based natural language processing techniques such as regular expression parsing, co-reference resolution, and sentence simplification to map the prompt to a semantic representation (e.g. a scene graph) that is rendered into an animation [Åkerberg et al. 2003; Badler et al. 1999; Ma 2006; Marti et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2019]. While effective for specialized domains such as posing virtual

humans [Badler et al. 1999] or simulating car accidents [Åkerberg et al. 2003], such methods typically require many special case rules to handle the ambiguity of general natural language.

In the current era of large generative AI models, researchers have explored end-to-end methods for directly generating animation from text prompts without passing through a semantic representation [Chen et al. 2024; Gal et al. 2024; Guo et al. 2023a,b; Xing et al. 2024b]. While these end-to-end methods can generate impressive animations, they regularly fail to capture all of the desired spatio-temporal properties mentioned in the text prompt. In contrast, we focus on automatically verifying such properties in synthesized motion graphics animations.

**LLM-based program synthesis.** Our work builds on recent techniques that use LLMs for program synthesis via in-context learning [Gupta and Kembhavi 2023; Surís et al. 2023]. These methods typically provide language documentation with code examples (pairs of text prompts with corresponding programs) as part of the system prompt context. The approach has been applied in a variety of visual synthesis domains including images [Gupta and Kembhavi 2023], vector graphics [Xing et al. 2024a], 3D scenes [Zhang et al. 2024], CAD [Jones et al. 2025], and human motion animation [Goel et al. 2024]. Closest to our work are Keyframer [Tseng et al. 2024] and LogoMotion [Liu et al. 2025] which apply this LLM-based program synthesis approach to the problem of generating 2D vector animations. While all these methods generate a human-editable program representation for the visual content, none of them provide automated verification capable of checking that the resulting visuals match the prompt specification. It remains up to the user to manually identify mismatches and fix the resulting program or to update their prompt and try again. Our work aims to close this gap in the context of motion graphics by providing automated verification and thereby allowing the LLM to iteratively correct the animation without user intervention.

**Visual verification.** Our work is inspired by recent efforts that use visual question answering (VQA) models to check that properties mentioned in an input prompt appear in diffusion generated images [Cho et al. 2024; Hu et al. 2023; Johnson et al. 2017]. For example, these methods convert the image generation prompt “A tree behind a motorcycle” into a series of natural language questions like “Does the image contain a tree?” and “Is the tree behind the motorcycle?” and use a VQA model to report the answer to each one. The answers can then be converted into a score or examined individually by users. Design2Code [Si et al. 2024], on the other hand, proposes a set of automatic metrics for evaluating webpage generation quality. DreamSync [Sun et al. 2024] incorporates the VQA-based review of visual outputs into an iterative optimization loop where the output from VQA model is automatically fed back to the image generating model. SceneCraft [Hu et al. 2025] and LLMR [De La Torre et al. 2024] apply this optimization approach in the context of 3D and VR scene generation respectively, using LLM-based question answering. Our work similarly provides an iterative optimization loop for motion graphics animation, but, instead of a VQA model, it uses an LLM to convert the prompt into a first-order logic based verification language.

Table 1. The MoVer language provides logic predicates that checks for the fulfillment of various spatio-temporal properties of objects and motions in an input animation. Note that each object and motion attribute predicate has a corresponding accessor form (e.g. `get_shp()`) that returns the value of that attribute.

Name	Syntax	Description
variables	$o_i, m_j$	Variables that represent objects and motions in the animation scene
<i>Logical operators</i>		
$\forall, \exists$	<code>exists(var, expr)</code>	<code>expr</code> is a logical statement, and <code>var</code> is an object or motion. Returns true if there is an assignment of <code>var</code> that satisfies <code>expr</code> .
$\iota$	<code>iota(var, expr)</code>	Returns an object or motion that satisfies <code>expr</code> and assign it to <code>var</code> .
$\mathbf{A}$	<code>all(var, expr)</code>	Return all objects or motions that satisfy <code>expr</code> and assign it to <code>var</code> .
$\neg$	<code>not expr</code>	Compute the negation of <code>expr</code> .
$\wedge, \vee$	<code>expr<sub>1</sub> and expr<sub>2</sub></code>	Compute the conjunction or disjunction of <code>expr<sub>1</sub></code> and <code>expr<sub>2</sub></code>
<i>Object attribute predicates</i>		
shape	<code>shp(<math>o_i</math>, shp_val)</code>	Returns true if $o_i$ has the shape specified by <code>shp_val</code> , and false otherwise.
color	<code>clr(<math>o_i</math>, clr_val)</code>	Returns true if $o_i$ has the color specified by <code>clr_val</code> , and false otherwise.
id	<code>id(<math>o_i</math>, id_val)</code>	Returns true if $o_i$ has the id specified by <code>id_val</code> , and false otherwise.
<i>Atomic motion attribute predicates</i>		
agent	<code>agt(<math>m_j</math>, <math>o_i</math>)</code>	Returns a vector $V$ of booleans (one per frame). If $o_i$ performs $m_j$ at frame $n$ , then $v_n \in V$ is true, and false otherwise.
type	<code>type(<math>m_j</math>, type_val)</code>	If $m_j$ has motion type of <code>type_val</code> (either <code>trn</code> , <code>rot</code> , or <code>scl</code> ) at frame $n$ , then $v_n \in V$ is true, and false otherwise.
direction	<code>dir(<math>m_j</math>, dir_val)</code>	If $m_j$ is in the direction <code>dir_val</code> at frame $n$ , then $v_n \in V$ is true, and false otherwise.
magnitude	<code>mag(<math>m_j</math>, mag_val)</code>	If $m_j$ reaches the magnitude <code>mag_val</code> over a sequence of frames $m, \dots, n$ , then $v_m, \dots, v_n \in V$ are true, and false otherwise.
origin	<code>orig(<math>m_j</math>, orig_val)</code>	If $m_j$ is performed around the origin <code>orig_val</code> at frame $n$ , then $v_n \in V$ is true, and false otherwise.
duration	<code>dur(<math>m_j</math>, dur_val)</code>	If $m_j$ lasts the duration <code>dur_val</code> over the sequence of frames, $m, \dots, n$ , then $v_m, \dots, v_n \in V$ are true, and false otherwise.
post	<code>post(<math>m_j</math>, expr)</code>	If <code>expr</code> evaluates to true on the last frame of $m_j$ , then $v_n \in V$ is true for all frames of $m_j$ , and false otherwise.
<i>Spatial and temporal relative predicates</i>		
temporal relative	<code>&lt;tmp_rel&gt;(<math>m_j</math>, <math>m_j</math>)</code>	<code>&lt;tmp_rel&gt;</code> is one of the 13 Allen's interval algebra predicates or aggregations of them (Figure 2 top). Returns true if the time intervals of $m_j$ and $m_j$ satisfy <code>&lt;tmp_rel&gt;</code> . MoVer includes three aggregated temporal predicates: <code>before()</code> , <code>while()</code> , and <code>after()</code> .
spatial relative	<code>&lt;spt_rel&gt;(<math>o_i</math>, <math>o_j</math>)</code>	<code>&lt;spt_rel&gt;</code> is one of the 169 rectangle algebra predicates or aggregations of them (Figure 2 bottom). Returns true if the spatial positions of $o_i$ and $o_j$ satisfy <code>&lt;spt_rel&gt;</code> . MoVer implements ten aggregated predicates: <code>top()</code> , <code>bottom()</code> , <code>left()</code> , <code>right()</code> , <code>border()</code> , <code>intersect()</code> , <code>top_border()</code> , <code>bottom_border()</code> , <code>left_border()</code> , and <code>right_border()</code> .

**Mapping language into formal logical specifications.** One approach to representing the semantic meaning of natural language expressions is to map the expression into formal logical specifications. For example, Artzi et al. [2013] show how to map English language navigational phrases such as “move to the chair” to a corresponding logical form  $\lambda a. \text{move}(a) \wedge \text{to}(a, ix. \text{chair}(x))$ . Researchers have explored this mapping approach in the context of instructing robotic manipulators [Wang et al. 2023], VQA [Hsu et al. 2024] and guidance for text-to-image generation [Sueyoshi and Matsubara 2024]. These methods often use specialized semantic parsing techniques [Kamath and Das 2018] to convert natural language into the formal logic. While our MoVer verification language is also based on formal, first-order logic, we use the program synthesis capabilities of an LLM to map prompts to MoVer predicates. We show that our LLM-based approach handles a wider variety of inputs than a rule-based semantic parser.

### 3 MoVer: A Motion Verification DSL

MoVer is a domain specific language for verifying that certain spatio-temporal concepts appear in a motion graphics animation. We first consider the design of the MoVer language (Section 3.1) and then describe how we execute a MoVer verification program (Section 3.2).

#### 3.1 MoVer Language Design

We designed MoVer based on prior work from cognitive psychology that has analyzed how people think about and describe spatio-temporal properties and relationships in animated scenes [Talmy 1975, 1983; Tversky and Lee 1998]. This work shows that linguistic descriptions of animation schematize the information to emphasize only the most salient aspects of the motions of each object. People break complex trajectories into basic motions; they individually describe the translation, rotation, and scaling of an object even when

all three occur simultaneously. People also commonly use relative frames of reference rather than absolute frames, e.g. saying “Move the circle above the square after rotating the triangle.” instead of “Move the circle to (100,100) starting at second 5.0”.

In MoVer, spatio-temporal concepts are expressed as first-order logic predicates (boolean functions) over variables representing objects  $o_i \in \mathbf{O}$  and their motions  $m_j \in \mathbf{M}$  (Table 1). MoVer treats seven attributes as *atomic* descriptions of a motion  $m_j$ :

- (1) **agt** The agent object  $o_i$  performing motion  $m_j$ .
- (2) **type** The motion type of  $m_j$ : “translation,” “rotation,” or “scale”.
- (3) **dir** The direction of motion  $m_j$ .
- (4) **mag** The magnitude or distance of motion  $m_j$ .
- (5) **orig** The origin of motion  $m_j$  when type is rotation or scale.
- (6) **dur** The duration of motion  $m_j$ .
- (7) **post** A postcondition the end state of motion  $m_j$  must satisfy.

MoVer includes predicates that can check the values for each of these attributes. For example, the predicate `dir( $m_j$ , [1, 0])` returns true for each frame where motion  $m_j$  is along the direction vector [1, 0] (i.e., rightwards). We can combine individual predicates into a complete logic statement to check whether an animation contains a motion  $m$  with a set of *atomic* properties as

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists m. \text{type}(m, \text{"trn"}) \wedge \text{dir}(m, [0, 1]) \wedge \text{mag}(m, 100) \\ &\wedge \text{agt}(m, io. \text{clr}(o, \text{"black"}) \wedge \text{shp}(o, \text{"square"})). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

This statement returns true for frames containing a motion where a black square-shaped object is translating upwards by 100 px.

MoVer also includes predicates that can check relative spatio-temporal relationships between motions. These predicates are based on Allen's [1983] temporal interval algebra and its 2D analog, the rectangle algebra [Balbiani et al. 1998; Navarrete et al. 2013]. These algebras provide a formal representation for 13 temporally relative relationships and 169 spatially relative relationships (Figure 2) and




Fig. 2. (top) The 13 low-level temporally relative predicates in Allen's interval algebra and the three aggregated predicates (disjunctions of the low level predicates) in MoVer: before(), while(), and after(). (bottom) The 169 spatially relative predicates in the rectangle algebra and four of the aggregated predicates in MoVer. MoVer implements 10 spatially relative aggregated predicates: top(), bottom(), left(), right(), border(), intersect(), top\_border(), bottom\_border(), left\_border(), and right\_border() as sub-regions of this table.

MoVer includes predicates that can check for all of them. In addition, MoVer aggregates certain relative predicates together with disjunction to form higher-level relative predicates to better accommodate for natural language's inherent ambiguity. For example, the higher-level aggregated temporal predicate while( $m_i, m_j$ ) (Figure 2 top) returns true for each frame where both  $m_i$  and  $m_j$  occur at the same time and aggregates nine lower-level Allen algebra predicates. Similarly, the aggregated spatial predicate top( $o_i, o_j$ ) returns true as long as the top edge of object  $o_i$  is above the top edge of  $o_j$  and aggregates 52 lower-level rectangle algebra predicates.

### 3.2 MoVer Execution Engine

We have implemented an execution engine for MoVer that can check whether a motion graphics animation is consistent with a MoVer program. It computes the set of frames that evaluate to false with respect to each logical statement and predicate in the verification program and outputs a verification report for each such expression (an example report is Figure 1 bottom left).

The MoVer execution engine operates on a generic, frame-level SVG representation of motion graphics animations. Specifically,

each foreground object is represented as an SVG <shape>, <g>, or <image> node with motion transforms specified per-frame. This SVG motion program representation is similar to that used by Zhang et al. [2023], and many high-level animation APIs, including CSS [MozDevNet 2025], anime.js [Garnier 2025], and GSAP [Doyle 2025], support rendering an animation into this type of per-frame SVG representation.


Given such an SVG motion program, our execution engine first builds a 2D *animation matrix* data structure where each row represents an object and each column represents a frame of the animation. In each cell ( $i, j$ ) of the animation matrix we store all atomic motion attributes (Section 3.1), except post, for object  $o_i$  at frame  $j$ . We compute these motion attributes by first factoring the per-frame transformation matrix of each object into a translation, rotation, and scale [Thomas 1991] and then depending on the type of motion, computing a direction, magnitude, and origin. We separately store static information for each object such as its color, shape, and bounding box in object local coordinates.

With these data structures in place, we implement our DSL as follows. We execute each logical predicate in the verification program on each cell of the animation matrix. We mark the cell as true if the predicate is satisfied and false otherwise. Thus each predicate produces a boolean matrix with the same shape as the animation matrix. For example, executing the predicate type( $m, "rot"$ ) sets matrix cell ( $i, j$ ) to true if object  $o_i$  has a non-zero rotation angle in frame  $j$ . Similarly, executing the predicate shp( $o_i, "square"$ ) sets the entire matrix row ( $i, *$ ) to true if object  $o_i$  is square-shaped. A predicate expression (i.e., expr) combines the results of multiple predicates by applying logical boolean operators (e.g.,  $\wedge, \vee, \neg$ ) element-wise on the predicate matrices. We can check logical quantifiers (e.g.,  $\exists, \forall$ ) by aggregating the boolean matrices. Finally, the  $\iota$  operator returns an object  $o_i$  or motion  $m_j$  for which a logical expression expr holds. We compute the expression on the animation matrix, identify a row for which the expression holds for at least one frame, and return the row index (if an object is requested) or the row itself (if a motion is requested).

While many predicates primarily involve looking up information in the animation and object data structures, temporal and spatial predicates based on the interval and rectangle algebras are more complex. These require comparisons between the starting and ending frames of the motions or between the relative positions and overlaps of the bounding boxes of the objects (Figure 1). An interval tree representation [Cormen et al. 2022] of the motions (2D intervals per-frame for spatial predicates, frame discretized 1D intervals for temporal predicates) enables efficient execution of these predicates.

## 4 LLM-Based Motion Program Synthesis and Verification

We leverage MoVer within an motion graphics synthesis and verification pipeline. It takes as input a text prompt describing the



desired animation along with a static SVG that sets the scene context for the prompt. It uses LLM-based program synthesis to pro-




Fig. 3. The input text prompt (top left) aims to move the Y and the S so that they touch the E on either side. The verification report (bottom left) shows that, although the Y does border the left side of E on frame 80 and `left_border()` evaluates to true, it continues its rightward motion  $m_1$  until frame 120, and so the `post()` predicate fails. Although  $m_2$ , the motion of S, successfully borders the right side of E, the `before()` predicate fails because  $m_1$  is false.




Fig. 4. Our pipeline automatically feeds the verification report (Figure 3) back to the LLM animation synthesizer to correct the animation. On the first iteration, the motion of Y correctly ends adjacent to the left side of E at frame 120. But the motion incorrectly overlaps in time with the motion of S. On the second correction iteration, the sequencing of the motions is correctly updated so that Y moves first (frames 1-60) before S (frames 61-120).

duce two programs; (1) the *animation synthesizer* produces a motion graphics animation program written in a high-level animation API (GSAP [Doyle 2025] in our implementation) and (2) the *MoVer synthesizer* generates a corresponding MoVer verification program. In both cases we follow the LLM-based in-context learning approach for program synthesis [Gupta and Kembhavi 2023; Suris et al. 2023], where we prompt GPT-4o [Hurst et al. 2024] with annotated API or DSL documentation and examples of text prompts paired with corresponding output programs (Appendix A gives the prompts used in our implementation).

We render the resulting motion graphics animation into the generic per-frame SVG motion program representation (Section 3.2). Then we execute the MoVer program on the SVG motion program to check that spatio-temporal properties mentioned in the prompt appear in the animation. The output is a verification report specifying which spatio-temporal properties appear in the animation and which do not. If the verification report indicates a failure, our pipeline can automatically send the report back to the animation synthesizer and request it to update the motion graphics animation, thereby supporting iterative correction. Note that when the feedback is automatically sent back to the LLM, we include the documentation of our MoVer DSL in the prompt so it can interpret the error report (Appendix A.3). In addition, a human user can examine the verification report and either manually fix the motion program,

or filter the feedback sent to the LLM. On each iteration, the LLM animation synthesizer has access to all previous animations it has generated and the corresponding verification reports in its chat history to help it make corrections.

## 5 Results

Figures 1, 3, 5 and 6 show examples of motion graphics animations generated with our synthesis and verification pipeline (more examples can be found at <https://mover-dsl.github.io>).

In Figure 1, the prompt asks for an upward translation of the orange circle above the rectangle and a 90-degree rotation of the letter H with both motions overlapping in time. The intention is that the animation should end after the shapes form the word "Hi." While the LLM-generated MoVer program captures the spatio-temporal properties described in the prompt, the LLM-generated animation does not. As shown in the animation frames and found by the verification report, there is no valid motion  $m_1$ , where the circle translates to the top of the rectangle, and so both `top()` and `post()` are false. A valid  $m_2$  is found as the letter H was rotated by 90 degrees clockwise. However, since  $m_1$  fails, the temporal predicate `while()` also fails since one of its input motions is invalid.

In Figure 3, the prompt describes a series of motions that aim to move the letters Y and S adjacent to the letter E. The MoVer program captures these desired properties and the verification report

**Text prompt**

```
<svg>...</svg>
Scale the yellow letter H from its top center in y to touch the top side of the red letter A. Then scale yellow H back down to 1. As the H scales down, scale the red letter A up in y from its bottom center to touch the bottom side of the yellow letter H. Then scale the red A back down to 1. As the yellow letter H scales up, resize the pink letter H up in y from its bottom center to touch the bottom side of the blue letter A. Then scale the pink H back down to 1. As the pink H scales down, resize the blue letter A up in y from its top center to touch the top side of the pink letter H. Then scale the blue A back down to 1.
```

**MoVer program**

```
o1 = r.id(o, "H-yellow") # check for an object with id "H-yellow"
o2 = r.id(o, "A-red") # check for an object with id "A-red"
o3 = r.id(o, "H-pink") # check for an object with id "H-pink"
o4 = r.id(o, "A-blue") # check for an object with id "A-blue"
# check for a scale by "H-yellow" from its top center to border "A-red" on its top
m1 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o1)Aorig(m,[50%,0%])Apost(m,top_border(o1,o2))
# check for a scale by "H-yellow" down to 1 in the y-axis
m2 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o1)Aorig(m,[0,-1])Amag(m,[1,1])
# check for a scale by "A-red" from its bottom center to border "H-yellow" on its bottom
m3 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o2)Aorig(m,[50%,100%])Apost(m,bottom_border(o2,o1))
# check for a scale by "A-red" down to 1 in the y-axis
m4 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o2)Aorig(m,[0,-1])Amag(m,[1,1])
before(m1,m2) # assert that scales of "H-yellow" happen sequentially
while(m2,m3) # assert that "H-yellow" downscale and "A-red" upscale overlap
before(m3,m4) # assert that scales of "A-red" happen sequentially
... (statements of "H-pink" and "A-blue" omitted for clarity)
```

**MoVer verification report**

```
m1 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o1)Aorig(m,[50%,0%])Apost(m,top_border(o1,o2)) false
post(m,top_border(o1,o2)) false
m3 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o2)Aorig(m,[50%,100%])Apost(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) false
post(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) false
before(m1,m2) false
while(m2,m3) false
before(m3,m4) false
```

**MoVer verification report of correction iteration 1**

```
m1 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o1)Aorig(m,[50%,0%])Apost(m,top_border(o1,o2)) false
post(m,top_border(o1,o2)) false
m3 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o2)Aorig(m,[50%,100%])Apost(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) false
post(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) false
before(m1,m2) false
while(m2,m3) false
before(m3,m4) false
```

...correction iteration 2-7 are identical to iteration 1...

**MoVer verification report of correction iteration 8**

```
m1 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o1)Aorig(m,[50%,0%])Apost(m,top_border(o1,o2)) true
post(m,top_border(o1,o2)) true
m3 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o2)Aorig(m,[50%,100%])Apost(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) false
post(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) true
before(m1,m2) true
while(m2,m3) false
before(m3,m4) false
```

**MoVer verification report of correction iteration 9**

```
m1 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o1)Aorig(m,[50%,0%])Apost(m,top_border(o1,o2)) true
post(m,top_border(o1,o2)) true
m3 = r.type(m, "sc1")Agst(m,o2)Aorig(m,[50%,100%])Apost(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) true
post(m,bottom_border(o2,o1)) true
before(m1,m2) true
while(m2,m3) true
before(m3,m4) true
```




**Initial motion graphics animation****Correction iteration 1****Correction iteration 8****Correction iteration 9**

Fig. 5. The input text prompt describes an animation in which the letter H and the letter A are asked to maintain contact as they scale up and down, as shown in the frames under Correction Iteration 9 (please refer to <https://mover-dsl.github.io> for the animations in action). However, the initial animation produced by the LLM animation synthesizer fails to satisfy any of the border() relations as indicated by the verification report. In the first correction iteration, the letters H and A are stretched to border the bottom edges of the letters below them, instead of top edges (frame 60 and 120). From there, the synthesizer becomes stuck in a loop, producing the same animation until the eighth correction iteration, where it has corrected the scaling of the yellow H and blue A. In the ninth iteration, it eventually changes the sign of the scale factor of the two bottom letters, passing all verification checks.

**Text prompt**

```
<svg> ... </svg>
Rotate the first letter W around the pink circle by 180 degrees. Then rotate the second letter W the same way. Finally, move the letter O down so that its bottom align with the rotated letter W
```

**MoVer program**

```
o1 = 10.id(o, "W-1") # check for an object with id "W-1"
o2 = 10.id(o, "W-2") # check for an object with id "W-2"
o3 = 10.id(o, "O") # check for an object with id "O"
o4 = 10.clr(o, "pink") Ashp(o, "circle") # check for a pink circle
# check for a rotation by "W-1" by 180 around the pink circle
m1 = 1m.type(m, "rot") Agt(m, o1) Amag(m, 180) Aorig(m, get_pos(o4))
# check for a rotation by "W-2" by 180 around the pink circle
m2 = 1m.type(m, "rot") Agt(m, o2) Amag(m, 180) Aorig(m, get_pos(o4))
# check for a translation by "O" to border "W-2" on its bottom side
m3 = 1m.type(m, "trn") Agt(m, o3) Adir(m, [0, -1]) Apost(m, bottom_border(o3, o2))
before(m1, m2) # assert that the rotation by "W-1" happens before that by "W-2"
before(m2, m3) # assert that the rotation by "W-2" happens before the translation by "O"
```

**MoVer verification report**

```
m3 = 1m.type(m, "trn") Agt(m, o3) Adir(m, [0, -1]) Apost(m, bottom_border(o3, o2)) false
dir(m, [0, -1]) false
post(m, bottom_border(o3, o2)) false
before(m2, m3) false
```

**MoVer verification report of correction iteration 1**

```
m3 = 1m.type(m, "trn") Agt(m, o3) Adir(m, [0, -1]) Apost(m, bottom_border(o3, o2)) false
dir(m, [0, -1]) true
post(m, bottom_border(o3, o2)) false
before(m2, m3) false
```

**MoVer verification report of correction iteration 2**

```
m3 = 1m.type(m, "trn") Agt(m, o3) Adir(m, [0, -1]) Apost(m, bottom_border(o3, o2)) true
dir(m, [0, -1]) true
post(m, bottom_border(o3, o2)) true
before(m2, m3) true
```

**Initial motion graphics animation****Correction iteration 1****Correction iteration 2**

Fig. 6. The input text prompt asks the two letter W’s to be rotated around the small pink circle and the letter O to be lowered so that the transformed letters form the word “mom” (animations can be found at <https://mover-dsl.github.io>). In the initial animation, the W’s are rotated correctly, but the letter O does not move at all, rendering both `dir()` and `post()` to false. Note that `bottom_border()` is true because the bottom edge of O aligns with those of the W’s at the beginning of the animation (frame 1). In the first correction iteration, the O moves towards the bottom but does not do so enough to align with the W’s. In the second iteration, the LLM synthesizer correctly computes the translation distance for O, producing an animation that says “wow mom” at the end (frame 180).

indicates that  $m_1$ , the motion of the letter Y, is false because `post()` failed, even though its input predicate `left_border()` evaluates to true. This is because at frame 80, the letter Y does border E on its left side. However, because the Y continues its translational motion  $m_1$  until frame 120, the `post()` predicate fails. Since  $m_1$  is invalid, the temporal predicate `before()` also fails. Figure 4 shows the next two automatic correction iterations of our pipeline for the example in Figure 3. In correction iteration 1, the verifier reports that the letter Y now properly borders the letter E at the end of the translation motion  $m_1$ . Although both  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are valid, the temporal predicate `before()` still fails because the motions do not occur sequentially. In the second iteration, the animation synthesizer fixes this problem, and every statement and predicate in the MoVer program evaluates to true, confirming that the final animation correctly matches the input prompt. Figures 5 and 6 similarly walk through examples that require multiple correction iterations. Please refer to their captions for more details.

## 6 Evaluation

**Test dataset.** To evaluate our LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline, we require a test dataset consisting of text prompts describing motion graphics animations and their corresponding ground truth MoVer programs. Since no such dataset is readily available, we synthetically build one using a template-based approach in combination with an LLM. Appendix B details our dataset construction. We divide the test dataset into four categories based on the types of MoVer predicates they exercise.

- (1) **Single atomic motion.** Each prompt describes one atomic motion with up to seven of its attributes as in Table 1 (e.g., “Expand the square by 2.”).
- (2) **Spatially relative motion.** Each prompt describes one atomic motion that is relative to the spatial position of another object to exercise predicates from the rectangle algebra (Figure 2 bottom) (e.g., “Move the square next to the circle.”).
- (3) **Temporally relative motions.** Each prompt describes multiple atomic motions with relative temporal sequencing relations to

Table 2. Success rate for our LLM-based MoVer program synthesizer and a baseline semantic parser. We determine the success rate by first computing the string difference between the LLM synthesized MoVer program and the corresponding ground truth program. We count a success only when there is no difference. We note that requiring a perfect string match is a stringent test for success as the underlying semantics of the two programs may match even without an exact string match.

MoVer program synthesis method	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
Ours (LLM-based)	96.5%	97.1%	97.7%	90.9%	95.1%
Semantic Parser	87.1%	86.3%	92.4%	76.8%	84.7%

exercise predicates from the Allen temporal interval algebra (Figure 2 top). (e.g., “Move the square, while scaling the circle”).

- (4) **Spatio-temporally relative motions:** Each prompt describes multiple atomic motions with both spatially and temporally relative relationships (e.g., “Move the circle next to the square, while it rotates”).

Our test dataset includes a total of 5600 pairs of prompts and MoVer programs (1200 single atomic, 1400 spatially relative, 1200 temporally relative, and 1800 spatio-temporally relative). We release this dataset to promote further research at <https://mover-dsl.github.io>.

**Accuracy of LLM-based MoVer synthesizer.** Table 2 reports the success rate for our LLM-based MoVer synthesizer across our test dataset. Overall we find that it generates correct MoVer programs for 95.1% of the test prompts. It is especially successful for prompts across the first three categories (above 96%), but less so for prompts in the spatio-temporally relative category at 90.9%. Analyzing failure cases, we find that the LLM tends to confuse relative spatial and temporal concepts. For example, with a prompt of the form “The square translates. After that, the circle scales,” the LLM MoVer synthesizer sometimes produces the predicate  $after(m_1, m_2)$  instead of  $before(m_1, m_2)$ . There are also cases where the LLM confuses relative positioning with absolute directions. For the prompt “Move the square to the right of the circle,” the LLM can produce  $dir(m, [1, 0])$  and  $right(o_1, o_2)$  instead of just the latter, confusing rightward motion with the right-side positioning. Nevertheless, the overall success rate of the LLM MoVer synthesizer suggests that it can produce correct programs across a variety of prompts.

To better understand the generalization capabilities of our LLM-based MoVer synthesizer, we implemented a classical rule-based semantic parser [Kamath and Das 2018] for converting a text prompt into a MoVer program. This parser serves as a baseline. Appendix C describes the parser in detail. Table 2 shows that, although the semantic parser achieves a high overall success rate of 83.5%, it is not as strong as our LLM-based approach. Examining the unsuccessful prompts, we find that the semantic parser has trouble generalizing to the variety of sentence structures found in our test set prompts. For example, to describe an upward motion of an object, a prompt might say “add an upward translation to ...” or “propel the object to climb ...” The former embeds the motion type as a noun, while the latter uses multiple verbs to express the same atomic motion. Our semantic parser does not contain the rules necessary to handle the former case and produces two motions for the latter. In general,

Table 3. Performance of our iterative LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline (a) and two variations of which we remove (b) and simplify (c) the verification reports. For our dataset of 5600 prompts, we compute the number that requires 0 correction iterations (pass@0), the number that requires 1 to 49 iterations (pass@1+), and the number that fails after 49 iterations. We report the average number of iterations and their min-max ranges for the pass@1+ prompts. Note that failed prompts are excluded from these metrics. The slight differences in pass@0 between pipelines are the results of using a temperature of 1.0. We use a seed of 1 to mitigate the inherent randomness of LLM generation.

**(a) Our LLM-based pipeline**

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	1060 (88.3%)	530 (37.9%)	1062 (88.5%)	640 (35.6%)	3292 (58.8%)
pass@1+	136 (11.3%)	718 (51.3%)	134 (11.2%)	962 (53.4%)	1950 (34.8%)
fail	4 (0.3%)	152 (10.9%)	4 (0.3%)	198 (11.0%)	358 (6.4%)
avg. iters.	1.1 (1-5)	6.2 (1-34)	1.8 (1-12)	6.7 (1-38)	5.8 (1-38)

**(b) No feedback pipeline**

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	1062 (88.5%)	528 (37.7%)	1064 (88.7%)	646 (35.9%)	3300 (58.9%)
pass@1+	42 (3.5%)	314 (22.4%)	118 (9.8%)	200 (11.1%)	674 (12.1%)
fail	96 (8.0%)	558 (39.9%)	18 (1.5%)	954 (53.0%)	1626 (29.0%)
avg. iters.	7.0 (1-32)	3.8 (1-35)	1.6 (1-10)	2.8 (1-38)	3.3 (1-38)

**(c) Minimal feedback pipeline**

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	1061 (88.4%)	532 (38.0%)	1059 (88.3%)	636 (35.3%)	3288 (58.7%)
pass@1+	129 (10.8%)	418 (29.9%)	133 (11.0%)	394 (21.9%)	1074 (19.2%)
fail	10 (0.8%)	450 (32.1%)	8 (0.7%)	770 (42.8%)	1238 (22.1%)
avg. iters.	2.6 (1-21)	3.6 (1-37)	1.6 (1-8)	6.7 (1-37)	4.4 (1-37)

rule-based methods are brittle as it is difficult to cover all the cases that can occur in natural language.

Yet, even though our LLM-based approach generalizes well to a wide variety of sentence structures and expressions, we find that it can fail unexpectedly. For example, it can randomly fail to include a  $mag()$  predicate explicitly mentioned in the prompt (e.g., “Rotate the square by 90 degrees”). It might also output the wrong parameters for predicates, such as flipping the sign of a directional parameter for  $dir()$  or using  $[1, 0]$  for an upward translation instead of  $[0, 1]$ . There is no clear pattern to such failures and we also find that many similar prompts can produce correct results.

**Effectiveness of LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline.**

Table 3a evaluates the effectiveness of our fully automatic LLM-based motion graphics synthesis and verification pipeline. It shows that with 0 correction iterations the LLM-based animation synthesizer produces a motion graphics animation that successfully passes all the checks in the ground-truth MoVer program for 58.8% of our test prompts (pass@0). It requires one or more correction iterations to successfully generate another 34.8% of the test prompts (pass@1+), and it fails to pass the ground-truth MoVer program after 49 correction iterations for 6.4% of the test prompts (fail). We also see that for the pass@1+ test prompts, the average number of




Fig. 7. MoVer can help user’s identify ambiguous prompts. Our pipeline correctly generates a MoVer program reflecting the user’s original prompt and it generates a motion that successfully passes verification. However, the user’s intention was for the blue square to make an arcing motion rather than rotating about its center and simultaneously translating. Understanding why the animation passed verification but did not meet their intentions, the user revised the prompt to ask for a rotation-only motion and produced the desired result.

iterations is 5.8 with a (min-max) range of 1-38. These numbers suggest that the automatic verification and correction iterations in our pipeline (pass@0 and pass@1+) significantly improves the number of correct animations produced, compared to using only a single forward pass of LLM-based animation synthesis alone (pass@0).

We observe that correction iterations are especially effective for the spatially and spatio-temporally relative prompts, as the iterations fix 51.3% and 53.4% (pass@1+) of these cases respectively. Examining the test prompts in these categories, we find that initially our LLM-based animation synthesizer often neglects the height or width of objects when translating one to a position relative to another, but such errors are often corrected within a couple of iterations. Examining the test prompts in these categories, we find that initially the LLM-based animation synthesizer has trouble interpreting certain relative spatial concepts. For example, for the test prompt “Translate the black square to touch the blue circle,” the synthesizer might initially move the square to fully overlap the circle, rather than moving it to the border of the circle. Errors like these can often be corrected within a couple of iteration as the feedback from the verification report allows the LLM to fix the problem.

Test prompts that require more correction iterations often ask for a rotation or scale motion to position one object relative to another. For example, with the prompt “The blue circle is rotated to lie on the top side of the black square”, the LLM-based animation synthesizer sometimes defaults to using translation despite the explicit specification otherwise in the prompt. It insists on using a translation for a few iterations, but after the verification report marks the motion as failing, it eventually corrects the motion to use a rotation.

To better understand the role of the MoVer verification reports in providing feedback for the correction iterations, we compare them to two alternative forms of feedback: (1) a *no feedback* report where we simply ask the LLM animation synthesizer to generate another animation without any feedback (Table 3b), and (2) a *minimal feedback* report where we only indicate whether an animation program passes or fails verification as a whole and do not include which predicates pass or fail (Table 3c). Overall, the results show that providing no or minimal feedback makes the LLM animation synthesizer less effective at iterative correction, as it fixes fewer prompts (pass@1+ decreases from 34.8% with *our pipeline* to 12.1% with *no feedback* and 19.2% with *minimal feedback*) and increases the number of prompts that fail (fail increases from 6.4% with *our pipeline* to 29.0% with *no feedback* and 22.1% with *minimal feedback*) across all prompt types. Spatially and spatio-temporally relative prompts produce the largest numbers of failures, with *no feedback* (39.9% and 53.0%) performing worse than *minimal feedback* (32.1% and 42.8%). We note that the

average iterations metrics decrease from 5.8 with *our pipeline* to 3.3 with *no feedback* and 4.4 with *minimal feedback* because we exclude failed prompts from these numbers.

While the numbers in Table 3 are based on assuming the pipeline has access to ground truth MoVer programs, in practice our pipeline generates MoVer program using an LLM. As shown in Table 2, our pipeline generates incorrect MoVer programs for 272 (4.9%) test prompts. Running these prompts through our full pipeline with incorrect MoVer programs, we find 70 (25.7%) pass@0, 20 (7.4%) fail, 134 (49.3%) pass@1+ and these require an average of 6.7 (1-32) iterations, while 48 (17.6%) generate MoVer programs that fail to execute. In other words, running our full pipeline on these prompts would falsely report that it produced correct animations for 204 (75%) of the prompts and that it produced incorrect animations for the remaining 68 (25%) prompts.

Finally, we have also run the evaluation in Table 3a with LLMs other than GPT-4o (i.e. o3-mini, Gemini 2.0 Flash, Llama 3.1 8B and Llama 3.3 70B). We find that our automatic verification and iterative corrections can increase the number of correct animations produced by LLMs regardless of their number of parameters. Please refer to Appendix D and <https://mover-dsl.github.io> for more details.

**Discussion.** Our experiment on the LLM-based MoVer synthesizer (Table 2) shows that it is relatively good at converting natural language prompts of motions into MoVer verification programs (95.1%). The high accuracy may be due to the fact that the concepts we include in the MoVer DSL are based on prior work in cognitive psychology [Talmy 1975, 1983; Tversky and Lee 1998] which has shown that these are the concepts people commonly use when they think about and verbally describe motions. This has two consequences; first, natural language animation prompts are likely to use these concepts, and, second, LLMs are likely to have encountered the concepts in their training data. As a result, our LLM-based synthesizer can more accurately parse the natural language prompts into our MoVer programs. When compared to a strong rule-based semantic parser (84.7%), our LLM-based approach exhibits better generalizability across different prompt categories. While the rule-based approach has trouble against unseen patterns, the black-box LLM can parse a wider variety of natural language descriptions of motions, perhaps because it has been trained on extremely large datasets.

Evaluations with our LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline indicate that our automatic verification and correction iterations help to produce more correct animations (Table 3a). Removing or simplifying the predicate-level feedback from the verification reports in the pipeline decreases the number of prompts that can be corrected and increases the number of failures (Table 3a, b, c). These

results suggest that increasing the feedback to the predicate level in the verification reports provides better in-context information for the LLM to correct animations.

While we have focused on the automated correction iterations, one benefit of our approach is that the verification reports are human interpretable. Users can adapt their prompts based on the report feedback. Figure 7 shows an example from a user in our lab who gave the pipeline the prompt “Rotate the blue square to intersect with the black square,” intending for the blue square to move in an arcing motion about the black square. Our pipeline produced an animation where the blue square only rotated around its own center, but simultaneously translated on a straight path to intersect the black square. It correctly passed the MoVer program and the user realized that the prompt was ambiguous. Several different animations could be consistent with it. MoVer verification helped the user adapt their prompt to be more precise and request “rotation-only” motion and thereby debug the prompt.

## 7 Limitations and Future Work

While our method enables verification of motion graphics animations and thereby supports LLM-based automated synthesis with iterative correction, it has some limitations. First, because MoVer represents motions in terms of low-level motion attributes, it requires a low-level description of the motion in the prompt. Prompts that describe complex motion paths (e.g., “Move the triangle on a figure eight path,” “Make the rectangle dance.”) are challenging for the LLM to convert the prompt into the low-level MoVer predicates. Such prompts are also ambiguous as it is unclear what set of low-level predicates would make sense to represent a “dance” motion. A direction for future work is to design higher-level predicates to accommodate such complex motion descriptions. Second, users can specify a self-contradictory prompt (e.g., “Move the triangle to the right and simultaneously to the left.”). Such prompts can be converted into valid MoVer statements, but they will always resolve to false for any given input animation. Automatic detection of such contradictory prompts may be possible using a SAT solver [Eén and Sörensson 2003] and is an open direction for future work. Third, while natural language prompting is an accessible interface for creating visual content, precisely describing spatio-temporal trajectories in language can be difficult. Converting other modalities of user controls (e.g. sketches, gestures, etc.) into motion graphics animations and corresponding MoVer programs could further facilitate animation creation. The challenge is to map such user inputs into appropriate spatio-temporal motion constraints. Fourth, the MoVer verification report is passive; it explains what went wrong, but does not suggest fixes for the problems. A suggestive interface [Igarashi and Hughes 2001] giving possible solutions as part of the report could further aid users in making their desired animations. Finally, while we have developed verification for animation, it may be possible to build verification languages for other visual content domains, such as CAD, video, and image generation to enable automated iterative optimization with LLMs.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Jiayuan Mao for valuable discussions. Jiaju Ma was supported by the Stanford Graduate Fellowship. This work was partially supported by the Brown Institute for Media Innovation at Stanford University, NSF Award #2219864, and the HPI-HAI Program on Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Human-Computer Interaction (HCI).

## References

- Ola Åkerberg, Hans Svensson, Bastian Schulz, and Pierre Nugues. 2003. CarSim: an automatic 3D text-to-scene conversion system applied to road accident reports. In *Demonstrations*.
- James F. Allen. 1983. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Commun. ACM* 26, 11 (Nov. 1983), 832–843. <https://doi.org/10.1145/182.358434>
- Yoav Artzi and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2013. Weakly Supervised Learning of Semantic Parsers for Mapping Instructions to Actions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 1 (2013), 49–62. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00209](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00209)
- Norman I. Badler, Martha S. Palmer, and Rama Bindiganavale. 1999. Animation control for real-time virtual humans. *Commun. ACM* 42, 8 (Aug. 1999), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1145/310930.310975>
- Philippe Balbiani, Jean-François Condotta, and L. Farinas Del Cerro. 1998. A model for reasoning about bidimensional temporal relations. In *PRINCIPLES OF KNOWLEDGE REPRESENTATION AND REASONING-INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE-.* MORGAN KAUFMANN PUBLISHERS, 124–130.
- Nacir Bouali and Violetta Cavalli-Sforza. 2023. A Review of Text-to-Animation Systems. *IEEE Access* 11 (2023), 86071–86087. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3304903>
- Haixin Chen, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Menghan Xia, Xintao Wang, Chao Weng, and Ying Shan. 2024. VideoCrafter2: Overcoming Data Limitations for High-Quality Video Diffusion Models. arXiv:2401.09047 [cs.CV]
- Jaemin Cho, Yushi Hu, Roopal Garg, Peter Anderson, Ranjay Krishna, Jason Baldridge, Mohit Bansal, Jordi Pont-Tuset, and Su Wang. 2024. Davidsonian Scene Graph: Improving Reliability in Fine-Grained Evaluation for Text-to-Image Generation. In *ICLR*.
- Thomas H Cormen, Charles E Leiserson, Ronald L Rivest, and Clifford Stein. 2022. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press.
- Fernanda De La Torre, Cathy Mengying Fang, Han Huang, Andrzej Banburski-Fahey, Judith Amores Fernandez, and Jaron Lanier. 2024. LLMR: Real-time Prompting of Interactive Worlds using Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 600, 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642579>
- Jack Doyle. 2025. Greensock Animation Platform v3. <https://gsap.com/docs/v3/>
- Niklas Eén and Niklas Sörensson. 2003. An extensible SAT-solver. In *International conference on theory and applications of satisfiability testing*. Springer, 502–518.
- Rinon Gal, Yael Vinker, Yuval Alaluf, Amit Bermano, Daniel Cohen-Or, Ariel Shamir, and Gal Chechik. 2024. Breathing Life Into Sketches Using Text-to-Video Priors. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 4325–4336.
- Julien Garnier. 2025. anime.js · JavaScript animation engine. <https://animejs.com/>
- Purvi Goel, Kuan-Chieh Wang, C. Karen Liu, and Kayvon Fatahalian. 2024. Iterative Motion Editing with Natural Language. In *Special Interest Group on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Conference Conference Papers '24 (SIGGRAPH '24)*. ACM, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3641519.3657447>
- Yuwei Guo, Ceyuan Yang, Anyi Rao, Maneesh Agrawala, Dahua Lin, and Bo Dai. 2023a. SparseCtrl: Adding Sparse Controls to Text-to-Video Diffusion Models. arXiv:2311.16933 [cs.CV]
- Yuwei Guo, Ceyuan Yang, Anyi Rao, Zhengyang Liang, Yaohui Wang, Yu Qiao, Maneesh Agrawala, Dahua Lin, and Bo Dai. 2023b. AnimateDiff: Animate Your Personalized Text-to-Image Diffusion Models without Specific Tuning.
- Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. 2023. Visual Programming: Compositional Visual Reasoning Without Training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 14953–14962.
- Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2021. CLIPScore: A Reference-free Evaluation Metric for Image Captioning. *ArXiv abs/2104.08718* (2021). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:233296711>
- Matthew Honnibal, Ines Montani, Sofie Van Landeghem, and Adriane Boyd. 2020. spaCy: Industrial-strength Natural Language Processing in Python. (2020). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1212303>
- Joy Hsu, Jiayuan Mao, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Jiajun Wu. 2024. What’s Left? concept grounding with logic-enhanced foundation models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (NIPS '23). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 1684, 17 pages.

- Yushi Hu, Benlin Liu, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Mari Ostendorf, Ranjay Krishna, and Noah A. Smith. 2023. TIFA: Accurate and Interpretable Text-to-Image Faithfulness Evaluation with Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 20406–20417.
- Ziniu Hu, Ahmet Iscen, Aashi Jain, Thomas Kipf, Yisong Yue, David A Ross, Cordelia Schmid, and Alireza Fathi. 2025. SceneCraft: an LLM agent for synthesizing 3D scenes as blender code. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (Vienna, Austria) (ICML '24)*. JMLR.org, Article 776, 31 pages.
- Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276* (2024).
- Takeo Igarashi and John F. Hughes. 2001. A suggestive interface for 3D drawing. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (Orlando, Florida) (UIST '01)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 173–181. <https://doi.org/10.1145/502348.502379>
- Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Judy Hoffman, Li Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. 2017. Inferring and Executing Programs for Visual Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*.
- Benjamin T Jones, Felix Hähnlein, Zihan Zhang, Maaz Ahmad, Vladimir Kim, and Adriana Schulz. 2025. A Solver-Aided Hierarchical Language for LLM-Driven CAD Design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09819* (2025).
- Aishwarya Kamath and Rajarshi Das. 2018. A survey on semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00978* (2018).
- Mohammad Sadil Khan, Sankalp Sinha, Talha Uddin Sheikh, Didier Stricker, Sk Aziz Ali, and Muhammad Zeshan Afzal. 2024. Text2CAD: Generating Sequential CAD Models from Beginner-to-Expert Level Text Prompts. *arXiv:2409.17106 [cs.CV]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.17106>
- Guy Lapalme. 2024. pyrealb at the GEM'24 Data-to-text Task: Symbolic English Text Generation from RDF Triples. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Natural Language Generation Conference: Generation Challenges*, Simon Mille and Miruna-Adriana Clinciu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Tokyo, Japan, 54–58. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.inlg-genchal.5/>
- Tony Lee, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chenlin Meng, Yifan Mai, Joon Sung Park, Agrim Gupta, Yunzhi Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Hannah Benita Teufel, Marco Bellagente, Minguk Kang, Taesung Park, Jure Leskovec, Jun-Yan Zhu, Li Fei-Fei, Jiajun Wu, Stefano Ermon, and Percy Liang. 2023. Holistic Evaluation of Text-To-Image Models. *arXiv:2311.04287 [cs.CV]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.04287>
- Vivian Liu, Rubaiat Habib Kazi, Li-Yi Wei, Matthew Fisher, Timothy Langlois, Seth Walker, and Lydia Chilton. 2025. LogoMotion: Visually-Grounded Code Synthesis for Creating and Editing Animation. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 157, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3714155>
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- Minhua Ma. 2006. *Automatic conversion of natural language to 3D animation*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Ulster.
- Marcel Marti, Jodok Vieli, Wojciech Witoń, Ruslit Sanghrayka, Daniel Inversini, Diana Wotruba, Isabel Simo, Sasha Schriber, Mubbassir Kapadia, and Markus Gross. 2018. CARDINAL: Computer Assisted Authoring of Movie Scripts. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (Tokyo, Japan) (IUI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 509–519. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3172944.3172972>
- George A. Miller. 1994. WordNet: A Lexical Database for English. In *Human Language Technology: Proceedings of a Workshop held at Plainsboro, New Jersey, March 8-11, 1994*. <https://aclanthology.org/H94-1111/>
- MozDevNet. 2025. Using CSS animations - CSS: Cascading style sheets: MDN. [https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/CSS/CSS\\_animations/Using\\_CSS\\_animations](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/CSS/CSS_animations/Using_CSS_animations)
- Isabel Navarrete, Antonio Morales, Guido Sciacvico, and M Antonia Cardenas-Viedma. 2013. Spatial reasoning with rectangular cardinal relations: The convex tractable subalgebra. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 67 (2013), 31–70.
- Shon Otmazgin, Arie Cattan, and Yoav Goldberg. 2022. F-coref: Fast, Accurate and Easy to Use Coreference Resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, Wray Buntine and Maria Liakata (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Taipei, Taiwan, 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-demo.6>
- Sagi Polacsek, Yuval Alaluf, Elad Richardson, Yael Vinker, and Daniel Cohen-Or. 2025. NeuralSVG: An Implicit Representation for Text-to-Vector Generation. *arXiv:2501.03992 [cs.CV]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.03992>
- Chenglei Si, Yanzhe Zhang, Zhengyuan Yang, Ruibo Liu, and Diyi Yang. 2024. Design2code: How far are we from automating front-end engineering? *arXiv e-prints* (2024), arXiv–2403.
- Kota Sueyoshi and Takashi Matsubara. 2024. Predicated Diffusion: Predicate Logic-Based Attention Guidance for Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 8651–8660.
- Jiao Sun, Yushi Hu, Deqing Fu, Royi Rassin, Sjoerd van Steenkiste, Dana Alon, Su Wang, Charles Herrmann, Ranjay Krishna, Da-Cheng Juan, and Cyrus Rashtchian. 2024. DreamSync: Aligning Text-to-Image Generation with Image Understanding Models. In *Synthetic Data for Computer Vision Workshop @ CVPR 2024*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17946>
- Didac Suris, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. 2023. ViperGPT: Visual Inference via Python Execution for Reasoning. *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2023).
- Leonard Talmy. 1975. *Semantics and Syntax of Motion*. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, 181 – 238. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368828\\_008](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368828_008)
- Leonard Talmy. 1983. How language structures space. In *Spatial orientation: Theory, research, and application*. Springer, 225–282.
- Spencer W. Thomas. 1991. VII.1 - DECOMPOSING A MATRIX INTO SIMPLE TRANSFORMATIONS. In *Graphics Gems II*, JAMES ARVO (Ed.). Morgan Kaufmann, San Diego, 320–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-050754-5.50069-4>
- Tiffany Tseng, Ruijia Cheng, and Jeffrey Nichols. 2024. Keyframer: Empowering Animation Design using Large Language Models. *arXiv:2402.06071 [cs.HC]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06071>
- Lewis Tunstall, Nils Reimers, Unso Eun Seo Jo, Luke Bates, Daniel Korat, Moshe Wasserblat, and Oren Pereg. 2022. Efficient Few-Shot Learning Without Prompts. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2209.11055>
- Barbara Tversky and Paul U Lee. 1998. How space structures language. In *Spatial cognition: An interdisciplinary approach to representing and processing spatial knowledge*. Springer, 157–175.
- Renhao Wang, Jiayuan Mao, Joy Hsu, Hang Zhao, Jiajun Wu, and Yang Gao. 2023. Programmatically Grounded, Compositionally Generalizable Robotic Manipulation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jinbo Xing, Hanyuan Liu, Menghan Xia, Yong Zhang, Xintao Wang, Ying Shan, and Tien-Tsin Wong. 2024b. Toonrafter: Generative cartoon interpolation. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 43, 6 (2024), 1–11.
- Ximing Xing, Juncheng Hu, Guotao Liang, Jing Zhang, Dong Xu, and Qian Yu. 2024a. Empowering LLMs to Understand and Generate Complex Vector Graphics. (2024).
- Sharon Zhang, Jiaju Ma, Jiajun Wu, Daniel Ritchie, and Maneesh Agrawala. 2023. Editing Motion Graphics Video via Motion Vectorization and Transformation. *ACM Trans. Article* 229 (dec 2023), 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3618316>
- Yunzhi Zhang, Zizhang Li, Matt Zhou, Shangzhe Wu, and Jiajun Wu. 2024. The Scene Language: Representing Scenes with Programs, Words, and Embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16770* (2024).
- Yeyao Zhang, Eleftheria Tspidi, Sasha Schriber, Mubbassir Kapadia, Markus Gross, and Ashutosh Modi. 2019. Generating Animations from Screenplays. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics ("SEM 2019)*, Rada Mihalcea, Ekaterina Shutova, Lun-Wei Ku, Kilian Evang, and Soujanya Poria (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 292–307. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/S19-1032>

## A LLM-based Generation Pipeline System Prompts

Our motion graphics synthesis and verification pipeline uses LLM-based in-context learning. Here we provide the system prompts for (1) our LLM animation synthesizer, (2) our LLM MoVer synthesizer, and (3) our correction iterations. In our implementation the system prompts include complete documentation for an animation API (GSAP [Doyle 2025]) and our MoVer DSL, but due to the length of this documentation we have abbreviated those sections of these prompts for clarity.

### A.1 LLM-based animation synthesizer

This system prompt asks the LLM to generate a motion graphics animation using GSAP [Doyle 2025] from the input text prompt.

```

1 ### Overview
2 - You are an experienced programmer skilled in creating
   SVG animations using the API documentation provided
   below.
3 - Please output JavaScript code based on the instruction.
4 - Think step by step.
5
6 ### Restrictions
7 - Only use functions provided in the API documentation.

```

```

8 - Avoid doing calculations yourself. Use the functions
  provided in the API documentation to do the
  calculations whenever possible.
9 - Always use `document.querySelector()` to select SVG
  elements.
10 - Always create the timeline element with `createTimeline
    ()`
11 - Always use `getCenterPosition(element)` to get the
    position of an element, and use `getSize(element)` to
    get the width and height of an element.
12 - Only use `getProperty()` to obtain attributes other
    than position and size of an element.
13 - Within the JavaScript code, annotate the lines of
    animation code with exact phrases from the animation
    prompt. Enclose each annotation with **.
14
15 ### SVG Setup
16 - In the viewport, the x position increases as you move
    from left to right, and y position increases as you
    move from top to bottom.
17 - In the SVG, the element listed first is rendered first,
    so the element listed later is rendered on top of
    the element listed earlier.
18
19 ### Template
20 The output JavaScript code should follow the following
    template:
21 ```javascript
22 // Select the SVG elements
23 <code></code>
24 // Create a timeline object
25 <code></code>
26 // Compute necessary variables. Comment each line of code
    with your reasoning
27 <code></code>
28 // Create the animation step by step. Comment each line
    of code with your reasoning
29 <code></code>
30 ```
31
32 ### API Documentation (only partially shown below)
33 /**
34  * This function adds a tween to the timeline to
    translates an SVG element.
35  * @param {object} timeline - The timeline object to add
    the translation tween to.
36  * @param {object} element - The SVG element to be
    translated.
37  * @param {number} duration - The duration of the tween
    in seconds
38  * @param {number} toX - The amount of pixels to
    translate the element along the x-axis from its
    current position. This value is a relative offset
    from the element's current x value.
39  * @param {number} toY - The amount of pixels to
    translate the element along the y-axis from its
    current position. This value is a relative offset
    from the element's current y value.
40  * @param {number} startTime - The absolute time in the
    global timeline at which the tween should start.
41  * @param {string} [easing='none'] - The easing function
    to use for the tween. The default value is linear
    easing. The easing functions are: "power2", "power4",
    "expo", and "sine". Each function should be appended
    with ".in", ".out", or ".inOut" to specify how the
    rate of change should change over time. ".in" means a
    slow start and speeds up later. ".out" means a fast
    start and slows down at the end. ".inOut" means both
    a slow start and a slow ending. For example, "power2.
    in" specifies a quadratic easing in. Another easing
    function is "slow(0.1, 0.4)", which slows down in the
    middle and speeds up at both the beginning and the
    end. The first number (0-1) is the porportion of the
    tween that is slowed down, and the second number
    (0-1) is the easing strength.
42  * @returns {void} - This function does not return
    anything.
43  * @example
44  * // Translates the square element 25 pixels to the
    right and 25 pixels down over 1 second.
45  * translate(tl, square, 1, 25, 25, 0);
46  *
47  * // Translates the square element 25 pixels to the
    right and 25 pixels down over 1 second, starting at 2
    seconds into the timeline. The easing function used
    is power1.out.
48  * translate(tl, square, 1, 25, 25, 2, 'power1.out');
49  */
50 function translate(timeline, element, duration, toX, toY,
    startTime, easing = 'power1.inOut')
51
52 /**
53  * This function adds a tween to the timeline to scale an
    SVG element.
54  * @param {object} timeline - The timeline object to add
    the translation tween to.
55  * @param {object} element - The SVG element to be scaled
    .
56  * @param {number} duration - The duration of the tween
    in seconds
57  * @param {number} scaleX - The scale factor to apply to
    the element along the x-axis. This value is absolute
    and not relative to the element's current scaleX
    factor.
58  * @param {number} scaleY - The scale factor to apply to
    the element along the y-axis. This value is absolute
    and not relative to the element's current scaleY
    factor.
59  * @param {number} startTime - Same as the startTime
    parameter for the translate function.
60  * @param {string} [elementTransformOriginX='50%'] - The
    x-axis transform origin from which the transformation
    is applied. The origin is in the element's
    coordinate space and is relative to the top left
    corner of the element. The default value is 50%,
    which means 50% of the element's width from the left
    edge of the element (horizontal center of the element
    ).
61  * @param {string} [elementTransformOriginY='50%'] - The
    y-axis transform origin from which the transformation
    is applied. The origin is in the element's
    coordinate space and is relative to the top left
    corner of the element. The default value is 50%,
    which means 50% of the element's height from the top
    edge of the element (vertical center of the element).
62  * @param {string} [absoluteTransformOriginX=null] -
    Similar to elementTransformOriginX, but the origin is
    in the absolute coordinate space of the SVG document
    and should be specified as a pixel value. Specify
    only elementTransformOriginX and
    elementTransformOriginY or absoluteTransformOriginX
    and absoluteTransformOriginY, but not both. When both
    are specified, elementTransformOriginX and
    elementTransformOriginY take precedence.
63  * @param {string} [absoluteTransformOriginY=null] -
    Similar to elementTransformOriginY, but the origin is
    in the absolute coordinate space of the SVG document
    and should be specified as a pixel value. Specify
    only elementTransformOriginX and
    elementTransformOriginY or absoluteTransformOriginX
    and absoluteTransformOriginY, but not both. When both
    are specified, elementTransformOriginX and
    elementTransformOriginY take precedence.
64  * @param {string} [easing='none'] - Same as the easing
    parameter for the translate function.
65  * @returns {void} - This function does not return
    anything.
66  * @example
67  * // Scale the square element to double its size over 1
    second from its center.
68  * scale(tl, square, 1, 2, 2, 0);

```

```

69 *
70 * // Scale the square element to double along x-axis and
    triple along y-axis over 2 second from its center,
    starting at 2 seconds into the timeline. The easing
    function used is power1.out.
71 * scale(tl, square, 1, 2, 3, 2, '50%', '50%', null, null
    , 'power1.out');
72 *
73 * // Scale the square element to be 4 times as large
    from its bottom right corner over 1 second.
74 * scale(tl, square, 1, 4, 4, 0, '100%', '100%');
75 *
76 * // Scale the square element to be 5 times as large
    along the x-axis and 2 times as large along the y-
    axis from (100px, 100px) in the SVG document over 2
    second.
77 * scale(tl, square, 2, 5, 2, 0, null, null, 100, 100);
78 */
79 function scale(timeline, element, duration, scaleX,
    scaleY, startTime, elementTransformOriginX = '50%',
    elementTransformOriginY = '50%',
    absoluteTransformOriginX = null,
    absoluteTransformOriginY = null, easing = 'power1.
    inOut')
80
81 /**
82 * This function adds a tween to the timeline to rotate
    an SVG element.
83 * @param {object} timeline - The timeline object to add
    the translation tween to.
84 * @param {object} element - The SVG element to be
    rotated.
85 * @param {number} duration - The duration of the tween
    in seconds
86 * @param {number} angle - The rotation angle in degree.
    This value is absolute and not relative to the
    element's current rotation angle.
87 * @param {number} startTime - Same as the startTime
    parameter for the translate function.
88 * @param {string} [elementTransformOriginX='50%'] - Same
    as the elementTransformOriginX parameter for the
    scale function.
89 * @param {string} [elementTransformOriginY='50%'] - Same
    as the elementTransformOriginY parameter for the
    scale function.
90 * @param {string} [absoluteTransformOriginX=null] - Same
    as the absoluteTransformOriginX parameter for the
    scale function.
91 * @param {string} [absoluteTransformOriginY=null] - Same
    as the absoluteTransformOriginY parameter for the
    scale function.
92 * @param {string} [easing='none'] - Same as the easing
    parameter for the translate function.
93 * @returns {void} - This function does not return
    anything.
94 * @example
95 * // Rotate the square element by 45 degrees (clockwise)
    from its center over 1 second.
96 * rotate(tl, square, 1, 45, 0);
97 *
98 * // Rotate the square element by -90 degrees (
    counterclockwise) from its bottom right corner over 1
    second, starting at 1.5 seconds into the timeline.
    The easing function used is power1.out.
99 * rotate(tl, square, 1, -90, 1.5, '100%', '100%', null,
    null, 'power1.out');
100 *
101 * // Rotate the square element by 135 degrees (clockwise
    ) from (300, 300) in the SVG document over 2 second.
102 * rotate(tl, square, 2, 135, 0, null, null, 300, 300);
103 */

```

```

104 function rotate(timeline, element, duration, angle,
    startTime, elementTransformOriginX = '50%',
    elementTransformOriginY = '50%',
    absoluteTransformOriginX = null,
    absoluteTransformOriginY = null, easing = 'power1.
    inOut')

```

## A.2 LLM-based MoVer synthesizer

This system prompt asks the LLM to generate a MoVer verification program from the input text prompt.

```

1 ### Instructions
2 - When a motion does not have any sequencing or timing
    constraints, simply use `exists` to check for the
    existence of the motion.
3 - Name the object variables as `o_1`, `o_2`, etc. and the
    motion variables as `m_1`, `m_2`, etc.
4 - List the object variables that are performing the
    action first, followed by the object variables that
    being used as reference objects.
5 - When using `exists`, no need to assign it to a variable
    , but do use a named variable in the lambda function.
    Do not just use `m` or `o`.
6 - The "type" predicate for motion only includes three
    values: "translate", "rotate", "scale".
7 - For integers, output them with one decimal point. For
    example, 100 should be output as 100.0.
8 - For floats, just output them as they are.
9 - For predicates about timing (t_before(), t_while(),
    t_after()), use the motion variables in sequential
    order. For example, if m_1 should happen before m_2,
    use `t_before(m_1, m_2)` and not `t_after(m_2, m_1)`.
10 - Always enclose the output with ``` . Do not output any
    other text.
11 - Order the object predicates as follows: color, shape.
12 - Order the motion predicates as follows: type, direction
    , magnitude, origin, post, duration, agent. This
    ordering has to be strictly followed.
13
14 ### Examples
15 Input:
16 "Translate the blue circle upwards by 100 px. Then rotate
    it by 90 degrees clockwise around its bottom right
    corner."
17
18 Output:
19 ```
20 o_1 = iota(Object, lambda o: color(o, "blue") and shape(o
    , "circle"))
21 m_1 = iota(Motion, lambda m: type(m, "translate") and
    direction(m, [0.0, 1.0]) and magnitude(m, 100.0) and
    agent(m, o_1))
22 m_2 = iota(Motion, lambda m: type(m, "rotate") and
    direction(m, "clockwise") and magnitude(m, 90.0) and
    origin(m, ["100%", "100%"]) and agent(m, o_1))
23 t_before(m_1, m_2)
24 ```
25
26 Input:
27 "Scale the black square up by 2 around its center for
    0.25 seconds."
28
29 Output:
30 ```
31 o_1 = iota(Object, lambda o: shape(o, "circle") and color
    (o, "blue"))
32 exists(Motion, lambda m_1: type(m_1, "scale") and
    direction(m_1, [1.0, 1.0]) and magnitude(m_1, [2.0,
    2.0]) and origin(m_1, ["50%", "50%"]) and duration(
    m_1, 0.25) and agent(m_1, o_1))
33
34
35 Input:

```

```

36 "The yellow circle is scaled up horizontally by 2.5 about
37     its center over a period of 10 seconds."
38 Output:
39 ```
40 o_1 = iota(Object, lambda o: color(o, "yellow") and shape
41     (o, "circle"))
42 exists(Motion, lambda m_1: type(m_1, "scale") and
43     direction(m_1, [1.0, 0.0]) and magnitude(m_1, [2.5,
44     0.0]) and origin(m_1, ["50%", "50%"]) and duration(
45     m_1, 10.0) and agent(m_1, o_1))
46 ```
47 Input:
48 "Over a period of 0.5 seconds, the blue circle moves to
49     be on the right of the black square."
50 Output:
51 ```
52 o_1 = iota(Object, lambda o: color(o, "blue") and shape(o
53     , "circle"))
54 o_2 = iota(Object, lambda o: color(o, "black") and shape(
55     o, "square"))
56 exists(Motion, lambda m_1: type(m_1, "translate") and
57     post(m_1, s_right(o_1, o_2)) and duration(m_1, 0.5)
58     and agent(m_1, o_1))
59 ```
60 ### Template
61 ```
62 <All object variables>
63 <All motion variables>
64 <All sequencing predicates>
65 ```
66 ### DSL Documentation (only partially shown below)
67 direction(motion_var, target_direction)
68 """
69 Determines the frames in which a specified motion
70 variable moves in a target direction for all objects
71 in the scene.
72 Args:
73 motion_var (Variable): The motion variable to check.
74 target_direction (str or list): The target direction
75 to check for. Can be a string for rotation ("
76 clockwise" or "counterclockwise") or a 2D vector for
77 translation and scaling directions. For scaling, use
78 1.0 for increase and -1.0 for decrease, and 0.0 if
79 the direction along a certain axis is not specified.
80 Returns:
81 TensorValue: A tensor containing boolean values
82 indicating whether the motion variable moves in the
83 target direction for each object over the frames.
84 Examples:
85 translate upward: direction(m_1, [0.0, 1.0])
86 translate to the left: direction(m_1, [-1.0, 0.0])
87 rotate clockwise: direction(m_1, "clockwise")
88 scale down along the x-axis: direction(m_1, [-1.0,
89 0.0]) ## Do not use values other than -1.0, 0.0, 1.0
90 for scaling directions
91 scale up (uniformly): direction(m_1, [1.0, 1.0]) ##
92 Do not use values other than -1.0, 0.0, 1.0 for
93 scaling directions
94 NOTE: Pay attention that, for scaling, the direction
95 is a 2D vector, where the first element is the x-axis
96 direction and the second element is the y-axis
97 direction.
98 If the direction along only one axis is specified,
99 the other axis should be 0.0.
100 """
101 """
102 magnitude(motion_var, target_magnitude)
103 """

```

```

84 Analyzes the magnitude of a specified motion variable
85 over a series of animation frames and determines
86 if it matches the target magnitude within a specified
87 tolerance.
88 Args:
89 motion_var (Variable): The motion variable to analyze
90 .
91 target_magnitude (float or list of floats): The
92 target magnitude to compare against.
93 If the motion type is "S" (scale), this should be
94 a list of two floats representing
95 the target scale factors for x and y axes. For
96 scale, if a direction along a certain axis is
97 not specified, the target magnitude should be 0.
98 Returns:
99 TensorValue: A tensor containing boolean values
100 indicating whether the motion with the specified
101 magnitude occurs for each object over the animation
102 frames.
103 """
104 origin(motion_var, target_origin)
105 """
106 Determines the frames during which objects in the scene
107 have a specific origin.
108 Args:
109 motion_var (Variable): The motion variable associated
110 with the scene.
111 target_origin (tuple): The target origin coordinates
112 to check for each object. % sign is used to indicate
113 relative origin.
114 Returns:
115 TensorValue: A tensor containing boolean values
116 indicating whether each object
117 has the target origin at each frame.
118 Examples:
119 Note: always output numbers with one decimal points,
120 even if they are integers.
121 Rotate around the point (400, 200): origin(m_1,
122 [400.0, 200.0])
123 Scale around the center: origin(m_1, ["50%", "50%"])
124 Scale around the top left corner: origin(m_1, ["0%",
125 "0%"])
126 """
127 post(motion_var, spatial_concept)
128 """
129 Processes the motion data and checks if, at the end of
130 the duration of "motion_var",
131 the spatial relationship between two objects expressed in
132 "spatial_concept" has been satisfied.
133 Args:
134 motion_var (Variable): The motion variable to check.
135 spatial_concept (TensorValue): A tensor containing
136 boolean values indicating whether two objects
137 maintained a certain spatial relationship at each
138 frame of the animation.
139 Returns:
140 TensorValue: A tensor containing boolean values
141 indicating whether spatial_concept has been satisfied
142 at the end of motion_var.
143 """
144 duration(motion_var, target_duration)
145 """
146 Determines the frames during which a motion of a
147 specified duration occurs for each object in the
148 scene.
149 Args:
150 motion_var (Variable): The motion variable to check.
151 target_duration (float): The target duration to match
152 for the motion.
153 """

```

```

134 Returns:
135     TensorValue: A tensor containing boolean values
136     indicating the frames during which the motion occurs
137     for each object.
138     ""
139 agent(motion_var, obj_var)
140 ""
141 Determines if the motion is performed by the agents
142 specified in the object variable.
143 Args:
144     motion_var (Variable): The motion variable containing
145     the name of the motion.
146     obj_var (Variable): The object variable representing
147     the object(s) involved.
148 Returns:
149     TensorValue: A tensor value indicating the presence
150     of motion for each object over the time steps.
151 ""

```

### A.3 Correction iteration

This system prompt is fed to the LLM animation synthesizer with each automated correction iteration as context for interpreting the MoVer verification report.

```

1 ### DSL Documentation
2 <same content as the DSL documentation shown in the
3 system prompt of the LLM-based MoVer synthesizer>
4
5 ### MoVer Program
6 <the MoVer program for the current text prompt>
7
8 ### MoVer Verification Report
9 <the verification report for the current animation>
10
11 ### Instruction
12 Please correct errors in the animation program as
13 indicated by the report

```

## B Synthetic Test Data Generation

We synthetically generated a test dataset consisting of text prompts describing an animation, paired with ground truth MoVer programs. We release our test dataset along with the scripts for generating it to encourage further research at <https://mover-dsl.github.io>.

Our approach is to first define an animation using a scene graph that explicitly represents each *atomic motion* using the seven atomic motion attributes; agt, type, dir, mag, orig, dur and post (Table 1). Each atomic motion may also include a reference object and a reference motion. From this animation scene graph, we generate a ground truth MoVer verification program by directly converting each object and atomic motion into MoVer predicates.

We also use the animation scene graph to generate multiple variations of a natural language text prompt. Our approach is to use a set of templates that can describe an atomic motion or objects in the scene in terms of their attributes. For example, a general template for an atomic motion is <motion type verb> <agent object> <dir> <mag> <orig> <dur> <post>. In English sentences verbs and objects are usually next to one another, but their ordering can be either verb-object or object-verb. Our sentence-level template for verb-object ordering, uses three different variations on imperative sentences: (1) “translate the blue square”, (2) “animate the blue square to translate”, and (3) “make the blue square translate.” Our template for object-verb ordering, uses present tense with either

active voice (e.g. “the blue circle translates”) or passive voice (e.g. “the blue circle is translated”). For each atomic motion in our scene graph, we choose a sentence-level template and fill the template parameters by mapping motion attributes and their values to natural language phrases. For example, if the value of the direction attribute is [0, 1] and the motion type is “translation” we map the direction to the concept “up”. To increase variation in the output prompts, we build a dictionary of synonymous expressions for each such concept sourced from thesaurus.com, synonym.com, WordNet [Miller 1994], and GPT-4o [Hurst et al. 2024]. For example, for the concept “up”, we obtain synonymous expressions like “upward”, “northward”, “towards the top”, etc.

To further increase prompt language variation, we vary the ordering of the motion attributes in the general template. For example, “The square translates for 0.5 seconds” can be reordered as “For 0.5 seconds, the square translates” and “The square, for 0.5 seconds, translates.” Our prompt generator includes all permutations of the motion attributes. To ensure that all the different prompt ordering variations form grammatical English, we use pyrealtb [Lapalme 2024] to handle details like subject-verb agreement and conjugation.

Finally, we add another class of prompt variations by taking one of the template-based prompts and asking GPT-4o to rewrite it with as many variations as possible. These LLM-generated variations tend to be more diverse in sentence structure than the variations produced by our template-based algorithm.

To produce our final test dataset, we build a set of 56 animation scene graphs. 12 of these graphs are of type single atomic motions, 12 of type temporally relative, 14 of type spatially relative, and 18 of type spatio-temporally relative. From those, we generated 56 MoVer verification programs as well as 5600 prompt variations. 80% of the prompt variations are based on synonyms and reordering, while the remaining 20% are from GPT-4o rewrites.

## C Semantic Parser Implementation

We have implemented a semantic parser that can convert a text prompt describing a desired animation into a MoVer motion verification program. It uses a rule-based approach that involves five main steps (Figure 8).

**Step 1: Resolve object co-references.** The first step identifies segments of text that refer to the same objects. For example, in Figure 8 we identify that “it” refers to “the black square.” To resolve such co-references, we use the fastcoref model [Otmazgin et al. 2022], which is primarily designed to handle noun co-references.

**Step 2: Split prompt into atomic motion clauses.** In step two we break the prompt into clauses, each representing a single atomic motion. Our approach uses a Roberta-based transformer model [Liu et al. 2019] trained as a dependency parser [Honnibal et al. 2020] to convert the input text prompt into a set of parse trees. Each resulting parse tree contains a verb at its root and represents a complete sentence. In English, a sentence may contain more than one verb, so we further split such trees at each such internal verb. For example, in Figure 8, we split “While it lifts, the blue square rotates by 90 degrees” into individual clauses “While it lifts” and “the blue square rotates by 90 degrees.”




Fig. 8. Our rule-based semantic parser consists of five main steps and serves as a baseline alternative to our LLM-based approach (Section 4) for converting natural language prompts into MoVer programs.

Each original parse tree includes either a subject marked with the dependency tag *nsbj* (nominal subject) or an object marked *dobj* (direct object). However, splitting a tree at internal verbs can result in a tree that does not contain a subject or object. In such cases, we look for the closest *nsbj* or *dobj* node in the original tree and attach it to the dangling tree. English also allows the use of an auxiliary verb in addition to the main verb to introduce a motion, such as “animate the square to rotate” and “make the square expand”. The dependency trees for such constructions includes non-motion verbs (“animate” and “make”) as roots. We resolve these case by combining the main and auxiliary verbs into one node and reattaching their original subtrees under the combined node.

**Step 3: Map phrases to MoVer predicates.** In this step, we map phrases in each atomic parse tree to a corresponding predicate or logic operator in MoVer. Our approach is to finetune a transformer-based text classifier with SetFit [Tunstall et al. 2022] to build this correspondence. More specifically, for each predicate and logic operator in MoVer, we manually look-up a small set of corresponding synonyms from WordNet [Miller 1994], thesaurus.com, and synonym.com and use them for finetuning. For example, for the predicate `type(m, "rot")` that checks for a rotational motion, we look up synonyms such as “spin”, “turn”, etc. and the after finetuning

the classifier with them, it can classify natural language words and phrases that are synonyms of the concept of `type(m, "rot")`.

We process the atomic parse tree in a top-down manner. For each node of the tree, we apply the finetuned classifier to check if there is a correspondence between a MoVer predicate or operator and the word or phrase spanned by the subtree rooted at that node. Once a correspondence is found, we extract relevant parameters for the predicate by analyzing the content of the mapped subtree. For example, we extract the number “90” from the subtree attached to the verb node “rotates” after we map its content to the `mag()` predicate (Figure 8). As we process each node, we first check if the node is marked as a *nsbj* or *dobj*. If so, we limit the correspondence match to the `agt()` predicate and object attribute predicates such as `shp()` and `clr()`.

**Step 4: Resolve motion co-references** There are cases where people might use a subordinate clause to refer to a previous motion. For example in Figure 8, the “while” clause references an existing translational motion instead of introducing a new motion. However, our earlier steps treat the “while” clause motion as a standalone atomic motion. To resolve this motion co-reference, we compare every atomic parse tree  $p_i$  that comes from a subordinate clause to all atomic trees that appear before it in the prompt. If they match in their `type()` and `agt()` predicates, we mark  $p_i$  as a co-reference

and remove its predicates. However, we retain its temporal sequencing predicate (e.g., `while()`) and append it to the atomic motion described in the original main clause.

**Step 5: Compose MoVer verification program.** We compose the final MoVer program by traversing the tree top-down and outputting the predicate or the logic operator that corresponds to each node as identified in Step 3.

## D Comparison with other LLMs

We have tested our LLM-based motion graphics synthesis and verification pipeline with LLMs other than GPT-4o (i.e. o3-mini, Gemini 2.0 Flash, Llama 3.3 70B, Llama 3.1 8B) on our dataset with 5600 test prompts, using the same setup as Table 3a. We observe that our pipelines are able to iteratively correct animations after initial failures regardless of the model size, reporting 32.5% pass@1+ for the large model *o3-mini*, 29.9% for *Gemini 2.0 Flash*, 32.0% for *Llama 3.3 70B*, and 16.1% for the smallest model *Llama 3.1 8B*. All LLMs seem to struggle with spatially and spatio-temporally relative prompts, with each achieving the lowest pass@0 and highest fail in the spatio-temporally relative category. Single atomic and temporally relative prompts are easier to process, although we do see a 23% drop in pass@0 for *Gemini 2.0 Flash*. Finally, stronger models might use more iterations to generate more fully correct animations; o3-mini takes the highest average number of iterations (6.5) to produce animations for 98.6% of the 5600 prompts (1.4% fail), and GPT-4o in Table 3a uses 5.8 average iterations for 93.6% (6.4% fail). The other three models all have fewer average number of iterations but higher failure rates.

Table 4. Performance of our LLM-based synthesis and verification pipeline on our 5600 test prompts with four different LLMs other than GPT-4o. Similarly to Table 3a, we report pass@0 (the number of prompts that requires 0 correction iterations), pass@1 (the number that requires requires 1 to 49 iterations), and the number that fails after 49 iterations. We report the average number of iterations and their min-max ranges for the pass@1+ prompts. We exclude failed prompts from these metrics.

### (a) o3-mini

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	1124 (93.7%)	712 (50.9%)	1079 (89.9%)	783 (43.5%)	3698 (66.0%)
pass@1+	76 (6.3%)	668 (47.7%)	118 (9.8%)	960 (53.3%)	1822 (32.5%)
fail	0 (0.0%)	20 (1.4%)	3 (0.3%)	57 (3.2%)	80 (1.4%)
avg. iters.	1.13 (1-2)	6.1 (1-38)	2.0 (1-32)	7.9 (1-38)	6.5 (1-38)

### (b) Gemini 2.0 Flash

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	1101 (91.8%)	660 (47.1%)	827 (68.9%)	772 (42.9%)	3360 (60.0%)
pass@1+	56 (4.7%)	586 (41.9%)	335 (27.9%)	698 (38.8%)	1675 (29.9%)
fail	43 (3.6%)	154 (11.0%)	38 (3.2%)	330 (18.3%)	565 (10.1%)
avg. iters.	3.5 (1-35)	4.1 (1-46)	2.4 (1-21)	4.4 (1-48)	3.9 (1-48)

### (c) Llama 3.3 70B

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	946 (78.8%)	700 (50.0%)	933 (77.8%)	768 (42.7%)	3347 (59.8%)
pass@1+	249 (20.8%)	577 (41.2%)	259 (21.6%)	702 (39.0%)	1787 (32.0%)
fail	5 (0.4%)	123 (8.8%)	8 (0.7%)	330 (18.3%)	466 (8.3%)
avg. iters.	2.0 (1-12)	3.6 (1-44)	2.1 (1-21)	4.0 (1-37)	3.3 (1-37)

### (d) Llama 3.1 8B

	Prompt Type				Overall
	Single atomic	Spatially relative	Temporally relative	Spatio-temporally	
pass@0	452 (37.7%)	366 (26.1%)	344 (28.7%)	218 (12.1%)	1380 (24.6%)
pass@1+	235 (19.6%)	333 (23.8%)	204 (17.0%)	129 (7.2%)	901 (16.1%)
fail	513 (42.8%)	701 (50.1%)	652 (54.3%)	1453 (80.7%)	3319 (59.3%)
avg. iters.	3.8 (1-44)	4.7 (1-48)	3.9 (1-20)	5.6 (1-48)	4.4 (1-48)