

Peer Review

Review of: "AniSora: Exploring the Frontiers of Animation Video Generation in the Sora Era"

Elakkiya R¹¹. Birla Institute of Technology and Science Pilani, Pilāni, India

1. AniSora performs well, and the comparison table shows its strengths. To make it even clearer, the authors can explain why AniSora does better than other models and what exact improvements make the difference. A short discussion on why other models struggle will help.
2. More details on the dataset would be useful. Explaining the variety in animation styles, lighting, and motion types will help show if the model works well in all cases. A quick note on how different datasets challenge different models would also be helpful.
3. Figure 9 gives a good visual comparison, but adding SSIM, FID, and LPIPS scores will give clear, number-based proof of animation quality. This will make it easier to see the difference between AniSora and other models.
4. AniSora seems to handle motion well, and adding optical flow or temporal consistency checks would make the claim stronger. This will help show that AniSora reduces motion blur and keeps character details stable across frames.
5. The comparison with other models is useful, and a small failure case analysis would help explain why some methods do not work well in animation. This will highlight what exactly AniSora does better.
6. The methodology is explained well, but adding details on hyperparameters, the training process, and optimization techniques will help with reproducibility. A short breakdown of why certain choices were made will make it clearer.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.