

# Failing to Learn: Autonomously Identifying Perception Failures for Self-driving Cars

Manikandasriram S.R.<sup>1</sup>, Cyrus Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Ram Vasudevan<sup>2</sup> and Matthew Johnson-Roberson<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract**—One of the major open challenges in self-driving cars is the ability to detect cars and pedestrians to safely navigate in the world. Deep learning-based object detector approaches have enabled great advances in using camera imagery to detect and classify objects. But for a safety critical application such as autonomous driving, the error rates of the current state-of-the-art are still too high to enable safe operation. Moreover, our characterization of object detector performance is primarily limited to testing on prerecorded datasets. Errors that occur on novel data go undetected without additional human labels. In this paper, we propose an automated method to identify mistakes made by object detectors *without ground truth labels*. We show that inconsistencies in object detector output between a pair of similar images can be used to identify false negatives (e.g. missed detections). In particular, we study two distinct cues - *temporal* and *stereo* inconsistencies - using data that is readily available on most autonomous vehicles. Our method can be used with any camera-based object detector and we evaluate the technique on several sets of real world data. The proposed method achieves over 97% precision in automatically identifying missed detections produced by one of the leading state-of-the-art object detectors in the literature. We also release a new tracking dataset with over 100 sequences totaling more than 80,000 labeled images from a game engine to facilitate further research.<sup>†</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

Object detection in self-driving cars is one of the most challenging and important impediments to full autonomy. Self-driving cars need to be able to detect cars and pedestrians to safely navigate their environment. In recent years, state-of-the-art deep learning approaches such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have enabled great advances in using camera imagery to detect and classify objects. In part these advances have been driven by benchmark datasets that have large amounts of labeled training data (one such example is the KITTI [1] dataset). Our understanding of how well we solve the object detection task has largely been measured by assessing how well novel detectors perform on this prerecorded labeled data. Alternatives such as simulation have been proposed to address the lack of extensive labeled data [2]. However, such solutions do not directly address how to use data logged from deployed autonomous vehicles (AVs).

<sup>1</sup>M. S.R. and C. Anderson are with Robotics Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA [srmani, andersct@umich.edu](mailto:srmani, andersct@umich.edu)

<sup>2</sup>R. Vasudevan is with the Mechanical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA [ramv@umich.edu](mailto:ramv@umich.edu)

<sup>3</sup>M. Johnson-Roberson is with the Department of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA [mattjr@umich.edu](mailto:mattjr@umich.edu)

<sup>†</sup>The dataset can be downloaded from <https://fcav.engin.umich.edu/research/failing-to-learn>

The current AV testing pipeline of repeatedly gathering and labeling large test datasets to benchmark object detector success is time-consuming and arduous. This solution also does not scale well as object detectors fail less frequently and as the number of deployed AVs increase. Without hand labeled ground truth, understanding when an object detector has failed to recognize an object is a relatively unstudied problem for self-driving cars.

This paper introduces a novel automated method to identify mistakes made by object detectors on the raw unlabeled perception data streams from an AV. While simple in its construction, the proposed system allows AVs to continuously evaluate their object detection performance in the real world for different locations, changing weather conditions and even across large time scales when the locations themselves evolve. As testing groups of AVs becomes more commonplace this approach provides an unsupervised mechanism to understand algorithmic, spatial, temporal, and environmental failures of a systems perception stack at the fleet level.

Detecting mistakes within unlabeled data is an inherently ill-posed problem. Without relying on additional data it is fair to assume an object detector will be maximizing its use of the information contained within a single image. We leverage the inherent spatial and temporal nature of the AV object detection domain. Typically either the vehicle or the objects in the scene are moving and often multiple views of the scene are taken (often with overlap as in the case of stereo cameras). While it is important to note object trackers also utilize temporal information (and in fact we leverage trackers for our approach) we are not attempting to solve the tracking problem. Object *detectors* are still required on AVs to initialize a tracker and if an object detector fails to fire, the tracking system is of no use and accidents may ensue.

We propose that inconsistencies in object detector output between a pair of similar images (either spatially or temporally), if properly filtered, can be used to identify errors as a vehicle traverses the world. The power of this should not be understated. It means that even miles driven by humans for testing purposes can be used to validate object detectors in an unsupervised manner and furthermore any archives of logged sensor data can be mined for the purposes of evaluating a vehicle's perception system.

The key contributions of our paper are as follows: 1) We present the first full system, to the best of our knowledge, that autonomously detects errors made by single frame object detectors on unlabeled data; 2) We show that inconsistencies in object detector output between pairs of similar images provides a strong cue for identifying missed detections; 3)

In conjunction with additional localization data available in AV systems we show that our system facilitates the analysis of spatial correlations in errors; 4) We release a tracking dataset with sequential imagery gathered at 10 Hz following the KITTI format with over 100 sequences totaling more than 80,000 labeled images from a game engine making it the largest publicly available dataset of its kind.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section II, we discuss related work. Next, we detail our technical approach in Section III. Section IV contains experimental results on a number of datasets for different state-of-the-art object detectors followed by a discussion in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes and addresses future work.

## II. RELATED WORK

Computer vision algorithms in robotics have recently been focused on applying deep neural networks, which has been made possible by large hand-labeled datasets such as KITTI [1] and Caltech Pedestrian dataset [3]. However, these datasets are limited in size because hand labeling is onerous. To combat this expensive manual annotation process, researchers have explored using simulated data, such as images from a game engine, to train object detectors. [2] show that orders of magnitude more simulated data can be used to train object detectors to outperform training on the available labeled datasets.

Despite the large number of images, game engines may not model all possible real-world scenarios, especially challenging scenarios that occur infrequently. This has led other research to focus on the development of synthetic datasets for uncommon scenarios. [4] propose manually labeling a small set of pedestrian images having rarely occurring poses. They then use a game engine to render synthetic images that have similar poses to ones in the hand-labeled dataset. Naturally, the diversity in the generated images is limited to what is present in the small hand-labeled dataset and the consistency between the simulation and real data can not be assured in all cases. Hence, testing on real world data on a large scale is vital for the development of truly safe autonomous vehicles. Our proposed system addresses the labeling burden of this exact problem.

Sensor fusion poses a related problem by using multiple modalities to understand the world and in some cases identify errors or provide self-supervised labeling [5]. However, in this work we focus on identifying errors within camera imagery alone. This enables single frame object detectors to be independently validated and improved without the confounds of other sensors.

Identifying systematic errors made by object detectors provides useful insights for designing better detectors. Over the years, researchers have regularly analyzed the performance of object detectors on labeled datasets to understand causes and correlations in errors [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. Of specific relevance to the current deep learning era, [9] begin by creating a human baseline for the Caltech Pedestrian dataset and use this to aid their analysis of state-of-the-art CNN

based detectors. In contrast, our proposed system does not require ground truth annotations in order to identify errors in unlabeled datasets. Consequently, the methods presented in these papers could be applied to understand the errors identified by our proposed system.

## III. TECHNICAL APPROACH

In this section, we present the technical details of our proposed system. We study two distinct cues to identify errors - *temporal* and *stereo* inconsistencies - that are readily available in the AV object detection domain. **Temporal:** CNN based object detectors often fail to consistently detect objects in subsequent frames even with little motion. But region based trackers (e.g., [12]) are often able to reliably track a patch across frames even with significant occlusions or lighting variations. This allows us to use a multi-object tracker to estimate the location of missed objects in current frame using detections in previous frames (see Fig. 1a). **Stereo:** Though a pair of stereo images appear visually similar to one another, particularly when considering a small baseline setup, object detectors often fail to consistently detect objects in both images (see Fig. 1b). We employ state-of-the-art algorithms for disparity map computation [13] to transfer detections from one image to another, allowing us to identify inconsistencies. Note that both computing disparity maps and tracking a region between a pair of images does not require any high level semantic information. Consequently, these operations are robust to small changes between the pair of images. The following sections explain our system in detail. We begin by briefly defining our problem and reviewing multi-object tracking. The remaining two subsections present our approaches to utilizing temporal and stereo cues respectively.

### A. Problem Definition

Consider a single frame object detector  $\mathcal{D}$  that is trained on a large labeled dataset  $\mathcal{L}$ . Additionally, there is an unlabeled dataset  $\mathcal{U}$  that is collected by continuously driving an autonomous vehicle equipped with a camera. In particular, we assume  $\mathcal{U} = \{I_j, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  has images in sequence captured at a sufficiently high framerate to allow for tracking and each  $I_j$  has a corresponding image  $I'_j$  captured from the stereo camera. We employ  $O_j = \{o_k^j, k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  to denote the set of objects detected by  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $I_j$  and similarly  $O'_j$  for detections on  $I'_j$ . The objective of this work is to reliably identify errors  $E = \{E_j, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  made by  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ . Recall that an error could either be a detection of a non-object (false positive) or a missed object (false negative). For current state-of-the-art detectors, the number of false negatives are much greater than false positives<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, we focus on identifying false negatives in this paper and henceforth use the term errors to refer to only false negatives of  $\mathcal{D}$ . For the temporal cue, consider a multi-object tracker  $\mathcal{T}$ , which belongs to *tracking-by-detection* paradigm and is

<sup>1</sup>From the precision-recall curve on KITTI, note that detectors achieve 100% precision for majority of recall values. Also see Table V.




Fig. 1: (a) Images from the Oxford RobotCar dataset [11] are shown with detections (cyan), tracks (yellow) and missed detections (red). (b) Images from KITTI dataset are shown with detections in left camera (cyan), detections in right camera (yellow), disparity map and the missed detections (red). [Best viewed in color]

also trained on  $\mathcal{L}$ . For the stereo cue, consider a disparity map generator  $\mathcal{S}$  also trained on  $\mathcal{L}$ .

### B. Multi-Object Tracking

In this subsection, we briefly review multi-object tracking and discuss its major sources of error. In *tracking-by-detection* paradigm, we have  $T_j = \mathcal{T}(I_j, O_j, T_{j-1})$  where  $T_j = \{t_l^j, l = 1, 2, \dots\}$  is the set of tracklets maintained for frame  $j$ . At every time step, each  $o_k^j \in O_j$  is associated to  $t_l^{j-1} \in T_{j-1}$  using a similarity metric specific to  $\mathcal{T}$ . For each unassociated  $o_k^j$ , a new tracklet is initialized and for each unassociated  $t_l^{j-1}$ , a region based tracker is used to estimate  $t_l^j$ . Consequently, the similarity metric and the region based tracker are the main sources of error for  $\mathcal{T}$ . These components are particularly unreliable in crowded regions with multiple overlapping objects, refer Fig. 2a, and when objects enter and exit the field of view, refer Fig. 2b. We refer the reader to [14] for an in-depth review of the multi-object tracking problem.

### C. Temporal Cues

Here we use the multi-object tracker  $\mathcal{T}$  presented in Sec. III-B to find errors made by  $\mathcal{D}$ . We propose that in each frame, the tracklets in  $T_j$  that do not have a corresponding detection in  $O_j$  are possible errors  $E_j$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Fig. 3 shows a flowchart of our system. In each frame  $I_j$ , we perform

bipartite matching between  $O_j$  and  $T_j$  using the Hungarian algorithm with the inverse of overlap as cost. There we enforce a minimum of 50% overlap for each match. Each resulting unmatched tracklet  $t_l^j$  is a candidate error of  $\mathcal{D}$ . This is identical to the set of tracklets which were estimated by the region based tracker. In order to ensure high precision, we employ a series of filters that conservatively selects errors  $E_j$ . Recall from Sec. III-B that objects entering and exiting the scene and crowded regions are key sources of error for  $\mathcal{T}$ . We address the former by using filter  $f_1$  to remove candidates that are near the border of the image. In addressing the latter, we first assume that crowded regions have multiple overlapping detections. Accordingly, we use filter  $f_2$  to remove candidates that have non-zero overlap with detections  $O_j$ . Finally, we use filter  $f_3$  to remove candidates that have an area smaller than a threshold.

In order to improve recall while maintaining high precision, we exploit the fact that our system can be used as a post-processing module. While multi-object trackers typically work online by using only the past information, these systems could potentially benefit from using all the information in a sequence when used in an offline fashion. Therefore, we use a separate multi-object tracker  $\mathcal{T}^-$  that processes the images  $I_j$  in reverse order. Note that  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^-$  had to be trained separately. This could be due to the asymmetry in the motion of objects in the scene -



Fig. 2: (a) In crowded regions, multi-object tracker creates some duplicates tracks that straddle multiple cars (shown in green). (b) Region based tracker maintains track even after car exits the scene (shown in green)




Fig. 3: Flowchart depicting the steps required for using temporal cues to find errors in a single image  $I_j$ . The different filters are described in Sec. III-C

objects typically appear from the vanishing point for forward sequences while objects move toward the vanishing point for backward sequences. We again use the Hungarian algorithm in each frame to match the forward tracks  $T_j$  and the backward tracks  $T_j^-$ . For every matched pair of tracklets, we choose the tracklet with the higher confidence. These tracklets, along with unmatched tracklets from  $T_j$  and  $T_j^-$ , constitute the merged tracklets. The merged tracklets are then used to detect errors as in Fig. 3.

#### D. Stereo Cues

Here we find errors in  $O_j$  using  $O'_j$ , using the detections made for calibrated stereo cameras with known geometry. We first find pixel-wise associations between the corresponding images using disparity map generator  $\mathcal{S}$  to compute  $d_j = \mathcal{S}(I_j, I'_j)$ . This allows us to compute the corresponding detections for  $O'_j$  in  $I_j$  denoted as  $P_j$ . As in Section III-C, we extract candidate errors by performing bipartite matching between  $O_j$  and  $P_j$ . As  $d_j$  can only be computed for the overlapping field-of-view between views  $I_j$  and  $I'_j$  we filter candidates near the border of  $I_j$  using  $f_1$ . We then apply filter  $f_3$  to remove candidates that have area smaller than a threshold. Note that the method can be similarly applied to obtain errors of  $\mathcal{D}$  in image  $I'_j$ .

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

We evaluate the proposed system for three state-of-the-art detectors, SSD [15], Faster R-CNN [16], and RRC [17], each trained on the KITTI object recognition dataset. For the temporal method, we use the MDP [18] multi-object tracker trained on KITTI tracking dataset, and for the stereo method, we use MC-CNN [13] trained on KITTI stereo dataset to generate the disparity maps. In section IV-A, we introduce the datasets used in our experiments. In sections IV-B and IV-C we perform qualitative and quantitative analysis to show

the effectiveness of the proposed system. In section IV-D we use additional localization data (available from a typical AV software stack) to analyze spatial correlations of errors.

Dataset	KITTI test	KITTI raw	Oxford	GTA
Images	11096	26746	227376	80655
Framerate	10	10	30	10
Labels				✓
Scene	real	real	real	simulated

TABLE I: Details of the different datasets used in the experiments. All KITTI datasets refer to the KITTI tracking benchmark.

Detector	KITTI (test)	KITTI (raw)	Oxford
SSD	915	2132	12577
Faster R-CNN	654	1353	13682
RRC	118	438	8045

TABLE II: Number of identified instances of missed cars for three state-of-the-art detectors on different datasets using temporal method.

#### A. Datasets

We use 3 different datasets in our experiments (see Table I). The KITTI test+raw dataset was treated as unlabeled images, simulating newly gathered data. The Oxford Robot-Car [11] dataset has over 100 sequences of unlabeled data collected with various weather conditions and times of the day, traversing the same route over the period of one year. Of these, we choose 6 sequences taken during the day.<sup>2</sup> In order to perform quantitative analysis of the accuracy of

<sup>2</sup>The sequences are indexed in Oxford dataset using the date and time when the data was collected. We used the following sequences: 2015-08-13-16-02-58, 2015-10-30-13-52-14, 2015-05-19-14-06-38, 2015-02-17-14-42-12, 2015-03-24-13-47-33, 2015-08-12-15-04-18



Temporal Cue					
Detector	Shadow	Saturated	Occluded	Visible	False Positive
SSD [15]					
Faster RCNN [16]					
RRC [17]					
Stereo Cue					
Detector	Shadow	Saturated	Occluded	Visible	False Positive
SSD [15]					
Faster RCNN [16]					
RRC [17]					

TABLE III: Examples of identified errors for different detectors using temporal and stereo cue. These images have been manually selected and each image is a  $200 \times 200$  crop centered around the missed car (shown in red). The size of the crops was fixed in order to show the different scales at which mistakes were identified.

our proposed system, we generated a large tracking dataset using a game engine as described in [2] and we call it the GTA dataset. This dataset was created to afford the ability to test on a much larger dataset with extensive ground truth to quantify the proposed system’s error detection accuracy continuously over sequences at much longer time scales than what could be hand-labeled feasibly.

### B. Qualitative Analysis

Table II lists the number of errors found by our system for each detector on KITTI test, KITTI raw and Oxford datasets. As expected, for the KITTI test and KITTI raw datasets, the number of identified errors decreases from SSD to RRC. Note that the number of identified mistakes are orders of magnitude smaller than the number of images in the dataset.



Temporal Cue - Oxford					
Detector	Shadow	Saturated	Occluded	Visible	False Positive
SSD [15]					
Faster RCNN [16]					
RRC [17]					
Temporal Cue - GTA					
Detector	Shadow	Dusk	Occluded	Visible	False Positive
SSD [15]					
Faster RCNN [16]					
RRC [17]					

TABLE IV: Examples of identified errors for different detectors using temporal cue. These images have been manually selected and each image is a  $200 \times 200$  crop (for Oxford) and  $300 \times 300$  crop (for GTA) centered around the missed car (shown in red). The size of the crops was fixed in order to show the different scales at which mistakes were identified.

This can help researchers to analyze the causes of the errors on a much smaller concise set of images. Both temporal and stereo methods were able to identify different types of errors including cars hidden in shadows, saturated images, occluded cars and clearly visible cars. Some examples of the different types of errors from the KITTI test+raw dataset are shown in Table III and examples for temporal method on Oxford and GTA datasets are shown in Table IV. Clearly, our system is

able to accurately localize the errors as well (see section IV-C). The last column shows false positives of our system. The first row shows a repeated false positive of the detector that results in a false positive for our proposed method. The second row shows a car that is completely occluded by a rising gate but the detection is flagged as a mistake by our method because the region based tracker continues to track the car. For the stereo cue, the false positives of our method

Name	Detector			Proposed System			
	TP	FP	FN	Found Errors	Overlap	Precision	Recall
Faster R-CNN	171881	23621	352264	9372	70% 30%	71.22% 83.86%	3.52% <b>4.14%</b>
SSD	56396	3949	466000	5952	70% 30%	88.00% 93.65%	1.73% 1.84%
RRC	74090	3421	441994	3555	70% 30%	93.75% <b>97.38%</b>	1.19% 1.23%

TABLE V: Quantitative results for Temporal method on GTA dataset. The true positives (TP), false positives (FP), and false negatives (FN) made by each detector are shown for reference.




Fig. 4: Spatial correlations in errors detected by the system. (a) black circles highlight certain intersections in Oxford that prove more difficult than others and warrant increased testing. (b) displays the spatial fidelity with which missed detections can be localized in the KITTI dataset with the incorporation of range data from the perception system. The red flags in the call out correspond to precise metric locations where missed cars were present. The trajectory of the AV is shown in blue. [Best viewed in colour]

are a result of the false positives made by the object detector itself that is inconsistently identified in both views.

### C. Quantitative Analysis

To enable comparison of the two cues, we manually annotated four sequences from the KITTI raw data, totalling 1139 images. Of those sequences, the temporal method found 106 mistakes made by SSD of which 99 were localized with  $> 70\%$  overlap with the ground truth annotations, and the remaining 7 had  $> 50\%$  overlap. This translates to a precision of 93.40% at 70% overlap. The recall, however, is 4.63% with the method having missed 2037 false negatives. Similarly, the stereo method found 67 mistakes, of which 66 had  $> 70\%$  overlap and the remaining mistake had  $> 50\%$  overlap. However, it missed 2070 mistakes, yielding precision of 98.51% and recall of 3.09%. In this small dataset Faster R-CNN and RRC made too few mistakes to allow for useful inference.

We used the GTA dataset to compare the performance of the temporal method for the different detectors, see Table V. We present the precision and recall of our system for high (70%) and low (30%) localization of errors, computed as

overlap with ground truth. As expected the precision of our proposed system increases as the number of false positives of the object detector decreases.

### D. Spatial Correlations in detected errors

The proposed system can be used to detect the spatially systematic errors of an object detector. Here we display results that highlight the utility of such a system for testing and development purposes. We use the sensor data in KITTI tracking and Oxford datasets to localize mistakes found using the temporal cues. By binning the vehicle’s pose estimates, we can then calculate the average number of errors per frame in various map regions. Heatmaps of the mistakes found appear (shown in Fig. 4a) to highlight that several intersections have an error rate of roughly twice that of other seemingly similar intersections along the vehicle’s route. Using the KITTI data we can harness additional range data enabling the identification of each missed car to the lane and trajectory through the intersection (see Fig. 4b).

## V. DISCUSSION

The experimental results presented in the previous section demonstrate the efficacy of our method in detecting real failures of state-of-the-art object detectors on unlabeled data. Here, we discuss some limitations of our proposed method. First, it identifies only a small fraction of the errors made by the object detector. This was an explicit trade-off that we made as precision of identified mistakes is more desirable. Second, our method cannot identify false positives of the object detector as both the temporal and stereo cue rely on the object detector for detecting objects. But we feel focusing on false negatives is high in importance in the nascent phases of AV testing given the safety concerns.

There are some significant and immediate advantages to our method that have application for currently deployed AV testing. Our method can be directly integrated with any off-the-shelf multi-object tracker and stereo disparity computation method. As a result, improvements in these algorithms directly improve the performance of our approach. In particular, the performance of the temporal cue can be greatly improved by developing an offline multi-object tracker that can use all information over an entire sequence. In addition, the typical AV comes equipped with a multi-object tracker and a stereo camera rig so there is no additional cost associated with using our algorithm. We posit that such systems could greatly increase safety and efficiency of both testing and training AVs with little overhead and additional infrastructure.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We presented a system for self-driving cars that enables checking for inconsistency using two distinct mechanisms: temporal and stereo cues. Our proposed system provides a means of identifying false negative detections made by single frame object detectors on large unlabeled datasets. We use an off-the-shelf multi-object tracker to predict the location of missed objects using detections in previous frames and our conservative policy ensures a high precision while suffering from low recall. We use stereo disparity to project detections from one camera view to the other in a stereo pair and localize missed detections from the second view. Through extensive experiments we have shown that even the state-of-the-art object detectors make systematic errors and we can reliably localize these in a global reference frame.

Naturally, the next step is to use these identified mistakes to continuously improve the object detector. This is a deceptively hard task for CNN based object detectors. In a supervised learning setting, the images are assumed to be exhaustively labeled. Consequently, any region in the image that does not have any labels is assumed to be a negative sample while the labels themselves are considered positive samples with tight bounding boxes. While our method reliably detects false negatives, it does not detect all mistakes in the image. Moreover, the estimated bounding box from the region based tracker is not guaranteed to be tight. We plan to address how best to learn from this partial information in our subsequent research work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Geiger, P. Lenz, and R. Urtasun, "Are we ready for autonomous driving? the kitti vision benchmark suite," in *CVPR*, 2012.
- [2] M. Johnson-Roberson, C. Barto, R. Mehta, S. N. Sridhar, K. Rosaen, and R. Vasudevan, "Driving in the matrix: Can virtual worlds replace human-generated annotations for real world tasks?" in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2017, pp. 1–8.
- [3] P. Dollár, C. Wojek, B. Schiele, and P. Perona, "Pedestrian detection: An evaluation of the state of the art," *PAMI*, vol. 34, 2012.
- [4] S. Huang and D. Ramanan, "Recognition in-the-tail: Training detectors for unusual pedestrians with synthetic imposters," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1703.06283, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.06283>
- [5] D. Barnes, W. Maddern, and I. Posner, "Find your own way: Weakly-supervised segmentation of path proposals for urban autonomy," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.01238*, 2016.
- [6] P. Dollár, C. Wojek, B. Schiele, and P. Perona, "Pedestrian detection: An evaluation of the state of the art," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 743–761, 2012.
- [7] C. Wojek and B. Schiele, "A performance evaluation of single and multi-feature people detection," *Pattern Recognition*, pp. 82–91, 2008.
- [8] D. Hoiem, Y. Chodpathumwan, and Q. Dai, "Diagnosing error in object detectors," *Computer Vision–ECCV 2012*, pp. 340–353, 2012.
- [9] S. Zhang, R. Benenson, M. Omran, J. Hosang, and B. Schiele, "How far are we from solving pedestrian detection?" in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 1259–1267.
- [10] P. Agrawal, R. Girshick, and J. Malik, "Analyzing the performance of multilayer neural networks for object recognition," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2014, pp. 329–344.
- [11] W. Maddern, G. Pascoe, C. Linegar, and P. Newman, "1 Year, 1000km: The Oxford RobotCar Dataset," *The International Journal of Robotics Research (IJRR)*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 3–15, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0278364916679498>
- [12] Z. Kalal, K. Mikolajczyk, and J. Matas, "Tracking-learning-detection," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 1409–1422, 2012.
- [13] J. Zbontar and Y. LeCun, "Stereo matching by training a convolutional neural network to compare image patches," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1510.05970, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.05970>
- [14] W. Luo, J. Xing, X. Zhang, X. Zhao, and T.-K. Kim, "Multiple object tracking: A literature review," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.7618*, 2014.
- [15] W. Liu, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, C. Szegedy, S. Reed, C.-Y. Fu, and A. C. Berg, "Ssd: Single shot multibox detector," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 21–37.
- [16] S. Ren, K. He, R. Girshick, and J. Sun, "Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015, pp. 91–99.
- [17] J. Ren, X. Chen, J. Liu, W. Sun, J. Pang, Q. Yan, Y.-W. Tai, and L. Xu, "Accurate single stage detector using recurrent rolling convolution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05776*, 2017.
- [18] Y. Xiang, A. Alahi, and S. Savarese, "Learning to track: Online multi-object tracking by decision making," in *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.