UDGS-SLAM : UniDepth Assisted Gaussian Splatting for Monocular SLAM

Mostafa Mansour^{1,*}, Ahmed Abdelsalam^{2,*}, Ari Happonen², Jari Porras^{2,3}, and Esa Rahtu⁴

¹Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Tampere University, Finland ²School of Engineering Science, LUT University, Finland ³School of Electrical Engineering, Aalto University, Finland ⁴Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences, University, Finland

^{*}Correspondences: mostafa.mansour@tuni.fi, ahmed.abdelsalam@lut.fi

advancements Abstract—Recent in monocular neural depth estimation, particularly those achieved by the UniDepth network, have prompted the investigation of integrating UniDepth within a Gaussian splatting framework for monocular SLAM. This study presents UDGS-SLAM, a novel approach that eliminates the necessity of RGB-D sensors for depth estimation within Gaussian splatting framework. UDGS-SLAM employs statistical filtering to ensure local consistency of the estimated depth and jointly optimizes camera trajectory and Gaussian scene representation parameters. The proposed method achieves high-fidelity rendered images and low ATE-RMSE of the camera trajectory. The performance of UDGS-SLAM is rigorously evaluated using the TUM RGB-D dataset and benchmarked against several baseline methods, demonstrating superior performance across various scenarios. Additionally, an ablation study is conducted to validate design choices and investigate the impact of different network backbone encoders on system performance.

Index Terms—UniDepth, Gaussian splitting, Monocular SLAM, Dense SLAM, Mapping, Scene representation

I. INTRODUCTION

Visual Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (VSLAM) is the task of estimating the pose of a moving vision sensor while simultaneously constructing a map (i.e., a scene representation) of the environment. VSLAM is crucial in several applications, including robotics, virtual reality, and augmented reality [1]–[3]. The choice of the map (or scene) representation is a critical component of SLAM technology, influencing the performance of other subsystems within the SLAM system and affecting external systems that rely on the SLAM outputs.

Given its significance, extensive research has focused on map representations [4] exploring different approaches for explicit handcrafted sparse [5]–[8] and dense representations [9]–[12] utilizing points, voxels, surfels, and signed distance fields for map construction. Despite the maturity of these representations and their use in production systems, they exhibit several limitations as they depend heavily on the availability of 3D geometric features and are limited to representing only observed parts of the environment. Moreover, they lack the capability to generate or synthesize photorealistic, highfidelity novel scenes from different camera viewpoints, which is a significant limitation in virtual and augmented reality applications.

Recently, many studies have aimed to overcome the limitations of explicit representations by employing implicit volumetric photorealistic representations using Neural Radiance Fields (NeRF) [13] and Gaussian Splatting (GS) [14] algorithms [15] to have a unified high fidelity scene representation. These methods enhanced high-fidelity scene representation by minimizing the photometric losses estimated through differentiable rendering. In the NeRF methods, fully connected multilayer perceptrons, employing ray marching for rendering, encodes the scene into the weight space of the neural network [13], [15]-[18]. However, NeRF-based methods encounter several challenges: they are computationally intensive, require lengthy training periods, and are overfitted to a single object or a limited scene, which complicates scene editing. They also heavily rely on visual cues without explicitly modeling spatial geometry and are susceptible to catastrophic forgetting [15]. In contrast, GS employs tile-based rasterization, making it efficient for rendering. It represents the scene as a group of 3D Gaussians, as explained in III-A, with Gaussian parameters optimized for each new input. GS-based SLAM is favored over NeRF-SLAM due to its rendering efficiency and its adaptability to large scenes without catastrophic forgetting. Additionally, GS-based SLAM integrates both photometric information and depth maps, making it well-suited for explicitly modeling spatial geometry. The differentiable rendering formulation of the Gaussians, combined with its rapid GPU-based implementation, facilitates fast and joint optimization of both the scene (Gaussian) parameters and the camera trajectory. As a result, due to its capabilities for photorealistic reconstruction, GS has emerged as a prominent method for 3D scene representation, effectively unifying the required representations for various tasks such as tracking, mapping, and rendering. Since depth information is a critical component in GS, recent research predominantly utilizes RGB-D inputs, benefiting from the integration of depth sensors [19]–[25]. However, there remains a notable gap in the exploration of monocular methods due to the lack of depth information [19].

In this context, and inspired by the significant advancements in monocular or single-shot depth estimation through the application of neural networks [26], we investigate the utilization of neural depth estimation within the framework of GS for monocular SLAM. This approach mitigates the need for RGB-D sensors for depth information while retaining the benefits of GS for scene representation. We specifically explore the application of the UniDepth network [27] for depth estimation within the GS-based monocular SLAM framework. Our proposed method emphasizes the joint optimization of camera trajectory and 3D Gaussian (map) representation, leveraging depth estimation provided by the UniDepth network. Additionally, we introduce a statistical filtering technique to enhance the local consistency of the estimated depth, thereby improving the quality of photorealistic reconstruction.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- Integrating UniDepth network for depth estimation within Gaussian Splatting: We leverage UniDepth for depth estimation from RGB images within the Gaussian Splatting framework, facilitating the joint optimization of camera trajectory and 3D photorealistic reconstruction.
- Introducing Statistical Filtering: We implement a straightforward yet effective statistical filtering stage that ensures local consistency of the estimated depth map, enhancing the overall performance of the framework.
- Evaluation on real dataset benchmark: Our method is rigorously tested on TUM RGB-D dataset, demonstrating superior performance compared to baseline methods in various scenarios.
- Ablation studies: We conduct comprehensive ablation studies using different backbone encoders of the UniDepth network, both with and without the implementation of statistical filtering, to evaluate their impact on performance.

II. Related work

A. Monocular Neural Depth estimation

Monocular depth estimation (MDE) is a classic research area in computer vision that involves determining the precise depth of each pixel in an image. This capability enables the reconstruction of 3D scenes from 2D images, which is crucial for a wide range of applications in computer vision and robotics, such as autonomous navigation, augmented reality, object detection, and 3D modeling. Early methods relied heavily on geometric principles and handcrafted features to estimate depth [28]–[30].

The advent of deep learning revolutionized the field of computer vision, including MDE. Neural networks offer a data-driven approach to learning complex features directly from images, allowing depth estimation from a single image. One of the earliest neural network-based methods for MDE was introduced by Eigen et al. [31]. This method leveraged the ability of CNNs to capture hierarchical features, achieving reasonable accuracy on the NYU [32] and KITTI [33] datasets. As neural networks continued to evolve, two main branches of monocular depth estimation from a single image emerged: Monocular Metric Depth Estimation (MMDE) and Monocular Relative (Scale-Agnostic) Depth Estimation (MRDE).

Focusing on MMDE [31], [34]–[41], it aims to predict absolute values in physical units (e.g., meters), which is necessary to perform 3D reconstruction effectively. Most of the existing MMDE methods have shown great accuracy across several benchmarks, but they fail to generalize to real-world scenarios and tend to overfit specific datasets [42]. Some methods have attempted to solve this by training a single metric depth estimation model across multiple datasets, but it has been reported that this often deteriorates performance, especially when the collection includes images with large differences in depth scale, such as indoor and outdoor images [42].

Few methods [43], [44] have tackled the difficult problem of generalization, but these methods still rely on controlled testing conditions, including fixed camera intrinsics. Unlike other methods, UniDepth [45] addresses the generalization problem without the limitation of fixed camera intrinsics. UniDepth consistently sets new stateof-the-art benchmarks, even compared with non-zero-shot methods. Therfore, the UniDepth network is chosen for depth estimation as a first step in our pipeline.

B. NeRF based SLAM

Mildenhall et al. introduced NeRF as an implicit volumetric scene representation [46]. Originally, NeRF required known camera poses to construct its scene representation. To accommodate this, many studies have employed the COLMAP structure-from-motion package [47] to estimate camera poses for use in NeRF implementations. iMAP [48] was the first to relax the requirement for known camera poses by simultaneously performing tracking and mapping using NeRF representation. Despite its innovation, iMAP faced scalability issues, which were subsequently addressed by NICE-SLAM [17] through the introduction of hierarchical multi-feature grids. Vox-Fusion [18] proposed a hybrid solution that combines NeRF with traditional volumetric fusion methods to enhance scene representation. Recently, Point-SLAM [49] enhanced 3D reconstruction by employing neural point clouds and feature interpolation for volumetric rendering. Other additional improvements are discussed in Tosi et al. [15]. Despite these advancements, NeRF-based methods still fundamentally grapple with long training times due to the computational demands of ray marching rendering, and issues with catastrophic forgetting. In contrast, Gaussianbased methods avoid these pitfalls by incorporating dynamic insertion and pruning techniques to manage newly visible scenes, and by utilizing fast rasterization instead of ray marching to boost rendering efficiency.

C. 3D Gaussians based SLAM

Since its introduction as a promising 3D scene representation [14], 3D Gaussian splatting has emerged as a prominent technology for SLAM due to its fast rasterization rendering via splatting and its ability to overcome the catastrophic forgetting problem through Gaussian insertion and pruning management [15]. Given the importance of depth maps in Gaussian representation, most studies employ RGB-D cameras within the Gaussian framework, benefiting from the integration of depth sensors [15], [19], [20], [25], [50]–[54]. Some works have integrated RGB-D cameras with IMUs within the Gaussian splatting framework [53], while others have incorporated various depth and normal prior cues with RGB-D measurements [50]. However, there is a notable lack of investigation into using monocular camera measurements within the Gaussian splatting framework, primarily, due to the absence of direct depth measurement.

Matsuki et al. introduced Gaussian splatting for SLAM using a monocular camera [19]. Their approach utilized prior knowledge about scene depth, initializing the 3D Gaussians with depths normally distributed around the mean scene depth. To address the lack of direct depth sensor data, they optimized the Gaussian parameters and camera trajectory by minimizing the photometric error. In contrast, UDGS-SLAM does not rely on any prior knowledge about scene depth. It leverages statistically filtered depth maps from the UniDepth network for initialization. Furthermore, it optimizes the Gaussian parameters and camera trajectory by minimizing a weighted sum of photometric and geometric errors. This approach enables UDGS-SLAM to outperform the monocular SLAM proposed by Matsuki et al. in most scenarios of the TUM dataset, as presented in section V.

III. Methodology

The proposed approach estimates the camera poses for each frame $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and reconstruct a 3D volumetric map representation of the scene from a sequential RGB image stream $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^N$ obtained from a monocular camera with known camera intrinsic $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$. The map is represented by a collection of 3D Gaussians, which can be rendered into a photorealstic image for a given view point of a camera pose. This representation is achieved by using differentiable rendering through 3D Gaussian splatting and gradient-based optimization, facilitating the optimization of the camera pose for each frame as well as the volumetric representation of the scene.

A. 3D Gaussian scene representation

The proposed approach optimizes the scene representation to effectively capture both geometrical and appearance features, enabling it to be rendered into high-fidelity color and depth images. We represent the scene as a set of 3D Gassians coupled with view-independent color, opacity, and a covariance matrix.

$$\mathbf{G} = \{ G_i : (\mu_i^W, \mathbf{c}_i, o_i, \Sigma_i^W) \mid i = 1, \dots, N \}.$$
(1)

Each 3D Gaussian G_i , in the world coordinate frame W is defined by its center position $\mu_i^W \in \mathbb{R}^3$, its RGB color \mathbf{c}_i , a covariance matrix Σ_i^W , and its opacity $o \in [0, 1]$. A Gaussian G_i affects a 3D point $X \in \mathbb{R}^3$ according to the unnormalized Gaussian equation weighted by its opacity as follows:

$$f(X) = o_i \left(\frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{2}(X - \mu_i^W)^T \Sigma_i^{W^{-1}}(X - \mu_i^W))}{\sqrt{2\pi^3 |\Sigma_i^W|}}\right).$$
 (2)

B. Color and Depth Differentiable Rendering via Splatting

The objective of Gaussian splatting [20] is to render high-fidelity RGB and depth images from the 3D volumetric Gaussian scene representation given a camera pose. Importantly, the rendering should be differentiable allowing the gradient to be calculated for the underlying Gaussians' map parameters and camera poses with respect to the photometric and geometric discrepancies between the rendered and the provided RGB and depth images, respectively. The gradient is used to minimize the discrepancies by updating both the parameters of 3D Gaussian splats and camera poses. According to [14], an RGB image is rendered from a set of 3D Gaussians by, first, sorting all the Gaussians from front to back with respect to a given camera pose. Then, the 3D Gaussians within the camera frustum are splatted (projected) into 2D pixel space using the camera pose and the camera intrinsic matrix K. Finally, an RGB image can be rendered by alpha-blending each 2D splatted Gaussian in order in pixel space. The rendered color of a p = (u, v) pixel can be written as:

$$C(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{c}_i f(p) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - f(p)), \qquad (3)$$



5



f) Rendered scene at the same pose of the input frame

Fig. 1: **UDGS-SLAM** utilizes 3D Gaussian splats for scene representation, enabling high-fidelity photorealistic reconstruction for dense SLAM using a monocular camera. It employs the Unidepth network to estimate scene depth from a single RGB image (a, b). The estimated depth is subsequently filtered for local consistency (c). Through differential rendering rasterization, it generates rendered RGB and depth images for a given camera pose. The system then achieves 3D scene representation by jointly optimizing 3D Gaussian splats and camera trajectory through the minimization of photometric error between the input and rendered RGB images, as well as the minimization of geometric error between the estimated depths (d). This approach enables the reconstruction of a dense scene (e) and allows for photorealistic rendering of the scene from any given camera pose (f).

where n is the number of pixels per image and f(p) is calculated according to (2) after projecting each 3D Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu^W, \Sigma^W)$ into 2D image space Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu^I, \Sigma^I)$ as follows:

$$\mu^{I} = \boldsymbol{\pi}(T_{CW}\mu^{W}),$$

$$\Sigma^{I} = \mathbf{JR}\Sigma^{W}(\mathbf{JR})^{T},$$
(4)

where π is the camera perspective projection function, $T_{CW} \in \mathbf{SE(3)}$ is the camera pose of a viewpoint in the world coordinate system. **J** is the Jacobian of the perspective projection function and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbf{SO(3)}$ is the rotation component of the camera pose T_{CW} . Similar to color, a rendered depth for a pixel p can be written as:

$$D(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^C f(p) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - f(p)),$$
 (5)

where $d_i^C = [T_{CW}\mu_i^W]_Z$ is the depth, i.e. Z coordinate, of a Gaussian *i* in camera coordinate frame. This formulation ensures that the rendered Gaussian splats are differentiable with respect to their 3D Gaussian splat parameters. By employing gradient descent optimization, Gaussian splats iteratively refine their optical and geometric parameters, thereby enabling an accurate representation of the scene with high fidelity.

C. Differentiable camera pose estimation

The formulation of the projected 2D Gaussian splats in (4) ensures that they are differentiable with respect to the camera pose T_{CW} as well. Applying the chain rule to (4):

$$\frac{\partial \mu^{I}}{\partial T_{CW}} = \frac{\partial \mu^{I}}{\partial \mu^{C}} \frac{\partial \mu^{C}}{\partial T_{CW}},$$
$$\frac{\partial \Sigma^{I}}{\partial T_{CW}} = \frac{\partial \Sigma^{I}}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}}{\partial \mu^{C}} \frac{\partial \mu^{C}}{\partial T_{CW}} + \frac{\partial \Sigma^{I}}{\partial \mathbf{R}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial T_{CW}}, \qquad (6)$$

where μ^C represents the 3D position of a Gaussian splat in the camera coordinate frame. Following [19], the derivatives with respect to the camera pose T_{CW} are derived using the exponential and logarithmic mapping between Lie algebra and the Lie group as follows,

$$\frac{\partial \mu^{C}}{\partial T_{CW}} = \mathbf{I} - \Omega^{+},$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial T_{CW}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\mathbf{R}_{1}^{+} \\ 0 & -\mathbf{R}_{2}^{+} \\ 0 & -\mathbf{R}_{3}^{+} \end{bmatrix},$$
(7)

where Ω^+ and \mathbf{R}_i^+ represent the skew matrices of μ^c and the i^{th} column of \mathbf{R} , respectively.

IV. SLAM PIPELINE

This section presents the details of the UDGS-SLAM pipeline. An overview of the system is summarised in fig.

A. Neural depth estimation

The UniDepth network is utilized to estimate the scene depth from a single shot of an RGB image captured by a monocular camera [27]. Unidepth network features different backbone encoders. Our findings indicate that using the ViT-style large-size model encoder delivers the highest accuracy. A performance comparison among different backbones is presented as an ablation study in sec.VI. Regardless of the employed backbone, it is observed that the estimated depth image is not locally consistent. Similar to stereo estimated depths [55], the UniDepth estimated values exhibit a left-skewed pattern with heavy right tails as presented in fig.3.c. These heavy tails patterns predominantly are observed at transitions between proximal and distal objects (see figures 3.a and 3.b). Empirical observations have indicated that filtering out these extreme values and ensuring local consistency in the depth map can enhance trajectory and map estimation accuracy. To assure local consistency, We introduce a straightforward yet effective statistical filtering method. The method retains only those depth values falling within the Interquartile Range (IQR), and marks any outliers beyond this range as invalid. Subsequently, only the valid depth values are utilized for geometric error computation. After applying statistical filtering to the depth image, a local consistent depth image is obtained, with outliers marked as invalid values, as presented in fig.3.d.

B. Rendering and loss computation

The 3D Gaussians **G** can be rendered for a viewpoint of given camera pose T_{CW} via differentiable rasterization. Rasterization involves sorting and alpha-blending of the Gaussians as outlined in section III-B. Given that rasterization is performance-critical, it is optimized for execution using CUDA. The derivatives for all parameters are calculated explicitly. We have adopted the implementations from [56] and [19] for rendering RGB and depth images, respectively. Once an RGB image is rendered, the photometric error is calculated by comparing the rendered image to the captured image as follows,

$$E_{pho} = \left\| \left| I - \hat{I}(\mathbf{G}, T_{CW}) \right\|_{1}, \tag{8}$$

where I is the input frame and $\hat{I}(\mathbf{G}, T_{CW})$ is the rendered rgb image of the Gaussians \mathbf{G} at a view point of a given camera pose T_{CW} . The rendered RGB image can be computed as explained in eq. 3. Similarly, the geometric error can be computed as

$$E_{geo} = \left\| D - \hat{D}(\mathbf{G}, T_{CW}) \right\|_{1}, \tag{9}$$

where D is the filtered neural depth calculated as presented in section IV-A and $\hat{D}(\mathbf{G}, T_{CW})$ is the rendered depth image. The rendered depth image can be computed as explained in eq. 5. A total loss function can then be formulated from a weighted combination of the photometric and geometric errors as follows,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{G}, T_{CW}) = \lambda E_{pho} + (1 - \lambda) E_{geo}, \quad (10)$$

where λ is a weighting factor that balances the contribution of the photometric error E_{pho} and the geometric error E_{qeo} in the total loss.

C. Tracking and mapping

This section introduces the different steps used for refining 3D Gaussian splats (map) and camera pose.

1) Keyframes Management: Although it is theoretically possible to use all previously obtained RGB and depth images for refining the map parameters and camera poses, this method is practically infeasible due to computational constraints. Instead of using all the images, carefully selected keyframes within a small window \mathcal{W}_k are used. The keyframes should not be redundant, should observe the same area [57], and should maintain a wide baseline among them to provide robust multiview constraints [58], [59]. following Matsuki et al. [19] and DSO [57], a small window \mathcal{W}_k of keyframs is maintained. A new frame is considered to be a keyframe by assessing its covisibility, which is calculated by determining the intersection over union of the observed Gaussians between the current frame and the previous keyframe. A new keyframe is added to the window if the covisibility falls below a certain threshold or if the translation (baseline) between the current frame and the previous keyframe is significantly large relative to the median depth.

2) Gaussians Insertion and Pruning Management: As the camera moves, newly unobserved areas come to the scene. Therefore, new Gaussians should be inserted to capture the optic and geometric properties of the new areas. The new Gaussians are inserted at each keyframes for the newly observed areas. Their means μ^w are initialized by back-projected the filtered UniDepth estimated depth values and their optics are obtained from the corresponding values of the RGB input image with opacity equal to 0.5. The properties of the new, and the old, Gaussians are refined during sequential optimization. In addition to Gaussian insertion, excess Gaussians are pruned. If a Gaussian within a keyframe was not observed by at least three obtained frames, it indicates geometrical instability, and the Gaussian is pruned.

3) Tracking and Mapping: The purpose of the tracking and mapping module is to maintain a 3D Gaussian map of the scene where each Gaussian is defined as explained in eq.1 and to estimate the camera pose for each obtained RGB frame. In addition, the map should be coherent and consistent enough to allow rendering RGB images



Fig. 2: **UDGS-SLAM** pipeline consists of three phases: neural depth estimation and local consistency enforcement (left), image rendering and loss computation (middle), and camera pose estimation and map parameter updates (right).



Fig. 3: The UniDepth network is used to estimate the scene depth from a single RGB image(a). The depths at transitions between proximal and distal objects exhibit nonconsistency (b). This inconsistency makes a lift-skewed distribution with right heavy tails (c). By applying statistical filtering, local consistency is achieved by marking outliers as invalid values (d).

with high fidelity. To achieve this consistency, a window of previously obtained keyframes W_r is used along with the current window of keyframes W_k for map and poses refinement. Similar to [19], two past keyframes are selected randomly to form W_r . The 3D Gaussian parameters (map parameters) and the camera pose estimation are formulated as an optimization problem and their parameters can be estimated by minimizing the loss function in (10) as follows,

$$\min_{T_{CW}^k, \mathbf{G}, \forall k \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{\forall k \in \mathcal{W}} (\lambda E_{pho}^k + (1 - \lambda) E_{geo}^k), \quad (11)$$

where k is a keyframe and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_r \cup \mathcal{W}_k$ is an optimization window of keyframes, calculated as the union of the randomly selected previous keyframes \mathcal{W}_r and the keyframes in the current window \mathcal{W}_k .

D. Pipeline initialization

Unlike Matsuki et al. in their monocular camera pipeline [19], UDGS-SLAM does not use any prior information about scene depth in the initialization step. Instead, the Gaussians are initialized at the depths of the filtered UniDepth estimated depth image. Their color proprieties are obtained from the corresponding pixels in the input RGB image. Then, The Gaussians parameters are refined further by minimizing the loss function in (10) using gradient descent for the map parameters solely. During initialization, the initial camera pose T_{CW} is set to $[\mathbf{I}_{3\mathbf{x}3}|\mathbf{0}_{3\mathbf{x}1}]$ or to the pose of the camera in the world coordinate system if it is known.

V. Experiments and Results

An evaluation of the proposed system is conducted on real-world dataset. Additionally, an ablation study is proposed to justify the design choices and to investigate the impact of different UniDepth backbone encoders on the results. This section presents the experiment setup and the results while the ablation study is presented in the subsequent section (sec. VI).

A. Experiment Setup

1) Dataset: The proposed approach is evaluated on TUM RGB-D dataset [60] (3 sequences). Although the dataset includes depth images, RGB images are only used in the proposed approach. Camera pose estimates are compared with the provided ground truth poses. For the ablation study, only one sequence (fr1-desk) from the dataset is used to assess the performance variations among different backbone encoders.

2) Implementation details: UDGS-SLAM is tested on a laptop with Intel Core i7-13700H, 5.0GHz, 32 GB RAM, and a single Nvidia GeForce RTX 4070 GPU. 3D Gaussian rendering relies on CUDA C++ implementation proposed at [19] and [14]. The rest of the pipeline is developed with Pytorch.

3) Metrics: For camera pose estimation, the pipeline reports the Root Mean Square Error of Absolute Trajectory Error (ATE RMSE \downarrow) of the estimated keyframes. To evaluate map and rendering quality, the pipeline reports standard metrics: Peak Signal-to-Noise Ration (PSNR \uparrow), Structural Similarity Index Measurement (SSIM \uparrow), and Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS \downarrow) [49].

4) BaseLine Methods: Since UDGS-SLAM does not incorporate loop closure, it is compared with similar SLAM methods that also lack explicit loop closure routines. Given the proposed solution reliance on monocular images, it is benchmarked against other monocular-based Gaussian splatting solutions. Due to the scarcity of monocular-based Gaussian splatting SLAM solutions, RGB-D Gaussian splatting methods are also considered for a more comprehensive performance comparison. Specifically, for RGB based methods the proposed solution is compared with DROID-VO [61]. DepthCov-VO [16], and MonoGS [19] using its monocular implementation. For RGB-D based methods, the proposed solution is compared with NICE-SLAM [17], Vox-Fusion [18], and SplaTAM [20].

B. Evaluation

This section presents the results of UDGS-SLAM. The results discussed herein utilize the ViT large model encoder of the UniDepth network and a statistical filter to ensure local consistency. The ablation study section discusses other UniDepth encoder backbones with/without statistical filtering (see section VI.

1) Camera Tracking Accuracy: Figure 4 presents camera trajectory estimation for 3 sequences. Despite poor RGB image quality (resolution is 640×480) and high motion blur, UDGS-SLAM gives small ATE RMSE. In Table I, UDGS-SLAM's camera pose estimation is benchmarked against various baselines using the TUM RGB-D dataset. A comprehensive quantitative analysis reveals that the proposed method performs well against both Gaussian splatting and non-Gaussian splatting-based methods. Additionally. The comparisons also include methods utilizing both monocular and RGB-D inputs. Remarkably, the proposed approach not only outperforms other monocularbased methods but also exceeds the performance of RGB-D-based methods. It reports the best (lowest) ATE RMSE, achieving the minimum trajectory error compared to all baselines in the fr1-desk sequence - reducing the error by more than 10% from 3.5cm to 3.0cm compared to SplaTAM [20]. In the fr2-xyz sequence, it achieves the second-best performance among monocular-based methods, trailing only behind DepthCov-VP [16], and outperforms the RGB-D based method NICE-SLAM [17]. In the fr3-office sequence, although it surpasses some baselines (DepthCov-VO [16] and Vox-Fusion [18]), its performance is not as high compared to the other sequences. This may be attributed to high motion blur due to fast camera motion and low image quality, indicating areas for potential future improvement.

2) Rendering Results: In addition to camera pose tracking estimation, the rendering performance is also analyzed for high photorealistic reconstruction. In UDGS-SLAM, the scene/map is represented by a number of Gaussians as explained in section III-A similar to the depiction in Figure 1.d. For a given viewpoint of camera pose, the scene can be rendered to produce a photorealistic image similar to the one presented in Figure 1.f. Using the metrics in section V-A3, Table II reports the rendering performance of UDGS-SLAM on TUM dataset showing good rendering metrics across all sequences.

UDGS-SLAM rendering metrics are compared with several baselines. The average metrics are reported in Table III.

*The results are adapted from [19].



Fig. 4: ATE RMSE $(\downarrow m)$ of Camera pose estimation using UDGS-SLAM. (a) Fr1-desk sequence trajectory estimation. (b) Fr2-xyz sequence trajectory estimation. (c) Fr3-office sequence trajectory estimation.

Methods	Input	Based on	fr1-desk	fr2-xyz	fr3-office
DROID-VO [61]*	Monocular	ConvGRU	5.2	10.7	7.3
DepthCov-VO [16]*	Monocular	Gaussian Process	5.6	1.2	68.8
MonoGS $[19]^*$	Monocular	Gaussian Splatting	3.78	4.6	3.5
NICE-SLAM [17]*	RGB-D	NERF	4.26	6.19	3.87
Vox-Fusion [18]*	RGB-D	NERF	3.52	1.49	26.01
SplaTAM [20]	RGB-D	Gaussian Splatting	3.35	1.24	5.16
UDGS-SLAM(ours)	Monocular	Gaussian Splatting	3.0	2.2	11.3

TABLE I: Camera tracking results on TUM for monocular and RGB-D. ATE RMSE in $(\downarrow cm)$ is reported.

Metric	fr1-desk	fr2-xyz	fr3-office	average
$PSNR \uparrow$	23.3	24.9	23.6	24
$SSIM \uparrow$	0.79	0.8	0.806	0.8
$\mathrm{LPIPS}\downarrow$	0.26	0.22	0.26	0.246

TABLE II: UDGS-SLAM rendering metrics for TUM dataset.

These results clearly demonstrate that the proposed approach not only surpasses monocular-based methods but also outperforms the RGB-D-based Point-SLAM. Furthermore, it demonstrates competitive performance, closely matching that of MonoGS in its RGB-D configuration.

VI. Ablation study

In Table IV, an ablative analysis is conducted to validate the design choices of the UniDepth network. The study examines the performance of different encoder backbones for the UniDepth network, both with (w) and without (w/o) statistical filtering to ensure local consistency. This analysis includes both version 1 (V1) and version 2 (V2) architectures of UniDepth [45] [62]. For V1, the ViT Large model and ConvNext are used as backbone encoders. For V2, the ViT Large model, the only available encoder at the time of testing, is utilized. The evaluation is conducted on the fr1-desk sequence of the TUM dataset. The results indicate that the UniDepth V1 network, when combined with the ViT Large model and statistical filtering, achieves the lowest ATE-RMSE and the highest rendering metrics.

VII. CONCLUSION

This work presents UDGS-SLAM, a system that adapts 3D Gaussians as its underlying map representation, enabling photorealistic rendering, dense mapping, and camera trajectory optimization without the need for explicit prior knowledge about the scene or camera motion. UDGS-SLAM leverages advances in neural depth estimation from a single RGB image by utilizing depth maps generated by the UniDepth network. Additionally, it employs a straightforward yet effective statistical filtering method to ensure local consistency and enhance estimation and rendering accuracy. The effectiveness of UDGS-SLAM is demonstrated through testing on the TUM RGB-D dataset, where it exhibits competitive performance, achieving results comparable to or better than existing baselines. This work highlights the potential of integrating neural depth estimation from monocular cameras with Gaussian splatting to develop more sophisticated and efficient SLAM methods. Nonetheless, potential improvements in the proposed approach remain. For example, due to their complementary nature, integrating image-IMU depth estimation with neural depth could yield more accurate depth maps, thereby enhancing overall performance. Furthermore, exploring the incorporation of loop closure could increase the global consistency of the map. These aspects will be investigated in future work.

References

- H. F. Durrant-Whyte and T. Bailey, "Simultaneous localization and mapping: part i," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 13, pp. 99–110, 2006.
- [2] X. Jiang, L. Zhu, J. Liu, and A. Song, "A slam-based 6dof controller with smooth auto-calibration for virtual reality," *Vis. Comput.*, vol. 39, p. 3873–3886, jun 2022.
- [3] G. Reitmayr, T. Langlotz, D. Wagner, A. Mulloni, G. Schall, D. Schmalstieg, and Q. Pan, "Simultaneous localization and mapping for augmented reality," in *Proceedings of International Symposium on Ubiquitous Virtual Reality*, ., 2010. International Symposium on Ubiquitous Virtual Reality : ISUVR 2010 ; Conference date: 07-07-2010 Through 10-07-2010.

Method	Input	$PSNR\uparrow$	SSIM \uparrow	LPIPS↓
MonoGS [19]	Monocular	21	0.7	0.3
MonoGS $[19]$ *	RGB-D	24.37	0.804	0.225
Point-SLAM [49]*	RGB-D	21.39	0.727	0.463
UDGS-SLAM (ours)	Monocular	24	0.8	0.246

TABLE III: Average rendering metrics for TUM dataset.

Backbone Encoder	Statistical Filtering	ATE-RMSE ↓cm	$\mathbf{PSNR}\uparrow$	$\mathbf{SSIM}\uparrow$	$\mathbf{LPIPS}\downarrow$
V1-ViT large	w	3	23.3	0.79	0.26
	w/o	3.6	23	0.75	0.27
V1-ConvNext large	w	3.7	21	0.7	0.28
V2-ViT large	w	6.2	23	0.75	0.28
	w/o	5.8	23	0.7	0.25

TABLE IV: Ablation analysis on the UniDepth backbone encoders with/without local consistency. The analysis confirms that using a V1-ViT large model encoder with statistical filtering to assure local consistency gives the best performance.

- [4] A. Macario Barros, M. Michel, Y. Moline, G. Corre, and F. Carrel, "A comprehensive survey of visual slam algorithms," Robotics, vol. 11, no. 1, 2022.
- [5] C. Cadena, L. Carlone, H. Carrillo, Y. Latif, D. Scaramuzza, J. Neira, I. Reid, and J. J. Leonard, "Past, present, and future of simultaneous localization and mapping: Toward the robust-perception age," IEEE Transactions on Robotics, vol. 32, p. 1309–1332, Dec. 2016.
- [6] C. Campos, R. Elvira, J. J. G. Rodriguez, J. M. M. Montiel, and J. D. Tardos, "Orb-slam3: An accurate open-source library for visual, visual-inertial, and multimap slam," IEEE Transactions on Robotics, vol. 37, p. 1874–1890, Dec. 2021.
- [7] A. J. Davison, I. D. Reid, N. D. Molton, and O. Stasse, "Monoslam: Real-time single camera slam," IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 1052–1067, 2007.
- R. Mur-Artal and J. D. Tardós, "Orb-slam2: An open-source slam system for monocular, stereo, and rgb-d cameras," IEEE Transactions on Robotics, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 1255–1262, 2017.
- T. Whelan, R. F. Salas-Moreno, B. Glocker, A. J. Davison, and S. Leutenegger, "Elasticfusion," Int. J. Rob. Res., vol. 35, p. 1697–1716, dec 2016.
- [10] J. Engel, T. Schöps, and D. Cremers, "Lsd-slam: Large-scale direct monocular slam," in Computer Vision - ECCV 2014 (D. Fleet, T. Pajdla, B. Schiele, and T. Tuytelaars, eds.), (Cham), pp. 834–849, Springer International Publishing, 2014.
- [11] T. Whelan, M. Kaess, H. Johannsson, M. Fallon, J. J. Leonard, and J. McDonald, "Real-time large-scale dense rgb-d slam with volumetric fusion," Int. J. Rob. Res., vol. 34, p. 598-626, apr 2015.
- [12] C. Kerl, J. Sturm, and D. Cremers, "Robust odometry estimation for rgb-d cameras," in 2013 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, pp. 3748-3754, 2013.
- [13] B. Mildenhall, P. P. Srinivasan, M. Tancik, J. T. Barron, R. Ramamoorthi, and R. Ng, "Nerf: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis," 2020.
- [14] B. Kerbl, G. Kopanas, T. Leimkühler, and G. Drettakis, "3d gaussian splatting for real-time radiance field rendering," ACM Transactions on Graphics, vol. 42, July 2023.
- [15] F. Tosi, Y. Zhang, Z. Gong, E. Sandström, S. Mattoccia, M. R. Oswald, and M. Poggi, "How nerfs and 3d gaussian splatting are reshaping slam: a survey," 2024.
- [16] E. Dexheimer and A. J. Davison, "Learning a depth covariance function," 2024.
- [17] Z. Zhu, S. Peng, V. Larsson, W. Xu, H. Bao, Z. Cui, M. R. Oswald, and M. Pollefeys, "Nice-slam: Neural implicit scalable encoding for slam," in Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), June 2022.
- [18] X. Yang, H. Li, H. Zhai, Y. Ming, Y. Liu, and G. Zhang, "Voxfusion: Dense tracking and mapping with voxel-based neural implicit representation," in 2022 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR), pp. 499-507, 2022.
- [19] H. Matsuki, R. Murai, P. H. J. Kelly, and A. J. Davison, "Gaussian splatting slam," 2024.

- [20] N. Keetha, J. Karhade, K. M. Jatavallabhula, G. Yang, S. Scherer, D. Ramanan, and J. Luiten, "Splatam: Splat, track map 3d gaussians for dense rgb-d slam," *arXiv preprint*, 2023. [21]
- S. Ha, J. Yeon, and H. Yu, "Rgbd gs-icp slam," 2024.
- J. Hu, X. Chen, B. Feng, G. Li, L. Yang, H. Bao, G. Zhang, [22]and Z. Cui, "Cg-slam: Efficient dense rgb-d slam in a consistent uncertainty-aware 3d gaussian field," 2024.
- [23] L. C. Sun, N. P. Bhatt, J. C. Liu, Z. Fan, Z. Wang, T. E. Humphreys, and U. Topcu, "Mm3dgs slam: Multi-modal 3d gaussian splatting for slam using vision, depth, and inertial measurements," 2024.
- C. Yan, D. Qu, D. Xu, B. Zhao, Z. Wang, D. Wang, and X. Li, [24]"Gs-slam: Dense visual slam with 3d gaussian splatting," 2024.
- [25]V. Yugay, Y. Li, T. Gevers, and M. R. Oswald, "Gaussian-slam: Photo-realistic dense slam with gaussian splatting," 2023.
- A. Masoumian, H. A. Rashwan, J. Cristiano, M. S. Asif, and [26]D. Puig, "Monocular depth estimation using deep learning: A review," Sensors, vol. 22, no. 14, 2022.
- [27] L. Piccinelli, Y.-H. Yang, C. Sakaridis, M. Segu, S. Li, L. V. Gool, and F. Yu, "Unidepth: Universal monocular metric depth estimation," 2024.
- "Özyeşil: A survey of structure from motion*. Google Scholar." [28]
- [29] D. Scharstein, R. Szeliski, and R. Zabih, "A taxonomy and evaluation of dense two-frame stereo correspondence algorithms," in Proceedings IEEE Workshop on Stereo and Multi-Baseline Vision (SMBV 2001), pp. 131-140, Dec. 2001.
- [30]A. Kundu, K. M. Krishna, and J. Sivaswamy, "Moving object detection by multi-view geometric techniques from a single camera mounted robot," in 2009 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, pp. 4306-4312, Oct. 2009. ISSN: 2153-0866.
- [31] D. Eigen, C. Puhrsch, and R. Fergus, "Depth map prediction from a single image using a multi-scale deep network," in Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS'14, (Cambridge, MA, USA), pp. 2366–2374, MIT Press, Dec. 2014.
- N. Silberman, D. Hoiem, P. Kohli, and R. Fergus, "Indoor [32]Segmentation and Support Inference from RGBD Images," in Computer Vision - ECCV 2012 (A. Fitzgibbon, S. Lazebnik, P. Perona, Y. Sato, and C. Schmid, eds.), (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 746–760, Springer, 2012.
- M. Menze and A. Geiger, "Object scene flow for autonomous [33] vehicles," in 2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp. 3061–3070, June 2015. ISSN: 1063-6919.
- [34]S. F. Bhat, I. Alhashim, and P. Wonka, "AdaBins: Depth Estimation Using Adaptive Bins," pp. 4009–4018, 2021.
- [35] S. F. Bhat, I. Alhashim, and P. Wonka, "LocalBins: Improving Depth Estimation by Learning Local Distributions," in Computer Vision - ECCV 2022 (S. Avidan, G. Brostow, M. Cissé, G. M. Farinella, and T. Hassner, eds.), (Cham), pp. 480-496, Springer Nature Switzerland, 2022.
- Z. Li, X. Wang, X. Liu, and J. Jiang, "BinsFormer: Revis-[36]iting Adaptive Bins for Monocular Depth Estimation," IEEE

Transactions on Image Processing, vol. 33, pp. 3964–3976, 2024. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Image Processing.

- [37] W. Yuan, X. Gu, Z. Dai, S. Zhu, and P. Tan, "Neural Window Fully-connected CRFs for Monocular Depth Estimation," in 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp. 3906–3915, June 2022. ISSN: 2575-7075.
- [38] H. Fu, M. Gong, C. Wang, K. Batmanghelich, and D. Tao, "Deep Ordinal Regression Network for Monocular Depth Estimation," 2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pp. 2002–2011, June 2018. Conference Name: 2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) ISBN: 9781538664209 Place: Salt Lake City, UT Publisher: IEEE.
- [39] V. Patil, C. Sakaridis, A. Liniger, and L. Van Gool, "P3Depth: Monocular Depth Estimation with a Piecewise Planarity Prior," 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp. 1600–1611, June 2022. Conference Name: 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) ISBN: 9781665469463 Place: New Orleans, LA, USA Publisher: IEEE.
- [40] L. Piccinelli, C. Sakaridis, and F. Yu, "iDisc: Internal Discretization for Monocular Depth Estimation," in 2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), (Vancouver, BC, Canada), pp. 21477–21487, IEEE, June 2023.
- [41] R. Ranftl, A. Bochkovskiy, and V. Koltun, "Vision Transformers for Dense Prediction," in 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), (Montreal, QC, Canada), pp. 12159–12168, IEEE, Oct. 2021.
- [42] Y. Wang, X. Chen, Y. You, L. E. Li, B. Hariharan, M. Campbell, K. Q. Weinberger, and W.-L. Chao, "Train in Germany, Test in the USA: Making 3D Object Detectors Generalize," in 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp. 11710–11720, June 2020. ISSN: 2575-7075.
- [43] V. Guizilini, I. Vasiljevic, D. Chen, R. Ambruş, and A. Gaidon, "Towards Zero-Shot Scale-Aware Monocular Depth Estimation," in 2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), (Paris, France), pp. 9199–9209, IEEE, Oct. 2023.
- [44] W. Yin, C. Zhang, H. Chen, Z. Cai, G. Yu, K. Wang, X. Chen, and C. Shen, "Metric3D: Towards Zero-shot Metric 3D Prediction from A Single Image," July 2023. arXiv:2307.10984 [cs].
- [45] L. Piccinelli, Y.-H. Yang, C. Sakaridis, M. Segu, S. Li, L. Van Gool, and F. Yu, "UniDepth: Universal Monocular Metric Depth Estimation," pp. 10106–10116, 2024.
- [46] B. Mildenhall, P. P. Srinivasan, M. Tancik, J. T. Barron, R. Ramamoorthi, and R. Ng, "Nerf: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis," 2020.
- [47] J. L. Schönberger, E. Zheng, J.-M. Frahm, and M. Pollefeys, "Pixelwise view selection for unstructured multi-view stereo," in *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016* (B. Leibe, J. Matas, N. Sebe, and M. Welling, eds.), (Cham), pp. 501–518, Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [48] E. Sucar, S. Liu, J. Ortiz, and A. J. Davison, "imap: Implicit mapping and positioning in real-time," 2021.
- [49] E. Sandström, Y. Li, L. V. Gool, and M. R. Oswald, "Pointslam: Dense neural point cloud-based slam," 2023.
- [50] M. Turkulainen, X. Ren, I. Melekhov, O. Seiskari, E. Rahtu, and J. Kannala, "Dn-splatter: Depth and normal priors for gaussian splatting and meshing," 2024.
- [51] S. Ha, J. Yeon, and H. Yu, "Rgbd gs-icp slam," 2024.
- [52] J. Hu, X. Chen, B. Feng, G. Li, L. Yang, H. Bao, G. Zhang, and Z. Cui, "Cg-slam: Efficient dense rgb-d slam in a consistent uncertainty-aware 3d gaussian field," 2024.
- [53] L. C. Sun, N. P. Bhatt, J. C. Liu, Z. Fan, Z. Wang, T. E. Humphreys, and U. Topcu, "Mm3dgs slam: Multi-modal 3d gaussian splatting for slam using vision, depth, and inertial measurements," 2024.
- [54] C. Yan, D. Qu, D. Xu, B. Zhao, Z. Wang, D. Wang, and X. Li, "Gs-slam: Dense visual slam with 3d gaussian splatting," 2024.
- [55] A. Abdelsalam, M. Mansour, J. Porras, and A. Happonen, "Depth accuracy analysis of the zed 2i stereo camera in an indoor environment," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 179, p. 104753, 2024.

- [56] A. Kaehler and G. Bradski, Learning OpenCV 3: computer vision in C++ with the OpenCV library. " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2016.
- [57] J. J. Engel, V. Koltun, and D. Cremers, "Direct sparse odometry," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 40, pp. 611–625, 2016.
- [58] B. V. Vishnyakov, Y. V. Vizilter, V. A. Knyaz, I. K. Malin, O. V. Vygolov, and S. Y. Zheltov, "Stereo sequences analysis for dynamic scene understanding in a driver assistance system," in *Proc. Automated Visual Inspection and Machine Vision*, *Munich, Germany*, vol. 9530, SPIE, June 2015.
- [59] M. Mansour, P. Davidson, O. Stepanov, and R. Piché, "Relative importance of binocular disparity and motion parallax for depth estimation: A computer vision approach," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 11, no. 17, 2019.
- [60] J. Sturm, N. Engelhard, F. Endres, W. Burgard, and D. Cremers, "A benchmark for the evaluation of rgb-d slam systems," in Proc. of the International Conference on Intelligent Robot Systems (IROS), Oct. 2012.
- [61] Z. Teed and J. Deng, "DROID-SLAM: Deep Visual SLAM for Monocular, Stereo, and RGB-D Cameras," Advances in neural information processing systems, 2021.
- [62] lpiccinelli eth, "Unidepth." https://github.com/lpiccinellieth/UniDepth, 2024. Accessed: 2024-07-16.