

Semantic and Articulated Pedestrian Sensing Onboard a Moving Vehicle

Maria Priisalu¹

Lund University, Sweden
maria.priisalu@math.lu.se

Abstract. It is difficult to perform 3D reconstruction from on-vehicle gathered video due to the large forward motion of the vehicle. Even object detection and human sensing models perform significantly worse on onboard videos when compared to standard benchmarks because objects often appear far away from the camera compared to the standard object detection benchmarks, image quality is often decreased by motion blur and occlusions occur often. This has led to the popularisation of traffic data-specific benchmarks. Recently Light Detection And Ranging (LiDAR) sensors have become popular to directly estimate depths without the need to perform 3D reconstructions. However, LiDAR-based methods still lack in articulated human detection at a distance when compared to image-based methods. We hypothesize that benchmarks targeted at articulated human sensing from LiDAR data could bring about increased research in human sensing and prediction in traffic and could lead to improved traffic safety for pedestrians.

Keywords: Pedestrian Detection · Autonomous Vehicles

1 Introduction

Autonomous vehicle (AV) research is gaining momentum [1–4] in modeling vehicle-to-vehicle interactions, but pedestrian-vehicle motion planning models [5–46] could be improved by articulated human motion modelling. Pedestrians in difference to vehicles provide strong visual cues of their intent, as well as current and future motion through their articulated pose [47–49]. Human motion is predictable up to one second with around one centimeter average per joint error when observing articulated motion [50]. The motion information present in the pedestrian pose is unused in most AV motion planning models [5–46], as well as in AV model testing. Progress in articulated pedestrian modeling is slowed down by the lack of data due to the difficulty in recovering articulated pedestrian poses in real traffic scenarios. The importance of preserving the relationship between pedestrian motion and scene semantics on pedestrian motion perception is shown in Fig. 1. The lack of data has led to the development of AV scene understanding models [5–46] that are oblivious to pedestrian poses and other visual cues (such as facial expressions etc), thus simply omitting available motion cues. Further AV testing is not yet utilizing realistic articulated pedestrian models and instead

tests AV’s interactions with heuristic pedestrian motions [51–77]. Since AV’s are not evaluated in interactions with real humans at scale the possible safety issues in pedestrian detection, tracking and forecasting are relatively unknown.




Fig. 1. By semantically modeling articulated pedestrians an AV in orange in the left figure can foresee that pedestrian 1 will continue moving in the same direction eventually being occluded by the tree (see right figure), that pedestrian 2 may choose to cross when standing next to a crosswalk (see right figure), and that the third pedestrian will continue to cross once visible. Modeling articulated pedestrians will also ease the AV to differentiate between the second and third pedestrians as their paths cross (see figure on right), as a sudden change in direction is unlikely on a crossroad and given the pedestrians’ articulated pose.

We argue that articulated semantically grounded pedestrian sensing and modeling is currently an underdeveloped research field due to a lack of Ground Truth (GT) data. Supervised articulated human sensing models[78–89] are often evaluated on clean benchmarks[90–95] where humans are and clearly and often fully visible, close to the camera and captured in good lightning conditions. This leads to methods that fail at a distance as well as in the presence of motion blur or poor lightning and occlusions. Unsupervised [94, 96–104] and weakly supervised[105–115] training have become popular to overcome the lack of difficult and varied GT data. These models could however be improved with combined temporal and traffic-centered semantic modeling to obtain human 3D pose tracking at scale from a moving vehicle.

A ground truth dataset of articulated human motion in 3D would allow one to evaluate the discrepancy between the true and estimated scale and depth, robustness to occlusions, and motion blur in human pose detection and forecasting. In parallel to this work, an approximated dataset of articulated humans in the wild has been released[116], but the dataset still exhibits humans that are close to the camera in the presence of little camera motion when compared to images from traffic and lacks annotations in the presence of large occlusions. Even though [116] is a step in the right direction it does not express the full complexity of the problem of articulated pedestrian motion estimation from onboard vehicles.

Existing monocular absolute scale depth estimators generalize poorly on previously unseen scenes[117, 118]. The same may be expected of the partially supervised and unsupervised 3D human sensing models[94, 96–115], and this is likely to also affect the estimated limb lengths of the pedestrian. Correctly estimated limb lengths however allow for a precise estimation of the pedestrian’s travelling speed. Note that a moving camera requires a robust and temporally smooth pedestrian sensor and motion model to deal with possible image blur,

occlusions and to avoid confusion between the motion of the pedestrian and the camera. Robust and complete pedestrian motion sensing and prediction may directly reduce the number of lethal collisions with AVs.

Pedestrian trajectory forecasting is hard because pedestrians appear to move stochastically when compared to the more regular motion of cars, in particular when pedestrians are modelled by their bounding (3d) boxes [5–46]. In general pedestrian motion prediction is hard as the goal of the pedestrians and the reason for a particular speed is unknown even if articulated motion is available. But pedestrians plan their motion in the scene depending on the geometry of the semantics surrounding them; for example, pedestrians may cross the road to avoid staying on a pavement that is very shallow and is next to a densely trafficked road [48, 49]. Further, pedestrian dynamics depend on the particular pedestrian’s physique [50]. A complete pedestrian forecasting model should therefore be semantically aware as well as articulated. Currently, to our knowledge only [119] present an articulated semantically reasoning pedestrian forecasting model. A key difficulty in training articulated and semantically reasoning pedestrian models lies in the lack of data as mentioned before, but also in the lack of varied data. Pedestrians act often monotonely in traffic [120–122] as complex behaviors occur seldom in traffic, and existing datasets often do not express the full variability in human dynamics and appearances. To be utilized on-board in real time further research is necessary into robust real-time articulated semantically reasoning pedestrian motion models.




Fig. 2. The modular reconstruction process: First the data capturing the vehicle’s trajectory is estimated from GPS coordinates or accelerometer data, this is then used to initialize camera matrices in the 3D reconstruction of the scene. The frames of the binocular video are semantically segmented, semantic segmentation is used to remove moving objects (vehicles and people), and the background objects are 3D reconstructed. The semantic segmentation (or images) is then used to find the bounding boxes (BBox) of pedestrians. Then pose estimation is performed followed by filtering to disallow physically unplausible poses. Note that from semantic segmentation 3D BBox of cars can be estimated.

Autonomous vehicles typically have a number of sensors that all together generate large amounts of data (possibly up to the order of Tb per minute), so the data must be filtered for salient objects. By filtering the data we stand at the risk of possibly missing something important like a partially occluded pedestrian. Therefore how to best represent a traffic scene for autonomous driving is still an open research topic [123–127]. Within motion planning High Definition (HD) maps containing scene details in a compact representation [128], and Bird’s Eye

View (BEV) images that is to say top view image of the scene, are common because they allow for 2D vision models to easily be utilized on traffic data[124]. Both HD and BEV are compressed scene representations that do not in general allow for sensor data augmentations. In this work we opt for a semantically labeled 3D reconstruction with articulated pedestrians because this allows for detailed modeling of pedestrians, the evaluation of physical distances between objects, and data augmentation for a number of sensors (such as camera and LiDAR). This is an uncompressed scene representation that allows for data augmentation and testing but it is difficult to recover from only onboard binocular video, as will be detailed. Human sensing is performed on images [129–141] because this is a more mature research field than human sensing from other sensor data such as LiDAR-scans [142–146].

Recovering a semantic 3D model of the scene with articulated pedestrians can be done modularly as shown in Fig. 2 by estimating the recording device’s motion, semantically segmenting the scene, and 3D reconstructing the scene. Adding articulated pedestrians to the 3D scene reconstruction requires detecting the pedestrians in the scene, estimating the pose of the pedestrians in 2D, estimating the pose of the pedestrians in 3D, and filtering any physically unrealistic poses. A number of estimation errors can occur along the way, making such data gathering hard. We hypothesize that articulated human sensing, tracking and prediction could be improved by combining the three tasks, as is done for vehicles in [146–151]. After the development of the presented results pose tracking has been posed as the problem of tracking the pose of one or more pedestrians [152–154].

Note that even though human motion can be captured with a Motion Capture (MoCap) system, or recently even from selected images [116], it is not trivial to set up large-scale experiments to gather traffic datasets that contain a large variety of possible scene geometries, semantics, and GT poses. This is because MoCap data gathering requires intervening with the scene, and existing human pose sensing methods from images cannot yet capture the poses of all humans in the images [116]. Further, most MoCap methods cannot be utilized accurately outdoors with large occlusions. More research is needed in human motion capture in traffic. Markerless human pose detection results often look impressive [155], but don’t often present any results for humans who are far away in the presence of motion blur, which is the case in traffic data. Human detection at a distance in the presence of motion blur is still challenging, let alone human pose detection. Other sensors can be used to remedy motion blur and aid in human detection[156] and articulated human sensing, for example [157] perform an initial step to utilize LiDAR and images to detect distant humans in real traffic data.



Fig. 3. A sub-sampled sequence of frames from the Cityscapes dataset, Aachen.

2 Scene reconstruction

We use the Cityscapes dataset[158] that consists of binocular video sequences, with a length of 30 frames at 17 frames per second, gathered from calibrated cameras placed on the front screen of a vehicle. Sample images are shown in Fig. 3. The data gathering vehicle’s position can be estimated from the provided GPS coordinates or accelerometer data. Disparity maps are provided for each frame, and a GT semantic segmentation is provided of the leftmost camera’s image at the 20th frame. The images contain some blur because they are captured from behind the windscreen as the vehicle moves. Image blur, the fast camera motion in the forward direction (most 3D reconstruction methods are fragile to this) and independently moving objects make 3D reconstruction of the sequences hard. The inherent difficulties in 3D reconstructing onboard videos have led to the increased popularity of LiDAR for depth estimation.




Fig. 4. Visualizations of 3D pointclouds from using the vehicle’s GPS coordinates or accelerometer readings to estimate camera position with per-frame disparity maps. The GPS is noisier than the accelerometer resulting in a noisier pointcloud.

2.1 Initial Camera Positions

Assuming that the cameras cannot move within the rig or the car we can estimate the cameras’ motion as the vehicle’s motion. The vehicle’s motion can be estimated from the Global Positioning System (GPS) or the accelerometer data. The GPS

coordinates contain jumps as seen in Fig. 4 where the cameras’ estimated position and each frame’s disparity map are used to create pointclouds for each frame that are then aggregated. It can be seen that in the GPS-based vehicle trajectory, the vehicle’s rotation oscillated from frame to frame causing the 3d point clouds of different frames to diverge, while the accelerometer data results in a smoother pointcloud. This suggests that the accelerometer-based vehicle trajectory is a better initialization for the camera matrices in a 3D reconstruction system.

2.2 3D Reconstruction

Multiple 3D reconstruction methods were tested, but only COLMAP[159] converged on a large number of the available sequences. It should be noted that all libraries were tested on the same three sequences, all containing some moving pedestrians and vehicles and strong forward motion as this is typical for the Cityscapes dataset. The following libraries were tested with the following results: *Open Structure for Motion Library* (OpenSFM)[160]- A Structure from Motion(SFM) system, that is an incremental 3d reconstruction system. Fails to reconstruct the Cityscapes scenes likely because the change in camera rotation is too small between frames. Bundler[161] is also a SFM system. Finds <10 matches, and fails again likely because the images are blurry and the rotational difference between the initial camera views is too small. *OpenCV Structure from motion library*[162] - A SFM library that uses DAISY features[163]. Result of 30 frames - finds relatively few points without a clear structure. See Fig. 5. *VisualSFM*[164] a parallelized SFM pipeline with Bundler. Only a thresholded number of large-scale features are matched across images. This unfortunately fails possibly because of image blur or the lack of distinct large-scale structures in the images. The method is unable to find enough SIFT feature points likely because the images are blurry and finds no verified matches between two stereo images. Finally, VisualSFM cannot handle forward motion, not finding a good initial pair of images with enough matches. *ORB-SLAM*[165]- ORB-feature[166] (a fast feature descriptor combining gradient and binary features) based Simultaneous Localization And Mapping (SLAM) system. Finds too few keypoints, likely due to blur and depth threshold. Results in a too sparse reconstruction. *COLMAP*[167, 168]- an incremental SFM and Muti-view stereo(MVS) system. Extracts SIFT[169] features that are exhaustively matched (other matching methods are also available) across all images. Converges for 150 scenes on the training and validation set and 150 scenes on the test set. See Fig. 6. For further details on the different systems see Table 1 and the Appendix.

A number of the reconstruction methods fail to find reliable matches across images, likely because of the motion blur and poor quality of the images as the cameras are mounted behind the windscreen of the vehicle. Secondly, the majority of visual 3D reconstruction methods fail at reconstructing in the presence of large forward motion of the camera in particular at fast speeds (i.e. the speed of a car) in the presence of a large number of objects at a large distance to the camera. COLMAP [167, 168] differs mostly from the other methods by the fact that it is modeled for camera views with at times large overlaps; by its outlier

Table 1. Overview of the algorithms used by the different SFM and SLAM libraries. See the Appendix for more details.

| Method | Image features | Matching algorithm | First view selection | Method for selecting additional views | Bundle Adjustment |
|-----------|----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| OpenSFM | HAFP+HOG | Exhaustive Fast approx. NN | First frames >30% outliers | largest overlap with pointcloud | |
| Bundler | SIFT | Exhaustive approx NN | large difference in rotation | largest overlap with pointcloud | SPA inexact Newton |
| OpenCv | DAISY | Exhaustive NN | | | |
| VisualSFM | SIFT GPU | Preemptive mathcing | thresholded no. of large features | largest overlap with pointcloud | Multicore BA |
| ORB_SLAM | ORB | Stereo matching closer than 40b | first frames | next frame | Levenberg Marquardt |
| COLMAP | SIFT | Exhaustive NN | Algorithm of Beder & Steffen | high inlier ratio | PCG |




Fig. 5. 3D pointcloud reconstructed by the OpenCV library. There are too few 3D points in the pointcloud to detect what has been reconstructed.




Fig. 6. COLMAP's sparse 3D reconstruction of the scene depicted in Fig. 7 and Fig. 4. The red rectangular pyramids depict the different camera positions, showing correctly that the vehicle traveled on a curved road.

robust triangulation, probabilistic new view selection and iteratively applied final Bundle adjustment (BA) alternated with filtering and triangulation. It should, however, be noted that COLMAP is not applicable in real-time, (recently a real-time adaption[159] has become available), and it could not reconstruct all of the Cityscapes scenes (3475 in the training set and 1525 in the test set). The majority of 3D reconstruction methods are not well-fitted to reconstruct images captured from a moving vehicle. This has led to the increased popularity of LiDAR sensors as they can measure directly the distance to objects which is particularly useful in the presence of moving objects (pedestrians, cars, bikers etc.) when only a few images may be available of the object at a particular location.

2.3 Filtering out Non-stationary Objects in the 3D Reconstructions

Moving objects such as cars and pedestrians need to be removed in SFM, to this end the Gated Recurrent Flow Propagation (GRFP) net[170] that is a video segmentation network that utilizes optical flow to stabilize semantic segmentation in video data. The GRFP is used to segment the frames of the Cityscapes sequences.

COLMAP is adapted by adding semantic segmentation as an additional channel (in addition to the 3 RGB channels) describing points during SFM. The camera matrices are initialized based on the accelerometer data. A subsampled sequence of frames from the left camera can be seen in Fig. 3 and the semantic segmentation of the last frame in the left and the right images can be seen in Fig. 7. The resulting sparse reconstruction in Fig. 6 and dense reconstruction can be seen in Fig. 8. Semantic segmentation of the reconstructed 2D points is then transferred to the 3D pointcloud as detailed in the supplementary material of [171]. Note that moving objects are filtered out only during sparse reconstruction, the dense reconstruction is instead filtered for objects with dynamic object labels during voxelisation.

A number of reconstructions are shown in Fig. 9. Some reconstructions correctly recover the structure of the road such as Tübingen, Ulm and Weimar, also in Fig. 10. In general, the reconstruction deteriorates further away from the camera. This can be seen in the reconstruction of Tübingen in Fig. 9 where some of the road (in purple) is misaligned with the rest of the reconstruction and is tilted downwards. This is expected as objects further away from the camera are harder to recognize and estimate the distance to. The reconstructions elongate objects as can be seen in the reconstruction of Tübingen Ulm and Weimar in Fig. 9. COLMAP is however not always successful, when the frames change in viewpoints is small the found reconstruction ends up being flat like in Bremen in Fig. 9 or almost flat like seen in the top view of Darmstadt in Fig. 9.

To directly label a pointcloud experiments were conducted with the popular pointcloud segmentation network *Pointnet++*[172]. The Cityscapes has no GT segmented pointclouds, so a model that was finetuned on CARLA[173] generated pointclouds was tested but resulted in confused labels. Finetuning of *Pointnet++*[172] on the synthetic CARLA dataset(from [171]) resulted in a low




Fig. 7. Points belonging to moving objects cannot be used in the SFM and must be filtered out. In the top row, the semantic segmentation of the left and the right camera images are shown for one frame, and in the bottom row, the points used in the sparse reconstruction of COLMAP are shown. In red points that are included in the SFM are shown. In blue points that are omitted in the SFM (as they belong to semantic classes of pedestrians and vehicles) are shown.




Fig. 8. COLMAP's dense 3D reconstruction of the scene depicted in Fig. 7 and Fig. 4. The dense reconstruction is noisy but the scene is recognizable.




Fig. 9. Dense reconstructions. *First row:* The Bremen sequence’s first frame (to the left) and a flat reconstruction (to the right) labeled with semantic segmentation labels (top) and RGB (bottom). *Second row:* The Darmstadt’s reconstruction appears fine from the front view (middle) but is flat and curved when viewed from the top (left). *Third row:* Tübingen results in a correct reconstruction of the street close to the camera (middle), but an incorrect estimation of the street topology due to uphill view (right). *Fourth row:* Ulm is reconstructed correctly with a patch of grass separating the road and the sidewalk as seen in front (middle) and top view (to the right). *Fifth row:* Correctly reconstructed street shape as seen in front (middle) and top view (to the right).

Table 2. Frequency of the semantic classes on the CARLA dataset and accuracy of the *Pointnet++* for the different semantic classes. The semantic classes are in the order of decreasing frequency. Objects of class wall obtains the lowest accuracy.

| Class | vegetation | building | road | sidewalk | fence | static | wall | pole | sign |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------------|------|------|
| Frequency % | 37.62 | 18.50 | 17.87 | 17.55 | 3.00 | 2.81 | 1.71 | 0.83 | 0.09 |
| Accuracy | 0.93 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.67 | 0.84 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.88 | 0.71 |

mean average class accuracy of 0.62, with per class results shown in Table 2. The classes that occur seldom get low accuracy, so objects such as traffic sign get almost always incorrectly labelled. It is also worth noting that strangely enough points belonging to walls are correctly marked only in half of the occurrences. In general the results suggest that *Pointnet++* results are not on par with labelling 3D reconstructions according to projections of 2D semantic maps. It is possible that more recent methods[174–181] could improve the results.




Fig. 10. Additional dense reconstructions from Bremen showing that noise levels vary but the street shape is often successfully reconstructed.

3 Pedestrian sensing

Detecting humans is hard because they are relatively small in traffic images, they vary in physique and visual qualities depending on the human’s pose and clothing, and they change their positions from frame to frame. The fact that most popular




Fig. 11. Segmentation, BBoxes and 2D joint position estimates of *OpenPose* with *Dilational*, *GRFP* and *FRCNN*. *Dilational* net and *GRFP* manage to separate different pedestrians who are visually close by but also introduce false positives. *GRFP* produces cleaner BBoxes than *Dilational*.

object detectors are biased to detect close-up objects centered in an image makes them ill-fitted to traffic data because in traffic humans appear often a distance from the camera. We compared object detection, segmentation, and human pose detecting network’s ability to detect pedestrians on the Cityscapes dataset[158] by comparing the detected pedestrian’s BBox overlap with BBoxes generated from GT segmentations. The tested methods are

- *DilationalNet-10* [182]- A popular semantic segmentation network with dilated convolutions for larger receptive field.
- *The Gated Recurrent Flow Propagation (GRFP)*[170] - A temporally smoothed video segmentation network showing temporally smooth result on the Cityscapes dataset[158].
- *Faster-RCNN (FRCNN)*[183] - A popular object detection network with high throughput and good performance on benchmarks.
- *OpenPose*[79, 80] - A popular multi human 2D pose estimating network, that has a runtime that scales well with increasing number of visible humans.

In Table 3 it can be seen that *FRCNN* produced the smallest false positive(FP) and false negative(FN) average BBox area, but has the second highest true positive(TP) Intersection over Union (IoU) area. Because the areas of the BBoxes vary we present both the FP, FN, and TP counts and areas (normalized with

Table 3. The number of true positive, false negative and false positive BBoxes on the training and validation sets of Cityscapes for the 20th frame. The two strongest contenders for pedestrian detection are the *GRFP* and the *FRCNN*. The *GRFP* produces the largest number and area of true positives, and the *FRCNN* produces the smallest number and area of false positives and negatives.

| Model | True positives | Average TP area | False positives | Average FP area | False Negatives | Average FP area |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Dilational | 2887 | 0.699 | 7,516 | 0.008 | 16,664 | 0.016 |
| GRFP | 3588 | 0.707 | 14,317 | 0.01 | 15,980 | 0.015 |
| FRCNN | 2952 | 0.706 | 578 | 0.001 | 16,522 | 0.009 |
| OpenPose | 165 | 0.682 | 343 | 0.003 | 18,997 | 0.017 |

respect to the total GT BBox areas), to observe how many individuals are detected versus how much of the visual area is covered by the pedestrians. *FRCNN* is accurate in detecting large BBoxes, and it detects on average larger BBoxes than the *GRFP* as seen in Fig. 12 *Left*. *GRFP* on the other hand is better at capturing distant pedestrians but also produces a large amount of FPs. Based on this *FRCNN* is the most suitable pedestrian detector as it is the most accurate in detecting pedestrians close to the vehicle, these pedestrians have the highest risk of being run over if undetected.




Fig. 12. *Left:* The average relative BBox areas of the different pedestrian detection methods. *FRCNN* detects on average the largest BBoxes and *OpenPose* the smallest. *Right:* The average distance from estimated joint positions to human mask (from GT segmentation). *GRFP*'s human BBoxes result in the lowest distance from estimated joint positions to human mask and *OpenPose* in the largest.

OpenPose is used to estimate the articulated human 2D pose on the BBoxes found by *Dilational*, *GRFP* and *FRCNN* and on the whole image. We introduce the Mean Per Joint Distance to Segmentation (MPJDS) metric which is the average distance from an estimated 2D joint position to a pedestrian or biker segmentation mask. The MPJDS is an approximate measure of how accurately

OpenPose can estimate the pose of a pedestrian present in the BBoxes found by the different models, results are shown in Fig. 12 *Right*. *GRFP* results is the smallest error likely because *GRFP* detects smaller BBoxes than *FRCNN* resulting in smaller absolute errors. *OpenPose* applied on the whole image detects pedestrians that appear to be far away from the camera, but fails to estimate their pose, resulting in large joint errors for small BBoxes. Eventhough *OpenPose* has presented impressive results it fails to detect multiple pedestrians in traffic scenarios without a separate pedestrian detector.

Table 4. The FRCNN detects fewer pedestrians and bikers than Dilational but results in a lower MPJDS, suggesting that FRCNN detects pedestrians that are clearer.

| Model | MPJDS | MPJDS norm. | Number of pedestrians | Number of bikers | Crossover pedestrians | Crossover bikers |
|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| GT | 32.50 | 0.99 | 1,803 | 17,415 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Dilational | 27.17 | 0.87 | 850 | 4,572 | 0.94 | 0.91 |
| FRCNN | 10.74 | 0.38 | 392 | 2,888 | 0.86 | 0.85 |




Fig. 13. *Left:* *FRCNN* detects only large BBoxes. *Dilational* can detect smaller BBoxes, but many GT bbes are undetected by both methods. *Right:* The BBoxes found by *FRCNN* are in general representative of the GT BBox sizes, while *Dilational* underestimates BBox sizes.

To study the accuracy of *OpenPose* on BBoxes that truly contain a pedestrian we filter out the BBoxes that have at least 50% cross-over with the GT BBoxes, results are shown in Table 4. By *cross-over* is meant the percentage that the GT BBox intercepts the estimated BBox with. If an estimated BBox intercepts with a number of GT BBoxes then only the highest cross-over is recorded. The MPJDS of *OpenPose* applied on the GT BBoxes in Table 4 is much larger than that of the other two methods because the GT contains pedestrians who are hard to spot in the images (distant or occluded as seen in sizes in Fig. 14). These pedestrians go unnoticed by the *Dilational* and *FRCNN*. Even though *FRCNN* has a lower cross-over percentage than the *Dilational* it obtains the lowest MPJDS

suggesting that *FRCNN* detects the most clearly visible pedestrians. In Table 4 it can be seen that *FRCNN* detects fewer pedestrians and bikers *Dilational*, but results in a much lower MPJDS. The MPJDS of *FRCNN* is high even though the cross-over is lower than for the other models. This is likely because *FRCNN* finds pedestrians that are closer to the camera and thus clearer, omitting smaller pedestrians that are captured by *Dilational* as seen in Fig. 13Left.

The *FRCNN* correctly estimates the GT BBox sizes as seen in Fig. 13 Right, but *Dilational* underestimates BBox sizes showing the pedestrians only partially and therefore has a higher MPJDS than *FRCNN* even for large GT BBoxes as seen in Fig. 14. *Dilational* net can detect smaller pedestrians because it has been trained on the Cityscapes dataset in difference to *FRCNN*. It is possible that *FRCNN* cannot detect small pedestrians because it has been trained with larger anchor sizes than the visible pedestrians. An example showing close up occluded pedestrians comparing the *GRFP*, *Dilational* net, *FRCNN* and GT can be seen in Fig. 11.




Fig. 14. Left: The MPJDS is plotted against the BBox area for the BBoxes found by the different methods. *FRCNN* finds larger BBoxes and results in lower MPJDS for these larger BBoxes than for the BBoxes found by *Dilational* net, suggesting that *FRCNN* finds easier to detect pedestrians. Right: Histogram of MPJDS distribution of the *FRCNN* detections shows that most errors are small. There appear to be no outliers with large MPJDS error.

Table 5. By introducing smallest size constraints on the BBoxes the number of false positives can be reduced significantly.

| Model | GT | GT Filtered | Dilational | GRFP |
|-----------------|--------|-------------|------------|-------|
| True Positives | 15,934 | 8,986 | 3,316 | 3,643 |
| False Positives | 0 | 0 | 235 | 1,038 |

The *Dilational* net has trouble differentiating between the labels: “pedestrian”, “biker”, and “bike” as seen in Fig. 11. Therefore *Dilational* net BBoxes are fitted

with skeletons after allowing biker and pedestrian labels to be interpreted as the same label. Also, bike labels are allowed to be interpreted as human if they are in connection to rider or pedestrian labels. In Fig. 11 it can also be seen that only a small change in the placement of the BBox around a pedestrian results in variations in the estimate of the pose, showing that *OpenPose* is not robust to errors in pedestrian BBox placement.

Further on crowded images the *FRCNN* has superior performance because it can separate between pedestrians as seen in Fig. 22, and *GRFP* is superior in distant pedestrian detection as seen in Fig. 23. In the crowded scene the pose estimator gets confused with BBoxes because for some pedestrians only a single body part is visible, and it is hard for the pose estimator to detect that the body part is not just a blurry image of a human. Videos of sample pose estimations can be found at <https://youtu.be/qpxpdtHbbGA> where it can be seen that the pose estimations are not temporally smooth for any of the proposed methods. To avoid false detections of the *Dilational* net and *GRFP* we remove any BBoxes that are smaller than 7 pixels in width and 25 pixels in height. This results in a decrease in the number of false positives for *GRFP* and the *Dilational* as seen in Table 5.




Fig. 15. A scene’s semantic segmentation, disparity map, triangulation of the frame from the disparity map and the triangulated human pose.

3.1 Reconstructing Pedestrians

Triangulation can be used to reconstruct the human 3D poses from the 2D poses found with the dataset’s disparity maps. This however results in a noisy

pose estimate as seen in Fig. 15. Stereo triangulation results in a noisy 3D reconstruction. The triangulated 2D joint positions can therefore receive incorrect depth resulting in implausible 3D poses. Often a body joint receives the depth of the background resulting in an elongated limb, as seen in Fig. 16. To correct such errors we apply a threshold to limb lengths, proportioned according to the hip length or back-bone length of the pedestrian. This is not robust because the hip and backbone length are estimated according to a standard skeleton from Human3.6M[90]. The limb length can be estimated according to an average skeleton relative to the height of a person. The height of the person can be roughly approximated from the bounding box height, with the downside that BBox height is pose-dependent.

The corrected skeleton may still suggest a physically implausible pose. To correct this the nearest neighbour plausible pose is found from Human3.6M[90]. To find an outlier robust estimate of the nearest neighbor a thresholded loss is applied. Procrustes analysis is used to find the optimal alignment between the skeletons. The final corrected pose with scaling according to hip or backbone are shown in Fig. 16.




Fig. 16. *To the Left:* Incorrectly triangulated head position, full image in Fig. 15. All axis are in meters. Procrustes corrected skeletons with (a) scaled according to backbone length and (b) scaled according to hipbone length. Neither of the scalings give the desired result.

It is clear that the scaling and rotation of the resulting 3D pose are imperfect. When triangulating the pose for each frame jitter can be expected between frames due to noise. Therefore a monocular single-person 3D pose estimator *Deep Multitask Architecture for Fully Automatic 2D and 3D Human Sensing (DMHS)*[184] is tested as well.

The *DMHS* is applied to GT and *FRCNN* see Fig. 17 *left* and *right* respectively. At times *FRCNN* provides a too small BBox, by increasing the boundary (with 10%) the results improve, see Fig. 17 *right*. The pose detector fails when multiple people are present in the BB, or when the pedestrians are poorly visible.




Fig. 17. To the *left* *DMHS* estimates the pose of a pedestrian decently correctly when the pedestrian is clearly visible. The 3D pose (scale in cm), 2D pose and Body part segmentation are shown respectively. To the *right* BBox enlargement improves the pose estimation when some limbs are not visible.

Eventhough *FRCNN* detects close-up pedestrians, still very few BBoxes are clearly visible and thus few obtain accurate pose estimations.

3.2 Reconstructing Vehicles




Fig. 18. To the *left* Cityscapes disparity map and *right* COLMAP depth estimate of a *FRCNN* BBox of a car clearly contain multiple cars.

The *FRCNN* has trouble separating multiple instances of cars when cars are parked in a row as seen in Fig. 18 due to the large visual overlap. During triangulation for simplicity we model cars found by the detection model by fixed sized 3D BBoxes. As a result during 3D triangulation multiple vehicles that are visible in one 2D BBox get replaced by one 3D BBox with an average disparity for all of the cars visible in the 2D bbox. This results in an incorrect 3D reconstruction of the scene. To improve this Path Aggregation Network for Instance Segmentation (*PANNET*)[185] an *FRCNN* architecture based instance segmentation network is utilized instead. Sample segmentation showing the correct instance segmentation of *PANNET* is shown in Fig. 3.2.

Fig. 19. PANNET correctly separates different parked cars even in the presence of occlusions.



4 Developments in the field

The presented results were developed from 2016 to 2018. In parallel to our work [186, 187] noted that detecting objects at a distance is hard, and in particular human detection at a distance or in the presence of occlusions has gained popularity [188–195]. Further it has been noted by [196] that a number of human detection models do not generalize across datasets. Optimal alignment of BBoxes has also been studied in [197]. The run-time accuracy trade-off of object detection methods aimed to be utilized on AVs is studied in [198].

More compact representations of scenes are often utilized in AV planning containing either rasterized graphs with local context [199] or BEV representations [124]. This is suitable as planning must occur fast, but we still believe that articulated human motion ought to be included in the representation. The advantage of utilizing 3D pointclouds and images is that the 3D reconstructed scenes can easily be utilized to train AVs on augmented data [119, 171, 200].

Human and object detection in traffic from alternative sensors such as Radar [201], LiDAR [143, 202–206], event cameras [207] have been studied as a way to boost object and human detection performance. Methods to improve low-quality image data by reducing motion blur [208], increasing image quality in low light or low-resolution images [209] performing detection on RAW images [210], or object in-painting to recover from occlusions [211] could possibly greatly improve human sensing in real traffic data.

Further LiDAR sensors have gained popularity to avoid the difficult task of estimating the depths of moving objects. Unfortunately sensing of articulated humans in LiDAR [212] has not yet caught up with the methods developed to sense humans in videos. There exist methods that combine LiDAR and RGB fusion [43, 213–216] for pedestrian detection and trajectory forecasting, the same could be done for human pose forecasting. Human pose estimation has developed greatly with more models that fit meshes to human bodies to densely estimate human pose and semantic mask [184, 212, 217–219], methods that reason about the physics of the estimated pose have been developed [220–222], as well as methods that utilize temporal constraints [223–225]. Still, the majority of articulated human sensing methods are developed on visuals where humans are centered in the images [184, 217, 218, 220–222], leaving a gap to traffic data where most

humans are relatively far away. Human pose estimation and forecasting are more frequently being combined with segmentation[226–228], tracking[226, 229, 230] gait recognition[231] and camera pose estimation[232, 233]. Human motion can be very informative in traffic and pedestrian behavior modeling can even be used to detect vehicles in blind spots in traffic [234]. To maximally utilize the available information in human motion, methods that are robust to variations in the human physique and behavior need to be developed, but this is hard due to the relative lack of data.

Vehicle orientation and shape estimation techniques are amongst others in images[235], in LiDAR[236]. A method that jointly performs semantic segmentation and 3D reconstructions could benefit both tasks[237].

Improved depth estimation of pedestrians and vehicles through a LiDAR data-like data representation Pseudo-LiDAR is studied in [238, 239] Finally, 3D reconstruction methods have developed greatly with more learning integrated into the 3D reconstruction pipeline [240–244], from learned monocular depthmaps[245], to learned 3D reconstruction features [246] to 3d matching[247] and the visually pleasing NERF-based methods[248, 249]. Semantic segmentation, tracking, and object detection methods are also becoming less supervised utilizing learned matching and language model based labels [144, 250–257]. Combining different visual tasks like object detection semantics segmentation, tracking with 3D modeling has seen success in [144, 258]. This is quite natural because as seen in Fig. 18 the two tasks are closely intertwined and information sharing may help in both directions.

Traffic datasets that are focused on pedestrians have become more abundant [259–270], but there exist only datasets with estimated articulated labels for pedestrians [157]. Even though progress has been made on marker-less human motion capture [116] the methods need to be made robust for multiple humans at a distance and in the presence of occlusions. In parallel to our work, a study[271] on occlusion rates in pedestrian bounding boxes on the Cityscapes dataset was performed. We note that [271] may be treated as complementary to the work presented here that focuses on the task of 3D human pose reconstruction rather than just bounding box occlusions.

5 Conclusion

None of the discussed methods of 3D reconstructing human pose are robust enough to be utilized to forecast human motion for assisted driving. This is because there is a gap in performance for human sensing methods between the datasets used in standard benchmarks and the performance on real traffic data, suggesting that benchmarks of human motion sensing are not representative of utilization in traffic. Instead, traffic-based articulated 3D human sensing benchmarks should be developed. Available 3D human pose datasets in the wild [116] still lack in distant pedestrians under poor lighting conditions, or provide only approximate human poses[157]. To make articulated human sensing robust temporal smoothness, consistent use of an individual’s estimated limb lengths,

foreseeing typical motions given the human's environment, and understanding of the physical constraints of the human body should be solved simultaneously as the problems share information. So far a number of methods have solved some of these subproblems, but a unifying method is still to be developed. As a result to the lack of a robust articulated humans sensing method a large number of existing autonomous vehicle planning models[5–36, 43, 199] treat pedestrians by their bounding boxes, thus omitting the motion cues available in human pose and therefore ignoring available future motion cues. If robust and complete articulated human sensing methods are developed, then complete human forecasting methods may be developed and utilized in the planning stages of AVs.

Bibliography

- [1] Brian Paden, Michal Čáp, Sze Zheng Yong, Dmitry Yershov, and Emilio Frazzoli. A survey of motion planning and control techniques for self-driving urban vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on intelligent vehicles*, 1(1):33–55, 2016.
- [2] Zeyu Zhu and Huijing Zhao. A survey of deep rl and il for autonomous driving policy learning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(9):14043–14065, 2021.
- [3] Fei Ye, Shen Zhang, Pin Wang, and Ching-Yao Chan. A survey of deep reinforcement learning algorithms for motion planning and control of autonomous vehicles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14218, accepted in IEEE Transactions on intelligent transportation systems.*, 2021.
- [4] Lianzhen Wei, Zirui Li, Jianwei Gong, Cheng Gong, and Jiachen Li. Autonomous driving strategies at intersections: Scenarios, state-of-the-art, and future outlooks. In *24th IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference, ITSC 2021, Indianapolis, IN, USA, September 19-22, 2021*, pages 44–51. IEEE, 2021.
- [5] Inhwan Bae and Hae-Gon Jeon. A set of control points conditioned pedestrian trajectory prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 6155–6165, 2023.
- [6] Macheng Shen, Golnaz Habibi, and Jonathan P How. Transferable pedestrian motion prediction models at intersections. In *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 4547–4553. IEEE, 2018.
- [7] Chengxi Li, Yue Meng, Stanley H Chan, and Yi-Ting Chen. Learning 3d-aware egocentric spatial-temporal interaction via graph convolutional networks. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 8418–8424. IEEE, 2020.
- [8] Nicholas Rhinehart, Rowan McAllister, Kris Kitani, and Sergey Levine. Precog: Prediction conditioned on goals in visual multi-agent settings. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2821–2830, 2019.
- [9] Yu Yao, Ella Atkins, Matthew Johnson-Roberson, Ram Vasudevan, and Xiaoxiao Du. Bitrap: Bi-directional pedestrian trajectory prediction with multi-modal goal estimation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(2):1463–1470, 2021.
- [10] Zhe Huang, Aamir Hasan, Kazuki Shin, Ruohua Li, and Katherine Driggs-Campbell. Long-term pedestrian trajectory prediction using mutable intention filter and warp lstm. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(2):542–549, 2020.
- [11] Nachiket Deo and Mohan M Trivedi. Trajectory forecasts in unknown environments conditioned on grid-based plans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00735*, 2020.

- [12] Hang Zhao, Jiyang Gao, Tian Lan, Chen Sun, Ben Sapp, Balakrishnan Varadarajan, Yue Shen, Yi Shen, Yuning Chai, Cordelia Schmid, et al. Tnt: Target-driven trajectory prediction. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 895–904. PMLR, 2021.
- [13] Karttikeya Mangalam, Harshayu Girase, Shreyas Agarwal, Kuan-Hui Lee, Ehsan Adeli, Jitendra Malik, and Adrien Gaidon. It is not the journey but the destination: Endpoint conditioned trajectory prediction. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16*, pages 759–776. Springer, 2020.
- [14] Jiachen Li, Chuanbo Hua, Jinkyoo Park, Hengbo Ma, Victoria Dax, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Evolvehypergraph: Group-aware dynamic relational reasoning for trajectory prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05470*, 2022.
- [15] Yuying Chen, Congcong Liu, Xiaodong Mei, Bertram E. Shi, and Ming Liu. Hgcn-gjs: Hierarchical graph convolutional network with groupwise joint sampling for trajectory prediction. In *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 13400–13405, 2022.
- [16] Nemanja Djuric, Vladan Radosavljevic, Henggang Cui, Thi Nguyen, Fang-Chieh Chou, Tsung-Han Lin, Nitin Singh, and Jeff Schneider. Uncertainty-aware short-term motion prediction of traffic actors for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 2095–2104, 2020.
- [17] Ming Liang, Bin Yang, Wenyuan Zeng, Yun Chen, Rui Hu, Sergio Casas, and Raquel Urtasun. Pnpnet: End-to-end perception and prediction with tracking in the loop. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11553–11562, 2020.
- [18] Yuanfu Luo, Panpan Cai, Yiyuan Lee, and David Hsu. Gamma: A general agent motion model for autonomous driving. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(2):3499–3506, 2022.
- [19] Yuexin Ma, Xinge Zhu, Sibozhang, Ruigang Yang, Wenping Wang, and Dinesh Manocha. Trafficpredict: Trajectory prediction for heterogeneous traffic-agents. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6120–6127, 2019.
- [20] Yanliang Zhu, Dongchun Ren, Mingyu Fan, Deheng Qian, Xin Li, and Huaxia Xia. Robust trajectory forecasting for multiple intelligent agents in dynamic scene. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13133*, 2020.
- [21] NN Sriram, Buyu Liu, Francesco Pittaluga, and Manmohan Chandraker. Smart: Simultaneous multi-agent recurrent trajectory prediction. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXVII 16*, pages 463–479. Springer, 2020.
- [22] Tianyang Zhao, Yifei Xu, Mathew Monfort, Wongun Choi, Chris Baker, Yibiao Zhao, Yizhou Wang, and Ying Nian Wu. Multi-agent tensor fusion for contextual trajectory prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12126–12134, 2019.

- [23] Katie Luo, Sergio Casas, Renjie Liao, Xinchun Yan, Yuwen Xiong, Wenyan Zeng, and Raquel Urtasun. Safety-oriented pedestrian motion and scene occupancy forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02385*, 2021.
- [24] Liangji Fang, Qinhong Jiang, Jianping Shi, and Bolei Zhou. Tpnnet: Trajectory proposal network for motion prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6797–6806, 2020.
- [25] Seong Hyeon Park, Gyubok Lee, Jimin Seo, Manoj Bhat, Minseok Kang, Jonathan Francis, Ashwin Jadhav, Paul Pu Liang, and Louis-Philippe Morency. Diverse and admissible trajectory forecasting through multimodal context understanding. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XI 16*, pages 282–298. Springer, 2020.
- [26] Tessa van der Heiden, Naveen Shankar-Nagaraja, Christian Weiß, and Efstratios Gavves. Safecritic: Collision-aware trajectory prediction.
- [27] Tao Yang, Zhixiong Nan, He Zhang, Shitao Chen, and Nanning Zheng. Traffic agent trajectory prediction using social convolution and attention mechanism. In *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 278–283. IEEE, 2020.
- [28] Hao Cheng, Wentong Liao, Michael Ying Yang, Bodo Rosenhahn, and Monika Sester. Amenet: Attentive maps encoder network for trajectory prediction. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 172:253–266, 2021.
- [29] Francesco Giuliari, Irtiza Hasan, Marco Cristani, and Fabio Galasso. Transformer networks for trajectory forecasting. In *2020 25th international conference on pattern recognition (ICPR)*, pages 10335–10342. IEEE, 2021.
- [30] Cyrus Anderson, Ram Vasudevan, and Matthew Johnson-Roberson. Off the beaten sidewalk: Pedestrian prediction in shared spaces for autonomous vehicles. *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, 5(4):6892–6899, 2020.
- [31] Tim Salzmann, Boris Ivanovic, Punarjay Chakravarty, and Marco Pavone. Trajectron++: Dynamically-feasible trajectory forecasting with heterogeneous data. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision - ECCV 2020 - 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XVIII*, volume 12363 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 683–700. Springer, 2020.
- [32] Mahmoud Hamandi, Mike D’Arcy, and Pooyan Fazli. Deepmotion: Learning to navigate like humans. In *28th IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication, RO-MAN 2019, New Delhi, India, October 14-18, 2019*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2019.
- [33] Xinjie Yao, Ji Zhang, and Jean Oh. Following social groups: Socially compliant autonomous navigation in dense crowds. *ArXiv*, abs/1911.12063, 2019.
- [34] Yuying Chen, Congcong Liu, Bertram E. Shi, and Ming Liu. Robot navigation in crowds by graph convolutional networks with attention learned from human gaze. *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, 5(2):2754–2761, 2020.

- [35] Boris Ivanovic, Karen Leung, Edward Schmerling, and Marco Pavone. Multimodal deep generative models for trajectory prediction: A conditional variational autoencoder approach. *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, 6(1):295–302, 2021.
- [36] Roger Girgis, Florian Golemo, Felipe Codevilla, Martin Weiss, Jim Aldon D’Souza, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Felix Heide, and Christopher Pal. Latent variable sequential set transformers for joint multi-agent motion prediction. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [37] Bohan Tang, Yiqi Zhong, Chenxin Xu, Wei-Tao Wu, Ulrich Neumann, Ya Zhang, Siheng Chen, and Yanfeng Wang. Collaborative uncertainty benefits multi-agent multi-modal trajectory forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.
- [38] Xin Huang, Stephen G McGill, Jonathan A DeCastro, Luke Fletcher, John J Leonard, Brian C Williams, and Guy Rosman. Diversitygan: Diversity-aware vehicle motion prediction via latent semantic sampling. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 5(4):5089–5096, 2020.
- [39] Bo Jiang, Shaoyu Chen, Xinggang Wang, Bencheng Liao, Tianheng Cheng, Jiajie Chen, Helong Zhou, Qian Zhang, Wenyu Liu, and Chang Huang. Perceive, interact, predict: Learning dynamic and static clues for end-to-end motion prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.02181*, 2022.
- [40] Charlie Tang and Russ R Salakhutdinov. Multiple futures prediction. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [41] Manish, Upasana Dohare, and Sushil Kumar. A survey of vehicle trajectory prediction based on deep learning models. In *Proceedings of Third International Conference on Sustainable Expert Systems: ICSES 2022*, pages 649–664. Springer, 2023.
- [42] Thomas Gilles, Stefano Sabatini, Dzmitry Tsishkou, Bogdan Stanculescu, and Fabien Moutarde. Thomas: Trajectory heatmap output with learned multi-agent sampling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [43] Lingyun Luke Li, Bin Yang, Ming Liang, Wenyuan Zeng, Mengye Ren, Sean Segal, and Raquel Urtasun. End-to-end contextual perception and prediction with interaction transformer. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 5784–5791. IEEE, 2020.
- [44] Wenyuan Zeng, Shenlong Wang, Renjie Liao, Yun Chen, Bin Yang, and Raquel Urtasun. Dsdnet: Deep structured self-driving network. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, pages 156–172, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- [45] Sergio Casas, Cole Gulino, Renjie Liao, and Raquel Urtasun. Spagnn: Spatially-aware graph neural networks for relational behavior forecasting from sensor data. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9491–9497. IEEE, 2020.

- [46] Kaouther Messaoud, Nachiket Deo, Mohan M Trivedi, and Fawzi Nashashibi. Trajectory prediction for autonomous driving based on multi-head attention with joint agent-map representation. In *2021 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 165–170. IEEE, 2021.
- [47] Fanta Camara, Nicola Bellotto, Serhan Cosar, Dimitris Nathanael, Matthias Althoff, Jingyuan Wu, Johannes Ruenz, André Dietrich, and Charles W Fox. Pedestrian models for autonomous driving part i: low-level models, from sensing to tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 22(10):6131–6151, 2020.
- [48] Fanta Camara, Nicola Bellotto, Serhan Cosar, Florian Weber, Dimitris Nathanael, Matthias Althoff, Jingyuan Wu, Johannes Ruenz, André Dietrich, Gustav Markkula, et al. Pedestrian models for autonomous driving part ii: high-level models of human behavior. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 22(9):5453–5472, 2020.
- [49] Amir Rasouli and John K Tsotsos. Autonomous vehicles that interact with pedestrians: A survey of theory and practice. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 21(3):900–918, 2019.
- [50] Kedi Lyu, Haipeng Chen, Zhenguang Liu, Beiqi Zhang, and Ruili Wang. 3d human motion prediction: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 489:345–365, 2022.
- [51] Xinhai Zhang, Jianbo Tao, Kaige Tan, Martin Törngren, Jose Manuel Gaspar Sanchez, Muhammad Rusyadi Ramli, Xin Tao, Magnus Gyllenhammar, Franz Wotawa, Naveen Mohan, et al. Finding critical scenarios for automated driving systems: A systematic mapping study. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 49(3):991–1026, 2022.
- [52] Ziyuan Zhong, Yun Tang, Yuan Zhou, Vania de Oliveira Neves, Yang Liu, and Baishakhi Ray. A survey on scenario-based testing for automated driving systems in high-fidelity simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00964*, 2021.
- [53] Wenhao Ding, Chejian Xu, Mansur Arief, Haohong Lin, Bo Li, and Ding Zhao. A survey on safety-critical driving scenario generation - A methodological perspective. *CoRR*, abs/2202.02215, 2022.
- [54] Ziyuan Zhong, Yun Tang, Yuan Zhou, Vânia de Oliveira Neves, Yang Liu, and Baishakhi Ray. A survey on scenario-based testing for automated driving systems in high-fidelity simulation. *CoRR*, abs/2112.00964, 2021.
- [55] Abdullah Hamdi, Matthias Mueller, and Bernard Ghanem. SADA: semantic adversarial diagnostic attacks for autonomous applications. In *In Proceedings of Thirty-Fourth Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 10901–10908. AAAI Press, 2020.
- [56] Piyush Gupta, Demetris Coleman, and J. Siegel. Towards safer self-driving through great pain (physically adversarial intelligent networks). *CoRR*, abs/2003.10662, 2020.
- [57] Mingyun Wen, Jisun Park, and Kyungeun Cho. A scenario generation pipeline for autonomous vehicle simulators. *Human-centric Computing and Information Sciences*, 10:24, 12 2020.
- [58] Mark Koren and Mykel J. Kochenderfer. Efficient autonomy validation in simulation with adaptive stress testing. In *In Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE*

- Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference*, pages 4178–4183. IEEE, 2019.
- [59] Golam Md Muktadir and Jim Whitehead. Adversarial jaywalker modeling for simulation-based testing of autonomous vehicle systems. In *In Proceedings of the 2022 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*, pages 1697–1702. IEEE, 2022.
- [60] Wenhao Ding, Haohong Lin, Bo Li, and Ding Zhao. Causalaf: Causal autoregressive flow for safety-critical driving scenario generation. In *To appear in Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Robot Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022.
- [61] Yasasa Abeysirigoonawardena, Florian Shkurti, and Gregory Dudek. Generating adversarial driving scenarios in high-fidelity simulators. In *In Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 8271–8277. IEEE, 2019.
- [62] Raja Ben Abdesslem, Annibale Panichella, Shiva Nejati, Lionel C. Briand, and Thomas Stifter. Testing autonomous cars for feature interaction failures using many-objective search. In Marianne Huchard, Christian Kästner, and Gordon Fraser, editors, *In Proceedings of the 33rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 143–154. ACM, 2018.
- [63] Yihao Li, Jianbo Tao, and Franz Wotawa. Ontology-based test generation for automated and autonomous driving functions. *Information and Software Technology*, 117, 2020.
- [64] Raja Ben Abdesslem, Shiva Nejati, Lionel C. Briand, and Thomas Stifter. Testing advanced driver assistance systems using multi-objective search and neural networks. In David Lo, Sven Apel, and Sarfraz Khurshid, editors, *In Proceedings of the 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 63–74. ACM, 2016.
- [65] Ziyuan Zhong, Gail Kaiser, and Baishakhi Ray. Neural network guided evolutionary fuzzing for finding traffic violations of autonomous vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2022.
- [66] Andreas Bussler, Lukas Hartjen, Robin Philipp, and Fabian Schuld. Application of evolutionary algorithms and criticality metrics for the verification and validation of automated driving systems at urban intersections. In *In Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*, pages 128–135. IEEE, 2020.
- [67] Sumaya Almanee, Xiafa Wu, Yuqi Huai, Qi Alfred Chen, and Joshua Garcia. scenorita: Generating less-redundant, safety-critical and motion sickness-inducing scenarios for autonomous vehicles. *CoRR*, abs/2112.09725, 2021.
- [68] Wenhao Ding, Baiming Chen, Bo Li, Kim Ji Eun, and Ding Zhao. Multi-modal safety-critical scenarios generation for decision-making algorithms evaluation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(2):1551–1558, 2021.
- [69] Priyam Parashar, Akansel Cosgun, Alireza Nakhaei, and Kikuo Fujimura. Modeling preemptive behaviors for uncommon hazardous situations from demonstrations. *CoRR*, abs/1806.00143, 2018.

- [70] A. Demetriou, Henrik Alfvåg, Sadegh Rahrovani, and M. Chehreghani. A deep learning framework for generation and analysis of driving scenario trajectories. *CoRR*, abs/2007.14524, 2020.
- [71] Daisuke Nishiyama, Mario Ynocente Castro, Shirou Maruyama, Shinya Shiroshita, Karim Hamzaoui, Yi Ouyang, Guy Rosman, Jonathan A. DeCastro, Kuan-Hui Lee, and Adrien Gaidon. Discovering avoidable planner failures of autonomous vehicles using counterfactual analysis in behaviorally diverse simulation. In *In Proceedings of 23rd IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2020.
- [72] Wenhao Ding, Mengdi Xu, and Ding Zhao. CMTS: A conditional multiple trajectory synthesizer for generating safety-critical driving scenarios. In *In Proceedings of 2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 4314–4321. IEEE, 2020.
- [73] Xiaohua Sun, Yiwen Zhang, and Wenjie Zhou. Building narrative scenarios for human-autonomous vehicle interaction research in simulators. In *Advances in Simulation and Digital Human Modeling - Proceedings of the 2020 Virtual Conferences on Human Factors and Simulation, and Digital Human Modeling and Applied Optimization*, volume 1206 of *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, pages 150–156. Springer, 2020.
- [74] Dhanoop Karunakaran, Stewart Worrall, and Eduardo Nebot. Efficient falsification approach for autonomous vehicle validation using a parameter optimisation technique based on reinforcement learning, 2020.
- [75] Dhanoop Karunakaran, Stewart Worrall, and Eduardo M. Nebot. Efficient statistical validation with edge cases to evaluate highly automated vehicles. In *In Proceedings of the 23rd IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2020.
- [76] Wenhao Ding, Baiming Chen, Minjun Xu, and Ding Zhao. Learning to collide: An adaptive safety-critical scenarios generating method. In *In Proceedings of 2020 IEEE/RSS International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 2243–2250. IEEE, 2020.
- [77] Jinggang Wang, Ava Pun, James Tu, Sivabalan Manivasagam, Abbas Sadat, Sergio Casas, Mengye Ren, and Raquel Urtasun. Advsim: Generating safety-critical scenarios for self-driving vehicles. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9909–9918, 2021.
- [78] Shih-En Wei, Varun Ramakrishna, Takeo Kanade, and Yaser Sheikh. Convolutional pose machines. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4724–4732, 2016.
- [79] Zhe Cao, Tomas Simon, Shih-En Wei, and Yaser Sheikh. Realtime multi-person 2d pose estimation using part affinity fields. In *CVPR*, 2017.
- [80] Z. Cao, G. Hidalgo Martinez, T. Simon, S. Wei, and Y. A. Sheikh. Openpose: Realtime multi-person 2d pose estimation using part affinity fields. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2019.
- [81] Jinlu Zhang, Zhigang Tu, Jianyu Yang, Yujin Chen, and Junsong Yuan. Mixste: Seq2seq mixed spatio-temporal encoder for 3d human pose estima-

- tion in video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13232–13242, 2022.
- [82] Yu Cheng, Bo Yang, Bo Wang, and Robby T Tan. 3d human pose estimation using spatio-temporal networks with explicit occlusion training. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 10631–10638, 2020.
- [83] Wenkang Shan, Zhenhua Liu, Xinfeng Zhang, Shanshe Wang, Siwei Ma, and Wen Gao. P-stmo: Pre-trained spatial temporal many-to-one model for 3d human pose estimation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 461–478. Springer, 2022.
- [84] Tianlang Chen, Chen Fang, Xiaohui Shen, Yiheng Zhu, Zhili Chen, and Jiebo Luo. Anatomy-aware 3d human pose estimation with bone-based pose decomposition. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(1):198–209, 2021.
- [85] Ce Zheng, Sijie Zhu, Matias Mendieta, Taojiannan Yang, Chen Chen, and Zhengming Ding. 3d human pose estimation with spatial and temporal transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11656–11665, 2021.
- [86] Ruixu Liu, Ju Shen, He Wang, Chen Chen, Sen-Ching S. Cheung, and Vijayan K. Asari. Attention mechanism exploits temporal contexts: Real-time 3d human pose reconstruction. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020*, pages 5063–5072. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [87] Jiahao Lin and Gim Hee Lee. Trajectory space factorization for deep video-based 3d human pose estimation. In *30th British Machine Vision Conference 2019, BMVC 2019, Cardiff, UK, September 9-12, 2019*, page 101. BMVA Press, 2019.
- [88] Andrei Zanfir, Elisabeta Marinoiu, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Monocular 3d pose and shape estimation of multiple people in natural scenes - the importance of multiple scene constraints. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2018.
- [89] Shashank Tripathi, Lea Müller, Chun-Hao P. Huang, Omid Taheri, Michael J. Black, and Dimitrios Tzionas. 3d human pose estimation via intuitive physics. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4713–4725, June 2023.
- [90] Catalin Ionescu, Dragos Papava, Vlad Olaru, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Human3.6m: Large scale datasets and predictive methods for 3d human sensing in natural environments. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 36(7):1325–1339, 2013.
- [91] Leonid Sigal, Alexandru O Balan, and Michael J Black. Humaneva: Synchronized video and motion capture dataset and baseline algorithm for evaluation of articulated human motion. *International journal of computer vision*, 87(1-2):4–27, 2010.

- [92] Dushyant Mehta, Helge Rhodin, Dan Casas, Pascal Fua, Oleksandr Sotnychenko, Weipeng Xu, and Christian Theobalt. Monocular 3d human pose estimation in the wild using improved cnn supervision. In *3D Vision (3DV), 2017 Fifth International Conference on*. IEEE, 2017.
- [93] Hanbyul Joo, Hao Liu, Lei Tan, Lin Gui, Bart C. Nabbe, Iain A. Matthews, Takeo Kanade, Shohei Nobuhara, and Yaser Sheikh. Panoptic studio: A massively multiview system for social motion capture. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2015, Santiago, Chile, December 7-13, 2015*, pages 3334–3342. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.
- [94] Mihai Zanfir, Andrei Zanfir, Eduard Gabriel Bazavan, William T. Freeman, Rahul Sukthankar, and Cristian Sminchisescu. THUNDR: transformer-based 3d human reconstruction with markers. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2021, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 10-17, 2021*, pages 12951–12960. IEEE, 2021.
- [95] Chun-Hao P. Huang, Hongwei Yi, Markus Höschle, Matvey Safroshkin, Tsvetelina Alexiadis, Senya Polikovsky, Daniel Scharstein, and Michael J. Black. Capturing and inferring dense full-body human-scene contact. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*, pages 13264–13275. IEEE, 2022.
- [96] Bastian Wandt, James J Little, and Helge Rhodin. Elepose: Unsupervised 3d human pose estimation by predicting camera elevation and learning normalizing flows on 2d poses. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6635–6645, 2022.
- [97] Xiaodan Hu and Narendra Ahuja. Unsupervised 3d pose estimation for hierarchical dance video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11015–11024, 2021.
- [98] Buzhen Huang, Yuan Shu, Jingyi Ju, and Yangang Wang. Occluded human body capture with self-supervised spatial-temporal motion prior. *CoRR*, abs/2207.05375, 2022.
- [99] Chenxin Xu, Siheng Chen, Maosen Li, and Ya Zhang. Invariant teacher and equivariant student for unsupervised 3d human pose estimation. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pages 3013–3021. AAAI Press, 2021.
- [100] Jogendra Nath Kundu, Siddharth Seth, Anirudh Jamkhandi, Pradyumna YM, Varun Jampani, Anirban Chakraborty, and Venkatesh Babu R. Non-local latent relation distillation for self-adaptive 3d human pose estimation. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 158–171, 2021.

- [101] Yicheng Deng, Cheng Sun, Jiahui Zhu, and Yongqi Sun. SVMAC: unsupervised 3d human pose estimation from a single image with single-view-multi-angle consistency. In *International Conference on 3D Vision, 3DV 2021, London, United Kingdom, December 1-3, 2021*, pages 474–483. IEEE, 2021.
- [102] Jogendra Nath Kundu, Siddharth Seth, Varun Jampani, Mugalodi Rakesh, R. Venkatesh Babu, and Anirban Chakraborty. Self-supervised 3d human pose estimation via part guided novel image synthesis. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020*, pages 6151–6161. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [103] Jogendra Nath Kundu, Siddharth Seth, Pradyumna YM, Varun Jampani, Anirban Chakraborty, and R. Venkatesh Babu. Uncertainty-aware adaptation for self-supervised 3d human pose estimation. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*, pages 20416–20427. IEEE, 2022.
- [104] Andrei Zanfir, Eduard Gabriel Bazavan, Mihai Zanfir, William T. Freeman, Rahul Sukthankar, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Neural descent for visual 3d human pose and shape. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 14484–14493, June 2021.
- [105] Wentao Zhu, Xiaoxuan Ma, Zhaoyang Liu, Libin Liu, Wayne Wu, and Yizhou Wang. Motionbert: Unified pretraining for human motion analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06551*, 2022.
- [106] Wenkang Shan, Zhenhua Liu, Xinfeng Zhang, Zhao Wang, Kai Han, Shanshe Wang, Siwei Ma, and Wen Gao. Diffusion-based 3d human pose estimation with multi-hypothesis aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11579*, 2023.
- [107] Kun Zhou, Xiaoguang Han, Nianjuan Jiang, Kui Jia, and Jiangbo Lu. Hemlets pose: Learning part-centric heatmap triplets for accurate 3d human pose estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2344–2353, 2019.
- [108] Zhihao Li, Jianzhuang Liu, Zhensong Zhang, Songcen Xu, and Youliang Yan. CLIFF: carrying location information in full frames into human pose and shape estimation. In Shai Avidan, Gabriel J. Brostow, Moustapha Cissé, Giovanni Maria Farinella, and Tal Hassner, editors, *Computer Vision - ECCV 2022 - 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23-27, 2022, Proceedings, Part V*, volume 13665 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 590–606. Springer, 2022.
- [109] Alin-Ionut Popa, Mihai Zanfir, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Deep multitask architecture for integrated 2d and 3d human sensing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, July 2017.
- [110] Mihai Fieraru, Mihai Zanfir, Teodor Szente, Eduard Bazavan, Vlad Olaru, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Remips: Physically consistent 3d reconstruction of multiple interacting people under weak supervision. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors,

- Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 19385–19397. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [111] Andrei Zanfir, Eduard Gabriel Bazavan, Hongyi Xu, William T. Freeman, Rahul Sukthankar, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Weakly supervised 3d human pose and shape reconstruction with normalizing flows. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision - ECCV 2020 - 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VI*, volume 12351 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 465–481. Springer, 2020.
 - [112] Mohsen Gholami, Bastian Wandt, Helge Rhodin, Rabab Ward, and Z. Jane Wang. Adaptpose: Cross-dataset adaptation for 3d human pose estimation by learnable motion generation. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*, pages 13065–13075. IEEE, 2022.
 - [113] Ben Usman, Andrea Tagliasacchi, Kate Saenko, and Avneesh Sud. Metapose: Fast 3d pose from multiple views without 3d supervision. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*, pages 6749–6760. IEEE, 2022.
 - [114] Kehong Gong, Jianfeng Zhang, and Jiashi Feng. Poseaug: A differentiable pose augmentation framework for 3d human pose estimation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2021, virtual, June 19-25, 2021*, pages 8575–8584. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2021.
 - [115] Soumava Kumar Roy, Leonardo Citraro, Sina Honari, and Pascal Fua. On triangulation as a form of self-supervision for 3d human pose estimation. In *International Conference on 3D Vision, 3DV 2022, Prague, Czech Republic, September 12-16, 2022*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2022.
 - [116] Timo Von Marcard, Roberto Henschel, Michael J Black, Bodo Rosenhahn, and Gerard Pons-Moll. Recovering accurate 3d human pose in the wild using imus and a moving camera. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 601–617, 2018.
 - [117] Yue Ming, Xuyang Meng, Chunxiao Fan, and Hui Yu. Deep learning for monocular depth estimation: A review. *Neurocomputing*, 438:14–33, 2021.
 - [118] Tom Roussel, Luc Van Eycken, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Monocular depth estimation in new environments with absolute scale. In *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 1735–1741. IEEE, 2019.
 - [119] Maria Priisalu, Aleksis Pirinen, Ciprian Paduraru, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Generating scenarios with diverse pedestrian behaviors for autonomous vehicle testing. In *PMLR: Proceedings of CoRL 2021*, November 2021.
 - [120] Ronny Hug, Stefan Becker, Wolfgang Hübner, and Michael Arens. Quantifying the complexity of standard benchmarking datasets for long-term human trajectory prediction. *IEEE Access*, 9:77693–77704, 2021.
 - [121] Saeed Saadatnejad, Mohammadhossein Bahari, Pedram Khorsandi, Mohammad Saneian, Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, and Alexandre Alahi. Are

- socially-aware trajectory prediction models really socially-aware? *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 141:103705, 2022.
- [122] Christoph Schöller, Vincent Aravantinos, Florian Lay, and Alois C. Knoll. What the constant velocity model can teach us about pedestrian motion prediction. *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, 5(2):1696–1703, 2020.
- [123] Junyao Guo, Unmesh Kurup, and Mohak Shah. Is it safe to drive? an overview of factors, challenges, and datasets for driveability assessment in autonomous driving. *CoRR*, abs/1811.11277, 2018.
- [124] Hongyang Li, Chonghao Sima, Jifeng Dai, Wenhai Wang, Lewei Lu, Huijie Wang, Enze Xie, Zhiqi Li, Hanming Deng, Hao Tian, Xizhou Zhu, Li Chen, Yulu Gao, Xiangwei Geng, Jia Zeng, Yang Li, Jiazhi Yang, Xiaosong Jia, Bohan Yu, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, Si Liu, Junchi Yan, Jianping Shi, and Ping Luo. Delving into the devils of bird’s-eye-view perception: A review, evaluation and recipe. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05324*, 2022.
- [125] Apoorv Singh and Varun Bankiti. Surround-view vision-based 3d detection for autonomous driving: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2302.06650, 2023.
- [126] Sergio Casas, Cole Gulino, Simon Suo, Katie Luo, Renjie Liao, and Raquel Urtasun. Implicit latent variable model for scene-consistent motion forecasting. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [127] Yuwen Xiong, Wei-Chiu Ma, Jingkan Wang, and Raquel Urtasun. Learning compact representations for lidar completion and generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [128] Wei-Chiu Ma, Ignacio Tartavull, Ioan Andrei Bârsan, Shenlong Wang, Min Bai, Gellért Mátyus, Namdar Homayounfar, Shrinidhi Kowshika Lakshmikanth, Andrei Pokrovsky, and Raquel Urtasun. Exploiting sparse semantic hd maps for self-driving vehicle localization. *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 5304–5311, 2019.
- [129] Younes Belkada, Lorenzo Bertoni, Romain Caristan, Taylor Mordan, and Alexandre Alahi. Do pedestrians pay attention? eye contact detection in the wild, 2021.
- [130] Amir Rasouli, Mohsen Rohani, and Jun Luo. Bifold and semantic reasoning for pedestrian behavior prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15600–15610, 2021.
- [131] Prateek Agrawal and Pratik Prabhanjan Brahma. Single shot multitask pedestrian detection and behavior prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02232*, 2021.
- [132] Manh Huynh and Gita Alaghband. Aol: Adaptive online learning for human trajectory prediction in dynamic video scenes. page 262, 2020.
- [133] Francesco Piccoli, Rajarathnam Balakrishnan, Maria Jesus Perez, Moraldeepsingh Sachdeo, Carlos Nunez, Matthew Tang, Kajsa Andreasson, Kalle Bjurek, Ria Dass Raj, Ebba Davidsson, et al. Fussi-net: Fusion of spatio-temporal skeletons for intention prediction network. In *2020 54th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, pages 68–72. IEEE, 2020.

- [134] Adithya Ranga, Filippo Giruzzi, Jagdish Bhanushali, Emilie Wirbel, Patrick Pérez, Tuan-Hung Vu, and Xavier Perotton. Vrunet: Multi-task learning model for intent prediction of vulnerable road users. *Electronic Imaging*, 32:1–10, 2020.
- [135] Javier Lorenzo, Ignacio Parra, Florian Wirth, Christoph Stiller, David Fernández Llorca, and Miguel Angel Sotelo. Rnn-based pedestrian crossing prediction using activity and pose-related features. In *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1801–1806. IEEE, 2020.
- [136] Karttikeya Mangalam, Ehsan Adeli, Kuan-Hui Lee, Adrien Gaidon, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Disentangling human dynamics for pedestrian locomotion forecasting with noisy supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 2784–2793, 2020.
- [137] Ue-Hwan Kim, Dongho Ka, Hwasoo Yeo, and Jong-Hwan Kim. A real-time vision framework for pedestrian behavior recognition and intention prediction at intersections using 3d pose estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10868*, 2020.
- [138] Vida Adeli, Ehsan Adeli, Ian Reid, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Hamid Reza Tofighi. Socially and contextually aware human motion and pose forecasting. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 5(4):6033–6040, 2020.
- [139] Davis Rempe, Leonidas J Guibas, Aaron Hertzmann, Bryan Russell, Ruben Villegas, and Jimei Yang. Contact and human dynamics from monocular video. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part V 16*, pages 71–87. Springer, 2020.
- [140] Raúl Quintero Mínguez, Ignacio Parra Alonso, David Fernández-Llorca, and Miguel Angel Sotelo. Pedestrian path, pose, and intention prediction through gaussian process dynamical models and pedestrian activity recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 20(5):1803–1814, 2018.
- [141] Zhe Cao, Hang Gao, Karttikeya Mangalam, Qi-Zhi Cai, Minh Vo, and Jitendra Malik. Long-term human motion prediction with scene context. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 16*, pages 387–404. Springer, 2020.
- [142] Junxuan Zhao, Yinfeng Li, Hao Xu, and Hongchao Liu. Probabilistic prediction of pedestrian crossing intention using roadside lidar data. *IEEE Access*, 7:93781–93790, 2019.
- [143] Zhishuai Zhang, Jiyang Gao, Junhua Mao, Yukai Liu, Dragomir Anguelov, and Congcong Li. Stinet: Spatio-temporal-interactive network for pedestrian detection and trajectory prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11346–11355, 2020.
- [144] Adam W Harley, Shrinidhi Kowshika Lakshmikanth, Paul Schydlo, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Tracking emerges by looking around static scenes, with neural 3d mapping. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European*

- Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXVI 16*, pages 598–614. Springer, 2020.
- [145] Andrei Zanfir, Mihai Zanfir, Alexander N. Gorban, Jingwei Ji, Yin Zhou, Dragomir Anguelov, and Cristian Sminchisescu. HUM3DIL: semi-supervised multi-modal 3d human pose estimation for autonomous driving. *CoRR*, abs/2212.07729, 2022.
 - [146] Meet Shah, Zhi ling Huang, Ankita Gajanan Laddha, Matthew Langford, Blake Barber, Sidney Zhang, Carlos Vallespi-Gonzalez, and Raquel Urtasun. Liranet: End-to-end trajectory prediction using spatio-temporal radar fusion. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2020.
 - [147] Ben Agro, Quin Sykora, Sergio Casas, and Raquel Urtasun. Implicit occupancy flow fields for perception and prediction in self-driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
 - [148] Lingyun Luke Li, Binh Yang, Ming Liang, Wenyuan Zeng, Mengye Ren, Sean Segal, and Raquel Urtasun. End-to-end contextual perception and prediction with interaction transformer. *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 5784–5791, 2020.
 - [149] Abbas Sadat, Sergio Casas, Mengye Ren, Xinyu Wu, Pranaab Dhawan, and Raquel Urtasun. Perceive, predict, and plan: Safe motion planning through interpretable semantic representations. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
 - [150] Ming Liang, Binh Yang, Wenyuan Zeng, Yun Chen, Rui Hu, Sergio Casas, and Raquel Urtasun. Pnpnet: End-to-end perception and prediction with tracking in the loop. *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11550–11559, 2020.
 - [151] Abbas Sadat, Mengye Ren, Andrei Pokrovsky, Yen-Chen Lin, Ersin Yumer, and Raquel Urtasun. Jointly learnable behavior and trajectory planning for self-driving vehicles. *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 3949–3956, 2019.
 - [152] Lumin Xu, Ruihan Xu, and Sheng Jin. Hieve acm mm grand challenge 2020: Pose tracking in crowded scenes. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '20, page 4689–4693, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
 - [153] Shuning Chang, Li Yuan, Xuecheng Nie, Ziyuan Huang, Yichen Zhou, Yupeng Chen, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. Towards accurate human pose estimation in videos of crowded scenes. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '20, page 4630–4634, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
 - [154] Li Yuan, Shuning Chang, Ziyuan Huang, Yichen Zhou, Yupeng Chen, Xuecheng Nie, Francis E.H. Tay, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. A simple baseline for pose tracking in videos of crowd scenes. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '20, page 4684–4688, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [155] Nitin Saini, Chun-Hao P Huang, Michael J Black, and Aamir Ahmad. Smartmocap: Joint estimation of human and camera motion using uncalibrated rgb cameras. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [156] Lunjun Zhang, Anqi Joyce Yang, Yuwen Xiong, Sergio Casas, Bin Yang, Mengye Ren, and Raquel Urtasun. Towards unsupervised object detection from lidar point clouds. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9317–9328, June 2023.
- [157] Fabian Windbacher, Michael Hödlmoser, and Margrit Gelautz. Single-stage 3d pose estimation of vulnerable road users using pseudo-labels. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 401–417, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [158] Marius Cordts, Mohamed Omran, Sebastian Ramos, Timo Rehfeld, Markus Enzweiler, Rodrigo Benenson, Uwe Franke, Stefan Roth, and Bernt Schiele. The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding. In *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016.
- [159] L Morelli, F Ioli, R Beber, F Menna, F Remondino, and A Vitti. Colmapslam: A framework for visual odometry. *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, 48:317–324, 2023.
- [160] Mapillary. Mapillary/opensfm: Open source structure-from-motion pipeline.
- [161] Noah Snavely, Steven M Seitz, and Richard Szeliski. Photo tourism: exploring photo collections in 3d. In *ACM siggraph 2006 papers*, pages 835–846. 2006.
- [162] OpenCV. Opencv 3.1.0 structure from motion library.
- [163] Engin Tola, Vincent Lepetit, and Pascal Fua. Daisy: An efficient dense descriptor applied to wide-baseline stereo. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 32(5):815–830, 2009.
- [164] Changchang Wu. Towards linear-time incremental structure from motion. In *2013 International Conference on 3D Vision-3DV 2013*, pages 127–134. IEEE, 2013.
- [165] Raúl Mur-Artal and Juan D. Tardós. Orb-slam2: An open-source slam system for monocular, stereo, and rgb-d cameras. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 33(5):1255–1262, 2017.
- [166] Ethan Rublee, Vincent Rabaud, Kurt Konolige, and Gary Bradski. Orb: An efficient alternative to sift or surf. In *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2564–2571, 2011.
- [167] Johannes Lutz Schönberger and Jan-Michael Frahm. Structure-from-motion revisited. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016.
- [168] Johannes Lutz Schönberger, Enliang Zheng, Marc Pollefeys, and Jan-Michael Frahm. Pixelwise view selection for unstructured multi-view stereo. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2016.
- [169] G Lowe. Sift-the scale invariant feature transform. *Int. J.*, 2(91-110):2, 2004.

- [170] David Nilsson and Cristian Sminchisescu. Semantic video segmentation by gated recurrent flow propagation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6819–6828, 2018.
- [171] Maria Priisalu, Ciprian Paduraru, Aleksis Pirinen, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Semantic synthesis of pedestrian locomotion. In *In Proceedings of the 2020 Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, volume 12623, pages 470–487. Springer, 2020.
- [172] Charles Ruizhongtai Qi, Li Yi, Hao Su, and Leonidas J Guibas. Pointnet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [173] Alexey Dosovitskiy, German Ros, Felipe Codevilla, Antonio Lopez, and Vladlen Koltun. Carla: An open urban driving simulator. In *In Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Robot Learning*, volume 78 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1–16. PMLR, 2017.
- [174] Jonas Schult, Francis Engelmann, Alexander Hermans, Or Litany, Siyu Tang, and Bastian Leibe. Mask3d: Mask transformer for 3d semantic instance segmentation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 8216–8223. IEEE, 2023.
- [175] Tuan Duc Ngo, Binh-Son Hua, and Khoi Nguyen. Isbnet: a 3d point cloud instance segmentation network with instance-aware sampling and box-aware dynamic convolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13550–13559, 2023.
- [176] Jiahao Sun, Chunmei Qing, Junpeng Tan, and Xiangmin Xu. Superpoint transformer for 3d scene instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 2393–2401, 2023.
- [177] Runnan Chen, Youquan Liu, Lingdong Kong, Xinge Zhu, Yuexin Ma, Yikang Li, Yuenan Hou, Yu Qiao, and Wenping Wang. Clip2scene: Towards label-efficient 3d scene understanding by clip. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7020–7030, 2023.
- [178] Ran Cheng, Ryan Razani, Ehsan Taghavi, Enxu Li, and Bingbing Liu. 2-s3net: Attentive feature fusion with adaptive feature selection for sparse semantic segmentation network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12547–12556, 2021.
- [179] Yuenan Hou, Xinge Zhu, Yuexin Ma, Chen Change Loy, and Yikang Li. Point-to-voxel knowledge distillation for lidar semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8479–8488, 2022.
- [180] Jianyun Xu, Ruixiang Zhang, Jian Dou, Yushi Zhu, Jie Sun, and Shiliang Pu. Rpvnet: A deep and efficient range-point-voxel fusion network for lidar point cloud segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 16024–16033, 2021.
- [181] Xinge Zhu, Hui Zhou, Tai Wang, Fangzhou Hong, Yuexin Ma, Wei Li, Hongsheng Li, and Dahua Lin. Cylindrical and asymmetrical 3d convolution networks for lidar segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF*

- conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9939–9948, 2021.
- [182] Fisher Yu and Vladlen Koltun. Multi-scale context aggregation by dilated convolutions. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.
- [183] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [184] Alin-Ionut Popa, Mihai Zanfir, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Deep multitask architecture for integrated 2d and 3d human sensing. In *proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6289–6298, 2017.
- [185] Shu Liu, Lu Qi, Haifang Qin, Jianping Shi, and Jiaya Jia. Path aggregation network for instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8759–8768, 2018.
- [186] Yandan Kong, Kai Liu, Zhihong Liang, Tiancheng Liu, Yuxiang Huang, and Mingming Qin. Research on small object detection methods based on deep learning. In *2022 IEEE 4th International Conference on Power, Intelligent Computing and Systems (ICPICS)*, pages 680–686. IEEE, 2022.
- [187] Qihan Feng, Xinzhen Xu, and Zhixiao Wang. Deep learning-based small object detection: A survey. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 20(4):6551–6590, 2023.
- [188] Ruohong Huan, Ji Zhang, Chaojie Xie, Ronghua Liang, and Peng Chen. Mlffcsp: a new anti-occlusion pedestrian detection network with multi-level feature fusion for small targets. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, pages 1–26, 2023.
- [189] Qihua Cheng and Shanshan Zhang. Efficiently handling scale variation for pedestrian detection. In *Intelligence Science and Big Data Engineering. Visual Data Engineering: 9th International Conference, IScIDE 2019, Nanjing, China, October 17–20, 2019, Proceedings, Part I 9*, pages 178–190. Springer, 2019.
- [190] Zexiang Liu, Chongyang Zhang, Yan Luo, Kai Chen, Qiping Zhou, and Yunyu Lai. Improving small-scale pedestrian detection using informed context. In *2019 IEEE Visual Communications and Image Processing (VCIP)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2019.
- [191] Jiale Cao, Yanwei Pang, Jungong Han, Bolin Gao, and Xuelong Li. Taking a look at small-scale pedestrians and occluded pedestrians. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 29:3143–3152, 2019.
- [192] Zixuan Xu, Banghuai Li, Ye Yuan, and Anhong Dang. Beta r-cnn: Looking into pedestrian detection from another perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19953–19963, 2020.
- [193] Tianrui Liu, Wenhan Luo, Lin Ma, Jun-Jie Huang, Tania Stathaki, and Tianhong Dai. Coupled network for robust pedestrian detection with gated multi-layer feature extraction and deformable occlusion handling. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 30:754–766, 2020.

- [194] Korbinian Hagn and Oliver Grau. Validation of pedestrian detectors by classification of visual detection impairing factors. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 476–491. Springer, 2022.
- [195] Fengmin Zou, Xu Li, Qimin Xu, Zhengliang Sun, and Jianxiao Zhu. Correlation-and-correction fusion attention network for occluded pedestrian detection. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 23(6):6061–6073, 2023.
- [196] Irtiza Hasan, Shengcai Liao, Jinpeng Li, Saad Ullah Akram, and Ling Shao. Generalizable pedestrian detection: The elephant in the room. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11328–11337, June 2021.
- [197] Manav Madan, Christoph Reich, and Frank Hassenpflug. Drawing and analysis of bounding boxes for object detection with anchor-based models. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 359–373, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [198] Xiaofeng Wang, Zheng Zhu, Yunpeng Zhang, Guan Huang, Yun Ye, Wenbo Xu, Ziwei Chen, and Xingang Wang. Are we ready for vision-centric driving streaming perception? the asap benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9600–9610, 2023.
- [199] Fang-Chieh Chou, Tsung-Han Lin, Henggang Cui, Vladan Radosavljevic, Thi Nguyen, Tzu-Kuo Huang, Matthew Niedoba, Jeff Schneider, and Nemanja Djuric. Predicting motion of vulnerable road users using high-definition maps and efficient convnets. In *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1655–1662. IEEE, 2020.
- [200] Maria Priisalu, Ciprian Paduraru, and Cristian Smichisescu. Varied realistic autonomous vehicle collision scenario generation. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 354–372, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [201] Yahia Dalbah, Jean Lahoud, and Hisham Cholakkal. Radarformer: Lightweight and accurate real-time radar object detection model. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 341–358, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [202] Yukang Chen, Jianhui Liu, Xiangyu Zhang, Xiaojuan Qi, and Jiaya Jia. Voxelnext: Fully sparse voxelnet for 3d object detection and tracking. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 21674–21683, 2023.
- [203] Ying Li, Lingfei Ma, Zilong Zhong, Fei Liu, Michael A Chapman, Dongpu Cao, and Jonathan Li. Deep learning for lidar point clouds in autonomous driving: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 32(8):3412–3432, 2020.
- [204] Jiale Li, Hang Dai, Hao Han, and Yong Ding. Mseg3d: Multi-modal 3d semantic segmentation for autonomous driving. In *CVPR*, pages 21694–21704, 2023.
- [205] Jiale Li, Hang Dai, and Yong Ding. Self-distillation for robust LiDAR semantic segmentation in autonomous driving. In *ECCV*, pages 659–676, 2022.

- [206] Pei Sun, Weiyue Wang, Yuning Chai, Gamaleldin F. Elsayed, Alex Bewley, Xiao Zhang, Cristian Sminchisescu, and Drago Anguelov. Rsn: Range sparse net for efficient, accurate lidar 3d object detection. *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5721–5730, 2021.
- [207] Fabien Colonnier, Aravind Seeralan, and Longwei Zhu. Event-based visual sensing for human motion detection and classification at various distances. In *Pacific-Rim Symposium on Image and Video Technology*, pages 75–88. Springer, 2022.
- [208] German F. Torres and Joni Kämäräinen. Depth-aware image compositing model for parallax camera motion blur. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 279–296, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [209] Andreas Aakerberg, Kamal Nasrollahi, and Thomas B. Moeslund. Relief: Joint low-light image enhancement and super-resolution with transformers. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 157–173, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [210] William Ljungbergh, Joakim Johnander, Christoffer Petersson, and Michael Felsberg. Raw or cooked? object detection on raw images. In Rikke Gade, Michael Felsberg, and Joni-Kristian Kämäräinen, editors, *Image Analysis*, pages 374–385, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [211] Andreas Lugmayr, Martin Danelljan, Andres Romero, Fisher Yu, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Repaint: Inpainting using denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11461–11471, 2022.
- [212] Ze Yang, Shenlong Wang, Sivabalan Manivasagam, Zeng Huang, Wei-Chiu Ma, Xinchun Yan, Ersin Yumer, and Raquel Urtasun. S3: Neural shape, skeleton, and skinning fields for 3d human modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13284–13293, 2021.
- [213] Sudeep Fadadu, Shreyash Pandey, Darshan Hegde, Yi Shi, Fang-Chieh Chou, Nemanja Djuric, and Carlos Vallespi-Gonzalez. Multi-view fusion of sensor data for improved perception and prediction in autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 2349–2357, 2022.
- [214] Yaodong Cui, Ren Chen, Wenbo Chu, Long Chen, Daxin Tian, Ying Li, and Dongpu Cao. Deep learning for image and point cloud fusion in autonomous driving: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(2):722–739, 2021.
- [215] J Alfred Daniel, C Chandru Vignesh, Bala Anand Muthu, R Senthil Kumar, CB Sivaparthipan, and Carlos Enrique Montenegro Marin. Fully convolutional neural networks for lidar-camera fusion for pedestrian detection in autonomous vehicle. *Multimed Tools Appl*, 82:25107–25130, 2023.
- [216] Andrei Zanfir, Mihai Zanfir, Alexander N. Gorban, Jingwei Ji, Yin Zhou, Drago Anguelov, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Hum3dil: Semi-supervised

- multi-modal 3d human pose estimation for autonomous driving. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2022.
- [217] Hongyi Xu, Eduard Gabriel Bazavan, Andrei Zanfir, Bill Freeman, Rahul Sukthankar, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Ghum & ghuml: Generative 3d human shape and articulated pose models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (Oral)*, pages 6184–6193, 2020.
- [218] Nitin Saini, Chun-Hao Paul Huang, Michael J. Black, and Aamir Ahmad. Smartmocap: Joint estimation of human and camera motion using uncalibrated rgb cameras. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 8:3206–3213, 2022.
- [219] Muhammed Kocabas, Chun-Hao P. Huang, Joachim Tesch, Lea Müller, Otmar Hilliges, and Michael J. Black. SPEC: Seeing people in the wild with an estimated camera. In *Proc. International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 11035–11045, October 2021.
- [220] Erik Gärtner, Mykhaylo Andriluka, Hongyi Xu, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Trajectory optimization for physics-based reconstruction of 3d human pose from monocular video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 13106–13115, June 2022.
- [221] Erik Gärtner, Mykhaylo Andriluka, Erwin Coumans, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Differentiable dynamics for articulated 3d human motion reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 13190–13200, June 2022.
- [222] Shashank Tripathi, Lea Muller, Chun-Hao Paul Huang, Omid Taheri, Michael J. Black, and Dimitrios Tzionas. 3d human pose estimation via intuitive physics. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.18246, 2023.
- [223] Lumin Xu, Ruihan Xu, and Sheng Jin. Hieve acm mm grand challenge 2020: Pose tracking in crowded scenes. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '20, page 4689–4693, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [224] Shuning Chang, Li Yuan, Xuecheng Nie, Ziyuan Huang, Yichen Zhou, Yupeng Chen, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. Towards accurate human pose estimation in videos of crowded scenes. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '20, page 4630–4634, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [225] Li Yuan, Shuning Chang, Ziyuan Huang, Yichen Zhou, Yupeng Chen, Xuecheng Nie, Francis E.H. Tay, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. A simple baseline for pose tracking in videos of crowd scenes. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, MM '20, page 4684–4688, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [226] Weijian Deng, Yumin Suh, Xiang Yu, Masoud Faraki, Liang Zheng, and Manmohan Chandraker. Split to learn: Gradient split for multi-task human image analysis. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 4340–4349, 2023.

- [227] Arindam Das, Sudip Das, Ganesh Sistu, Jonathan Horgan, Ujjwal Bhattacharya, Edward Jones, Martin Glavin, and Ciarán Eising. Deep multi-task networks for occluded pedestrian pose estimation. *24th Irish Machine Vision and Image Processing Conference*, 2023.
- [228] Perla Sai Raj Kishore, Sudip Das, Partha Sarathi Mukherjee, and Ujjwal Bhattacharya. Cluenet : A deep framework for occluded pedestrian pose estimation. In *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2019.
- [229] Sridhar Raj S, Munaga V.N.K. Prasad, and Ramadoss Balakrishnan. Generative segment-pose representation based augmentation (gsra) for unsupervised person re-identification. *Image and Vision Computing*, 131:104632, 2023.
- [230] Sisi You, Hantao Yao, and Changsheng Xu. Multi-target multi-camera tracking with optical-based pose association. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 31(8):3105–3117, 2021.
- [231] Chunyun Meng, Xiaobing He, Zhen Tan, and Li Luan. Gait recognition based on 3d human body reconstruction and multi-granular feature fusion. *J. Supercomput.*, 79(11):12106–12125, 2023.
- [232] Nitin Saini, Chun-Hao P. Huang, Michael J. Black, and Aamir Ahmad. Smartmocap: Joint estimation of human and camera motion using uncalibrated rgb cameras. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 8(6):3206–3213, 2023.
- [233] Vickie Ye, Georgios Pavlakos, Jitendra Malik, and Angjoo Kanazawa. Decoupling human and camera motion from videos in the wild. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2023.
- [234] Kensho Hara, Hirokatsu Kataoka, Masaki Inaba, Kenichi Narioka, Ryusuke Hotta, and Yutaka Satoh. Predicting vehicles appearing from blind spots based on pedestrian behaviors. In *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 1–8, 2020.
- [235] Jingnan Shi, Heng Yang, and Luca Carlone. Optimal pose and shape estimation for category-level 3d object perception. In *Robotics: Science and Systems 2021*, volume XVIII, Columbia University, New York City, NY, USA, 2021.
- [236] Hunter Goforth, Xiaoyan Hu, Michael Happold, and Simon Lucey. Joint pose and shape estimation of vehicles from lidar data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03964*, 2020.
- [237] Jun Hayakawa and Behzad Dariush. Recognition and 3d localization of pedestrian actions from monocular video. In *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2020.
- [238] Yurong You, Yan Wang, Wei-Lun Chao, Divyansh Garg, Geoff Pleiss, Bharath Hariharan, Mark Campbell, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Pseudo-lidar++: Accurate depth for 3d object detection in autonomous driving. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [239] Yan Wang, Wei-Lun Chao, Divyansh Garg, Bharath Hariharan, Mark Campbell, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Pseudo-lidar from visual depth

- estimation: Bridging the gap in 3d object detection for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8445–8453, 2019.
- [240] Xingkui Wei, Yinda Zhang, Zhuwen Li, Yanwei Fu, and Xiangyang Xue. Deepsfm: Structure from motion via deep bundle adjustment. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 16*, pages 230–247. Springer, 2020.
- [241] Yuxi Xiao, Nan Xue, Tianfu Wu, and Gui-Song Xia. Level-s fm: Structure from motion on neural level set of implicit surfaces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17205–17214, 2023.
- [242] Zihan Zhu, Songyou Peng, Viktor Larsson, Weiwei Xu, Hujun Bao, Zhaopeng Cui, Martin R. Oswald, and Marc Pollefeys. Nice-slam: Neural implicit scalable encoding for slam. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 12786–12796, June 2022.
- [243] Paul-Edouard Sarlin, Ajaykumar Unagar, Mans Larsson, Hugo Germain, Carl Toft, Viktor Larsson, Marc Pollefeys, Vincent Lepetit, Lars Hammarstrand, Fredrik Kahl, and Torsten Sattler. Back to the feature: Learning robust camera localization from pixels to pose. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3247–3257, June 2021.
- [244] Zihan Zhu, Songyou Peng, Viktor Larsson, Zhaopeng Cui, Martin R Oswald, Andreas Geiger, and Marc Pollefeys. Nicer-slam: Neural implicit scene encoding for rgb slam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03594*, 2023.
- [245] Chaoqiang Zhao, Qiyu Sun, Chongzhen Zhang, Yang Tang, and Feng Qian. Monocular depth estimation based on deep learning: An overview. *Science China Technological Sciences*, 63(9):1612–1627, 2020.
- [246] Daniel DeTone, Tomasz Malisiewicz, and Andrew Rabinovich. Superpoint: Self-supervised interest point detection and description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 224–236, 2018.
- [247] Paul-Edouard Sarlin, Daniel DeTone, Tomasz Malisiewicz, and Andrew Rabinovich. Superglue: Learning feature matching with graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4938–4947, 2020.
- [248] Ben Mildenhall, Pratul P. Srinivasan, Matthew Tancik, Jonathan T. Barron, Ravi Ramamoorthi, and Ren Ng. Nerf: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis. In *ECCV*, 2020.
- [249] Zhuopeng Li, Lu Li, and Jianke* Zhu. Read: Large-scale neural scene rendering for autonomous driving. In *AAAI*, 2023.
- [250] Chunyuan Li, Haotian Liu, Liunian Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Jianwei Yang, Ping Jin, Houdong Hu, Zicheng Liu, Yong Jae Lee, et al. Elevater: A benchmark and toolkit for evaluating language-augmented visual models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9287–9301, 2022.

- [251] Siyuan Li, Tobias Fischer, Lei Ke, Henghui Ding, Martin Danelljan, and Fisher Yu. Ovtrack: Open-vocabulary multiple object tracking. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*, 2023.
- [252] Matthieu Paul, Martin Danelljan, Christoph Mayer, and Luc Van Gool. Robust visual tracking by segmentation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision ECCV*, 2022.
- [253] Tianfei Zhou, Fatih Porikli, David J Crandall, Luc Van Gool, and Wenguan Wang. A survey on deep learning technique for video segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(6):7099–7122, 2022.
- [254] Xueyan Zou, Jianwei Yang, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Gao, and Yong Jae Lee. Segment everything everywhere all at once. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06718*, 2023.
- [255] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Xueyan Zou, Shilong Liu, Chunyuan Li, Jianfeng Gao, Jianwei Yang, and Lei Zhang. A simple framework for open-vocabulary segmentation and detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08131*, 2023.
- [256] Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Peize Sun, Xueyan Zou, Shilong Liu, Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Lei Zhang, and Jianfeng Gao. Semantic-sam: Segment and recognize anything at any granularity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04767*, 2023.
- [257] Xueyan Zou, Zi-Yi Dou, Jianwei Yang, Zhe Gan, Linjie Li, Chunyuan Li, Xiyang Dai, Harkirat Behl, Jianfeng Wang, Lu Yuan, et al. Generalized decoding for pixel, image, and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15116–15127, 2023.
- [258] Victor Vaquero, Ivan Del Pino, Francese Moreno-Noguer, Joan Sola, Alberto Sanfeliu, and Juan Andrade-Cetto. Deconvolutional networks for point-cloud vehicle detection and tracking in driving scenarios. In *2017 European Conference on Mobile Robots (ECMR)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2017.
- [259] Holger Caesar, Varun Bankiti, Alex H. Lang, Sourabh Vora, Venice Erin Liong, Qiang Xu, Anush Krishnan, Yu Pan, Giancarlo Baldan, and Oscar Beijbom. nuscenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020*, pages 11618–11628. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [260] Quang-Hieu Pham, Pierre Sevestre, Ramanpreet Singh Pahwa, Huijing Zhan, Chun Ho Pang, Yuda Chen, Armin Mustafa, Vijay Chandrasekhar, and Jie Lin. A*3d dataset: Towards autonomous driving in challenging environments. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, ICRA 2020, Paris, France, May 31 - August 31, 2020*, pages 2267–2273. IEEE, 2020.
- [261] Peishan Cong, Xinge Zhu, Feng Qiao, Yiming Ren, Xidong Peng, Yuenan Hou, Lan Xu, Ruigang Yang, Dinesh Manocha, and Yuexin Ma. Stcrowd: A multimodal dataset for pedestrian perception in crowded scenes. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*,

- CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*, pages 19576–19585. IEEE, 2022.
- [262] Shifeng Zhang, Yiliang Xie, Jun Wan, Hansheng Xia, Stan Z. Li, and Guodong Guo. Widerperson: A diverse dataset for dense pedestrian detection in the wild. *IEEE Trans. Multim.*, 22(2):380–393, 2020.
- [263] Jasmin Breitenstein and Tim Fingscheidt. Amodal cityscapes: A new dataset, its generation, and an amodal semantic segmentation challenge baseline. In *2022 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, IV 2022, Aachen, Germany, June 4-9, 2022*, pages 1018–1025. IEEE, 2022.
- [264] Xiao Wang, Jun Chen, Zheng Wang, Wu Liu, Shin’ichi Satoh, Chao Liang, and Chia-Wen Lin. When pedestrian detection meets nighttime surveillance: A new benchmark. In Christian Bessiere, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2020*, pages 509–515. ijcai.org, 2020.
- [265] Lukás Neumann, Michelle Karg, Shanshan Zhang, Christian Scharfenberger, Eric Piegert, Sarah Mistr, Olga Prokofyeva, Robert Thiel, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and Bernt Schiele. Nightowls: A pedestrians at night dataset. In C. V. Jawahar, Hongdong Li, Greg Mori, and Konrad Schindler, editors, *Computer Vision - ACCV 2018 - 14th Asian Conference on Computer Vision, Perth, Australia, December 2-6, 2018, Revised Selected Papers, Part I*, volume 11361 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 691–705. Springer, 2018.
- [266] Amir Rasouli, Iuliia Kotseruba, Toni Kunic, and John K. Tsotsos. PIE: A large-scale dataset and models for pedestrian intention estimation and trajectory prediction. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2019, Seoul, Korea (South), October 27 - November 2, 2019*, pages 6261–6270. IEEE, 2019.
- [267] Noor ul Huda, Bolette Dybkjær Hansen, Rikke Gade, and Thomas B. Moeslund. The effect of a diverse dataset for transfer learning in thermal person detection. *Sensors*, 20(7):1982, 2020.
- [268] Devansh Sharma, Tihitina Hade, and Qing Tian. Comparison of deep object detectors on A new vulnerable pedestrian dataset. *CoRR*, abs/2212.06218, 2022.
- [269] Zhewei Xu, Jiajun Zhuang, Qiong Liu, Jingkai Zhou, and Shaowu Peng. Nighttime FIR pedestrian detection benchmark dataset for ADAS. In Jian-Huang Lai, Cheng-Lin Liu, Xilin Chen, Jie Zhou, Tieniu Tan, Nanning Zheng, and Hongbin Zha, editors, *Pattern Recognition and Computer Vision - First Chinese Conference, PRCV 2018, Guangzhou, China, November 23-26, 2018, Proceedings, Part IV*, volume 11259 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 322–333. Springer, 2018.
- [270] Paulius Tumas, Adam Nowosielski, and Artūras Serackis. Pedestrian detection in severe weather conditions. *IEEE Access*, PP:1–1, 03 2020.
- [271] Shanshan Zhang, Rodrigo Benenson, and Bernt Schiele. Citypersons: A diverse dataset for pedestrian detection. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 4457–4465. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.

- [272] Krystian Mikolajczyk and Cordelia Schmid. Scale & affine invariant interest point detectors. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 60:63–86, 10 2004.
- [273] Robert K McConnell. Method of and apparatus for pattern recognition, U. S. Patent No. 4,567,610, Jan. 1986.
- [274] Marius Muja and David G. Lowe. Fast approximate nearest neighbors with automatic algorithm configuration. In *International Conference on Computer Vision Theory and Applications*, 2009.
- [275] Sunil Arya, David M Mount, Nathan S Netanyahu, Ruth Silverman, and Angela Y Wu. An optimal algorithm for approximate nearest neighbor searching fixed dimensions. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(6):891–923, 1998.
- [276] Martin A Fischler and Robert C Bolles. Random sample consensus: a paradigm for model fitting with applications to image analysis and automated cartography. *Communications of the ACM*, 24(6):381–395, 1981.
- [277] Richard Hartley and Andrew Zisserman. *Multiple view geometry in computer vision*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- [278] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer, 1999.
- [279] Manolis Lourakis and Antonis Argyros. The design and implementation of a generic sparse bundle adjustment software package based on the levenberg-marquardt algorithm. Technical report, Technical Report 340, Institute of Computer Science-FORTH, Heraklion, Crete . . . , 2004.
- [280] Sameer Agarwal, Noah Snavely, Steven M Seitz, and Richard Szeliski. Bundle adjustment in the large. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2010: 11th European Conference on Computer Vision, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, September 5–11, 2010, Proceedings, Part II 11*, pages 29–42. Springer, 2010.
- [281] Changchang Wu. Siftgpu: A gpu implementation of scale invariant feature transform (sift)(2007). URL <http://cs.unc.edu/~ccwu/siftgpu>, 2011.
- [282] Changchang Wu, Sameer Agarwal, Brian Curless, and Steven M Seitz. Multicore bundle adjustment. In *CVPR 2011*, pages 3057–3064. IEEE, 2011.
- [283] Rainer Kümmerle, Giorgio Grisetti, Hauke Strasdat, Kurt Konolige, and Wolfram Burgard. g 2 o: A general framework for graph optimization. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 3607–3613. IEEE, 2011.
- [284] Snavely Noah. *Scene Reconstruction and Visualization from Internet Photo Collections*. PhD thesis, Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Computer Science and Engineering . . . , 2008.
- [285] Christian Beder and Richard Steffen. Determining an initial image pair for fixing the scale of a 3d reconstruction from an image sequence. In *Joint Pattern Recognition Symposium*, pages 657–666. Springer, 2006.
- [286] Timothy A Davis and W Hager. Cholmod: supernodal sparse cholesky factorization and update/downdate, 2005.
- [287] Manolis IA Lourakis and Antonis A Argyros. Sba: A software package for generic sparse bundle adjustment. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 36(1):1–30, 2009.

A 3D reconstruction systems overview

Open Structure for Motion Library (OpenSFM)[160]- A Structure for Motion system, that is an incremental 3d reconstruction system. Uses Hessian Affine Feature Point detector[272] and Histogram of Oriented Gradients (HOG)[273] descriptors jointly which are nearest neighbor matched[274] across images. A rotation-only transformation is found between the first frames if at least 30% of the points are outliers (to ensure a large enough change in viewpoint). From the initial pair, a sparse 3D cloud is found by the 5-point algorithm or by assuming planar motion of the camera, whichever performs best. The resulting camera matrices are then used for triangulation and bundle adjustment (BA). Additional frames are added according to the largest overlap with the existing pointcloud, and are aligned with the pointcloud to minimize the re-projection error of the pointcloud. BA is applied after adding new images to the pointcloud. Fails to reconstruct the Cityscapes scenes likely because the change in camera rotation is too small between frames.

Bundler[161] is also a SFM system. It detects SIFT[169] features that are matched with approximate nearest neighbors[275]. RANSAC[276] is used to find the fundamental matrix with the 8-point algorithm[277]. The fundamental matrix is refined, its outliers are removed and keypoints tracks are checked for consistency. Levenberg-Marquardt[278] is used to find the first camera matrices and in sparse bundle adjustment[279] for any additional cameras (images chosen in the order of largest number of matches with triangulated points) that are initialized with Direct Linear Transform (DLT)[277]. The initial image pair is chosen such that there is a large enough rotational difference between the images. Finds <10 matches, and fails again likely because the images are blurry and the rotational difference between the camera views is too small.

OpenCV Structure from motion library[162] - A SFM library that uses DAISY features[163]. Finds the essential matrix with RANSAC and the 8-point algorithm. And an inexact Newton method Schur-based solvers[280] to optimize BA. Result of 30 frames - finds relatively few points without clear structure. See Fig. 5

VisualSFM[164] a parallelized SFM pipeline with Bundler. Uses SIFT on the GPU[281] and Multicore Bundle adjustment[282]. Only a thresholded number of large-scale features are matched across images. This unfortunately fails possibly because of image blur or the lack of distinct large-scale structures in the images. The method is unable to find enough SIFT feature points likely because the images are blurry and finds no verified matches between two stereo images. Finally, VisualSFM cannot handle forward motion, not finding a good initial pair of images with enough matches.

ORB-SLAM[165]- ORB-feature[166] (a fast feature descriptor combining gradient and binary features) based Simultaneous Localization And Mapping system. ORB features from the left image are matched along epipolar lines with ORB features from the right image, and the disparity is calculated. Points that are further than 40 baselines away from the camera are ignored. The points that are close to the camera are triangulated, and the left camera is considered to be the origin. Additional cameras are added by performing camera position

optimization in BA between matched 3D points and keypoints in the new frame, BA of the newly added added keypoints, and by finally performing full BA after loop-closure detection and correction. BA is optimized with Levenberg–Marquardt implemented as g20[283] Finds too few keypoints, likely due to blur and depth threshold. Results in a too sparse reconstruction.

COLMAP[167, 168]- an incremental Structure for Motion and Muti-view stereo system. Extracts SIFT[169] features that are exhaustively matched (other matching methods are also available) across all images. The reconstruction is built from an initial pair of images, chosen by [284, 285] additional views are chosen by high inlier ratios that approximate uncertainty estimates and by prioritizing images with uniformly distributed keypoints that match with triangulated points. The method uses a robust RANSAC-based triangulation with adaptive outlier thresholds to add new camera views to the reconstruction. Local BA is performed after a new camera view is added. Finally, a global BA is performed iteratively followed by filtering of outliers and degenerate camera view, and triangulation until the BA converges. BA is performed by Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient[280, 282] for a large number of cameras and by [286, 287] for smaller systems. Converges for 150 scenes on the training and validation set and 150 scenes on the test set out of the 3475 scenes available. See Fig. 6.

B Additional Results

B.1 Error distribution per human body joint

In Fig. B.1 it can be seen that in general feet are the hardest to estimate the position of, while the head is the easiest. If the articulated human motion is to be predicted we however need the feet position to be accurate to foresee the pedestrian’s future velocity. To improve this temporally smooth human detection and pose estimation methods should be utilized in the future. In Fig. B.1*Right* a comparison between the error distribution of *Dilational* net and *GRFP* is shown. It is clear that *GRFP* produces joint estimations that have a lower distance to the human mask.

B.2 Procrustes Analysis

The results of aligning the thresholded pose with its nearest neighbor from Human3.6M is shown in Fig. 21. Because all limb lengths are reconstructed under noise the different limbs get elongated or compressed to a different degree. Therefore scaling the pose according to hip length results in this case in a too large scaling factor because the hip length is compressed in the reconstruction. The backbone is elongated so scaling according to the backbone results in a too small scaling factor. The elongations and compression of the different limbs vary from one triangulated pose to another, making the choice of a scaling factor hard. The height difference between the feet and the heat depends on the pose and is therefore not a suitable measure for scale. The same applies to the distance between the feet and hands.




Fig. 20. *Left:* The JDS for different joints. The feet are the most difficult to detect. *Right:* Comparison of the MPJDS rates of the Dilational and GRFP net. GRFP has lower MPJDS than the Dilational net.


B.3 Additional Pedestrian Detection and Pose Estimation

OpenPose misses a large number of pedestrians (with variations from frame to frame) as seen in the supplementary video at <https://youtu.be/qpxpdtHbbGA> and Fig. 22. OpenPose misses pedestrians due to large distance to camera, poor lightning and motion blur as seen in the supplementary video. OpenPose can produce impressive results when pedestrians are close to the camera but at a distance it has trouble with occlusions and can produce a number of odd false positive pedestrian detections, as seen in the video. Pedestrian detection is improved by applying FRCNN object detector. But FRCNN still omits distant pedestrians as seen in the video and Fig. 22, Fig. 23, and Fig. 24. On the other hand the semantic segmentation networks are susceptible for false positive as seen in the video. Finally it can be noted that on close by pedestrians FRCNN produces bboxes that are larger than the pedestrian often leading to better 2D pose estimates than the segmentation network, as seen in Fig. 25.

B.4 Additional DMHS results

The DMHS's accuracy is like OpenPose, depend on the bbox placement. Because the FRCNN produces bboxes that jump from frame to frame as seen in Fig. 26. FRCNN can even jump frames, by being unable to detect pedestrians at some frames. This motivates our suggestion that temporally smoothed methods should be developed for articulated pedestrian detection. DMHS's quality varies from image to image, some samples with quality variations are shown in Fig. 27

Fig. 21. Skeleton with thresholded limb lengths after scaling according to hip bone length shown with its nearest neighbor from the Human3.6M dataset. The longer skeleton is the thresholded 3D reconstructed human pose. The unthresholded skeleton is shown in Fig. 16 *Left*.






Fig. 22. OpenPose when applied on the whole image detects only a few pedestrians. FRCNN detects some selected pedestrians. The segmentation networks can detect all of the pedestrians, but because they produce only class labels one single BBox is given to multiple pedestrians. GRFP has smoother segmentation than DilationalNet and results in a better separation of the pedestrian BBoxes.




Fig. 23. FRCNN misses a large number of the distant pedestrians. The Dilational net and GRFP detect more distant pedestrians than FRCNN and GRFP results in a more accurate 2D pose for the closest pedestrian to the right.



Fig. 24. On the top: Dilational Net can detect pedestrians even in the presence of occlusions, but produces one single bounding box for close by pedestrians. FRCNN can detect pedestrians that are close to the camera well, but fails to detect far away pedestrians.




Fig. 25. The placement of the bounding box affects the estimated 2D body pose. FRCNN produces larger bounding boxes than found by the GT segmentation mask. This produces a more correct 2D body pose.




Fig. 26. Consecutive pedestrian detections by FRCNN followed by 2D pose(top row), body parts segmentation (middle row) and 3D pose estimates(bottom row). No pedestrian is detected in frames 12,13 and 15,16. The FRCNN BBoxes jump around the pose estimates to jump. When the pedestrians head is not visible then the body part segmentation fails. The 3D poses do not resemble the true 3D pose as the human appears to be crawling on knees in 3D poses. The 2D poses jump from frame to frame.




Fig. 27. Some varied results of DMHS.DMHS gets confused in the case of multiple occluding humans. And appears to have trouble with body part segmentation when a human is on a bike. The 2D body pose estimate seems to be greatly affected by the poorly fitting FRCNN bboxes that leave out the pedestrians head.