

# DSText V2: A Comprehensive Video Text Spotting Dataset for Dense and Small Text

Weijia Wu<sup>a</sup>, Yiming Zhang<sup>a</sup>, Yefei He<sup>a</sup>, Luoming Zhang<sup>a</sup>, Zhenyu Lou<sup>a</sup>,  
Hong Zhou<sup>a</sup> (✉), and Xiang Bai<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Zhejiang University, HangZhou, China

<sup>b</sup>Huazhong University of Science and Technology, WuHan, China

---

## Abstract

Recently, video text detection, tracking, and recognition in natural scenes are becoming very popular in the computer vision community. However, most existing algorithms and benchmarks focus on common text cases (*e.g.*, normal size, density) and single scenario, while ignoring extreme video text challenges, *i.e.*, dense and small text in various scenarios. In this paper, we establish a video text reading benchmark, named DSText V2, which focuses on **D**ense and **S**mall text reading challenges in the video with various scenarios. Compared with the previous datasets, the proposed dataset mainly include three new challenges: 1) Dense video texts, a new challenge for video text spotters to track and read. 2) High-proportioned small texts, coupled with the blurriness and distortion in the video, will bring further challenges. 3) Various new scenarios, *e.g.*, ‘Game’, ‘Sports’, etc. The proposed DSText V2 includes 140 video clips from 7 open scenarios, supporting three tasks, *i.e.*, video text detection (Task 1), video text tracking (Task 2), and end-to-end video text spotting (Task 3).

In this article, we describe detailed statistical information of the dataset, tasks, evaluation protocols, and the results summaries. Most importantly, a thorough investigation and analysis targeting three unique challenges derived from our dataset are provided, aiming to provide new insights. Moreover, we hope the benchmark will promise video text research in the community. DSText v2 is built upon DSText v1, which was previously introduced to organize the ICDAR 2023 competition for dense and small video text. The dataset website can be found at [RRC](#) or [Zenodo](#).


*Keywords:* Video Text Spotting; Small Text; Text Tracking; Dense Text

---

## 1. Introduction

The field of reading text from static images has witnessed remarkable progress in recent years, thanks to advancements in deep learning and the availability of extensive public datasets such as MJSynth Jaderberg et al. (2014), SynthText Gupta et al. (2016), ICDAR2015 Karatzas et al. (2015), FlowText Zhao et al. (2023), and Total-Text Ch'ng and Chan (2017), as well as various algorithms including PSENet Wang et al. (2019), EAST Zhou et al. (2017), MaskTextSpotter Lyu et al. (2018), Polygon-Free Wu et al. (2022), DText Cai et al. (2022), TextMountain Zhu and Du (2021), TextCohesion Wu et al. (2019), and FOTS Liu et al. (2018). In contrast, the progress in video-level text spotting Yin et al. (2016) has been notably slow, which limited numerous applications of video text, *e.g.*, video understanding Srivastava et al. (2015), video retrieval Dong et al. (2021); Wu et al. (2023), video text translation, and license plate recognition Anagnostopoulos et al. (2008), etc. There have been a few previous video text spotting benchmarks attempting to develop video text spotting, which focuses on easy cases, *e.g.*, normal text size, and density in a single scenario. ICDAR2015 (Text in Videos) Karatzas et al. (2015), as the most popular benchmark, was introduced during the ICDAR Robust Reading Competition in 2015 focus on wild scenarios: walking outdoors, searching for a shop in a shopping street, etc. YouTube Video Text (YVT) Nguyen et al. (2014) contains 30 videos from YouTube. The text category mainly includes overlay text (caption) and scene text (*e.g.*, driving signs, business signs). RoadText-1K Reddy et al. (2020) provides 1,000 driving videos, which promote driver assistance and self-driving systems. LSVTD Cheng et al. (2019) proposes 100 text videos, 13 indoor (*e.g.*, bookstore, shopping mall) and 9 outdoor (*e.g.*, highway, city road) scenarios, and support two languages, *i.e.*, English and Chinese. BOVText Wu et al. (2021) establishes a large-scale, bilingual video text benchmark, including abundant text types, *i.e.*, title, caption, or scene text.

However, as shown in Figure 1, the above benchmarks still suffer from some limitations: 1) Most text instances present standard text size without challenge, *e.g.*, ICDAR2015(video) YVT, BOVText. 2) Sparse text density in a single scenario, *e.g.*, RoadText-1k, and YVT, which can not evaluate the small and dense text robustness of the algorithm effectively. 3) Most benchmarks present unsatisfactory maintenance. YVT, RoadText-1k, and BOVText all do not launch a corresponding competition and release open-source evaluation scripts. Besides, the download links of YVT even have



**Figure 1 – Visualization of DSText.** Different from previous benchmarks, DSText focuses on dense and small text challenges. Each frame of the video contains dense small texts, coupled with camera movements, posing unique challenges for detection, tracking, and recognition models.

become invalid. The poor maintenance plan is not helpful to the development of video text tasks in the community. To break these limitations, in this work, we establish one new benchmark, which focuses on dense and small texts in various scenarios, as shown in Figure 1. Our dataset has several advantages and unique challenges. **Firstly**, the high-quality, high-resolution, and various videos with dense and small texts (*i.e.*, 140 videos, 62.1k video frames, and 2.2m text instances) are collected from *YouTube* enabling the development of deep design specific for video text spotting. **Secondly**, Each frame of the video contains a significant amount of small text, which presents significant challenges for detection, tracking, and recognition models when encountering distortions and motion blur. **Thirdly**, The average text density per frame reaches a high value of 24, significantly surpassing the maximum text density of previous datasets (5.55 from ICDAR 2015). This poses significant challenges for tracking models, as the high text density can lead to ID switches in tracking, resulting in a decrease in tracking accuracy. The benchmark mainly supports three tasks, *i.e.*, *video text detection*, *video text tracking*, and end-to-end *video text spotting* tasks, including 140 videos with 62.1k frames.

To further advance the field, we also organize the ICDAR 2023 Video Text Reading competition for dense and small text, which includes two competition tracks: video text tracking, and spotting tasks. This competition can serve as a standard benchmark for assessing the robustness of algorithms that are designed for video text spotting in complex natural scenes, which is more challenging. In this paper, we have expanded the dataset with an additional 40 videos, resulting in a total of 140 videos. And we also provide comprehensive data analysis, experimental analysis, and additional insights into the unique challenges posed by our dataset. In the Section 3 of this paper, we provide a detailed overview of how the V2 version of the dataset was constructed, annotated, and present comprehensive information on the data distribution and statistical analysis. In the Section 4, we list all tasks and metrics, along with a brief analysis. Section 5 includes various experimental comparisons and introduces new insights.

The main contributions of this work are three folds:

- We collect and annotate a high-quality, high-resolution video text benchmark with various video domains, which includes 140 videos, 62.1k video frames, and 2.2m text instances.
- Compared to the current existing video text reading datasets, the proposed DSText V2 provides some *unique* features and challenges, including 1) Abundant video scenarios, high-quality videos, 2) Massive and high-proportion of small text, and 3) dense text distribution per frame.
- We provide comprehensive data analysis, experimental analysis, and additional insights into the unique challenges of our dataset, enabling future researchers to better understand and leverage its potential.

## 2. Related Work

In this section, we provide a concise overview of the relevant literature and benchmarks related to our work, specifically focusing on end-to-end text-spotting methods and corresponding benchmarks.

### 2.1. Image Text Spotting

Numerous image-level deep learning-based approaches Li et al. (2017); He et al. (2018); Lyu et al. (2018); Liu et al. (2020, 2023); Lu et al. (2021);

Zheng et al. (2020); Wu et al. (2020a,b, 2023) have been introduced to tackle the task of image text spots, resulting in significant performance improvements. Li et al. (2017) pioneered the development of an end-to-end trainable scene text spotting method. Their approach effectively integrates detection and recognition features using RoI Pooling Ren et al. (2015), achieving notable success. Lyu et al. (2018) introduced a novel approach called Mask TextSpotter, which extends the capabilities of Mask R-CNN by incorporating character-level supervision for simultaneous character detection and recognition. In addition, to mature algorithms, there are also numerous excellent datasets Zhou et al. (2015); Veit et al. (2016); Ch'ng and Chan (2017); Karatzas et al. (2013) available that contribute significantly to the advancement of research in this field. These datasets provide a diverse range of annotated images, offering valuable resources for training and evaluating text detection and recognition models. Some notable datasets such as IC-DAR 2015 Zhou et al. (2015) benchmarks and COCOText Veit et al. (2016), which offer a wide variety of text instances in different contexts. This data is collected using Google Glasses, which captures a wide range of diverse scenes, including but not limited to street views, indoor environments, and shopping malls. Furthermore, there are emerging datasets like Total-Text Ch'ng and Chan (2017) that focus on curved and irregular text, pushing the boundaries of existing algorithms and fostering innovation in the field of text analysis.

## 2.2. Video Text Spotting

Unlike image text detection, the development of video-level tracking in the context of text spotting has been relatively slow. In recent years, there have been several efforts Yu et al. (2021); Tu et al. (2018); Yin et al. (2016); Rong et al. (2014); Wu et al. (2021); Wang et al. (2017) to address the challenges of video text tracking and spotting. Researchers have explored various approaches to overcome the complexities associated with tracking text in videos, including visual feature association Yu et al. (2021), learnable query embedding Wu et al. (2021), detection bounding box association Rong et al. (2014). Nguyen et al. (2014) performs character detection and recognition via scanning-window templates trained with mixture models. Yu et al. (2021) leverage the advantages of contrastive learning to track text across consecutive frames. They employ a contrastive loss to minimize the distance between the embeddings of the same text instance across frames while maximizing the distance between embeddings of different text instances. Wang et al. (2017) propose a method to link text across adjacent frames using a combination

**Table 1 – Statistical Comparison.** ‘Box’, and ‘Text Area’ denote the box annotation type and average area (# pixels) of text while the shorter side of the image is 720 pixels. ‘Text Density’ refers to the average text number per frame.

Dataset	Video	Frame	Text	Box	Text Area	Text Density	Supported Scenario (Domain)
AcTiV-D Zayene et al. (2016)	8	1,843	5,133	Upright	-	-	News video
YVT Nguyen et al. (2014)	30	13k	16k	Upright	8,664	1.15	Cartoon, Outdoor(supermarket, shopping street, driving...)
ICD15 VTZhou et al. (2015)	51	27k	144k	Oriented	5,013	5.33	Driving, Supermarket, Shopping street...
RoadTextReddy et al. (2020)	1k	300k	1.2m	Upright	2,141	0.75	Driving
LSVTDCheng et al. (2019)	100	66k	569k	Oriented	2,254	5.52	Shopping mall, Supermarket, Hotel...
BOVText Wu et al. (2021)	2k	1.7m	8.8m	Oriented	10,309	5.12	Cartoon, Vlog, Travel, Game, Sport, News ...
DSText V1 Wu et al. (2023)	100	56.0k	671k	Oriented	1,984	23.5	Driving, Activity, Street View (indoor), Street View (outdoor), Sports, News, Movie, Cooking
DSText V2	140	62.1k	2.2m	Oriented	<b>1,758</b>	<b>42.4</b>	Driving, Activity, Street View (indoor), Street View (outdoor), Game, Sports, Unknown

of detection box IoU and transcription-based edit distance matching. Cheng et al. (2019) and Free Cheng et al. (2020) propose a video text spotting framework that performs text recognition only once for the localized text. This approach reduces the computational costs and improves efficiency. Wu et al. (2021) propose a video text spotting approach that utilizes object features from the previous frame as a tracking query for the current frame. They employ IoU matching to obtain accurate text tracking and train a separate recognition model to obtain the final recognition results. TransDETR Wu et al. (2022) was the first to propose an end-to-end framework that addresses the tasks of detection, tracking, and recognition in a unified framework. This method employs a query embedding to represent a text instance across multiple frames, effectively modeling the long sequence relationship. Overall, end-to-end video text spotting remains scarce and there is still significant room for improvement in terms of speed and accuracy.

### 2.3. Video Text Dataset

The progress in video text spotting has been limited in recent years due to the scarcity of efficient datasets. The ICDAR 2015 Video dataset Zhou et al.

(2015) comprises only 25 training videos and 25 test videos. The videos are categorized into a few specific scenarios, such as walking outdoors or searching for a shop in a street, where the majority of the text instances are considered relatively easy cases, as they do not pose significant challenges in terms of text size, density, or other characteristics. The Minetto Dataset Minetto et al. (2011) is a relatively small dataset that includes only 5 videos captured in outdoor scenes. The frame size of the videos is 640 x 480 pixels. YVT Nguyen et al. (2014), consists of a total of 30 videos. Out of these, 15 videos are used for training, and the remaining 15 videos are designated for testing. RoadText-1K Reddy et al. (2020) offers a collection of driving videos consisting of 1000 videos, which are sampled from the BDD100K Yu et al. (2018). The dataset primarily focuses on the driving scenario, making it specific to road scenes. BOVText Wu et al. (2021), is a bilingual dataset collected from YouTube and Kuaishou. It comprises over 2,000 videos. A majority of these videos in this dataset may not exhibit significant challenges in terms of text spotting, as shown in Figure 1. Existing datasets primarily focus on normal text and lack challenging examples of dense and small text. Besides, many datasets suffer from poor maintenance.


### 3. Dataset

#### 3.1. Dataset and Annotations

##### 3.1.1. Dataset Source.

We collect high-quality videos with dense and small text from three data sources:

- 1) 30 videos sampled from the large-scale video text dataset BOVText Wu et al. (2021). BOVText as the largest video text dataset, comprising over 2,000 videos, is a valuable data source. It covers a wide range of scenarios and includes a substantial number of videos with small and dense text. We employ a selection process to identify the top 30 videos with small and dense texts based on criteria that the average text area within the video and the average number of text instances per frame. This ensures that we focus on videos that exhibit a high concentration of small and dense text.
- 2) We collect 10 videos for driving scenario from RoadText-1k Reddy et al. (2020). As shown in Figure 1, the RoadText-1k dataset exhibits




**Figure 2 – The Data Distribution for 7 Open Scenarios.** (a) Video number distribution (b). The number distribution of video frames. (c) Text instance distribution. (d) Average text area (# pixels) distribution while the shorter side of the image is 720. (e) The distribution of average text number per frame (density).

a significant presence of small texts, which aligns with the challenge of our dataset. Thus we also randomly select 10 videos to enrich the driving scenario.

- 3) 100 videos for other scenarios, such as street view scenes and supermarkets, are collected from YouTube. Except for BOVText and RoadText-1k, we also need more high-quality videos with dense and small texts for other scenarios, such as games, street view scenes, and supermarkets. Therefore, we also collect 100 videos with dense and small texts from YouTube.

Therefore, we obtain 140 videos with 62.1k video frames, as shown in Table 1. Then the dataset is randomly divided into two parts: the training set with 34,907 frames from 90 videos, and the testing set with 27,234 frames from 50 videos. In this paper, we have added an additional 40 videos to the training set in DSText expanding the size and diversity of the dataset. Furthermore, the original 12 video scenarios have been reorganized into 7 more representative scenarios. This categorization involved grouping certain






**Figure 3 – The distribution of different text size range on different datasets** ”%” denotes the percentage of text size region over the whole data. Text area (# pixels) is calculated while the shorter side of the image is 720 pixels.

categories with fewer data samples (*i.e.*, movie, news) into the ”unknown” category.

### 3.1.2. Annotation

We adopt two main annotation approaches based on the different sources of data: 1) For the 30 videos from BOVText, we just adopt the original annotation, which includes four kinds of description information: the rotated bounding box of detection, the tracking identification(ID) of the same text, the content of the text for recognition, the category of text, *i.e.*, caption, title, scene text, or others. 2) As for the 110 videos from RoadText-1k and YouTube, we hire a professional annotation team to label each text for each frame. The annotation format is the same as BOVText. For each video, we extract frames at a rate of 15 frames per second (FPS) and require each annotator to annotate frame by frame. Then, we invite an audit team with around 5 persons to carry out another round of annotation checks, and re-label part video frames with unqualified annotation. We require a bounding box and text transcription accuracy of over 95% for acceptance. This means that all the correctly annotated boxes should cover the entire text region, and any missed or incorrect annotations are considered annotation errors. As for text transcription, every letter should be accurately transcribed. Similar to the ICDAR2015 video dataset Zhou et al. (2015), for blurry or non-English texts, we require the annotators to only annotate the bounding box and tracking




**Figure 4 – Comparison for frame number of different text numbers.** ”%” denotes the percentage of the corresponding frame over the whole data. The majority of video frames from the existing datasets only contain 0 to 5 text instances. In contrast, our dataset includes a significant number of text-dense scenes, with 58% of video frames containing 15 or more text instances.


ID while setting the text transcription as ‘ignored’. These texts will not be considered when calculating tracking or spotting metrics. In other words, the detection of these texts will not receive any reward in terms of metrics, and there will be no penalty for missing them. One mentionable point is that the videos from RoadText-1k only provide the upright bounding box (two points), thus we abandon the original annotation and annotate these videos with the oriented bounding box. As a *labor-intensive* job, the whole labeling process took **30** men in one and a half months, *i.e.*, around **7,200** man-hours, to complete the 110 video frame annotations. In our dataset, due to the high density of text in each frame, the average annotation cost per frame is significantly higher compared to other datasets, requiring approximately three to four times more time and effort. As shown in Figure 10, it is quite time-consuming and expensive to annotate a mass of text instances at each frame.

### 3.2. Dataset Comparison and Analysis

In this section, we present detailed statistical data and comparative analysis. Table 2 presents an overall comparison for the basic information, *e.g.*,



**Figure 5 – Distribution of frame for different text numbers on DSText V2.** Frames with more than 10 texts account for around 70% of the dataset.



**Figure 6 – The Data Distribution for the newly added 40 videos on DSText V2.**

the number of videos, frame, text, average text area, text density, and supported scenarios. In comparison with previous works, the proposed DSText V2 shows the denser text instances density per frame (*i.e.*, average 42.4 texts per frame) and smaller text size (*i.e.*, average 1,758 pixels area of texts). Figure 3, Figure 2, and Figure 4 present detailed data distributions and comparisons with the existing datasets for DSText v2. In addition, we have provided comprehensive data analytics for the newly added 40 videos in DSText V2, as illustrated in Figure 6. This includes statistics on the distribution of video quantities per video scenario, the average text area distribution per video scenario, and the average text count (per frame) distribution per video scenario category. Due to the substantial presence of Street (indoor) and Street (outdoor) scenes in the V1 version, in the V2 version, we primarily






Figure 8 – Wordcloud visualizations for DStext V2.

inclusion of smaller-sized text in our V2 version. DStext V2 also presents a higher proportion for small texts (less 400 pixels) with up to 50%. This type of small text poses significant challenges, as demonstrated in the supermarket (street indoor) scene shown in Figure 9. For text detectors and recognizers, such text is prone to false negatives, false positives, or recognition errors. RoadText-1K Reddy et al. (2020) and LSVTD Cheng et al. (2019) also exhibit relatively small average text areas in Table 1. However, their text density is quite sparse, with only 0.75 texts and 5.12 texts per frame, which is significantly lower than our text density of 42.4. Besides, RoadText-1k only focuses on the driving domain, which limits the evaluation of other scenarios.

### 3.2.3. Dense Text Distribution

Figure 4 presents the comparison of text density at each frame. The frames with more than 15 text instances occupies 58% in our dataset, at least 30% improvement than the previous work (7% and 8% for BOVText and ICDAR2015 video), which presents more dense text scenarios. Besides, the proportion of frames with fewer than 5 text instances is significantly lower in our dataset, accounting for only 22%. In contrast, ICDAR2015 video had 70% and BOVText had 66% of frames with fewer than 5 text instances. Therefore, the proposed DStext V2 shows the challenge of dense text tracking and recognition. Figure 5 shows the detailed data distribution for our DStext V2. Frames containing 5-40 text instances comprise the majority, while there are also over 4,000 frames with densely packed scenes



**Figure 9 – More Qualitative Video Text Visualization of DSText V2.** DSText V2 covers small and dense texts in various scenarios, which is more challenging.

containing more than 150 text instances. More visualization can be found in Figure 9 (Visualization for various scenarios) and Figure 10 (Representative case with around 200 texts per frame).

### 3.2.4. WordCloud

We also visualize the word cloud for text content in Figure 8 and Figure 7. All words from annotation must contain at least 3 characters, we consider the words less than four characters usually insignificant, *e.g.*, ‘is’. Comparing Figure 7 and Figure 8, we can observe significant changes in the word cloud distribution due to the addition of the extra 40 videos. Some new words have emerged, such as ”variety” and ”PACK.”

## 4. Tasks and Metric

The proposed dataset supports three tasks: 1) video text detection, where the objective is to obtain a rough estimation of the text areas in the image, in terms of bounding boxes that correspond to parts of text. 2) video text



**Figure 10 – One Case for around 200 Texts per Frames.** DStext V2 includes huge amounts of small and dense text scenarios.

tracking, where the objective is to localize and track all words in the video sequences. and 3) the end-to-end video text spotting: where the objective is to localize, track and recognize all words in the video sequence. In this paper, we will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of these three tasks.

#### 4.1. Task 1: Video Text Detection

Video text detection is similar to image-level detection, the method requires detecting all the text in the video frames and returning the corresponding detection boxes. And we will directly use the image-level evaluation metrics from ICDAR 2015 Karatzas et al. (2015) to evaluate.

#### 4.2. Task 2: Video Text Tracking

The task requires one network to detect and track text over the video sequence simultaneously. Given an input video, the network should produce two results: a rotated detection box, and tracking ids of the same text. For simplicity, we adopt the evaluation method from the ICDAR 2015 Video Robust Reading competition Zhou et al. (2015) for the task. The evaluation was revised in 2020, utilizing MOTChallenge Dendorfer et al. (2019) for multiple object tracking For each method, MOTChallenge provides three different metrics: the Multiple Object Tracking Precision (MOTP), the Multiple Object Tracking Accuracy (MOTA), and the IDF1. See the 2013 competition report Karatzas et al. (2013) and MOTChallenge Dendorfer et al. (2019) for details about these metrics.


**Table 2 – The Related Metric for Video Text Spotting Task.** These metrics have been adopted by ICDAR2015(V), ICDAR2013(V), RoadText-1k, BOVText, DSText V1, and DSText V2.

Metric	Better	Description
ID <sub>F1</sub>	higher	ID <sub>F1</sub> Score Ristani et al. (2016). The ratio of correctly identified detections&recognitions over the average number of ground-truth and computed detections&recognitions. Formula: $\frac{ID_{Recall} \times ID_{Precision} \times 2}{ID_{Recall} + ID_{Precision}}$
ID <sub>Recall</sub>	higher	Ratio of correct detections&recognitions to total number of GTs. Formula: $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$
ID <sub>Precision</sub>	higher	Ratio of correct detections&recognitions to total number of predicted detections&recognitions. Formula: $\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$
MOTA	higher	Multi-Object Tracking Accuracy Bernardin and Stiefelhagen (2008). This measure combines three error sources: false positives, missed targets and identity switches. Formula: $1 - \frac{FN+FP+ID\ Sw.}{TP+FN}$
MOTP	higher	Multiple Object Tracking Precision Bernardin and Stiefelhagen (2008) measures the average precision of target position predictions in multiple object tracking tasks.
Mostly Tracked	higher	Mostly tracked targets. The ratio of ground-truth trajectories that are covered by a track hypothesis for at least 80% of their respective life span.
Partially Matched	lower	The percentage of ground-truth trajectories covered by a track hypothesis, within the range of 20% to 80% of their respective lifespan.
Mostly Lost	lower	Mostly lost targets. The ratio of ground-truth trajectories that are covered by a track hypothesis for at most 20% of their respective life span.
False Postive(FP)	lower	The total number of false positives.
False Negative(FN)	lower	The total number of false negative.
True Postive(TP)	higher	The total number of true positives.
True Negative(TN)	higher	The total number of true negatives.
ID Sw.	lower	Number of Identity Switches Li et al. (2009). The ID Switch metric measures the frequency of target ID changes in text tracking, representing the occurrences of target identity transitions within a sequence.

#### 4.3. Task 3: End-to-End Video Text Spotting

Video Text Spotting (VTS) task that requires simultaneously detecting, tracking, and recognizing text in the video. The word recognition performance is evaluated by simply whether a word recognition result is completely correct. And the word recognition evaluation is case-insensitive and accent-insensitive. All non-alphanumeric characters are not taken into account, including decimal points, such as ‘1.9’ will be transferred to ‘19’ in our GT. Similarly, the evaluation method (*i.e.*, ID<sub>F1</sub>, MOTA and MOTP) from the ICDAR 2015 Robust Reading competition is also adopted for the task. Table 2 shows all metrics and their corresponding explanations. The main issue with MOTA is its primary focus on the number of incorrect decisions made by the tracker, such as ID switches (IDSW). In certain scenarios, there is a greater concern for the duration of tracking for a specific ID. For instance, when a trajectory is consistently tracked for the majority of its lifespan, even





**Figure 11 – Tracking performance (*i.e.*,  $ID_{F1}$ ) with TransDETR Wu et al. (2022) in different scenarios of DSText V2.** The ”Street Indoor” scenario presents smaller text areas and denser text data, which introduces significant challenges for existing algorithms and datasets.

if it experiences multiple ID switches in the early or late stages, we consider the trajectory to be a reasonable prediction. Therefore,  $ID_{F1}$  is introduced to address this phenomenon.  $ID_{F1}$  is particularly concerned with the length of time a tracker correctly matches the same ID. In cases where a trajectory maintains correct ID matches for the majority of its tracking duration, occasional acceptable ID switches may occur. Conversely, even if there is only one ID switch, but the majority of ID matches are incorrect, this is deemed unacceptable in practical applications.


## 5. Experimental

### 5.1. Implementation Details for Baseline

**TransDETR Wu et al. (2022)**, as the official baseline <sup>1</sup> of DSText V1, is used to further evaluate and validate our dataset. TransDETR is a novel, simple, and end-to-end video text DEtection, Tracking, and Recognition framework (TransDETR), which views the video text spotting task as a direct long-sequence temporal modeling problem. We followed the official open-source code <sup>2</sup> for various implementation details, including learning rate, data augmentation, and optimizer. All speed and performance are

<sup>1</sup><https://rrc.cvc.uab.es/?ch=22&com=downloads>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/weijiawu/TransDETR>



**Figure 12 – Tracking performance (*i.e.*,  $ID_{F1}$ ) of videos with different average text area.** TransDETR is the baseline, and is trained on the training set of DSText V2.


tested with a batch size of 1 on a V100 GPU and a 2.20GHz CPU in a single thread.

**Other baselines.** In addition to the TransDETR, we also included several other baselines. As shown in Table 5, image-level detectors, including EAST Zhou et al. (2017), and PSENet Wang et al. (2019), were used to detect text objects. We strictly followed the settings and configurations provided in the official open-source code for all aspects of object detection. Wang et al. (2017) was utilized to link and match text objects across frames using IOU and edit distance. Finally, CRNN Shi et al. (2016) was employed as the recognition model to identify each text trajectory in the video. We used the re-implementation code of DTRB <sup>3</sup> for our experiments.

### 5.2. Attribute Experiments Analysis for DSText V2

**Small Text, New Challenge for Video Text.** A key contribution of this work is the distribution of a high proportion of small text. To validate the technical challenges posed by small text, we analyze the problem from two perspectives. Firstly, we compare the performance of videos with different text densities. As shown in Figure 12, we compute the average


<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/clovaai/deep-text-recognition-benchmark>



**Figure 13 – Tracking performance (*i.e.*,  $ID_{F1}$ ) of videos with different text density.** TransDETR is the baseline, and is trained on the training set of DSText V2.

text area and corresponding  $ID_{F1}$  metric for 50 test videos. It can be observed that within a certain range, larger text areas result in better tracking performance. However, when the average text area is less than 500 pixels, it becomes challenging to achieve an  $ID_{F1}$  score above 50%. Secondly, we evaluate the tracking performance based on video scenarios. As shown in Figure 11, we categorize the evaluation based on video scenarios. It is evident that scenarios with smaller average text areas exhibit lower tracking performance. For example, the "Street Indoor" scenario presents the lowest performance, with an average text area of only 900 pixels. Additionally, we explore the transferability of models trained on other existing video text benchmarks and tested on our dataset. Figure 11 presents that the challenge of small text persists, even when models are trained on other benchmarks.

**Dense Texts, New Challenge for Video Text.** Similar to analyzing the challenge posed by small text, we also examined the distributional changes between text density and  $ID_{F1}$  metric. As shown in Figure 13, it is evident that as the text density increases, the  $ID_{F1}$  performance gradually decreases. Interestingly, when the average text density is less than 100, almost no video performance is below 30%. However, among videos with an average text density greater than 150, three of them exhibit performance below 30%.



**Figure 14 – Ablation Study for the Number of Query.** When the number of queries is less than 200, increasing the query quantity results in significant performance gains.

**Effect of Different Scenarios** Figure 11 compares the performance on the test set across different scenarios. The “Sport” scenario demonstrates the best performance, while the “Street Indoor” scenario performs the worst. This is reasonable since the “Street Indoor” scenario contains a large amount of dense small text, with an average text area of only 900 pixels. However, the average text per frame is as high as 140. It is important to note that the “Unknown” scenario does not exist in the test set. The “Unknown” scenario is introduced as a new scenario in the training set of the V2 version, and we did not expand it to the test set.

**Effect of the Number of Query.** Table 14 presents the ablation study for the number of query. When the number of queries is less than 200, increasing the query quantity results in significant performance gains. However, when the number of queries exceeds 200, further increases seem to yield diminishing returns, indicating a saturation in performance.

### 5.3. Video Text Detection

As shown in Table 3, we provide six baselines for evaluation. EAST, PSENet, and DB are image-level detectors, while TransDETR is an end-to-end video text spotter. For TransDETR, we directly use the tracking detection boxes as predictions to calculate the metrics. With 200 queries, TransDETR achieves the highest performance with an F-measure of 62.9%. In comparison to existing benchmarks, the detection performance is noticeably lower. For example, the highest performance on ICDAR15 is close to

**Table 3 – Video Text Detection Performance on DSText V2.** ‘Size’ and ‘Q’ means the shorter side of the input and query, respectively.

Method	Backbone	Pretrain	Video Text Detection/%			
			Precision	Recall	F-measure	FPS
EAST (size: 800) Wu et al. (2021)	VGG16	COCO-Text	72.1	37.8	49.6	8.7
PSENet (size: 800) Wang et al. (2019)	ResNet18	COCO-Text	76.1	38.5	51.1	3.6
DB (size: 800) Liao et al. (2020)	ResNet18	COCO-Text	76.5	40.3	52.8	6.3
DB++ (size: 800) Liao et al. (2022)	ResNet18	COCO-Text	77.8	41.6	54.2	5.5
TransVTSpotter (Q:200) Wu et al. (2021)	ResNet50	COCO-Text	77.2	45.3	57.1	8.9
TransDETR (Q:100) Wu et al. (2022)	ResNet50	-	74.9	42.0	53.8	11.9
TransDETR (Q:100) Wu et al. (2022)	ResNet50	COCO-Text	75.0	52.3	61.6	11.9
TransDETR (Q:200) Wu et al. (2022)	ResNet50	COCO-Text	78.5	52.5	62.9	11.4

**Table 4 – Video Text Tracking Performance on DSText V2.** ‘Size’ and ‘Q’ means the shorter side of the input and learnable query embedding, respectively. Mostly Tracked (M-T) denotes the number of tracked objects at least 80% of lifespan, Mostly Lost (M-L) denotes the number of objects tracked less than 20% of lifespan. EAST Zhou et al. (2017), VMFT Wang et al. (2017), TransDETR Wu et al. (2022), and PSENet Wang et al. (2019) are used as the baselines.

Method		Backbone	Pre.	Video Text Tracking/%					FPS	
Detection	Tracking			ID <sub>F1</sub>	MOTA	MOTP	M-T <sup>↑</sup>	P-T <sup>↑</sup>		M-L <sup>↓</sup>
EAST	VMFT	VGG16	COCO-Text	32.1	24.8	76.1	2890	2670	7017	7.1
PSENet	VMFT	ResNet18	COCO-Text	33.8	24.5	77.3	3025	2509	7043	2.3
YORO		ResNet50	COCO-Text	33.2	23.4	73.5	985	1762	9893	5.4
TransVTSpotter (Q:200)		ResNet50	COCO-Text	50.1	31.0	77.2	2378	1892	8307	8.9
TransDETR (Q:100)		ResNet50	-	26.8	35.2	76.7	3191	2347	7039	11.9
TransDETR (Q:200)		ResNet50	-	47.1	30.4	77.1	2878	2091	7608	11.4
TransDETR (Q:100)		ResNet50	COCO-Text	52.7	36.0	77.8	3796	2484	6297	11.9
TransDETR (Q:200)		ResNet50	COCO-Text	55.2	39.3	77.4	4368	2505	5704	11.4

90%, while the current highest performance on the video version of ICDAR15 is 75%. There still seems to be significant room for improvement. Furthermore, it is worth noting that dense text poses a significant challenge not only in terms of detection accuracy but also in terms of detection speed. For algorithms that cannot process text instances in parallel, such as DB and PSENet, the inference speed is greatly restricted due to the need to process over 100 text instances in each frame. As a result, the inference speed is only around 5 frames per second (fps), which is unacceptable for video tasks.

#### 5.4. Video Text Tracking

Table 4 presents the corresponding tracking performance for DSText V2. With 200 queries, TransDETR achieves the best performance with an IDF1

**Table 5 – End-to-End Video Text Spotting Performance on DSText V2.** ‘Q’ means the number of query. EAST Zhou et al. (2017), VMFT Wang et al. (2017), TransDETR Wu et al. (2022), CRNN Shi et al. (2016), and PSENet Wang et al. (2019) are used as the baselines.

Method			Backbone	Pre.	Video Text Spotting/%					FPS	
Detection	Tracking	Recognition			ID <sub>F1</sub>	MOTA	MOTP	M-T↑	P-T↑		M-L↓
EAST	VMFT	CRNN	VGG16	COCOText	9.3	-31.2	77.3	553	527	11497	6.7
PSENet	VMFT	CRNN	ResNet18	COCOText	10.2	-31.0	77.3	536	587	11454	2.0
TransDETR (Q:100)			ResNet50	-	9.8	-16.4	77.9	407	404	11766	11.9
TransDETR (Q:200)			ResNet50	-	12.0	-11.9	78.8	446	313	11818	11.4
TransDETR (Q:100)			ResNet50	COCOText	27.0	-9.7	80.4	1458	780	10339	11.9
TransDETR (Q:200)			ResNet50	COCOText	25.5	-1.3	81.3	1110	725	10742	11.4

**Table 6 – Cross-dataset Evaluations on DSText V2.** TransDETR with 200 queries is used as the baseline.

Pre.	Train Set	Test Set	Video Text Tracking/%					
			ID <sub>F1</sub>	MOTA	MOTP	M-T↑	P-T↑	M-L↓
COCO-Text	BOVText	DSText V2	29.6	10.9	74.5	925	1801	9851
-	COCO-Text	DSText V2	43.4	27.9	79.0	1533	1210	9834
-	ICDAR2015 video	DSText V2	44.8	29.1	73.1	1388	1329	9860
COCO-Text	ICDAR2015 video	DSText V2	49.9	32.3	72.2	2406	1994	8177
COCO-Text	DSText V2	DSText V2	55.2	39.3	77.4	4368	2505	5704
-	DSText V2	ICDAR 2015 video	54.2	35.3	76.7	760	219	937
COCO-Text	DSText V2	ICDAR 2015 video	63.4	44.0	73.5	947	390	579

of 55.2% and a MOTA of 39.3%, showing a significant improvement compared to a simple combination of image text detectors and tracking link algorithms. It’s worth noting that compared to YORO and TransVTSpotter, our method has a simpler and more efficient pipeline, eliminating the need for multiple models to assist each other. Additionally, pretraining on COCOText Veit et al. (2016) leads to a significant improvement, with at least a 10% increase in ID<sub>F1</sub>. Furthermore, increasing the number of queries results in further improvement. This is reasonable since, as shown in Figure 5, there are approximately 4000 frames with over 150 texts. In such scenarios, having more queries is necessary to capture all the texts accurately. We also provide more detailed information for each video Figure 7.

### 5.5. Video Text Spotting

We also provide the performance of end-to-end video text spotting in Table 5. Compared to the text tracking task, the performance of the end-to-end task appears to be significantly unsatisfactory. One main reason is that,

**Table 7 – Detailed information on the size, density, and tracking performance of text in each video.** Dense and small text scenarios are typically more challenging.

Video Name	209	184	208	202	210	122	228	199	214	156
Text Area (# pixel)	418.8	436.1	465.3	466.3	469.5	506.9	507.7	518.0	580.2	600.6
Text Number per Frame	254.1	28.5	391.1	69.6	178.1	19.6	22.4	65.2	207.1	213.2
ID <sub>F1</sub> /%	21.8	42.4	31.9	40.9	47.1	58.4	43.7	58.2	37.0	70.0
MOTA/%	21.4	24.6	20.8	23.6	33.3	48.6	22.3	21.1	29.1	51.5
Video Name	128	239	162	121	135	175	192	125	143	216
Text Area (# pixel)	644.9	666.4	686.7	688.4	730.5	735.2	808.4	812.7	847.1	872.7
Text Number per Frame	24.4	5.1	75.7	14.2	26.6	24.1	195.5	29.7	17.7	24.9
ID <sub>F1</sub> /%	67.7	58.6	63.6	55.0	50.0	57.1	24.0	66.7	51.7	54.8
MOTA/%	54.0	38.9	48.3	32.4	39.4	36.2	27.1	40.7	24.3	-9.6
Video Name	145	149	126	174	112	232	222	211	133	197
Text Area (# pixel)	900.9	902.5	987.9	992.0	998.8	1017.5	1018.7	1033.4	1039.5	1068.3
Text Number per Frame	30.2	23.2	70.5	19.5	30.8	20.0	138.1	56.2	42.7	84.7
ID <sub>F1</sub> /%	68.9	51.7	54.5	65.3	80.6	50.5	45.0	51.5	47.6	62.8
MOTA/%	48.6	46.8	32.4	46.9	68.4	29.8	41.5	39.4	31.1	45.2
Video Name	196	171	167	223	237	172	132	231	220	218
Text Area (# pixel)	1128.8	1195.4	1196.8	1259.0	1312.1	1379.9	1385.7	1424.5	1511.8	1615.7
Text Number per Frame	168.3	158.1	17.8	8.7	10.9	90.4	16.8	32.2	60.4	251.8
ID <sub>F1</sub> /%	32.5	27.7	62.2	66.9	66.3	49.2	59.7	37.6	59.4	42.0
MOTA/%	42.7	27.9	36.8	42.0	51.6	33.3	29.0	17.2	46.2	50.2
Video Name	230	242	136	105	108	144	178	134	114	123
Text Area (# pixel)	1769.3	1776.1	1783.3	2079.6	2366.3	2435.2	2959.7	3092.6	3310.9	6919.1
Text Number per Frame	6.3	11.8	24.6	25.8	24.1	14.5	79.8	12.5	18.3	22.3
ID <sub>F1</sub> /%	62.4	63.4	58.6	63.9	68.8	64.6	51.9	68.3	84.9	86.0
MOTA/%	34.9	42.8	38.5	53.8	56.9	38.3	35.5	51.1	90.9	78.4

unlike tracking metrics, the end-to-end task requires both tracking and recognizing the text with complete accuracy. The predicted result is considered correct only when every letter in each word is correctly recognized. However, this is a challenging task, especially in video scenarios where there are camera movements, distortions, and occlusions. Overall, with 200 queries and pretraining on COCOText Veit et al. (2016), the model achieves the best performance with an ID<sub>F1</sub> of 25.5% and a MOTA of -1.3%. This indicates that there is still significant room for improvement, such as using more powerful recognition models, among other approaches. Additionally, further iterations are needed to enhance the inference speed in dense scenes. The current inference speed is insufficient for practical applications, especially for video streaming applications.

### 5.6. Cross-datasets Evaluations

Table 6 presents the related cross-datasets evaluations for studying the generalizability and transferability between different domains. The ICDAR2015

video dataset, being the most popular dataset currently, is primarily used as a benchmark for comparison. It is observed that a model trained on the ICDAR2015 video dataset fails to achieve satisfactory performance on DSText V2, yielding only a 49.6  $ID_{F1}$ . However, a model trained on DSText V2 achieves a notable 63.4  $ID_{F1}$  score on the ICDAR2015 video dataset. This suggests that the model trained on DSText V2 possesses stronger generalization capabilities, performing well on other domain data. The dissatisfactory performance of the model trained on ICDAR2015 video in DSText V2 indicates the presence of unique challenges in the video scenarios of DSText V2 that are absent in the ICDAR2015 video dataset. This is reasonable, as DSText V2 presents numerous challenges related to small and densely packed text. In contrast, the majority of text in the ICDAR 2015 video dataset corresponds to typical scenes, as indicated by the data comparison in Table 1. Therefore, a model trained on ICDAR 2015 video may struggle to handle very small and dense text scenarios.

## 6. Potential Limitations

Although our dataset addresses important gaps and challenges, there are still some potential limitations. Here, we briefly enumerate and discuss several limitations. Firstly, the dataset mainly focuses on multi-oriented English text and does not support curved text annotation. While multi-oriented English text is the most common occurrence in real-life scenarios, the inability to support curved text is a limitation. This is particularly relevant in scenarios where curved text, such as text on billboards, cannot be adequately fit by multi-oriented bounding boxes. Furthermore, the scale of this dataset is still not very large. Exploring ways to further expand the dataset size at a lower cost remains one of the directions worth considering.

## 7. Conclusion and Future Work

Here, we present a new video text reading benchmark, which focuses on dense and small video text. We provide a well-maintained project page <sup>4</sup> with corresponding links for dataset download. Compare with the previous datasets, the proposed dataset mainly includes two new challenges for dense and small video text spotting. High-proportioned small texts are a new

---

<sup>4</sup><https://rrc.cvc.uab.es/?ch=22&com=introduction>



challenge for the existing video text methods. Furthermore, we provide a comprehensive data analysis that includes the number of videos in different scenarios, the average text area, and the average text density. Additionally, we provide more experimental analysis corresponding to the two unique challenges, namely small text and dense text, further validating their impact. Overall, we believe and hope the benchmark, as one standard benchmark, develops and improve the video text tasks in the community.

## 8. Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (# 2022YFC3602601), the Key Research and Development Program of Zhejiang Province of China (# 2021C02037), and the National Natural Science Foundation (NSFC#62225603) Besides, we extend our appreciation to OpenAI for the valuable contribution of ChatGPT, which played a crucial role in refining the grammar and enhancing the writing of this paper.

## References

- M. Jaderberg, K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, A. Zisserman, Synthetic data and artificial neural networks for natural scene text recognition, in: Workshop on Deep Learning, NIPS, 2014.
- A. Gupta, A. Vedaldi, A. Zisserman, Synthetic data for text localisation in natural images, in: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2016, pp. 2315–2324.
- D. Karatzas, L. Gomez-Bigorda, A. Nicolaou, S. Ghosh, A. Bagdanov, M. Iwamura, J. Matas, L. Neumann, V. R. Chandrasekhar, S. Lu, et al., Icdar 2015 competition on robust reading, in: IEEE International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition, 2015, pp. 1156–1160.
- Y. Zhao, W. Wu, Z. Li, J. Li, W. Wang, Flowtext: Synthesizing realistic scene text video with optical flow estimation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03327 (2023).
- C. K. Ch'ng, C. S. Chan, Total-text: A comprehensive dataset for scene text detection and recognition, in: IEEE International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition, 2017, pp. 935–942.

- W. Wang, E. Xie, X. Li, W. Hou, T. Lu, G. Yu, S. Shao, Shape robust text detection with progressive scale expansion network, in: IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2019, pp. 9336–9345.
- X. Zhou, C. Yao, H. Wen, Y. Wang, S. Zhou, W. He, J. Liang, East: an efficient and accurate scene text detector, in: IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2017, pp. 5551–5560.
- P. Lyu, M. Liao, C. Yao, W. Wu, X. Bai, Mask textspotter: An end-to-end trainable neural network for spotting text with arbitrary shapes, in: European Conference on Computer Vision, 2018, pp. 67–83.
- W. Wu, E. Xie, R. Zhang, W. Wang, P. Luo, H. Zhou, Polygon-free: Unconstrained scene text detection with box annotations, in: 2022 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP), IEEE, 2022, pp. 1226–1230.
- Y. Cai, Y. Liu, C. Shen, L. Jin, Y. Li, D. Ergu, Arbitrarily shaped scene text detection with dynamic convolution, *Pattern Recognition 127 (2022)* 108608.
- Y. Zhu, J. Du, Textmountain: Accurate scene text detection via instance segmentation, *Pattern Recognition 110 (2021)* 107336.
- W. Wu, J. Xing, H. Zhou, Textcohesion: Detecting text for arbitrary shapes, arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12640 (2019).
- X. Liu, D. Liang, S. Yan, D. Chen, Y. Qiao, J. Yan, Fots: Fast oriented text spotting with a unified network, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2018, pp. 5676–5685.
- X.-C. Yin, Z.-Y. Zuo, S. Tian, C.-L. Liu, Text detection, tracking and recognition in video: a comprehensive survey, *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing 25 (2016)* 2752–2773.
- N. Srivastava, E. Mansimov, R. Salakhudinov, Unsupervised learning of video representations using lstms, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, 2015, pp. 843–852.
- J. Dong, X. Li, C. Xu, X. Yang, G. Yang, X. Wang, M. Wang, Dual encoding for video retrieval by text, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (2021)*.

- W. Wu, Y. Zhao, Z. Li, J. Li, H. Zhou, M. Z. Shou, X. Bai, A large cross-modal video retrieval dataset with reading comprehension, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03347 (2023).
- C.-N. E. Anagnostopoulos, I. E. Anagnostopoulos, I. D. Psoroulas, V. Loumos, E. Kayafas, License plate recognition from still images and video sequences: A survey, *IEEE Transactions on intelligent transportation systems* 9 (2008) 377–391.
- P. X. Nguyen, K. Wang, S. Belongie, Video text detection and recognition: Dataset and benchmark, in: *IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision*, 2014, pp. 776–783.
- S. Reddy, M. Mathew, L. Gomez, M. Rusinol, D. Karatzas, C. Jawahar, Roadtext-1k: Text detection & recognition dataset for driving videos, in: *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2020, pp. 11074–11080.
- Z. Cheng, J. Lu, Y. Niu, S. Pu, F. Wu, S. Zhou, You only recognize once: Towards fast video text spotting, in: *ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2019, pp. 855–863.
- W. Wu, D. Zhang, Y. Cai, S. Wang, J. Li, Z. Li, Y. Tang, H. Zhou, A bilingual, openworld video text dataset and end-to-end video text spotter with transformer, in: *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.
- H. Li, P. Wang, C. Shen, Towards end-to-end text spotting with convolutional recurrent neural networks, in: *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 5238–5246.
- T. He, Z. Tian, W. Huang, C. Shen, Y. Qiao, C. Sun, An end-to-end textspotter with explicit alignment and attention, in: *IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 5020–5029.
- Y. Liu, H. Chen, C. Shen, T. He, L. Jin, L. Wang, Abcnet: Real-time scene text spotting with adaptive bezier-curve network, in: *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 9809–9818.

- C. Liu, C. Yang, H.-B. Qin, X. Zhu, C.-L. Liu, X.-C. Yin, Towards open-set text recognition via label-to-prototype learning, *Pattern Recognition* 134 (2023) 109109.
- N. Lu, W. Yu, X. Qi, Y. Chen, P. Gong, R. Xiao, X. Bai, Master: Multi-aspect non-local network for scene text recognition, *Pattern Recognition* 117 (2021) 107980.
- Y. Zheng, Y. Xie, Y. Qu, X. Yang, C. Li, Y. Zhang, Scale robust deep oriented-text detection network, *Pattern Recognition* 102 (2020) 107180.
- W. Wu, N. Lu, E. Xie, Y. Wang, W. Yu, C. Yang, H. Zhou, Synthetic-to-real unsupervised domain adaptation for scene text detection in the wild, in: *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020a.
- W. Wu, J. Xing, C. Yang, Y. Wang, H. Zhou, Texts as lines: text detection with weak supervision, *Mathematical Problems in Engineering* 2020 (2020b) 1–12.
- W. Wu, Y. Zhao, M. Z. Shou, H. Zhou, C. Shen, Diffumask: Synthesizing images with pixel-level annotations for semantic segmentation using diffusion models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11681* (2023).
- S. Ren, K. He, R. Girshick, J. Sun, Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015) 91–99.
- X. Zhou, S. Zhou, C. Yao, Z. Cao, Q. Yin, Icdar 2015 text reading in the wild competition, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03184* (2015).
- A. Veit, T. Matera, L. Neumann, J. Matas, S. Belongie, Coco-text: Dataset and benchmark for text detection and recognition in natural images, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.07140* (2016).
- D. Karatzas, F. Shafait, S. Uchida, M. Iwamura, L. G. i Bigorda, S. R. Mestre, J. Mas, D. F. Mota, J. A. Almazan, L. P. De Las Heras, Icdar 2013 robust reading competition, in: *2013 12th international conference on document analysis and recognition, IEEE*, 2013, pp. 1484–1493.
- H. Yu, Y. Huang, L. Pi, C. Zhang, X. Li, L. Wang, End-to-end video text detection with online tracking, *Pattern Recognition* 113 (2021) 107791.

- D. Tu, L. Chen, M. Lv, H. Shi, G. Chen, Hierarchical online nmf for detecting and tracking topic hierarchies in a text stream, *Pattern Recognition* 76 (2018) 203–214.
- X. Rong, C. Yi, X. Yang, Y. Tian, Scene text recognition in multiple frames based on text tracking, in: 2014 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME), IEEE, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- X. Wang, Y. Jiang, S. Yang, X. Zhu, W. Li, P. Fu, H. Wang, Z. Luo, End-to-end scene text recognition in videos based on multi frame tracking, in: 2017 14th IAPR International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR), volume 1, IEEE, 2017, pp. 1255–1260.
- Z. Cheng, J. Lu, B. Zou, L. Qiao, Y. Xu, S. Pu, Y. Niu, F. Wu, S. Zhou, Free: A fast and robust end-to-end video text spotter, *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 30 (2020) 822–837.
- W. Wu, Y. Cai, C. Shen, D. Zhang, Y. Fu, H. Zhou, P. Luo, End-to-end video text spotting with transformer, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10539* (2022).
- O. Zayene, M. Seuret, S. M. Touj, J. Hennebert, R. Ingold, N. E. B. Amara, Text detection in arabic news video based on SWT operator and convolutional auto-encoders, in: *Workshop on Document Analysis Systems*, 2016, pp. 13–18.
- W. Wu, Y. Zhao, Z. Li, J. Li, M. Z. Shou, U. Pal, D. Karatzas, X. Bai, Icdar 2023 video text reading competition for dense and small text, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04376* (2023).
- R. Minetto, N. Thome, M. Cord, N. J. Leite, J. Stolfi, Snoopertrack: Text detection and tracking for outdoor videos, in: *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, 2011, pp. 505–508.
- F. Yu, W. Xian, Y. Chen, F. Liu, M. Liao, V. Madhavan, T. Darrell, Bdd100k: A diverse driving video database with scalable annotation tooling, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04687* (2018).
- P. Dendorfer, H. Rezatofghi, A. Milan, J. Shi, D. Cremers, I. Reid, S. Roth, K. Schindler, L. Leal-Taixe, Cvpr19 tracking and detection challenge: How crowded can it get?, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04567* (2019).

- E. Ristani, F. Solera, R. Zou, R. Cucchiara, C. Tomasi, Performance measures and a data set for multi-target, multi-camera tracking, in: European conference on computer vision, Springer, 2016, pp. 17–35.
- K. Bernardin, R. Stiefelhagen, Evaluating multiple object tracking performance: the clear mot metrics, EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing 2008 (2008) 1–10.
- Y. Li, C. Huang, R. Nevatia, Learning to associate: Hybridboosted multi-target tracker for crowded scene, in: 2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, IEEE, 2009, pp. 2953–2960.
- B. Shi, X. Bai, C. Yao, An end-to-end trainable neural network for image-based sequence recognition and its application to scene text recognition, IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence 39 (2016) 2298–2304.
- M. Liao, Z. Wan, C. Yao, K. Chen, X. Bai, Real-time scene text detection with differentiable binarization, in: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, volume 34, 2020, pp. 11474–11481.
- M. Liao, Z. Zou, Z. Wan, C. Yao, X. Bai, Real-time scene text detection with differentiable binarization and adaptive scale fusion, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 45 (2022) 919–931.