

Cross-Modal Object Tracking via Modality-Aware Fusion Network and A Large-Scale Dataset

Lei Liu, Mengya Zhang, Cheng Li, Chenglong Li, and Jin Tang

Abstract—Visual tracking often faces challenges such as invalid targets and decreased performance in low-light conditions when relying solely on RGB image sequences. While incorporating additional modalities like depth and infrared data has proven effective, existing multi-modal imaging platforms are complex and lack real-world applicability. In contrast, near-infrared (NIR) imaging, commonly used in surveillance cameras, can switch between RGB and NIR based on light intensity. However, tracking objects across these heterogeneous modalities poses significant challenges, particularly due to the absence of modality switch signals during tracking. To address these challenges, we propose an adaptive cross-modal object tracking algorithm called Modality-Aware Fusion Network (MAFNet). MAFNet efficiently integrates information from both RGB and NIR modalities using an adaptive weighting mechanism, effectively bridging the appearance gap and enabling a modality-aware target representation. It consists of two key components: an adaptive weighting module and a modality-specific representation module. The adaptive weighting module predicts fusion weights to dynamically adjust the contribution of each modality, while the modality-specific representation module captures discriminative features specific to RGB and NIR modalities. MAFNet offers great flexibility as it can effortlessly integrate into diverse tracking frameworks. With its simplicity, effectiveness, and efficiency, MAFNet outperforms state-of-the-art methods in cross-modal object tracking. To validate the effectiveness of our algorithm and overcome the scarcity of data in this field, we introduce CMOTB, a comprehensive and extensive benchmark dataset for cross-modal object tracking. CMOTB consists of 61 categories and 1000 video sequences, comprising a total of over 799K frames. We believe that our proposed method and dataset offer a strong foundation for advancing cross-modal object tracking research. The dataset, toolkit, and source code will be publicly available at: <https://github.com/mmic-lcl/Datasets-and-benchmark-code>.

Index Terms—Cross-modal object tracking, Modality-aware fusion network, Dataset.

I. INTRODUCTION

This research is partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62376004), the Natural Science Foundation of Anhui Province (No. 2208085J18), and the Natural Science Foundation of Anhui Higher Education Institution (No. 2022AH040014). (Corresponding author: Chenglong Li.)

Chenglong Li is affiliated with the Information Materials and Intelligent Sensing Laboratory of Anhui Province, Anhui Provincial Key Laboratory of Multimodal Cognitive Computation, School of Artificial Intelligence, Anhui University, Hefei 230601, China (e-mail: lcl1314@foxmail.com).

Lei Liu, Mengya Zhang, and Jin Tang are affiliated with the Information Materials and Intelligent Sensing Laboratory of Anhui Province, Key Laboratory of Intelligent Computing and Signal Processing of the Ministry of Education, Anhui Provincial Key Laboratory of Multimodal Cognitive Computation, School of Computer Science and Technology, Anhui University, Hefei 230601, China (e-mail: liulei970507@163.com; 2846190720@qq.com; tangjin@ahu.edu.cn).

Cheng Li is affiliated with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Anhui University, Hefei 230601, China (e-mail: farawaylc@qq.com).

VISUAL object tracking is a fundamental task in computer vision, involving locating a target object in subsequent video frames given its initial position in the first frame. It plays a crucial role in various visual systems, such as video surveillance, intelligent transportation, and human-computer interaction. However, existing tracking methods often rely on RGB image sequences, which are sensitive to changes in lighting conditions [1], [2]. As a result, these methods struggle to locate targets effectively in low-light conditions, leading to a significant degradation in tracking performance. Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop trackers that can maintain robust performance even in varying lighting conditions.

To overcome the limitations of the visible light modality, a viable solution is to incorporate other modalities that are less affected by lighting variations. These modalities can include thermal infrared modality that perceives object thermal radiation information [3], [4], [5], [6], depth modality that perceives distance information [7], [8], or event modality that perceives motion information [9]. While incorporating these multi-modal data can effectively overcome challenges posed by lighting variations, it also introduces new problems. For instance, the thermal infrared modality has lower resolution and is susceptible to interference from background temperature. The depth modality is generally more suitable for indoor scenes and has a limited sensing range. The event modality is not sensitive to slow-moving objects and exhibits lower frame rates in low-light environments. Additionally, these modalities have imaging characteristics that significantly differ from the visible light modality, often requiring independent sensors. Moreover, precise multi-modal data alignment is essential to effectively utilize the multi-modal information. However, this process introduces additional time and resource consumption and the need for complex multi-modal imaging platform design [10].

Near-infrared (NIR) imaging, commonly used in surveillance cameras [11], plays a crucial role by automatically switching between RGB and NIR modalities based on variations in lighting intensity. The NIR wavelength range (700 to 1100 nanometers) provides superior penetration capabilities compared to visible light imaging. It remains unaffected by lighting fluctuations and effectively overcomes the limitations of RGB sources in low-light scenarios. Unlike conventional multi-modal vision systems, this adaptive imaging system dynamically switches modalities based on external lighting conditions, ensuring that only one modality is active at any given time. This eliminates the need for multi-modal data alignment, thereby reducing the time and effort required for the alignment process and addressing the challenges associated with building such a complex multi-modal imaging platform.




Fig. 1. Examples of visual object tracking, multi-modal object tracking, and cross-modal object tracking.

Fig. 1 provides visual demonstrations of visual object tracking, multi-modal object tracking, and cross-modal object tracking, illustrating the heterogeneity and distinct visual properties of RGB and NIR modalities. As a result, target objects exhibit significant appearance variations across different modalities, posing a substantial challenge for cross-modal object tracking. Unfortunately, existing tracking methods have not extensively addressed this problem.

In this work, we focus on tackling the challenge of cross-modal object tracking and aim to solve two key questions. Firstly, we aim to develop an algorithm that effectively bridges the appearance gap between RGB and NIR modalities, while also offering flexible integration into different tracking frameworks to ensure robust cross-modal object tracking. Secondly, we aim to create a benchmark dataset of video sequences that can serve as a valuable resource for the advancement of cross-modal object tracking algorithms.

To address the first problem, we propose the **Modality-Aware Fusion Network (MAFNet)** for adaptive cross-modal object tracking. MAFNet effectively bridges the appearance gap between RGB and NIR modalities by learning modality-specific target representation and modality-aware fusion through an adaptive weighting mechanism based on the modality-aware fusion module (MAFM). One of the key advantages of MAFM is its plug-and-play nature, allowing flexible integration into different tracking frameworks. MAFM consists of two main components: an adaptive weighting module and a modality-specific representation module. The adaptive weighting module predicts fusion weights for the weighting process, enabling dynamic adaptation of the contribution from each modality. This module utilizes a lightweight network with a Sigmoid activation function to handle the challenge of unknown modality switches commonly encountered in real-world scenarios.

During the training stage, it is trained using modality states as ground truth supervision. This approach accommodates the limitations of commercial sensors, which often cannot acquire the modality state (although it might be available by customizing the sensor). To capture target representations under different modalities, we introduce a modality-specific representation module. This module leverages modality-based Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) to extract modality-specific features. By integrating the adaptive weighting module and the modality-specific representation module into the

tracking network, MAFNet achieves end-to-end training and adaptively learns modality-specific target representations and modality-aware fusion for training samples in different modalities based on the predicted adaptive fusion weights.

To solve the second problem, we establish a comprehensive benchmark dataset comprising 1000 cross-modal object tracking sequences that cover 61 object categories. The dataset consists of over 799K video frames, with an average sequence length exceeding 799 frames and a maximum length surpassing 2800 frames. To ensure a more comprehensive evaluation of tracker performance in cross-modal scenarios, we divide the dataset into two subsets: the easy set and the hard set. The easy set primarily focuses on common tracking scenarios where each sequence contains modality switches. Conversely, the hard set encompasses more challenging tracking scenarios, such as modality delay caused by the limited adaptability of cross-modal sensors in modality switch scenarios. Each subset is further split into training and testing sets to facilitate separate evaluation. Additionally, we can conduct joint training to obtain more comprehensive evaluation results. Moreover, we introduce three novel challenge attributes specifically designed for cross-modal scenarios. These attributes, namely modality adaptation, modality mutation, and modality delay, represent three typical situations involving modality switches during the tracking process. By evaluating tracker performance on these challenge attributes, we can verify their robustness in cross-modal scenarios.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce a new task called cross-modal object tracking, which is highly challenging and applicable in real-world scenarios.
- We propose the modality-aware fusion network that effectively addresses appearance differences between different modalities, ensuring robust cross-modal object tracking. Moreover, we integrate this algorithm into two widely-used tracking frameworks to validate its effectiveness.
- We construct a large-scale unified benchmark dataset for cross-modal object tracking. It offers a strong foundation for advancing cross-modal object tracking research.
- We conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate the superior performance of our proposed method compared to state-of-the-art trackers.

This paper is an extended version of our conference paper

[12] and brings three main improvements. Firstly, we propose a novel method called MAFNet, which enhances the training algorithm compared to the previous MArMOT [12]. It achieves modality-specific representation learning and modality-aware fusion in an end-to-end training manner, eliminating the need for tedious multi-stage training methods and addressing the issue of sub-optimization. Secondly, we expand the scale of the dataset and consider more realistic challenges in cross-modal scenarios, such as the inadequate adaptation of cross-modal cameras to modality switches, resulting in modality delay. Moreover, we divide the dataset into easy and hard subsets, and for each subset, we have separate training and testing sets. Evaluation can be performed on the easy and hard subsets individually or jointly. Thirdly, MAFNet maintains comparable performance while simplifying the training complexity compared to MArMOT. We observe consistent performance improvements compared to MArMOT on both the easy and hard subsets.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Visual Object Tracking

Existing trackers can be categorized into three typical schemes: classification-based tracking algorithms, matching-based two-stream tracking algorithms, and transformer-based one-stream tracking algorithms. Classification-based tracking algorithms[13], [14] distinguish between foreground and background by training a robust classifier offline. However, due to the adaptability issue of target appearance changes, these methods usually require online updating, resulting in low tracking efficiency. Matching-based two-stream tracking algorithms[15], [16], [17], [18] treat the tracking task as a template matching problem, using the features of the template image as convolution kernels to convolve the features of the search area. The position with the maximum response is the target to be tracked. These methods are fast but require separate feature extraction and relation modeling, limiting the ability of the network to jointly learn the correlation between the template image and the search area, thus restricting further improvement in tracking performance. With the widespread application of transformers[19] in computer vision [20], some studies have successfully constructed one-stream tracking frameworks using transformers[21], [22]. These frameworks achieve joint feature extraction and relation modeling, simplify the tracking process, and improve tracking accuracy.

Despite the significant performance enhancement achieved by these advanced methods, they rely solely on RGB data, which is limited by inherent drawbacks such as sensitivity to lighting variations. Therefore, achieving robust tracking performance in all-weather and all-day conditions poses a challenge for these methods. In contrast, we exploit the complementary advantages of RGB and NIR data, effectively compensating for the limitations of RGB data.

B. Multi-Modal Object Tracking

To enhance the adaptability of visual tracking algorithms under varying lighting conditions, researchers have attempted to incorporate data from other modalities to improve their

robustness. For instance, Li et al.[23] utilize thermal infrared data to perceive the thermal radiation information of objects, and Yan et al.[7] employ depth data to perceive distance information, while Wang et al.[9] introduce event data to perceive motion information. Additionally, several algorithms have been proposed to effectively utilize multiple modalities, including pixel-level fusion[24], [4], feature-level fusion[9], [25], [26], and decision-level fusion[27].

Although the integration of multi-modal data have significantly improved tracking performance under harsh lighting conditions, precise pixel-level alignment of multi-modal data is necessary to fully leverage their complementary advantages, which is a time-consuming and labor-intensive process. Moreover, constructing multi-modal imaging platforms is complex and expensive, typically costing thousands to tens of thousands of dollars. In contrast, our cross-modal tracking method can effectively exploit the complementary advantages of multi-modal data while avoiding the tedious multi-modal data alignment process. Additionally, cross-modal cameras are easily obtainable and inexpensive in surveillance scenarios, costing only a few dozen dollars.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we introduce our proposed method, the Modality-Aware Fusion Module (MAFM), for adaptive cross-modal object tracking. MAFM aims to bridge the appearance gap between RGB and NIR modalities and enable modality-aware fusion of target representations. It consists of two main components: an adaptive weighting module and a modality-specific representation module. These components work together to effectively fuse information from both modalities. Next, we describe the integration of MAFM with two typical tracking frameworks. This integration allows MAFM to seamlessly combine with different trackers, leveraging their existing infrastructure and capabilities to enhance cross-modal object tracking performance. Then, we delve into the details of the end-to-end training algorithm employed by MAFM. Through joint optimization, both the adaptive weighting module, the modality-specific representation module, and the tracking framework are trained simultaneously. Finally, we provide a detailed explanation of the online tracking process.

A. Modality-Aware Fusion Module

In the task of cross-modal object tracking, the RGB and NIR modalities exhibit significant differences in their visual properties, posing a challenge for cross-modal object tracking. To address this issue, we propose the Modality-Aware Fusion Module (MAFM) for modality-specific target representation learning and modality-aware fusion, to alleviate the appearance gap between RGB and NIR modalities during the tracking process, as shown in Fig. 2(a).

MAFM employs an adaptive weighting mechanism to dynamically fuse information and capture specific target representations from different modalities. It consists of an adaptive weighting module and a modality-specific representation module. The adaptive weighting module predicts fusion weights for the adaptive weighting process, allowing dynamic adjustment




Fig. 2. Details of the modality-aware fusion module. The BN+ReLU layers after each convolutional layer (1×1 , 1×3 , 3×1 , 3×3) and the ReLU layer between different FC layers are omitted for clarity. GAP indicates global average pooling.

of the contribution from each modality. The modality-specific representation module takes into account the visual properties of RGB and NIR modalities and captures discriminative features specific to each modality. It uses modality-based Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) to extract modality-specific target representation, thereby enhancing the fusion of information from RGB and NIR modalities. Importantly, MAFM offers great flexibility as it can effortlessly integrate into diverse tracking frameworks.

1) *Modality-Specific Representation Module*: NIR imaging switches to RGB based on light intensity, leading to significant variations in target appearance. Therefore, it is necessary to model target representations under different modalities. In particular, we design a modality-specific representation module, as illustrated in Fig. 2(a). It is implemented using modality-based CNN with two branches, each responsible for modeling modality-specific target representations. This design simplifies the modeling of cross-modal target representation with distinct appearance differences.

For efficiency and effectiveness, each branch utilizes an inception-like network [28]. In each modality-specific branch, the first 1×1 convolutional layer captures the representation of modality-specific information. It is then split into two streams using two additional 1×1 convolutional layers with half the channels, reducing the dimension of the input feature and computational complexity. Subsequently, two types of 3×3 convolutions are employed to enhance the network’s adaptability in learning target features of different scales. Finally, the outputs are concatenated to form the modality-specific target representation. Details of the modality-specific branch are depicted in Fig. 2(b).

2) *Adaptive Weighting Module*: In the training stage, the modality state is known. However, in the tracking process, it is often unavailable in commercial sensors (although it might be available by customizing the sensor). Therefore, handling scenarios with unknown modality switches is essential.

To address this problem, we design an adaptive weighting module that predicts fusion weights to determine the contribution of each modality in the adaptive weighting process. We use a lightweight network with a Sigmoid activation function to handle unknown modality switches commonly encountered in real-world scenarios. During the training stage, the adaptive weighting module is trained using modality states as ground

truth supervision.

As shown in Fig. 2, our adaptive weighting module consists of a Global Average Pooling (GAP) layer and two Fully Connected (FC) layers, followed by a Sigmoid function. This predicts a normalized fusion weight that is assigned to different modality-specific branches for the adaptive weighting fusion. The fusion process is defined by the equation:

$$F_{out} = \rho \times F_{rgb} + (1 - \rho) \times F_{nir} \quad (1)$$

where ρ is the predicted fusion weight, F_{rgb} and F_{nir} are the modality-specific features corresponding to different modalities, and F_{out} is the modality-aware fusion feature. By predicting fusion weights based on the observed data, MAFM can adaptively adjust the contribution of each modality even in the absence of explicit modality switch signals. During the training stage, the supervision of the adaptive weighting module is the ground truth modality state, and the loss function is the binary cross-entropy loss.

In Fig. 3, we present the results of adaptive weight prediction for a typical sequence, comparing them with the tracking results of the baseline tracker DiMP [29] and MArMOT [12]. It is evident that our method demonstrates high accuracy in both fusion weight prediction and tracking results, thereby validating the effectiveness of our approach.

B. Integration with Tracking Frameworks

Existing tracking frameworks typically use one-stream backbone networks to extract features, making it challenging to handle significant appearance differences caused by modality switches in cross-modal tracking. To address this issue, we propose adding MAFM behind the feature extraction network of the existing tracker.

Specifically, we embed the proposed plug-and-play MAFM into two tracking frameworks: RT-MDNet [14] and DiMP [29], named MAFNet_{RT} and MAFNet_{DiMP}, respectively, to verify the effectiveness and generalization of MAFM. The overall tracking frameworks are shown in Fig. 4. For each tracking framework, we first use the backbone network to extract deep feature representations of the target. Then, we embed MAFM to bridge the appearance gap between RGB and NIR modalities by learning modality-aware fusion target representations through the proposed adaptive weighting mechanism. Finally,




Fig. 3. Effectiveness of fusion weight predictions and representative tracking results in a video sequence. The curves demonstrate the accurate fusion weight predictions of our MAFNet, enhancing the robustness compared to the baseline tracker DiMP [29] and MArMOT [12].




Fig. 4. Visualization of the tracking architectures with MAFM. (a) and (b) show the detailed structures of MAFM combined with RT-MDNet and DiMP, respectively.

the modality-aware fusion feature is sent to the classification branch and regression branch to perform target localization.

For RT-MDNet, it starts with several convolutional layers borrowed from VGG-M [30], which capture common low-level information across modalities. Therefore, we insert MAFM after the last convolutional layer to learn modality-aware target representations fusion. This design also reduces computational complexity since the feature map’s size in the last layer is the smallest, as shown in Fig. 4(a). For DiMP, the backbone network connects the IoU predictor and model predictor simultaneously, using different layer features. Thus, we need to insert MAFM modules after different layers for these two predictors, as shown in Fig. 4(b). The consideration for reducing computational complexity is the same as the design in RT-MDNet.

C. End-to-End Training Algorithm

Researchers have explored various approaches to address the challenge of single-branch networks struggling with diverse complex scenarios in tracking tasks. These approaches include decoupling the learning of target representations based on different attributes and utilizing separate branches to model these attributes. For example, ANT [31] and CAT [3] focus on learning attribute-specific representations, while ADRNet

[32] and APFNet [26] focus on integrating multi-branch representations. In cross-modal object tracking, MArMOT [12] decouples modality-specific representation learning. However, these methods often involve multi-stage learning for adaptive multi-branch representation fusion, making the training process complex and lacking end-to-end optimization, which may lead to suboptimal solutions.

To achieve end-to-end training of the proposed modality-aware fusion module and tracking framework, we use the modality weighting scheme to perform effective fusion of different modalities. This scheme is based on the adaptive weighting operation, which is differentiable and can be integrated into the end-to-end learning framework. By jointly optimizing the network parameters, MAFNet effectively fuses information from RGB and NIR modalities, achieving modality-specific target representation learning and modality-aware fusion.

1) *Loss Function:* The loss function L is a weighted sum of the loss for the adaptive weighting module L_{weight} and the loss for the tracking framework L_{track} :

$$L = \alpha \times L_{\text{weight}} + \beta \times L_{\text{track}} \quad (2)$$

where α and β represent the weights of the different losses. In our experiments, we set α and β to 1. Through the optimization of the adaptive weighting module, modality-




Fig. 5. Illustration of heterogeneous properties between RGB and NIR modalities. The cross-modal camera changes RGB imaging to NIR when the light intensity becomes low from normal, and vice versa.




Fig. 6. Distribution of object categories in the CMOTB dataset.

specific representation module, and the tracking framework in an end-to-end training manner, the adaptive weighting weights can adapt to variations in input cross-modal data and maintain feature discrimination when modality switches occur.

2) *Training Details*: We initialize our model with the parameters of the backbone network pretrained on large-scale datasets such as ImageNet[33] and GOT-10K[1]. The whole model is then trained in an end-to-end manner. In our setting, the learning rate of the network parameters (excluding MAFM) is set to one-tenth of the default learning rate of the tracking framework. The learning rates of the modality-specific representation module and the adaptive weighting module are set to $5e-5$ and $5e-4$, respectively. The number of iterations is the same as that of the basic tracking framework.

D. Online Tracking

The online tracking procedures and parameter configurations of our trackers closely resemble those of the fundamental tracking framework. However, a notable distinction lies in the utilization of deep features extracted by the backbone networks (VGG-M[30] in MAFNet_{RT} and ResNet50[34] in MAFNet_{DiMP}). These features are then fed into our proposed MAFM for modality-aware fusion, effectively mitigating the appearance discrepancies present in target representations captured across different modalities. The resulting outputs from MAFM serve as inputs to both the classifiers (FC4-FC6 in




Fig. 7. Examples of frame-level modality states in the CMOTB dataset.

MAFNet_{RT} and the model predictor in MAFNet_{DiMP}) and the regressor (IoU predictor module in MAFNet_{DiMP}). For a comprehensive understanding of the tracking processes, please refer to Fig. 4 for a detailed visual representation.

IV. CMOTB BENCHMARK DATASET

A. Data Collection and Annotation

1) *Large-scale Collection*: To overcome the scarcity of cross-modal video data in visual object tracking research, we create the CMOTB dataset. Our primary objective is to offer a large-scale and diverse dataset that accurately represents real-world scenarios and challenges. To achieve this, we use hand-held cameras to capture video data from various scenes with different background complexities. Unlike traditional visual object tracking data, we also consider variations in light intensity that trigger modality switches during data creation. Additionally, we carefully select environmental conditions to simulate real-world applications such as visual surveillance, intelligent transportation, and autonomous driving systems. Fig. 5 shows a typical example of the CMOTB dataset, where the imaging switches between RGB and NIR modalities several times. Specifically, we collect a total of 1000 cross-modal image sequences, comprising over 481K frames in total. The average video length exceeds 735 frames, covering 61 different object categories. The distribution of these categories is illustrated in Fig. 6.

2) *High-quality Dense Annotation*: To provide accurate annotations, we represent target object states using minimum bounding boxes that capture position and scale. Due to the time-consuming nature of the labeling process, we have developed an auxiliary labeling tool based on ViTBAT [35]. This tool allows for manual or semi-automatic labeling of target object states through a simple and user-friendly interface, improving efficiency. The generated bounding boxes are accurate in most situations. However, when the target object undergoes drastic appearance variations, the generated bounding boxes may not be entirely accurate. In such cases, we manually adjust the bounding boxes with great care.

To ensure high-quality annotations, we have trained a team of four professional annotators to adhere to consistent annota-




Fig. 8. Sample frames from the CMOTB dataset. Attributes are shown at the bottom.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTIONS OF ATTRIBUTES IN THE CMOTB DATASET.

	Definition
FO	Full Occlusion - Target fully occluded.
PO	Partial Occlusion - Target partially occluded.
DEF	Deformation - Target undergoes non-rigid movement.
SV	Scale Variation - Ratio of current to initial bounding box outside $\tau \in [0.5, 2]$.
ROT	Rotation - Target object rotates.
FM	Fast Motion - Motion larger than bounding box size.
CM	Camera Motion - Abrupt camera movement.
IV	Illumination Variation - Changes in target illumination.
TB	Target Blur - Blurry target appearance.
OV	Out-of-View - Target completely missing.
BC	Background Clustering - Similar color/texture to target in the background.
SIO	Similar Interferential Object - Objects visually resembling the target.
LR	Low Resolution - Bounding box area less than 400.
ARC	Aspect Ratio Change - Significant change in bounding box aspect ratio outside $[0.5, 2]$.
VC	Viewpoint Change - Change in target viewpoint.
MA	Modality Adaptation - Slow modality switch with pseudo intermediate modality.
MM	Modality Mutation - Rapid modality switch without pseudo intermediate modality.
MD	Modality Delay - Delayed modality switch due to inadequate adaptation.

tion standards. Additionally, professional checkers perform a frame-by-frame inspection to prevent incorrect and inaccurate labels. In scenarios where modality switches occur and objects become temporarily invisible, we maintain the ground truth unchanged for the target object until it becomes visible again.

In addition to target object state annotations, we provide frame-level modality state annotations, including four states: RGB state, modality adaptation state, NIR state, and invisible state, to support the learning of modality states. Examples of these four states can be seen in Fig. 7.

B. Attributes

Existing multi-modal tracking datasets include two-modal data in each frame, whereas our dataset contains only one modality per frame but may exhibit modality switches. This

is the major difference from existing multi-modal visual object tracking datasets.

Considering the modality switch, we introduce three new attributes called modality adaptation, modality mutation, and modality delay, representing three typical situations involving modality switches during the tracking process. By evaluating tracker performance on these challenging attributes, we verify their robustness in cross-modal scenarios. Specifically, modality adaptation refers to a slow modality switch leading to the appearance of a pseudo intermediate modality. Modality mutation refers to a rapid modality switch without going through a pseudo intermediate modality. Modality delay refers to a delay in modality switch caused by inadequate adaptation of the device to environmental changes, such as frames that are completely white or black.

To enable attribute-based performance analysis of trackers, we annotate each sequence with 18 attributes, including Full Occlusion (FO), Partial Occlusion (PO), Deformation (DEF), Scale Variation (SV), Rotation (ROT), Fast Motion (FM), Camera Motion (CM), Illumination Variation (IV), Target Blur (TB), Out-of-View (OV), Background Clustering (BC), Similar Interferential Object (SIO), Low Resolution (LR), Aspect Ratio Change (ARC), Viewpoint Change (VC), Modality Adaptation (MA), Modality Mutation (MM), and Modality Delay (MD). We provide detailed definitions for each attribute in Table I and present visual examples of some sequences containing these 18 attributes in Fig. 8 for a more intuitive demonstration.

C. Statistics

The CMOTB dataset consists of 1000 video sequences, covering a wide range of challenges encountered in real-world scenarios. To ensure a comprehensive evaluation of tracker performance in cross-modal scenarios, we divide the dataset into two subsets: the easy set and the hard set. The easy set primarily focuses on common tracking scenarios where each sequence contains modality switches, and it consists of 644 video sequences. The hard set encompasses more challenging tracking scenarios, such as modality delay caused by the limited adaptability of cross-modal sensors in modality switch




Fig. 9. Information statistics of the CMOTB dataset.

scenarios, and it consists of 356 video sequences. Since there are no other cross-modal object tracking datasets available, each subset is further split into training and test sets to facilitate separate evaluation. Additionally, joint training can be conducted to obtain more comprehensive evaluation results. The specific division of each subset of CMOTB is shown in Fig. 9(a), and the distribution of sequence frame counts for each subset is shown in Fig. 9(b).

Modality switch refers to the change in imaging modality caused by variations in light intensity. In such scenarios, the appearance of the target object usually varies significantly, making it challenging for trackers. The number of modality switches in a sequence is a key factor that affects the performance of trackers. Therefore, we record the number of switch times during data creation and report the data distribution of switch times in Fig. 9(d). Additionally, we also summarize the distribution of different attributes in Fig. 9(c).

D. Evaluation Metrics

In our experiments, we utilize the one-pass evaluation (OPE) protocol to evaluate the performance of all trackers. We employ three widely used evaluation metrics in the tracking field [36]: precision rate (PR), normalized precision rate (NPR), and success rate (SR).

- PR (Precision Rate): The precision rate quantifies the percentage of frames where the center distance between the predicted position and the ground truth position is

smaller than a predefined threshold, denoted as τ . For our experiments, we set τ to 20.

- NPR (Normalized Precision Rate): To account for variations in the size of the tracked object across different sequences, we introduce the normalized precision rate as an additional evaluation metric. NPR facilitates fair comparisons by normalizing the precision rate (PR) based on the average size of the ground truth bounding box. This normalization helps alleviate any bias towards trackers that perform better on either larger or smaller objects, enabling a more comprehensive assessment of precision.
- SR (Success Rate): In addition to precision, we evaluate the success rate to measure tracker effectiveness. SR assesses the ratio of tracked frames, determined by the Intersection-over-Union (IoU) between the tracking result and the ground truth. We construct a success plot (SP) by varying the overlap thresholds to visualize tracker performance at different levels of overlap. The success rate (SR) is then computed as the area under the curve of the SP, providing an overall measure of tracking success.

E. Discussion

1) *Differences From Relevant Tasks*: Our task of cross-modal object tracking differs from the task of multi-modal visual object tracking in several aspects. Existing work usually introduces thermal infrared, depth, or event data to achieve multi-modal visual object tracking. Comparing our task with multi-modal visual object tracking, we have identified the

TABLE II

THE PR, NPR, AND SR SCORES (%) OF VARIOUS TRACKERS ON DIFFERENT SUBSETS. THE BEST AND SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN *red* AND *blue* COLORS, RESPECTIVELY.

Methods	Publication	Classification	Easy Set			Hard Set			Joint Set			FPS
			PR	NPR	SR	PR	NPR	SR	PR	NPR	SR	
MAFNet _{DiMP}	ours		74.4	77.8	63.8	32.2	53.6	47.0	55.1	66.4	56.1	36
MArMOT _{DiMP}	AAAI 2022		73.9	77.4	63.6	30.6	52.6	46.3	53.8	64.5	54.6	33
ToMP	CVPR 2022		59.4	62.0	52.7	25.6	42.2	40.1	44.1	53.0	47.0	25
TrDiMP	CVPR 2021		60.2	62.5	53.9	24.7	41.1	40.0	44.1	52.8	47.6	26
TransT	CVPR 2021		58.0	59.6	51.0	29.6	43.9	41.2	45.2	52.5	46.5	50
Ocean	ECCV 2020		47.7	50.8	42.5	17.0	31.5	30.2	33.8	42.0	36.9	42
SiamBAN	CVPR 2020		55.6	58.3	47.7	23.8	40.7	35.7	41.2	50.3	42.3	29
TACT	ACCV 2020	Matching-based	40.4	43.3	38.7	15.6	32.7	31.9	29.2	38.5	35.6	29
DiMP	ICCV 2019	Two-stream Methods	58.1	61.3	51.3	22.7	38.3	36.0	42.1	50.9	44.4	41
ATOM	CVPR 2019		56.2	58.7	48.3	21.7	35.8	31.4	40.6	48.4	40.7	28
SiamRPN++	CVPR 2019		54.6	57.1	47.1	22.6	38.9	35.1	40.1	48.9	41.6	21
SiamMask	CVPR 2019		54.3	56.4	45.7	22.0	37.2	32.0	39.7	47.7	39.5	41
SiamDW	CVPR 2019		40.3	44.7	35.2	12.6	26.3	23.2	27.8	36.4	29.8	22
GradNet	ICCV 2019		44.6	46.5	36.5	13.7	26.5	22.5	30.6	37.5	30.2	68
DaSiamRPN	ECCV 2018		51.1	54.5	43.4	9.0	24.5	21.0	32.1	40.9	33.3	144
SiamFC	ECCVW 2016		43.3	45.2	37.3	11.6	20.9	18.5	28.9	34.2	28.8	44
MAFNet _{RT}	ours		53.0	56.2	43.7	16.2	29.9	23.5	35.6	43.7	33.8	23
MArMOT _{RT}	AAAI 2022		48.9	52.0	39.8	15.5	28.5	22.7	34.5	42.6	32.4	23
RT-MDNet	ECCV 2018	Classification-based Methods	41.8	44.4	35.3	13.6	25.3	20	29.1	35.8	28.4	29
VITAL	CVPR 2018		29.7	31.4	26.3	16.1	31.3	27.1	23.6	31.3	26.7	0.3
MDNet	CVPR 2016		51.6	54.2	42.7	16.5	33.5	29.2	35.7	44.8	36.6	1
ROMTrack	ICCV 2023		55.2	56.8	49.5	31.6	45.2	42.0	44.5	51.6	46.1	62
GRM	CVPR 2023		50.5	51.8	46.0	29.8	42.8	40.4	41.1	47.7	43.4	45
MixFormerV2	NeurIPS 2023		52.2	54.1	47.8	28.5	41.7	39.8	41.5	48.5	44.2	165
DropTrack	CVPR 2023		60.6	61.7	53.8	35.9	50.5	46.8	49.4	56.7	50.6	30
SeqTrack	CVPR 2023	Transformer-based One-stream Methods	57.9	60.1	51.0	31.8	47.3	43.3	46.1	54.3	47.5	40
ARTrack	CVPR 2023		59.7	60.7	53.1	34.3	47.8	44.8	48.2	54.9	49.4	26
AiATrack	ECCV 2022		62.1	64.2	54.9	31.7	48.6	45.6	48.3	57.2	50.7	38
OSTrack	ECCV 2022		51.0	52.2	46.2	28.3	41.6	39.6	40.7	47.4	43.2	93
Stark	ICCV 2021		56.0	57.8	50.4	26.8	41.5	40.2	42.8	50.4	45.8	30

following differences and advantages. First, our task is more practical as many visual cameras are already equipped with NIR imaging, whereas other multi-modal imaging platforms require two cameras. Second, our task is more cost-effective as other multi-modal imaging platforms are typically expensive, while our task only relies on surveillance cameras, eliminating these limitations. Finally, the multi-modal data in our task do not have any alignment errors compared to other multi-modal visual tracking tasks that involve two cameras and require alignment across different modalities. In contrast, our imaging system includes only one camera, which can switch between RGB and NIR modalities.

2) *Acquisition of Modality Switch Signals*: To the best of our knowledge, commercial sensors currently do not provide signals for modality switches. However, it might be possible to obtain such signals by customizing the sensor. Therefore, studying how to handle scenarios with unknown modality switches is essential.

V. EXPERIMENTS

Our tracker is implemented using PyTorch on a PC computer equipped with an Intel Xeon Gold 5220R CPU and two NVIDIA A100 GPUs.

A. Comparison with State-of-the-art Trackers

1) *Evaluated Algorithms*: We evaluate 28 advanced and representative trackers on our benchmark. These trackers

encompass the mainstream tracking algorithms developed between 2016 and 2023. The evaluated trackers in our study can be divided into three types. The first type consists of 15 matching-based two-stream methods, including MArMOT_{DiMP} [12], ToMP [37], TrDiMP [38], TransT [39], Ocean [40], SiamBAN [41], TACT [42], DiMP [29], ATOM [43], SiamRPN++ [16], SiamMask [44], SiamDW [18], GradNet [45], DaSiamRPN [17], and SiamFC [15]. The second type includes 4 classification-based methods, namely MArMOT_{RT} [12], RT-MDNet [14]¹, VITAL [47], and MDNet [13]. The third type consists of 9 transformer-based one-stream methods, which are ROMTrack [48], GRM [49], MixFormerV2 [50], DropTrack [51], SeqTrack [52], ARTrack [53], AiATrack [54], OSTrack [21], and Stark [55]. It is important to note that we evaluate the performance of these algorithms on our testing set using the provided models from the authors.

2) Overall Performance:

Comparison with Matching-based Two-stream Trackers. Matching-based two-stream tracking algorithms have long been the mainstream solution in the field of visual object tracking, as they possess efficient inference speed and excellent tracking accuracy. Typically, these algorithms employ an offline-trained regressor to perform the tracking process. However, these algorithms face challenges in cross-modal object

¹In our approach, to adapt to our experimental platform, we replace the RoI Align layer in RT-MDNet with the Precise RoI Pooling [46] layer.




Fig. 10. Comparison based on attributes in the joint set.

tracking scenarios due to significant appearance differences between different modalities, as shown in Table II. To validate the effectiveness of our approach, we integrate MAFM into a typical tracking framework, DiMP, creating MAFNet_{DiMP}.

In particular, MAFNet_{DiMP} significantly outperforms the baseline DiMP, demonstrating its effectiveness. In the easy set, MAFNet_{DiMP} achieves improvements of 16.3%, 16.5%, and 12.5% under PR, NPR, and SR metrics, respectively. In the hard set, the improvements are 9.5%, 15.3%, and 11.0%, and in the joint set, they are 13.0%, 15.5%, and 11.7%.

Furthermore, compared to MArMOT_{DiMP}, our method consistently achieves performance improvements across all subsets. Specifically, in the easy set, MAFNet_{DiMP} shows improvements of 0.5%, 0.4%, and 0.2% under PR, NPR, and SR metrics, respectively. In the hard set, the improvements are 1.6%, 1.0%, and 0.7%, and in the joint set, they are 1.3%, 1.9%, and 1.5%. It is important to note that both our method and MArMOT_{DiMP} employ modality-aware fusion techniques. However, MArMOT_{DiMP} requires a time-consuming and resource-intensive multi-stage training process, whereas our framework adopts an end-to-end training approach, significantly simplifying the training complexity while improving performance.

Comparison with Classification-based Trackers.

Classification-based tracking methods typically utilize offline learning of a generic classifier and achieve discrimination between the target and background through online fine-tuning. To validate the generalization of our approach, we incorporate MAFM into a typical classification-based tracking framework, RT-MDNet, creating MAFNet_{RT}. Similarly, MAFNet_{RT} demonstrates significant enhancements compared to the baseline RT-MDNet tracker. In the easy set, it achieves improvements of 11.2%, 11.8%, and 8.4% under PR, NPR, and SR metrics, respectively. In the hard set, the improvements are 2.6%, 4.6%, and 3.5%, and in the joint set, they are 6.5%, 7.9%, and 6.4%.

Furthermore, compared to MArMOT_{RT}, our method consistently achieves performance improvements across all subsets. Specifically, in the easy set, our method shows improvements

of 4.1%, 4.2%, and 3.9% on the PR, NPR, and SR metrics, respectively. In the hard set, our method demonstrates improvements of 0.7%, 1.4%, and 1.2%, and in the joint set, our method exhibits improvements of 1.1%, 1.1%, and 1.4%.

Comparison with Transformer-based One-stream Trackers.

Transformer-based one-stream tracking methods have gained increasing attention in recent years due to their significant performance advantages over other types of tracking methods, achieved by unifying the processes of feature extraction and relational modeling. However, the application of our MAFM on these frameworks presents certain challenges as it currently relies solely on CNN. In the future, we aim to explore the design of suitable structures for transformer-based trackers to address the issue of significant cross-modal appearance variations. Nonetheless, we have already conducted performance comparisons with some classical transformer-based trackers.

For example, compared to OTrack, our MAFNet_{DiMP} demonstrates performance improvements in the easy set with increases of 1.2%, 3.0%, and 1.3% for the PR, NPR, and SR metrics, respectively. In the hard set, the improvements are 0.2%, 3.3%, and 2.1%, and in the joint set, the improvements are 4.2%, 1.0%, and 1.1%.

These experimental results provide strong evidence for the simplicity and effectiveness of our method in cross-modal scenarios. Additionally, these results illuminate the challenges faced by existing algorithms in dealing with significant appearance variations caused by modality switches in cross-modal tracking scenarios. In the subsequent paper, unless otherwise specified, when referring to MAFNet and MArMOT, we are referring to the variants based on DiMP.

3) *Attribute-based Performance*: To validate the robustness of trackers in cross-modal tracking scenarios, we evaluate the performance of different trackers across 18 attributes, as shown in Fig. 10. For clarity, we only display the results of the four typical trackers. From the figure, it is evident that our method achieves significant improvements across all attributes. Particularly, our method demonstrates a more pronounced advantage in tackling challenges related to modality switches, such as MM, MA, and MD attributes. These results strongly




Fig. 11. Comparison of the 3 trackers under varying switch times in the joint set.

TABLE III

THE PR, NPR, AND SR SCORES (%) OF VARIOUS TRACKERS ON DIFFERENT SUBSETS. * INDICATES THAT THE TRACKER IS RE-TRAINED USING THE JOINT TRAINING SET. THE BEST AND SECOND-BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN *red* AND *blue* COLORS, RESPECTIVELY.

Methods	Easy Set			Hard Set			Joint Set		
	PR	NPR	SR	PR	NPR	SR	PR	NPR	SR
MDNet	51.6	54.2	42.7	16.5	33.5	29.2	35.7	44.8	36.6
MDNet*	58.2	61.8	48.1	17.5	35.3	30.1	41.0	51.8	41.1
RT-MDNet	41.8	44.4	35.3	13.6	25.3	20.0	29.1	35.8	28.4
RT-MDNet*	45.6	49.3	37.2	16.2	29.0	22.5	32.3	40.1	30.5
DiMP	58.1	61.3	51.3	22.7	38.3	36.0	42.1	50.9	44.4
DiMP*	70.4	73.8	60.0	30.8	50.4	45.1	52.5	63.2	53.3
TrDiMP	60.2	62.5	53.9	24.7	41.1	40.0	44.1	52.8	47.6
TrDiMP*	66.8	69.9	58.3	29.1	46.2	41.2	49.7	59.2	50.6
TransT	58.0	59.6	51.0	29.6	43.9	41.2	45.2	52.5	46.5
TransT*	68.9	72.0	59.1	30.4	49.9	43.4	51.5	62.0	52.0
OTrack	51.0	52.2	46.2	28.3	41.6	39.6	40.7	47.4	43.2
OTrack*	74.3	76.8	63.3	35.9	52.7	46.0	56.9	65.9	55.5
MAFNet _{DiMP}	74.4	77.8	63.8	32.2	53.6	47.0	55.1	66.4	56.1
MAFNet _{RT}	53.0	56.2	43.7	16.2	29.9	23.5	35.6	43.7	33.8

demonstrate the effectiveness of our method in addressing cross-modal tracking scenarios.

4) *Impact of Switch Times*: Modality switch is a crucial factor that affects the performance of cross-modal trackers. To validate the impact of modality switch times on tracker performance, we present the performance results under different switch times in Fig. 11. For clarity, we only display the results of the three typical trackers. From the figure, it can be observed that as the modality switch times increase, the performance of the baseline tracker, DiMP, exhibits a consistent downward trend. This emphasizes the greater challenges introduced by modality switch in cross-modal tracking. However, it is noteworthy that our method, MAFNet, as well as MArMOT, exhibit improved performance in NPR and SR metrics when the switch times are three compared to the case when it is two. This indicates the advantage of our methods in addressing the challenges posed by modality switches.

5) *Training Dataset Validation*: To demonstrate the necessity of constructing a large-scale cross-modal dataset, we retrain six trackers (RT-MDNet, MDNet, DiMP, TrDiMP, TransT and OTrack) using the training data from CMOTB. The experimental results, presented in Table III, clearly indicate significant performance improvements for all trackers

TABLE IV
TRACKING RESULTS ON THE CMOTB JOINT TEST SET USING THE PROPOSED END-TO-END TRAINING METHOD AND THE MULTI-STAGE TRAINING METHOD, RESPECTIVELY.

Method	Joint Set			Total Training Time \downarrow	Total Training Params \downarrow
	PR	NPR	SR		
MAFNet	55.1	66.4	56.1	22.5 hours	58.5 M
MArMOT	53.8	65.4	54.6	59.2 hours	75.95 M
MArMOT _{E2E}	52.2	63.0	52.8	24.6 hours	58.4 M

after retraining. This finding highlights the importance of our proposed cross-modal dataset in driving advancements in cross-modal object tracking research.

Furthermore, by integrating MAFNet into the DiMP and RT-MDNet frameworks, we observe further performance improvements. Specifically, we achieve enhancements of 2.6%/3.2%/2.8% and 3.3%/3.6%/3.3% on the three metrics, respectively, for both tracking frameworks under the joint set. This provides strong evidence for the effectiveness of our proposed approach in addressing cross-modal tracking tasks.

B. Qualitative Analysis

To provide an intuitive demonstration of the performance of our MAFNet, we present qualitative results in Fig. 12. It showcases visual comparisons of our MAFNet with several state-of-the-art trackers on four representative sequences. These sequences encompass challenging scenarios with appearance variations, offering a rigorous evaluation of tracking performance. Our visual results prominently highlight the remarkable ability of MAFNet in handling appearance differences caused by cross-modal variations. Across all sequences, our method consistently outperforms other trackers after modality changes, demonstrating the robustness and adaptability of our approach in tracking objects across different modalities.

For instance, in Sequence 8, a sudden modality switch occurs at frame 230, which poses a significant challenge for most trackers. However, our MAFNet adeptly adapts to the new modality and accurately localizes the target. This showcases the superior performance of our method in handling modality switches.

Furthermore, in Sequence 151, while many trackers can successfully track the target in the RGB modality, their performance significantly deteriorates in the NIR modality. In contrast, our method maintains precise and reliable tracking in both modalities consistently. Additionally, in Sequences 701 and 716, our method stably tracks the target even amidst frequent modality switches, whereas other trackers struggle to achieve consistent tracking results. These cases demonstrate the capability of our algorithm to effectively adapt to cross-modal appearance variations, thereby validating the effectiveness of modality-aware fusion.

C. Effectiveness of End-to-End Training

In this paper, we face the challenging task of achieving end-to-end learning for modality-aware fusion. To address this problem, we ingeniously design an adaptive weighting




Fig. 12. Visual comparison on four representative sequences.

mechanism to enable modality-specific representation learning and modality-aware fusion. Similar to our approach, MArMOT also aims to achieve modality-specific representation modeling and adaptive integration. However, they require a multi-stage training scheme to achieve their goal as they are unable to accomplish it within an end-to-end framework.

To validate the effectiveness and efficiency of our end-to-end training approach, we compare it with MArMOT in terms of training costs (total training time and total trainable parameters) and performance. Please refer to Table IV for detailed results. From the table, we observe that our end-to-end training strategy achieves higher performance compared to the multi-stage training scheme employed in MArMOT, with only one-third of the training time and fewer trainable parameters required. Conversely, if MArMOT tries to adopt an end-to-end training approach (referred to as MArMOT_{E2E}), the results indicate that under end-to-end training, MArMOT_{E2E} fails to effectively learn modality-specific representations, leading to a noticeable decline in tracking performance.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a large-scale benchmark dataset with high-quality dense bounding box annotations for cross-modal object tracking. The dataset is divided into easy and hard subsets based on the complexity of the tracking scenarios. Additionally, we propose a simple yet effective method for cross-modal object tracking based on modality-aware fusion network. The method is validated in two typical tracking frameworks, showcasing its generalization. By employing an end-to-end learning approach, we jointly train the tracking network, adaptive weighting module, and modality-specific representation module. Through extensive experimentation on the cross-modal tracking dataset, our method surpasses the current state-of-the-art trackers in terms of performance. By releasing this dataset, we believe it will have a positive

impact on the research and development of cross-modal object tracking. In the future, we will continue to explore more efficient tracking algorithms to address the challenges of cross-modal tracking.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Huang, X. Zhao, and K. Huang, "Got-10k: A large high-diversity benchmark for generic object tracking in the wild," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1562–1577, 2019.
- [2] Y. Zhu, C. Li, Y. Liu, X. Wang, J. Tang, B. Luo, and Z. Huang, "Tiny object tracking: A large-scale dataset and a baseline," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [3] C. Li, L. Liu, A. Lu, Q. Ji, and J. Tang, "Challenge-aware rgbd tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 222–237.
- [4] P. Zhang, J. Zhao, D. Wang, H. Lu, and X. Ruan, "Visible-thermal uav tracking: A large-scale benchmark and new baseline," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 8886–8895.
- [5] A. Lu, C. Qian, C. Li, J. Tang, and L. Wang, "Duality-gated mutual condition network for rgbd tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2022.
- [6] C. Li, Z. Xiang, J. Tang, B. Luo, and F. Wang, "Rgbd tracking via noise-robust cross-modal ranking," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 5019–5031, 2021.
- [7] S. Yan, J. Yang, J. Käpylä, F. Zheng, A. Leonardis, and J.-K. Kämäräinen, "Depthtrack: Unveiling the power of rgbd tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 10725–10733.
- [8] S. Song and J. Xiao, "Tracking revisited using rgbd camera: Unified benchmark and baselines," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2013, pp. 233–240.
- [9] X. Wang, J. Li, L. Zhu, Z. Zhang, Z. Chen, X. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and F. Wu, "Visevent: Reliable object tracking via collaboration of frame and event flows," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2023.
- [10] C. Li, W. Xue, Y. Jia, Z. Qu, B. Luo, J. Tang, and D. Sun, "Lasher: A large-scale high-diversity benchmark for rgbd tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 31, pp. 392–404, 2021.
- [11] H. Li, C. Li, X. Zhu, A. Zheng, and B. Luo, "Multi-spectral vehicle re-identification: A challenge," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 07, 2020, pp. 11345–11353.
- [12] C. Li, T. Zhu, L. Liu, X. Si, Z. Fan, and S. Zhai, "Cross-modal object tracking: Modality-aware representations and a unified benchmark," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2022, pp. 1289–1296.

- [13] H. Nam and B. Han, "Learning multi-domain convolutional neural networks for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 4293–4302.
- [14] I. Jung, J. Son, M. Baek, and B. Han, "Real-time mdnet," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 83–98.
- [15] L. Bertinetto, J. Valmadre, J. F. Henriques, A. Vedaldi, and P. H. Torr, "Fully-convolutional siamese networks for object tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*. Springer, 2016, pp. 850–865.
- [16] B. Li, W. Wu, Q. Wang, F. Zhang, J. Xing, and J. Yan, "Siamrpn++: Evolution of siamese visual tracking with very deep networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4282–4291.
- [17] Z. Zhu, Q. Wang, B. Li, W. Wu, J. Yan, and W. Hu, "Distractor-aware siamese networks for visual object tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 101–117.
- [18] Z. Zhang and H. Peng, "Deeper and wider siamese networks for real-time visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4591–4600.
- [19] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [20] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [21] B. Ye, H. Chang, B. Ma, S. Shan, and X. Chen, "Joint feature learning and relation modeling for tracking: A one-stream framework," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 341–357.
- [22] Y. Cui, C. Jiang, L. Wang, and G. Wu, "Mixformer: End-to-end tracking with iterative mixed attention," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 13 608–13 618.
- [23] C. Li, H. Cheng, S. Hu, X. Liu, J. Tang, and L. Lin, "Learning collaborative sparse representation for grayscale-thermal tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 5743–5756, 2016.
- [24] A. L. Chan and S. R. Schnelle, "Fusing concurrent visible and infrared videos for improved tracking performance," *Optical Engineering*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 017 004–017 004, 2013.
- [25] L. Liu, C. Li, Y. Xiao, and J. Tang, "Quality-aware rgbt tracking via supervised reliability learning and weighted residual guidance," in *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2023, pp. 3129–3137.
- [26] Y. Xiao, M. Yang, C. Li, L. Liu, and J. Tang, "Attribute-based progressive fusion network for rgbt tracking," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2022, pp. 2831–2838.
- [27] M. Feng, K. Song, Y. Wang, J. Liu, and Y. Yan, "Learning discriminative update adaptive spatial-temporal regularized correlation filter for rgb-t tracking," *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, vol. 72, p. 102881, 2020.
- [28] C. Szegedy, S. Ioffe, V. Vanhoucke, and A. A. Alemi, "Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [29] G. Bhat, M. Danelljan, L. V. Gool, and R. Timofte, "Learning discriminative model prediction for tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 6182–6191.
- [30] K. Chatfield, K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman, "Return of the devil in the details: delving deep into convolutional nets," in *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference*. British Machine Vision Association, 2014.
- [31] Y. Qi, S. Zhang, W. Zhang, L. Su, Q. Huang, and M.-H. Yang, "Learning attribute-specific representations for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 01, 2019, pp. 8835–8842.
- [32] P. Zhang, D. Wang, H. Lu, and X. Yang, "Learning adaptive attribute-driven representation for real-time rgb-t tracking," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 129, pp. 2714–2729, 2021.
- [33] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. Ieee, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [34] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [35] T. A. Biresaw, T. Nawaz, J. Ferryman, and A. I. Dell, "Vitbat: Video tracking and behavior annotation tool," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Advanced Video and Signal Based Surveillance*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 295–301.
- [36] M. Muller, A. Bibi, S. Giancola, S. Alsubaihi, and B. Ghanem, "Trackingnet: A large-scale dataset and benchmark for object tracking in the wild," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 300–317.
- [37] C. Mayer, M. Danelljan, G. Bhat, M. Paul, D. P. Paudel, F. Yu, and L. Van Gool, "Transforming model prediction for tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 8731–8740.
- [38] N. Wang, W. Zhou, J. Wang, and H. Li, "Transformer meets tracker: Exploiting temporal context for robust visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 1571–1580.
- [39] X. Chen, B. Yan, J. Zhu, D. Wang, X. Yang, and H. Lu, "Transformer tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 8126–8135.
- [40] Z. Zhang, H. Peng, J. Fu, B. Li, and W. Hu, "Ocean: Object-aware anchor-free tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 771–787.
- [41] Z. Chen, B. Zhong, G. Li, S. Zhang, and R. Ji, "Siamese box adaptive network for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 6668–6677.
- [42] J. Choi, J. Kwon, and K. M. Lee, "Visual tracking by tridental alignment and context embedding," in *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [43] M. Danelljan, G. Bhat, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Atom: Accurate tracking by overlap maximization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4660–4669.
- [44] Q. Wang, L. Zhang, L. Bertinetto, W. Hu, and P. H. Torr, "Fast online object tracking and segmentation: A unifying approach," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 1328–1338.
- [45] P. Li, B. Chen, W. Ouyang, D. Wang, X. Yang, and H. Lu, "Gradnet: Gradient-guided network for visual object tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 6162–6171.
- [46] B. Jiang, R. Luo, J. Mao, T. Xiao, and Y. Jiang, "Acquisition of localization confidence for accurate object detection," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 784–799.
- [47] Y. Song, C. Ma, X. Wu, L. Gong, L. Bao, W. Zuo, C. Shen, R. W. Lau, and M.-H. Yang, "Vital: Visual tracking via adversarial learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 8990–8999.
- [48] Y. Cai, J. Liu, J. Tang, and G. Wu, "Robust object modeling for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 9589–9600.
- [49] S. Gao, C. Zhou, and J. Zhang, "Generalized relation modeling for transformer tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 18 686–18 695.
- [50] Y. Cui, T. Song, G. Wu, and L. Wang, "Mixformerv2: Efficient fully transformer tracking," *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [51] Q. Wu, T. Yang, Z. Liu, B. Wu, Y. Shan, and A. B. Chan, "Dropmae: Masked autoencoders with spatial-attention dropout for tracking tasks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 14 561–14 571.
- [52] X. Chen, H. Peng, D. Wang, H. Lu, and H. Hu, "Seqtrack: Sequence to sequence learning for visual object tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 14 572–14 581.
- [53] X. Wei, Y. Bai, Y. Zheng, D. Shi, and Y. Gong, "Autoregressive visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 9697–9706.
- [54] S. Gao, C. Zhou, C. Ma, X. Wang, and J. Yuan, "Aiatrack: Attention in attention for transformer visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 146–164.
- [55] B. Yan, H. Peng, J. Fu, D. Wang, and H. Lu, "Learning spatio-temporal transformer for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 10 448–10 457.