## SHARE: Single-view Human Adversarial REconstruction

Shreelekha Revankar

revankar@umd.edu

Shijia Liao lengyue@terpmail.umd.edu Yu Shen yushen@umd.edu Junbang Liang

junbangl@amazon.com

Huaishu Peng

Ming Lin lin@umd.edu

### Abstract

The accuracy of 3D Human Pose and Shape reconstruction (HPS) from an image is progressively improving. Yet, no known method is robust across all image distortion. To address issues due to variations of camera poses, we introduce SHARE, a novel fine-tuning method that utilizes adversarial data augmentation to enhance the robustness of existing HPS techniques. We perform a comprehensive analysis on the impact of camera poses on HPS reconstruction outcomes. We first generated large-scale image datasets captured systematically from diverse camera perspectives. We then established a mapping between camera poses and reconstruction errors as a continuous function that characterizes the relationship between camera poses and HPS quality. Leveraging this representation, we introduce **RoME** (Regions of Maximal Error), a novel sampling technique for our adversarial fine-tuning method.

The SHARE framework is generalizable across various single-view HPS methods and we demonstrate its performance on HMR, SPIN, PARE, CLIFF and ExPose. Our results illustrate a reduction in mean joint errors across single-view HPS techniques, for images captured from multiple camera positions without compromising their baseline performance. In many challenging cases, our method surpasses the performance of existing models, highlighting its practical significance for diverse real-world applications.

### 1. Introduction

The reconstruction of human body pose and shape (HPS) has gained attention from industries like fashion, healthcare, special effects, surveillance, computer animation, and virtual and augmented reality [25, 31, 50]. Single-view 3D human pose and shape recovery is of particular interest due to its simplicity and practicality, sparking renewed research efforts to enhance its accuracy and robustness.

Common issues affecting HPS reconstruction results, such as self-occlusion, low-contrast lighting or poor depth perception are often due to suboptimal camera poses [44,



Figure 1. **The SHARE Framework** adversarially augments and modifies synthetic training data for a single-view HPS model. It is initialized by generating training data from all camera poses. Each iteration of SHARE operates in four phases: (1) augmenting the model's training data to train the model, (2) assessing camera-pose-wise performance, (3) sampling the most adversarial camera poses and (4) down-selecting a new training dataset for augmentation using RoME sampled poses.

63, 68]. Therefore, it is vital to understand how camera poses impact reconstruction quality. Furthermore, in large-scale consumer applications of HPS, such as virtual try-on or healthcare, these effects can significantly influence the user experience.

In this paper, we study the influence of various camera poses on HPS using images. We propose novel methods to minimize disparities due to such camera pose variations. Our adversarial fine-tuning method complements numerous pre-trained HPS models and improves their robustness against diverse camera poses not commonly found in their training data.

The key contributions of this work include:

- A framework for the automatic creation of large-scale image datasets for given bodies, camera poses, and scene settings (Sec. 3.1) to be publicly released;
- 2. A systematic study and analysis on the impact of camera

*poses* on the quality of human pose and shape reconstruction (Sec. 3.2);

 An adversarial data augmentation technique for finetuning pre-trained HPS models against image variation due to camera poses using differentiable sampling techniques (Sec. 3.4);

### 2. Related and Concurrent Works

We provide a review of recent advancements in human pose and shape estimation (HPS), along with the availability of datasets specifically curated for this purpose. We also explore the challenges posed by image distortions, specifically focusing on those caused by camera pose variation, and discuss the application of different techniques to improve the robustness of HPS.

#### 2.1. Data-driven methods for HPS

The process of reconstructing human pose and shape through data-driven methods typically involves the application of machine learning techniques to establish a correlation between 2D images and 3D body models.

While techniques utilizing multiple viewpoints, video footage, or a combination of visual and other sensory inputs have shown enhanced reconstruction capabilities over single-view or monocular methods [10, 32, 50, 56, 74, 99], the demand for robust single-view reconstruction remains paramount in many large-scale use cases of HPS [5, 14, 39, 62, 65, 88, 91, 97], especially in real-world applications like virtual try-on.

At the heart of these data-driven approaches lies the existence of extensive datasets, comprising of human images sourced from various outlets, including online images, motion capture sessions, and artificially generated images based on 3D body models [39, 43, 45, 49]. Despite the remarkable progress achieved by these methods, it is crucial to acknowledge a significant challenge: the limitations of training data.

#### 2.2. Datasets for HPS

The data behind data-driven HPS models has evolved over time. Early datasets, laid the foundation for such an approach [23, 24, 53]. More recent datasets have emerged with distinct objectives; however, they often lack 3D ground truth annotations [2, 35, 51, 95].

In response to this, recent efforts have involved fitting body models to these datasets to derive new 3D "ground truth" information for 2D human images [37, 47, 73, 96].

Obtaining accurate 3D ground truth data for evaluating reconstruction methods is challenging and time-consuming in the real world, leading real-world datasets to have varying limitations. Some require full-body motion capture [54, 79], which restricts clothing variety or necessitate a controlled lab environment [36, 89]. Others employ markerless motion capture with Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU)

sensors. Thus, inherently, this ground truth information is susceptible to measurement uncertainties and sensor errors, irrespective of the collection method or source. Despite these challenges, such datasets provide the most realistic inputs for our models [33, 60, 79, 83]. Datasets like 3DPW [85] and MPI-INF-3DHP [59] are favored for HPS evaluation due to their mobile nature and multi-view capabilities.

Nevertheless, for our goal of analyzing the effect of camera poses variations on HPS, real-world datasets typically lack the necessary comprehensive information on camera poses and camera details during image capture.

Advancements in computer graphics have facilitated the creation of synthetic or simulated datasets that provide known ground truth details, including body sizes, shapes, and poses, which are often absent in real-world datasets [4, 59, 60, 64, 67, 69, 84]

While some may consider these generated datasets as not realistic enough for human eyes, for image processing (where edges, features, and patterns are critical for machine perception) and neural network training (when there is insufficient data to represent corner cases), the use of simulated data is perhaps one of the best practical alternatives, as proven in many recent works on HPS and otherwise [20, 84].

To generate such data, 3D human body representations have been widely employed [1, 6, 9, 55, 66, 70, 71]. Simulated data has demonstrated its potential to enhance the accuracy of HPS methods, improving reconstruction results, as indicated in various studies [8, 50]. However, datasets which offer diverse bodies and rendering settings, often have limited camera pose ranges and may lack publicly available human models, making it difficult to capture additional data from new camera perspectives [4, 64, 67, 84]. This highlights **the need for a dataset that comprehensively covers a wide range of camera perspectives.** 

#### 2.3. Robustness & Adversarial Data Augmentation

Several studies have highlighted the presence of failures in HPS caused by challenging depth ambiguities [5, 39, 62]. It is recognized that factors like camera pose and self-occlusion significantly impact depth perception [63, 82]. However, the specific influence of a camera pose on reconstruction results has not been extensively investigated in the existing literature.

Researchers have introduced adversarial techniques [13, 39, 41, 86] and regression networks [7, 28, 34, 43, 93, 94] to tackle (self-)occlusions and improve the overall quality of HPS.

Liu et. al, Sun et. al., and Sardari et. al among others have also worked on creating camera pose invariant methods for HPS, but these works present entirely new reconstruction paradigms. [52, 72, 81]. Other techniques, such as CanonPose [87], AdaptPose [26], and SPEC [44], focus on accurately predicting camera poses from images. However, these inverse techniques often require additional components, such as training separate models specifically for inferring camera parameters. Moreover, in the case of SPEC, the training details are not yet available. In contrast, **our objective is to develop a generalizable approach that directly improves the robustness of existing and future HPS models themselves.** 

Outside of HPS, in the field of machine learning, efforts have been made to address biases and improve the robustness of datasets and models. Techniques include introducing corruptions or biases to existing datasets to evaluate neural network robustness [29]. These datasets can also be utilized for adversarial machine learning, a method that enhances model robustness. Adversarial data augmentation is a notable technique in this regard.

Ghosh et al. analyze the impact of quality degradations on convolutional neural networks, leading to improved learning outcomes [27]. Cubuk et al. propose a method for searching enhanced data augmentation policies [17]. Various frameworks have demonstrated that adversarial data aumentation can enhance model robustness [18, 30, 90, 92]. Shen et al. use adversarial training to improve robustness in autonomous driving by addressing different perturbations [77]. These works provide valuable insights that can inspire advancements in HPS.

In this work, we present a new adversarial, finetuning framework for human pose and shape regression models, to improve their robustness against camera pose variation. In contrast to most recent related works [30, 78], SHARE analyzes specific camera pose variations with respect to the human figure and focuses on the impact of camera perspectives that lead to poor performance on 3D HPS, thereby hardening existing HPS methods without retraining an entirely new model.

### 3. Methodology

Our aim is to improve robustness in human pose and shape recovery against ubiquitous perturbations caused by camera pose variation. We begin with the large-scale generation of data (Sec. 3.1) for sensitivity analysis of pre-existing HPS methods (Sec. 3.2). Through this systematic sensitivity analysis, we can approximate to what degree a camera pose may affect reconstruction (Sec. 3.3). With these results we implement an adversarial framework *SHARE* to rectify the disparities created by camera pose variation (Sec. 3.4). We illustrate this method in Fig. 1.

### 3.1. Data Generation

We introduce an automated human image dataset generator that relies on a rendering engine, a human body model, and efficient configuration.

To create and configure human bodies in our generator, we incorporated body models from RenderPeople [71]



Figure 2. Examples of images generated using our data generator from various camera poses.

and the Skinned Multi-Person Linear Model (SMPL). The SMPL model offers extensive control over body shapes, sizes, and poses, with 82 SMPL parameters [55]. We obtained a wide range of realistic human poses from large-scale datasets [33, 79] to complement the body model. This combination enabled the generation of diverse bodies for use in our rendering environment.

To enable our automatic generator's functionality, we developed a script capable of receiving user-specified parameters and settings for rendering. These parameters encompass a wide array of features, such as human body proportions, poses, clothing, and skin tone, as well as rendering factors like lighting, background, and camera positions.

In response to these requirements, the script dynamically generates a configuration file that is compatible with multiple rendering environments. Our image generator has been tested on both Unity [38] and Blender [15], with scripts designed to accept various configuration files and produce rendered images, complete with relevant details.

The fusion of rendered images, corresponding camera perspectives, and ground truth body parameters derived from the generated human body models forms a comprehensive human image dataset suitable for tasks like human pose and shape reconstruction. **This generator will be publicly released.** 

Employing our image generator, we produced multiple images from 2500 viewpoints encircling the body models within a polar coordinate system. Fig. 2 exhibits select images from our dataset, highlighting the distinctive camera perspectives. This dataset serves as the basis for a sensitivity analysis to examine the influence of camera poses.

### 3.2. Analysis of Camera Poses

Common distortions such as self-occlusion or low-contrast can often be the result of poor camera positioning [44, 63, 68]. Therefore, our objective, after developing a dataset generator, was to evaluate the impact of different camera positions. We aimed to determine whether specific camera poses resulted in improved body reconstruction outcomes and to identify those that led to suboptimal results across a



Figure 3. Sensitivity analysis on PARE [43] with respect to camera pose using PA-MPJPE. The x-axis iterates through all camera poses  $(\theta, \phi)$ , where  $\phi$  represents the azimuthal angle around the body (0, 360), and  $\theta$  represents the vertical viewing angle (-60, 60) for each  $\phi$ . The y-axis represents the average error in PA-MPJPE over a diverse dataset encompassing a wide range of bodies, body poses, and environments. This plot explicitly depicts the average error associated with each camera pose, revealing a discernible oscillatory bias with varying performance in different regions around the human body. Additional plots for single-person datasets and comparisons with other HPS techniques are available in the appendix.

wide range of human bodies and environmental settings

To evaluate the influence of different camera poses, we created a dataset consisting of 10,000 images, uniformly sampled from 2,500 distinct camera perspectives. Each image portrays a unique human body with randomly chosen body poses, clothing, skin tones, lighting conditions, and environmental settings. This dataset is referred to as our evaluation dataset (All Camera Poses) *to be publicly released.* 

We selected four pre-trained HPS models as our baselines from the OpenMMLab 3D Human Parametric Model Toolbox and Benchmarks, which are available under the Apache License 2.0 [16]to maintain consistency and replicatability. We chose Human Mesh Recovery (HMR) [39], SMPL with optimization IN the loop (SPIN) [45], Part Attention REgressor (PARE) [43] and Carrying Location Information in Full Frames (CLIFF) [49].

We employed our evaluation dataset and our baseline models to reconstruct the simulated bodies and computed the average errors for every camera pose. Our metrics were the standard mean per joint position error (MPJPE) metric to evaluate reconstructed human bodies, as well as a variation that includes Procrustes alignment (PA-MPJPE) [33].

Looking specifically at a current state-of-art model, PARE, the average PA-MPJPE from all camera poses 124.28 mm, which is significantly greater than the reported average PA-MPJPE of 50.78mm on another popular evaluation dataset 3DPW [85]. This difference indicates that the larger variety of camera poses creates a great impact on reconstruction results. Thus, rectifying any losses due to camera pose variations can improve reconstruction accuracy.

Upon plotting the camera poses against their associated errors (Fig. 3.2), we observed that specific regions consistently exhibited better or worse performance regardless of body poses. To validate this observation, we generated two additional datasets, each featuring a singular distinct body in a distinct pose. We then calculated the average error across each of the 2500 camera positions. We found that while the error values and variances differed, the overall error patterns remained consistent. These results can be found in the appendix.

We could now readily distinguish the camera pose regions that excelled and those that underperformed. Notably, as the camera perspectives shifted towards the front side of the human body, we noticed substantial reductions in errors, indicating an improved quality of reconstruction. Additionally, when transitioning from a higher to a lower camera perspective, a distinct and recurring error pattern emerged.

The cyclical nature of the performance across camera

poses demonstrated using PARE can be noted in Fig. 3. While Fig. 3 plots the average errors across images from camera poses in the evaluation dataset, which contains a diverse set of bodies and poses. We include similar plots with the error curves for a singular body/pose as well as the other baselines in the appendix.

Upon inspecting the images from different regions, we found that the camera perspectives with the lowest errors were those captured near or slightly below the waistlines in the front view. These angles displayed enhanced depth perception and reduced self-occlusion. In contrast, images taken from a top-down, peering angle yielded the poorest reconstruction quality. This can be attributed to limited depth perception and occlusion due to the chest or head obstructing other body parts.

This discovery holds significance in the context of deploying image-based HPS models since the camera poses with suboptimal performance align with what are commonly referred to as "selfie" angles [22].

As real-world images are not curated by experts specifically for training HPS methods, they may not adhere to the same criteria as the images used in training and testing. To ensure the reliability of user input in HPS, the reconstruction quality must be resilient to limited depth perception resulting from variations in camera perspective.

#### **3.3.** Camera Poses and Reconstruction Errors

Leveraging the consistent behavior of camera poses on reconstruction results across a wide variety of bodies and poses, we can create a mapping between relative camera perspective and reconstruction error. Providing us with a continous representation of the relationship between relative camera poses and their predicted reconstruction results.

Such a continous representation can be very useful in real-world scenarios where ground truth information is not easy to obtain.

We model human pose and shape estimation as G, which accepts an image and approximates human mesh parameters, consisting of *shape*,  $\beta$ , and *pose*,  $\alpha$ .

Let p be an image captured of a human. p can be characterized by the camera perspective in polar coordinates  $(\theta, \phi)$ relative to the human h. We define the ground truth characteristics of h as  $h(\beta_{gt}, \alpha_{gt})$  and p can be expressed as  $p((\theta, \phi), h)$ . Giving us the following:

$$G(p((\theta, \phi), h)) = \{\beta, \alpha\}$$
(1)

These parameters can be utilized by a parametric model [9, 55, 70] to generate human meshes.

The general goal of most HPS regression models is to accurately reduce the difference between the reconstructed body joints and the joints of the human. In other words, their goal is to minimize the loss  $L_{3d}$ . Commonly this loss is calculated as such:

$$L_{3d} = ||\alpha_{gt} - T(\alpha)||_2^2$$
 (2)





Figure 4. Loss Landscape for PARE [43]. The x-axis represents the scaled  $\theta$  values, while the y-axis represents the scaled  $\phi$  values, the z-axis depicts the predicted PA-MPJPE associated with a given camera pose. We include the loss landscapes for all baselines in the appendix.

where  $\alpha_{gt}$  represents true joints of the human pose to be reconstructed and T is rigid transformation  $T(x) = s \ge R + t$ for Procrustes Alignment. With t, s, R as the translation, rotation matrix and scaling factor for Procrustes Alignment respectively. The full details of this transformation is included in the appendices.

Using Eqn. 1 and 2, we obtain:

$$L_{3d} = ||\alpha_{gt} - G(p((\theta, \phi), h))||_2^2 = f(\theta, \phi)$$
(3)

By sampling over  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ , we are able to recover the continuous representation of  $L_{3d} = f(\theta, \phi)$  in a numerical way, then use an neural network to approximate f. After that, we can use partial derivatives  $\frac{df}{d\theta}$  and  $\frac{df}{d\phi}$  to describe the sensitivity of  $L_{3d}$  w.r.t.  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ , thus modelling the relationship between relative camera poses and reconstruction errors.

#### 3.3.1 Generation of Loss Landscape

With the ability to generate a large dataset of images from a vast number of camera poses, we can fit camera-pose-wise errors to a mesh to create a loss landscape that can be used to understand the impact of a change in camera poses for a specific model.

Since the camera positions are in spherical coordinates, and our radius is fixed for the evaluation dataset, we can use the  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  of the camera position as the x and y coordinates of each camera pose in our mesh.

We then train a multi-layer perceptron to predict the error given a  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  location, following the principle described in eq. 3. This approximated error E is used along the z axis for each camera pose. We then scale the E,  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  into the range [-1, 1] using min-max feature scaling, as seen for PARE in Fig. 4.

The large variance in results from the different camera poses proves that there is a need to ameliorate HPS methods against camera pose variation. We provide a technique to do so, *SHARE*, a major contribution of our paper. SHARE is an adversarial data augmentation fine-tuning technique to make existing HPS models more robust to camera pose variation (Sec. 3.4). A camera pose-wise situated loss landscape is an important backbone to sampling methods employed in **SHARE** and can allow us to visualize the predicted performance of camera poses in relation to one another.

### 3.4. SHARE Adversarial Data Augmentation

Our method, Single-view Human Adversarial Reconstruction (SHARE), serves as an adversarial fine-tuning technique applicable to a wide range of pre-trained HPS models.

The SHARE framework operates by adversarially augmenting and modifying training data for a single-view HPS model at specific intervals.

The process commences with the generation of training and validation data using our data generator *from all camera poses*, described in Section 3.1. The validation dataset comprises of images from various camera poses, each paired with its expected output.

SHARE operates in four phases within each interval. (See Fig. 1):

(1) Firstly, we augment a small percentage of the model's original training data with our training data, then train the model using its native training paradigm for a predefined number of epochs.

(2) Next, we assess the model's performance using our validation dataset to compute example-wise, i.e., camera-pose-wise errors. These results enable us to construct a loss landscape, as described in Sec. 3.3.

(3) With this continuous representation of camera-posewise performance, we employ a sampling technique to select camera poses associated with higher errors.

(4) Subsequently, we generate a new training dataset for adversarial data augmentation using the sampled camera poses, and the next interval commences.

**Data Diversity** During dataset generation, we enhance human body and pose diversity by randomly selecting shape/pose parameters [5] from the MPII dataset [2], which is based on real-world bodies and poses. We also randomly sample background environments, lighting conditions, skin tones, body sizing, and clothing.

**Compatibility with Existing Models** SHARE seamlessly integrates with various existing single-view HPS regressors, provided they adhere to similar input-output formats—commonly employed by state-of-the-art methods. This inherent compatibility underscores SHARE's *generalizability* and its applicability to enhance a wide range of approaches.

#### 3.4.1 Sampling Techniques

Within the context of the SHARE framework, the 3rd phase includes sampling camera poses from our loss landscape.

The most direct approach is the **Greedy** method, which entails selecting the worst performing camera positions. One way to implement this is by choosing all camera positions that produce errors higher than the mean error and then sampling new images from these poses. However, this approach treats all camera poses performing worse than average, whether slightly or significantly, in the same manner.

For better performance, we propose a **Regions of Maximal Error** (RoME) sampling method. This sampling technique ensures that the regions with the highest error are sampled more densely than others. **RoME Sampling** works on the idea that we can assign a local average to a *region* on our loss landscape.

Suppose that we have N samples in the form of  $(\theta, \phi, E)$  obtained through evaluating on our validation dataset. We generate a loss landscape f(N) to create a continuous representation of the relationship between camera poses and their reconstruction errors (3.3).

Our samples are now defined as  $\{(X_n, Y_n, E_n)\}_{n=1}^N$ , where  $X_n, Y_n$  are coordinates of the sample on our landscape, and E represents the predicted error along the z axis.

At each sample point, we calculate the first  $f'_{E,n}$  and second  $f''_{E,n}$  derivatives. By combining the error with its first and second derivatives, we create a composite metric  $W_n$  that accounts for both the magnitude of the error and the slope and curvature of the loss landscape at that point:  $W_n = |E_n| + f'_{E,n} + f''_{E,n}$ . As a result, our samples are now defined as  $\{(X_n, Y_n, W_n)\}_{n=1}^N$ .

We define a variable P to denote the number of partitions we wish to create within our mesh. For instance, if P = 8we create  $8^3 = 512$  regions within our mesh.

We calculate a threshold  $\tau$  which is computed as the mean of all  $W_n$  in our loss landscape and remove regions that do not contain any samples surpassing  $\tau$  from our sampling pool.

With the remaining regions, we calculate the mean  $W_n$  for all samples within a region. These average regional scores are denoted by the set  $\{AW_r\}_{r=1}^R$ .

For regions where the average regional score is greater than the threshold, i.e.  $AW_r > \tau$ , we employ a random selection process. M samples are randomly selected from such regions, ensuring a degree of diversity in the chosen samples, where  $M = \alpha N/P^3$ , where  $\alpha$  is the scaling factor determining the proportion of the total available samples in N to be selected based on the parameter P.

Conversely, in regions where the average region score is below or equal to the threshold, i.e.  $AW_r \leq \tau$ , we opt to select only  $M/\alpha$  sample from these regions.

The selected samples from RoME sampling excel in denser sampling from regions with poorer performance, optimizing both time and space efficiency compared to indiscriminate methods (e.g. random sampling). These samples are then used to generate new adversarial examples for the next iteration of SHARE.

### 4. Experimental Setup

SHARE is applicable to common HPS regressors that infer parametric body models [9, 55, 70]. We illustrate its benefit using the following methods: HMR [39], SPIN [45], PARE [43] and CLIFF [49]. We further demonstrate the extension of SHARE into body parts using ExPose-hand [14].

**Training:** For HMR and SPIN, the training data was composed of a mixture of the Moshed Human3.6M dataset [33], COCO [51], MPI-INF-3DHP [59], LSP [35], LSPET [35], and MPII [2]. For PARE the training data was comprised of the Moshed Human3.6M dataset, MPI-INF-3DHP, EFT-COCO, EFT-LSPET, and EFT-MPII [37]. For CLIFF the training data was composed of the Moshed Human3.6M, MPI-INF-3DHP, COCO and MPII with pseudo-GT provided by the CLIFF annotator for the latter two. ExPose-hand was trained using the FreiHand [98] dataset.

To ensure consistency and reproducibility, we trained baseline models using MMHuman3D [16], an open-source computer vision platform developed by OpenMMlab. We maintain identical training data and schemes as the original HPS models for fair comparisons across benchmark settings.

**Evaluation & Metrics:** We evaluate quantitatively on the test sets of 3DPW [85], MPI-INF-3DHP [59], Frei-Hand [98] and All Camera Poses, generated as described in Sec. 3.2. We use the "Procrustes aligned mean per joint position error" (PA-MPJPE), and the "mean per joint position error" (MPJPE) metrics. We evaluate qualitatively using both the real-world datasets and online images. We use results from online images to perform a user preference study to best assess qualitative results.

### 5. Results

We first evaluate both the quantitative and qualitative performance of the SHARE framework as well as its generalizability on different HPS regressors. We then demonstrate the effectiveness of RoME sampling over other data augmentation techniques in an ablation study.

### 5.1. Quantitative Results

We compare a variety of HPS models against their performance after fine-tuning with SHARE on the test datasets of 3DPW [85] and MPI-INF-3DHP [59]. These datasets allow us to see the performance of SHARE on diverse real-world images.

We also evaluate using our simulated evaluation datasets ("All Camera Poses") to demonstrate the improvements overall against a wide array of camera pose variations.

As seen from Table 1, SHARE improves the performance of HMR by around 30%, SPIN by around 20%, PARE by around 20% and CLIFF by around 20% when tested on the simulated datasets with all camera poses and hundreds of diverse bodies. With the MPI-INF-3DHP and



Figure 5. Qualitative results on internet and MPI-INF-3DHP images using baselines [39, 43, 45, 49] before (center in red) and after fine-tuning with SHARE (right in green). Additional qualitative results on MPI-INF-3DHP [59] for individual baselines can be found in the appendix.

3DPW test datasets we observed maintained performance across all baselines with improvements in some.

### 5.1.1 Hand Reconstruction

To further demonstrate that our pipeline is applicable to any HPS regressor, we extend SHARE to hand pose and shape recovery and test its performance on ExPose [14] for hands. Here we use the SHARE pipeline, with the only difference being the parametric model is that of hands, we evaluate the performance using the FreiHand test dataset [98] as well as a simulated hand dataset, generated with from all camera poses. As seen from Table 2, SHARE improves the performance of ExPose by around **20%** when tested on All Camera Poses with some improvements on FreiHand.

#### **5.2. Qualitative Results**

To assess the qualitative performance of the models before and after the implementation of SHARE, we conducted a survey presenting respondents with 8 sets of 3 images. The first image, sourced online, served as the input to the model, while the second and third images represented the inferred body reconstruction using a baseline and a baseline + SHARE, both in the same color. The order of the second and third images was randomly varied. **Surveying 100 individuals, we found that respondents overwhelmingly preferred the reconstructions with SHARE, averaging 81.9%** preference. Qualitative results are visualized in Fig. 5, and additional results for each baseline are provided in the appendix

#### 5.3. Ablation Study on Sampling Techniques

Here we compare our novel RoME sampling technique against the greedy sampling technique (g). We include re-

	3DPW [85]		MPI-INF-3DHP [59]		All Camera Poses	
Method	MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓	MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓	MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓
HMMR [40]	116.5	72.6	-	-	-	-
VIBE [42]	93.5	56.5	96.6	64.6	-	-
Pose2Mesh [11]	89.2	58.9	-	-	-	-
I2L-MeshNet [61]	93.2	58.6	-	-	-	-
DSR [21]	91.7	54.1	-	-	-	-
HybrIK <sup>†</sup> [48]	80.0	48.8	91.0	-	-	-
Biggs et. al [3]	93.8	59.9	-	-	-	-
ProHMR [46]	-	55.1	-	65.0	-	-
Sengupta et. al [75]	84.9	53.6	-	-	-	-
HuManiFlow [76]	83.9	53.4	-	-	-	-
Doersch et al. [19]	-	74.7	-	-	-	-
MEVA [57]	86.9	54.7	96.4	65.4	-	-
LearnedGD [80]	-	55.9	-	-	-	-
TCMR [12]	95.0	55.8	97.4	62.8	-	-
HMR* [39]	112.3	67.5	124.2	89.8	357.6	154.0
HMR + SHARE	111.9	67.4	114.6	74.3	113.7	107.9
SPIN* [45]	96.0	59.0	107.1	70.1	364.9	146.0
SPIN + SHARE	97.5	59.7	104.9	69.8	138.1	115.7
PARE* [43]	81.8	50.8	100.12	68.9	327.0	124.3
PARE + SHARE	79.7	49.1	99.9	66.9	113.9	98.6
CLIFF* <sup>†</sup> [49]	76.5	48.7	99.6	70.0	360.7	135.8
$CLIFF + SHARE^{\dagger}$	74.8	47.30	98.0	67.2	122.8	108.5

Table 1. Evaluation of SHARE and SOTA HPS on 3DPW, MPI-INF-3dHP and All Camera Poses. All metrics are in mm. \* denotes the OpenMMLab implementation of the method and † indicates the model has been trained with 3DPW. Fine-tuning with SHARE improves the performance of several HPS techniques (HMR, SPIN, PARE, and CLIFF) beyond its baseline capabilities and often achieve the best or comparable results across all SOTA methods.

	FreiHand	All Camera Poses(Hands)		
Method	PA-MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓		
Pose2Mesh [11]	7.40	-		
I2L-MeshNet [61]	7.40	-		
ExPose* (hand) [14]	10.3	40.0		
ExPose + SHARE	9.3	31.7		

Table 2. Evaluation of SHARE and SOTA HPS on FreiHand and All Camera Poses (Hands) All metrics are in mm. \* denotes the OpenMMLab implementation of the technique. Finetuning with SHARE improves the performance of ExPose beyond its baseline capabilities.

sults fine-tuned with the simple augmentation of our generated data without the SHARE sampling pipeline. The results demonstrate that the models benefit from SHARE with the *RoME* sampling technique effectively improving the SHARE pipeline.

### 6. Conclusion

In summary, our investigation highlights the susceptibility of current human pose and shape (HPS) reconstruction methods to distortions induced by varied camera poses. Our investigation into the impact of camera poses variations on reconstruction results led us to create a fine-tuning framework *SHARE*, which performs dynamic adversarial data augmentation using a novel *RoME* sampling technique. We demonstrate the performance of SHARE using various HPS methods and perform an ablation study to demonstrate the advantage gained through RoME sampling. Additionally we performed a survey to adequately

	3DPW [85]		MPI-INF-3DHP [59]		All Camera Poses	
Method	MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓	MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓	MPJPE↓	PA-MPJPE↓
HMR + syn. data	132.6	73.7	122.4	80.8	136.6	115.8
HMR + SHARE (g)	116.63	69.3	122.1	77.8	115.3	99.70
HMR + SHARE	111.9	67.4	114.6	74.3	113.7	107.9
SPIN + syn. data	106.8	64.2	117.2	73.6	255.4	143.7
SPIN + SHARE (g)	97.8	59.8	109.4	76.4	159.0	126.5
SPIN + SHARE	97.5	59.7	104.9	69.8	138.1	115.7
PARE + syn. data	84.6	50.3	104.9	69.6	115.1	102.2
PARE + SHARE (g)	88.5	51.4	100.6	67.5	117.6	100.7
PARE + SHARE	79.7	49.1	99.9	66.9	113.9	98.6
CLIFF + syn. data	81.9	52.7	111.8	73.5	147.7	116.6
CLIFF + SHARE (g)	80.6	50.7	101.4	70.2	143.4	113.6
$CLIFF + SHARE^{\dagger}$	74.8	47.30	98.0	67.2	122.8	108.5

Table 3. Ablation study of Sampling techniques in SHARE on 3DPW, MPI-INF-3dHP and All Camera Poses. All metrics are in mm. † indicates the model has been trained with 3DPW and (g) indicates SHARE with *greedy* sampling. *RoME* sampling offers improvements over greedy sampling and the original techniques (HMR, SPIN, PARE, and CLIFF).

evaluate the qualitative performance of SHARE. We found that SHARE improved the baseline performances of multiple tested HPS methods and bolstered the robustness of these models against camera pose variations. We intend to publicly release the datasets and implementation of SHARE for the benefit of the research community.

Limitations and Generalization: Factors such as body size, skin tones, body-environment contrast, etc. can also affect reconstruction results. SHARE holds promise for further extension to provide a more comprehensive adversarial training framework for handling other forms of image variation.

### References

- [1] Adobe. Mixamo, 2020. 2
- [2] Mykhaylo Andriluka, Leonid Pishchulin, Peter Gehler, and Bernt Schiele. 2d human pose estimation: New benchmark and state of the art analysis. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014. 2, 6, 7
- [3] Benjamin Biggs, David Novotny, Sebastien Ehrhardt, Hanbyul Joo, Ben Graham, and Andrea Vedaldi. 3d multi-bodies: Fitting sets of plausible 3d human models to ambiguous image data. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33:20496–20507, 2020. 8
- [4] Michael J. Black, Priyanka Patel, Joachim Tesch, and Jinlong Yang. BEDLAM: A synthetic dataset of bodies exhibiting detailed lifelike animated motion. In *Proceedings IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 8726–8737, 2023. 2
- [5] Federica Bogo, Angjoo Kanazawa, Christoph Lassner, Peter Gehler, Javier Romero, and Michael J Black. Keep it smpl: Automatic estimation of 3d human pose and shape from a single image. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11-14, 2016, Proceedings, Part V 14*, pages 561–578. Springer, 2016. 2, 6
- [6] Leyde Briceno and Gunther Paul. Makehuman: a review of the modelling framework. In *Congress of the International Ergonomics Association*, pages 224–232. Springer, 2018. 2
- [7] Dongyue Chen, Yuanyuan Song, Fangzheng Liang, Teng Ma, Xiaoming Zhu, and Tong Jia. 3d human body reconstruction based on smpl model. *The Visual Computer*, pages 1–14, 2022. 2
- [8] Wenzheng Chen, Huan Wang, Yangyan Li, Hao Su, Zhenhua Wang, Changhe Tu, Dani Lischinski, Daniel Cohen-Or, and Baoquan Chen. Synthesizing training images for boosting human 3d pose estimation. In 2016 Fourth International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV), pages 479–488. IEEE, 2016. 2
- [9] Yin Chen, Zhan Song, Weiwei Xu, Ralph R Martin, and Zhi-Quan Cheng. Parametric 3d modeling of a symmetric human body. *Computers & Graphics*, 81:52–60, 2019. 2, 5, 7
- [10] Ke-Li Cheng, Ruo-Feng Tong, Min Tang, Jing-Ye Qian, and Michel Sarkis. Parametric human body reconstruction based on sparse key points. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 22(11):2467–2479, 2016. 2
- [11] Hongsuk Choi, Gyeongsik Moon, and Kyoung Mu Lee. Pose2mesh: Graph convolutional network for 3d human pose and mesh recovery from a 2d human pose. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VII 16*, pages 769–787. Springer, 2020. 8
- [12] Hongsuk Choi, Gyeongsik Moon, Ju Yong Chang, and Kyoung Mu Lee. Beyond static features for temporally consistent 3d human pose and shape from a video. In *Proceedings* of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 1964–1973, 2021. 8
- [13] Chia-Jung Chou, Jui-Ting Chien, and Hwann-Tzong Chen. Self adversarial training for human pose estimation. In 2018 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association

Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC), pages 17–30. IEEE, 2018. 2

- [14] Vasileios Choutas, Georgios Pavlakos, Timo Bolkart, Dimitrios Tzionas, and Michael J Black. Monocular expressive body regression through body-driven attention. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 20–40. Springer, 2020. 2, 7, 8
- [15] Blender Online Community. Blender a 3D modelling and rendering package. Blender Foundation, Stichting Blender Foundation, Amsterdam, 2018. 3
- [16] MMHuman3D Contributors. Openmmlab 3d human parametric model toolbox and benchmark. https:// github.com/open-mmlab/mmhuman3d, 2021. 4, 7
- [17] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Dandelion Mane, Vijay Vasudevan, and Quoc V Le. Autoaugment: Learning augmentation policies from data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09501*, 2018.
  3
- [18] Terrance DeVries and Graham W Taylor. Improved regularization of convolutional neural networks with cutout. arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.04552, 2017. 3
- [19] Carl Doersch and Andrew Zisserman. Sim2real transfer learning for 3d human pose estimation: motion to the rescue. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 32, 2019. 8
- [20] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Philipp Fischer, Eddy Ilg, Philip Hausser, Caner Hazirbas, Vladimir Golkov, Patrick Van Der Smagt, Daniel Cremers, and Thomas Brox. Flownet: Learning optical flow with convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer* vision, pages 2758–2766, 2015. 2
- [21] Sai Kumar Dwivedi, Nikos Athanasiou, Muhammed Kocabas, and Michael J Black. Learning to regress bodies from images using differentiable semantic rendering. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 11250–11259, 2021. 8
- [22] Julia Eckel, Jens Ruchatz, and Sabine Wirth. The selfie as image (and) practice: Approaching digital self-photography. *Exploring the selfie: Historical, theoretical, and analytical approaches to digital self-photography*, pages 1–23, 2018. 5
- [23] Ahmed Elhayek, Edilson de Aguiar, Arjun Jain, Jonathan Tompson, Leonid Pishchulin, Micha Andriluka, Chris Bregler, Bernt Schiele, and Christian Theobalt. Efficient convnet-based marker-less motion capture in general scenes with a low number of cameras. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3810–3818, 2015. 2
- [24] Ahmed Elhayek, Edilson de Aguiar, Arjun Jain, Jonathan Thompson, Leonid Pishchulin, Mykhaylo Andriluka, Christoph Bregler, Bernt Schiele, and Christian Theobalt. Marconi—convnet-based marker-less motion capture in outdoor and indoor scenes. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(3):501–514, 2016. 2
- [25] Yazeed Ghadi, Israr Akhter, Mohammed Alarfaj, Ahmad Jalal, and Kibum Kim. Syntactic model-based human body 3d reconstruction and event classification via association based features mining and deep learning. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 7:e764, 2021. 1
- [26] Mohsen Gholami, Bastian Wandt, Helge Rhodin, Rabab Ward, and Z Jane Wang. Adaptpose: Cross-dataset adap-

tation for 3d human pose estimation by learnable motion generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13075–13085, 2022. 2

- [27] S. Ghosh, R. Shet, P. Amon, A. Hutter, and A. Kaup. Robustness of deep convolutional neural networks for image degradations. In 2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), pages 2916–2920, 2018. 3
- [28] Riza Alp Guler and Iasonas Kokkinos. Holopose: Holistic 3d human reconstruction in-the-wild. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 10884–10894, 2019. 2
- [29] Dan Hendrycks and Thomas G Dietterich. Benchmarking neural network robustness to common corruptions and surface variations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01697, 2018. 3
- [30] Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02781, 2019. 3
- [31] PengPeng Hu, Duan Li, Ge Wu, Taku Komura, Dongliang Zhang, and Yueqi Zhong. Personalized 3d mannequin reconstruction based on 3d scanning. *International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology*, 2018. 1
- [32] Pengpeng Hu, Edmond Shu-Lim Ho, and Adrian Munteanu. 3dbodynet: fast reconstruction of 3d animatable human body shape from a single commodity depth camera. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 24:2139–2149, 2021. 2
- [33] Catalin Ionescu, Dragos Papava, Vlad Olaru, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Human3. 6m: Large scale datasets and predictive methods for 3d human sensing in natural environments. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 36(7):1325–1339, 2013. 2, 3, 4, 7
- [34] Aaron S Jackson, Chris Manafas, and Georgios Tzimiropoulos. 3d human body reconstruction from a single image via volumetric regression. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) Workshops*, pages 0–0, 2018. 2
- [35] Sam Johnson and Mark Everingham. Clustered pose and nonlinear appearance models for human pose estimation. In *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference*, 2010. 2, 7
- [36] Hanbyul Joo, Hao Liu, Lei Tan, Lin Gui, Bart Nabbe, Iain Matthews, Takeo Kanade, Shohei Nobuhara, and Yaser Sheikh. Panoptic studio: A massively multiview system for social motion capture. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3334–3342, 2015. 2
- [37] Hanbyul Joo, Natalia Neverova, and Andrea Vedaldi. Exemplar fine-tuning for 3d human model fitting towards in-the-wild 3d human pose estimation. In 2021 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV), pages 42–52. IEEE, 2021.
  2, 7
- [38] Arthur Juliani, Vincent-Pierre Berges, Ervin Teng, Andrew Cohen, Jonathan Harper, Chris Elion, Chris Goy, Yuan Gao, Hunter Henry, Marwan Mattar, et al. Unity: A general platform for intelligent agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02627, 2018. 3

- [39] Angjoo Kanazawa, Michael J. Black, David W. Jacobs, and Jitendra Malik. End-to-end recovery of human shape and pose, 2018. 2, 4, 7, 8, 1
- [40] Angjoo Kanazawa, Jason Y Zhang, Panna Felsen, and Jitendra Malik. Learning 3d human dynamics from video. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 5614–5623, 2019. 8
- [41] Shian-Ru Ke, Jenq-Neng Hwang, Kung-Ming Lan, and Shen-Zheng Wang. View-invariant 3d human body pose reconstruction using a monocular video camera. In 2011 Fifth ACM/IEEE International Conference on Distributed Smart Cameras, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2011. 2
- [42] Muhammed Kocabas, Nikos Athanasiou, and Michael J Black. Vibe: Video inference for human body pose and shape estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5253–5263, 2020. 8
- [43] Muhammed Kocabas, Chun-Hao P Huang, Otmar Hilliges, and Michael J Black. Pare: Part attention regressor for 3d human body estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11127– 11137, 2021. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 1
- [44] Muhammed Kocabas, Chun-Hao P Huang, Joachim Tesch, Lea Müller, Otmar Hilliges, and Michael J Black. Spec: Seeing people in the wild with an estimated camera. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 11035–11045, 2021. 1, 2, 3
- [45] Nikos Kolotouros, Georgios Pavlakos, Michael J Black, and Kostas Daniilidis. Learning to reconstruct 3d human pose and shape via model-fitting in the loop. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2252–2261, 2019. 2, 4, 7, 8, 1, 3
- [46] Nikos Kolotouros, Georgios Pavlakos, Dinesh Jayaraman, and Kostas Daniilidis. Probabilistic modeling for human mesh recovery. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 11605–11614, 2021. 8
- [47] Vincent Leroy, Philippe Weinzaepfel, Romain Brégier, Hadrien Combaluzier, and Grégory Rogez. Smply benchmarking 3d human pose estimation in the wild. In 2020 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV), pages 301–310. IEEE, 2020. 2
- [48] Jiefeng Li, Chao Xu, Zhicun Chen, Siyuan Bian, Lixin Yang, and Cewu Lu. Hybrik: A hybrid analytical-neural inverse kinematics solution for 3d human pose and shape estimation, 2021. 8
- [49] Zhihao Li, Jianzhuang Liu, Zhensong Zhang, Songcen Xu, and Youliang Yan. Cliff: Carrying location information in full frames into human pose and shape estimation. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2, 4, 7, 8, 1, 5
- [50] Junbang Liang and Ming C Lin. Shape-aware human pose and shape reconstruction using multi-view images. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, pages 4352–4362, 2019. 1, 2
- [51] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 2, 7

- [52] Ting Liu, Jennifer J Sun, Long Zhao, Jiaping Zhao, Liangzhe Yuan, Yuxiao Wang, Liang-Chieh Chen, Florian Schroff, and Hartwig Adam. View-invariant, occlusion-robust probabilistic embedding for human pose. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–25, 2021. 2
- [53] Yebin Liu, Carsten Stoll, Juergen Gall, Hans-Peter Seidel, and Christian Theobalt. Markerless motion capture of interacting characters using multi-view image segmentation. In *CVPR 2011*, pages 1249–1256. Ieee, 2011. 2
- [54] Matthew Loper, Naureen Mahmood, and Michael J Black. Mosh: motion and shape capture from sparse markers. ACM Trans. Graph., 33(6):220–1, 2014. 2
- [55] Matthew Loper, Naureen Mahmood, Javier Romero, Gerard Pons-Moll, and Michael J. Black. SMPL: A skinned multi-person linear model. ACM Trans. Graphics (Proc. SIGGRAPH Asia), 34(6):248:1–248:16, 2015. 2, 3, 5, 7
- [56] Yao Lu, Shang Zhao, Naji Younes, and James K Hahn. Accurate nonrigid 3d human body surface reconstruction using commodity depth sensors. *Computer animation and virtual worlds*, 29(5):e1807, 2018. 2
- [57] Zhengyi Luo, S Alireza Golestaneh, and Kris M Kitani. 3d human motion estimation via motion compression and refinement. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020. 8
- [58] Dushyant Mehta, Helge Rhodin, Dan Casas, Pascal Fua, Oleksandr Sotnychenko, Weipeng Xu, and Christian Theobalt. Monocular 3d human pose estimation in the wild using improved cnn supervision. In 2017 international conference on 3D vision (3DV), pages 506–516. IEEE, 2017. 2, 3, 4
- [59] Dushyant Mehta, Helge Rhodin, Dan Casas, Pascal Fua, Oleksandr Sotnychenko, Weipeng Xu, and Christian Theobalt. Monocular 3d human pose estimation in the wild using improved cnn supervision. In 3D Vision (3DV), 2017 Fifth International Conference on. IEEE, 2017. 2, 7, 8
- [60] Dushyant Mehta, Oleksandr Sotnychenko, Franziska Mueller, Weipeng Xu, Srinath Sridhar, Gerard Pons-Moll, and Christian Theobalt. Single-shot multi-person 3d pose estimation from monocular rgb. In 2018 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV), pages 120–130. IEEE, 2018. 2
- [61] Gyeongsik Moon and Kyoung Mu Lee. I2I-meshnet: Imageto-lixel prediction network for accurate 3d human pose and mesh estimation from a single rgb image. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VII 16*, pages 752–768. Springer, 2020. 8
- [62] Mohamed Omran, Christoph Lassner, Gerard Pons-Moll, Peter Gehler, and Bernt Schiele. Neural body fitting: Unifying deep learning and model based human pose and shape estimation. In 2018 international conference on 3D vision (3DV), pages 484–494. IEEE, 2018. 2
- [63] Hui En Pang, Zhongang Cai, Lei Yang, Tianwei Zhang, and Ziwei Liu. Benchmarking and analyzing 3d human pose and shape estimation beyond algorithms. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets* and Benchmarks Track, 2022. 1, 2, 3
- [64] Priyanka Patel, Chun-Hao P. Huang, Joachim Tesch, David T. Hoffmann, Shashank Tripathi, and Michael J.

Black. AGORA: Avatars in geography optimized for regression analysis. In *Proceedings IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. 2

- [65] Georgios Pavlakos, Vasileios Choutas, Nima Ghorbani, Timo Bolkart, Ahmed AA Osman, Dimitrios Tzionas, and Michael J Black. Expressive body capture: 3d hands, face, and body from a single image. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 10975–10985, 2019. 2
- [66] Pawel Potemkowski. Populating your digital worlds!, 2023.2
- [67] Albert Pumarola, Jordi Sanchez, Gary Choi, Alberto Sanfeliu, and Francesc Moreno-Noguer. 3DPeople: Modeling the Geometry of Dressed Humans. In *International Conference in Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. 2
- [68] Mihai Marian Puscas, Dan Xu, Andrea Pilzer, and Niculae Sebe. Structured coupled generative adversarial networks for unsupervised monocular depth estimation. In 2019 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV), pages 18–26. IEEE, 2019. 1, 3
- [69] Anurag Ranjan, David T Hoffmann, Dimitrios Tzionas, Siyu Tang, Javier Romero, and Michael J Black. Learning multihuman optical flow. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 128(4):873–890, 2020. 2
- [70] Matthew P Reed, Ulrich Raschke, Rishi Tirumali, and Matthew B Parkinson. Developing and implementing parametric human body shape models in ergonomics software. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international digital human modeling conference, Tokyo*, 2014. 2, 5, 7
- [71] renderpeople. Renderpeople, 2018. https://renderpeople.com/3d-people/. 2, 3
- [72] Faegheh Sardari, Björn Ommer, and Majid Mirmehdi. Unsupervised view-invariant human posture representation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08730, 2021. 2
- [73] Akash Sengupta, Ignas Budvytis, and Roberto Cipolla. Synthetic training for accurate 3d human pose and shape estimation in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10013*, 2020.
  2
- [74] Akash Sengupta, Ignas Budvytis, and Roberto Cipolla. Probabilistic 3d human shape and pose estimation from multiple unconstrained images in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16094–16104, 2021. 2
- [75] Akash Sengupta, Ignas Budvytis, and Roberto Cipolla. Hierarchical kinematic probability distributions for 3d human shape and pose estimation from images in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 11219–11229, 2021. 8
- [76] Akash Sengupta, Ignas Budvytis, and Roberto Cipolla. Humaniflow: Ancestor-conditioned normalising flows on so (3) manifolds for human pose and shape distribution estimation. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 4779–4789, 2023. 8
- [77] Yu Shen, Laura Zheng, Manli Shu, Weizi Li, Tom Goldstein, and Ming Lin. Gradient-free adversarial training against image corruption for learning-based steering. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:26250–26263, 2021.

- [78] Yu Shen, Laura Zheng, Manli Shu, Weizi Li, Tom Goldstein, and Ming C Lin. Improving robustness of learning-based autonomous steering using adversarial images. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.13262, 2021. 3
- [79] Leonid Sigal, Alexandru O Balan, and Michael J Black. Humaneva: Synchronized video and motion capture dataset and baseline algorithm for evaluation of articulated human motion. *International journal of computer vision*, 87(1):4–27, 2010. 2, 3
- [80] Jie Song, Xu Chen, and Otmar Hilliges. Human body model fitting by learned gradient descent. In *European Conference* on Computer Vision, pages 744–760. Springer, 2020. 8
- [81] Yu Sun, Yun Ye, Wu Liu, Wenpeng Gao, Yili Fu, and Tao Mei. Human mesh recovery from monocular images via a skeleton-disentangled representation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5349–5358, 2019. 2
- [82] James T Todd, Lore Thaler, Tjeerd MH Dijkstra, Jan J Koenderink, and Astrid ML Kappers. The effects of viewing angle, camera angle, and sign of surface curvature on the perception of three-dimensional shape from texture. *Journal of vision*, 7(12):9–9, 2007. 2
- [83] Matthew Trumble, Andrew Gilbert, Charles Malleson, Adrian Hilton, and John Collomosse. Total capture: 3d human pose estimation fusing video and inertial sensors. In *Proceedings of 28th British Machine Vision Conference*, pages 1–13, 2017. 2
- [84] Gul Varol, Javier Romero, Xavier Martin, Naureen Mahmood, Michael J Black, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Learning from synthetic humans. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 109–117, 2017. 2
- [85] Timo von Marcard, Roberto Henschel, Michael Black, Bodo Rosenhahn, and Gerard Pons-Moll. Recovering accurate 3d human pose in the wild using imus and a moving camera. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018. 2, 4, 7, 8, 5
- [86] Bastian Wandt and Bodo Rosenhahn. Repnet: Weakly supervised training of an adversarial reprojection network for 3d human pose estimation. 2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 7774–7783, 2019. 2
- [87] Bastian Wandt, Marco Rudolph, Petrissa Zell, Helge Rhodin, and Bodo Rosenhahn. Canonpose: Self-supervised monocular 3d human pose estimation in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13294–13304, 2021. 2
- [88] Donglai Xiang, Hanbyul Joo, and Yaser Sheikh. Monocular total capture: Posing face, body, and hands in the wild. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 10965–10974, 2019. 2
- [89] Zhixuan Yu, Jae Shin Yoon, In Kyu Lee, Prashanth Venkatesh, Jaesik Park, Jihun Yu, and Hyun Soo Park. Humbi: A large multiview dataset of human body expressions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2990–3000, 2020. 2
- [90] Sangdoo Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. Cutmix: Regu-

larization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *International Conference on Computer Vision* (*ICCV*), 2019. **3** 

- [91] Andrei Zanfir, Eduard Gabriel Bazavan, Mihai Zanfir, William T Freeman, Rahul Sukthankar, and Cristian Sminchisescu. Neural descent for visual 3d human pose and shape. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 14484–14493, 2021. 2
- [92] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N. Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. 3
- [93] Hongwen Zhang, Yating Tian, Xinchi Zhou, Wanli Ouyang, Yebin Liu, Limin Wang, and Zhenan Sun. Pymaf: 3d human pose and shape regression with pyramidal mesh alignment feedback loop. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11446–11456. IEEE, 2021. 2
- [94] Hongwen Zhang, Yating Tian, Yuxiang Zhang, Mengcheng Li, Liang An, Zhenan Sun, and Yebin Liu. Pymaf-x: Towards well-aligned full-body model regression from monocular images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023. 2
- [95] Song-Hai Zhang, Ruilong Li, Xin Dong, Paul Rosin, Zixi Cai, Xi Han, Dingcheng Yang, Haozhi Huang, and Shi-Min Hu. Pose2seg: Detection free human instance segmentation. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 889–898, 2019. 2
- [96] Tianshu Zhang, Buzhen Huang, and Yangang Wang. Objectoccluded human shape and pose estimation from a single color image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7376–7385, 2020. 2
- [97] Zerong Zheng, Tao Yu, Yixuan Wei, Qionghai Dai, and Yebin Liu. Deephuman: 3d human reconstruction from a single image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 7739–7749, 2019. 2
- [98] Christian Zimmermann, Duygu Ceylan, Jimei Yang, Bryan Russell, Max Argus, and Thomas Brox. Freihand: A dataset for markerless capture of hand pose and shape from single rgb images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 813–822, 2019. 7
- [99] Pierre Zins, Yuanlu Xu, Edmond Boyer, Stefanie Wuhrer, and Tony Tung. Data-driven 3d reconstruction of dressed humans from sparse views. In 2021 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV), pages 494–504. IEEE, 2021. 2

## SHARE: Single-view Human Adversarial REconstruction



# Supplementary Material

Figure 6. Sensitivity analysis on HMR [39], SPIN [45], PARE [43] and CLIFF [49] before and after SHARE with respect to camera pose using PA-MPJPE. The x-axis iterates through all camera poses ( $\theta$ ,  $\phi$ ), where  $\phi$  represents the azimuthal angle around the body (0, 360), and  $\theta$  represents the vertical viewing angle (-60, 60) for each  $\phi$ . The y-axis represents the average error in PA-MPJPE over a diverse dataset encompassing a wide range of bodies, body poses, and environments. This plot explicitly depicts the average error associated with each camera pose, revealing a discernible oscillatory bias with varying performance in different regions around the human body, with a significant decrease in variance with SHARE

### 7. Qualitative Results

Figures 8, 9 and 10 visualize qualitative results of each baseline before and after SHARE.

## 8. Sensitivity Analysis on HPS techniques with Respect to Camera Pose

Fig 6 plots for the sensitivity analyses for all baselines with respect to camera poses. With each technique we see a discernible oscillatory bias with varying performance in different regions around the human body, the mean and variance of the errors drops significantly after the implementation of SHARE.

### 9. Additional Implementation Details

For our adversarial training, we augmented 15% of the original training data at every iteration. Using this configuration we perform fine-tuning on the baseline HPS versions.



Figure 7. Loss Landscapes for All Baseline models

For each cycle of SHARE we sample 50,000 images from our synthetic training dataset. One training interval of SHARE consists of 5 epochs. Our synthetic testing dataset is composed of 10,000 images. Each dataset contains images from 2500 camera poses. For each image, we sampled diverse realistic bodies, poses, skin tones, clothing, lighting, and environments. We trained our model on multiple servers: a dual NVIDIA 3090 machine takes around 8 hours for 40 epochs.



Figure 8. Qualitative results on reference images [58, 85] (left) of HMR [39] (center) and HMR + SHARE (right).



Figure 9. Qualitative results on reference images [58] (left) of SPIN [45] (center) and SPIN + SHARE (right).



Figure 10. Qualitative results on reference images [58] (left) of PARE [43] (center) and PARE + SHARE (right).



Figure 11. Qualitative results on reference images [85] (left) of CLIFF [49] (center) and CLIFF + SHARE (right).