
BlinkTrack: Feature Tracking over 100 FPS via Events and Images

Yichen Shen^{1*} Yijin Li^{1,2*} Shuo Chen¹ Guanglin Li¹
Zhaoyang Huang² Hujun Bao¹ Zhaopeng Cui¹ Guofeng Zhang^{1†}

¹State Key Lab of CAD&CG, Zhejiang University ²Avolution AI

Abstract

Feature tracking is crucial for, structure from motion (SFM), simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM), object tracking and various computer vision tasks. Event cameras, known for their high temporal resolution and ability to capture asynchronous changes, have gained significant attention for their potential in feature tracking, especially in challenging conditions. However, event cameras lack the fine-grained texture information that conventional cameras provide, leading to error accumulation in tracking. To address this, we propose a novel framework, BlinkTrack, which integrates event data with RGB images for high-frequency feature tracking. Our method extends the traditional Kalman filter into a learning-based framework, utilizing differentiable Kalman filters in both event and image branches. This approach improves single-modality tracking, resolves ambiguities, and supports asynchronous data fusion. We also introduce new synthetic and augmented datasets to better evaluate our model. Experimental results indicate that BlinkTrack significantly outperforms existing event-based methods, exceeding 100 FPS with preprocessed event data and 80 FPS with multi-modality data.

1 Introduction

Feature tracking aims to estimate the trajectories of query points from a reference timestamp over subsequent periods. It serves as the cornerstone for many computer vision tasks, including structure from motion [46, 47], simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) [42, 43, 10], and object tracking [59, 58, 63].

In recent years, the success of event cameras [19, 20] has garnered significant attention in the research community. Event cameras are innovative sensors that asynchronously detect changes in a scene at a very high temporal resolution, capturing events as they occur rather than recording frames at fixed intervals. This unique characteristic enables event cameras to perform feature tracking at high frequencies, even under challenging lighting conditions or with fast-moving objects.

Nevertheless, the event cameras are unable to capture detailed fine-grained texture information like conventional cameras, which can lead to error accumulation and inhibit tracking performance. Therefore, in this paper, we leverage an integration of the valuable information from event cameras with that of standard cameras for efficient and powerful feature tracking.

To achieve our objective, we must address two primary challenges: (i) Event cameras and standard cameras do not operate in a synchronized manner, with standard cameras capturing at fixed fps (e.g., 30fps) and event cameras detecting changes asynchronously. This mismatch can lead to ambiguity in

*Yichen Shen, Yijin Li contributed equally to this work.

tracking positions when fusing these two signals. (ii) Another significant challenge is to seamlessly integrate the complementary data from both modalities while minimizing noise interference.

Previous learning-based methods for feature tracking, such as Deep-EV-Tracker [40], naively combine event data and RGB images by initializing the tracking position with results from another modality, which leads to only limited improvements. In other fields [61, 62], attention-based [53] modules have been explored for alignment and fusion. While these methods can be effective, they do not meet the efficiency requirements for high-frame-rate feature tracking. On the other hand, traditional techniques such as the Kalman filter [29], offer efficient tools for the fusion of asynchronous data. However, they usually require careful hand-crafted parameter tuning and still do not achieve the performance levels as recent learning-based methods.

Based on these observations, we propose a novel framework that can achieve high-frame-rate feature tracking (over 100 FPS) by leveraging the event data and RGB images, dubbed BlinkTrack. Our method is inspired by the traditional technique, i.n., Kalman filter, but extends it to the learning-based framework. Specifically, our framework consists of an event branch and an image branch. Both branches employ the differentiable Kalman filters. They learn to predict uncertainty from new measurements and incorporate these measurements into feature tracking through end-to-end training. The characteristics inherited from the differentiable Kalman filter offer several advantages. First, it improves the single-modality tracker by learning the optimal state. Second, it helps resolve ambiguities and incorrect measurements caused by occlusions. Third, it naturally supports the fusion of asynchronous measurements from different modalities. In addition to the Kalman filter, our event branch and RGB branch are well-designed, achieving a balance of high precision and efficiency.

However, during training and evaluation, we found that the current datasets are too simple. As a result, they do not fully allow our model to reach its potential and fail to provide a thorough evaluation. To address this, we first generated a more complicated synthetic dataset for training our model. Then, we augmented two existing evaluation datasets with more occlusions. The experiments show that the proposed tracker significantly outperforms existing event-based method and is much more robust to occlusions. Additionally, it can run at over 100 FPS.

Our contributions can be outlined as follows. First, we propose an efficient Kalman-filter-based framework that can achieve state-of-the-art performance while running at over 100 FPS. Second, we generate new datasets for training and evaluating event-based feature tracking. Lastly, exclusive experiments show that the proposed methods outperform existing methods by a large margin and are much more robust in handling occlusions.

2 Related Work

Frame-based Feature Tracking Frame-based feature tracking methods develop rapidly for their wide application. Harley et al.[26] and Doersch et al.[14] were pioneers in this area, introducing new datasets and networks. Harley et al. proposed the FlyingThings++[26] based on FlyingThings[38], while Doersch et al. introduced Kubric[25]. Both datasets are synthetic and the proposed networks, PIPs[26] and TAP-Net[14], are trained on them. PointOdyssey[64] significantly improves the training dataset with an automatic scene generate pipeline and extends PIPs to PIPs+[64] and PIPs++[64] which is more robust in long-term tracking. Context-PIPs[7] uses context feature near tracked points to achieve more stable tracking while CoTracker[31] tracks almost dense points and sharing motions between nearby points. While frame based methods is suffering from hardware limitations, event cameras have low temporal resolution and lite data which could handle these extreme scenes.

Event-based Feature Tracking The event camera is used to increase tracking robustness in challenging conditions in recent years. ICP[6] is widely used in early traditional methods[33, 44, 66], which also hold the possibility to fuse with standard camera[15]. Recently, asynchronous tracker is developing[1, 13], among them AMH[2] and HASTE[3] explore the multi-hypothesis using pure event data, and EKLt[20] makes use of warped color patch gradient to track features. To better fit the motion, Bézier curves and B-splines are applied to optimize trajectories by Seok et al.[48] and Chui et al.[12], while eCDT[28] and Wang et al.[55] use event cluster and blob to represent a feature. Inspired by recent data-driven event-based optical flow estimate method[66, 36, 22, 65], Deep-EV-Tracker[40] is the first to implement neural networks on event-based feature tracking. Given the absence of a dataset that includes both event data and corresponding ground truth trajectories, Deep-EV-Tracker




Figure 1: **Overview of the proposed BlinkTrack.** BlinkTrack contains an event module and an image module. For the event module, it takes a reference patch $\mathbf{P}_{evt_{ref}}$ extracted from a grayscale image \mathbf{I}_{ref} and an event patch \mathbf{P}_{evt_j} preprocessed from the event stream at timestep evt_j as input, and estimates the feature relative displacement $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ and the uncertainty $\hat{\Sigma}_{evt_j}$. The image module has a similar behavior. Both modules are trained using the differentiable Kalman filter and learn to predict the optimal state free from measurement noise.

uses MultiFlow[23], with calculated trajectories from ground truth optical flow. Our event module follows Deep-EV-Tracker and improves its network architecture design. We also follow MultiFlow to generate our own synthetic dataset, which is the first event-based dataset on feature tracking.

Kalman Filter Kalman filter has been widely used for object tracking[8, 17] and optical flow[11, 18] because it is able to build an explicit motion model, which could benefit the tracking task. The differentiability of the Kalman filter makes it coexistent with neural networks. Bao et al.[4, 5] add Kalman filter on existing optical flow methods, gaining performance promotion. Also, Kalman filter holds the advantage of fusing different signals, which is used by Wang et al.[56] to reconstruct video using LDR image and event data. Our work employs differentiable Kalman filters to supervise our learning-based network and combine predictions from the event module and color module.

3 BlinkTrack

Feature tracking usually takes a reference frame and a query point $\mathbf{p}_{ref} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ as input, and aims to track this point in subsequent T timestamps to get estimation $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{T-1}\}$. An overview of our method BlinkTrack is presented in Fig. 1. It consists of an event module and an image module. Both modules are trained using the differentiable Kalman filter. In Sec. 3.1,3.2,3.3,3.4 we introduce how we design the event module and how we integrate it with the differentiable Kalman filter. Then in Sec. 3.5 we talk about the design of the color module. Finally, we introduce how to supervise the training in Sec. 3.6.

3.1 Pyramid Feature Extraction

From the reference grayscale image \mathbf{I}_{ref} at \mathbf{p}_{ref} , we extract the reference patch $\mathbf{P}_{evt_{ref}}$ with size $P_{evt} \times P_{evt}$. Then taking it as the reference, the event module predicts the relative feature displacement by comparing it with the event patch \mathbf{P}_{evt_j} , where the latter one is extracted from the event stream according to last predicted position \mathbf{p}_{j-1} . In practice, we use two shallow convolution neural networks to encode the reference patch and the event patch, respectively. Then we construct a two-level feature pyramid by applying average pooling to the patch features, as inspired by DPVO [52]. The feature maps of smaller scale are designed to offer more detailed information for the small displacement in high frame rate event data, while the feature maps of larger scale could produce vast information to resist unstable tracking, especially on similar features. Compared with Deep-EV-Tracker [40], the design of the two-level feature pyramid allows for a larger perception field with a limited increase in budget. Then, we compute the correlation \mathbf{C}_{evt_j} between the reference feature vector, aiming

to explicitly compare the similarity between the reference feature and the event feature, which is extracted from the center of the reference feature map $\mathbf{F}_{evt_{ref}}$ and the event patch feature map \mathbf{F}_{evt_j} .

3.2 LSTM Displacement Predictor

Previous methods [24, 40] have demonstrated that the design of LSTM provides significant benefits to event-based tasks due to its efficiency in extracting temporal features and producing smooth results. Since temporal context information is beneficial to estimation accuracy, we also employ LSTM in our tracking module to convey information between frames. Specifically, to better facilitate information sharing across frames, we propose a dual LSTM module for feature and motion information delivery. The feature LSTM module employs a ConvLSTM Block[50] and several standard convolutional layers, transforming the concatenated $\mathbf{F}_{evt_{ref}}$, \mathbf{F}_{evt_j} and \mathbf{C}_{evt_j} into a displacement feature vector \mathbf{f}_{evt_j} . The displacement LSTM module maintains a hidden displacement feature vector \mathbf{h}_{j-1} across frames to utilize displacement insights from preceding frames. Each displacement feature vector \mathbf{f}_{evt_j} is fused with the preceding \mathbf{h}_{j-1} through a MLP, obtaining a merged displacement vector \mathbf{m}_j . This vector is processed through a gating layer to formulate the current hidden displacement feature vector \mathbf{h}_j , which is subsequently followed by a linear predictor to predict the displacement prediction $\Delta\hat{\mathbf{p}}$.

3.3 Uncertainty Predictor

This module predicts the uncertainty (or noise) associated with each measurement and the uncertainty can be incorporated with the update step of kalman filter. Unlike the previous displacement predictor, this module does not employ LSTM because the uncertainty may change drastically and does not follow temporal smoothness. Such cases occur, for example, during occlusions. Besides, general uncertainty ranges from 0 to positive infinity, covering too wide a distribution, which is not stable for learning. As a result, we learn an approximation: the probability of visibility, which ranges from 0 to 1. Then the probability is remapped using a parabola function and finally extended to $\hat{\Sigma}_{evt_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$. Specifically, the predictor takes all $\mathbf{F}_{evt_{ref}}$, \mathbf{F}_{evt_j} and \mathbf{C}_{evt_j} as input, which is concatenated and convoluted into an uncertainty feature vector \mathbf{f}_{uncert_j} . A linear layer followed by a Softmax function is then applied to generate the occlusion probability and visible probability $(\hat{p}_{occ}, \hat{p}_{vis})$.

3.4 Kalman Filter

The Kalman filter[30, 57] is composed of two fundamental steps: prediction and update. Based on the current state estimate and the process model, the prediction step predicts the state and the uncertainty at the next time step. It is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_{k|k-1} &= F\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}, \\ P_{k|k-1} &= FP_{k-1|k-1}F^T + Q.\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

Here, $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$ is the current state estimate, $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$ is the predicted state estimate, $P_{k-1|k-1}$ is the current state covariance, $P_{k|k-1}$ is the predicted covariance F is the state-transition model, and Q is the process noise covariance. The update step incorporates the new measurement to refine the state estimate and its uncertainty. It is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}y_k &= z_k - H\hat{x}_{k|k-1}, \\ S_k &= HP_{k|k-1}H^T + R, \\ K_k &= P_{k|k-1}H^T S_k^{-1}, \\ \hat{x}_{k|k} &= \hat{x}_{k|k-1} + K_k y_k, \\ P_{k|k} &= (I - K_k H)P_{k|k-1},\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where y_k is the measurement residual (innovation), z_k is the new measurement, $\hat{x}_{k|k}$ is the updated state estimate, S_k is the residual covariance, R is the measurement noise covariance, $P_{k|k}$ is the updated covariance, H is the observation model, K_k is the Kalman gain, and I is the identity matrix. The measurement z_k and the measurement noise covariance R are the predictions from our network. The process of kalman filter is fully differentiable. As a result, it allows the network to learn to minimize error by incorporating correct measurements and preventing interference from noise. In our implementation, we use a simple assumption of constant velocity model. The detailed value can be found in the supplementary material.

3.5 Color Frame Relocalization Module

Event cameras are not good at measuring fine-grained texture information like traditional cameras, which can easily lead to error accumulation and track loss. To improve long-term tracking performance and minimize cumulative error, we developed a lightweight Color Frame Relocalization Module. The design of our color module is inspired by recent work on point tracking, such as PIPs[26]. However, these works usually run slowly, negating the low latency advantage of event cameras, so we simplified the architecture design, and our module can operate at over 50 FPS. Specifically, we utilize a Pyramid Encoder[51] to encode the image and achieve a much larger receptive field than that of the event module. Then, a pyramid correlation map is calculated to capture multi-scale information. Finally, an iterative updater takes the embedded feature vector and correlation map to predict displacement and uncertainty, which are subsequently incorporated into the Kalman filter to obtain the final prediction. The detailed design of the color module is provided in the supplementary material.

3.6 Supervision

The mixed train of event and color modules would not be efficient and consume too many calculation resources, so we chose to train the two modules separately. To ensure the direct predict accuracy and training stability, we first train our event module without Uncertainty Predictor 3.3 and Kalman filter 3.4 on our synthetic dataset, MultiTrack, see Sec. 4.1. As there is no dataset for event feature tracking offering visible conditions currently, our MultiTrack could offer ground truth visible conditions to help supervise our full module including Uncertainty Predictor and Kalman filter, while our color module is also trained on this dataset.

Event Displacement Supervision Since the synthetic dataset could provide ground truth track position, we could apply L1 distance between the predicted displacement $\Delta\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ and ground truth displacement $\Delta\mathbf{p}$ each frame to construct the loss. We only gather loss for those ground truth points in our largest pyramid patch with radius r , which is in the receptive field. Moreover, we follow [40] to augment the patch from each frame with scale, translation, and rotation.

$$\mathcal{L}_{disp} = \begin{cases} \|\Delta\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \Delta\mathbf{p}\|_1, & \|\Delta\mathbf{p}\|_1 < r \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Event Uncertainty Supervision To ensure displacement prediction, we freeze the total pipeline of displacement prediction including Pyramid Feature Encoder 3.1 and LSTM Displacement Predictor 3.2. We supervise the uncertainty predictor on both displacement loss and uncertainty loss. Kalman filter is added to make use of predicted uncertainty, and the displacement loss supervises on Kalman filter prediction $\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$. For uncertainty, we apply cross-entropy loss on predicted possibility $\hat{p} = (\hat{p}_{occ}, \hat{p}_{vis})$ and ground truth visible status v , because visibility is a strong reference for uncertainty. We also add parameter $w_1 = 2$ to balance the proportion of two losses.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{disp} &= \begin{cases} \|\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{p}} - \Delta\mathbf{p}\|_1, & \|\Delta\mathbf{p}\|_1 < r \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{L}_{uncert} &= CrossEntropy(\hat{p}, v) \\ \mathcal{L}_{event} &= \mathcal{L}_{disp} + w_1 \mathcal{L}_{uncert} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The supervision for color module is provided in the supplementary material.

4 MultiTrack, EC-occ and EDS-occ

Since there is no dataset with event data that have occluded track, and the ground truth of visual condition could hardly be manually labeled, we introduce a pipeline, see Fig. 2 which could synthesize color image, event, tracks with occlusion and visibility with adjustable parameters, or generate these data from existing dataset, which only need raw color image and given pixel trajectories.




Figure 2: **Overview of Occluded Data Synthetic Pipeline.** The high frame rate occlusion images are overlaid on the high frame rate background images to compose occluded images, which are used to generate synthetic event data.

Table 1: **Performance evaluation on real event data and synthetic event data.**

Methods	Expect FA↑			
	Real	EC Synthetic	Real	EDS Synthetic
Deep-EV-Tracker[40]	0.787	0.812	0.451	0.454
Ours(Event)	0.819	0.830	0.474	0.461

4.1 MultiTrack

For the generated dataset, following MultiFlow[23], a background image is chosen from Flickr 30k Dataset[60] while foreground images have two types. The first type consists of objects with transparent backgrounds from Google Scanned Objects[16], the other type has random polygons or smoothed shapes with random images hatch, whose shape is inspired by AutoFlow[39], and images are from COCO2014[35]. With random translation, rotation, and scale of each image, the foreground images are overlaid together on background images, producing synthetic high frame rate images, instance maps, and dense tracks with visibility. The high frame rate images are taken as input to DVS-Voltmeter[34] to generate synthetic event data while they are also sampled in a normal frame rate to get a color image. By using this pipeline, we generate MultiTrack as our train data.

4.2 EC-occ, EDS-occ

When applying occlusion on an existing dataset, in order to acquire high frame rate images, we interpolate the color image using FILM[45], which iterates 4 times, inserting 15 frames for each color frame interval. With existing high frame rate background images, the same procedures are applied to create occlusion on existing dataset, obtaining event data with occlusion from DVS-Voltmeter[34] and visibility of given tracks with instance map.

EC[41] and EDS[27] are occluded and processed to EC-occ and EDS-occ. However, it is held by some that synthetic events exhibit significant differences from events captured by real event cameras since the noise is not modeled. So we conduct an experiment by also generating events from interpolated but not occluded images, EC-syn and EDS-syn, to measure the real events and our synthetic events. Tab. 1 shows the slight difference in evaluation metric between real and synthetic data, which proves that the synthetic data could be creditable in evaluation.

5 Experiment

Dataset We test our method in a commonly used real captured dataset, Event Camera dataset(EC)[41] and Event-aided Direct Sparse Odometry dataset (EDS)[27]. EC provides 24 Hz APS frames and events with a resolution of 240×180 , which is recorded by a DAVIS240C

Table 2: Stability evaluation on EC and EDS.

Methods	EC		EDS	
	Feature Age(FA) \uparrow	Expect FA \uparrow	Feature Age(FA) \uparrow	Expect FA \uparrow
HASTE[3]	0.442	0.427	0.096	0.063
EKLT[20]	0.811	0.775	0.325	0.205
Deep-EV-Tracker[40]	0.795	0.787	0.549	0.451
Ours(Event)	0.833	0.819	0.568	0.474
Ours(Event+Kalman)	0.835	0.820	0.569	0.475
KLT[49]	0.734	0.729	0.588	0.497
Ours(Color)	0.778	0.772	0.633	0.524
Ours(Color+Kalman)	0.784	0.778	0.619	0.511
Deep-EV-Tracker[40] + KLT[49]	0.735	0.730	0.594	0.503
Ours(Event+Color)	0.786	0.780	0.634	0.532
Ours(Event+Color+Kalman)	0.851	0.845	0.653	0.550

camera[9] while EDS contains 640×480 pixels data with a beam splitter setup. The events from EC and EDS are pre-processed to SBT-Max[54] with intervals 10ms and 5ms, so that the input event data are in frequency of 100Hz and 200Hz, respectively. These datasets do not originally offer the ground truth for feature tracking, and [40] extend it by calculating the ground truth through KLT[49] tracking and triangulation. We also test in our synthetic dataset with occlusion, EC-occ, and EDS-occ introduced at Sec. 4. Another widely-used event-based dataset, DSEC[21, 22], is also used in qualitative comparison to evaluate performance on large outdoor scenes.

Baselines We conduct experiments against the state-of-the-art method Deep-EV-Tracker[40], which tracks event frames with grayscale image reference with smaller patches and produces no uncertainty. We also compare with EKLT[20] which has a similar pipeline with Deep-EV-Tracker but without using a neural network. Additionally, HASTE[3], which demands no color image but uses pure event data, is included. Moreover, to manifest our novel multi-modality combination technique, we combine Deep-EV-Tracker and KLT[49], a classic and popular color frame tracker, by replacing the initial position with another module’s prediction as [40] mentioned.

Metric The EC[41] and EDS[27] only provide ground truth trajectories with 24Hz and 75Hz. To evaluate the high-rate event predictions with 100Hz and 200Hz, we interpolate the event predictions to continuous trajectories and sample points on those timestamps that have ground truth data following the setting in [40]. We evaluate feature age, defined as the duration for which a feature exceeds a specified distance from the ground truth, and expect feature age, which is calculated as the product of feature age and the ratio of stable tracks. These two metrics are common in event-based feature tracking benchmark[40]. We also evaluate accuracy through δ_{avg} [14], which is the average fraction of points tracked within 1, 2, 4, 8, and 16 pixels, also widely used in point tracking benchmarks. The detailed definition can be found in previous methods [40].

Implementation Details As mentioned in Sec. 3.6, our event module is pre-trained on the MultiTrack dataset on 30000 feature tracks from 2000 sequences employing a continual learning approach [40]. We use ADAM[32] optimizer with a learning rate of 1×10^{-4} and 140000 training steps in total with batch size 32. To stabilize training at the beginning, the input sequences are clipped to 4 frames, which would increase to 12 and 23 after 80000 and 120000 steps following [40]. Then we train our uncertainty predictor on the same dataset with the same hyperparameters. At the same time, we train our color module on MultiTrack which is generated for color image training with 10000 sequences using ADAMW[37] with a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} . Each sequence is regarded as a batch, which is set to size 16, and we sample 24 tracks from each track. The sequence length is fixed to 10 in all 50000 training steps. We run supervision on two NVIDIA RTX3090 24GB GPUS for 48 hours and experiments on one NVIDIA RTX3090 GPU and Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6139M CPU.

5.1 Experiments Results

Quantitative Experiment As reported in Tab. 2, our method achieves the best performance on EC and EDS merely using the event module. With the Kalman filter and color module, we attain even more margin, while we must emphasize that the origin EC and EDS are all static scenes with almost no occluded trajectories, which do not fully reveal the superiority of our approach. Besides, the comparison between with and without Kalman filter reveals the effectiveness of the Kalman filter.

Table 3: **Performance increase from module without Kalman filter to module with Kalman filter.** “D-tracker” denotes Deep-EV-Tracker[40]. “E” denotes event, “C” denotes color and “K” denotes Kalman. “Incr” denotes the performance increase from our module without Kalman filter to those with Kalman filter.

Data	Metric	EC-occ				EDS-occ			
		D-tracker[40]	Ours(E)	Ours(E+K)	Incr(%) \uparrow	D-tracker[40]	Ours(E)	Ours(E+K)	Incr(%) \uparrow
E	$\delta^{vis} \uparrow$	26.8	29.3	30.5	3.92	31.3	35.1	36.7	4.50
	$\delta^{occ} \uparrow$	20.2	23.1	24.1	4.41	21.3	24.6	25.9	5.05
	$\delta^{all} \uparrow$	26.3	28.7	29.8	3.95	30.9	34.6	36.2	4.51
		KLT[49]	Ours(C)	Ours(C+K)	Incr(%) \uparrow	KLT[49]	Ours(C)	Ours(C+K)	Incr(%) \uparrow
C	$\delta^{vis} \uparrow$	32.5	38.1	42.8	12.36	34.4	41.5	46.0	10.95
	$\delta^{occ} \uparrow$	5.8	11.8	18.1	53.16	11.0	17.9	20.9	16.46
	$\delta^{all} \uparrow$	30.6	36.3	41.1	13.26	33.2	40.1	44.5	10.89
		D-tracker[40] + KLT[49]	Ours (E+C)	Ours (E+C+K)	Incr(%) \uparrow	D-tracker[40] + KLT[49]	Ours (E+C)	Ours (E+C+K)	Incr(%) \uparrow
E+C	$\delta^{vis} \uparrow$	32.1	37.2	44.5	19.73	35.0	43.1	52.0	20.64
	$\delta^{occ} \uparrow$	5.8	11.4	28.5	149.06	10.7	18.6	26.8	43.61
	$\delta^{all} \uparrow$	30.3	35.5	43.4	22.32	33.7	41.6	50.6	21.51




Figure 3: **Qualitative Comparison.**

To better demonstrate the superiority of the Kalman filter, experiments are conducted on datasets with occlusion, EC-occ, and EDS-occ, see Tab. 3. The better performance of modules with Kalman filter proves the ability to stabilize tracking, especially in the occluded situation since the occluded points has the most increment. When the point is occluded, the uncertainty would increase, and the Kalman filter would trust its explicit motion state rather than the untrustworthy network output.

Both experiments support the argument that multimodality should be combined carefully. Simply combining two modules by replacing initial points does not produce desirable results and can even yield worse outcomes than using a single module. However, with the assistance of the Kalman filter, we observed a significant improvement, demonstrating that the Kalman filter is an effective method for combining multimodality modules.

To explain in more depth, uncertainty increases in scenarios where event cameras or traditional cameras are challenged, such as extreme lighting or motion for traditional cameras or low latent features for event cameras. In these situations, the biased prediction has a slight influence on the final prediction when passed through the Kalman filter. This process naturally leverages the advantages of both event and color cameras, balancing predictions from the two different sources.

Qualitative Comparison We visualize the tracks estimated by our methods, along with those from other methods, in Fig. 3. As shown, all methods exhibit apparent errors after occlusion, but our methods result in fewer lost tracks. The effectiveness of the color relocalization module is evident, as it facilitates relocalization after occlusion, whereas the other methods struggle and often fail post-occlusion. In conclusion, our methods provide the longest and most stable estimated tracks, demonstrating their robustness in occlusion situations.

Table 4: **Ablation experiments.** The ablated versions are labeled under the experiments. Settings used in our final model are underlined.

Experiment	Method	Expect FA \uparrow				Parameters
		EC	EC-occ	EDS	EDS-occ	
Feature Pyramid (Ours Event)	<u>On</u>	<u>0.819</u>	<u>0.522</u>	<u>0.474</u>	<u>0.343</u>	33.1M
	Off	0.789	0.439	0.395	0.283	29.3M
LSTM Module (Ours Event)	<u>Feature+Displacement</u>	<u>0.819</u>	<u>0.522</u>	<u>0.474</u>	<u>0.343</u>	33.1M
	Feature	0.794	0.473	0.428	0.337	32.7M
	Displacement	0.617	0.332	0.282	0.186	31.9M
	Off	0.568	0.338	0.294	0.225	31.6M
Correlation Vector (Ours Event)	<u>Feature Map Center</u>	<u>0.819</u>	<u>0.522</u>	<u>0.474</u>	<u>0.343</u>	33.1M
	U-Net Bottleneck	0.792	0.472	0.441	0.330	35.7M
Dataset (Ours Event & Deep-EV-Tracker)	<u>MultiTrack</u>	<u>0.800</u>	<u>0.510</u>	<u>0.412</u>	<u>0.283</u>	-
	MultiFlow[23]	0.777	0.453	0.405	0.269	-

Runtime Analysis Our event module takes less than 9 ms to track one event patch across one preprocessed event frame on EC[41] and EDS[27] using an Nvidia RTX3090. The introduction of the Kalman filter adds less than 1 ms to the budget. As a result, the integration of the event module and Kalman filter enables precise predictions at frequencies exceeding 100Hz. Additionally, our image module can operate efficiently with the Kalman filter at frequencies above 50Hz, making it efficient enough for low-frequency image relocalization.

5.2 Ablations

To evaluate the distinct contributions of each integrated network component on tracking accuracy and stability, we conducted a series of ablation studies on real data EC[41] and EDS[27] and occluded data EC-occ and EDS-occ outlined in Tab. 4.

Feature Pyramid We use a Feature Pyramid to take both the perception field and accuracy into account. We experiment with replacing the Pyramid Feature Encoder with a single patch like [40] do, which achieves worse performance because of the scarcer information from the patch, indicating that the pyramid has a contribution both on tracking accuracy and occlusion.

LSTM Module Our event module employs two LSTM modules, designed for delivering feature and displacement information. We tested versions with one of the LSTM modules removed and a version with no LSTM modules. The results show that removing any LSTM module leads to performance loss, demonstrating the contribution of both LSTM modules.

Correlation Vector The Deep-EV-Tracker[40] uses the U-Net bottleneck vector as the reference vector to correlate with the target feature map, while we believe the reference vector should come from the reference feature map considering symmetry. So we conduct an experiment on it, in which the vector from the reference feature map performs better.

Dataset In this experiment, we train our event module and Deep-EV-Tracker[40] respectively on the MultiTrack and MultiFlow[23] datasets and evaluate average performance of the two methods on the two datasets. Although we view MultiTrack as a supplement to MultiFlow rather than a complete replacement, the results show that our MultiTrack dataset still outperforms the MultiFlow dataset on average metrics. This suggests that MultiTrack can unleash more potential of modules.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented BlinkTrack, a novel framework for high-frame-rate feature tracking that leverages the strengths of both event data and RGB images. By integrating a differentiable Kalman filter within a learning-based architecture, BlinkTrack effectively addresses the challenges of asynchronous data fusion and improves tracking performance under occlusions. Our extensive experiments, supported by newly generated and augmented datasets, show that BlinkTrack significantly outperforms existing methods in terms of robustness and speed, achieving state-of-the-art performance while running at over 100 FPS. These results underscore the potential of our approach for advanced feature tracking applications, establishing a new benchmark for future research in this field. **Limitations.** Since the event module and color image module are trained separately, their

fusion performance could be hindered. In our future work, we will explore training these two modules jointly with more resources.

References

- [1] Ignacio Alzugaray and Margarita Chli. Ace: An efficient asynchronous corner tracker for event cameras. In *2018 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, pages 653–661, 2018.
- [2] Ignacio Alzugaray and Margarita Chli. Asynchronous multi-hypothesis tracking of features with event cameras. In *2019 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, pages 269–278, 2019.
- [3] Ignacio Alzugaray and Margarita Chli. Haste: multi-hypothesis asynchronous speeded-up tracking of events. In *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2020.
- [4] Wenbo Bao, Xiaoyun Zhang, Li Chen, and Zhiyong Gao. Kalmanflow: Efficient kalman filtering for video optical flow. In *2018 25th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 3343–3347, 2018.
- [5] Wenbo Bao, Xiaoyun Zhang, Li Chen, and Zhiyong Gao. Kalmanflow 2.0: Efficient video optical flow estimation via context-aware kalman filtering. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 28(9):4233–4246, 2019.
- [6] P.J. Besl and Neil D. McKay. A method for registration of 3-d shapes. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 14(2):239–256, 1992.
- [7] Weikang Bian, Zhaoyang Huang, Xiaoyu Shi, Yitong Dong, Yijin Li, and Hongsheng Li. Context-pips: Persistent independent particles demands spatial context features, 2023.
- [8] S. Blackman and Robert Populi. Design and analysis of modern tracking systems. 1999.
- [9] Christian Brandli, Raphael Berner, Minhao Yang, Shih-Chii Liu, and Tobi Delbruck. A 240×180 130 db $3 \mu\text{s}$ latency global shutter spatiotemporal vision sensor. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, 49(10):2333–2341, 2014.
- [10] Carlos Campos, Richard Elvira, Juan J. Gomez, Jose M. M. Montiel, and Juan D. Tardos. ORB-SLAM3: An accurate open-source library for visual, visual-inertial and multi-map SLAM. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 37(6):1874–1890, 2021.
- [11] T.M. Chin, W.C. Karl, and A.S. Willsky. Probabilistic and sequential computation of optical flow using temporal coherence. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 3(6):773–788, 1994.
- [12] Jason Chui, Simon Klenk, and Daniel Cremers. Event-based feature tracking in continuous time with sliding window optimization, 2021.
- [13] Laurent Dardet, Ryad B. Benosman, and Sio-Hoi Ieng. An event-by-event feature detection and tracking invariant to motion direction and velocity. 2021.
- [14] Carl Doersch, Ankush Gupta, Larisa Markeeva, Adrià Recasens, Lucas Smaira, Yusuf Aytar, João Carreira, Andrew Zisserman, and Yi Yang. Tap-vid: A benchmark for tracking any point in a video, 2023.
- [15] Yan Dong and Tao Zhang. Standard and event cameras fusion for feature tracking. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Machine Vision and Applications, ICMVA '21*, page 55–60, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [16] Laura Downs, Anthony Francis, Nate Koenig, Brandon Kinman, Ryan Hickman, Krista Reymann, Thomas B. McHugh, and Vincent Vanhoucke. Google scanned objects: A high-quality dataset of 3d scanned household items, 2022.
- [17] Bertil Ekstrand. Some aspects on filter design for target tracking. *J. Control Sci. Eng.*, 2012, jan 2012.

- [18] P. Elad and A. Feuer. Recursive optical flow estimation-adaptive filtering approach. In *Proceedings of 19th Convention of Electrical and Electronics Engineers in Israel*, pages 387–390, 1996.
- [19] Guillermo Gallego, Jon E.A. Lund, Elias Mueggler, Henri Rebecq, Tobi Delbruck, and Davide Scaramuzza. Event-based, 6-dof camera tracking from photometric depth maps. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 40(10):2402–2412, October 2018.
- [20] Daniel Gehrig, Henri Rebecq, Guillermo Gallego, and Davide Scaramuzza. EKLt: Asynchronous, photometric feature tracking using events and frames. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 2019.
- [21] Mathias Gehrig, Willem Aarents, Daniel Gehrig, and Davide Scaramuzza. Dsec: A stereo event camera dataset for driving scenarios. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2021.
- [22] Mathias Gehrig, Mario Millhäusler, Daniel Gehrig, and Davide Scaramuzza. E-raft: Dense optical flow from event cameras. In *International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, 2021.
- [23] Mathias Gehrig, Manasi Muglikar, and Davide Scaramuzza. Dense continuous-time optical flow from event cameras. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–12, 2024.
- [24] Mathias Gehrig and Davide Scaramuzza. Recurrent vision transformers for object detection with event cameras. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13884–13893, 2023.
- [25] Klaus Greff, Francois Belletti, Lucas Beyer, Carl Doersch, Yilun Du, Daniel Duckworth, David J Fleet, Dan Gnanapragasam, Florian Golemo, Charles Herrmann, Thomas Kipf, Abhijit Kundu, Dmitry Lagun, Issam Laradji, Hsueh-Ti (Derek) Liu, Henning Meyer, Yishu Miao, Derek Nowrouzezahrai, Cengiz Oztireli, Etienne Pot, Noha Radwan, Daniel Rebain, Sara Sabour, Mehdi S. M. Sajjadi, Matan Sela, Vincent Sitzmann, Austin Stone, Deqing Sun, Suhani Vora, Ziyu Wang, Tianhao Wu, Kwang Moo Yi, Fangcheng Zhong, and Andrea Tagliasacchi. Kubric: a scalable dataset generator. 2022.
- [26] Adam W Harley, Zhaoyuan Fang, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. Particle video revisited: Tracking through occlusions using point trajectories. In *ECCV*, 2022.
- [27] Javier Hidalgo-Carrio, Guillermo Gallego, and Davide Scaramuzza. Event-aided direct sparse odometry. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, June 2022.
- [28] Sumin Hu, Yeeun Kim, Hyungtae Lim, Alex Junho Lee, and Hyun Myung. ecdt: Event clustering for simultaneous feature detection and tracking. In *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 3808–3815, 2022.
- [29] R. E. Kalman. A New Approach to Linear Filtering and Prediction Problems. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 82(1):35–45, 03 1960.
- [30] Rudolf E. Kálmán and Richard S. Bucy. New results in linear filtering and prediction theory. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 83:95–108, 1961.
- [31] Nikita Karaev, Ignacio Rocco, Benjamin Graham, Natalia Neverova, Andrea Vedaldi, and Christian Rupprecht. Cotracker: It is better to track together. *arXiv:2307.07635*, 2023.
- [32] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2017.
- [33] Beat Kueng, Elias Mueggler, Guillermo Gallego, and Davide Scaramuzza. Low-latency visual odometry using event-based feature tracks. In *2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 16–23, 2016.
- [34] Songnan Lin, Ye Ma, Zhen-Qiang Guo, and Bihan Wen. Dvs-voltmeter: Stochastic process-based event simulator for dynamic vision sensors. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022.

- [35] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, Lubomir D. Bourdev, Ross B. Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft COCO: common objects in context. *CoRR*, abs/1405.0312, 2014.
- [36] Min Liu and Tobi Delbruck. Edflow: Event driven optical flow camera with keypoint detection and adaptive block matching. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(9):5776–5789, 2022.
- [37] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019.
- [38] N. Mayer, E. Ilg, P. Häusser, P. Fischer, D. Cremers, A. Dosovitskiy, and T. Brox. A large dataset to train convolutional networks for disparity, optical flow, and scene flow estimation. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016. arXiv:1512.02134.
- [39] Nikolaus Mayer, Eddy Ilg, Philipp Fischer, Caner Hazirbas, Daniel Cremers, Alexey Dosovitskiy, and Thomas Brox. What makes good synthetic training data for learning disparity and optical flow estimation? *CoRR*, abs/1801.06397, 2018.
- [40] Nico Messikommer, Carter Fang, Mathias Gehrig, and Davide Scaramuzza. Data-driven feature tracking for event cameras, 2023.
- [41] Elias Mueggler, Henri Rebecq, Guillermo Gallego, Tobi Delbrück, and Davide Scaramuzza. The event-camera dataset and simulator: Event-based data for pose estimation, visual odometry, and SLAM. *CoRR*, abs/1610.08336, 2016.
- [42] Raul Mur-Artal, J. M. M. Montiel, and Juan D. Tardos. Orb-slam: A versatile and accurate monocular slam system. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 31(5):1147–1163, October 2015.
- [43] Raúl Mur-Artal and Juan D. Tardós. ORB-SLAM2: an open-source SLAM system for monocular, stereo and RGB-D cameras. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 33(5):1255–1262, 2017.
- [44] Zhenjiang Ni, Aude Bolepion, Joël Agnus, Ryad Benosman, and Stéphane Regnier. Asynchronous event-based visual shape tracking for stable haptic feedback in microrobotics. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 28(5):1081–1089, 2012.
- [45] Fitsum Reda, Janne Kontkanen, Eric Tabellion, Deqing Sun, Caroline Pantofaru, and Brian Curless. Film: Frame interpolation for large motion. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022.
- [46] Johannes Lutz Schönberger and Jan-Michael Frahm. Structure-from-motion revisited. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016.
- [47] Johannes Lutz Schönberger, Enliang Zheng, Marc Pollefeys, and Jan-Michael Frahm. Pixelwise view selection for unstructured multi-view stereo. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2016.
- [48] Hochang Seok and Jongwoo Lim. Robust feature tracking in dvs event stream using bézier mapping. In *2020 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 1647–1656, 2020.
- [49] Jianbo Shi and Tomasi. Good features to track. In *1994 Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 593–600, 1994.
- [50] Xingjian Shi, Hourong Chen, Hao Wang, Dit-Yan Yeung, Wai-kin Wong, and Wang-chun Woo. Convolutional lstm network: a machine learning approach for precipitation nowcasting. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, NIPS’15, page 802–810, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015. MIT Press.
- [51] Zachary Teed and Jia Deng. RAFT: recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow. *CoRR*, abs/2003.12039, 2020.
- [52] Zachary Teed, Lahav Lipson, and Jia Deng. Deep patch visual odometry, 2023.

- [53] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need, 2023.
- [54] Lin Wang, I.S. Mohammad Mostafavi, Yo-Sung Ho, and Kuk-Jin Yoon. Event-based high dynamic range image and very high frame rate video generation using conditional generative adversarial networks. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10073–10082, 2019.
- [55] Ziwei Wang, Timothy Molloy, Pieter van Goor, and Robert Mahony. Event blob tracking: An asynchronous real-time algorithm, 2023.
- [56] Ziwei Wang, Yonhon Ng, Cedric Scheerlinck, and Robert Mahony. An asynchronous kalman filter for hybrid event cameras. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. IEEE, October 2021.
- [57] Greg Welch. An introduction to the kalman filter. In *International Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques*, 1995.
- [58] Nicolai Wojke and Alex Bewley. Deep cosine metric learning for person re-identification. In *2018 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 748–756. IEEE, 2018.
- [59] Nicolai Wojke, Alex Bewley, and Dietrich Paulus. Simple online and realtime tracking with a deep association metric. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 3645–3649. IEEE, 2017.
- [60] Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier. From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2:67–78, 2014.
- [61] Jiqing Zhang, Yuanchen Wang, Wenxi Liu, Meng Li, Jinpeng Bai, Baocai Yin, and Xin Yang. Frame-event alignment and fusion network for high frame rate tracking. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9781–9790, June 2023.
- [62] Jiqing Zhang, Xin Yang, Yingkai Fu, Xiaopeng Wei, Baocai Yin, and Bo Dong. Object tracking by jointly exploiting frame and event domain, 2021.
- [63] Yifu Zhang, Chunyu Wang, Xinggang Wang, Wenjun Zeng, and Wenyu Liu. Fairmot: On the fairness of detection and re-identification in multiple object tracking. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129:3069–3087, 2021.
- [64] Yang Zheng, Adam W. Harley, Bokui Shen, Gordon Wetzstein, and Leonidas J. Guibas. Pointodyssey: A large-scale synthetic dataset for long-term point tracking. In *ICCV*, 2023.
- [65] Alex Zhu, Liangzhe Yuan, Kenneth Chaney, and Kostas Daniilidis. Ev-flownet: Self-supervised optical flow estimation for event-based cameras. In *Robotics: Science and Systems XIV, RSS2018*. Robotics: Science and Systems Foundation, June 2018.
- [66] Alex Zihao Zhu, Nikolay Atanasov, and Kostas Daniilidis. Event-based feature tracking with probabilistic data association. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 4465–4470, 2017.