

Temporally-aware Human Pose Estimation on 3D videos: A review of the State of the Art

Joris LIMONIER¹[0000–0002–0393–2247], Frédéric
PRECIOSO²[0000–0001–8712–1443], and Lucile
SASSATELLI²[0000–0003–1232–1787]

¹ Université Côte d’Azur, Biot, France joris.limonier@etu.univ-cotedazur.fr
² {frederic.precioso, lucile.sassatelli}@univ-cotedazur.fr

Abstract. The abstract should briefly summarize the contents of the paper in 15–250 words.

Keywords: Computer Vision · Human Pose Estimation · 3D Human Pose Estimation · Human Pose Estimation in Videos

1 Introduction

The Deep Learning revolution, coupled with increasing computing power and the improved use of GPU opened new opportunities in the field of Computer Vision. New architectures arose and new techniques suggested numbers of parameters that hadn’t been seen before, some of them reaching hundreds of millions of parameters [4]: up to 94.9M for Faster R-CNN [5], 127.3M for Cascade R-CNN [6], 51.0M for FCOS [7], 210.1M for CenterNet [8], 135.2M for Cascade Mask R-CNN [6], 138.2M for Hybrid Task Cascade [9] and 63.4M for Mask R-CNN [5]. Such complex networks manage to segment images, detect objects images or identify the pose of a person. Our interest goes to the latter task. The task of Human Pose Estimation (HPE) aims at detecting joints of a human being in a frame. This could be considered a solved problem in the 2D case when the person is clearly visible. Some other cases are more challenging, one of which is when some body parts are hidden (occlusions) in a 2D image. Another challenging case is finding spatial coordinates in a 3D image, this will be our focus throughout this study.

Furthermore, one can consider HPE applied to images but also HPE applied to videos. We want to focus on videos, as well as the interest of considering the temporal dimension rather than a frame-per-frame joints detection. Doing so brings its set of challenges and its complexity to the problem, which makes it even more interesting.

We want to study the current state of the art for 3D HPE on videos while considering the temporal dimension. In order to do so, we will list and examine related work, then we will gather existing datasets and metrics while analysing their strengths and weaknesses. Subsequently, we will evaluate and compare existing methods on common datasets. Finally, we will give our conclusions and propose study pathways for the future of this study.

2 Related Work

HPE encompasses several subtasks, not all of which we are interested in. In this section, we describe the tasks we want to tackle, then we describe existing approaches.

2.1 Task Description

As mentioned in section 1, HPE can be applied in 2D (planar coordinates), as well as in 3D (spatial coordinates), our focus is on the 3D case. This means that we want to predict the 3D location of body joints. Several industries find applications of these techniques, namely the movie & animation industry and the sport industry, only to name a few.

When talking about images that have been taken from one viewpoint only, we talk about *monocular* images. Such images result in a projection from the 3D space we live in to the 2D space that is the image. As such, each point in the image is the projection of one of an infinite number of points (namely, the whole straight line starting at the camera and going infinitely in the direction of the projected point). For this reason, the 3D HPE monocular problem is ill-posed. Although ill-posed, inferences could be made in the the 3D HPE monocular problem thanks to the temporal awareness. This is why we want to work with videos and take advantage of the consecutiveness of their frames. We want the algorithm to understand that the frames are in a sequence, not simply making a frame-per-frame prediction. Predicting one frame at a time is the simplest approach, but completely disregards the advantage given by a video over an equivalent number of independent frames.

2.2 Approaches

Several methods can be used to solve the 3D video HPE problem, we will detail them in this section. Some of the solutions are presented for completeness, but they focus on a per-frame basis, which is not what we will want to study eventually.

We will focus on 3D HPE from RGB images as this is the simplest, most common case. In this setting, one uses a conventional camera to capture videos. One can use one or multiple cameras to capture images. We will start with the one-camera case. As mentioned previously, this is an ill-posed problem as the captured 2D images come from a projection of the 3D space onto a 2D screen. Reverting the operation seems impossible in the general, mathematically-posed problem but using some commonsensical tricks could help achieve better results in some cases. For instance, the length of a human arm lies within a fixed-radius 3D ball for all human beings, which a smart algorithm could use to infer a set of plausible positions to lift such an arm from 2D to 3D. We will start with single-view, single person 3D HPE, then study single-view, multi-person 3D HPE, then finally multi-view 3D HPE.

Single view, single person 3D HPE. In this setting, we distinguish three types of tasks: skeleton-only, the kinematic model and Human Mesh Recovery (HMR). We will detail each of these techniques in their own paragraph.

The Skeleton-only method aims at predicting the spatial (*i.e.* 3D) coordinates of the joints of a person. Estimating a 3D skeleton can be done in two ways. The first way is called direct estimation. It consists of training a neural network to predict the 3D joints directly from the image. The other way is to use an existing 2D joint predictor, which are very performant as we mentioned before, then try to lift the joints from 2D to 3D with a custom neural network.

The kinematic model is another task which consists in estimating the segments between joints. This task allows to pass custom rules to the network and leverage prior knowledge such as restricting joint rotation angles or fixing bone-length ratios.

HMR is the final task in this list. It aims at superimposing a 3D, volumetric body model correctly in space. The body is seen as a unique, connected (in the topological sense) structure where the limbs are able to evolve within their respective ranges of motion.

Single-view, multi-person 3D HPE. In this setting, there are two main approaches. These are the top-down approaches and the bottom-up ones. We will start by detailing each of those, then we will compare them.

The top-down approaches start by detecting each individual person in the frame, then they find a so-called “root” for each person, which represents a center joint, almost like a center of mass. Subsequently, these approaches use the root of each person in order to infer their respective 3D poses and position the joints in space.

The bottom-up approaches, contrary to the top-down approaches, first find two things. On the one hand, they identify all body joints in the image. On the other hand, they produce depth maps, which are used to group joints and roots into a person’s joints and therefore deduce the pose.

Comparison of top-down and bottom-up approaches. Top-down approaches tend to outperform bottom-up ones, at a cost of super-linear time complexity. Indeed, they manage to leverage top-performing person detection methods, but the computational complexity (and therefore the inference time) may increase drastically with respect to the number of people in the scene. Increased time and computation is further enhanced when compared to the computation and time complexity of bottom-up approaches which is linear with respect to the number of people. This can be explained by the fact that top-down approaches need to optimize joint detection on each and every individual in the scene after finding their roots. This leads to multiple optimization processes going on, and therefore results in potentially important computational complexity and inference times. Moreover, since the top-down approaches set bounding boxes around the identified people in the image, they discard everything that is outside these bounding boxes and as a result they may lose contextual information. In conclusion, bottom-up approaches tend to be not as good as top-down approaches, but

they may be faster and less computationally intense, especially as the number of people in the scene increases.

Multi-view 3D HPE. We previously mentioned that occlusions were challenging for 3D HPE. While this is true for single view HPE, it is not for the multi-view setting. Indeed in this case, an occlusion in a given view may not occur in another view. The complexity however lies in getting multi-view data and locating cameras with respect to one another. The multi-view setting is mostly used for multi-person cases [1], which is why we do not precise whether we work with single-person or multi-person images.

Although 3D methods are more likely to solve occlusions' challenges, reconstructing the 3D relative location of cameras is computationally expensive, especially for multi-person 3D HPE. To suppress this constraint, it may be worth noting that some effort has been made to remove the need for 3D reconstruction before performing 3D HPE [10], in particular through the use of transformers.

3 Datasets and Metrics

3.1 Datasets

3.2 Metrics

4 Evaluation and Comparison

5 Conclusion and Perspectives

5.1 Conclusion

5.2 Perspectives

References

1. C. Zheng et al., "Deep Learning-Based Human Pose Estimation: A Survey," arXiv:2012.13392 [cs], Jan. 2021, Accessed: Jan. 12, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.13392>
2. H.-Y. Wu, L. Nguyen, Y. Tabei, and L. Sassatelli, "Evaluation of deep pose detectors for automatic analysis of film style," in EUROGRAPHICS Workshop on Intelligent Cinematography and Editing, Reims, France, 2022, p. 9.
3. W. Li, H. Liu, H. Tang, P. Wang, and L. V. Gool, "MHFormer: Multi-Hypothesis Transformer for 3D Human Pose Estimation," in 2022 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), Montreal, QC, Canada, Jun. 2022.
4. Wang J, Sun K, Cheng T, Jiang B, Deng C, Zhao Y, Liu D, Mu Y, Tan M, Wang X, Liu W. Deep high-resolution representation learning for visual recognition. IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence. 2020 Apr 1;43(10):3349-64.
5. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S. and Sun, J., 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (pp. 770-778).

6. Cai, Z. and Vasconcelos, N., 2019. Cascade R-CNN: high quality object detection and instance segmentation. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 43(5), pp.1483-1498.
7. Tian, Z., Shen, C., Chen, H. and He, T., 2019. Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision* (pp. 9627-9636).
8. Duan, K., Bai, S., Xie, L., Qi, H., Huang, Q. and Tian, Q., 2019. Centernet: Key-point triplets for object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision* (pp. 6569-6578).
9. Chen, K., Pang, J., Wang, J., Xiong, Y., Li, X., Sun, S., Feng, W., Liu, Z., Shi, J., Ouyang, W. and Loy, C.C., 2019. Hybrid task cascade for instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (pp. 4974-4983).
10. Zhang, J., Cai, Y., Yan, S. and Feng, J., 2021. Direct multi-view multi-person 3d pose estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, pp.13153-13164.