

# AAA: Adaptive Aggregation of Arbitrary Online Trackers with a Regret Bound

九州大学 システム情報科学府

修士2年 ソン ホン

15:20 ~ 15:50

July 14, 2020



KYUSHU  
UNIVERSITY



# Index

## 1. Single object tracking (SOT)

1. Introduction
2. Tracking with multiple online tracker
3. Experiments & results

## 2. Multiple object tracking (MOT)

1. Introduction
2. Tracking with multiple online tracker for MOT
3. Experiments & results

Download the presentation file here!




Single object tracking (SOT)

# INTRODUCTION



# What is online Single Object Tracking (SOT)?

- Given a target location at the first frame,  
we should track the target and predict the location.





# What makes online SOT difficult?

- Depending on videos, we may have to track completely different objects.
- There might be a heavy appearance change of the target or occlusion even in a video.





# What makes online SOT difficult?

No almighty online tracker





# Use multiple online trackers for robust tracking



I track  
animals  
well



I track  
plastics  
well



I track  
occluded  
object  
well


We call them  
“experts”








# Use multiple online trackers for robust tracking

For example...




Simply average  
experts' estimation  
every frame





# Problems with using experts

- Most algorithms using experts require a lot of restrictions to use online trackers as experts.





# In our work

- The proposed method can aggregate arbitrary trackers.
- Moreover, The performance of the proposed method is theoretically guaranteed.





Single object tracking (SOT)


# **TRACKING WITH MULTIPLE ONLINE TRACKER**



# Aggregate multiple online trackers based on expert aggregation technique<sup>[1]</sup>



The size of arrow  
= Reliability




Frame 2


[1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.



# Aggregate multiple online trackers based on expert aggregation technique<sup>[1]</sup>



Frame 2




[1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.



# Aggregate multiple online trackers based on expert aggregation technique<sup>[1]</sup>



Select one  
based on  
reliabilities



Frame 3



[1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.



# Aggregate multiple online trackers based on expert aggregation technique<sup>[1]</sup>



Select one  
based on  
reliabilities




Frame 4



[1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.



# Aggregate multiple online trackers based on expert aggregation technique<sup>[1]</sup>



[1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.



# Aggregate multiple online trackers based on expert aggregation technique<sup>[1]</sup>



Frame 5



Repeat this  
until the  
video ends





[1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.



# How can we get feedback?



Where  
is she?



Frame 1 → Frame 2 → Frame 3 →



# How can we get feedback?



Here  
she is!

Anchor frame =


When the target location can be predicted with high confidence



Frame 1 → Frame 2 → Frame 3 → Frame 4



# How can we get feedback?



Anchor  
frame


Frame 1 → Frame 2 → Frame 3 → Frame 4

Give offline  
tracking results  
as feedback

Anchor  
frame




# How can we get feedback?





# Overview of the proposed method





# Why should we use online prediction?



Total error  $L_1^T$



Total error  $L_2^T$



Total error  $L_3^T$



Total error  $L_{Ours}^T$

minimum

Defined only  
at the end of  
the video

$L_2^T (= L_{best}^T)$

Difference  
=Regret  
 $= L_{Ours}^T - L_{best}^T$

$L_{Ours}^T$



# Why should we use online prediction?

- Surprisingly, the regret of the proposed method is bounded without any assumption.
- We do not need to know who will be the best expert, which data will be given, and how long the video is.

The length of the video

$$\text{Regret} = \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{Ours}}^T - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{best}}^T \leq O(\sqrt{T \ln N})$$

The number of the experts



Single object tracking (SOT)

# **EXPERIMENTS & RESULTS**



# Experts and Benchmarks

- I would like to demonstrate that the proposed method is robust for arbitrary videos and experts.
- For arbitrary video, I evaluated the proposed method on six different benchmarks.
- For arbitrary experts, I prepared twelve experts and divide into 2 groups according to their performance.



# Comparision with High group

- High group included six high-performance experts.
- Ours outperformed the experts on almost benchmarks.

	OTB2015 [14]		TCo128 [15]		UAC123 [16]		NFS [17]		LaSOT [18]		VOT2018 [19]
	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AO
Experts	ATOM [2]	0.67	0.87	0.6	0.81	0.62	0.82	0.58	0.69	0.51	0.51
	DaSiamRPN [3]	0.65	0.88	0.53	0.75	0.57	0.78	0.55	0.67	0.43	0.42
	SiamMCF [4]	0.65	0.85	0.57	0.78	0.54	0.77	0.57	0.7	0.44	0.45
	SiamRPN++ [5]	0.69	0.9	0.58	0.77	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.74	0.49	0.51
	SPM [6]	0.67	0.87	0.58	0.79	0.59	0.77	0.57	0.67	0.47	0.48
	THOR [7]	0.64	0.85	0.52	0.72	0.57	0.77	0.57	0.68	0.4	0.41
	Ours	0.7	0.91	0.62	0.84	0.62	0.83	0.61	0.75	0.53	0.55

Experts


2nd

1st



# Comparision with High group


- No tracker was always the best, and the best expert drastically changed over the videos.





# Comparision with High group


- Ours achieved the second or third best performance for most videos.





# Tracking example in SOT

- Ours(AAA) can follow the best expert by adaptively aggregating the trackers.





# Comparision with Low group

- Low group included six low-performance experts.
  - Ours achieved at least the second best performance for all benchmarks.

	OTB2015 [14]		TCo128 [15]		UAC123 [16]		NFS [17]		LaSOT [18]		VOT2018 [19]
	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AO
GradNet [8]	0.63	0.85	0.56	0.76	0.51	0.74	0.51	0.64	0.36	0.38	0.4
MemTrack [9]	0.63	0.82	0.54	0.74	0.49	0.7	0.5	0.61	0.34	0.35	0.39
SiamDW [10]	0.67	0.91	0.53	0.75	0.46	0.69	0.5	0.63	0.35	0.34	0.37
SiamFC [11]	0.59	0.78	0.52	0.7	0.51	0.74	0.51	0.6	0.35	0.36	0.33
SiamRPN [12]	0.63	0.83	0.52	0.71	0.58	0.77	0.56	0.66	0.45	0.45	0.48
Staple [13]	0.6	0.79	0.51	0.68	0.45	0.64	0.41	0.48	0.24	0.23	0.3
<b>Ours</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.45</b>




Multiple object tracking (MOT)

# INTRODUCTION



# What is online Multiple Object Tracking (MOT)?


- We should track every pedestrian in a video from the first frame.
- It is necessary to predict not only the location of each pedestrian, but also the unique number of the pedestrian (i.e., ID).





# What is the difference from SOT?

- The initial location of pedestrians is not given. Instead, **human detection results** using some human detectors are given.
- Some pedestrians enter or leave the scene.



Orange: ground truth, purple: human detection results



# Can the same approach as SOT be used?

- The definition of the anchor frame should be changed because it is difficult to predict the location of “all pedestrians” with high confidence.



Can I be sure that  
I know everyone's  
location?





# Can the same approach as SOT be used?

- Since the output of experts is the location and ID, the ID must be matched with each other when the selected tracker changes.



Frame  $t - 1$   
Tracker 1 is selected



Frame  $t$   
Tracker 2 is selected



Multiple object tracking (MOT)

# **TRACKING WITH MULTIPLE ONLINE TRACKER**




# For the first step step to expansion for MOT

- I assume that every 70 frames are anchor frames.
- Furthermore, it is assumed that a bounding box at a position similar to a bounding box in the previous frame is an object of the same ID.



Frame 1 ... Frame 71 ... Frame 141



Frame  $t - 1$  and  $t$



Multiple object tracking (MOT)

# **EXPERIMENTS & RESULTS**



# What I try to reduce

- The main evaluation criterion is MOTA, which consists of FP, FN, and IDs.
- Since FN is very large in most data, FN is evaluated as the loss of expert.

Sequence	MOTA	IDF1	MOTP	MT	ML	FP	FN	Recall	Precision	FAF	ID Sw.	Frag
MOT17-01-DPM	41.1	47.9	76.8	7	9	529	3,245	49.7	85.8	1.2	24	43
MOT17-01-FRCNN	40.8	49.2	76.7	8	9	625	3,166	50.9	84.0	1.4	27	47
MOT17-01-SDP	41.5	47.8	76.3	9	8	668	3,075	52.3	83.5	1.5	31	55
MOT17-03-DPM	79.3	69.0	78.6	92	11	1,193	20,320	80.6	98.6	0.8	178	471
MOT17-03-FRCNN	79.9	69.6	78.6	90	9	1,278	19,555	81.3	98.5	0.9	179	465
MOT17-03-SDP	80.4	69.8	78.5	92	10	1,351	18,959	81.9	98.4	0.9	181	473
MOT17-06-DPM	53.0	40.8	77.4	58	72	632	4,811	59.2	91.7	0.5	97	203



# Comparision with state-of-the-art trackers

- In a simple experiment, Ours achieved the performance similar to the best tracker.
- There were a lot of cases where IDs were wrongly predicted.

	MOT17[25]			
	FP ↓	FN ↓	IDs ↓	MOTA ↑
DAN[20]	13346	161362	4183	46.9%
DeepSort[21]	11784	161372	1451	48.2%
DeepT[22]	18974	170195	4381	42.5%
MOTDT[23]	8194	155780	1441	50.9%
Sort[24]	15465	167937	2681	44.8%
<b>Ours</b>	<b>10300</b>	<b>149601</b>	<b>8638</b>	<b>50.0%</b>

Experts


1st

2nd



# Comparision with state-of-the-art trackers

- Similar to the SOT tasks, no tracker was the best.
- Ours achieved at least third lowest FN for all videos.
- Good performance was also obtained for MOTA.





## Future work

- I try to define anchor frames that allows the proposed method to achieve good performance for MOT.
- In order to reduce the case of incorrectly predicting ID, person re-identification will be applied.
- I will conduct experiments with the large variations of benchmark and expert in the MOT tasks to demonstrate that the proposed method can achieve state-of-the-art with arbitrary trackers.



# Reference

- [1] Quanrud, Kent and Daniel Khashabi, "Online Learning with Adversarial Delays," in Proc. NIPS, 2014.
- [2] Danelljan, Martin, et al, "Atom: Accurate tracking by overlap maximization," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.
- [3] Zhu, Zheng, et al. "Distractor-aware siamese networks for visual object tracking," in Proc. ECCV, 2018.
- [4] Morimitsu, Henrique, "Multiple context features in Siamese networks for visual object tracking," in Proc. ECCV, 2018.
- [5] Li, Bo, et al, "Siamrpn++: Evolution of siamese visual tracking with very deep networks," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.
- [6] Wang, Guangting, et al, "Spm-tracker: Series-parallel matching for real-time visual object tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.
- [7] Sauer, Axel, Elie Aljalbout, and Sami Haddadin, "Tracking holistic object representations," in Proc. BMVC, 2019.
- [8] Li, Peixia, et al, "Gradnet: Gradient-guided network for visual object tracking," in Proc. ICCV, 2019.
- [9] Yang, Tianyu, and Antoni B. Chan, "Learning dynamic memory networks for object tracking," in Proc. ECCV, 2018.
- [10] Zhang, Zhipeng, and Houwen Peng, "Deeper and wider siamese networks for real-time visual tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.
- [11] Bertinetto, Luca, et al, "Fully-convolutional siamese networks for object tracking." in Proc. ECCV, 2016.



# Reference

- [12] Li, Bo, et al, "High performance visual tracking with siamese region proposal network," in Proc. CVPR, 2018.
- [13] Bertinetto, Luca, et al, "Staple: Complementary learners for real-time tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2016.
- [14] Wu, Yi, Jongwoo Lim, and Ming-Hsuan Yang, "Online object tracking: A benchmark," in Proc. CVPR, 2013.
- [15] Liang, Pengpeng, Erik Blasch, and Haibin Ling, "Encoding color information for visual tracking: Algorithms and benchmark," TIP 24.12 (2015): 5630-5644.
- [16] Mueller, Matthias, Neil Smith, and Bernard Ghanem, "A benchmark and simulator for uav tracking," in Proc. ECCV, 2016.
- [17] Kiani Galoogahi, Hamed, et al, "Need for speed: A benchmark for higher frame rate object tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2017.
- [18] Fan, Heng, et al, "Lasot: A high-quality benchmark for large-scale single object tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.
- [19] Kristan, Matej, et al, "A novel performance evaluation methodology for single-target trackers," TPAMI, 38.11 (2016): 2137-2155.
- [20] Sun, ShiJie, et al, "Deep affinity network for multiple object tracking," TPAMI, (2019).
- [21] Wojke, Nicolai, and Alex Bewley, "Deep cosine metric learning for person re-identification," in Proc. WACV, 2018.
- [22] Yoon, Young-chul, et al, "Online multi-object tracking with historical appearance matching and scene adaptive detection filtering," in Proc. AVSS, 2018.



# Reference

- [23] Chen, Long, et al, "Real-Time Multiple People Tracking with Deeply Learned Candidate Selection and Person Re-Identification," in Proc. ICME, 2018.
- [24] Bewley, Alex, et al, "Simple online and realtime tracking," in Proc. ICIP, 2016.
- [25] Milan, Anton, et al, "MOT16: A benchmark for multi-object tracking," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.00831* (2016).
- [26] Zhang, Li, Yuan Li, and Ramakant Nevatia, "Global data association for multi-object tracking using network flows," in Proc. CVPR, 2008
- [27] Brasó, Guillem, and Laura Leal-Taixé, "Learning a neural solver for multiple object tracking." in Proc. CVPR, 2020.
- [28] He, Kaiming, et al, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in Proc. CVPR, 2016.
- [29] Bernardin, Keni, and Rainer Stiefelhagen, "Evaluating multiple object tracking performance: the CLEAR MOT metrics," *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing* 2008 (2008): 1-10.
- [30] Wang, Ning, et al, "Multi-cue correlation filters for robust visual tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2018.




# APPENDIX



# How to track the target offline in SOT

- Create a graph with each tracker's estimation as a node as below and find minimum-cost flow<sup>[26]</sup>.



[26] Zhang, Li, Yuan Li, and Ramakant Nevatia, "Global data association for multi-object tracking using network flows," in Proc. CVPR, 2008



# How to track the target offline in MOT

- Fortunately, various offline tracking methods have been proposed for MOT.
- In this work, we used state-of-the-art offline multiple object tracker, named MPN tracker<sup>[27]</sup>.



# How to detect anchor frame in SOT

- Extract a target feature vector from the target image which is cropped at the first frame by ResNet<sup>[28]</sup>.
- In the same way, feature vectors are extracted from bounding boxes predicted by trackers every frame.
- If the cosine similarity between the target feature vector and each extracted feature vector by trackers is greater than a threshold, the frame is considered to be an anchor frame.



# How to calculate the loss of experts in SOT

The offline tracker gives the bounding box of the target object  $y^{u+1}, \dots, y^t$  between the previous anchor frame  $u + 1$  to current anchor frame  $t$ . Using the offline tracking results, the loss of tracker  $i$  is calculated using the following equation:

$$L_i = \sum_{\tau=u+1}^t 1 - \text{GIoU}(f_i^\tau, y^\tau),$$

where  $f_i^\tau$  is the  $i$ -th tracker's estimation of the target location at frame  $\tau$ .



# How to calculate the loss of experts in MOT

The offline tracker gives the bounding box of the target object  $y^{u+1}, \dots, y^t$  between the previous anchor frame  $u + 1$  to current anchor frame  $t$ . Based on the offline tracking results, the loss of tracker  $i$  is calculated using the following equation:

$$L_i = \sum_{\tau=u+1}^t \text{false negative of expert } i \text{ at frame } \tau,$$

where the false negative of the expert is calculated by CLEAR-MOT<sup>[29]</sup>.

[29] Bernardin, Keni, and Rainer Stiefelhagen, "Evaluating multiple object tracking performance: the CLEAR MOT metrics," *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing* 2008 (2008): 1-10.



# Why we use the FN as the loss of tracker

- MOTA can be calculated as follows:

$$MOTA = 1 - \frac{\sum_t FP + FN + IDs}{\sum_t GT}$$

- However, for the MOT benchmark, the FN of all experts is far greater than the FP and IDs.
- In addition, we have to make sure that experts with small cumulative losses have a high MOTA.
- Therefore, we used the cumulative sum of the expert's FNs as the expert's loss.



# How to update the reliability

Based on the loss, the reliability of tracker  $i$  is updated according to following equation:


$$w_i^{t+1} = \frac{w_i^t \exp(-\eta L_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_j^t \exp(-\eta L_j)},$$

where  $\eta$  is a learning rate and  $N$  is the number of aggregated trackers.



# How to select one estimation

- For selecting one of experts' estimation, we use roulette wheel selection, known as fitness proportionate selection, according to their weight.
- Each tracker's weight represents the probability that the tracker's estimation will be selected.





# Comparision with High group

- I compared the proposed method with other aggregation-based trackers.
- In other trackers, performance was lower than most experts.

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AO
ATOM	0.67	0.87	0.60	0.81	0.62	0.82	0.58	0.69	0.51	0.51	0.52
DaSiamRPN	0.65	0.88	0.53	0.75	0.57	0.78	0.55	0.67	0.43	0.42	0.43
SiamMCF	0.65	0.85	0.57	0.78	0.54	0.77	0.57	0.70	0.44	0.45	0.45
SiamRPN++	0.69	0.90	0.58	0.77	0.60	0.80	0.60	0.74	0.49	0.51	0.50
SPM	0.67	0.87	0.58	0.79	0.59	0.77	0.57	0.67	0.47	0.48	0.48
THOR	0.64	0.85	0.52	0.72	0.57	0.77	0.57	0.68	0.40	0.41	0.47
MCCT <sup>[30]</sup>	0.64	0.83	0.53	0.72	0.58	0.76	0.57	0.69	0.42	0.44	0.40
Random	0.66	0.87	0.56	0.77	0.58	0.79	0.57	0.69	0.46	0.46	0.48
Max	0.68	0.89	0.56	0.77	0.58	0.78	0.61	0.74	0.46	0.46	0.46
AAA	0.70	0.91	0.62	0.84	0.62	0.83	0.61	0.75	0.53	0.55	0.52



# Comparision with Low group

- Even when we aggregate experts in Low group, no other trackers can outperform the experts.

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AO								
GradNet	0.63	0.85	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.76</b>	0.51	0.74	0.51	0.64	0.36	0.38	0.40
MemTrack	0.63	0.82	0.54	0.74	0.49	0.70	0.50	0.61	0.34	0.35	0.39
SiamDW	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.91</b>	0.53	0.75	0.46	0.69	0.50	0.63	0.35	0.34	0.37
SiamFC	0.59	0.78	0.52	0.70	0.51	0.74	0.51	0.60	0.35	0.36	0.33
SiamRPN	0.63	0.83	0.52	0.71	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.48</b>
Staple	0.60	0.79	0.51	0.68	0.45	0.64	0.41	0.48	0.24	0.23	0.30
MCCT <sup>[30]</sup>	0.59	0.79	0.49	0.66	0.50	0.70	0.51	0.63	0.32	0.34	0.32
Random	0.62	0.83	0.53	0.72	0.50	0.71	0.50	0.60	0.35	0.35	0.38
Max	0.63	0.83	0.52	0.71	0.51	0.73	0.53	0.64	0.35	0.35	0.38
AAA	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.45</b>



# Comparision with Mix group

- Mix group included three high-performance experts and three low-performance experts.

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AO
ATOM	0.67	0.87	0.60	0.81	0.62	0.82	0.58	0.69	0.51	0.51	0.52
SiamRPN++	0.69	0.90	0.58	0.77	0.60	0.80	0.60	0.74	0.49	0.51	0.50
SPM	0.67	0.87	0.58	0.79	0.59	0.77	0.57	0.67	0.47	0.48	0.48
MemTrack	0.63	0.82	0.54	0.74	0.49	0.70	0.50	0.61	0.34	0.35	0.39
SiamFC	0.59	0.78	0.52	0.70	0.51	0.74	0.51	0.60	0.35	0.36	0.33
Staple	0.60	0.79	0.51	0.68	0.45	0.64	0.41	0.48	0.24	0.23	0.30
MCCT[30]	0.60	0.78	0.50	0.66	0.53	0.71	0.53	0.65	0.36	0.38	0.33
Random	0.64	0.84	0.55	0.75	0.54	0.74	0.53	0.63	0.40	0.41	0.42
Max	0.65	0.84	0.56	0.76	0.55	0.76	0.57	0.68	0.40	0.42	0.43
AAA	0.68	0.89	0.62	0.83	0.60	0.81	0.59	0.71	0.51	0.53	0.49



# Offline tracking results with Mix group

- In some cases, the performance of an offline tracker was worse than that of an expert.

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AUC	DP	AO
ATOM	0.69	0.89	0.61	0.81	0.66	0.87	0.61	0.73	0.55	0.55	0.54
SiamRPN++	0.70	0.92	0.58	0.78	0.64	0.84	0.64	0.78	0.52	0.54	0.52
SPM	0.67	0.88	0.58	0.80	0.63	0.82	0.60	0.70	0.51	0.52	0.51
MemTrack	0.64	0.84	0.55	0.75	0.54	0.75	0.54	0.66	0.38	0.40	0.42
SiamFC	0.60	0.79	0.53	0.72	0.55	0.78	0.56	0.66	0.39	0.40	0.37
Staple	0.62	0.81	0.52	0.69	0.50	0.70	0.47	0.56	0.28	0.28	0.35
AAA	0.69	0.90	0.63	0.84	0.65	0.87	0.64	0.77	0.55	0.58	0.51



# Average regret with Mix group

- However, the regret of the proposed method was still smaller than that of any expert, and it can be seen that the regret was minimized.

Tracker	OTB2015	TColor128	UAV123	NFS	LaSOT	VOT2018
ATOM	32.36	<i>24.73</i>	<i>65.72</i>	479.28	281.13	<i>41.65</i>
SiamRPN++	<i>27.21</i>	42.01	84.93	<i>279.48</i>	<i>220.56</i>	42.34
SPM	30.20	31.36	72.44	440.12	266.94	47.40
MemTrack	45.66	47.10	123.54	488.33	414.40	53.20
SiamFC	63.63	58.49	109.16	463.40	440.14	76.74
Staple	66.24	64.67	147.94	855.97	753.89	94.19
AAA	<b>-31.25</b>	<b>-23.75</b>	<b>-31.27</b>	<b>-229.27</b>	<b>-98.45</b>	<b>-16.80</b>



# Comparision with SiamDW<sup>[10]</sup>

- we implemented experts using several parameter sets (e.g., backbone networks, the weight of the network, and hyper-parameters) in SiamDW<sup>[10]</sup>

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AO								
SiamDW_SiamFCRes22	0.64	0.84	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.79</b>	0.51	0.73	0.52	0.64	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.39</b>	0.38
SiamDW_SiamFCIncep22	0.61	0.81	0.55	0.76	0.50	0.72	0.51	0.64	0.36	0.38	0.35
SiamDW_SiamFCNext22	0.62	0.82	0.57	0.76	0.49	0.71	0.51	0.63	0.37	0.38	0.32
SiamDW_SiamRPNRes22	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.91</b>	0.53	0.75	0.46	0.69	0.50	0.63	0.35	0.34	0.37
SiamDW_SiamFCRes22_VOT	0.63	0.84	0.56	0.77	0.51	0.73	0.52	0.65	0.36	0.37	0.37
SiamDW_SiamFCIncep22_VOT	0.60	0.80	0.54	0.75	0.50	0.73	0.49	0.61	0.35	0.36	0.35
SiamDW_SiamFCNext22_VOT	0.61	0.81	0.54	0.74	0.49	0.72	0.51	0.63	0.35	0.38	0.34
SiamDW_SiamRPNRes22_VOT	0.66	<b>0.90</b>	0.53	0.74	0.46	0.69	0.51	<b>0.66</b>	0.35	0.35	<b>0.43</b>
MCCT <sup>[30]</sup>	0.63	0.83	0.54	0.74	0.50	0.71	0.51	0.65	0.34	0.36	0.34
Random	0.63	0.84	0.55	0.76	0.49	0.71	0.51	0.64	0.36	0.37	0.37
Max	0.64	0.86	0.55	0.76	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.53</b>	0.66	0.36	0.36	0.37
AAA	<b>0.66</b>	0.88	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.42</b>

[10] Zhang, Zhipeng, and Houwen Peng, "Deeper and wider siamese networks for real-time visual tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.

[30] Wang, Ning, et al, "Multi-cue correlation filters for robust visual tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2018.



# Comparision with SiamRPN++<sup>[5]</sup>

- we implemented experts using several parameter sets (e.g., backbone networks, the weight of the network, and hyper-parameters) in SiamRPN++<sup>[5]</sup>

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AO								
SiamRPN++_AlexNet	0.66	0.87	0.57	0.77	0.58	0.77	0.54	0.65	0.45	0.45	0.47
SiamRPN++_AlexNet_OTB	0.66	0.86	0.55	0.75	0.58	0.78	0.54	0.66	0.43	0.43	0.45
SiamRPN++_ResNet-50	0.65	0.86	0.56	0.75	0.61	0.80	0.58	0.71	0.50	0.51	0.51
SiamRPN++_ResNet-50_OTB	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.58</b>	0.77	0.60	0.80	0.60	<b>0.74</b>	0.49	0.51	0.50
SiamRPN++_ResNet-50_LT	0.63	0.84	0.58	<b>0.79</b>	0.61	<b>0.81</b>	0.56	0.68	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.51</b>
SiamRPN++_MobileNetV2	0.65	0.86	0.56	0.76	0.60	0.79	0.57	0.70	0.45	0.46	0.50
SiamRPN++_SiamMask	0.65	0.85	0.54	0.73	0.60	0.80	0.58	0.72	0.47	0.48	0.48
<hr/>											
MCCT [30]	0.64	0.84	0.55	0.75	<b>0.61</b>	0.81	0.59	0.72	0.48	0.50	0.45
Random	0.66	0.86	0.56	0.76	0.60	0.79	0.57	0.69	0.47	0.48	0.49
Max	0.66	0.87	0.56	0.76	0.60	0.80	<b>0.60</b>	0.73	0.47	0.48	0.50
AAA	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.52</b>

[5] Li, Bo, et al, "Siamrpn++: Evolution of siamese visual tracking with very deep networks," in Proc. CVPR, 2019.

[30] Wang, Ning, et al, "Multi-cue correlation filters for robust visual tracking," in Proc. CVPR, 2018.



# Accuracy in anchor frames

- We also evaluate whether the proposed method can actually detect the target location with high confidence in anchor frames

Tracker	OTB2015		TColor128		UAV123		NFS		LaSOT		VOT2018
	AUC	DP	AO								
ATOM	0.72	0.93	<b>0.66</b>	0.88	<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.91</b>	0.66	0.80	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.61</b>
DaSiamRPN	0.70	0.92	0.61	0.84	0.68	0.88	0.64	0.79	0.59	0.62	0.57
SiamMCF	0.71	0.91	0.66	0.88	0.66	0.88	0.67	0.83	0.60	0.64	0.57
SiamRPN++	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.94</b>	0.64	0.85	0.70	0.89	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.84</b>	0.64	0.69	0.60
SPM	0.72	0.92	0.65	<b>0.89</b>	0.69	0.87	0.65	0.78	0.63	0.67	0.60
THOR	0.68	0.90	0.59	0.79	0.67	0.87	0.64	0.79	0.55	0.58	0.59
AAA	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.64</b>



# Tracking example in MOT

