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Abstract. Supervised approaches to 3D pose estimation from single images are remarkably effective when labeled data is abundant. Therefore, much of the recent attention has shifted towards semi and (or) weakly supervised learning. Generating an effective form of supervision with little annotations still poses major challenges in crowded scenes. However, since it is easy to observe a scene from multiple cameras, we propose to impose multi-view geometrical constraints by means of a differentiable triangulation and to use it as form of self-supervision during training when no labels are available. We therefore train a 2D pose estimator in such a way that its predictions correspond to the re-projection of the triangulated 3D one and train an auxiliary network on them to produce the final 3D poses. We complement the triangulation with a weighting mechanism that nullify the impact of noisy predictions caused by self-occlusion or occlusion from other subjects. Our experimental results on Human3.6M and MPI-INF-3DHP substantiate the significance of our weighting strategy where we obtain state-of-the-art results in the semi and weakly supervised learning setup. We also contribute a new multi-player sports dataset that features occlusion, and show the effectiveness of our algorithm over baseline triangulation methods.

1 Introduction

Supervised approaches in capturing human 3D pose are now remarkably effective, provided that enough annotated training data is available [23, 24, 34, 37, 44, 45, 52, 53]. However, there are many scenarios that involve unusual activities for which not enough annotated data can be obtained. Semi-supervised or unsupervised methods are then required [4, 5, 16, 25, 36, 47]. A promising subset of those rely on constraints imposed by multi-view geometry: If a scene is observed by several cameras, there is a single a priori unknown 3D pose whose projection is correct in all views [18, 30, 40]. This is used to provide a supervisory signal with limited need for manual annotations. There are many venues, such as a sports arena, that are outfitted with multiple cameras, which can easily be used for this purpose.

These semi-supervised approaches, however, are sensitive to occlusions or noisy predictions, which are prevalent in crowded scenes. In this paper, we propose an approach that can handle them effectively. To this end, we start from the observation that

*equal contribution
there are now many off-the-shelf pre-trained 2D pose estimation models that do not necessarily perform well in new environments but can be fine-tuned to do so. Our approach therefore starts with one of these that we run on all images taken at the same time and whose results can be triangulated. The model is then trained so that the prediction in all views correspond to the re-projection of the pseudo 3D pose target. In particular, we give the 2D prediction of each view a weight, that is derived from the level of agreement of that view with respect to all other views. In doing so, we apply a principled triangulation weighting mechanism to obtain pseudo 3D targets that can discard erroneous views, hence helping the model bootstrap in semi and weakly supervised setups. Our approach can be used in any multi-view context, without restriction on camera placement. At inference time, our retrained network can be used on single-view images and have their output lifted to 3D by an auxiliary network.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach on the traditional Human3.6M [12] and MPI-INF-3DHP [28] datasets. To highlight its ability to handle more crowded scenes, we acquired a multi-view dataset featuring an amateur basketball game and use to test the robustness of our approach under more challenging conditions. We will make this dataset publicly available along with our code.

2 Related Work

With the advent of deep learning, direct regression of 2D and 3D poses from images has become the dominant approach for human pose estimation [23, 29, 31, 41, 42]. Recent variations on this theme use volumetric representations [15], lift 2D poses to 3D [14, 27], use graph convolutional network (GCN) [2, 6, 26, 50, 54] or generate and refine pseudo labels from video sequences [25, 36]. Given enough annotated training data, these methods are now robust and accurate. Thus, in recent years, the attention has shifted from learning 3D human poses in fully supervised setups to semi- or weakly-supervised ones [3, 16, 32, 35, 48, 49], with a view to drastically reduce the required amount of annotated images.

In many venues such as sport arenas, there are multiple cameras designed to provide different viewpoints, often for broadcasting purposes. Hence, a valid approach is to exploit the constraints that multi-view geometry provides for training purposes, while at inference time, the trained network operates on single views. For example, in [18], a single-view 3D pose estimator is trained using pseudo labels generated by triangulating the predictions of a pre-trained 2D pose estimator in multiple images. However, as the 2D pose estimator is fixed, pseudo label errors caused by noisy 2D detections are never corrected.

In [14, 40], a regressor is trained to produce consistent 3D poses from single-views, while guaranteeing consistency of the predictions across multiple views. A problem with these approaches is that predictions can be consistent but wrong, which makes it necessary to use some annotated 3D or 2D data. The method of [39] relies on a similar setup but reduces the required amount of annotated data by using multi-view unsupervised pre-training to learn a low-dimensional latent representation from which a simple regressor could infer 3D pose. However, due to the low-dimensionality of the learned latent space, the structural information from the image is lost, which makes
Fig. 1: **Network Architecture.** It comprises a detection network that outputs 2D joint locations in individual views and a lifting network that predicts root relative distances to the camera which are then turned to 3D poses using the 2D ones and the intrinsic camera parameters. They are trained jointly using a small number of images with corresponding 3D annotations and a much larger set of images acquired using multiple cameras. During training, the prediction networks feed their 2D detections into a differentiable triangulation layer that estimates 3D joint locations. These are re-projected into the images to minimize the discrepancy between the projections and the original detections, along with a supervised loss that operates on the frames for which annotations are available. The estimated 3D joint locations are also used to train the lifting network.

Triangulation is at the heart of our approach and is also used extensively in the fully-supervised method of [15], which uses 3D labels to refine the triangulation process, and of [38] where 2D poses are fused in a latent space. While [38] uses standard triangulation that does not weigh different views, [15] learns a weight for each view, which requires a much stronger supervision than ours to learn an effective weighting scheme. In contrast, ours is derived from the agreement of 2D views and can better handle semi- and weakly-supervised setups because the weights are computed from multi-view consistency rather than required to be learned. In the result section, we show that the triangulation of [15] applied to our semi-supervised framework results in less accurate poses when the amount of labeled data is limited.

### 3 Method

Our goal is to train a deep neural network to estimate 3D human poses from single images using as little labeled data as possible. To this end we acquire multiple views of...
our subjects and train a 2D pose estimator to detect joint locations consistently across views. This detection network is complemented by a lifting network that infers 3D poses from 2D ones. During training, we check for consistency across views of unlabeled images by triangulating the 2D detections and re-projecting the results into the images and use the weighted triangulated 3D points to train the lifting network.

Both networks are trained in a semi-supervised way on our target dataset, that is, we assume that the ground-truth 2D and 3D poses are known only for a small subset of the entire dataset. To train the detection network, in addition to a small set of 2D labels, we use a robust differentiable triangulation layer that takes as input the predicted 2D poses for unlabeled images in individual views and produces the 3D estimates. They are used as pseudo labels to check for consistency of the 2D pose estimates and to train both the detection and the lifting networks. The complete pipeline is depicted by Fig. 1 and is end-to-end trainable. Making the triangulation process robust to mis-detections in some of the views is a key component of our approach because some joints are not visible in some views, especially in crowded scenes.

3.1 Notations

Let $L = \{[I^l,c]_{c=1}^{NC}, p_{3D}^l\}_{l=1}^{NL}$ be a sequence of labeled RGB images $I^l,c \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times 3}$ taken using $NC$ different cameras, and $p_{3D}^l$ be the ground-truth 3D pose, where $c$ denotes the number of cameras and $l$ is the index of the labeled images. Similarly, let $U = \{[I^u,c]_{c=1}^{NC}\}_{u=1}^{NU}$, where $u$ denotes the unlabeled, be a larger sequence of multi-view images without associated 3D pose labels. We take $p_{3D}^l$ to be the entire set of body joints $\{X_l^j\}_{j=1}^{NJ}$, where $X_l^j \in \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes the 3D coordinates of joint $j$ for the $l$ sample. Similarly, let $p_{2D}^l$ be $\{x_{l,c}^j\}_{j=1}^{NJ}$, where $x_{l,c}^j \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the projection of $X_l^j$ in view $c$. In the remainder of this section, we drop the $l$, $u$, and $c$ notations when there is no ambiguity.

Let $f_\theta$ and $g_\phi$ denote the detection and lifting network with weights $\theta$ and $\phi$ respectively. The detection network $f_\theta$ takes $I$ as input and returns a 2D pose estimate in that view $\hat{p}_{2D} = \{\hat{x}_j^c\}_{j=1}^{NJ}$. The lifting network $g_\phi$ takes as input such a 2D pose predictions and returns root relative distances to the camera which are then turned to a 3D pose estimate $\hat{p}_{3D} = \Pi(\{\hat{x}_j^c\}_{c=1}^{NC})$.

Finally, let $\Pi$ be a function that takes as input the known camera parameters and a set of image points, one per view, and triangulates to a location in the world $X_j = \Pi(\{\hat{x}_j^c\}_{c=1}^{NC})$.

3.2 Training the Detection and Lifting Networks

We train the detection network $f_\theta$ and the lifting network $g_\phi$ by minimizing two loss functions that we define below, which we describe in more details in the following subsections.
Detection Loss $L^f(\theta)$. We take it to be the sum of a supervised term computed on $\mathcal{L}$ and an unsupervised one computed on $\mathcal{U}$. We write it as

$$L^f(\theta) = L_{sup}(\theta; \mathcal{L}) + L_{tri}(\theta; \mathcal{U}),$$

where

$$L_{sup}(\theta; \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{l=1}^{N_L} \sum_{j=1}^{N_J} \sum_{c=1}^{N_C} \left\| \hat{x}_l^{j,c} - x_l^{j,c} \right\|_2^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

and

$$L_{tri}(\theta, \mathcal{U}) = \sum_{u=1}^{N_U} \sum_{c=1}^{N_C} \sum_{j=1}^{N_J} \left\| \hat{x}_u^{u,c} - x_u^{u,c} \right\|_2^2,$$

where $\hat{x}_u^{u,c}$ denotes the projection of the $\hat{X}_u$ obtained by triangulating the $\hat{x}_u^{u,c}$ predicted by the network. $L_{sup}$ is the supervised MSE loss between the predicted 2D poses and the ground-truth ones. $L_{tri}$ is the unsupervised loss that is at its minimum when the detected 2D poses are consistent with the projections of the triangulated poses. $L_{tri}$ pools information from the multiple views to provide a supervisory signal to our model without using any labels. All the image location in the losses are normalized in the range $[-1, 1]$ with respect to their subject’s bounding box.

As shown in Fig. 1, $L_{tri}$ provides two sets of gradients during back-propagation. One from the re-projected triangulated pose directly to the detection model and one that flows into the triangulation. Blocking either one of these results in a different behavior that makes this self-supervised loss less stable in practice. We provide more details and experiments Section § 4.4 to highlight this.

Lifting Loss $L^g(\phi; f_\theta)$. Once $f_\theta$ is trained, we use its predictions on $\mathcal{U}$ and the triangulation operation $\Pi$ to create a new set with pseudo 3D poses $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = \{[I_{u,c}, \hat{p}^u_{3D}]_{c=1}^{N_C} \}_{u=1}^{N_U}$. We consider the lifting loss to be

$$L^g(\phi; f_\theta) = L^{3D}_{semi-sup}(\phi; f_\theta, \mathcal{L} \sim \hat{\mathcal{U}}),$$

with respect to $\phi$. $L^{3D}_{semi-sup}$ is the MSE loss between the predicted 3D poses and ground-truth or triangulated ones. The parameters of the 2D pose estimator $f_\theta$ are fixed and provide the 2D poses as input to $g_\phi$. $\sim$ denotes the concatenation operation on $\mathcal{L}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$.

3.3 Self-Supervision by Triangulation

Computing $L_{tri}(\theta, \mathcal{U})$ of Eq. 1 requires triangulating each joint $j$ in the set of 2D locations $\{x_j^{l,c}_{l=1} \}_{c=1}^{N_C}$. In theory, the most reliable way to triangulate is to perform non-linear minimization [10]. However, because this computation is part of our deep learning, it must be differentiable, which is not easy to achieve for this kind of minimization. We therefore rely on the Direct Linear Transform (DLT) [1], which involves transforming the projection equations to a system of linear ones whose solution can be found using Singular Value Decomposition [9]. This is less accurate but easily differentiable.

In practice, occlusions and mis-detections pose a much more significant challenge than any loss of accuracy due to the use of DLT. It is inevitable that some joints are hidden in some views and their estimated 2D locations $\hat{x}_j^{u,c}$ are erroneous, which results in
inaccurate triangulations. To prevent this, we introduce a weighing strategy that reduces the influence of mis-detections in such problematic views. We apply these weights in DLT and re-write the unsupervised loss of Eq. 1 as

\[ L_{\text{tri}}(\theta, \mathcal{U}) = \sum_{u=1}^{N_U} \sum_{c=1}^{N_C} \sum_{j=1}^{N_J} w_{j}^{u,c} ||\hat{x}_{j}^{u,c} - \bar{x}_{j}^{u,c}||^2, \]

where \( w_{j}^{u,c} \) denotes the reliability of the estimate of the location of joint \( j \) in view \( c \). To estimate these weights, we use the purely geometrical approach based on robust statistics described below.

**Robust Localization.** To robustly estimate the 3D location of a joint \( j \), we first compute candidate 3D locations using all pairs of 2D detections \((\hat{x}_{j}^{c}, \hat{x}_{j}^{c'}))\) in pairs of views. Let

\[ T_j = \{ \hat{Y}_{j}^{c,c'} = \Pi(\hat{x}_{j}^{c}, \hat{x}_{j}^{c'}) | (c, c') \in \binom{N_C}{2} \}, \]

\[ \tilde{X}_j = \text{GeoMed}(T_j) \]

where \( T_j \) is a detection cluster and \( \tilde{X}_j \) is the center of the cluster, as shown in Fig. 2. \( \Pi \) denotes the triangulation, \( \binom{N_C}{2} \) denotes the set of all pairs of views, and GeoMed refers to calculating the geometric median of \( T_j \). When most of the predicted image locations are correct, \( \tilde{X}_j \) closely represent the true location of the \( j^{th} \) joint. Instead, when more than a half of the image locations are erroneous, the geometrical median cannot recover the joint location reliably. We explain how to overcome this difficulty using a measure of homogeneity defined within the cluster \( T_j \) in the subsequent paragraphs.

Given \( T_j \) and \( \tilde{X}_j \), we take the weights to be

\[ w_{j}^{c} = \text{Median}(W_{j}^{c}) \]

\[ W_{j}^{c} = \{ w_{j}^{c,c'} = \exp(-\frac{||\tilde{X}_{j} - \hat{Y}_{j}^{c,c'}||^2}{\sigma^2}) | c' \in C_j \backslash \{c\} \} \]

where \( W_{j}^{c} \) is a set of weights for joint \( j^{th} \) from view \( c \) to all other views. These encode the distance of each candidate location in \( T_j \) to its center and are bounded in the range \([0, 1]\) using a Gaussian function. \( \sigma \) is a parameter of the model that is set according to the amount of noise present in the candidate joints. Intuitively, when a joint estimate in \( T_j \) is an outlier, its weights should be closer to zero, otherwise it should be close to one. In all our experiments we set it to 10 millimeters.

**Joint Selection.** The above formulation relies on \( \tilde{X}_j \) obtained in Eq. 4 being reliable, which is usually true when more than 50% of the 2D detections are correct. However, this is not always the case. To handle this, at each training iteration, we assign a score to each \( T_j \) and momentarily discards the joints whose score is below a certain threshold.
To compute this score, we use the normalized Within-Cluster-Sum of Squared Errors (WSS) as follows:

\[
WSS_j = \frac{1}{|T_j|} \sum_{Y_{j,c} \in T_j} \|\hat{Y}_{j,c} - \tilde{X}_j\|_2^2.
\]  

(6)

WSS is a measure of homogeneity defined within an agglomeration often used in clustering methods. Intuitively, when the image points are erroneous, the joint estimates composing the cluster \(T_j\) are distant from one another resulting in a high \(WSS_j\). Therefore, if \(WSS_j\) is greater than a manually defined value during training, we momentarily discard the joint. As the training progresses, the model improves iteratively, allowing for the possibility of previously discarded joints to contribute towards the training of the model. In all our experiments we set this threshold to 20 millimeters that we found empirically.

In summary, the weights computed using our purely geometric approach of Eq. 5 allow the triangulation to output a more robust estimate of the true location of the joint. That is the center of the cluster \(\tilde{X}_j\). Instead, Eq. 6 allows to discard the noisy 2D detections, thus reducing their negative impact on the model.

Figure 4, of the experiment section, shows a comparison between ours (with weights) and the standard triangulation method (without weights). We show that our method produces more accurate results than the others when less than 50\% of the views are affected by the noise, while obtaining similar performance otherwise.

3.4 Implementation Details

**Lifting 2D Poses to 3D.** The second stage of our pipeline “lifts” the predictions of our finetuned 2D pose estimator to 3D poses in the camera coordinate system. We adopt a commonly used pose representation [13, 14, 33, 44] namely 2.5D \(p^{2.5D} = \{(u_j, v_j, d^{\text{root}} + d^{\text{rel}_j})\}_{j=1}^{N_J}\) where \(u_j\) and \(v_j\) are the 2D location of joint \(j^{th}\) in the undistorted image space, \(d^{\text{root}}\) is a scalar representing the depth of the root joint with respect to the camera and \(d^{\text{rel}_j}\) is the relative depth of each joint to the root. The advantage of using this representation lies in the fact that the 2D pose \(\{(u_j, v_j)\}_{j=1}^{N_J}\) is spatially
coincident with the image, which allows to fully exploit the characteristics of convolutional neural networks. In addition, the 2D pose estimator can be further improved using additional in-the-wild 2D pose datasets.

To obtain 3D poses we first train a multi-layer neural network as in [27] and output root relative depths $d_{rel}^j = g_\phi(f_\theta(I))$. Then, we recover the 3D pose in the camera or in the world coordinate system using the inverse of the projection equations:

$$
(d_{root} + d_{rel}^j) \begin{pmatrix} u_j \\ v_j \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = K \begin{pmatrix} X_C^j \\ Y_C^j \\ (d_{root} + d_{rel}^j) \end{pmatrix} = K \begin{bmatrix} R \begin{pmatrix} X_j \\ Y_j \\ Z_j \end{pmatrix} + t \end{bmatrix}
$$

(7)

where $X_C$ and $Y_C$ are the first two components of a joint in camera space, $(X_j, Y_j, Z_j)$ is the joint in the world coordinate and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ are the intrinsic matrix, rotation matrix, and translation vector of the camera respectively. The above formulation assumes that the depth of the root joint $d_{root}$ is known. In previous works [27, 40, 44], the position of the root is taken to be the ground-truth one or not used at all simply because the dataset itself is provided in camera coordinate. We follow the same protocol and use the ground-truth depth of the root, however, an approximation can be obtained analytically as shown in [13].

A simple multi-layer neural network can effectively learn the distribution of relative depths from the joint coordinate of 2D poses, however, the image can still provide useful information to reduce ambiguities. For this reason, we use an additional convolutional neural network $h_\gamma$, parameterized by $\gamma$, that takes an image $I$ as input and outputs a small feature vector. We then concatenate this feature vector with the joint coordinate of a 2D pose and feed it into the multi-layer neural network to output the relative depth $d_{rel}^j = g_\phi(f_\theta(I) - h_\gamma(I))$. This additional network contributes to distinguish classes of poses such as when subjects are standing, sitting and lying that can be more easily captured from the images themselves. In our experiments we consider $h_\gamma$ to be a ResNet50 [11] pre-trained on ImageNet [43] and replace its last linear layer with an MLP that shrinks the size of the output feature from 2048 to 16.

**Detection and Lifting models.** We use Alphapose [8] trained on Crowdpose dataset [22] as our 2D pose estimator $f_\theta$ where we replace the original non-differentiable Non-Maximum Suppression (NMS) by a two-dimensional Soft-argmax as in [44]. For the lifting network $g_\phi$ we used a multi-layer perceptron network with 2 hidden layers with hidden size of 2048. The first two layers are composed of a linear layer followed by ReLU activation and 10% dropout while the last layer is a linear layer. The lifting network takes as input the feature vector obtained by concatenating the joint coordinates of a 2D pose and the 16 dimensional feature obtained from $h_\gamma$. $h_\gamma$ takes the cropped image resized to $256 \times 256$ as the input. The 2D pose is defined in the undistorted image space and is normalized in the range $[-1, 1]$ with respect to the bounding box.

**Training Procedure.** We resize the input crops to $320 \times 256$ pixels by keeping the original aspect ratio and apply random color jittering for regularization. In all our experiments we pretrained the 2D detection network first on the small set of labeled set
and then we finetuned it on both labeled and unlabeled sets with our losses. During training, we used mini-batches of size 24 samples where 8 samples come from the labeled set and the other from the unlabeled one. We use Adam optimizer [17] with constant learning rate of $1e^{-4}$ for the pre-training and $1e^{-5}$ for the fine-tuning. We do not use weight decay nor learning rate scheduling. All the 3D losses were computed on poses expressed in meters and the image coordinates of the 2D losses are all normalized in the range $[-1, 1]$ with respect to the bounding boxes.

4 Experiments

We primarily report our results in the semi-supervised learning setup, where we have 3D annotations only for a subset of the training images. We use the projection of these 3D annotations to train $f_\theta$ and they are directly used to supervise the training of $g_\phi$. For the unannotated samples, we use the 3D poses triangulated from 2D estimations and their projections to train both $g_\phi$ and $f_\theta$.

4.1 Datasets and Metrics

We validate our proposed framework on two large 3D pose estimation datasets and a new multi-view dataset featuring an amateur basketball match to study the influence of occlusions in a crowded scene. We will release it publicly.

Human3.6M [12]. It is the most widely used indoor dataset for single and multi-view 3D pose estimation. It consists of 3.6 million images captured from 4 calibrated cameras. As in most published papers, we use subjects S1, S5, S6, S7, S8 for training and S9, S11 for testing. In the semi-supervised setup we follow two separate protocols:

1. Subject S1 is the only source of supervision, while other training subjects are treated as unlabeled, as done in [21, 32, 40].
2. Only 10% of uniformly sampled training samples are considered annotated and the rest as unlabeled [20].

The temporal sampling rate of the unlabeled videos is always set to 5.

MPI-INF-3DHP [28]. This dataset contains both constrained indoor and some complex outdoor images for single person 3D pose estimation. It features 8 subjects performing 8 different actions, which are recorded using 14 different cameras, thereby covering a wide range of diverse 3D poses. We follow the standard protocol and use the 5 chest-height cameras only. In the semi-supervised setup, as for the Human3.6M dataset, we exploit annotations for subject S1 of the training set.

SportCenter. We filmed an amateur basketball match using 8 fixed and calibrated cameras. 2 of the 8 cameras are mounted on the roof of the court, which makes them useful for location tracking but less useful for pose estimation. The images feature a
variable number of subjects ranging from 10 to 13. They are either running, walking, or standing still. The players are often occluded either by others or by various objects, such as the metal frames of the nets. There are also substantial light variations that makes it even more challenging. We computed the players’ trajectories for the whole sequence and manually annotated a subset with 2D poses. Thereafter, we obtained the 3D poses by triangulating the manually annotated 2D detections. The dataset comprises 315,000 images out of which 560 are provided with 3,740 2D poses and 700 3D poses. We use two subjects for testing and the remaining subjects are used for training. In total, we have 140 annotated 3D poses for the test phase, while the remaining 560 annotated 3D poses are used for training in the semi-supervised setup.

**Metrics.** We report the Mean Per-Joint Position Error (MPJPE), the normalized NMJPE, and the procrustes aligned PMPJPE in millimeters. On the MPI-INF-3DHP dataset we also report the Percentage of Correct Keypoints in 3D (3DPCK) with a threshold of 150mm. The best score is always shown in bold.

**Quantitative Evaluation**

We report our results for the semi-supervised learning setup in Tables 1, 2 and 3 for Human3.6M [12], MPI-INF-3DHP [28] and SportCenter datasets respectively.

Considering only 10% of data as labeled for Human3.6M dataset in Tables 1, we note that our approach is able to outperform Kundu et al. [20] (46.1mm vs. 50.8 mm) in terms of PMPJPE by a significant margin. Similarly, we perform better then them when considering all samples of S1 as labeled (Only S1) (48.3mm vs. 51 mm PM-PJPE). Note that Kundu et al. [20] make use of additional datasets such as in-the-wild YouTube videos and the MADS [51] dataset, in addition to a part-based puppet to instill prior human skeletal knowledge in their overall learning framework. However, our experimental results demonstrate that we circumvent the need of such supplementary components by designing an effective geometrical reasoning based on a weighting strategy that nullifies the impact of noisy detections as the training progresses. Furthermore,
we also obtained better results than Iqbal et al. [14] (60.8mm vs 62.8mm in terms of MPJPE) in semi-supervised by at least 2 mm in both MPJPE and PMPJPE.

Table 2 shows the comparison on the semi-supervised setups on MPI-INF-3DHP dataset. Here the approach of Iqbal [14] was able to produce slightly better results then us with 113.8 millimeters compared to 119.1 of ours. However, we note that [14] uses ground-truth 2D poses for the unlabeled set as source of supervision.

Table 1: Quantitative results Human3.6M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MPJPE</th>
<th>NMPJPE</th>
<th>PMPJPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kundu et al. [20]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Quantitative results MPI-INF-3DHP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MPJPE</th>
<th>NMPJPE</th>
<th>PMPJPE</th>
<th>3DPCK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodin et al. [40]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocabas et al. [18]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqbal et al. [14]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparative study between ours, Kundu [20], Pavllo [36] and Iskakov et al. [15] is also shown in Fig. 3 as we progressively increase the amount of labeled 3D poses in the semi-supervised learning setup. It is observed that we outperform both Kundu [20] and Pavllo [36] by a significant margin when working with limited amount of labeled images (e.g. 5/10 %S1). This clearly shows that our model is able to take advantage of unlabeled multi-view images to provide supervisory signal to our model.

We evaluate the effectiveness of our triangulation method on the SportsCenter dataset in the semi-supervised setup. We compare our proposed triangulation approach against i) Standard DLT, which is the standard triangulation, and ii) Ours+Iskakov using the learned triangulation approach of [15], added to our backbone. We use the same architecture for all triangulation approaches to better observe the impact of triangulation. We follow the setup of [15] for learning the weights using a neural network. Our approach instead is purely geometrical, which is an advantage when limited amount of labeled data is available. We report the multi-view (MV) and the single-view (SV) results in Table 3. We can note that our triangulation method is superior than Standard DLT because of its ability to produce reliable 3D poses from multiple 2D views even in the presence of occlusion, which is frequent in the SportCenter dataset. This is observed in the multi-view case and as a consequence also in the single view results. Moreover, our approach also obtains better results than Ours+Iskakov on this task. We believe Ours+Iskakov suffers from the lack of adequate amounts of labeled data, which is needed to train pre-
Table 3: Quantitative results on SportCenter (semi-supervised) using different triangulation approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Multiview</th>
<th>Single View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPJPE↓ NMPJPE↓ PMPJPE↓</td>
<td>MPJPE↓ NMPJPE↓ PMPJPE↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard DLT</td>
<td>80.5 78.4 66.7</td>
<td>118.5 116.5 95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours+Iskakov [15]</td>
<td>88.3 83.6 70.9</td>
<td>121.1 119.5 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>72.0 71.0 60.7</td>
<td>112.1 110.1 88.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cise weights in this approach, and also from the noise in the 2D detections caused by the occlusion.

Table 4: Quantitative results on the Second Spectrum dataset (semi-supervised) using different triangulation approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Multiview</th>
<th>Single View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPJPE↓ NMPJPE↓ PMPJPE↓</td>
<td>MPJPE↓ NMPJPE↓ PMPJPE↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard DLT</td>
<td>61.5 60.3 52.3</td>
<td>95.7 93.9 75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>54.3 52.9 46.2</td>
<td>94.7 92.8 74.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Second Spectrum Dataset

Here we evaluate and compare our proposed method against the Standard DLT on a basketball dataset provided by Second Spectrum. The dataset consists of 15 players and 3 referees playing a game of basketball at the National Basketball Association (NBA). The videos are captured using 8 calibrated cameras, with 4 placed in each half of the court. We have considered 2 (out of 15) players and 1 referee (out of 3) to be the test set, while the remaining 13 players and 2 referees are considered as the train set. Each subject has its annotated 2D and 3D ground truth poses. In the semi-supervised learning setup, we have considered 2, 160 annotated images as the labeled set \( \mathcal{L} \) and the unlabeled set \( \mathcal{U} \) consists of 19,865 images. The results for multiview and single view experiments are shown in Table 4. As seen, we consistently outperform the Standard DLT [1] across all the three evaluation metrics for both the multiview and the single view experiments; thereby clearly demonstrating the importance and effectiveness of our proposed weighting strategy in handling noisy 2D detections and producing reliable triangulated 3D poses.

4.3 Mobile Camera

In this section, we evaluate and compare our proposed methods against (a) Standard DLT [1] and (b) Ours+Iskakov [15] on a video sequence of SportCenter dataset captured on a single mobile camera. The images are captured using a calibrated Iphone6.
Table 5: Quantitative results on SportCenter dataset captured on a mobile camera (Single View).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Using $\hat{x}$</th>
<th>Using $x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPJPE↓</td>
<td>NMPJPE↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard DLT</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>197.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours + Iskakov [15]</td>
<td>197.7</td>
<td>193.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>188.9</td>
<td>186.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like before, we evaluate the learnt models of Table 3 on two test subjects, thereby resulting in a test set of 38 images. The results using the predictions of the learnt 2D pose estimator model $f_\theta$ (i.e. $\hat{x}$) and the 2D ground truth annotations (i.e. $x$) are shown in Table 5. As expected, there exists a significant performance gap ($\sim 60$ mm) between using $\hat{x}$ and $x$ as the input to the lifting network $g_\phi$. We believe this gap in performance can be bridged provided sufficient amount of data obtained using a mobile camera is available to improve the performance of $f_\theta$. Having said that, our proposed method still remains the best performing method against the other two baseline methods which clearly shows the effectiveness of our weighting strategy to generate suitable triangulated 3D poses.

4.4 Ablation Study

Learning with Unlabeled Data

Here we aim to study the impact of the “unlabeled” set of images in our proposed weighted triangulation method for semi-supervised learning. Table 6 compares the results of “Ours” against a standard “Baseline” as we progressively increase the amount of available 3D supervision on the Human3.6M [12] dataset for single view learning setup. The 2D pose estimator $f_\theta$ is trained using Eq. 1 for all setups and is fixed. In “Baseline”, we train the lifting network $g_\phi$ directly on the labeled set of images $L$ for each setup using the following loss function:

$$L^g(\phi; f_\theta) = L^{3D}(\phi; f_\theta, L),$$

where $L^{3D}$ is the MSE loss between the predicted and the ground truth 3D poses on $L$. In Ours, in addition to the labelled set we also train the lifting network using the estimated triangulated 3D poses on the unlabeled data. As expected, the performance

Table 6: Comparative study on the impact of unlabeled data for different levels of supervision $L$. We report the MPJPE results in millimeters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L$</th>
<th>1% S1</th>
<th>5% S1</th>
<th>10% S1</th>
<th>50% S1</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S1, S5</th>
<th>S1, S5, S6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>135.3</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of both networks improve as the amount of labeled data in increased gradually, however, our algorithm still manages to outperform the fully supervised baseline network. Most importantly, in cases with low amount of available 3D supervision (such as 1% S1, 5% S1) there exists a significant gap in performance (∼30mm) between ours and the baseline network. This clearly demonstrates that our proposed method makes the most of the unlabeled set of images $U$ in learning the important features to generate the appropriate supervision via weighted triangulation.

**Triangulation Robustness Analysis**

In this experiment we analyze how the estimated object locations, that are the results of applying triangulation, are affected by localization error for our triangulation approach and the standard one. To do so, we create a simulation using six views with real camera parameters. We first generate $N$ three-dimensional object locations and then obtain their corresponding ground-truth projections in each one of the views using the camera parameters. We then run experiments in which we randomly select a subset of cameras and gradually increase the amount of 2D noise applied to the projected points in these views. The noise that we apply to the 2D points is uniformly sampled on a circle of radius $r$ around the ground-truth 2D locations, where $r$ is the level of noise. For our triangulation approach with $WSS$ of Eq. 6, when $WSS$ is bigger than a threshold $\lambda = 20$ millimeters we set all the weights to a small but equal weight. This is equivalent to using standard triangulation.

![Fig. 4: Triangulation Error (lower is better)](image)

Fig. 4: Triangulation Error (lower is better). Triangulation error with respect to an increasing level of noise expressed in pixels and applied to a varying number of views. Our triangulation approach (w/ weights w/ WSS) performs better than standard triangulation (wo/ weights) when less than 50% of the cameras are affected by the noise and on par otherwise. Without WSS (w/ weights wo/ WSS) instead, the triangulation produces less accurate locations when most of the image points are erroneous.
In Figure 4 we report the MPJPE between the triangulated results and the ground-truth object locations, where noise is applied to different number of cameras, for standard triangulation (wo/ weights), ours with weights (w/ weights wo/ WSS) and ours with weights and WSS (w/ weights w/ WSS).

It can be noted that our robust triangulation produces more accurate results than standard triangulation when less than 50% of the views are affected by the noise and on par otherwise. When WSS is disabled instead, our triangulation produces worse results when more than 50% of the views are noisy.

![Fig. 5: Balancing $L_{tri}$. $L_{tri}$ provides two gradients flows that we control with parameter $\alpha$. We show the effect on the loss and MPJPE for different values of $\alpha$ in a controlled test setup. When $\alpha = 0$ the model can potentially reach the best MPJPE but then deviates quickly as the training continues. On the other hand, when $\alpha = 0.1$ the loss is much more stable.](image)

**Stability of $L_{tri}$**

As discussed in Section § 3.2, the self-supervised loss term $L_{tri}$ minimizes the difference between the predicted image points $\hat{x}$ and the projection of the triangulated one $\bar{x}$ using the Mean Squared Error (MSE). Since both are function of the network $f_\theta$, there are two gradients that affect the network weights $\theta$. To better understand the contribution of each gradient we decompose $L_{tri}$ in two terms as shown in Eq. 9. In the first term, we consider $\bar{x}$ to be ground-truth data, that means that there is no gradient flowing in it. In the second term instead we consider $\hat{x}$ as to be the ground-truth. Note that, $\hat{x}$ and $\bar{x}$ are dependent on one another and can change from one iteration to another.

$$L_{tri}(\hat{x}, \bar{x}) = \alpha L(\hat{x}, \bar{x}_{GT}) + (1 - \alpha)L(\hat{x}_{GT}, \bar{x})$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

When $\alpha = 0$, the gradient flows only through the differentiable triangulation via $\bar{x}$. When $\alpha = 1$ it flows only through the predictions $\hat{x}$, with the triangulated points considered as the ground-truth. Since we want to exploit triangulation, setting $\alpha = 0$ seems
a reasonable choice, however, we demonstrate with a simulation (Fig. 5) that it can be counterproductive.

To do so, we run an experiment in a controlled environment by isolating the self-supervised loss $L_{tri}$ from the rest of the pipeline; neural networks are not used here either. We first generate $N$ three-dimensional object locations and project them in each one of the views (3 in our case) to obtain ground-truth image locations $\mathbf{x}$ using camera parameters. Then, to simulate the error of the 2D pose estimator, we inject a moderate amount (1 pixel) of Gaussian noise to all the image points and a higher amount (10 pixels) to one view only. Finally, we optimize the position of the noisy image locations $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ using $L_{tri}$ where at each iteration we compute $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ using the standard differentiable triangulation. The problem can be expressed as $\hat{x}^\ast = \arg\min_{\hat{x}} L_{tri}(\hat{x}, \bar{x})$.

Figure 5 depicts the loss values and the MPJPE between the triangulated points and the ground-truth ones for different values of $\alpha$. It can be noted that when $\alpha = 0$ the MPJPE can reach its lowest value but, as the training continues, it deviates quickly. This is due to having the model aiming to put all the joint locations at the center of the image, which is a target that can minimize the triangulation loss without minimizing the MPJPE error. This means that minimizing the self-supervised loss does not correspond to minimizing the MPJPE. On the other hand, when $\alpha = 1$ the error on the noisy image key-points is hardly reduced but is rather propagated to the other views leading to the degradation of the learnt model. When both terms in Eqn. 9 are active, the image points that are precise deviate less and the MPJPE curve is more stable. Note that with additional supervision from labeled data all the MPJPE curves in Fig. 5 would improve over time. In our experiment we found that using $\alpha = 0.5$ is a good compromise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MPJPE</th>
<th>NMPJPE</th>
<th>PMPJPE</th>
<th>P3DCK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavlakos et al. [33]</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanzawa et al. [16]</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wundt et al. [38]</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tome et al. [46]</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocabas et al. [18]</td>
<td>77.75</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. [37]</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drover et al. [47]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolotouros et al. [19]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. [49]</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqbal et al. [14]</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundu et al. [20]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Weighted Triangulation

Here we study the impact of our proposed weighting strategy to generate suitable triangulated 3D poses for training the lifting network $g_{\theta}$. Therefore, we report our results in the weakly-supervised setup in Tables 7 and 8 for Human3.6M [12], MPI-INF-3DHP [28] datasets respectively, both measured in single-view. In this learning setup, we use 2D manual annotations for all the training images to train $f_{\theta}$ and the triangulated
3D poses obtained from 2D predictions of the training images are the sole source of supervision to train \( g_\phi \). Note that since the lifting network is trained on model predictions, rather than ground truth 3D targets, this setup leads to lower accuracy compared to the semi-supervised setup. Table 7 provides the results for H36M dataset. We outperform existing solutions in all the three metrics. In Table 8 we show results on MPI dataset, where we obtain comparable results to other baselines. It is worth noting that while we rely only on the triangulated 3D poses from 2D model predictions to train \( g_\phi \), while [14, 20] use additional sources of supervisions.

5 Qualitative Results

Fig. 6, 7 and 8 show single view qualitative results for Human3.6M [12], SportCenter and MPI-INF-3DHP [28] datasets, respectively.
Fig. 7: **Qualitative results for the test set of SportCenter.** The pose in the top image corresponds to the projection of the 3D prediction in this view from our single view model trained in semi-supervised setup. This projected pose is equivalent to the prediction of the 2D pose estimator. The bottom image depicts the same 3D pose but from another viewpoint. The bottom image allows us to visualise the depth information, which would be invisible otherwise.

Fig. 8: **Qualitative results for the test set of MPI-INF-3DHP.** We show the single view 3D predictions of our model trained under semi-supervised learning.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we have presented an effective way of using triangulation as a form of self-supervision for single view 3D pose estimation. Our approach imposes geometrical constraints on multi-view images to train models with little annotations in semi- and weakly-supervised learning setups. This was made possible by making the pipeline end-to-end differentiable. We have demonstrated how the proposed robust triangulation can reliably generate pseudo labels even in crowded scenes and how to use them to
supervise a single view 3D pose estimator. The experimental results, especially in the SportsCenter dataset, clearly shows its advantages in learning a precise triangulated 3D pose over other triangulation methods. In future, we plan to further investigate the impact of integrating temporal or spatial constraints into our learning framework.
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