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Abstract

For semantic-guided cross-view image translation, it is crucial to learn where to sample pixels from the source view image and where to reallocate them guided by the target view semantic map, especially when there is little overlap or drastic view difference between the source and target images. Hence, one not only needs to encode the long-range dependencies among pixels in both the source view image and target view the semantic map but also needs to translate these learned dependencies. To this end, we propose a novel generative adversarial network, PI-Trans, which mainly consists of a novel Parallel-ConvMLP module and an Implicit Transformation module at multiple semantic levels. Extensive experimental results show that the proposed PI-Trans achieves the best qualitative and quantitative performance by a large margin compared to the state-of-the-art methods on two challenging datasets. The code will be made available at https://github.com/Amazingren/PI-Trans.

1. Introduction

Semantic-guided cross-view image translation aims at generating images from a source view to a different target view given a target view semantic map as the guidance. In particular, we focus on the cases of translating from the aerial-view to the ground-view for photo-realistic urban scene synthesis, which can be beneficial for geolocalization or civil engineering design with the semantic map either being extracted from another modality or being designed [17, 25, 26, 29, 35].

However, translating images from two distinct viewpoints with little overlap is a challenging problem, as the area coverage, the appearances of objects and their geometrical arrangement in the ground-view image can be extremely different from the aerial-view image (as the comparison between the first column and the last column shown in Fig. 1). Early works usually adopt the convolutional neural networks (CNN) based encoder-decoder structure [32, 35] with the generative adversarial networks (GANs) [15, 28]. However, such methodology suffers from satisfactory results when there exists little overlap between the source-view image and the target-view image. This is because the CNN-based models struggle to establish the latent long-range dependencies due to the design nature of the convolutional kernels.

Usually, it’s not easy to generate photo-realistic image when just following the direct translation setting (the direct translation here means that the generated ground-view image $I_g$ is directly generated from the aerial view image $I_a$ without the assistance of the semantic map $S_g$, see the direct translation branch in Fig. 2). To improve the quality of the cross view translation task, previous methods [17, 19, 25] all took the target-view semantic map into consideration. Specifically, Regmi et al. [17] produced the street view images from the satellite images under the supervision of the corresponding semantic maps. Tang et al. proposed SelectionGAN [25] which enlarged the generation space for better results in a coarse-to-fine manner also under the guidance of the target-view semantic map. To further overcome
this problem, Ren et al. [19] proposed a multilayer perceptron (MLP) based CrossMLP, which firstly takes the latent correspondence between the source-view aerial image and the target-view ground semantic map into consideration, to generate the target images in a progressive manner.

Though very insightful explorations had been performed by earlier methods, we find there are still some limitations that hinder the improvement of the quality of the generated target-view images from three aspects. (i) The pure CNN based models like [17,25] are difficult to establish the latent long-range relation due to its natural physical design of the convolutional kernels. (ii) The heavy fully-connected layers relied method like [19] are subject to be insufficient for modeling the fine spatial information. (iii) All these three state-of-the-art methods mentioned above missed utilizing the very crucial but the easiest to be ignored direct translation information (the direct translation branch shown in Fig. 2).

To this end, we propose the Parallel-ConvMLP and Implicit-Transformation based GAN (PI-Trans). PI-Trans is shown in Fig. 2, which is mainly built with two encoder branches and two decoder branches. In the encoder branches, we propose the novel parallel-ConvMLP module that can effectively manage both the latent long-range relation and the detailed spatial information with its unique spatial-channel MLP in a parallel manner. Our way to combine the two MLPs is novel compared to existing combination operations that perform the two MLP-based operations sequentially [19,27]. Besides, the input feature is uniformly split into two chunks, and each of them is fed to each MLP operation. By doing so, we implicitly introduced channel shuffling, thus being beneficial for long-range reasoning. In the decoder branches, unlike previous methods which just take the combined feature from the source-view image and the target-view semantic map for recovering the target-view image, we for the first time utilize the direct translation information which can provide reasonable color distribution via the proposed implicit-transformation modules at multiple feature levels.

To summarize, our contributions are listed as following:

- We have designed a novel model, PI-Trans, which can use the transformation information that is directly learned from the source-view to the target-view images to boost the performance.
- We have proposed a novel parallel-ConvMLP module, an effective combination of CNN and MLP. It models both the latent long-range relation and the fine spatial information.
- To make good use of the direct translation information, we design an implicit transformation module which conducts the attention-based fusion at multiple feature levels.
- Extensive experimental results show that our method generates highly photo-realistic target-view ground images, scoring new state-of-the-art numerical results on two challenging datasets.

2. Related Work

Cross-View Image Geo-localization. Image geo-localization has been tackled as an image matching task to tell the location of a query image by comparing it with geo-tagged database images [22,23]. Different from previous works that focus on the ground-to-ground image matching [1,13,21], recent works pay more attention to the cross-view setting where the query image is at ground level while the geo-tagged image gallery is captured by the satellite at the aerial view [2,7,12,36]. Though the cross-view setting of geo-localization is promising at lots of computer vision tasks such as robot navigation, civil engineering design, as well as the way-finding in AR/VR applications, it’s also challenging due to the vast differences in terms of both the appearances and the distinctive geometric configurations between the aerial-view and the ground-view images that from two drastic viewpoints. To this end, Regmi et al. proposes to use conditional GAN to generate an aerial image from its corresponding ground view panorama and use it for minimizing the domain gap between the drastic two views [18]. Similarly, Toker et al. also boosts the performance of geo-localization with the help of the generated ground-view panorama from its corresponding aerial-view image [26]. Instead of using the global information like the entire panorama edge map used in [18] or a polar transformation operation used in [26] during the generation part in their methods, we use just the random cropped ground-view semantic map as the condition inputs, which is obvious isolated from the rest part and the information provided by the cropped semantic map is also limited. Consequently, the condition setting in our paper is more challenging for generating realistic cross-view images but more flexible because the target-view condition input is easier to acquire either from other modality or just elaborately designed by human.

Cross-View Image Translation. Conditional GAN is a special generative model for generating new samples which have the desired data distributions with guidance from the conditioned information like class labels, attention maps, and so on [4]. In this paper, we adopt the random cropped ground-view semantic map as conditional information for cross-view image translation task.

Unlike most of the previous methods on cross-view image translation task that there exists a large degree of overlapping in both appearance or geometry structures [3,5,35]. When the two views are dramatically different, this task certainly becomes very challenging since the severe discrepancy leads to lots of problems like geometry mismatch, scale uncertainty, and so on. Zhai et al. firstly proposed a
CNN-based framework to address this problem [33]. Due to the target-view semantic map is easy to acquire from another modality. Regmi et al. designed two GAN based structures X-Fork and X-Seq to further address this problem conditioned on the ground-view semantic map [17]. To further improve the performance, Tang et al. proposed a two-stage framework which can generate better results based on its enlarged generation space [25]. These two methods are all not good at modeling the long-range relation for the given input. Ren et al. eased this problem with its cross MLP module progressively [19]. Different from above approaches that completely rely on a deep learning architecture, Lu et al. explicitly add the geometric configuration for cross-view image generation [14], however, besides the semantic condition information, their method needs the depth information from both the aerial-view and the ground-view as supervision, which puts this task in a more expensive level.

Most of these cross-view translation methods solely rely on the semantic condition guided generation as a ritual, and pay little attention to the information of the direct translation branch (shown in Fig. 2) which actually could provide useful colour distribution to make the final generated ground view image sharper and more realistic. What’s more, since in our setting, the condition information from the semantic map is just a small part of the entire panorama, it is even essential for the deep model to have a strong ability for modeling the long-range dependencies and the spatial information in both the given aerial images and the semantic maps under this global information limited situation. Hence, we aim to overcome these issues by the proposed PI-Trans under the support of the proposed parallel-ConvMLP and the implicit-transformation modules.

3. The Proposed Method

We present the architecture of the proposed PI-Trans in Fig. 2, which consists of two encoder branches and two decoder branches. Specifically, PI-Trans takes as input both the source-view aerial image \( I_a \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times H \times W} \) and the conditional target-view ground semantic map \( S_g \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times H \times W} \) at two encoder branches. Firstly \( I_a \) and \( S_g \) are processed by two encoders to semantic level \( L_1 \) with dimension \((C_{L_1}, H/2, W/2)\), where \( C \), \( H \), and \( W \) mean the channel number, the height, and the width of a given feature map, respectively. We then use the proposed parallel-ConvMLP module to further encode the \( L_1 \) level feature to \( L_2 \) \((2C_{L_1}, H/4, W/4)\), \( L_3 \) \((4C_{L_1}, H/8, W/8)\), and \( L_4 \) \((8C_{L_1}, H/16, W/16)\) semantic levels, successively. Unlike other state-of-the-art methods [19,25] which generate the final target-view ground image \( I_g \) only based on the combined feature coming from \( I_a \) and \( S_g \) at \( L_4 \) level. We exploit another pathway, the direct translation branch, that directly produces a ground image \( I_g \) at the target view from the source view, without interacting with the conditional semantic map. We utilize this direct transformation information accompanied with the semantic feature at the lower target pathway via our proposed implicit transformation at 3 semantic levels \((L_2, L_3, \text{and})\).
Given one pixel, it’s extremely significant for the cross-view image translation task to understand which other pixels are related to it, or which object it belongs to. However, conventional CNN kernels (Fig. 3(a)) are not good at modeling the long-range relation for a given input because of the locality of the fixed kernels, therefore lots of MLP-based methods like MLP-Mixer [27], ConvMLP [11] (Fig. 3(c), and CrossMLP [19] (Fig. 3(d)) were proposed to ease this problem. While MLP-Mixer and CrossMLP were demonstrated with a good performance, they are computationally heavy and are not subject to modeling the fine spatial patterns at the feature level. ConvMLP [11] tackles this problem by combining a depth-wise convolution between two channel-wise MLPs. Yet, its performance is still unsatisfactory for the cross-view translation task. Comparative results of these methods are presented in Section 3.2.

Thus, to explore the balance for the long-range relation and the spatial pattern modeling, we propose the novel plug-and-play module named parallel-ConvMLP, which is shown in Fig. 3(e). Given an input feature $X_{in}$ in shape $(b, c, h, w)$, it firstly goes through two convolutional layers, the first one is strided ($\text{downConv}()$) and another is a normal one ($\text{Conv}()$). We omit the normalization and activation operations that followed after each convolutional operation, and abstract this progress as follows:

$$X' = \text{Conv}(\text{downConv}(X_{in})),$$

where $X'$ is the output with the dimension $(b, 2c, h/2, w/2)$. This convolutional-based encoder ensures the latent appearance and the local spatial pattern can be well established. Different from previous methods that simultaneously model the long-range relation and the spatial information in a sequential manner [19, 27], we decouple the problem by dividing $X'$ along channel dimension into two parts. Specifically, we choose the channels with the odd index for the channel-wise process and the channels with an even index for the spatial-wise process as follows:

$$X_c = X'_{2i-1}, \quad X_s = X'_{2i}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, \cdots, 2c. \quad (2)$$

Then two fully-connected MLPs (channel-wise and spatial-wise) are used to model the latent long-range dependence. To accommodate the dimension for MLP to process $X_c$ and $X_s$, we first flatten $X_c$ and $X_s$ from $(b, c, h/2, w/2)$ to $(b, n, c)$ and $(b, c, n)$, forming the $F_c$ and $F_s$, respectively. Here $n = w/2 \times h/2$ indicates the spatial-size. Each MLP block contains two fully-connected layers and a nonlinear GELU [6] activation function. These two parallel MLP operations can be described as follows:

$$F'_c = W'^c_2 \sigma(W'^c_1(F_c)_{s,i}), \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, \cdots, c,$$

$$F'_s = W'^s_2 \sigma(W'^s_1(F_s)_{s,j}), \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3, \cdots, n, \quad (3)$$

where $W'^c_1$ and $W'^s_1$ denote the learnable weights for channel-wise MLP, while $W'^c_2$ and $W'^s_2$ are the learnable weights for spatial-wise MLP. $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the element-wise nonlinear GELU activation function. Then we reshape $F'_c$ and $F'_s$ back to $(b, c, h, w)$ and concatenate them along the channel dimension. Finally, we use a skip-connection to link the
concatenated feature to $X'$ for maintaining the fine spatial information established by convolutional kernels as follows:

$$X_{out} = X' + \text{Cat}(\text{Reshape}(F'_s), \text{Reshape}(F'_s)), \quad (4)$$

where $\text{Cat}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Reshape}(\cdot)$ denote the concatenation and reshape operations individually. $X_{out}$ is the final output of the proposed parallel-ConvMLP module in shape $(b, 2c, h/2, w/2)$.

### 3.2. Implicit Transformation Module

It’s challenging for a model to directly translate the source-view aerial image to target-view ground image owing to the dramatically different appearance and geometry structures between two views. As a matter of fact, the performance for this direct translation ($I_a \rightarrow I'_g$) is in a bad condition with messy textures (see $I'_g$ in Fig. 2 or the third column in Fig. 1). Hence, previous methods, e.g. SelectionGAN [25] and CrossMLP [19], ignored the direct translation branch and just used the combined feature $F'^{(L+4)}_L$ that comes from source-view aerial image feature $F'^{(L+4)}_L$ and the target-view ground semantic map feature $F'^{(L+4)}_K$. Instead, we explore how this kind of latent information within the direct transformation branch may impact the overall generation performance since it provides a reasonable color distribution though bad in spatial structure. To make full use of the useful color distribution, we propose the implicit transformation module (the yellow blocks in Fig. 2) which conducts the fusion at multiple semantic levels in the decoder branch.

Specifically, there are three implicit transformation modules at $L_4$, $L_3$, and $L_2$ levels, each of them takes as input three kinds of information, i.e., the ground view semantic map feature $F_Q$, the directly translated feature $F_K$, and an extra input feature $F_V$. As shown in Fig. 2, we visualise these three kinds information flows in green, red, and black colors, respectively. The main idea behind the proposed implicit transformation module is to enable the transformed feature $F_K$ to provide useful latent appearance or color information for generation. More specifically, we exploit the semantic map feature $F_Q$ and the directly transformed feature $F_K$ to construct an attention map with a softmax function. This operation uses the target-view semantic feature $F'_Q$ to select the most important information in the directly transformed feature $F'_K$, which can also be seen as a learned latent transformation pattern. This attention map is then used to activate the most relevant feature in $F_V$, achieving the feature-level implicit transformation guided by the attention map. Finally, we exploit a skip-connection to maintain the result at the last module.

Since all three implicit transformation module share the same structure, we take the one at $L_3$ level for the detailed description. Given three inputs $F'^{(L+3)}_Q$, $F'^{(L+3)}_K$, and $F'^{(L+3)}_V$, we firstly reshape them from $(b, c, h, w)$ to $(b, c/4, n)$, $(b, c/4, n)$, and $(b, c, n)$, respectively. Here $n = h \times w$ indicates the spatial-wise size. Then we adopt the residual attention mechanism to learn the fused feature as follows:

$$F'^{(L+3)}_{out} = F'^{(L+3)}_V + \text{softmax}(F'^{(L+3)}_Q(F'^{(L+3)}_K)^T)F'^{(L+3)}_K, \quad (5)$$

where $F'^{(L+3)}_{out}$ denotes the output of this implicit transformation module, it will also serve as the Value feature for the next implicit translation module at next semantic level. Note that for the first implicit transformation module, we directly use an summation between the semantic map feature $F'^{(L+4)}_Q$ and the directly transformed feature $F'^{(L+4)}_K$ at $L_4$ semantic level as the extra Value input. For others, the extra Value inputs come from the output of its previous implicit transformation module.

Compared to the conventional self-attention mechanism that the Query, Key, and Value coming from the same features. In our case, Query vectors comes from the target-view semantic features which provide accuracy target semantic guidance. Key vectors come from the direct translation branch which provides reasonable color distribution to improve the fidelity of the generated images. For the Value vectors at $L_4$ semantic level, it just contains both the appearance information from the source aerial-view image and the target ground-view semantic map, while for Value vectors at $L_3$ and $L_2$ semantic levels, it also involve extra reasonable color distribution from its previous implicit transformation module.

### 3.3. Discriminator and Optimization Objective

**Discriminator.** For the direct transformation branch which outputs the $I'_g$, we follow [17] and [25], and let the discriminator takes the real aerial image $I_a$ and the ground-truth ground-view image $I_g$ as input. The discriminator is desired to tell apart whether a pair of images come from different domains. For the lower decoder branch, the discriminator takes the real image $I_a$ and the generated $I''_g$ or the ground-truth image $I_g$ as input.

**Optimization Objective.** The full optimization objective of the proposed PI-Trans is shown as follows:

$$\min_{\{G\}} \max_{\{D\}} \mathcal{L} = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_c \mathcal{L}_{cGAN} + \lambda_t \mathcal{L}_t + \lambda_{per} \mathcal{L}_{per}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1$ denotes the pixel-level loss which consists of two parts: the first one is used to minimize the difference between the generated image $I'_g$ and the ground truth image $I_g$, while the second one is to minimize the difference between the $I''_g$ and the $I_g$. $\mathcal{L}_{cGAN}$ denotes the adversarial loss, which is used for distinguishing the synthesized images pairs $(I_a, I'_g)$ from the real image pairs $(I_a, I_g)$. It is formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cGAN}(I_a, I'_g) = \mathbb{E}_{I_a, I_g} \left[ \log D(I_a, I_g) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{I_a, I''_g} \left[ \log(1 - D(I_a, I''_g)) \right]. \quad (7)$$
We utilize the same encoder for both the source-view aerial image $I_s$ and the target-view semantic map $S_g$, and the target-view semantic map $S_g$.

$L_{tv}$ is the total variation regularization [9] item on the generated image $I_g$. $L_{per}$ is the perception loss which is commonly used for the generative tasks [9, 24] to make the produced images look more natural and smooth. To make it fair for the experimental comparison, we follow the setting of [25], and set $\lambda_1, \lambda_{cGAN} \lambda_{tv}$ and $\lambda_{per}$ to 100, 5, 1, and 50, respectively.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Settings

Datasets. To validate the effectiveness of our method. We conduct extensive experiments on two challenging public datasets, i.e. Dayton [30] and CVUSA [31]1, following the similar settings as in [17, 25]. For Dayton [30], we firstly select 76,046 images and create a train/test split of 55,000/21,048 pairs, then resize them from the resolution 354×354 to 256×256. Regarding CVUSA [31], there are 35,532/8,884 image pairs in the train/test split. The aerial images are center-cropped to 224×224 and resized to 256×256, while the first quarter of both the ground images and their corresponding segmentation maps are resized to 256×256.

Evaluation Metrics. We follow a similar evaluation protocol as in [17, 25] to measure the quality of the generated street-view images. Specifically, we adopt the top-K prediction accuracy [17], the inception score (IS) [20], KL divergence score and LPIPS [34] for the numerical evaluation metrics. Note that we adopt LPIPS instead of SSIM or PSNR that are used by previous methods because the principle behind LPIPS is more consistent with human visual evaluation. Note that for the top-K prediction accuracy and IS, the higher the better, while for the KL and LPIPS, the lower the better.

4.2. Implementation Details

Encoders. We utilize the same encoder for both the source-view aerial image $I_s$ and the target-view semantic map $S_g$.

The encoder consists of one two-strided down-sampling convolutional layer and two one-strided ones (filter numbers: 16, 32, 32) to generate the $L_1$ level features. Note that each of the convolutional layers is also accompanied by its corresponding batch normalization and ReLU activation function. Given an input in shape $(b, 3, 256, 256)$, the shape of the output feature after the encoder is $(b, 32, 128, 128)$, where $b$ denotes the batch size.

Up-sampling. The up-sampling blocks (depicted in purple in Fig. 1 in the main manuscript) that are used in the decoder branches of our method all share the same structure. Each of them consists of one nearest up-sampling layer, two one-strided convolutional layers (kernel size: 3, 3) that are accompanied with its corresponding batch normalization and ReLU activation function.

Decoders. The decoder consists of three one-strided convolutional layers (kernel size: 3, 3, and padding: 1, 1) and 1 Tanh activation function.

Training Settings. Following [17] and [25], we conduct the optimization as one gradient descent step on the discriminator and one step on the generator in an alternative manner. Adam methods [10] is used as the solver with momentum terms $\beta_1 = 0.5$ and $\beta_2 = 0.99$, and the initial learning rate for Adam is set to 0.0002. In addition, we train the proposed PI-Trans 35 epochs on the Dayton dataset and 30 epochs on the CVUSA dataset in an end-to-end manner. Our method is implemented in PyTorch [16].

4.3. Experimental Results

PI-Trans is compared with five state-of-the-art methods, including Pix2pix [8], X-Fork [17], X-Seq [17], SelectionGAN [25], and CrossMLP [19].

Quantitative Comparisons. Table 1 and Table 2 show the numerical results on the Dayton and CVUSA datasets, respectively. Note that * in the table means these results are reported in [25]. Others are re-evaluated by ourselves with their provided checkpoints. Our PI-Trans achieves the best performance on all the metrics with a significant improvement compared with the existing methods on both challenging datasets.

---

1Ethics statement is provided in supplementary materials.
Table 2. Quantitative results on the CVUSA dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy (%)</th>
<th>Inception Score</th>
<th>KL</th>
<th>LPIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-1</td>
<td>Top-5</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>Top-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pix2pix [8]</td>
<td>7.33*</td>
<td>9.25*</td>
<td>25.81*</td>
<td>32.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Fork [17]</td>
<td>20.58*</td>
<td>31.24*</td>
<td>50.51*</td>
<td>63.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Seq [17]</td>
<td>15.98*</td>
<td>24.14*</td>
<td>42.91*</td>
<td>54.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelectionGAN [25]</td>
<td>41.52</td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>89.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossMLP [19]</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>69.96</td>
<td>76.98</td>
<td>91.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI-Trans (Ours)</td>
<td><strong>47.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.36</strong></td>
<td>94.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the proposed PI-Trans also achieves the lowest LPIPS score which indicates that the images generated by our method are more similar to the ground-truth images even from a person’s perspective.

**Qualitative Comparisons.** The qualitative results of our PI-Trans and the state-of-the-art methods are shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 for Dayton and CVUSA datasets, respectively. We can see that the target-view ground images generated by PI-Trans are more natural and sharper, in line with the LPIPS metric. Specifically, it’s clear that for our results, the texture of trees is richer (1st and 5th rows in Fig. 4), the contour and shape of the house and car are clearer (2nd and 3rd rows in Fig. 4), the color of the sky is more natural (1st and 4th rows in Fig. 5), and the lane lines of the road are more vivid (2nd and 3rd in Fig. 5) compared to other state-of-the-art methods.

To better appreciate the superiority of our method, we present more samples and their generated results with existing methods with both Dayton [30] and CVUSA [31] datasets. Specifically, we compare the proposed PI-Trans
Figure 5. Qualitative results of different methods on the CVUSA dataset.

Table 3. Ablation results on the Dayton-Ablation dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy (%) ↑</th>
<th>Inception Score ↑</th>
<th>KL ↓</th>
<th>LPIPS ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-1 Top-5</td>
<td>all Top-1 Top-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Basic Conv</td>
<td>43.61 71.85 76.56 91.55</td>
<td>2.8132 2.1399 2.8036</td>
<td>2.9343 ± 0.9248</td>
<td>0.4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: MLP-Mixer</td>
<td>44.36 72.08 77.57 92.44</td>
<td>3.3207 2.2852 3.3282</td>
<td>2.5810 ± 0.8489</td>
<td>0.3926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: ConvMLP</td>
<td>42.75 69.35 76.49 89.82</td>
<td>3.2442 2.2229 3.2580</td>
<td>2.8470 ± 0.8619</td>
<td>0.4093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: CrossMLP</td>
<td>43.41 70.73 76.84 91.77</td>
<td>3.3241 2.2580 3.3340</td>
<td>2.7250 ± 0.8703</td>
<td>0.3987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: P-ConvMLP</td>
<td>45.63 73.04 80.02 92.62</td>
<td>3.2573 2.2742 3.2957</td>
<td>2.4877 ± 0.8014</td>
<td>0.3917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: PI-Trans</td>
<td>49.90 79.27 82.83 95.20</td>
<td><strong>3.3975</strong> 2.3461 <strong>3.4111</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0856 ± 0.7045</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3828</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Data</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>3.8307 2.5749 3.9159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with SelectionGAN [25] and CrossMLP [19]. The qualitative results are shown in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 for Dayton and CVUSA, respectively. For convenience, we also mark out the regions that contain obvious artifacts with dotted red boxes.

On the Dayton dataset, PI-Trans can outperform other state-of-the-art methods vividly in terms of preserving the object geometry, e.g., the shape of the house, the contour of the cars, and the texture of the trees or ground. On the CVUSA dataset, we can see that the lane line, the texture of the trees, the surface of the road, and the clouds on the sky generated by our method are more natural and closer to the ground-truth images.

4.4. Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of each proposed module, we design six baselines, i.e., A (Basic Conv), B (MLP-Mixer), C (ConvMLP), D (CrossMLP), E (Parallel-
Figure 6. Qualitative results of different methods on the Dayton dataset.
Figure 7. Qualitative results of different methods on the CVUSA dataset.
ConvMLP), and F (PI-Trans). For baseline A, we just use the convolutional layers instead of the proposed parallel-convMLP in the encoder branches, without the implicit transformation modules. The output directly comes out from a combination of the features between source-view image features and the semantic map features. Baseline B, C, D, and E follow a similar setting as baseline A, with the only difference in the encoder branches. Finally, F is the full architecture of our proposed method as shown in Fig. 2, with the Parallel-ConvMLP and implicit transformation module. All these baseline models are trained and tested with the same configuration. Note that to reduce the training time, we select 1/3 samples randomly from the entire Dayton dataset forming the Dayton-Ablation dataset with 18,334/7,017 pairs. The IS scores for real data in Table 3 are also re-evaluated over the Dayton-Ablation dataset.

Ablation Discussion. The results of the ablation study are shown in Table 3. The result of Baseline A demonstrates that in general, the pure CNN-based models cannot address the cross-view generation satisfactorily with the view gap being large as they struggle to establish the latent long-range relation. From the comparison between our proposed baseline E and baselines B, C, D, it’s clear that the proposed Parallel-ConvMLP achieves a better performance in almost all the metrics, thanks to its ability to keep the balance between long-range relation and fine spatial information modeling. Moreover, our full PI-Trans model outperforms baseline E with a large margin in terms of all the evaluation metrics. Our novel implicit transformation module can successfully exploit the seemingly coarse transformation from the aerial view to the ground view via the multi-level attentive fusion, which provides the semantic-to-appearance correspondence of the generated target-view image at each feature level.

We also provide the qualitative comparison using different ablated methods in Fig. 8. It shows that the results of A, C, D and E are all better than B, which means that when taking the convolutional operations into consideration, the spatial information, like the texture of the houses can be better preserved. Images generated by D (CrossMLP [19]) is better than A, B, and C thanks to its heavy cascaded architecture. From the comparison between E and F, we can see that by just using the proposed parallel-ConvMLP module, we can achieve nearly the best performance compared to A, B, C, and D. However, there are still artifacts existing.
in the bottom right of each generated images. We think E is not able to handle the bias in the training data. When we add the proposed implicit transformation module at multiple feature levels to E, the final PI-Trans can greatly improve the texture and structure of the generated target-view ground images, with the artifacts eliminated.

4.5. Efficiency Analysis

We also compare the parameters and the computation cost of the proposed PI-Trans and other two most recent state-of-the-art works SelectionGAN [25] and CrossMLP [19] that are all implemented by Pytorch [16]. And from the comparison results shown in Table. 4. We conclude that compared SelectionGAN and CrossMLP, the proposed PI-Trans is more parameter and computation friendly but with much better performance on two challenging datasets, qualitatively and quantitatively.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a unique generative adversarial network, PI-Trans, for generating realistic cross-view images. Significantly, the parallel-ConvMLP module is designed for balancing the relationship between latent long-range dependency modeling and spatial information maintenance. And The implicit transformation module we designed at multiple semantic levels in this paper carefully takes care of not only the target-view semantic map feature and the source-view aerial image feature but also the direct translation information that is usually ignored by previous methods. We extensively validated the effectiveness and advances of our proposed modules over existing state-of-the-art methods. In future work, we will explore the applicability of the proposed PI-Trans for other conditional information-guided image translation tasks.

6. Limitations

Though PI-Trans has made significant improvements over other state-of-the-art methods both numerically and visually, we notice that there are still two aspects that we could further improve. Firstly, it’s still challenging for our method to generate the precise texture of the small objects, such as cars and small houses. Secondly, the color of some objects in the generated image, although plausible, can be sometimes be different from the ground-truth image. For both aspects, enforcing attention on top of such objects may help to improve the generation, which we will explore in our future work.
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