Abstract

Recently, neural networks for scene flow estimation show impressive results on automotive data such as the KITTI benchmark. However, despite of using sophisticated rigidity assumptions and parametrizations, such networks are typically limited to only two frame pairs which does not allow them to exploit temporal information. In our paper we address this shortcoming by proposing a novel multi-frame approach that considers an additional preceding stereo pair. To this end, we proceed in two steps: Firstly, building upon the recent RAFT-3D approach, we develop an advanced two-frame baseline by incorporating an improved stereo method. Secondly, and even more importantly, exploiting the specific modeling concepts of RAFT-3D, we propose a U-Net like architecture that performs a fusion of forward and backward flow estimates and hence allows to integrate temporal information on demand. Experiments on the KITTI benchmark do not only show that the advantages of the improved baseline and the temporal fusion approach complement each other, they also demonstrate that the computed scene flow is highly accurate. More precisely, our approach ranks second overall and first for the even more challenging foreground objects, in total outperforming the original RAFT-3D method by more than 16%. Code is available at [https://github.com/cv-stuttgart/M-FUSE](https://github.com/cv-stuttgart/M-FUSE).

1. Introduction

Estimating the 3D motion field of objects in the 3D world from stereo or RGBD image sequences, the so-called scene flow, is one of the fundamental tasks in computer vision. Its fields of application range from robotics and automotive scenarios [21] over markerless motion capture for virtual and augmented reality [37] to action recognition and intention prediction [40].

Early works go back to the seminal approach of Vedula et al. [38] in the late nineties and since then variational methods have been among the leading techniques to solve this task; see e.g. [8, 39, 41]. Only recently, four years after their first application to scene flow estimation [20], neural networks have been able take the lead in dedicated benchmarks such as KITTI [21]; see e.g. the approaches in [14, 35, 43, 44]. This comparably late success of neural networks, however, is not surprising: Scene flow estimation has more degrees of freedom than other correspondence problems that only work in 2D or 1D, such as optical flow and stereo, hence solving this task requires more sophisticated ideas and more complex network architectures.

One way to deal with these additional degrees of freedom is to use semantic information. This information can be given in terms of object models [21] or instance segmentations [2, 16, 44]. Another way is to rely on point-wise [35] or segment-wise rigidity priors [4, 16, 21, 39], or to explicitly learn segmenting rigid motions [44]. In combination with semantic information such rigidity estimates allow to assign rigid motions to all independently moving objects and to the background [16, 44]. And finally, it is also possible to reduce the difficulty of the problem. This can either be done by decoupling stereo and 3D motion estimation [1, 14, 35, 41, 43], which also enables the use of dedicated state-of-the-art algorithms for stereo, or by directly relying on RGBD footage [4, 5, 24, 25], e.g. by using time-of-flight cameras or LiDAR [14].

In view of the aforementioned progress in neural networks for scene flow estimation, it is remarkable that currently leading methods [1, 13, 14, 16, 35, 43, 44] do not exploit potentially valuable temporal information to further improve the results. In fact, while differing in the actual inputs – monocular images [1, 43], stereo pairs [13, 14, 16, 43, 44, 53], RGBD images [35] or LiDAR point clouds [14] – all leading networks are restricted to the standard two-frame setting. In this context, it is also surprising that the best multi-frame scene flow method on the KITTI benchmark is still a classical variational method which dates back to 2015 [39]. This illustrates that developing suitable multi-frame extensions of existing network architectures is indeed a difficult task.

The latter observation is also reflected in the recent literature on multi-frame scene flow networks [28, 9]. On the one hand, on the KITTI benchmark, only slight improvements of 2%-4% have been reported compared to the underlying
two-frame baseline. Evidently, for recent multi-frame architectures, the often much larger training gains do not generalize well to the actual test data. On the other hand, the proposed multi-frame concepts were either not incorporated into state-of-the-art baselines [28] or they were developed for the even more challenging self-supervised monocular setting [9]. This in turn gives an explanation for the relatively poor overall performance of recent multi-frame methods compared to currently leading supervised two-frame approaches. And finally, as of today, the accuracy of leading two-frame approaches in general has improved by a factor two compared to the baseline in [28]; see e.g. [14, 44, 44]. This in turn raises the question if suitable multi-frame extensions can be developed at all, if the underlying baseline already provides a sufficiently high accuracy.

Contributions. In our paper, we show that multi-frame ideas are still valuable in the context of recent high-accuracy networks. Based on the RAFT-3D method [35], we propose a novel multi-frame approach that allows to leverage the performance of current two-frame techniques. In this context we make the following contributions: (i) Initially, we show that the original RAFT-3D approach can be significantly improved by substituting the underlying stereo approach with a more suitable counterpart and by retraining the entire model. (ii) Then, building upon this improved baseline, we propose a novel multi-frame approach that particularly exploits the advantages of the underlying RAFT-3D architecture by combining a $SE(3)$ based prediction step with a U-Net based fusion architecture. (iii) Moreover, performing ablation studies and further experiments based on fourfold cross validation, we illustrate the benefits of the different architectural components and identify a fusion strategy that generalizes well to the test data. (iv) And finally, with improvements of 9\% for the baseline and 16\% for the overall approach, we do not only report much larger performance gains than existing multi-frame scene flow networks, but also achieve competitive results, eventually ranking second in the KITTI scene flow benchmark.

2. Related work

Multi-frame scene flow. Regarding the use of multiple time frames for scene flow estimation, one can mainly distinguish three types of methods. Like our approach, most of them rely on a three frame setting that has proven to be a good compromise between available temporal information and efficiency for both optical flow [18, 19, 26, 42] and scene flow [9, 22, 28, 29, 33].

(i) On the one hand, there are approaches that explicitly model multi-frame scene flow in terms of an energy minimization framework. Such approaches are the method of Vogel et al. [39] that, based on piece-wise rigidity assumption, enforces a consistent piece-wise planar segmentation over time, the method of Golyanik et al. [4] that follows a similar idea but relies on RGBD data instead of stereo sequences, the method of Taniai et al. [33] which fuses estimates from optical flow and multi-frame time stereo, and the method of Neoral and Šochman [22] that extends the two-frame scene flow approach of Menze and Geiger [21] by additionally propagating object labels over time.

(ii) On the other hand, there are sparse-to-dense methods that speed up the computation of energy-based methods by considering sparse matching strategies followed by a robust interpolation step. Such a method is the approach of Schuster et al. [29], which performs a sparse multi-frame matching relying on the assumption that the 3D motion in terms of the scene flow is constant over time.

(iii) And finally, as in the two-frame case, neural networks recently also gained popularity in the context of multi-frame scene flow. Such methods include another approach of Schuster et al. [28] that predicts the forward from the backward flow based on a small learned motion inverter and subsequently fuses both flows using a convex fusion step, and the self-supervised monocular approach of Hur and Roth [9] that uses a convolutional LSTM to encourage consistency over time.

While our multi-frame method is also based on a neural network that fuses backward and forward flows, its strategy differs significantly from the one of Schuster et al. [28]. On the one hand, our method not only relies on a much more advanced baseline, i.e. RAFT-3D, its architecture is also explicitly tailored towards this baseline. In particular, our approach successfully exploits both the local $SE(3)$-based parametrization and the valuable inputs of RAFT-3D’s recurrent unit when adaptively incorporating temporal information. On the other hand, instead of learning a motion model via a small motion inverter that is naturally limited in its generalization capabilities and subsequently restricting the fusion to a convex combination, our approach predicts the motion using a $SE(3)$-based extrapolation and then considers a more generalized U-Net based fusion step. While the $SE(3)$-based prediction holds in many scenarios, the generalized fusion step allows to implicitly learn possibly required corrections of this prediction.

Multi-frame optical flow. In contrast to scene flow estimation (3D motion), there is already an extensive literature on multi-frame neural networks in the closely related field of optical flow estimation (2D motion). In this context, one can roughly distinguish three strategies:

(i) A first common strategy is to rely on a relaxed version of a constant motion model. This can either be achieved by adding a temporal smoothness constraint to the loss such as the unsupervised method of Janai et al. [11] or, even

---

1 We considered from both papers the best overall results in terms of the standard SF-all outlier measure: [28]: DTF-SENSE (9.18) vs. SENSE (9.55). [9]: Multi-Mono-SF-ft (33.09) vs. Self-Mono-SF-ft (33.88).
less strict, by initializing the estimation with the motion-
compensated previous flow (warm start) as employed by the
method of Teed and Deng [34].

(ii) A second strategy is to estimate multiple flows in a 
joint recurrent unit (≠ shared recurrent unit). A corre-
sponding self-supervised approach has been proposed by Liu et al. [15] who estimate forward and backward flows with a 
double cost volume, which allows to learn flow in occluded 
regions without an explicit motion model.

(iii) A third strategy seeks to improve the estimation by 
incorporating a learned motion model. To this end, Maurer 
and Bruhn [18] proposed an approach that integrates pre-
dictions from a motion model that is learned with a small 
network on the fly. Similarly, Stone et al. [31] incorpo-
rated this idea in an unsupervised method, where the 
learned motion model helps to teach the flow in occluded 
regions. And finally, Ren et al. [26] fuse a forward flow 
estimate based on a constant motion model, but allow cor-
corrections in a later fusion step, where they employ the fusion 
module from FlowNet2 [10] originally designed for fusing 
small and large displacements.

In contrast to these multi-frame strategies for optical 
flow, our approach works in the scene flow setting. There, 
predictions are, per constructions, much more meaningful, 
since they are not restricted to projected 2D space. On the 
other hand, this allows us to perform a more realistic SE(3)-
based prediction. On the one hand, when fusing this pre-
diction with the original forward flow, we can consider an-
ditionally disparity information which makes it simpler for 
the fusion network to learn possibly required corrections.

Similar to [26], we employ a U-Net architecture. However, 
we tightly integrate our model with the baseline approach 
and do not use warping of previous flow estimates.

3. Approach

We propose a neural network for scene flow estimation 
from a triplet of stereo frames. Given the three stereo frames 
\((I_{t-1}, I_t, I_{t+1})\), \((I_t, I_{t+1})\) and \((I_t, I_{t-1})\), our goal is to es-
mate the four-dimensional scene flow \((u, v, d, d')\) between 
frame \(t\) and frame \(t+1\). Here, \((u, v)\) denotes the 
optical flow and \(d\) and \(d'\) are the disparities at time \(t\) and 
\(t+1\) registered to the reference frame \(I_t\).

Following recent works [1] [14] [35] [43], we thereby de-
couple the disparity estimation from the recovery of the 
3D motion. To this end, we precompute disparities for 
each stereo frame using a dedicated stereo method, yielding 
\(D^{t-1}, D^t\) and \(D^{t+1}\). This allows us to directly take over the 
final estimate for \(d\) from \(D^t\). Hence, the scene flow problem 
reduces to estimating \((u, v, d')\). Please note that \(d'\) cannot 
be taken over directly from \(D^{t+1}\) since \(d'\) is registered to 
\(I_t\) while \(D^{t+1}\) is registered to \(I_t\). However, knowing \(D^t\), 
we can easily convert between \(d'\) and the change in disparity 
\(\Delta d\), with \(d' = D^t + \Delta d\) when estimating the scene flow.

Using this notation, let us now explain our two-frame 
baseline and subsequently our full multi-frame network.

3.1. Improved two-frame baseline

We base our work on the recent two-frame approach 
RAFT-3D [35], which first uses an off-the-shelf stereo es-
timation network to compute left-right disparities and then 
estimates the scene flow while keeping the reference dis-
parity \(D^t\) fixed. The approach employs a recurrent neu-
ral network which operates at 1/8th of the original resolu-
tion, where the final result is obtained by a learned con-
 vex upsampling [34]. Notably, RAFT-3D predicts the scene 
flow in terms of a field of \(SE(3)\) transformation matrices, 
and afterwards translates them to the standard parametriza-
tion \((u, v, d')\). Building upon this work, we proceed in two 
steps. Making use of recent progress in the field of stereo 
estimation, we first exchange RAFT-3D’s stereo estimation 
network, GANet [45] with the recently well-performing 
LEAStereo [3]. Subsequently, with the improved stereo re-
results, we fully retrain RAFT-3D using their provided code. 
This way, we obtain an improved two-frame baseline serv-
ing as a building block in our multi-frame network.
Figure 2. Input features to our fusion module. *From left to right:* Disparity in the reference frame $D^t$, disparity change $\Delta d$, optical flow $(u, v)$, rigid-motion embedding vectors, correlation cost, disparity residuals. *Top row:* features from forward direction, *bottom row:* features from backward direction. For the disparity and optical flow estimates we employ standard color visualizations, for the 16-channel embedding vectors we used PCA to reduce them to 3 channels for visualization.

### 3.2. Multi-frame fusion network

Conceptually, our multi-frame fusion network consists of two shared instances of our improved two-frame baseline and a fusion module predicting the final scene flow. More precisely, given two initial motion estimates for the forward and backward flow in low resolution, we derive low-resolution features which we adaptively upsample and subsequently combine with high-resolution features, eventually fusing forward and inverted backward flow estimates in a feature-guided high-resolution fusion module. In the following, we discuss all steps of our approach in detail; see Figure 1 for a complete overview.

**Initial scene flow estimation.** In an initial step, our improved two-frame baseline predicts forward scene flow ($t \rightarrow t+1$) and backward scene flow ($t \rightarrow t-1$) at 1/8th of the full image resolution; as in the original RAFT-3D method [35]. It predicts flow estimates in terms of a field of $SE(3)$ transformation matrices as well as a weighting mask for convex upsampling.

**Low-resolution features.** In order to later guide our fusion of flow estimates, we consider two features derived from the specific architecture of our baseline. First, rigid-motion embedding vectors ($embVec$) are essential to our baseline method, as they are used for a soft-grouping of pixels that belong to objects with the same rigid motion [35]. Since this segmentation information can be valuable for the fusion of forward and backward flow estimates, we utilize these features as an input to our fusion module. To this end, we extract the 16-channel prediction of the rigid-motion embedding vectors by the network for both the forward and the backward baselines. Second, the cost volume is at the core of recent motion estimation algorithms [32, 34, 35] since it assigns matching costs to potential flow estimates. In order to better guide our fusion module, we look up the correlation costs ($corrCost$) for the current flow estimates in forward and backward direction, which provides supporting information on the quality of the estimates. Note that we omit the multi-scale pyramid and the spatially extended lookup employed by [34] [35] and only extract a single cost value per pixel for the central location.

**Joint convex upsampling.** So far, the flow predictions as well as the extracted features are given on 1/8th of the original resolution. As the next step, we will hence exploit the convex upsampling mask predicted by the baseline networks in order to obtain flow predictions and features on the original high resolution. This proceeding offers three advantages: We can utilize disparity maps, which are given at the original resolution, we can perform backward-to-forward prediction at the original resolution and we can ultimately fuse flows at the original resolution.

**High-resolution features.** With the correlation cost at hand, we have matching information based on image features, but so far we do not make use of any disparity cues to guide the fusion. In order to create meaningful features, we first convert the upsampled forward and backward transformation fields to optical flow and disparity estimates which yields $(u_{fw}, v_{fw}, d_{fw}^t)$ and $(u_{bw}, v_{bw}, d_{bw}^t)$, respectively. Then, we warp the initial high-resolution disparity estimates $D^{t+1}$ and $D^{t-1}$ using these optical flows such that they are aligned with the reference frame and subtract the corresponding disparity estimates in order to compute disparity residuals ($dispRes$) for both directions as

$$W(D^{t+1}, u_{fw}, v_{fw}) - d_{fw}^t,$$

$$W(D^{t-1}, u_{bw}, v_{bw}) - d_{bw}^t,$$

where $W(D, u, v)$ denotes backward-warping of $D$ using the optical flow $(u, v)$. If the correct scene flow is given, the residuals are 0 for non-occluded pixels [35].

**Backward-to-forward prediction.** In our initial flow estimation, we predicted backward flow pointing towards the previous frame. In order to obtain a meaningful prediction in forward direction, we utilize the $SE(3)$ motion parametrization of the upsampled scene flow and invert the backward transformations with a differentiable matrix inversion [35]. Note that this inversion in matrix space is capable of performing true inversion of rotational motion rather than simple linear inversion in the standard scene flow representation, which only flips the sign. Subsequently, we convert the matrix representation of the forward and the inverted backward flow to optical flow and disparity change, which is the parametrization we employ for the fusion.

**Fusion inputs.** As a final step, we concatenate the forward and backward flow and all features which we provide to the
our training using a robustified sublinear L1 loss, reading

\[ L_{\text{fuse}} = \sum_x (\alpha \cdot |d' - d'_{\text{gt}}| + |u - u_{\text{gt}}| + |v - v_{\text{gt}}| + \epsilon)^\gamma. \]  

In all our experiments, we chose \( \epsilon = 0.01 \) and \( \gamma = 0.4 \). We additionally introduce a weighting parameter \( \alpha \) to balance the loss components for disparity and optical flow and set it to 2. Finally, we also utilize the original RAFT-3D loss \( L_{\text{R3D}} \) and apply it directly to the output of the forward baseline. The total loss then reads \( L = L_{\text{fuse}} + \mu \cdot L_{\text{R3D}} \), with \( \mu = 0.1 \).

4. Experiments

We implemented our model in PyTorch [23] and initialized the fusion module’s weights with the normal distributed initialization by He et al. [6] for convolutions, and zero-initialization for biases. For the two-frame baseline, we used code provided by the authors [35].

Training details. For the two-frame baseline, we followed the original training of RAFT-3D [35] with 200K steps pre-training on FlyingThings3D [20] and 50K steps finetuning on the KITTI train split [21]; the latter using our improved disparity estimates [3]. For training our multi-frame method, we initialized our shared forward and backward model with the pretrained two-frame baseline and also finetuned for 50K steps on the KITTI train split – this time, however, dividing the 50K steps in two stages. First, for 10K steps, we kept the parameters of the shared baseline models fixed in order to pretrain the fusion module. Then, for the remaining 40K steps, we trained our entire model end-to-end. Thereby, we used the Adam optimizer [12] with the same linear-decay learning rate strategy [30] as RAFT-3D [35], employing maximum learning rates of \( 5 \cdot 10^{-4} \) and \( 1 \cdot 10^{-4} \) for the two finetuning stages. During all stages, we trained on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU with batch size 4. Moreover, we utilized spatial and photometric augmentations [35] with crop size \( 256 \times 960 \).

4.1. Benchmark results

In our first experiment, we compare the accuracy of our multi-frame scene flow method to that of other recent scene flow approaches from the literature. To this end, we computed the scene flow for the KITTI test split both with our novel M-FUSE approach as well as with its underlying two-frame baseline and submitted the corresponding flow fields to the official benchmark [21]. Table 1 shows the obtained results together with the results of the ten top-ranked published scene flow methods. Thereby, it lists the standard outlier rates \( D1 \) and \( D2 \) for the disparities at time \( t \) and \( t+1 \), the optical flow error \( F1 \) and the scene flow error \( SF \). These errors are evaluated on all pixels, as well as separately for static background (bg) objects only moving due to camera motion and for dynamic foreground (fg) objects that move independently; see [21] for details. Additionally, for each outlier rate, the table shows relative improvements of the baseline and our method with respect to RAFT-3D as well as the relative improvements of our multi-frame approach compared to the two-frame baseline.
Table 1. Top ranking non-anonymous submissions to the KITTI benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>D1-bg</th>
<th>D1-fg</th>
<th>D1-all</th>
<th>D2-bg</th>
<th>D2-fg</th>
<th>D2-all</th>
<th>Fl-bg</th>
<th>Fl-fg</th>
<th>Fl-all</th>
<th>SF-bg</th>
<th>SF-fg</th>
<th>SF-all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF, SSENSE [28]</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereo expansion [43]</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOSF [13]</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UberATG-DRISF [16]</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFT-3D [35]</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereo expansion [43]</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CamLiFlow [14]</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline Improvements
(Baseline vs. RAFT-3D) 5.4% 15.9% 8.8% 21.5% 2.5% 13.6% 12.1% -8.2% 5.4% 17.3% -2.3% 9.9%

Multi-frame Improvements
(M-FUSE vs. Baseline) - - - -8.6% 12.1% 1.3% 10.7% 21.5% 14.8% 2.8% 12.7% 7.1%

Overall Improvements
(M-FUSE vs. RAFT-3D) 5.4% 15.9% 8.8% 14.7% 14.4% 14.7% 21.5% 15.0% 19.3% 19.7% 10.8% 16.3%

![Figure 4](image-url) Figure 4. Qualitative evaluation of multi-frame improvements for 5 sequences of the KITTI benchmark (M-FUSE vs. baseline). From top to bottom: reference frame, change in D2, Fl and SF. Grey: Both methods are correct, blue: M-FUSE is correct and two-frame baseline is not, red: two-frame baseline is correct and M-FUSE is not, yellow: both methods fail.

As one can see, already our M-FUSE baseline allows to significantly improve results compared to the original RAFT-3D approach. In this context, the total gain of 9.9% can be mainly attributed to very strong improvements in the background region. Our full M-FUSE approach then improves these results even further, outperforming RAFT-3D by 16.3%. Thereby, it also shows strong gains in the foreground, which this time are due to the consideration of multi-frame information (see M-FUSE vs. Baseline). As a consequence, on the KITTI benchmark our method ranks second for all pixels, and even first for foreground regions.

In Figure 4, we analyze the multi-frame improvements for five exemplary sequences of the KITTI benchmark. In accordance with the numbers in Table 1, we observe that (i) multi-frame improvements are strongest for the optical flow error compared to the disparity error and (ii) the improvements are most significant on the individually moving foreground objects.

4.2. Ablations

We ablate our model architecture in Table 2. For these and all following experiments, we perform 4-fold cross validation on the KITTI train split for more reliable evaluations with only limited data available. Note that we omit the error measure for D1 in the tables since it is identical.

**Feature aggregation.** Our U-Net computes additive increments for previous layers at the same resolution, which
leads to a residual structure. We compare this approach to the strategy presented in [27], where feature maps are concatenated and not summed up before a convolution. Using additive residual connections consistently improves results.

**Fusion module depth.** In a second study, we ablate the depth of our fusion U-Net by comparing variants with two, three and four levels. While a two-level U-Net still gives on-par results in the $D_2$ error, our three-level U-Net outperforms both the other networks in the $Fl$ and $SF$ errors.

**In-between convolutions.** As can be seen in Figure 3 in every depth level for the contracting as well as the expanding part one additional in-between convolutional layer is used to process information. Thus, we performed an ablation over several options: completely omitting this layer (none), having one (1 conv) or two (2 convs) convolutions, or using a residual block [7] (resblock). The results for none, one or two convolutional layers are very close to each other, where no convolutional layer results in on-par $D_2$ results. Two convolutions outperform a single one in the $Fl$ error – however at the cost of decreased $D_2$ quality. Thus, in the combined $SF$ error, one convolution slightly outperforms the other choices. Finally, despite being most closely related to the two convolutions, the residual block further decreases the quality compared to all other cases.

**Additional fusion inputs.** Our fusion network makes use of forward and backward scene flow estimates. In a larger set of experiments we determined which additional inputs to our fusion module are useful. To this end, we compare our set of additional inputs (correlation costs, disparity residuals and rigid motion embedding vectors) to omitting all of them (none) and to omitting each of them individually, to assess their individual contribution.

The results show that omitting all additional features significantly worsens results, which indicates that valuable information is contained in our set of features. Further, we see that omitting the rigid motion embedding vectors gives nearly on-par results to our method, with superior results in the $D_2$ but a worse $Fl$ error. The disparity residuals seem most essential: When removed, the resulting quality lowers significantly for all measures. Similarly, removing correlation costs has a clear negative impact. Additionally, we investigated if adding the reference frame $I_l^t$ to the set of inputs is helpful, which was suggested by [26]. However, this did not improve results any further, presumably because the correlation cost provides already sufficient information.

**Image features.** Finally, we compare two options to encode image-related features guiding our fusion module. The first option is to utilize the learned correlation cost from our baseline, which is upsampled from 1/8th of the resolution. The second option is a full-resolution brightness constancy error map [26] as the $L_2$ distance between the warped and original image. As one can see, the brightness constancy maps are outperformed by learned correlation features – even if they are only upsampled from the lower resolution.

### 4.3. Scene flow parametrization

Next, we investigate the influence of the underlying scene flow parametrization in our fusion module. Table 3 compares the image-space parametrizations of optical flow and target disparity $(u, v, d')$ against optical flow and the change in disparity $(u, v, \Delta d)$. Additionally, we investigate the world-space 3D motion vector parametrization $(x, y, z)$.

Evidently, the image-space parametrizations outperform the 3D vector parametrization by a large margin in the optical flow error $Fl$. We argue that this is due to the error measures that are employed in scene flow estimation, which also work in image space. Among the image-space parametriza-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature aggregation</th>
<th>$D_2$</th>
<th>$Fl$</th>
<th>$SF$</th>
<th>#param</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>concat.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (ours)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fusion module depth</th>
<th>$D_2$</th>
<th>$Fl$</th>
<th>$SF$</th>
<th>#param</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 levels</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 levels (ours)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 levels</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-between convs</th>
<th>$D_2$</th>
<th>$Fl$</th>
<th>$SF$</th>
<th>#param</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 conv (ours)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 convs</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resblock</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional fusion inputs</th>
<th>$D_2$</th>
<th>$Fl$</th>
<th>$SF$</th>
<th>#param</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corrCost,dispRes</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrCost,embVec</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispRes,embVec</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrCost,dispRes,embVec</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrCost,dispRes,embVec, $I_l^t$</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image features</th>
<th>$D_2$</th>
<th>$Fl$</th>
<th>$SF$</th>
<th>#param</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corrCost (ours)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Influence of the scene flow parametrization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>Fl</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((u, v, d'))</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((u, v, \Delta d)) (ours)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((x, y, z))</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Comparison of multi-frame strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>Fl</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>two-frame</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm-start (inv. backward)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm-start (warped prev.)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learned inv + mask fusion</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialized U-Net + inputs</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-FUSE</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Comparison of multi-frame strategies

As a final experiment we compare our approach to three multi-frame strategies available in the literature: Warm-starting the method, a learned inversion with mask-based fusion and a specialized U-Net with additional inputs, which are compared in Table 4.

First, the warm-start initialization strategy has been shown to be highly successful in recent recurrent networks [34]. We considered two variants for our baseline approach: For one, we used the matrix-inverted backward flow as an initialization, in contrast to the identity matrix initialization from [35]. For the other, we initialized with the previous forward scene flow that is forward-warped in the corresponding Lie algebra [36] using the estimated optical flow. In Table 4, both approaches perform considerably worse than the two-frame baseline, even though the forward-warping variant yields better results than the inverted-backward variant. This is in line with previous studies, where warm-start on the KITTI dataset did not yield improvements [34].

Second, we considered a recent strategy that relies on a learned backward-to-forward inverter [18] [28] followed by a predicted fusion mask that linearly combines forward and backward estimates [28]. We reimplemented the inversion and fusion module from [28] and pretrained the former, before using these modules in our method. For comparability, we adapted the modules to our three-channel prediction case, keeping \(D^t\) fixed. In Table 5, this strategy clearly yields worse results than our approach. We attribute this to the simplistic structure of the motion model and the restrictive convex combination of flow inputs.

Third, we investigated a strategy that employs the specialized fusion U-Net from FlowNet2 [10] for fusing forward and backward optical flow estimates [26] guided by a brightness constancy map and the reference image. To this end, we extended this fusion module to the scene flow setting and embedded it in our approach. For a fair comparison, we also added disparity residuals to its fusion inputs. While such a strategy slightly outperforms the two-frame baseline, it cannot keep up with the significantly better results achieved by our method.

4.5. Timing and parameter counts

Our method takes around 1.3s per frame for inference on a NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti. The parameter counts are given in Table 5. Our multi-frame fusion approach increases the required parameters by 5% compared to the two-frame baseline in terms of the scene flow estimator. However, when comparing to the full RAFT-3D approach [35], we still need less parameters as a result of the more parameter-efficient stereo approach [3].

5. Conclusion

We proposed a novel multi-frame scene flow approach that leverages the performance of recent high accuracy two-frame methods. To this end, we developed an improved RAFT-3D baseline and embedded it into a U-Net-based fusion approach that adaptively integrates temporal information by combining an \(SE(3)\)-based extrapolation of the backward flow with the jointly estimated forward flow. The achieved results clearly demonstrate that our strategy of explicitly tailoring our architecture towards the underlying baseline pays off. With more than 16% improvements compared to the original RAFT-3D approach, they show significantly larger improvements than other multi-frame networks in the literature. Moreover, in absolute accuracy our method ranks second in the public KITTI benchmark, clearly outperforming all other multi-frame approaches.
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