Supplementary Material: Cross-Domain Synthetic-to-Real In-the-Wild Depth and Normal Estimation for 3D Scene Understanding

Jay Bhanushali¹ Manivannan Muniyandi¹ Praneeth Chakravarthula² ¹Haptics Lab, Indian Institute of Technology Madras ²UNC Chapel Hill

1. Supplementary Material

In this supplementary material, we discuss our approach on generating the OmniHorizon dataset in Unreal Engine 4. We elaborate on the factors and certain assumptions that we made in order to render the dataset. Additionally, we discuss about training the UBotNet on indoor datasets and architecture choices. Finally, we demonstrate additional results for depth and normal estimation from real-world images in the wild.

1.1. Depth clamping

Rendering engines such as Unreal Engine 4 work with a larger depth range compared to that captured by physical sensors. However, we were interested in exploring the range of depth information that can be used for covering a wide range of objects in outdoor scenarios. This motivated us to simulate the limitations of the physical sensors and restrict the depth range to 150 m, similar to the Fukuoka dataset [5]. The engine places the far plane at infinity, which results in depth values being generated for extremely distant objects. To avoid this, we modify the depth material to visualise the impact of constraining the depth to a maximum specified value. We show the results for the clamping of depth at a range of 10m, 75m and 150m in Figure 2. At a depth of 10 m, only the truck is visible. When the depth range is raised to 75 m, cars and building start to appear in the background. At 150 m, the trees and most of the background are visible. By limiting the depth in outdoor environments, it is possible to focus solely on nearby items, or, depending on the application, on distant objects as well.

1.2. View-space vs world-space normals

The view space normals are calculated relative to the camera orientation, whereas the world space normals are calculated with respect to the global axes of the scene. The normals in view space are desired when using a perspective camera as they are tied to the camera pose (extrinsic parameters). However, the panoramic image is obtained by rotating the camera on both the horizontal and vertical axis in increments of fixed angle steps (5°) , followed by merging the multiple views.





Since the coordinate system is relative to the camera in view space, it also gets modified with the rotation. This results in a gradient of normals with no basis vectors. The normals obtained in world space are absolute and independent of camera pose. Figure 1 shows the difference between the view-space and world-space normals. Therefore, we captured the normals in world space as it was consistent for both within and between the scenes. We show the convention used for the world-space normals in Figure 3.

1.3. Virtual Avatars

As discussed in main paper, we utilised Metahumans [4] for the virtual avatars in the scene. We have used premade MetaHumans available in the Quixel bridge. It allowed us to bring in highly detailed characters and more diversity in the pedestrians. But there were certain challenges while using the Metahumans for the dataset. They are generated with multiple level of details (LODs) for perfomance optimisation. As a result, there would be sudden popups and other artifacts when the camera is approaching a character. Figure 4 illustrates how the character hair and details change when the camera is approaching the character. Lower LOD level (LOD 8) indicates lowest detailed polygon mesh with no advanced features such as detail normal maps or hairs. The higher LOD level (Level 0/1) has higher polygons with extra detail maps for the skin and hair grooming system.



Figure 2. *Depth clamping experiment*. Comparison between various depth ranges after clamping to a specific range: 10 m, 75 m and 150 m. Inverted depth maps are shown for better visualization.



Figure 3. Convention for the world-space normals.

Additionally, we also observed artifacts in the normal maps for the characters with detailed grooming such as facial hair. Figure 5 shows the issues with the normal maps of a character in the region with facial hair. For such characters we used LOD 1 or LOD 2 to resolve the problems.

1.4. Assumptions in the Dataset

Our dataset renders several realistic outdoor and indoor environments with dynamic scene components. While curating this dataset, we made certain assumptions especially about the outdoor scenes which we list below:

- The sky is assumed to be situated at infinitely large distance from the camera, and is represented as a spherical mesh of large radius encompassing the entire scene. Additionally, normals are not rendered for the sky region. It is represent using black which indicates invalid normal values. This allows us to distinguish sky from other regions in the scene.
- 2. Transparent and transluscent materials such as water, windows of the buildings and windshields of vehicles are replaced with fully reflective materials. We observed that inferring depth of such materials from color images is challenging and this limitation, for example, also applies to real-world datasets captured using lidars [8]. Figure 6 depicts the limitation of using transparent and translucent materials in the dataset. The original water shader in the scene was designed in such a way that it acted as a see-through material in case of depth. As a result, the depth map captures the terrain hidden underneath the water surface. We modified the the water shader to a reflective surface and thus depth

is correctly rendered as a planar surface. We observed a similar case for the glass shader used for windows in the vehicles. The vehicles indeed have detailed indoors but due to reflections on the glass, the inside is not clearly visible. However, the depth map has much cleaner view of the indoors. To avoid this conflict of information, we use fully opaque and reflective materials for the windows.

2. UBotNet

UBotNet for Indoor datasets. In the main paper, we discussed about the UBotNet architecture and the results from training on the OmniHorizon dataset. We additonally trained UBotNet on real-world indoor dataset Pano3D [1] to validate the performance of the network on other datasets. Pano3D is proposed as a modification of Matteport3D [2] and Gibson3D [10]. We used the official splits provided by the authors for Matterport3D for training and validation. For, Gibson, we used the *GibsonV2 Full Low Resolution* for training and validated on Matterport. All the images used for training were of 512 x 256 resolution. We used the loss function and training parameters outlined in our main paper. We trained UBotNet Lite on the both the datasets for 60 epochs.

 Table 1. Quantitative results for depth estimation using UBotNet

 Lite validated on indoor dataset - Matterport3D.

	Ľ	epth Er	ror↓	Depth Accuracy \uparrow			
Dataset	RMSE	MRE	RMSE log	$\delta 1$	$\delta 2$	$\delta 3$	
Matterport3D	0.639	0.142	0.064	0.817	0.952	0.981	
Gibson 3D	0.591	0.154	0.061	0.830	0.965	0.986	

Table 1 shows the quantitative results for the task of depth estimation by UBotNet Lite evaluated on Matterport3D. We also show the qualitative results for the validation task in Figure 8. We observed better performance in overall metrics and the visual results when the network is trained on the Gibson3D.



Figure 4. *Dynamic LODs vs Constant LOD.* a) The Dynamic LOD system loads different meshes with various level of details based on the proximity to camera. This however results in sudden poping up of the meshes which generates artefacts in the data. b) Default LOD settings used by the engine. c) The modified LOD system is used to maintain LODs at a fixed LOD so that the avatar's appearance is unaffected by distance. d) The LOD of the character is locked to 1 using Forced LOD.



Figure 5. Artefacts in normal maps for facial hairs. When the camera is very close to the characters, the engine uses additional detail meshes for characters with facial hair at the highest LOD level (LOD 0). As a result, artefacts appear in the normal maps.We use LOD 1 or 2 for such characters.

Absolute vs Relative positional encoding. We utilised relative positional encoding [6] for self-attention in our proposed UBotNet architecture. We compare it against the absolute positional embeddings and show the quantitative results in Table 2. The absolute positional embeddings perform inferior to the relative positional embeddings used for self-attention. Moreover, the differences are more prominent in case of normal estimation. This is reaffirmed by the visual differences shown in Figure 7. The network loses the context required for learning the consistent representation of the normals. It behaves similar to the UNet₁₂₈ network discussed in the main paper.

Network architecture Table 3 shows the detailed layout of the UBotNet architecture. The three major sections of the architecture are: UNet Encoder, Bottleneck Transformer and UNet Decoder.

3. Addition Results

Figure 9 shows the results for the networks discussed in main paper for depth and normal estimation on 360 images captured from real-world locations. As evident from the results, other methods struggle when estimating the normal information. On the other hand, UBotNet leverages this information and estimates both depth and normal information with increased accuracy. Note that some of networks also struggle with changing sky conditions and hence produce artifacts in those regions. UBotnet is more robust to diverse outdoor lighting and sky conditions. Interestingly, other networks also fail to identify vertical structures (as shown in last image of Figure 9) whereas both UBotNet and UbotNet Lite are able to segment ground from the walls and boundaries.

Figure 10 demonstrates the qualitative results for the architectures that perform only depth estimation. The visual output of depth estimation from the Bifuse [9] support the quantitative results in the main paper where Bifuse performs really well in OmniHorizon benchmark. Figure 11 shows additional examples of depth and normal estimation by UBot-Net on real-world images. We test the network in overcast cast conditions, uneven terrain and reflective floors. UBot-Net also performs well with diverse vegetation scenarios ranging from small shrubs to complex forests. We also show few results for indoor scenarios where the network performs well even though it was trained for outdoor scenarios. Note that all the networks used for the evaluation and results discussed in this section were trained purely on OmniHorizon dataset.



b) Modification of glass shader to opaque reflective surface

Figure 6. Assumptions for the dataset. a) Modification of water shader to achieve constant depth across the surface of the water. b) Modification of glass shader into opaque reflective surface which hides the interior parts of the vehicles.



Figure 7. Comparison between Abs. and Rel. positional embedding. Absolute positional embedding loses the context required for learning the normals when used for self-attention.

Table 2. Quantitative results for the comparison between the positional embedding used in the UBotNet architecture for self-attention. The results for the Relative Positional Embedding are repeated from our main paper for the comparison.

	Depth Error \downarrow		Depth Accuracy ↑			Normal Error \downarrow			Normal Accuracy †			
Method	RMSE	MRE	RMSE log	$\delta 1 < 1.25$	$\delta 2 < 1.25^2$	$\delta 3 < 1.25^3$	Mean	Median	RMSE	5.0°	7.5°	11.25°
Absolute Pos. Emb.	0.053	0.290	0.152	0.691	0.871	0.925	8.65	3.98	13.99	54.26	63.00	73.23
Relative Pos. Emb.	0.054	0.271	0.151	0.712	0.875	0.926	7.44	3.61	12.12	56.80	67.28	78.52



Figure 8. Qualitative results for UBotNet Lite trained on Indoor datasets - Matterport3D and Gibson3D.



Figure 9. Depth and Normal estimation on real-world images in the wild. Comparison between all the networks discussed in main paper for depth and normal estimation on real world images.



Figure 10. Qualitative results for monocular depth estimation by [7], [3] and [9] on OmniHorizon and real-world images.



Figure 11. Examples of depth and normal estimation using UBotNet on real-world images in the wild.

References

- [1] Georgios Albanis, Nikolaos Zioulis, Petros Drakoulis, Vasileios Gkitsas, Vladimiros Sterzentsenko, Federico Alvarez, Dimitrios Zarpalas, and Petros Daras. Pano3d: A holistic benchmark and a solid baseline for 360° depth estimation. In 2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW), pages 3722–3732, 2021. 2
- [2] Angel Chang, Angela Dai, Thomas Funkhouser, Maciej Halber, Matthias Niessner, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Andy Zeng, and Yinda Zhang. Matterport3d: Learning from rgb-d data in indoor environments. *International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, 2017. 2
- [3] Giovanni Pintore et al. SliceNet: deep dense depth estimation from a single indoor panorama using a slice-based representation. In *CVPR*, 2021. 6

- [4] Epic Games. Metahumans, 2022. https://www. unrealengine.com/en-US/metahuman. 1
- [5] Oscar Martinez Mozos, Kazuto Nakashima, Hojung Jung, Yumi Iwashita, and Ryo Kurazume. Fukuoka datasets for place categorization. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 38(5):507–517, 2019. 1
- [6] Aravind Srinivas, Tsung-Yi Lin, Niki Parmar, Jonathon Shlens, Pieter Abbeel, and Ashish Vaswani. Bottleneck transformers for visual recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 16519–16529, June 2021. 3
- [7] Cheng Sun, Min Sun, and Hwann-Tzong Chen. Hohonet: 360 indoor holistic understanding with latent horizontal features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2573–2582, 2021.
- [8] Igor Vasiljevic, Nick Kolkin, Shanyi Zhang, Ruotian Luo, Haochen Wang, Falcon Z. Dai, Andrea F. Daniele, Mohammadreza Mostajabi, Steven Basart, Matthew R. Walter, and Gregory Shakhnarovich. DIODE: A Dense Indoor and Outdoor DEpth Dataset. *CoRR*, abs/1908.00463, 2019. 2
- [9] Fu-En Wang, Yu-Hsuan Yeh, Min Sun, Wei-Chen Chiu, and Yi-Hsuan Tsai. Bifuse: Monocular 360 depth estimation via bi-projection fusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 462–471, 2020. 3, 6
- [10] Fei Xia, Amir R. Zamir, Zhiyang He, Alexander Sax, Jitendra Malik, and Silvio Savarese. Gibson env: Real-world perception for embodied agents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2018. 2

UNet Encoder Bottleneck Transformer UNet Decoder Layer Output Shape Params Layer Output Shape Params Laver Output Shape Params Conv2d-1 128, 512, 256 3.456Identity-64 2048.32.16 ConvTranspose2d-158 1024, 64, 32 8,389,632 0 BatchNorm2d-2 1.048.576 Conv2d-159 128, 512, 256 256Conv2d-65 512.32.16 1024.64.32 18,874,368 ReLU-3 128, 512, 2560 BatchNorm2d-66 512, 32, 16 1,024BatchNorm2d-160 1024, 64, 32 2,048Conv2d-4 128, 512, 256147.456ReLU-67 512, 32, 16 0 ReLU-161 1024, 64, 32 0 9,437,184 BatchNorm2d-5 128, 512, 256 256ReLU-68 512, 32, 16 0 Conv2d-162 1024, 64, 32 ReLU-6 ReLU-69 BatchNorm2d-163 128, 512, 2560 512, 32, 16 0 1024, 64, 32 2,048DoubleConv-7 128, 512, 2560 ReLU-70 512, 32, 160 ReLU-164 1024, 64, 32 0 ReLU-71 MaxPool2d-8 128, 511, 255 0 512, 32, 16 0 DoubleConv-165 1024, 64, 32 0 128, 511, 255ReLU-72 1024, 64, 32 MaxPool2d-9 0 512, 32, 16UNet-up-block-166 ConvTranspose2d-167 Conv2d-168 $\begin{array}{c} 2,097,664 \\ 4,718,592 \end{array}$ ReflectionPad2d-10 128 514 258 0 Conv2d-73 1024.32.16 524 288 512, 128, 64 ReflectionPad2d-11 128,514,2580 Conv2d-74 512, 32, 16 262, 144512, 128, 64BlurPool-12 128, 256, 128 RelPosEmb-75 4,512,512BatchNorm2d-169 512, 128, 64 0 0 1,024BlurPool-13 128,256,128 Softmax-76 4 512 512 0 ReLU-170 512, 128, 64 0 0 2, 359, 296 Conv2d-14 256, 256, 128 294, 912 MHSA-77 512, 32, 16Conv2d-171 512, 128, 64 0 BatchNorm2d-15 256, 256, 128 Identity-78 512, 32, 16BatchNorm2d-172 512, 128, 641,0245120 ReLU-16 1.024ReLU-173 256, 256, 128 0 BatchNorm2d-79 512.32.16 512, 128, 64 0 589, 824 Conv2d-17 256, 256, 128 ReLU-80 512, 32, 160 DoubleConv-174 512, 128, 64 0 BatchNorm2d-18 256, 256, 128 512ReLU-81 512, 32, 16UNet-up-block-175 512, 128, 64 0 0 524.544ReLU-19 256, 256, 128 0 ReLU-82 512.32.16 0 ConvTranspose2d-176 256.256.128 256, 256, 128 DoubleConv-20 256, 256, 128 0 ReLU-83 512, 32, 160 Conv2d-177 1, 179, 648 UNet-down-block-21 256, 256, 1280 ReLU-84 512, 32, 160 BatchNorm2d-178 256, 256, 128 512MaxPool2d-22 ReLU-85 256, 255, 127 0 512, 32, 16 0 ReLU-179 256, 256, 128 0 MaxPool2d-23 256, 255, 127 2048, 32, 16 Conv2d-180 256, 256, 128 589,8240 Conv2d-86 1,048,576ReflectionPad2d-24 256, 258, 130 0 BatchNorm2d-87 2048, 32, 164,096BatchNorm2d-181 256, 256, 128 512 256, 258, 130 ReLU-88 256, 256, 128 ReflectionPad2d-25 ReLU-182 0 2048, 32, 16 0 0 BlurPool-26 256, 128, 64ReLU-89 2048, 32, 16 DoubleConv-183 256, 256, 128 0 0 BlurPool-27 256, 128, 64 0 ReLU-90 2048.32.16 0 UNet-up-block-184 256, 256, 128 0 Conv2d-28 512, 128, 64 1,179,648 ReLU-91 2048, 32, 16 0 ConvTranspose2d-185 128, 512, 256131,200 BatchNorm2d-29 512, 128, 641,024ReLU-92 2048, 32, 16 Conv2d-186 128, 512, 256294,9120 ReLU-30 512, 128, 64 0 ReLU-93 2048.32.16 0 BatchNorm2d-187 128.512.256 256512, 128, 64 2,359,296 BoTBlock-94 2048, 32, 16 ReLU-188 128, 512, 256 0 Conv2d-31 0 BatchNorm2d-32 512, 128, 641,024Identity-95 2048, 32, 16 Conv2d-189 128, 512, 256147,456 1.048.576 Conv2d-96 128, 512, 256 ReLU-33 512, 128, 64 0 512.32.16 BatchNorm2d-190 256DoubleConv-34 512, 128, 640 BatchNorm2d-97 512, 32, 161,024ReLU-191 128, 512, 2560 UNet-down-block-35 512, 128, 640 ReLU-98 512, 32, 16512, 32, 160 DoubleConv-192 128, 512, 2560 ReLU-99 MaxPool2d-36 512, 127, 63 0 0 UNet-up-block-193 128, 512, 256 0 Linear-194 MaxPool2d-37 512, 127, 630 ReLU-100 512, 32, 16 0 512, 256, 512 66,048512, 130, 66512, 130, 66512, 32, 16512, 32, 16ReflectionPad2d-38 0 ReLU-101 ReLU-195 512.256.512 0 0 ReflectionPad2d-39 ReLU-102 512, 256, 512 Dropout-196 0 0 0 BlurPool-40 512, 64, 32 0 ReLU-103 512, 32, 16 Linear-197 512, 256, 128 65, 664524, 288 BlurPool-41 512.64.32 0 Conv2d-104 1024, 32, 16 ReLU-198 512.256.128 0 512, 32, 16 Conv2d-42 4,718,592 Conv2d-105 262,144 Dropout-199 512, 256, 128 1024, 64, 32 0 512, 256, 1BatchNorm2d-43 1024, 64, 32 2,048RelPosEmb-106 4,512,512Linear-200 129 ReLU-44 1024.64.32 0 Softmax-107 4.512.5120 Sigmoid-201 512, 256, 1 0 1024, 64, 329,437,184MHSA-108 512, 32, 16Conv2d-45 Linear-202 512, 256, 3 387 0 BatchNorm2d-46 1024, 64, 32 2,048 Identity-109 512, 32, 16 Sigmoid-203 512, 256, 3 0 BatchNorm2d-110 1,024 ReLU-47 1024.64.32 0 512.32.16 DoubleConv-48 1024, 64, 32 ReLU-111 512, 32, 160 0 1024, 64, 32 ReLU-112 512, 32, 16UNet-down-block-49 0 0 MaxPool2d-50 1024.63.31 0 ReLU-113 512.32.16 0 ReLU-114 MaxPool2d-51 1024, 63, 31 512, 32, 16 0 0 ReflectionPad2d-52 1024.66.34 0 ReLU-115 512.32.16 0 ReflectionPad2d-53 1024,66,34 0 ReLU-116 512, 32, 16 BlurPool-54 1024, 32, 16 Conv2d-117 2048, 32, 16 1.048.576 BatchNorm2d-118 BlurPool-55 1024.32.16 2048.32.16 4.096 0 Conv2d-56 2048, 32, 16 18,874,368 ReLU-119 2048, 32, 16 0 BatchNorm2d-57 2048, 32, 164,096ReLU-120 2048.32.16 0 ReLU-58 2048 32 16 0 ReLU-121 2048 32 16 0 ReLU-122 Conv2d-59 2048, 32, 16 37, 748, 736 2048, 32, 16 0 ReLU-123 BatchNorm2d-60 2048, 32, 16 4,0962048, 32, 16 0 ReLU-61 2048.32.16 0 ReLU-124 2048.32.16 0 0 BoTBlock-125 DoubleConv-62 2048, 32, 16 2048, 32, 16 0 UNet-down-block-63 2048, 32, 160 Identity-126 2048, 32, 16Conv2d-127 512.32.16 1.048.576BatchNorm2d-128 1,024512, 32, 16 ReLU-129 512, 32, 160 ReLU-130 512.32.16 0 ReLU-131 512, 32, 16 0 ReLU-132 512, 32, 160 ReLU-133 512.32.16 0 ReLU-134 512, 32, 16Conv2d-135 1024, 32, 16524,288 Conv2d-136 512.32.16 262.144RelPosEmb-137 4,512,512Ó Softmax-138 4,512,5120 MHSA-139 512.32.16 0 512, 32, 16 Identity-140 512, 32, 16512, 32, 16BatchNorm2d-141 1,024ReLU-142 0 ReLU-143 512, 32, 160 ReLU-144 512, 32, 16 0 ReLU-145 512, 32, 160 ReLU-146 512.32.16 0 ReLU-147 512.32.16 0 Conv2d-148 2048, 32, 16,048,576 BatchNorm2d-149 2048, 32, 164,096ReLU-150 2048.32.16 0 ReLU-151 2048, 32, 16 0 ReLU-152 2048, 32, 16 0 ReLU-153 2048, 32, 16 0 ReLU-154 2048, 32, 16 0 ReLU-155 2048.32.16 0 ŏ BoTBlock-156 2048, 32, 16

BoTStack-157

2048, 32, 16

Table 3. *UBotNet Network Architecture*. The network consists of three major segments: UNet Encoder, Bottleneck Transformer and UNet Decoder. Note: To simplify the table we have included the final dense and sigmoid layers in the Decoder towards the end.