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Abstract

The ill-posed nature of monocular 3D geometry (depth map and surface normals) estimation makes it rely mostly on data-driven approaches such as Deep Neural Networks (DNN). However, data acquisition of surface normals, especially the reliable normals, is acknowledged difficult. Commonly, reconstruction of surface normals with high quality is heuristic and time-consuming. Such fact urges methodologies to minimize dependency on ground-truth normals when predicting 3D geometry. In this work, we devise CO-planarity REgularized (CORE) loss functions and Structure-Aware Normal Estimator (SANE). Without involving any knowledge of ground-truth normals, these two designs enable pixel-wise 3D geometry estimation weakly supervised by only ground-truth depth map. For CORE loss functions, the key idea is to exploit locally linear depth-normal orthogonality under spherical coordinates as pixel-level constraints, and utilize our designed Adaptive Polar Regularization (APR) to resolve underlying numerical degeneracies. Meanwhile, SANE easily establishes multi-task learning with CORE loss functions on both depth and surface normal estimation, leading to the whole performance leap. Extensive experiments present the effectiveness of our method on various DNN architectures and data benchmarks. The experimental results demonstrate that our depth estimation achieves the state-of-the-art performance across all metrics on indoor scenes and comparable performance on outdoor scenes. In addition, our surface normal estimation is overall superior.

1. Introduction

Depth and surface normals are essential elements of 3D geometry. With the assistance of surface normals, depth map is able to faithfully describe the characteristics of the 3D scenes [4], which benefits various 3D applications, e.g., 3D reconstruction [33, 4], augmented reality [18] and autonomous driving [16]. To recover 3D geometry, monocular depth and surface normal estimation provide the most convenient solutions, and meanwhile define the challenging ill-posed problems.

Recent approaches mostly tackle these two ill-posed problems as genuine data-driven tasks by DNN regression or classification. However, it is widely acknowledged that data acquisition of surface normals is not a straightforward task [22, 8, 41, 3]. Particularly, the reliable surface normals are much more difficult to be obtained [22, 8, 3]. There are various commercial sensors such as LiDAR and ToF to acquire depth map directly, but no alternative available for surface normals. To acquire surface normals, the common practice is to involve least-square plane fitting from the depth maps [41]. Unfortunately, these depth maps cap-
tured by consumer-level sensors are usually contaminated by noises, resulting in deteriorated quality on generated surface normals [22, 41, 3]. As a compromise, heuristic and time-consuming post-processing is commonly involved during preparation of the ground truth normals [22, 8].

It is certainly a meaningful advantage to be able to predict surface normals by depending less or none of ground-truth normals. One idea is to employ pre-trained surface normal estimation network, followed by refinement that makes use of depth-normal consistency [38, 32, 34, 4]. On the condition of pre-training, the later refinement is effective even without ground-truth normals. However, the pre-training still involves the ground truth as prerequisites, and the depth-normal consistency is utilized for building refinement rather than guiding regression from scratch. Another idea is about the proposal of surface normal candidates from depth map or point cloud, including differentiable least-square [32, 30, 31], local differentiation [17, 20] and random sampling [41, 29]. Nevertheless, when the proposal of depth region shrinks to a small local area or finally pixel level, suboptimal and noisy surface normal candidates could appear. At this time, more supervision by ground-truth normals are demanded [17, 20, 29]. As for the global proposal, it would suffer from computational burden and insufficient local features [32, 30, 31, 41].

In this work, we propose novel Co-planarity Regularized (CORE) loss functions derived from regularized spherical depth-normal constraints at pixel level. These CORE loss functions establish pixel-wise surface normal regression weakly supervised by only ground-truth depth map. It is worth noting that we particularly express pixel-level depth-normal constraints with spherical coordinates, and regularize these constraints by the polar view. Similar to the occurrence of suboptimal surface normal candidates, depth-normal constraints are progressively weakened towards the pixel level, resulting in the emergence of degeneracies during back-propagation (see Sec. 3.1). By re-formulating depth-normal constraints under spherical coordinates, we observe that the degeneracies are mostly attributed to the polar angle collapse as shown in Fig. 2. To counter this, we devise a novel Adaptive Polar Regularization (APR) term as a part of CORE loss functions. This term adaptively penalizes polar angle estimation at the sub-optimal state, thus resolving the degeneracies. As a result, the regularized spherical depth-normal constraints can be used as stable pixel-level constraints that serve as loss functions to efficiently guide surface normal regression from scratch. Moreover, our surface normal prediction is visualized in Fig. 1 and Sec. 4, which presents plenty of local geometry details.

Another advantage of our method is that CORE loss functions are perfect for multi-task learning on both depth and surface normal estimation. Accordingly, we design a Structure-Aware Normal Estimator (SANE) that collaborates with our CORE loss functions. SANE can be easily applied as a side branch to existing encoder-decoder architectures of depth estimation as shown in Fig. 3. Driven by CORE loss functions, both depth estimation from the original architecture and surface normal estimation from SANE mutually achieves performance leap.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We devise CORE loss functions from the pixel-level constraints of depth-normal orthogonality. Without any pre-training or surface normal candidates, CORE loss functions enable pixel-wise surface normal regression in a weakly supervised manner by only ground-truth depth map.

- We propose SANE to collaborate with CORE loss functions for multi-task learning. SANE can be easily plugged to existing encoder-decoder approaches of depth estimation without breaking their integrity, which meanwhile benefits the whole performance.

- We achieve steady depth enhancement and superior surface normal prediction. For depth estimation, the experimental results show new state-of-the-art performance across all metrics on NYUv2 and ScanNetv2, and comparable performance on KITTI. For surface normal estimation, despite of weak supervision, it is even comparable with relevant supervised methods.

2. Related Work

Monocular depth estimation. Monocular depth estimation describes a problem that takes a single RGB image as
Figure 3: The architecture overview. $\hat{P}_i$, $\hat{Z}_i$ and $Z_i$ are planar prediction, depth prediction and raw depth map per pixel $i$, respectively. The planar prediction contains surface normal and distance prediction. The index of multi-scales is donated by $n$. $F_n$ are decoder features. $F_n^{g}$ are decoder features after the global self-attention. $\hat{H}_n$ is the intermediate planar prediction at spherical polar coordinates. Discrete differentiation is usually achieved by Sobel operator. $L_{\text{depth}}$ and ($R_{\text{APR}}, L_{\text{CPD}}, L_{\text{CPR}}$) are depth loss and components of CORE losses explained in Sec. 3.2. The details for SANE are described in Sec. 3.3.

input and predicts the corresponding depth map as output. Recently monocular depth estimation has been extensively studied by DNN approaches [12, 11, 27, 23, 15, 21, 2]. Most of them thoroughly or partially formulate the solutions as an encoder-decoder architecture similar to [36, 13]. Some approaches [6, 14] treat monocular depth estimation as a classification task rather than a regression task. Other methods [24, 19] apply the co-planarity constraint to up-sampling layers or attention layers. As the rising of Transformer architectures [10, 28], the more recent approaches [5, 35, 43, 26, 1] further improve the depth estimation performance by better global perception.

Monocular surface normal estimation. Monocular surface normal estimation defines a similar problem as the above monocular depth estimation. Early attempts mostly follow the similar DNN regression as monocular depth estimation. Recent approaches [18, 9, 39] try to employ extra priors to enhance previous approaches. Specifically, Huang et al. [18] took the canonical frames and principal directions as additional supervised signals. Do et al. [9] designed a spatial rectifier to learn from the the gravity-aligned training data. VPLNet [39] and self-supervised StructDepth [25] refer to Manhattan world assumptions, e.g., Manhattan lines. Besides extra priors, Bae et al. [3] proposed a loss function under angular vonMF distribution to predict surface normal and its uncertainty.

Monocular geometry estimation. Monocular geometry estimation combines the monocular depth and surface normal estimation together as a whole 3D geometry, and considers the consistency between them for mutual enhancement [38, 32, 33, 34, 41, 29, 31, 4]. Most methods require both ground truth of depth and surface normals [38, 32, 33, 34, 29, 4]. Qi et al. in their works [32, 33] proposed an iterative CNN framework to refine depth map and surface normals from coarse initials. The similar ideas about pre-training and refining are also proposed by SURGE [38], SharpNet [34] and IronDepth [4]. Due to the difficulties on acquisition of the ground truth, there are also works that depend on less or none of ground-truth normals [41, 31]. Among them, Yin et al. [41] introduced global sampling for virtual surface normals. Long et al. [29] proposed better 3D region sampling and area adaption. The latest work by Patil et al. [31] introduces offset vector field and mean plane loss that employs least square fitting. These methods are mostly related to our method, whereas our method is distinguished by the pixel-wisely end-to-end manner of weak supervision.

3. Method

In this section, we explain the details of our methodology. Firstly, we introduce the mathematical model under spherical coordinates, which formulates the pixel-level depth-normal constraints derived from local co-planarity assumption and pinhole camera model. From these constraints, we analytically demonstrate degeneracies and the causes from the view of loss functions. Secondly, APR term is proposed as a countermeasure to the degeneracies, and CORE loss functions are introduced accordingly. At last, we explain details of SANE that collaborates with our loss functions for multi-task learning.

3.1. Spherical Depth-Normal Model

Depth-normal constraint at each individual pixel. We assume the local linearity for common 3D scenes, and it depicts a small tangent plane and its corresponding unit surface normal $n = (n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $\|n\|_2 = 1$ at a 3D point $P_0 = (X_0, Y_0, Z_0)$. $(u, v)$ is the pixel coordinate that $P_0$ is projected to by pinhole camera model. Given that a surface normal $n$ is a unit vector, it is a common practice to describe this vector $\in \mathbb{R}^3$ in concise spherical coordinates.
\((\theta, \phi) \in \mathbb{R}^2\). We rewrite the surface normal at spherical polar coordinates \(\mathbf{n} = (\sin \theta \cos \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \theta)\), where \(\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]\) and \(\phi \in (-\pi, \pi]\) mean the polar and azimuthal angle, respectively. Moreover, we treat the world coordinates as the same as the camera coordinates, and consider the camera model as an ideal pinhole model in the following sections. The constraint between depth map and surface normals at each individual pixel is obtained by

\[
\sin \theta \cos \phi \frac{u - c_x}{f_x} + \sin \theta \sin \phi \frac{v - c_y}{f_y} + \cos \theta = Z^{-1},
\]

(1)

where \(Z^{-1}\) is the inverse depth map, and \(n_4 = \sin \theta \cos \phi X_0 + \sin \theta \sin \phi Y_0 + \cos \theta Z_0\) is the distance from world origin to the tangent plane. Conditionally on \(Z\) and \((u, v)\), \(n_4\) can be parameterized by \(\theta\) and \(\phi\), namely \(n_4(\theta, \phi)\). \((c_x, c_y)\) and \((f_x, f_y)\) are the camera principal points and focal lengths, respectively. The fundamental Eq. (1) associates surface normals and depth map at each individual pixel. Minimization on pixel-wise difference between the left-hand side (LHS) and the right-hand side (RHS) of Eq. (1) suggests a loss objective, e.g., pixel-wise L1 or L2 distance.

The trivial solution of Eq. (1). However, without considering neighboring pixels, Eq. (1) indicates a quick trivial solution \((\theta = 0, n_4 \equiv Z)\). This trivial solution degenerates the estimation of surface normals constrained by Eq. (1), since the back-propagation with gradient-decent strategy stably converges the prediction to it as a shortcut. We notice that \(\theta \equiv 0\) is the persistent suboptimal state that incurs polar angle collapse and meanwhile causes the trivial solution.

Depth-normal constraint between local pixels. The first-order partial derivatives at pixel level connect an individual pixel with local neighbors, which prevents the emergence of the trivial solution of Eq. (1). Naturally, we take the first-order partial derivatives of \(u\) and \(v\) on both sides of Eq. (1). The depth-normal constraint between local pixels is formulated by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\sin \theta \cos \phi}{n_4(\theta, \phi)f_x} \\
\frac{\sin \theta \sin \phi}{n_4(\theta, \phi)f_y}
\end{pmatrix}
\n\n= \nabla (Z^{-1}),
\]

(2)

where \(\nabla (Z^{-1})\) is the 2D image gradient of inverse depth map. Even though Eq. (2) does not suffer from the trivial solution anymore, common objectives, e.g., L1 or L2, are still not applicable for Eq. (2). The reason lies in the imbalanced distribution of un-normalized \(\nabla (Z^{-1})\). Intuitively, for the loss objective, cosine similarity would be effective with only angular differences taken into consideration.

The degeneracy of Eq. (2). However, cosine similarity introduces another degeneracy on Eq. (2). Given that \(f_x\) and \(f_y\) are approximate constants and independent term of \(\sin \theta\), we simplify Eq. (2) to the following new relation:

\[
\sin \theta \left(\frac{\cos \phi}{n_4(\theta, \phi)} \frac{\sin \phi}{n_4(\theta, \phi)}\right) \sim \nabla (Z^{-1})
\]

From the above relation, it is not difficult to realize that \(\sin \theta\), as a proportion, hardly contributes to minimize cosine similarity. The consequence is that optimization of \(\theta\) quickly becomes inactive around the suboptimal state \(\theta \approx 0\). The pixel-level constraint from Eq. (2) loses the degree of freedom of \(\theta\), which also causes collapse on polar angle estimates. Therefore, the objective of cosine similarity degenerates the optimization of \((\theta, \phi, n_4)\) as well.

3.2. Co-planarity Regularized (CORE) Losses.

Hereafter we specify the arbitrary pixel \((u, v)\) as \(i\) for the brief and consistent notation. Planar estimation \(\hat{P}_i\) is \((\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \hat{n}_3, \hat{n}_4)\) \(^1\) parameterized by spherical polar predictions: \((\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi})\). We use the notation of planar estimation in our CORE losses for brevity.

Adaptive polar regularization (APR). According to the above analysis on the degeneracies, the fundamental cause is the polar angle collapse during back-propagation. The intuitive but crucial countermeasure becomes how to regularize the predicted \(\hat{\theta}\) to be away from its suboptimal state \(\hat{\theta} \approx 0\). To this end, we propose APR that consists of a polar regularizer \(g_i\) and an adaptive weight map \(\omega_i\). The polar regularizer \(g_i\) exploits penalties to prevent the polar angle collapse. It is simply parameterized by only \(\hat{\theta}\), which is defined as:

\[
g_i = -\ln (4\hat{n}_3^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 - \hat{n}_3^{\frac{1}{2}})), \tag{3}
\]

where scalar 4 aims to arrange penalties \(\in [0, \infty)\), and the power 1/4 on \(\hat{n}_3^{\frac{1}{2}}\) is to set regularization minimums to close to \(\pm \pi/2\) (see more discussion on the choice of power in our supplementary material). As a result, regularized depth-normal constraints tend to guide polar angle estimation along the decaying direction of regularization in range of \((0^-, -\pi/2)\) and \((0^+, \pi/2)\) which are also consistent to the real value domain of \(\hat{\theta}\). Polar regularizer \(g_i\) forces \(\theta\) away from 0, but \(\theta \approx 0\) shall reasonably exist in the 3D scenes as planes parallel to the image XY-plane. Accordingly, as the other component of APR, we introduce adaptive weight map \(\omega_i\) to control the application of polar regularization per pixel:

\[
\omega_i = 1 - \exp(\frac{-\|\nabla (Z^{-1})_i\|^2}{\sigma \gamma}), \tag{4}
\]

where \(\sigma = \text{std}(\|\nabla (Z^{-1})\|_2)\) for all the pixels from a mini-batch, and \(\gamma\) is a scalar hyper-parameter for different

\(^1\hat{n}_1 = \sin \hat{\theta} \cos \hat{\phi}, \hat{n}_2 = \sin \hat{\theta} \sin \hat{\phi}, \hat{n}_3 = \cos \hat{\theta} \)
datasets. The purpose of $\omega_i$ is to utilize the statistical knowledge of $\|\nabla(Z^{-1})\|_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ by a Gaussian RBF kernel, which adaptively loosen the polar regularizer and maintains the local correlation. Finally, we formulate APR as:

$$R_{APR} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_i (\omega_i \circ g_i),$$

(5)

where $\circ$ is the element-wise multiplication, and $T$ is hereafter the total number of pixels having valid raw depth values ($Z_i \neq 0$). $\nabla(Z^{-1})$ can be approximated by a $3 \times 3$ Sobel operator on the inverse raw depth. We find that $\gamma = 4$ and $\gamma = 16$ are empirically working well for indoor and outdoor datasets that we use in Sec. 4, respectively.

Co-planar differentiation loss (CPD loss). With the above APR that resolves the optimization degeneracies, we firstly introduce our designed CPD loss function according to Eq. (2), which minimizes the angular difference between $\tilde{q}_i = (n_1/n_{4f_x}, n_2/n_{4f_y})$ and $q_i = \nabla(Z^{-1})$. To be sensitive to small angular errors, we tailor the cosine similarity to the angular loss. Additionally, inspired by Do et al. [9] who suggest that a normalized L2 loss at large angular ($> \pi/2$) is more robust to outliers, we segment our CPD loss function into two parts as follows:

$$L_{CPD} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (s_i^{-1}) & s_i \in [0, 1], \\ \frac{1}{M} \sum_i (\pi/2 - s_i) & s_i \in [-1, 0), \end{cases}$$

(6)

where $s_i$ is the cosine similarity between $\tilde{q}_i$ and $q_i$, and $s_i^{-1}$ is the inverse cosine. $\tilde{q}_i$ is related to network predictions and focal lengths. $N$ and $M$ are the total number of valid pixels that satisfy $s_i \in [0, 1]$ and $s_i \in [-1, 0)$, respectively, where $N + M = T$.

Co-planar refinement loss (CPR loss). Next, we propose our CPR loss which aims to compensate normal estimation bias and meanwhile refine depth map and surface normals together. Although CPD and APR can guide surface normals regression by the first-order depth-normal constraint, they discard the constant term per pixel between absolute and relative estimates. To compensate these, we consider the absolute depth-normal constraint from Eq. (1) for refinement. As a result, according to Eq. (1), we design CPR loss in terms of the smooth L1 that is effective in refinement tasks.

$$L_{CPR} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_i |c_i \cdot \hat{p}_i - \hat{Z}_i^{-1}|_{smooth},$$

(7)

where $c_i = ((u - c_u)/f_x, (v - c_v)/f_y, 1)$ is calculated from image coordinates and camera intrinsics. $\hat{p}_i = (\hat{n}_1/\hat{n}_4, \hat{n}_2/\hat{n}_4, \hat{n}_3/\hat{n}_4)$ and $\hat{Z}_i^{-1}$ are both from network predictions.

Overall loss. Finally, our overall loss function is given as:

$$L_{total} = (L_{CPD} + R_{APR} + L_{CPR}) + L_{depth},$$

(8)

where $L_{depth}$ is a loss to supervise the depth estimation. Here we use Scale-Invariant Logarithmic (SiLog) loss [12].

3.3. Structure-Aware Normal Estimator (SANE)

The overall architecture shown in Fig. 3 contains two major components, namely an encoder-decoder architecture for depth estimation and our designed SANE for surface normal estimation. The design for SANE as shown in upper part of Fig. 3 contains three cascade blocks to perform global perception, pixel-wise regression and multi-scale fusion successively.

Global perception. We propose to utilize Global Context Networks (GCNet) [7] to enhance global perception, since the multi-scale features $F_n$ could have insufficient global information. GCNet introduces a light-weighted way to pixel-wisely apply global self-attention at feature level. It can be conveniently inserted after feature maps that are extracted from the encoder-decoder architecture.

Pixel-wise regression. We design simple pixel-wise Multi-Layer Perceptions (MLP) for the regression task. The Pixel MLP is easily achieved by pixel-wise Conv1x1 + BN + GELU for channels. The regression contains 2 PixelMLPs that squeeze the channels of $F_n$: $C_n \times H_n \times W_n$ by the ratio of $\lambda = 0.5$, and then outputs the intermediate prediction $\hat{H}_n$: $3 \times H_n \times W_n$ that contains $\theta, \phi, \hat{n}_4$ as channel components. We apply Sigmoid on $\hat{H}_n$ and rectify it to the actual value domains by scalar $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, $\phi \in (-\pi, \pi)$ and $\hat{n}_4 \in [Z_{min}, Z_{max}]$.

Multi-scale fusion. We fuse the planar prediction $\hat{P}_{n,i}$ that contains $(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \hat{n}_3)^T$ and $\hat{n}_4$ at the pixel $i$ per scale $n$. For the fusion strategy, we bi-linearly interpolate $\hat{P}_{n,i}$ to the original size, and pixel-wisely assemble them over scales. Specifically, for $(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \hat{n}_3)^T \in \mathbb{R}_3$, we pixel-wisely apply weighted summation over scales, e.g., from 1/4 scale to 1/32 scale, and normalization after each summation. The weights are related to the up-ratio as $1/upratio$. As for $\hat{n}_4$, it is the common pixel-wisely average over all scales.

4. Experiments

4.1. Implementation Details

In this work, we choose existing depth estimation methods, namely BTS [24], Adabins [5] and NeWCRs [43], to present the effectiveness of CORE losses and SANE on various DNN architectures. For details, BTS proposes a
Table 1: Quantitative results of depth estimation on NYUv2. “*” means using additional data during training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>σ₁↑</th>
<th>σ₂↑</th>
<th>σ₃↑</th>
<th>Abs.Rel↑</th>
<th>RMSE↑</th>
<th>log₁₀↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigen et al. [12]</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORN [14]</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoNet [32]</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNL [41]</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SharpNet* [34]</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASNDepth [29]</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPT* [35]</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDDepth [31]</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IronDepth* [4]</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BinsFormer [26]</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PixelFormer [1]</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTS [24]</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adabins [5]</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeWCRFs [43]</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (BTS)</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (Adabins)</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (NeWCRFs)</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Quantitative results of surface normal estimation on NYUv2. “✓” means training (including pre-training) supervised by ground-truth normals, while “*” means not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sup. Mean₁ 11.2°</th>
<th>22.5°</th>
<th>30°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DORN [14]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu et al. [17]</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTS [24]</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adabins [5]</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeWCRFs [43]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (BTS)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (Adabins)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours (NeWCRFs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Datasets

**NYU depth v2** [37] is an indoor RGB-D dataset which provides samples with the resolution of 480 x 640 and maximum depth of 10 meters. We train our network with the same subsets as [24, 5, 43], and evaluate our method on the official 654 testing samples with center cropping defined by Eigen et al. [12]. For surface normal evaluation, we use 654 ground truth generated by Ladicky et al. [22] on only the valid pixels by following Zhang et al. [44] and Do et al. [9].

**KITTl** [16] is a stereo-LiDAR dataset for outdoor scenes. It provides the 376 x 1241 stereo-RGBs and sparse depth map with maximum depth of 80 meters. We reserve the training subset defined by [24, 43]. The test set contains 697 samples specified by Eigen et al. [12] and cropped as Garg et al. [15].

**ScanNetv2** [8] is also an RGB-D video dataset containing 2.5 million views in more than 1,500 scans indoors. We use the 2,167 official test samples to cross-evaluate our method that is well trained with NYUv2 dataset. This dataset is not used as training data.

4.3. Evaluation Metrics

**Depth.** We consider evaluation metrics used in Eigen et al. [12] to compare our depth with others. These metrics are defined as: Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) and its log variant RMSE_{log}. Average Relative Error (Abs.Rel) and its square variant Sqr.Rel., Average (log_{10}) Error, and Threshold Accuracy (δ_t) for 1.25, 1.25², 1.25³.

**Surface normal.** Following previous works [25, 42], the main ranking metrics of mean and the percentage of pixels with error under thresholds t ∈ [11.25°, 22.5°, 30°] are reported for angular errors.

4.4. Comparison with the State-of-the-Art

**Evaluation on NYU depth v2.** We evaluate our method on NYUv2 dataset for indoor scenes. As presented in Tab. 1, the performance of depth estimation has been steadily improved after applying CORE losses and SANE onto the original methods [24, 5, 43]. Since NYUv2 dataset has been saturated for a while [43], we use relative gains for better indication. On NeWCRFs [43], our method further improves its main indicators by 5.1% (RMSE) and 7.3% (AbsRel). Also, the enhanced NeWCRFs [43] by our method outperforms the latest state-of-the-art of PixelFormer [1] on all the metrics. Besides the metrics, our method is able to ameliorate the 3D geometry estimation from over-smoothing,
which is visualized by point clouds in Fig. 4. These point clouds present that our method can rectify curved planes, sharpen plane intersection, and recover local surface with more precise shape and texture, e.g., the hanging box and heater. Our depth estimation is visualized in Fig. 5, which shows similarly better geometry details.

For surface normal estimation, Tab. 2 demonstrates that our weakly supervised method outperforms relevant methods that involve none of ground-truth normals. The comparison results are mainly cited from the original papers and published articles [29, 41]. For NeWCRFs [43] and Adabins [5], we compute the surface normals from their estimated depth by least-square plane fitting, following the common practice. Although ASNDepth [29] and IronDepth [4] provide slightly better performance, they explicitly require the ground-truth normals. From Fig. 5, qualitative results show that our method is able to predict more geometry details of textures and boundaries, which are even absent in the ground truth, e.g., the thin pole (in the first row) and wrinkles on the towels (in the third row).

**Evaluation on KITTI.** We only evaluate our depth estimation on KITTI dataset for outdoor scenes because of the absence of standard ground-truth normals. Tab. 3 shows that our method still progressively enhances the original depth estimation. On BTS [24], our method considerably reduces its RMSE by 11.4% and Sqr.Rel by 17.6%. On NeWCRFs [43], our method boosts its performance very close to the latest PixelFormer [1]. It is worth noting that this performance gain requires no extra network parameters, because SANE can be discarded after training. Moreover, on the condition of distance, we observe that our method consistently ameliorates Abs.Rel for near scenes < 20m, and yet slightly affects Abs.Rel at far scenes > 50m (see details in our supplementary material). We argue that the local co-planarity assumption holds mostly for near regular scenes, while some far scenes are exceptions. Fortunately, the depth density in far range > 50m is usually low, and the overall impact is insignificant.

**Evaluation on ScanNetv2.** To indicate the generalisation of our method, we perform a cross-evaluation on ScanNetv2 dataset, similar to [29, 31]. Tab. 4 shows that our method steadily improves corresponding original approaches without decreasing the generalisation. Also, our NeWCRFs-based solution states the best results.

### Table 3: Quantitative results of depth estimation on KITTI.

| Method | σ₁↑ | σ₂↑ | σ₃↑ | Abs. Rel | RMSE | Sqr. Rel | RMSElog | |
|--------|------|------|------|----------|------|----------|--------|
| Eigen et al. [12] | 0.702 | 0.898 | 0.967 | 0.203 | 6.307 | 1.548 | 0.282 | |
| DORN [14] | 0.932 | 0.984 | 0.994 | 0.072 | 2.727 | 0.307 | 0.120 | |
| GeoNet [33] | 0.897 | 0.968 | 0.986 | 0.094 | – | – | – | |
| VNL [41] | 0.938 | 0.990 | 0.998 | 0.072 | 3.258 | – | 0.117 | |
| DPFD* [15] | 0.959 | 0.995 | 0.999 | 0.062 | 2.573 | – | 0.092 | |
| P3Depth [31] | 0.953 | 0.993 | 0.998 | 0.071 | 2.842 | 0.270 | 0.103 | |
| BinsFormer [26] | 0.974 | 0.997 | 0.999 | 0.052 | 2.098 | 0.151 | 0.079 | |
| PixelFormer [1] | 0.976 | 0.997 | 0.999 | 0.051 | 2.081 | 0.149 | 0.077 | |
| BTS [24] | 0.956 | 0.993 | 0.998 | 0.059 | 2.756 | 0.245 | 0.096 | |
| Adabins [5] | 0.962 | 0.995 | 0.999 | 0.058 | 2.422 | 0.217 | 0.091 | |
| NeWCRFs [43] | 0.974 | 0.997 | 0.999 | 0.052 | 2.129 | 0.155 | 0.079 | |
| Ours (BTS) | 0.962 | 0.994 | 0.999 | 0.090 | 2.442 | 0.202 | 0.092 | |
| Ours (Adabins) | 0.962 | 0.995 | 0.999 | 0.059 | 2.379 | 0.195 | 0.091 | |
| Ours (NeWCRFs) | 0.976 | 0.997 | 0.999 | 0.052 | 2.095 | 0.149 | 0.077 | |

## Table 4: Quantitative results of depth estimation on the ScanNetv2 (cross-evaluation on 2,167 official test images).

| Method | σ₁↑ | σ₂↑ | σ₃↑ | Abs. Rel | RMSE | log₁₀ | |
|--------|------|------|------|----------|------|-------|
| VNL [41] | 0.565 | 0.886 | 0.967 | 0.238 | 0.505 | 0.104 | |
| ASNDepth [29] | 0.609 | 0.861 | 0.955 | 0.233 | 0.484 | 0.100 | |
| P3Depth [31] | 0.551 | – | – | 0.223 | 0.538 | – | |
| BTS [24] | 0.583 | 0.858 | 0.951 | 0.246 | 0.506 | 0.104 | |
| Adabins [5] | 0.622 | 0.858 | 0.945 | 0.223 | 0.466 | 0.100 | |
| NeWCRFs [43] | 0.727 | 0.943 | 0.984 | 0.182 | 0.359 | 0.081 | |
| Ours (BTS) | 0.520 | 0.888 | 0.966 | 0.224 | 0.420 | 0.094 | |
| Ours (Adabins) | 0.642 | 0.885 | 0.963 | 0.218 | 0.443 | 0.093 | |
| Ours (NeWCRFs) | 0.739 | 0.946 | 0.986 | 0.178 | 0.349 | 0.073 | |

Figure 5: The qualitative results on NYUv2. Depth and normal estimation are from ours (NeWCRFs) because of limited spaces. More qualitative results can be found in our supplementary material. Zoom-in and best view in color.
Table 5: Ablation studies on our proposed CORE losses. ✓ means a failure prediction because of the polar angle collapse. “×” means not applicable. Without depth loss, CPR loss uses ground-truth depth instead.

Table 6: Ablation studies on our proposed SANE. The global perception is crucial to benefit the surface normal estimation for CNN architectures.

4.5. Ablation Study

In this section, we conduct ablation studies to analyze the effectiveness of our design. The ablation studies are mainly performed with NeWCRFs [43] and NYUv2 [37] as default. CORE losses. 1) APR is the spotlight of our design for CORE losses, which guarantees the weakly supervised normal estimation. As discussed in Sec. 3.1 and shown in Fig. 2, without APR, surface normals could not be properly predicted because of the polar angle collapse. 2) According to Tab. 5, we notice that CPD loss still improves the performance of depth prediction regardless of APR. The latent reason is that azimuthal of ϕ is persistently optimized by CPD loss even under the degeneracy. 3) The results in Tab. 5 also indicate that CPR loss is crucial. This loss further polishes both performance, especially for the surface normals. As discussed in Sec. 3.2, CPR loss compensates and refines the relative surface normal estimation, so that the estimates are more consistent to the ground truth as shown in Fig. 6. In a nutshell, each component of our CORE losses is indispensable (see more analysis in our supplementary material).

SANE. As presented in Tab. 6, when GCNet [7] is removed from SANE, surface normal estimation obviously decreases on performance for BTS [24] and Adabins [5] which employ CNN backbones, whereas the impact is slight for NeWCRFs [43]. The reason lies in that NeWCRFs has already utilized Swin-Transformer [28] to perform decent global perception. This fact suggests that SANE can benefit the surface normal estimation for some CNN architectures without sufficient global information. Moreover, the results in Tab. 7 indicate that Pixel MLPs and Multi-scale Fusion basically remains stable to the configurations except for the extreme setting, e.g. 1 Pixel MLP and 1 Multi-scale Fusion. Our default settings aim to balance the accuracy and computation.

Multi-task learning. As also presented in Tab. 5, multi-task learning is important for both depth and surface normal estimation. Particularly, the surface normal estimation is boosted by 13.5° after depth branch is enabled. Thus, it is mostly a wise choice to perform such full multi-task training and then reserve the necessary regression head at inference time, because multi-task learning with SANE is light-weighted and involved only in the training stage.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we explore the feasibility to utilize depth-normal constraints as pixel-wise loss functions for 3D geometry estimation. Firstly, we propose CORE losses from spherical depth-normal constraints, which enable surface normal regression weakly supervised by only ground-truth depth map. Then, we design SANE for multi-task learning, which introduces CORE losses to existing methods of depth estimation, and boosts the whole performance. Finally, our method achieves new state-of-the-art of indoor depth estimation, comparable outdoor depth estimation and superior surface normal estimation. In future, we will focus on the further improvement of our method for outdoor scenes.
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