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1. Overview

This supplementary document provides further results that accompany the paper. It contains three parts, including two qualitative generalization comparison and more interpolation results.

- Section 2 provides more qualitative comparison with CoMA [3].
- Section 3 provides some qualitative comparison with mesh sampling proposed in [3].
- Section 4 provides more interpolation comparison with other methods.

2. More Comparison with CoMA [3]

In Fig. 1, we show more qualitative comparison results with [3] on the Swing dataset [5]. It can be seen that our method has better reconstruction results on unseen data.

3. Comparison with Mesh Sampling

We replace our pooling operation with sampling operation [3] to compare reconstruction errors in the submitted paper. Here, we present several qualitative comparisons with sampling operation on the SCAPE dataset [1] in Fig. 2.

4. More Interpolation Results

In Fig. 3, we show a comparison with the method of [2], another VAE-based method, which leads to artifacts especially in the synthesized human hands. We also compare our method on the SCAPE dataset [1] with MeshVAE as shown in Fig. 4. We can see that Mesh VAE [4] produces interpolation results with obvious artifacts.
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Figure 1. More qualitative comparison with [3]. It can be seen that our method leads to more accurate reconstructions.
Figure 2. Qualitative comparison with mesh sampling in [3]. Reconstruction errors are color-coded. It can be seen that our method leads to more accurate reconstructions.

Figure 3. Comparison of mesh interpolation results with [2]. First row is the result of [2], and second row is our result.
Figure 4. Comparison of mesh interpolation results with [4]. The models in the leftmost and rightmost columns are the input models to be interpolated. 1st row: the results of [4], and 2nd row: our results.