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Abstract

Scene understanding has been of high interest in computer vision. It encompasses not only identifying objects in a scene, but also their relationships within the given context. With this goal, a recent line of works tackles 3D semantic segmentation and scene layout prediction. In our work we focus on scene graphs, a data structure that organizes the entities of a scene in a graph, where objects are nodes and their relationships modeled as edges. We leverage inference on scene graphs as a way to carry out 3D scene understanding, mapping objects and their relationships. In particular, we propose a learned method that regresses a scene graph from the point cloud of a scene. Our novel architecture is based on PointNet and Graph Convolutional Networks (GCN). In addition, we introduce 3DSSG, a semi-automatically generated dataset, that contains semantically rich scene graphs of 3D scenes. We show the application of our method in a domain-agnostic retrieval task, where graphs serve as an intermediate representation for 3D-3D and 2D-3D matching.

1. Introduction

3D scene understanding relates to the perception and interpretation of a scene from 3D data, with a focus on its semantic and geometric nature, which includes not only recognizing and localizing the objects present in the 3D space therein, but also their context and relationships. This thorough understanding is of high interest for various applications such as robotic navigation, augmented and virtual reality. Current 3D scene understanding works include perception tasks such as instance segmentation [12, 21, 44, 50], semantic segmentation [34, 36, 5, 38] as well as 3D object detection and classification [40, 34, 35, 54]. While these works mostly focus on object semantics, their context and relationships are primarily used to improve the per-object class accuracy.

Scene understanding from images has recently explored the use of scene graphs to aid understanding object relationships in addition to characterizing objects individually. Before that, scene graphs have been used in computer graphics to arrange spatial representations of a graphical scene, where nodes commonly represent scene entities (object instances), while the edges represent relative transformations between two nodes. This is a flexible representation of a scene which encompasses also complex spatial relations and operation grouping. Some of these concepts were successively adapted or extended in computer vision datasets, such as support structures [32], semantic relationships and attributes [19] and hierarchical mapping of scene entities [3]. Scene graphs have been shown to be relevant, for instance, for partial [46] and full matching [17] in image search, as well as image generation [16].

In 3D, scene graphs have only recently gained more popularity [3]. In this work, we want to focus on the semantic aspects of 3D scene graphs as well as their potential. Our goal is to obtain dense graphs with labeled instances (nodes), semantically meaningful relationships (edges) such as lying on or same as and attributes including color, shape or affordances (see Fig. 1). These resemble the scene graph representation of [17], associated with images. We believe semantic scene graphs are especially important in 3D since a) they are a compact representation, that describes a (potentially large) 3D scene, b) they are robust towards small scene changes and noise and c) they close the gap between different domains, such as text or images. These properties make them suitable for cross domain tasks such as 2D-3D Scene Retrieval or VQA.

*the authors contributed equally to this paper
We believe that the capability of regressing the scene graph of a given 3D scene can be a fundamental piece for 3D scene understanding, as a way to learn and represent object relationships and contextual information of an environment. For this purpose, we propose a learned method, based on PointNet [34] and Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) [18], to predict 3D semantic graphs. Given a class-agnostic instance segmentation of a 3D point cloud, we jointly infer a 3D scene graph composed of nodes (scene components) and edges (their relationships). For this purpose, we introduce a 3D semantic scene graph dataset that features detailed semantics in the nodes (instances) including attributes and edges (relationships), which will be publicly released. Generating 3D semantic scene graphs from real-world scans is particularly challenging due to missing data and clutter and the complexity of the relationships between objects. For instance, two chairs that are of the same style could have very different appearances, while a jacket lying on one of them might occlude most of its visible surface. While our method outperforms the baseline, it operates end-to-end and is able to predict multiple relationships per edges. We further show how – in a cross-domain scenario – scene graphs serve as a common encoding between 3D and 2D in a scene retrieval task in changing conditions. Given a single image the task is to find the matching 3D model from a pool of scans. Scene graphs suit particularly well because they are inherently robust towards dynamic environments, which manifest illumination changes and (non-)rigid changes introduced by human activity. In summary, we explore the prediction and application of semantic scene graphs in 3D indoor environments with the following contributions:

- We present 3DSSG, a large scale 3D dataset that extends 3RScan [45] with semantic scene graph annotations, containing relationships, attributes and class hierarchies. Interestingly, 2D scene graphs can be obtained by rendering the 3D graphs, which results in 363k graph-image pairs.

- We propose the first learned method that generates a semantic scene graph from a 3D point cloud.

- We show how 3D semantic scene graphs can be used in cross-domain retrieval, specifically 2D-3D scene retrieval of changing indoor environments.

2. Related Work

Semantic Scene Graphs with Images. Johnson et al. [17] introduced scene graphs – motivated by image retrieval – as a representation that semantically describes an image, where each node is an object while edges represent interactions between them. Additionally, the object nodes contain attributes that describe object properties. Later, Visual Genome [19], a large scale dataset with scene graph annotations on images, gave rise to a line of deep learning based advances on scene graph prediction from images [48, 11, 37, 51, 25, 49, 24, 32]. These methods propose diverse strategies for graph estimation and processing, such as message passing [48], graph convolutional networks (GCN) [49], permutation invariant architectures [11] and attention mechanisms [37]. Most of these methods rely on an object detector to extract node- and edge-specific features prior to the graph computation [48, 49, 24]. Recent works explore the reverse problem of using scene graphs to generate new images [16] or manipulate existing images [6].

3D Understanding: From Objects to Relationships. An active research area within 3D scene understanding focuses on 3D semantic segmentation [34, 4, 36, 7, 38, 12] and object detection and classification [41, 34, 35, 52]. These works mostly focus on object semantics and context is only used to improve object class accuracy. Holistic scene understanding [40] on the other side predicts not only object semantics, but also the scene layout and sometimes even the camera pose [13]. Scene context is often represented through a hierarchical tree, where the leaves are typically objects and the intermediate nodes group the objects in scene components or functional entities. A line of works use probabilistic grammar to parse scenes [28, 53] or control scene synthesis [15]. Shi et al. [39] show that the object detection task benefits from joint prediction of the hierarchical context. GRAINS [23] explore hierarchical graphs to synthesize diverse 3D scenes, using a recursive VAE that generates a layout, followed by object retrieval. In a 3D from single image scenario, Kulkarni et al. [20] consider relative 3D poses between objects (as edges), which are shown to outperform neighbour-agnostic 6D pose estimation.

Another line of works incorporate graphs structures for object-level understanding, rather than entire scenes. Te et al. [43] use a Graph CNN for semantic segmentation of object parts. StructureNet [31] represent the latent space of an object as a hierarchical graph of composing parts, with the goal of generating plausible shapes. However, all of these works are either focused on object parts, or do not consider semantic relationships that go beyond generic edges (without semantic labels) or relative transformations. In the context of semantic scene graphs on synthetic data, Fisher et al. [9] use graph kernels for 3D scene comparison, based on support and spatial relationships. Ma et al. [30] parse natural language into semantic scene graphs, considering pairwise and group relationships, to progressively retrieve sub-scenes for 3D synthesis.

Only recently the community started to explore seman-
tic relationships in 3D and on real world data. Armeni et al. [3] present a hierarchical mapping of 3D models of large spaces in four layers: camera, object, room and building. While they feature smaller graphs (see Tbl. 1) their focus is not on semantically meaningful inter-instance relationships such as support. Moreover, the absence of changing scenes, does not enable the proposed 3D scene retrieval task.

3D Scene Retrieval Many image-based 3D retrieval works focus on retrieving 3D CAD models from RGB images: IM2CAD generates a 3D scene from a single image by detecting the objects, estimating the room layout and retrieving a corresponding CAD model for each bounding box [14]. Pix3D on the other hand propose a dataset for single image 3D shape modeling based on highly accurate 3D model alignments in the 2D images [42]. Liu et al. show improved 2D-3D model retrieval by simulating local context to generate false occlusion [27]. The SHREC benchmark [1, 2], enables 2D-3D retrieval of diverse scenes (beach, bedroom or castle), while [30] and [9] operate on indoor environments but also only focus on synthetic data rather than real 3D reconstructions.

3. 3D Semantic Scene Graphs

With this work, we release 3DSSG which provides 3D semantic scene graphs for 3RScan [45], a large scale, real-world dataset which features 1482 3D reconstructions of 478 naturally changing indoor environments. A semantic scene graph $\mathcal{G}$ in 3DSSG, is a set of tuples $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R})$ between nodes $\mathcal{N}$ and edges $\mathcal{R}$ (see Fig. 2). Nodes represent specific 3D object instances in a 3D scan. In contrast to previous works [19, 3, 4, 45], our nodes are not assigned a single object category $C$ only, but instead are defined by a hierarchy of classes $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ where $c \in \mathcal{C}^d$, and $d$ can vary. Additionally to these object categories each node has a set of attributes $A$ that describe the visual and physical appearance of the object instance. A special subset of the attributes are affordances [47]. We consider them particularly important since we deal with changing environments. The edges in our graphs define semantic relationships (predicates) between the nodes such as standing on, hanging on, more comfortable than, same material. To obtain the data in 3DSSG we combine semantic annotations with geometric data and additional human verification to ensure high quality graphs. In summary, our dataset features 1482 scene graphs with 48k object nodes and 544k edges. An interesting feature of 3D scene graphs is that they can easily be rendered to 2D. Given a 3D model and a camera pose, one can filter the graph nodes and edges that are present in that image. Support and attribute comparison relations remain the same, while directional relationships (left, right, behind, front) must be updated automatically for the new viewpoint. Given the 363k RGB-D images with camera poses of 3RScan, this results in 363k 2D scene graphs. A comparison of our dataset with the only other real 3D semantic scene graph dataset, namely Armeni et al. [3] is listed in Tbl. 1. More information and statistics about 3DSSG are provided in the supplementary. In the following a detailed description of the different entities of our 3D semantic scene graphs are given.

![Figure 2. Scene graph representation in 3DSSG including hierarchical class labels c and attributes A per node, as well as relationship triplets between nodes.](Image)

### Table 1. Semantic 3D scene graph comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dataset</th>
<th>size</th>
<th>instances</th>
<th>classes</th>
<th>obj. rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armeni et al. [3]*</td>
<td>35 buildings</td>
<td>3k</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>727 rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DSSG (Ours)</td>
<td>1482 scans</td>
<td>48k</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>478 scenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We compare against the 3D scene graph dataset on the tiny Gibson split, the most recent release at the time of the submission.
3.1. Nodes

The nodes in our graph are per definition 3D object instances, and each instance is assigned to a 3D scene. Each instance is defined by a class hierarchy where the class of order 1, $c_1$, in $c$ is the corresponding annotated label. The subsequent class labels are acquired by recursively parsing the lexical definition for hypernyms of $c_1$ using WordNet [8]. The definition “chair with a support on each side for arms” gives us $c_{n+1} = chair$ as a hypernym for $c_n = armchair$. Lexical ambiguities result in multiple interpretations of a class label (lexeme); therefore a selection step is required to get only a single definition per class that is most likely in an indoor setting. Given the fact that the 1.5k 3D reconstructions feature 534 different class labels, 534 lexical descriptions and their corresponding class hierarchy are provided. Fig. 3 visualizes the lexical relationships on a small subset of classes. A more complete graph can be found in the supplementary.

Figure 3. Simplified graphical visualization of the lexical relationships on a small subset of classes

3.2. Attributes

Attributes are semantic labels that describe object instances. This includes static and dynamic properties, as well as affordances. Due to the large number of object instances and the desired semantic diversity of the attributes, an efficient extraction and annotation design is crucial. In the following we define the different types of attributes and their acquisition.

Static Properties include visual object features such as the color, size, shape or texture but also physical properties e.g. the (non-)rigidity. Geometric data and class labels are utilized to identify the relative size of the object in comparison with other objects of the same category. Since some features are class specific, we assign them on the class level. An example is an automatic attribute extraction from the lexical descriptions e.g. a ball is spherical. The remaining, more complex, attributes such as the material (wooden, metal), shape (rectangular, L-shaped) or the texture (color or pattern) are instance specific and manually annotated by expert annotators with an interface that was specifically designed for this purpose. We annotate static attributes in the reference scan and copy to each rescan, since they are not subject of change.

Dynamic Properties are particularly important object attributes, which we refer to as states, such as open / closed, full / empty or on / off. We define a state category to be class specific, while its current condition is a matter of instance and therefore also annotated with the aforementioned interface, together with generic static properties. Since state properties of objects can change over time specific instances in the rescans are separately annotated.

Affordances Following previous works [10, 47, 3] we define affordances as interaction possibilities or object functionalities of nodes of a specific object class e.g. a seat is for sitting. We however condition them with their state attribute: only a closed door can be opened. This is particularly interesting since our 3D scans are from changing scenes. These changes often involve state changes caused by human interaction (see examples in the supplementary material). Overall, 3DSSG features 93 different attributes on approx. 21k object instances and 48k attributes in total.

3.3. Relationships

3DSSG has a rich set of relationships classifiable into a) spatial / proximity relationships b) support relations and c) comparative relationships.

Support Relationships Support relationships indicate the supporting structures of a scene [32]. By definition, an instance can have multiple supports; walls are by default supported by the floor and the floor is the only instance that, by definition, does not have any support. Automatically extracting support relationships is quite challenging due to the noisy and partial nature of real 3D scans. For each object in the scene, we consider neighbouring instances in a small radius (e.g. 5cm) support candidates. These support candidates then undergo a verification procedure to a) eliminate incorrect supports and b) complete missing candidates. Remaining class-to-class (e.g. bottle-table) support pairs are then annotated with a so called semantic support (e.g. standing, lying) and then specified for each instance in the dataset.

Proximity Relationships Proximity relationships describe the spatial relationships (e.g. next to, in front of) with respect to a reference view. To limit
redundancy, we only compute proximity relationships between the nodes that share a support parent. A bottle on a table therefore has no proximity relationship with a chair but the supporting table does, since the proximity relationship of the bottle can automatically be derived from its support parent.

**Comparative Relationships** The last group of relationships are derived from comparison of attributes, e.g. bigger than, darker than, cleaner than, same shape as. We use aforementioned attributes, see Section 3.2, to generate these.

### 4. Graph Prediction

Given the point set \( \mathcal{P} \) of a scene \( s \) and the class-agnostic instance segmentation \( \mathcal{M} \), the goal of the Scene Graph Prediction Network (SGPN) is to generate a graph \( \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R}) \), describing the objects in the scene \( \mathcal{N} \) as well as their relationships \( \mathcal{R} \), Fig. 4. We base our learning method in a common principle in scene graph prediction \([29, 48, 49]\), which involves extraction of visual features for every node \( \phi_n \) and edge \( \phi_r \). We use two PointNet \([34]\) architectures for the extraction of \( \phi_n \) and \( \phi_r \), which we dub namely ObjPointNet and RelPointNet. For a scene, we extract the point set of every instance \( i \) separately, masked with \( \mathcal{M} \)

\[
\mathcal{P}_i = \{\delta_{m,k} \odot p_k\}_{k=1,|\mathcal{P}|}
\]

where \( \delta \) represents the Kronecker delta \(^2\), \( p, m \) are instances of \( \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M} \) and \( |\cdot| \) is the cardinality of \( \mathcal{P} \), i.e. the number of points. Each of the individual point sets \( \mathcal{P}_i \) is the input to ObjPointNet.

Additionally, we extract a point set for every pair of nodes \( i \) and \( j \), using the union of the respective 3D bounding boxes \( \mathcal{B} \)

\[
\mathcal{P}_{ij} = \{p_k|p_k \in (\mathcal{B}_i \cup \mathcal{B}_j)\}_{k=1,|\mathcal{P}|}. \tag{2}
\]

The input to RelPointNet is a point set \( \mathcal{P}_{ij} \), concatenated with the respective mask \( \mathcal{M}_{ij} \), which is one if the point corresponds to object \( i \), two if the point corresponds to object \( j \) and zero otherwise. Preserving the orientation of the edge context \( \mathcal{P}_{ij} \) is important to infer proximity relationships like left or right. Therefore, we disable rotational augmentation. We normalize the center of the object and edge point clouds, before feeding them to the respective networks. We arrange the extracted features in a graph structure, in the form of relationship triples \((subject, predicate, object)\), where \( \phi_s \) occupy subject / object units, while edge features \( \phi_r \) occupy the predicate units.

We employ a Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) \([18]\), similar to \([16]\), to process the acquired triples. As scenes come with diverse complexities, we want the GCN to allow flexibility in the number of input nodes. Each message-passage layer \( l \) of the GCN consists of two steps. First, each triplet \( ij \) is fed in an MLP \( g_l(\cdot) \) for information propagation

\[
(p_s, p_i, \psi_{s,ij}) = g_l(p_s, p_i, \phi_{s,ij}, \psi_{s,ij}) \tag{3}
\]

where \( \psi \) represent the processed features, \( s \) indicates subject, \( o \) indicates object, and \( p \) predicate. Second, for a certain node, in an aggregation step, the signals coming from all the valid connections of that node (either as a subject or an object) are averaged together

\[
\rho^{(l)}_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}_{i,s}| + |\mathcal{R}_{i,o}|} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_s} \psi^{(l)}_{s,ij} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_o} \psi^{(l)}_{o,ij} \right) \tag{4}
\]

where \( |\cdot| \) denotes cardinality and \( \mathcal{R}_s \) and \( \mathcal{R}_o \) are the set of connections of the node as subject and as objects respectively. The resulting node feature is fed in another MLP \( g_2(\cdot) \). Inspired by \([22]\), we adapt a residual connection to overcome potential Laplacian smoothing on graphs and obtain the final node feature as

\[
\phi^{(l+1)}_i = \phi^{(l)}_i + g_2(\rho^{(l)}_i). \tag{5}
\]

The final features \( \phi^{(l+1)}_{s,ij}, \phi^{(l+1)}_{p,ij}, \phi^{(l+1)}_{o,ij} \) are then processed by the next convolutional layer \( l \), in the same fashion. After each layer \( l \), the node visibility is propagated to a further neighbour level. Hence, the number of layers equals the order of relations that the model can capture.

The last part of the GCN consists of two MLPs for the prediction of the node and predicate classes.

#### Losses

We train our model end-to-end, optimizing an object classification loss \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{obj}} \) as well as a predicate classification loss \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{pred}} \)

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \lambda_{\text{obj}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{obj}} + \lambda_{\text{pred}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{pred}} \tag{6}
\]

where \( \lambda_{\text{obj}} \) is a weighting factor. We assume that, realistically, for a certain object pair there are multiple valid relationships that describe their interaction. For instance, in Fig. 1, a chair can be front of another chair, while simultaneously having the same appearance (same as). Therefore, we formulate \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{pred}} \) as per-class binary cross entropy. This way, it is judged independently whether an edge should be assigned a certain label (e.g. standing on) or none. To deal with class imbalance, for both loss terms we use a focal loss \([26]\)

\[
\mathcal{L} = -\alpha_t (1 - p_t)^\gamma \log p_t \tag{7}
\]

where \( p_t \) represents the logits of a prediction and \( \gamma \) is a hyper-parameter. \( \alpha_t \) is the normalized inverse frequency for the multi-class loss \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{obj}} \) and a fixed edge / no-edge factor for the per-class loss \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{pred}} \).

Implementation details are provided in the supplement.
5. Scene Retrieval

We introduce a new cross-domain task named image based 3D scene retrieval in changing indoor environments which is about identifying the 3D scene from a list of scans given a single 2D image with potential global and local changes (see Fig. 5). This is particularly challenging since it involves a) multiple domains (2D images and 3D models) and b) scene changes (moving objects, changing illumination). For the evaluation we select semantically rich 2D images from the rescan sequences in 3RScan [45]. Due to the domain gap between 2D images and 3D we propose carrying out this novel retrieval task through scene graphs – which are by definition more stable towards scene changes – and serve as a shared domain between 2D and 3D. Such an approach also allows to retrieve 3D scenes from any input domain from which a scene graph can be generated e.g. natural language or 3D directly. We show how different similarity metrics can be used to successfully find the correct 3D scene using not only object semantics but also the scene context in form of semantically meaningful relationships between object instances. Computing the similarity between graphs is a NP-complete problem, so instead of matching graphs directly via their graph edit distance we first transform our scene graphs into multisets containing node classes and their (semantic) edges / tuples. Please note that these potentially have repetition of elements. To get the similarity of of two graphs, a similarity scores \( \tau \) is applied on the corresponding multisets \( s(G) \) respectively. For our tests we explore two different similarity functions: Jaccard \( \tau_J(A, B) \), eq. 8 and Szymkiewicz-Simpson \( \tau_S(A, B) \), eq. 9.

\[
\tau_J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|} \tag{8}
\]

\[
\tau_S(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{\min(|A|, |B|)} \tag{9}
\]

While the Jaccard coefficient is a widely used metric, the Szymkiewicz-Simpson coefficient can provide more meaningful similarity scores especially when the two sets \( A \) and \( B \) have very different sizes which is often the case in a 2D-3D scenario. When matching two graphs \( G \) and \( G' \) we combine the similarity metric of the object semantics, generic node edges \( \mathcal{E} \) as well as semantic relationships \( \mathcal{R} \) and obtain
Figure 6. **Qualitative results of our scene graph prediction model** (best viewed in the digital file). *Green:* correctly predicted edges, *blue:* missing ground truth, *red:* miss-classified edges, *gray:* wrongly predicted as *none* when GT is a valid relationship.

\[
f(\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}') = \frac{1}{|\tilde{G}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|	ilde{G}|} \tau(s(\tilde{G}^{(i)}), s(\tilde{G}'^{(i)}))^3
\]

(10)

where \( \tau \) is either the Jaccard or Szymkiewicz-Simpson coefficient and \( \tilde{G} \) is defined as the augmented graph \( \tilde{G} = (N, E, R) \) where \( E \) are binary edges. Interestingly, one can use our retrieval method to find rooms that fulfill certain requirements such as the availability of objects e.g. meeting room with a TV, whiteboard but could also include affordances: sitting for 20 people.

### 6. Evaluation

In the following, we first report results of our 3D graph prediction by comparing it against a relationship prediction baseline, inspired by [29], on our newly created 3DSSG-dataset. We re-implemented and adapted their method to work with 3D data. The baseline extracts node and edge features from an image, which we translate to PointNet features in 3D, similar to our network. The edge and node features are passed directly, namely to a predicate and object classifier. For evaluation we use the same train and test splits as originally proposed by [45]. We validate the effectiveness of our multi predicate classifier and GCN in our proposed network in an ablation study. In the second section, we evaluate different graph matching functions in 2D-3D as well as 3D-3D retrieval by matching changed scenes.

---

3 We define \( f_S \) and \( f_J \) to use \( \tau_S \) and \( \tau_J \) respectively.

### 6.1. Semantic Scene Graph Prediction

Here, we report the results of our scene graph prediction task. Following previous works [48] we first separately evaluate the predicate (relationship) prediction in isolation from the object classes. The overall scene graph prediction performance is evaluated jointly where the relationship as well as the object categories are to be predicted given a set of localized objects. Since our method predicts the relationship as well as the object categories independently from another, we obtain an ordered list of triplet classification scores by multiplying the respective scores [49]. Similarly to the predicate prediction, the performance of the object categories is reported. We adopt the recall metric used in [29] to evaluate most confident (subject, predicate, object) triplets against the ground-truth in a top-n manner. Tbl. 2 shows that we outperform the baseline in graph related metrics, while being on par in object classification. Additionally, as expected, the multiple predicate prediction model leads to a higher predicate accuracy, which we attribute to the inherent ambiguity in a single classification problem, when multiple outputs are plausible. Moreover, we compare two versions of our model, in which the object classification is performed a) directly on the PointNet features \( \phi_n \) and b) to the output of the GCN. We observe a slight improvement in the object and predicate accuracy for the former. Fig. 6 illustrates the predicted scene graphs. In all edges and nodes we show the predictions together with the ground truth in brackets. More examples can be found in the supplement.
6.2. Scene Retrieval

Tbl. 3 and 4 report two scene retrieval tasks. The goal is to match either a single 2D image (Tbl. 4) or a 3D rescan of an indoor scene (Tbl. 3) with the most similar instance from a pool of 3D reference scans from the validation set of 3RScan. We compute the scene graph similarity between each rescan (2D or 3D) and the target reference scans. We then order the matches by their similarity and report the top-n metric, i.e. the percentage of the true positive assignments, placed in the top-n matches from our algorithm. In our experiment, we either use ground truth or predictions for the query and source graphs (see Graph-column in Tbl. 3 and 4). To measure the effect of the different similarity functions, decoupled from the graph prediction accuracy, we first evaluate \( \tau_f (s(N_{2D}), s(N_{3D})) \) and \( \tau_s (s(N_{2D}), s(N_{3D})) \) using ground truth graphs. Since the size of image and 3D scene graphs are significantly different, using the Szymkiewicz-Simpson coefficient in 2D-3D matching leads to better results while the performance of the Jaccard coefficient is on par or better in the 3D-3D scenario. We observe that adding semantic relationships to the graph matching improves the scene retrieval. The results also confirm that our predicted graphs \( 2 \) achieve higher matching accuracy compared to the baseline model \( 1 \). Note that for the purpose of this experiment, predicted 2D graphs are obtained by rendering the predicted 3D graphs as described in Section 3.

Table 3. Evaluation: 3D-3D scene retrieval of changing 3D rescans to reference 3D scans in 3RScan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Relationship Prediction</th>
<th>Object Class Prediction</th>
<th>Predicate Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R@50</td>
<td>R@100</td>
<td>R@5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Relation Prediction Baseline</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Predicate, ObjCls from PointNet Features</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Multi Predicate, ObjCls from PointNet Features</td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Predicate, ObjCls from GCN Features</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Evaluation: 2D-3D scene retrieval of changing rescans to reference 3D scans in 3RScan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph</th>
<th>Top-1</th>
<th>Top-3</th>
<th>Top-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_f (s(N_{3D}), s(N_{3D})) )</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_s (s(N_{2D}), s(N_{3D})) )</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_J (G_{2D}, G_{3D}) )</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_S (G_{2D}, G_{3D}) )</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_s (s(N_{2D}), s(N_{3D})) )</td>
<td>( 1 )</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_S (G_{2D}, G_{3D}) )</td>
<td>( 1 )</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_s (s(N_{2D}), s(N_{3D})) )</td>
<td>( 2 )</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_S (G_{2D}, G_{3D}) )</td>
<td>( 2 )</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Conclusion

In this work, we explore 3D semantic scene graphs. We release 3DSSG a 3D scene graph dataset with semantically rich relationships based on 3RScan [45]. We use our data to train a graph prediction network for 3D scenes that is able to estimate not only object semantics but also relationships between objects. Further, we show the usefulness of graphs in 3D scenes by applying it to a new cross-domain task called image based 3D scene retrieval in changing indoor environments. This shows how semantic scene graphs are useful to bridge the domain gap between 2D-3D; opening doors for new applications such as text-3D scene retrieval or VQA. We further believe that scene graphs (and their changes) could potentially help to better reason about human activities in changing indoor environments.
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