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SUMMARY

Multiple human tracking is a fundamental problem in understanding the context of a visual scene. Although both accuracy and speed are required in real-world applications, recent tracking methods based on deep learning focus on accuracy and require a substantial amount of running time. We aim to improve tracking running speeds by performing human detections at certain frame intervals because it accounts for most of the running time. The question is how to maintain accuracy while skipping human detection. In this paper, we propose a method that interpolates the detection results by using an optical flow, which is based on the fact that someone’s appearance does not change much between adjacent frames. To maintain the tracking accuracy, we introduce robust interest point detection within the human regions and a tracking termination metric defined by the distribution of the interest points. On the MOT17 and MOT20 datasets in the MOTChallenge, the proposed SDOF-Tracker achieved the best performance in terms of total running time while maintaining the MOTA metric. Our code is available at https://github.com/hitottiez/sdof-tracker.
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1. Introduction

Understanding the context of a scene in a video is one of the biggest challenges in computer vision. Humans are often the center of attention in a scene, and tracking them in a video is the fundamental objective. Multiple human tracking is the task defined as detecting the positions of multiple humans while maintaining their identities (IDs) over an image sequence. In real-world applications such as surveillance, tracking needs to be performed in real-time with high accuracy. In crowded scenes such as large stations, stadiums and plazas, there is often a failure to detect humans accurately, leading to ID switches. An ID switch is a serious problem because it can lead to a misunderstanding of human behavior. In addition to the need for accurate tracking, real-time tracking is crucial for many real-world applications. For example, the real-time recognition of suspicious behavior is essential in surveillance.

With the development of deep learning technology, the accuracy of human detection has been significantly improved (e.g., Faster R-CNN [1], Mask R-CNN [2] and YOLOv4 [3]), and tracking-by-detection has become the mainstream approach in recent years [4]–[16]. The approach implements human tracking by detecting humans with a human detector and making associations with the detection results using a similarity metric. The main advantage of this approach is that it is easy to determine the start and end of a tracking event even with occlusions and frame ins/outs. Most methods using this approach detect humans by a deep learning-based detector and extract the re-identification (re-ID) features from each region using another deep learning model. However, human detection and re-ID feature extraction take a considerable amount of time; hence, an efficient computational resource is required for real-time tracking, as shown in Fig. 1 (a). Some methods tackle this problem by conducting human detection and re-ID feature extraction simultaneously with a single deep learning model [17]–[22]. However, their methods have a limitation that the speed can not be increased while keeping accuracy.

We aim to improve the tracking running speed by bypassing every-frame human detection, which is a computationally heavy task; that is, we perform the task at a certain interval. Figure 1 (b) shows our approach. During the interval, human detection is skipped and interpolated by faster processing. We name this process Skipped-Detection. This enables the effective use of computational resources and
achieves an average running speed sufficient for real-time tracking. The question to be addressed is how to interpolate human detection in skipped frames. We focus on the fact that someone’s appearance is generally stable between adjacent frames. In such a situation, primitive features are useful to associate humans between adjacent frames at a pixel level. Sparse optical flow [23] can estimate flow vectors at a high speed by focusing on a small number of interest points. In this paper, we use sparse optical flow to interpolate between skipped human detections, as shown in Fig. 1 (b). Additionally, the optical flow can also estimate target locations even in situations where the human detector misses someone.

Many tracking methods using optical flow have been proposed [10]–[14], and they attempt to improve the tracking accuracy by human detection and optical flow at every frame. In contrast, we aim to maintain the tracking accuracy only with optical flow with the support of skipped detections. The problem is that the optical flow itself cannot determine the start and termination of the tracking. In this paper, we propose a novel human tracking method that integrates Skipped-Detection and Optical-Flow, and we name it SDOF-Tracker. In the SDOF-Tracker, tracking by optical flow is triggered by human detection and terminated based on the variance of the interest points.

Moreover, the proposed SDOF-Tracker can prevent false negatives even if the human detector misses someone. To prevent false negatives, even if a human target is not detected, tracking by optical flow is continued for a while. Additionally, to set robust interest points for optical flow, they are set inside a limited human region obtained by an instance segmentation.

2. Related Work

In this section, we review the related work on multiple human tracking in terms of the tracking-by-detection approach and the faster approaches.

2.1 Tracking-by-Detection Approach

A tracking-by-detection approach performs human tracking by detecting humans and associating the detection results using a similarity metric. DeepSORT [4] utilizes the overlap between bounding boxes and the re-ID features extracted from the appearance and applies the Hungarian algorithm [24] for data association. The Kalman filter is applied for robust tracking. MHT-MAF [5] utilizes human action features for data associations. LTSiam [6] is based on a Siamese network, which has tandem inputs and the same weights in both branches. MPNTrack [7], LPC_MOT [8], and GNMMatch [9] are based on a graph neural network, which captures the dependence of graphs via message passing. However, these methods require considerable time for human detection and re-ID feature extractions for data associations, so a substantial computational resource is required for real-time tracking.

Many tracking methods based on optical flow have been proposed to improve tracking accuracies. Everingham et al. [10] proposed a method that utilizes the portion of the inlier trajectories over the outliers that are between the face detections to cluster them. Schikora et al. [11] proposed a method that could deal with false positives and ID switches by using finite set statistics. Fragkiadaki et al. [12] proposed a method that jointly optimizes detectlet classification and the clustering of optical flow trajectories. Choi et al. [13] proposed an aggregated local flow descriptor that could accurately measure the affinity between a pair of detections. Bullinger et al. [14] proposed a method that exploits instance segmentation and predicts the positions and shapes in the next frame by optical flows. However, these methods require a considerable amount of running time because they perform human detection in every frame and combine the detection results with the optical flow.

2.2 Faster Approach

While the tracking-by-detection approach has a two-stage structure for detection and data association, the latest approaches jointly perform them in a single neural network for fast and accurate tracking. Tracktor [17] can detect the position in the next frame based on the existing detector without additional training. SimpleReID [19] learns a re-identification model in an unsupervised manner. TBC [21] explicitly accounts for the object counts inferred from density maps and simultaneously performs detection and tracking. TransCenter [22] is a transformer-based architecture that handles long-term complex dependencies by using an attention mechanism. Although most of these methods are faster than the previous tracking-by-detection approach, the speedup is limited because they perform human detection in every frame.

Other approaches do not utilize appearance features for data association. SORT [15] and IOU Tracker [16] utilize only the overlap between the bounding boxes and are widely used in real-world applications due to their speed. However, these methods may fail in crowded scenes due to a lack of appearance features.

Unlike human tracking, AdaVP [25] was proposed to make human detection faster by optical flow in real-time detection. Since the method does not care about consistent human IDs, the method cannot be directly applied to multiple human tracking applications discussed in this paper.

3. Proposed Method

In contrast to conventional methods, the proposed SDOF-Tracker does not perform human detection in every frame and employs only optical flow to interpolate the detection results. In this section, we first define symbols in the human tracking. Second, we introduce the overall design of the SDOF-Tracker, and then we explain each step.
3.1 Symbol Definition

We define symbols in the human tracking. Let $B_t = (b_1^t, b_2^t, \ldots)$ be the bounding boxes in frame $o_t$ at time $t$. Here, $b_i^t$ denotes the $i$-th bounding box in frame $o_t$. The bounding box is represented in the image coordinate system by $b = (x, y, w, h)$, where $x$ and $y$ are the top-left $x$ and $y$ coordinates of the bounding box, respectively, and $w$ and $h$ are the width and height of the bounding box, respectively. For the $i$-th bounding box $b_i^t$ in frame $o_t$, let $a_i^t = (b_i^t, z_i^t)$ be the pair of the bounding box $b_i^t$ and its tracklet ID $z_i^t$. Let $A_t = (a_1^t, a_2^t, \ldots)$ be the collection of all of these in frame $o_t$. Human tracking can be formulated as the problem of finding $\{A_t | t \geq 1\}$ given a time series image $\{o_t | t \geq 1\}$.

3.2 Overall Design

We aim to improve the running speed of tracking by using optical flow, which can estimate flow vectors at high speeds. While high-speed tracking is performed using optical flow in every frame, detections are just performed at a certain frame interval. To improve the robustness, interest points are set inside segmented regions. Moreover, tracking by optical flow is continued after several frames even if the human detector misses a human target. This continuation can prevent false negatives, thus also preventing ID switches.

3.3 Details of Each Step

SDOF-Tracker has four steps: A. human detection, B. interest point detection, C. human tracking by optical flow, and D. data association. Figure 2 shows human tracking by the SDOF-Tracker. It works in an online manner in that the tracking result is immediately available with each incoming frame. In the first frame, A. human detection and B. interest point detection are executed. From the frame, C. human tracking by optical flow is executed for $L$ frames. After that (frame 4 in the figure), A. human detection, D. data association, and B. interest point detection (initialization) are executed. The details of each step are described below.

A. Human Detection

This step estimates bounding boxes $D_t = (d_1^t, d_2^t, \ldots)$ using the trained human detector, where $d = (x, y, w, h)$. In this work, we use a multitask network that not only detects humans but also performs instance segmentations to set robust interest points. In the first frame, bounding box $b_1^t$ is determined to have the same value as $d_1^t$ and ID $z_1^t$ is determined to be unique for each $i$.

B. Interest Point Detection

This step sets interest points inside the bounding boxes for optical flow calculations. In the first frame, the target bounding boxes are $D_t = (d_1^t, d_2^t, \ldots)$. On the other hand, in frame $o_t (t \geq 2)$, the target bounding boxes are $B_t = (b_1^t, b_2^t, \ldots)$. To improve the robustness of C. human tracking by optical flow, we use the instance segmentation result to limit the region of the interest points. The segmentation mask is represented as a binary image that indicates whether the human region. The segmentation region is eroded using the morphological operator [26] to avoid setting interest points in the background regions. Each pixel is set to 1 if all the pixels in the kernel region have a pixel value of 1; otherwise, they are set to 0. The points of interest $p_i^t = (p_{i1}^t, p_{i2}^t, \ldots, p_{iQ}^t)$ are randomly sampled inside the eroded segmentation region, where $Q$ is a predetermined parameter.

C. Human Tracking by Optical Flow

In this step, bounding boxes $F_t = (f_1^t, f_2^t, \ldots)$ are estimated from $B_{t-1} = (b_{1}^{t-1}, b_{2}^{t-1}, \ldots)$ by optical flow, where $f = (x, y, w, h)$. In the following, we explain how to predict the $i$-th bounding box $f_i^t$ from $b_i^{t-1}$. First, the optical flow $\Delta_i^t = (\delta_i^{t1}, \delta_i^{t2}, \ldots, \delta_i^{tQ})$, which indicates where the interest point $(p_{i1}^{t-1}, p_{i2}^{t-1}, \ldots, p_{iQ}^{t-1})$ has moved, is estimated. Second, the location of the bounding box $(x_i^t, y_i^t)$...
is obtained by adding the median of the optical flow.

\[
(x', y') = (x_{t-1}', y_{t-1}') + \Delta t
\]  

(1)

Third, the width and height of the bounding box, \(w_i\) and \(h_i\), are determined as the same value as time \(t - 1\) because they change very little between adjacent frames. Finally, when \(t ≠ 1 + nL\), \(b_i^t\) is determined to have the same value as \(f_i^t\) and tracklet ID \(z_i^t\) inherits the same ID as time \(t - 1\). Otherwise, \(b_i^t\) and \(z_i^t\) are determined by data association using \(f_i^t\) as described in the next Sect. D.

However, tracking may fail when the points of interest track other humans or objects. In such cases, interest points often spread out rapidly. In this work, the termination of tracking is determined using the ratio of the variance of the interest points between the adjacent frames. The ratio is calculated by the variance of the interest point \(P_i\) and tracklet ID \(z_i\) is determined to have the same value as \(t_i\) because they change very little between adjacent frames. Finally, when \(t ≠ 1 + nL\), \(b_i^t\) is determined to have the same value as \(f_i^t\) and tracklet ID \(z_i^t\) inherits the same ID as time \(t - 1\). Otherwise, \(b_i^t\) and \(z_i^t\) are determined by data association using \(f_i^t\) as described in the next Sect. D.

\[
\alpha_i^t = \frac{\text{var}(P_i)}{\text{var}(P_{i-1})}
\]  

(2)

Note that the interest points estimated by optical flow may have noise, so we remove such interest points before calculating the variances. For removing noise, we use Hotelling theory, which Hotelling theory is a fundamental method of outlier determination that assumes that data is generated with a normal distribution. Additionally, the tracking is terminated when the number of interest points becomes less than a predetermined threshold \(R\).

D. Data Association

In this step, each bounding box \(f_i^t ∈ F_t\) estimated by optical flow is associated with each detection \(d_j^t ∈ D_t\) estimated by the human detector in each \(L\) frame. The data association has three important roles: the estimation of a tracklet ID, determination of the start of tracking, and determination of the termination of the tracking. The Hungarian algorithm [24] is used for the association. The cost matrix for the Hungarian algorithm is calculated using the intersection over union (IoU) between the detections and bounding boxes. When performing an association, if the cost is larger than a predefined threshold \(\varepsilon\), the bounding box is not associated with the detection to prevent a false association.

For each matching pair, bounding box \(b_i^t\) is determined to have the same value as \(d_j^t\). Tracklet ID \(z_i^t\) is determined to have the same value as \(z_{j-1}^t\) corresponding to \(f_i^t\). For each unmatched detection, tracking starts with a new tracklet ID. For each unmatched bounding box, the tracking is terminated. However, in crowded scenes, bounding boxes tend to be unmatched due to false negatives. In this work, even if a bounding box is unmatched within \(M\) frames, the tracking is continued.

4. Experiments

To verify the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed SDOF-Tracker, we conducted human tracking experiments using two major datasets, MOT17 and MOT20.

4.1 Experimental Conditions

Dataset: For the experiments, we used two major datasets, MOT17 [27] and MOT20 [28]. They were captured with a fixed or moving camera in a square, street and shopping mall. MOT17 includes less dense crowds but more diverse scenarios than MOT20. For MOT17, the frame rate is from 14 to 25 fps, the resolution is from (640 × 480) to (1,920 × 1,080), the time is from 15 to 85 seconds, and the total number of objects is from 24 to 222. We used 21 sequences in the test set. On the other hand, for MOT20, the frame rate is 25 fps, the resolution is from (1,173 × 880) to (1,920 × 1,080), the time is from 17 to 133 seconds, and the total number of objects is from 90 to 1,121. We used 4 sequences in the training set. The training set was used for evaluation (Sect. 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4) because the test set does not have ground truth. Note that any model was not trained.

Evaluation Metric: The evaluation metrics include the number of objects tracked for more than 80% of the flow line (mostly tracked; MT), the number of objects tracked for less than 20% (mostly lost; ML), recall (Rcll), precision (Prcn), ID switches (IDsw), false associations (Frag), and multiple object tracking accuracy (MOTA) [29]. MOTA is a widely used and comprehensive metric that combines three error sources (false negative, ID switch and false positive). We also measured the average speed per 1 frame. We used an Intel Core i7-7700K 4.20 GHz CPU, 32 GB RAM, and an NVIDIA GeForce Titan X Pascal GPU.

Implementation Details: As the baseline method, human detection and re-ID feature extraction are performed in every frame. We used Mask R-CNN [2] for the human detector, and it was trained using MS COCO [30]. The same human detection result was used for the baseline and the proposed SDOF-Tracker. The threshold of human detection was set to 0.2. The following are the parameters for SDOF-Tracker, the values of which were set by preliminary experiments. The frame interval for human detection was set to \(L = 5\). The frame length for tracking continuation was set to \(M = 10\). For the segmentation region eroding, a 2 × 2 kernel was applied two times. For the optical flow calculation, the Lucas-Kanade method [23] was used. The window size was set to \(15 × 15\) and the height of image pyramid was set to \(2\). The maximum and minimum numbers of interest points were set to \(Q = 10\) and \(R = 3\), respectively. The parameter for human association was set to \(\varepsilon = 0.7\).

4.2 Ablation Study

In this section, we verify the effectiveness of each of the three factors in the SDOF-Tracker, the segmentation for
Table 1  Ablation study. S: Segmentation, C: Continuation, T: Termination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>MT ↑</th>
<th>ML ↓</th>
<th>Rcll [%] ↑</th>
<th>Prcn [%] ↑</th>
<th>IDsw ↓</th>
<th>Frag ↓</th>
<th>MOTA ↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (DeepSORT [1])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13,731</td>
<td>18,198</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>13,622</td>
<td>17,796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ✓</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>9,709</td>
<td>15,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ✓</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13,967</td>
<td>18,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>9,574</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>14,013</td>
<td>18,098</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>9,685</td>
<td>15,084</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>9,537</td>
<td>14,770</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Analysis of Accuracy and Speed

We evaluated whether the running speed could be improved while maintaining the tracking accuracy when the frame interval (L) for human detection is increased. The speed includes the time required for human detection. For the baseline method, human detection is performed in every frame, and it is equivalent to DeepSORT [4]. On the other hand, the SDOF-Tracker performs human detection in every L frame. In the SDOF-Tracker, we evaluated how segmentation, tracking continuation, and tracking termination affect the accuracy and speed. To compare the accuracy fairly, we use the same detection result using Mask-RCNN, both with and without SCT. Therefore, the segmentation time is included when evaluating “without SCT”, but the actual speed without segmentation is even faster. We used the MOT20 dataset for the experiment.

Figure 3 (a) shows the change in the tracking accuracy. In “with SCT”, MOTA is almost the same when L = 1 as when L = 5. Then, MOTA decreases when L ≥ 5 and is almost the same when L = 15 as the baseline. By contrast, in “without SCT”, MOTA decreases when L ≥ 1 and is almost the same when L = 10 as the baseline. “with S” is not so effective when L = 5, but is the most effective of S, C, and T when L ≥ 10. This suggests that the importance of setting good interest points is increasing as L increases.

On the other hand, Fig. 3 (b) shows the change in running speed. As L increases, the running speed increases in both “with/without SCT”. The speed improvement rate ac-
Fig. 4  Cropped example of the tracking result using the baseline and SDOF-Tracker. The brightness and contrast of the images were increased for visibility.

cording to $L$ is higher with SCT than without SCT. This is because the frequency of termination is increased and the number of tracked humans is decreased as $L$ increases. Thus, the SDOF-Tracker with SCT can improve the running speed while maintaining the tracking accuracy.

4.4 Tracking Examples

Figure 4 shows a cropped example of the tracking result using the baseline and SDOF-Tracker in the MOT20 dataset. This is a scene where three people are walking towards the back. In the baseline, ID switches (IDsw) occur due to false negatives (FN). In the SDOF-Tracker, human detection is performed in frame 475 because we set $L = 5$. In the SDOF-Tracker without SCT, false negatives are prevented in frames 473 and 474 due to tracking by optical flow. However, the other false negatives remain. This is because the optical flow cannot start when the false negative occurs in frame 475, which is a chance for human detection. On the other hand, in an SDOF-Tracker with SCT, all false negatives and ID switches are prevented due to tracking continuation in frame 475. Moreover, interest points are accurately set on the regions with human bodies. Figure 5 shows an example of the tracking result using the SDOF-Tracker with SCT. Even though this is a very crowded scene, most humans are accurately tracked.

4.5 MOTChallenge Result

We compared the SDOF-Tracker to the state-of-the-art methods in the MOTChallenge\(^1\) on the MOT17 and MOT20 datasets. We compared the performance with methods that have been published in the research literature. We use the public detection results of the MOTChallenge to fairly compare both accuracy and speed. Note that the SDOF-Tracker did not use a GPU for human tracking. Since the public detection results do not include segmentation results, regions were not limited for setting interest points, i.e., it is equivalent to pattern 6 in Table 1. The runtimes of detections are not published on the MOTChallenge, so we cited the runtimes from the related literature [32], [33].

MOT17: The runtime of detection was assumed to be 60.0 ms [32]. Using this runtime, the average runtime of the SDOF-Tracker was estimated as 25.1 ms when the frame interval for human detection was set to $L = 5$. Table 2 shows the MOTChallenge result on the MOT17 dataset. The SDOF-Tracker achieved the best performance in terms of the total runtime. Nevertheless, MOTA was better than GM_PHD.

MOT20: The runtime of detection was assumed to be 131.6 ms [33]. Using this runtime, the average runtime of the SDOF-Tracker was estimated as 68.0 ms when the frame interval for human detection was set to $L = 5$. Table 3

\(^1\)https://motchallenge.net
Fig. 5 Example of tracking result using the SDOF-Tracker with SCT.

Table 2 MOTChallenge result on MOT17 dataset. The result is cited from the MOTChallenge web page† (Our entry name on the web page is “FlowTracker”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rcll [%] ↑</th>
<th>Prcn [%] ↑</th>
<th>IDsw ↓</th>
<th>MOTA ↑</th>
<th>Avg. runtime [ms] ↓ (Excluding detection)</th>
<th>Avg. runtime [ms] ↓ (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDOF-Tracker</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOU Tracker [16]</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>5,988</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORT [15]</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>4,852</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM,PHD</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM,PHD_Rdl17</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM,PHD_GM17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoCT/pub</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD,LMP</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLSTM_MTP_O</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>109.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTDT17</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>114.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTA</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>116.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 MOTChallenge result on MOT20 dataset. The result is cited from the MOTChallenge web page† (Our entry name on the web page is “FlowTracker”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rcll [%] ↑</th>
<th>Prcn [%] ↑</th>
<th>IDsw ↓</th>
<th>MOTA ↑</th>
<th>Avg. runtime [ms] ↓ (Excluding detection)</th>
<th>Avg. runtime [ms] ↓ (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDOF-Tracker</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORT [15]</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTSiam [6]</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>164.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPNTrack [7]</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>153.8</td>
<td>285.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC [21]</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>310.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SimpleReID [19]</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>769.2</td>
<td>900.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracktor [17]</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>833.3</td>
<td>964.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCenter [22]</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>4,493</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,131.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC_MOT [8]</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>1,428.6</td>
<td>1,560.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mfl_ist [31]</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,131.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNNMatch [9]</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>10,131.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shows the MOTChallenge result on the MOT20 dataset. The SDOF-Tracker achieved the best performance in terms of the total runtime. Nevertheless, MOTA was better than SORT and LT-Siam.

**Discussion:** SORT is widely used in real-world applications such as surveillance, and is capable of tracking with practically acceptable accuracy despite its high speed. As shown in MOTA and the average runtime (total) of Table 2 and 3, SDOF-Tracker is comparable to SORT in accuracy, but much faster. Compared to SORT, the speed of SDOF-Tracker is more than twice as fast on both MOT17 and MOT20.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed the SDOF-Tracker, a fast and accurate human tracking method using skipped detection and optical flow. In the SDOF-Tracker, tracking by optical flow is triggered by human detection and ends based on the variance of the interest points. To maintain accuracy, we introduced robust interest point detection within human regions and a tracking termination metric calculated by the distribution of the interest points. In our experiments, we confirmed that the SDOF-Tracker can improve the running speed while maintaining the tracking accuracy when the frame interval for human detection is increased. Moreover, the SDOF-Tracker achieved the best performance in terms of the total running time (68.0 ms) while maintaining MOTA (46.7) on the MOT20 dataset in the MOTChallenge. In the future, we will develop a method that can dynamically change the frame interval for human detections.
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