Joint object detection and online multi-object tracking (JDT) methods have been proposed recently to achieve one-shot tracking. Yet, existing works overlook the importance of detection itself and often result in missed detections when confronted by occlusions or motion blurs. The missed detections affect not only detection performance but also tracking performance due to inconsistent tracklets. Hence, we propose a new JDT model that recovers the missed detections while associating the detection candidates of consecutive frames by learning object-level spatio-temporal consistency through edge features in a Graph Neural Network (GNN). Our proposed model Sparse Graph Tracker (SGT) converts video data into a graph, where the nodes are top-K scored detection candidates, and the edges are relations between the nodes at different times, such as position difference and visual similarity. Two nodes are connected if they are close in either a Euclidean or feature space, generating a sparsely connected graph. Without motion prediction or Re-Identification (ReID), the association is performed by predicting an edge score representing the probability that two connected nodes refer to the same object. Under the online setting, our SGT achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) on the MOT17/20 Detection and MOT16/20 benchmarks in terms of AP and MOTA, respectively. Especially, SGT surpasses the previous SOTA on the crowded dataset MOT20 where partial occlusion cases are dominant, showing the effectiveness of detection recovery against partial occlusion. Code will be released at https://github.com/HYUNJS/SGT.

1. Introduction

Tracking-by-detection (TBD) is a dominant framework for multi-object tracking (MOT) that detects objects and associates them across frames in a video. Initially, two-stage models are proposed based on two or three separate models for detection and association (i.e., tracking) [5, 6, 36, 44, 49, 52, 56, 65], but the performance is sub-optimal, and the inference speed is slow. To address these issues, end-to-end (E2E) jointly trainable detection and tracking (JDT) methods are proposed in [2, 9, 30, 37, 42, 47, 60, 63]. However, all these methods only use the positive detections which confidence score is above a detection threshold value for association. Partial occlusion as shown by the green box in Figure 1 results in the missed detection that the confidence score of true detection is below the detection threshold. Such missed detections consequently lead to inconsistent trajectory of tracklets due to frequent disconnections. Accordingly, finding the detection threshold that achieves the best trade-off between false positives and true positives is crucial.

Online MOT methods are required to output tracklets at every timestep; thus, missed detections should be recovered in an online manner as well. Existing works utilize temporal cues based on previous frames to reduce missed detections. Chained-Tracker [37] and CenterTrack [63] use extra convolution layers with input of two consecutive frames.
GSDT [46], CorrTracker [45], and TransTrack [43] propose using GNN [32], correlation layer [15], and transformer [66] to enhance the features for detection and tracking, respectively. These methods are effective in reducing missed detection, but they still have an issue that low-confident true detections are excluded from association, leading to missing tracklets.

In an association stage, existing online MOT works utilize pairwise relational features between two detections, such as the similarity of appearance features [26, 30, 45–47, 54, 60], the center distance [63], and the Intersection over Union (IoU) score [43]. These features reflect only the relations between two objects and are not discriminative enough for accurate matching in a crowded scene. Extra tracking components such as a motion predictor (e.g., Kalman filter [4], or a learnable offset head [63]) are commonly employed to improve online MOT performance. On the contrary, we jointly use all these pairwise relational features to initialize edge features and update them to higher-order (multi-hop) relational features by aggregating the features of neighboring nodes and edges through GNN. Without a motion predictor, the higher-order relational features are strong enough to match tracklets with the current frame’s motion predictor, the higher-order relational features are of neighboring nodes and edges through GNN. Without a multi-hop relational features by aggregating the features to initialize edge features and update them to higher-order relational features. While matching detection candidates of consecutive frames, two frames. LPCMOT [11] generates and scores tracklet proposals based on a set of frames and detections using a Graph Convolution Network (GCN) [22]. These models are either not JDT or not online methods.

However, CSTrack [26] points out that the objectives of detection and ReID are conflicting, and proposes a cross-correlation network that learns task-specific features. Recently, RelationTrack [54] developed this line of works by learning more discriminative ReID features by considering the relation between objects in an image. Similarly, GSDT [46] improves the features by spatio-temporal relational modeling through GNN. CorrTracker [45], which is the current SOTA model, fuses the correlation in spatial and temporal dimensions to the image features at multiple pyramid levels.

### JDT by motion prediction

D&T [17] and CenterTrack [63] introduce object motion prediction to MOT model. While D&T uses correlation between feature maps of two consecutive frames, CenterTrack adds the feature maps and an object heatmap of the previous frame. Chained-Tracker [37] concatenates feature maps of consecutive frames and predicts paired boxes in two frames. TraDeS [50] predicts the offset of objects between two consecutive frames based on a cost volume which is computed by a similarity of ReID features of the frames. TransTrack [43] is a transformer-based model that propagates previous frame’s tracklets to the coordinates in current frame and matches with current frame’s detections by IoU score.

### Comparison

Our SGT is also a JDT model based on CenterNet [64]. Compared with others using pairwise relations (e.g., IoU or cosine similarity of ReID features), SGT exploits edge features, which are higher-order relational features generated through GNN, to solve tracking as an edge classification as shown in Figure 1.

### 2.2. Graph-based Multi-object Tracking

A graph is an effective way to represent relational information, and GNN learns higher-order relational information through a message passing process that propagates and aggregates neighboring features. STRN [52] is an online MOT method with a spatio-temporal relation network that consists of a spatial relation module and a temporal relation module. TNT [44] builds a graph using each short tracklet as a vertex and predicts the connectivity score between tracklets so that fragmented tracklets are connected. MPNTrack [6] adopts a message passing network [18] with time-aware node update module to solve MOT problem by exploiting both node and edge features from a batch of frames. LPCMOT [11] generates and scores tracklet proposals based on a set of frames and detections using a Graph Convolution Network (GCN) [22]. These models are either not JDT or not online methods.
GSDT [46] is the first work that applies a GNN in an online JDT method; however, a graph does not have edge features and the GNN is limited to only enhancing the node features reflecting spatio-temporal relations. In contrast, our SGT uses edge features for tracking with top-K detections and recovers the missed detections which confidence score is lower than the threshold.

2.3. Online Detection Recovery

ByteTrack [59] and OMC [27] are concurrent works sharing our motivation and performing an online detection recovery. In ByteTrack [59], the unmatched tracklets are matched with low-scored detections, which score is between the original detection threshold (\( \tau_D \)) and a new introduced threshold (\( \tau_{Dis} \)), using IoU. OMC [27] uses cross-correlation between ReID features of previous tracklets and feature map of current frame to recover missed detections. Both works conduct detection recovery after or before association using pairwise relational features, but SGT integrates it in an association step exploiting edge features.

3. Sparse Graph Tracker

3.1. Overall Architecture

Figure 2 shows the architecture of SGT. While various image backbones and object detectors can be flexibly adopted, we experiment based on CenterNet [64] with a variant of the DLA-34 backbone [55] which is used in our baseline model, FairMOT [60]. Following [60], we modify CenterNet such that the box size predictor outputs left, right, top, and bottom sizes \((s_l, s_r, s_t, s_b)\) from a center point of an object instead of its width and height. CenterNet is a point-based object detector that predicts objects at every pixel of a feature map. The score predictor outputs a heatmap which is denoted as \( B_{score} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_x \times H_w \times 1} \), where \( H_x \) and \( H_w \) are height and width of the feature map. The output from the box size predictor is denoted as \( B_{size} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_x \times H_w \times 4} \). The box offset predictor adjusts the center coordinates of objects using \( B_{off} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_x \times H_w \times 2} \).

At frame \( T \), CenterNet finally outputs detections \( D_T = (S_T, B_T) \), where \( S_T \in \mathbb{R}^{H_x \times H_w \times 4} \) is the detection score \( (B_{score}) \) and \( B_T \in \mathbb{R}^{H_x \times H_w \times 4} \) composed of the top-left and bottom-right coordinates of the boxes.

**Sparse Graph Builder** takes top-K scored detection candidates from each frame \((I_{t1} \text{ and } I_{t2})\) and sets them as the nodes of a graph \((N_{t1} \text{ and } N_{t2})\). In the inference phase, the previous timestep’s \( N_{t2} \) will be the current timestep’s \( N_{t1} \). We sparsely connect \( N_{t1} \) and \( N_{t2} \) if they are close in either a Euclidean or feature space. Specifically, \( n_{t1}^1 \in N_{t1} \) is connected to \( n_{t2}^1 \) with three criteria: 1) small distance between their center coordinates; 2) high cosine similarity between their features; 3) high IoU score. For each criterion, the given number of \( N_{t2} \) \((e.g., 10)\) are selected to be connected to \( n_{t1}^1 \) without duplicates. The connections are bidirectional so that both \( N_{t1} \) and \( N_{t2} \) update their features. The visual features of the detection candidates and the relational features between them are used as the features of nodes \((V)\) and edges \((E)\), respectively.

To include detection candidates, we can introduce an extra low threshold value, \( \tau_{low} \), as an alternative to using top-K scored detection candidates. Although it can also achieve good performance as shown in Appendix, such detection threshold value is sensitive to the detector’s score distribution. As a result, using \( \tau_{low} \) requires careful calibration for different datasets. In contrast, top-K method is robust to such issues as it is not affected by the score distribution. Since \( K \) is the maximum number of objects that the model can detect, we set \( K \) to be sufficiently larger than the maximum number of people in the dataset \((e.g., 100 \text{ in MOT16/17}; 300 \text{ in MOT20})\). In Table 7, we experimentally show the robustness of \( K \) values.

Some tracklets fail to connect for a duration when they are invisible due to full occlusion. These missing tracklets are cached for a certain period \((\text{max age})\) and used in long-term association. Existing MOT works \([5, 45, 47, 50, 60]\) usually apply the motion predictor \((e.g., \text{Kalman filter})\) to the missing tracklets, and then match with the new detections. In SGT, they are appended to \( N_{t1} \) and association can be performed in a graph without the motion predictor. Also, we introduce \( \text{min age} \) which is the minimum length of the missing tracklets to be cached. When \( \text{min age} = 10 \), the missing tracklets which were successfully matched for at least 10 frames are included in the graph.

**Graph Neural Network** updates the features of nodes \((V)\) and edges \((E)\) in the graph through a message passing process, as shown in Figure 3, that propagates the features to the neighboring nodes and edges and then aggregates those features. By iterating this process, \( V \) now contain features of both the neighboring nodes and edges and \( E \) indirectly aggregates the features of other edges which are connected to the same node. Further iteration allows the edges to have higher-order \((\text{multi-hop})\) edge features. Initial edge features represent the pairwise relation of two detection candidates; however, updated edge features represent the higher-order relation of neighboring detection candidates. More details can be found in Section 3.2.

**Edge Classifier** is a FC layer that predicts the edge score \((ES)\) from the updated edge features. The edge score is the probability that the connected detection candidates at \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) refer to the same object. Since \( n_{t1}^1 \) is connected to many nodes at \( t_2 \), we use the Hungarian algorithm \([23]\) for optimal matching based on the edge score matrix. As a result, \( n_{t1}^1 \) has only one edge score which is optimally assigned. Then, the edge threshold (\( \tau_E \)) is used for deciding a positive or negative edge. The yellow box shown in Figure 2 is the recovered detection that \( n_{t2}^3 \) is negative due to its
Figure 2. Schematic of SGT. (S1) Top-K scored detections and their features are extracted from I$_{11}$ and I$_{12}$. The red boxes are positive detections which score above the detection threshold ($\tau_D$) while the white boxes are top-K scored detections but below $\tau_D$. (S2) A sparse graph is built, where a node, $n_{iT} \in N_T$ ($i \in [1, K]$), is a detection candidate of frame $T = \{t_1, t_2\}$ and an edge ($e_{i,j}$) is a connection between $n_{i1}$ and $n_{i2}$. The red nodes are positive detections. The green nodes are the tracklets that are missed until $t_1$ and are appended to $N_{t1}$. (S3) GNN updates the features of nodes and edges to become higher-order by aggregating neighboring features. (S4) The edge score of the red line (a positive edge) is above the edge threshold ($\tau_E$) while the green line represents a negative edge. The yellow node ($n_{i12}$) is an example of detection recovery. It was previously negative detection due to its low score, but it becomes a positive detection with the help of a positive edge. (S5) The recovered detection ($n_{i12}$) in S4 is verified by the node score. If the node score is below the node threshold ($\tau_N$), it is regarded as a false positive and is filtered out. Otherwise, the node is recovered and hence can be successfully detected which is shown by the yellow node becoming red.

Figure 3. In GNN, the message passing process updates node and edge features in two steps. Firstly, initial edge features ($E_0^1$) are updated to $E_1^1$ containing the features of connected two nodes ($V_1^0$ and $V_{t2}^0$). Secondly, initial node features ($V_0^1$) are updated to $V_1^1$ containing the features of connected nodes ($V_1^0$) and edges ($E_1^1$) which are already updated in the first step. For simplicity, we omit the bidirectional connection and show only few edges.

3.2. Graph Construction and Update

Designing the node and edge features is crucial for graphs. Here, we use a FC layer, layer normalization [1] and ReLU activation function as a basic FC block.

**Initial node features.** Contrary to the graph-based MOT works using ReID features of detected objects [6, 48, 52], SGT exploits the image backbone’s visual features ($H$) which are shared for the detection task and jointly trained.

**Initial edge features.** We denote an edge feature as $e_{i,j}^l$, where $i$ and $j$ are the starting and ending node indices respectively, and $l$ indicates iteration. Inspired by MPN-Track [6], SGT initializes high-dimensional edge features as Figure 1.

$$e_{i,j}^l = f_{enc}\left([x_i - x_j, y_i - y_j, \log(h_i), \log(w_i), IoU_{i,j}, Sim_{i,j}]\right),$$

where $[\cdot]$ is a concat operator, $x$ and $y$ are the center coordinates, $h$ and $w$ are the height and width of a bounding box, and $f_{enc}$ refers to two FC blocks. As the initialized edge features are direction-aware, two edges connecting the same nodes but reversely will have different features considering different relations (e.g., $t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ and $t_2 \rightarrow t_1$). $V_{t1}$ and $V_{t2}$ are updated on two different MLPs with these different edge features. After updating in GNN, these bidirectional edge features are averaged to predict a single edge score.
Initial graph, shown in the left of Figure 3, is denoted by \( G^0 = \{ V^0, E^0 \} \), where \( E^0 = \{ e^0_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq 2K + |V_{\text{miss}}| \} \) is a set of initial edge features and \( V^0 = V^0_1 \cup V^0_2 \cup V^0_{\text{miss}} \) is a set of initial node features at \( t_1, t_2 \), and missing tracklets.

**Update in node and edge features.** Figure 3 describes two steps to update the features of nodes and edges during the message passing process in GNN. The initial edge features \( e^0_{i,j} \), shown in the left side of the graph, are pairwise relational features considering only the two connected nodes at \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) (direction \( i \rightarrow j \)).

In Step 1 of Figure 3, the edge features are updated as Eq. 2.

\[
e^1_{i,j} = f_e \left( [v^1_{i,j}, v^1_{j,i}, e^0_{i,j}, e^1_{i,j}] \right),
\]

where \( f_e \) refers to two FC blocks, \( l \) is the number of iterations \( l \in [1, N_{\text{iter}}] \), \( v_i \) is the features of node \( i \), and \( v^l_i \) indicates the node features of the previous iteration. Therefore, the current state of the two connected nodes, initial and current edge features are concatenated and passed to \( f_e \) to update edge features as \( e^1_{i,j} \). Initial edge features \( (e^0_{i,j}) \) are concatenated every iteration to prevent the over-smoothing issue in GNN [34]. Although we use the shared MLPs \( f_e \) for the edges of two different directions, the edge features of the opposite direction may not be the same since their edge features are encoded in a direction-aware manner.

In Step 2 of Figure 3, node \( j \) aggregates the features of the connected nodes and edges as Eq. 3.

\[
u^1_j = f_{vout} \left( \frac{1}{|E^1_{i,j}|} \sum_i f_{venc} \left( [v^1_{i,j}, e^1_{i,j}] \right) \right),
\]

where \( f_{vout} \) is an FC block, \( |E^1_{i,j}| \) is the number of edges connected to the node \( j \), \( f_{venc} \) refers to two FC blocks, \( e^1_{i,j} \) is the updated edge features in Step 1 (Eq. 2) and \( v^1_{i,j} \) is the features of starting node. We suppose the index of \( N_{i,j} \) is from 1 to \( K \) and \( N_{j,i} \) is from \( K + 1 \) to \( 2K + |V_{\text{miss}}| \). When \( i > j \), \( e_{i,j} \) is the edge features with direction of \( t_1 \rightarrow t_2 \). Thus, message passing is from \( t_1 \) to \( t_2 \) and \( V_{\text{out}} \) are updated. As our edge features are direction-aware, we use different \( f_{venc} \) for message passing \( t_1 \) to \( t_2 \) and \( t_2 \) to \( t_1 \).

### 3.3. Training and Inference Strategies

SGT is trained by the sum of the detection loss \( \mathcal{L}_D \) and the association loss \( \mathcal{L}_A \).

**Detection loss.** Since we adopt CenterNet [64] as a detector, we follow [64] to compute the detection loss which is the weighted sum of losses from three heads as Eq. 4.

\[
\mathcal{L}_D = \mathcal{L}_{\text{score}} + w_{\text{size}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{size}} + w_{\text{off}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{off}}
\]

The size head outputs \( B_{\text{size}} \) composed of \( (s_i, s_{-i}, \tilde{s}_{t}, \tilde{s}_b) \). The offset head outputs \( B_{\text{off}} \) which is the quantization error of the center coordinates caused by the stride of feature map (e.g., 4). For each ground-truth (GT) object \( \hat{b} = (\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{x}_{-i}, \hat{y}_{-i}) \), GT size \( \hat{b}_{\text{size}} = (\hat{s}_i, \hat{s}_{-i}, \hat{t}, \hat{b}) \) is computed by the difference between center coordinates \( (\hat{c}_x, \hat{c}_y) = (\frac{\hat{x} + \hat{x}_{-i}}{2}, \frac{\hat{y} + \hat{y}_{-i}}{2}) \) and \( \hat{b} \). Each GT size \( \hat{b}_{\text{size}} \) is assigned to the prediction \( b_{\text{size}} \in B_{\text{size}} \), where \( (x, y) = (\frac{\hat{c}_x}{c_{\text{size}}}, \frac{\hat{c}_y}{c_{\text{size}}}) \).

Each GT offset \( (\hat{o}_x, \hat{o}_y) = (\frac{\hat{c}_x}{c_{\text{size}}} - \frac{\hat{x}}{c_{\text{size}}}, \frac{\hat{c}_y}{c_{\text{size}}} - \frac{\hat{y}}{c_{\text{size}}}) \) is assigned to the prediction \( b_{\text{off}} \). Then, \( L_1 \) loss is used to compute \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{size}} \) and \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{off}} \). For training the score head, GT heatmap \( M_{xy} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 1} \) is generated by the Gaussian kernel as Eq. 5.

\[
M_{xy} = \frac{N_D}{\sum_{l=1}^D \exp(-\frac{(x - \hat{x}_l)^2 + (y - \hat{y}_l)^2}{2 \sigma_d^2})}, \tag{5}
\]

where \( N_D \) is the number of GT object and \( \sigma_d \) is computed by width and height of each object [24]. \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{score}} \) is computed as the pixel-wise logistic regression with the penalty-reduced focal loss [28].

**Association loss.** Our association loss is the weighted sum of the edge and node classification losses as Eq. 6.

\[
\mathcal{L}_A = w_{\text{edge}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{edge}} + w_{\text{node}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{node}} \tag{6}
\]

In SGT, the edge and node classifiers output the edge and node scores \( (ES \text{ and } NS) \), respectively. \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{edge}} \) and \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{node}} \) are computed on these scores with the focal loss [28]. Since it is difficult to assign GT labels to the edges connecting the background patches, we exclude them in \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{edge}} \) as Eq. 7.

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{edge}} = \frac{1}{N_{E+}} \sum_{e_{i,j} \in E} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{FL}(ES_{i,j}, e_{y_{i,j}}), & \text{if } ny_i = 1 \text{ or } ny_j = 1; \\
0, & \text{otherwise},
\end{array} \right.
\]

where \( N_{E+} \) is the number of GT edges which at least one of the endpoints is positive, \( E \) is a set of edges in \( G \). FL is the focal loss, edge in direction of \( t_1 \rightarrow t_2 \), \( e_{y_{i,j}} \) is the GT label of edge connecting the nodes \( n_i \) and \( n_j \), and \( ny_i \) is the GT label of \( n_i \). We compute \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{node}} \) only on the node scores at \( t_2 \) as Eq. 8.

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{node}} = \frac{1}{N_{N^+}} \sum_{n_j \in N_{t_2}} \text{FL}(NS_{n,j}, n_{y_j}), \tag{8}
\]

where \( N_{N^+} \) is the number of GT positive nodes at \( t_2 \). We output zero when \( N_{E+} = 0 \) or \( N_{N^+} = 0 \).

**Node and edge label assignment** is an essential step for computing the losses. MPNTrack [6] and other existing works [45, 47, 60] use GT boxes to train matching branch. Instead of training with GT boxes, we introduce using pseudo labels, which are prediction boxes, to train edge and node classifiers of SGT. Similar to one-to-one matching adopted in DETR [8], Hungarian algorithm [23] optimally matches the GT boxes and the prediction boxes based on their IoU score matrix; the matched GT object IDs are assigned to the prediction boxes. To prevent the misallocation
of GT ID, the assigned IDs are filtered out if IoU of their matching is lower than the threshold (e.g., 0.5). This step is repeated for \(N_{I1}\) and \(N_{I2}\) to assign \(n_{y_j}\) and \(n_{y_j}\). Finally, the GT edge label \((e_{y_j})\) is assigned to the edges by matching the IDs of nodes. An edge is labeled as 1 if the two connected nodes have the same GT ID, and 0 otherwise.

**Adaptive Feature Smoothing** is our proposed inference technique to deal with recovered detections. Recent online MOT models update appearance features of tracklets in an exponential moving average manner as introduced in JDE [47] following \(emb_{t2}^{trk} = \alpha \times emb_{t1}^{trk} + (1 - \alpha) \times emb_{t2}^{det}\). This method updates the appearance features of tracklets adding the current detection features with the fixed weight, \(\alpha\). However, low-scored recovered objects have unreliable appearance features since they may suffer from the occlusion or blur. Therefore, we use adaptive weight computed by the object scores \((S_T)\) as Eq. 9.

\[
emb_{t2}^{trk} = emb_{t1}^{trk} \times \frac{S_{t1}}{S_{t1} + S_{t2}} + emb_{t2}^{det} \times \frac{S_{t2}}{S_{t1} + S_{t2}} \tag{9}
\]

4. Experiments

4.1. Datasets and Implementation Details

**Datasets.** We train and evaluate on the datasets of the MOT16/17/20 Challenge [13,31]. Due to a small size of the MOT Challenge training dataset, JDE [47] introduces training with additional pedestrian detection and ReID datasets: ETH [16], CityPerson [57], CalTech [14], CUHK-SYSU [51] and PRW [62]. FairMOT [60] further introduces CrowdHuman [41], which is a pedestrian detection dataset. Recent SOTA models report high performance using these additional datasets. We also use CrowdHuman [41] as an additional training dataset. Since CrowdHuman does not have ID data and is a still image, we assign a unique ID to every bounding box and randomly warp an image to generate a pair of \(I_{t1}\) and \(I_{t2}\).

**Implementation details.** SGT’s detector is initialized with the official CenterNet’s weight [64] pretrained on the COCO object detection dataset [29]. Our input image size is 1088 × 608 following and the output feature map size \((H_w \times H_h)\) is 272 × 152. We randomly sample two images in the interval of [1, 30] from MOT datasets. Following FairMOT [60], random flip, warping and color jittering are selected as data augmentation. The same augmentation is applied to a pair of images. We use Adam optimizer [21] with a batch size of 12 and initial learning rate (lr) of \(2e^{-4}\) which drops to \(2e^{-5}\). There are 60 training epochs and lr is dropped at 50. For training, we use 1 for \(w_{off}\), 0.1 for \(w_{size}, w_{edge}\), and 10 for \(w_{node}\). For inference, we use 0.5, 0.4 and 0.4 as \(T_D, T_E\) and \(T_N\), respectively. These values are chosen empirically. We will release code for details.

### 4.2. MOT Challenge Evaluation Results

We submit SGT to the MOT16/17/20 Challenge and compare it with the recent SOTA online MOT models as shown in Table 1 and 2.

**Evaluation metrics.** We use the standard evaluation metrics for 2D MOT [3]: Multi-Object Tracking Accuracy (MOTA), ID F1 Score (IDF1), False Negative (FN), False Positive (FP), Identity Switch (IDS) [25]. While MOTA is computed by FP, FN and IDS to emphasize the detection performance, IDF1 [40] is a metric focused on the pure tracking performance. Also, mostly tracked targets (MT) and mostly lost targets (ML) represent the ratio of GT trajectories covered by a track hypothesis for at least 80% of their respective life span, and at most 20% of their respective life span, respectively. For MOT17/20 Detection Challenge, we use precision, recall, F1, and AP [29] which is the average precision taken over a set of reference recall values \((0:0.1:1)\) with IoU threshold 0.5.

**Evaluation results of MOT17/20 Detection.** We evaluate the object detection performance on the MOT17/20Det Challenge and the results are shown in Table 1. For both MOT17/20Det, SGT achieves SOTA performance in every metric and outperforms GSDT [46] which is also based on CenterNet [64] and GNN. Especially, SGT’s high precision shows that it recovers missed detections effectively with few false positives. Node classifier’s filtering stage contributes to this result as shown in Table 3.

**Evaluation results of MOT16/17.** As shown in Table 2, in terms of MOTA, SGT achieves the highest and the second rank in MOT16/17, respectively, with the best trade-off between FP and FN. SGT also ranks the highest MT on both MOT16/17, and the lowest and the second lowest ML in MOT16/17, respectively. These results indicate that SGT generates stable and long-lasting tracklets, proving that SGT effectively recovers missed detections in association. Among the CenterNet-based models [35,45,46,50,54,58,60,63], CenterTrack [63], TraDeS [50], GSDT [46] and CorrTracker [45] use more than one frame to exploit the spatio-temporal cues. Although CorrTracker [45] shows marginally higher MOTA than SGT by 0.2% in MOT17, CorrTracker [45] exploits longer temporal cues with five previous frames, compared with ours using

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>AP↑</th>
<th>Recall↑</th>
<th>Precision↑</th>
<th>F1↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOT17Det</td>
<td>FRCNN</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSDT [46]</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT20Det</td>
<td>ViPDet20 [10]</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSDT [46]</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Detection evaluation on the MOT17/20Det Benchmark. The best result for each metric is bolded.
Table 2. Evaluation results of ours and recent SOTA online JDT models under the “private detector” protocol on the MOT16/17/20 benchmarks. Note that the methods using tracklet interpolation in the post-processing step are excluded to strictly satisfy “online setting”. The values not provided by the paper are filled up with “-”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>MT↑</th>
<th>ML↓</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10689</td>
<td>20428</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC [27]</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorrTracker [45]</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10860</td>
<td>30756</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelationTrack [54]</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10860</td>
<td>30756</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTMOT [61]</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDTrack [63]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCenter [53]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC [27]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorrTracker [45]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelationTrack [54]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTMOT [61]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC [27]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorrTracker [45]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelationTrack [54]</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112897</td>
<td>56282</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One limitation of SGT is its high IDS caused by lack of discriminative appearance features due to the absence of a ReID network, compared with others [26, 27, 45, 50, 54, 56]. Also, in MOT17, occlusion is sometimes caused by non-human objects, such as vehicles, which are not included in top-K detections for relational modeling. Extension of SGT with a ReID network and open-world object detection [20] is a promising future work, but this paper focuses on showing the effectiveness of the proposed graph tracker performing detection recovery in an online manner.

Evaluation results of MOT20. MOT20 is a challenging dataset with severely crowded scenes. Specifically, on each frame, while MOT17 has 30 people, MOT20 has 170 people on average. The most crowded scenes of MOT20 have more than 200 people. Such crowded situation causes frequent partial occlusion between people, and existing methods suffer from missed detections with less confident detection output. Our proposed detection recovery method leads SGT to being robust on such crowded scenes so that SGT achieves SOTA in MOT20 with a large gap as shown in Table 2. SGT surpasses SOTA in MOT20.

Apart from SOTA, SGT achieves high IDF1 and low IDS in MOT20. In MOT20, IDS of SGT is the lowest, whereas it is higher than other methods in MOT16/17. Since the detection models are more vulnerable to the missed detections in the crowded scene, existing methods [45, 54, 60] use lower detection threshold; however, this leads to significantly high FP, and high IDS and low IDF1, consequently. In Appendix, we also analyze the ratio of recovered detections by each sequence in MOT20 and show that the sequences with high ratio of recovered detections achieve large improvement.

Running time. We measure the running time in terms of frames-per-second (FPS) using a single V100 GPU; SGT runs at 23.0/23.0/19.9 FPS on MOT16/17/20, respectively. For fair comparison, we select the methods reporting FPS measured on the same GPU. In MOT17, CorrTracker [45] and TransTrack [43] run at 14.8 and 10.0 FPS, respectively. In MOT20, CorrTracker [45] runs 8.5 FPS. SGT records much faster than them in both MOT17/20 because SGT performs relational modeling in the object-level sparsely compared with CorrTracker [45] and TransTrack [43] densely relational model features in the pixel-level.

Although FairMOT [60], SOTMOT [61], and OMC [27] all measure FPS using a single RTX 2080Ti GPU rather than V100 GPU, we can compare their decrease in FPS between MOT17 and MOT20. When the number of objects increases (MOT17 → MOT20), their FPSs are dropped by half; specifically, 25.9 → 13.2, 16.0 → 8.5, and 13.2 → 6.7 in the order of FairMOT [60], SOTMOT [61], and OMC [27]. However, SGT shows robustness of FPS (23.0 → 19.9) since SGT does not use Kalman Filter [4].
Figure 4. Qualitative comparison against CenterNet [64] based online JDT models [45, 46, 60, 61] in MOT17/20 Test which videos are available in MOT Challenge website. In MOT17, ours detects occluded people who are missed in the existing methods [45, 46, 60] based on the proposed detection recovery in association approach. In MOT20, ours does not have FP shown in the existing methods [46, 60, 61].

Figure 5. When the pointed people are fully occluded, the tracklets are missed in frame 390 and 405. SGT can perform long-term association without Kalman filter [4].

which running time increases proportional to the number of objects.

Visualization results. Figure 4 shows a qualitative comparison of SGT and other methods [45, 46, 60, 61]. In MOT17, partially occluded people are missed by FairMOT [60], GSDT [46], and CorrTracker [45], but SGT detects all of them. In MOT20, FairMOT [60], GSDT [46], and SOTMOT [61] all show FP detections on the chairs due to their low detection threshold; however, SGT does not have such FP without missed detections. Although SGT is robust against partial occlusion, detection recovery is failed and the tracklets are missed when the objects are fully occluded as shown in Figure 5.

4.3. Ablation Experiments

We conduct an ablation study to validate the effectiveness of each proposed module. We train FairMOT [60] and SGT on the first half of the MOT17 training dataset and evaluate it on the rest. Refer to Appendix for more details and results using different backbones.

Detection recovery. Table 3 shows the results of experiments comparing our GNN-based detection recovery architecture with another detection recovery method. BYTE [59] has an extra step associating unmatched tracklets with low-scored detections using IoU score, leading to the marginal improvement in overall but degradation in FP. Instead of performing detection recovery at a later stage, SGT matches tracklets with top-K detections including low-scored detections in a single step. Edge features, which are higher-order relational features yielded from iterations of GNN, better represent object-level spatio-temporal consistency than pairwise relational features, such as IoU; thus, using edge features for matching in SGT significantly decreases FN and increases AP attributed to recovered detections. To solve high FP issue, we add Step5 as shown in Figure 2 to filter out false positive recovered detections by node classification. As a result, better trade-off between FN and FP with lower FN can be achieved and consequently, MOTA is improved. In our final model, not only top-K scored detections of the $t_2$ are used as nodes ($N_{t_2}$) in a graph, but those of the $t_1$ are also included in $N_{t_1}$ so that features of the background patches in the previous frame ($t_1$) can be propagated to $N_{t_2}$ through the GNN iterations. This contributes to better IDF1 and IDS.

Long-term association. As shown in Table 4, introducing long-term association into SGT with max_age of one second increases IDF1 by 10.8%. We use min_age of ten frames.
so that only the stable tracklets are cached and false positive recovery cases are avoided as much as possible. Figure 5 shows that SGT can match the missing tracklets without Kalman filter [4].

**Training strategy.** Table 5 shows training SGT with pseudo labeling is an important technique to reduce FP significantly. Using top-$K$ detections as pseudo labels can generate edge labels of not only object-object pairs but also object-background pairs. Training with object-background pairs as extra negative examples helps SGT not to false object-background pairs. Jointly training detection and tracking branches can further improve performance.

**Adaptive feature smoothing.** Naively update features with branches can further improve performance. Some higher-order edge features. According to Table 8, the number of FN and IDS decreases as GNN iterates. This trend proves that the higher-order relational features are more effective in learning spatio-temporal consistency than the pairwise relational features. The performance saturates when $N_{\text{iter}} = 4$; thus, we decide to use $N_{\text{iter}} = 3$ which achieves the lowest FP and IDS.

### 5. Conclusion

Partial occlusion in a video leads to low-confidence detection outputs, and the existing online JDT models suffer from missed detections since they only use the detections which confidence score is higher than the threshold. This paper presents SGT, a new approach of online JDT that can recover missed detections while associating top-$K$ detections. With our proposed graph-based tracker, SGT effectively captures an object-level spatio-temporal consistency in video data by exploiting higher-order relational features of objects and background patches across time. This paper also proposes pseudo labeling and adaptive feature smoothing as training and inference techniques, respectively. The effectiveness of our proposed detection recovery is shown by SOTA performance in the MOT16/20 and MOT17/20 Detection benchmarks. In particular, SGT surpasses the current SOTA significantly in the MOT20 benchmark which is vulnerable to missed detections due to crowded scenes. SGT successfully performs detection recovery in the case of partial occlusion; still, detection recovery under full occlusion is yet to be solved. Possible future works are exploiting longer temporal cues and modeling the spatio-temporal relations of non-human objects (e.g., cars or traffic sign object) which can occlude humans. We hope SGT will serve as a new online MOT method which is robust against occlusion.
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A. Appendix

In this appendix, we provide additional implementation details, experiment results, analysis, and visualization results that were not included in the main paper due to space limitations. The organization is as follows:

1. Section A.1 describes the details of implementation.
2. Section A.2 compares using low thresholding and top-K sampling of detections for building a graph in SGT.
3. Section A.3 shows the ratio of recovered detections for each sequence in MOT17/20. In the sequences with the highest recovery ratio, SGT achieves the largest improvement of MOTA compared with other sequences in MOT17/20.
4. Section A.4 reports additional ablation experiments.
5. Section A.5 presents additional visualization results of detection recovery cases in MOT20 test dataset.

A.1. Implementation Details

We use different training epochs and loss weight terms for the ablation experiments in the main paper which do not use CrowdHuman dataset [41] as extra training dataset but only use half of MOT17 training dataset [31]. SGT is trained for 30 epochs and learning rate is dropped from $2e^{-4}$ to $2e^{-5}$ at 20 epoch. The same detection loss weights are adopted, but we use $w_{edge}$ as 1, instead of 0.1. When SGT is trained with $K = 500$, $w_{nodes}$ decreases from 10 to 5 due to larger scale of loss. All these values are chosen empirically.

A.2. Low Threshold vs Top-K

SGT can achieve detection recovery by including detections which score is below the detection threshold in the association step. In the main paper, our experiments were based on top-$K$ detections with a large $K$ value, such as 100 or 300. Introducing an extra low detection threshold ($\tau_{low}$), instead of top-$K$, is another option to include low-scored detections, but $\tau_{low}$ is a sensitive parameter to be carefully tuned for the datasets. In the main paper, we already demonstrated the robustness of top-$K$ method by showing the consistent performance with different $K$ values ranging from 50 to 500.

In this appendix, we conduct the experiment that SGT is trained and evaluated with different $K$ and $\tau_{low}$ values. Table 9 shows that the performance of using $K$ of 300 and 50 for inference is consistent even when SGT is trained with $\tau_{low}$, instead of top-$K$. In contrast, when SGT adopts $\tau_{low}$ for inference, the performance decreases with increasing $\tau_{low}$. Although the performance is consistent when SGT is trained with $\tau_{low} = 0.1$, finding such an optimal parameter increases the complexity of training. Also, in the training phase, using higher $\tau_{low}$ of 0.1 rather than 0.01 leads SGT to output consistent performance; however, in the inference phase, using lower $\tau_{low}$ of 0.1 instead of 0.3 increases MOTA. In other words, the optimal value for $\tau_{low}$ is different for the training and inference phases. Due to this issue of $\tau_{low}$, we developed SGT based on top-$K$.

A.3. Ratio of Recovered Detections

We further support the effectiveness of detection recovery in SGT based on the ratio of recovered detections over detections for each sequence of MOT17 [31] and MOT20 [13]. As shown in Table 10, SGT outputs the highest ratio of recovered detections in MOT17-08 and MOT20-08 sequences. In these two sequences, SGT surpasses other methods in terms of MOTA with the highest gap as shown in Table 11. Specifically, SGT achieves slightly lower MOTA than CorrTracker [45] in the average of MOT17 sequences;

### Table 9. Ablation study of low threshold and top-$K$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>train</th>
<th>inference</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K = 300$</td>
<td>$K = 300$</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 300$</td>
<td>$K = 50$</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 300$</td>
<td>$\tau_{low} = 0.1$</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 300$</td>
<td>$\tau_{low} = 0.3$</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 100$</td>
<td>$K = 300$</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 100$</td>
<td>$K = 50$</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>2496</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 100$</td>
<td>$\tau_{low} = 0.1$</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 100$</td>
<td>$\tau_{low} = 0.3$</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Ratio of recovered detections over all detections in each sequence of MOT17/20 test datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Recovery Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-01</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-03</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-06</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-07</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-08</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT17-14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT20-04</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT20-06</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT20-07</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT20-08</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Detection recovery cases in MOT20 test dataset [13]. We show the annotation of each prediction box in the format of “{id}-[detection score]”. The detection threshold value is 0.5 so the objects which score below 0.5 are recovered detections.

Table 11. Evaluation results of MOT17/20 sequences collected from MOTChallenge leaderboard. MT and ML are computed by the number of ground-truth tracklets from [12, 13].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>MT↑</th>
<th>ML↓</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>3533</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSDT [46]</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorrTracker</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3346</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOT17-06 (6.7% recovery)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>MT↑</th>
<th>ML↓</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>8560</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>11191</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSDT [46]</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>10523</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorrTracker</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOT17-08 (14.3% recovery)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>MT↑</th>
<th>ML↓</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2283</td>
<td>4775</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2988</td>
<td>4770</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSDT [46]</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>6115</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTMOT [61]</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>5066</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOT20-07 (4.9% recovery)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>MT↑</th>
<th>ML↓</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>32598</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>32104</td>
<td>23447</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSDT [46]</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>9916</td>
<td>36420</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTMOT [61]</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16025</td>
<td>27216</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOT20-08 (35.2% recovery)

Table 12. Ablation study on different backbones. Original model is based on the dla34 backbone network [55]. Here, we compare with FairMOT [60] based on the resnet18/101 [19] and hourglass104 [33] networks which are modified with additional upsampling layers as in CenterNet [64]. The models are trained with an extra CrowdHuman [41] dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Backbone</th>
<th>MOTA↑</th>
<th>IDF1↑</th>
<th>MT↑</th>
<th>ML↓</th>
<th>FP↓</th>
<th>FN↓</th>
<th>IDS↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>resdcn18</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>13719</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>resdcn101</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2545</td>
<td>13178</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>dladcn34</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3204</td>
<td>11853</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>dladcn34</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>12325</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairMOT [60]</td>
<td>hg104</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>10844</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGT (ours)</td>
<td>hg104</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2694</td>
<td>10370</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128 is allowed. According to Table 12, SGT achieves lower FN and ML, and higher MT and MOTA than FairMOT [60] across all backbone networks. These indicate that SGT has less number of missed detections and more stable tracklets than FairMOT [60] which are the effects of detection recovery. Thus, our proposed detection recovery with SGT works well regardless of the backbone networks to output the better trade-off between FP and FN.

A.4. Additional Ablation Studies

Here, we provide the results of SGT and FairMOT [60] using different backbones [19, 33, 55]. For the hourglass backbone network [33], we use an image size of \((H, W) = (640, 1152)\), instead of \((608, 1088)\) since only a multiple of 128 is allowed. According to Table 12, SGT achieves lower FN and ML, and higher MT and MOTA than FairMOT [60] across all backbone networks. This indicate that SGT has less number of missed detections and more stable tracklets than FairMOT [60] which are the effects of detection recovery. Thus, our proposed detection recovery with SGT works well regardless of the backbone networks to output the better trade-off between FP and FN.

A.5. Additional Visualization Results

Figure 6 shows the examples of detection recovery in MOT20 test dataset. In the first row, people labeled by the blue and brown bounding boxes are occluded each other. From frame #34 to #37, their detection scores are below the detection threshold and they were missed detections originally; however, SGT successfully recovers them by including low-scored detections in the association step, Figure 6.
also shows the detection recovery case of people labeled by the green and orange bounding boxes in the second row.