
SPARSE BEV FUSION WITH SELF-VIEW CONSISTENCY FOR MULTI-VIEW DETECTION AND TRACKING

Keisuke Toida¹, Taigo Sakai¹, Naoki Kato², Kazutoyo Yokota², Takeshi Nakamura², Kazuhiro Hotta²

¹Meijo University, 1-501 Shiogamaguchi, Tempaku-ku, Nagoya 468-8502, Japan

²Chubu Electric Power Co., Inc., 1-1 Higashishin-cho, Higashi-ku, Nagoya 461-8680, Japan

190442098@ccalumni.meijo-u.ac.jp, 200442066@ccalumni.meijo-u.ac.jp,

Katou.Naoki7@chuden.co.jp, Yokota.Kazutoyo@chuden.co.jp, Nakamura.Takeshi@chuden.co.jp,

kazuhotta@meijo-u.ac.jp

September 11, 2025

ABSTRACT

Multi-View Multi-Object Tracking (MVMOT) is essential for applications such as surveillance, autonomous driving, and sports analytics. However, maintaining consistent object identities across multiple cameras remains challenging due to viewpoint changes, lighting variations, and occlusions, which often lead to tracking errors. Recent methods project features from multiple cameras into a unified Bird's-Eye-View (BEV) space to improve robustness against occlusion. However, this projection introduces feature distortion and non-uniform density caused by variations in object scale with distance. These issues degrade the quality of the fused representation and reduce detection and tracking accuracy. To address these problems, we propose SCFusion, a framework that combines three techniques to improve multi-view feature integration. First, it applies a sparse transformation to avoid unnatural interpolation during projection. Next, it performs density-aware weighting to adaptively fuse features based on spatial confidence and camera distance. Finally, it introduces a multi-view consistency loss that encourages each camera to learn discriminative features independently before fusion. Experiments show that SCFusion achieves state-of-the-art performance, reaching an IDF1 score of 95.9% on WildTrack and a MODP of 89.2% on MultiviewX, outperforming the baseline method TrackTacular. These results demonstrate that SCFusion effectively mitigates the limitations of conventional BEV projection and provides a robust and accurate solution for multi-view object detection and tracking.

1 Introduction

Multi-object tracking (MOT) is a task that aims to identify and track multiple objects, such as pedestrians and vehicles, across frames in video sequences [1, 2]. It has gained significant importance due to its broad applicability in areas such as surveillance, robotic vision, autonomous driving, and sports analytics.

In multi-view multi-object tracking (MVMOT), the goal is to associate the same object observed from different viewpoints and track its movement across a larger area. However, challenges unique to the multi-view setting arise, including variations in appearance due to changes in camera angle and lighting conditions, occlusions caused by blind spots, and increased computational overhead from simultaneous multi-camera processing.

MVMOT which utilizes multiple viewpoints can enhance the robustness against occlusion. However, the process of projecting features into a common Bird's-Eye-View (BEV) [3] space introduces new challenges. Specifically, the non-uniform density of projected features, a problem caused by variations in object scale with distance has been largely unaddressed. This density distortion degrades the detection accuracy, particularly for distant objects. This paper tackles this problem of feature non-uniformity in BEV projection.




Figure 1: Comparison between Late Multi-View and Early Multi-View approaches. Late fusion performs detection and tracking per camera and aggregates in BEV, whereas Early fusion projects features to BEV space before joint detection.

We propose three solutions. (1) a sparse transformation method to avoid unnatural pixel interpolation, (2) density-aware weighting that adjusts feature fusion based on spatial confidence and distance to cameras, and (3) a multi-view consistency loss that encourages each camera’s features to be individually informative for BEV detection.

SCFusion’s robust performance is validated on standard benchmarks. It achieved a new state-of-the-art 95.9% IDF1 tracking score on WildTrack and a significantly improved 85.4% MOTP for detection on MultiviewX.

In Section 2, we review related works on MVMOT, categorizing existing methods into late and early fusion approaches. Section 3 describes our SCFusion in detail, addressing the feature integration problem in multi-view scenarios. Section 4 presents experimental validation on the MultiviewX dataset. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and outlines future directions.

2 Related works

2.1 Multi-View Multi-Object Tracking (MVMOT)

MVMOT is a technique that tracks multiple objects from multiple viewpoints. Compared to single-view methods, MVMOT mitigates issues such as occlusion and blind spots by leveraging information from multiple perspectives. As illustrated in Figure 1, MVMOT approaches can be categorized into two types based on the stage at which multi-view information is fused: Late Multi-View and Early Multi-View. The Late Multi-View approach first performs detection independently on each camera and then fuses the results. Examples of this method include PolarMOT [4], which projects 2D detection results into a BEV polar coordinate system, and MTMCT [5], which uses re-identification based on features from single-view tracking. However, this method is limited because information from each camera is kept separate during detection. A detection error in one view due to occlusion cannot be corrected by another view, which limits accuracy.

In contrast, the Early Multi-View approach aggregates feature maps from all cameras into a unified BEV before performing detection. By sharing the information at the feature level, this approach is more robust to occlusion and allows for more accurate object localization. In fact, methods like MVDet [6], MUTR3D [7], and BEVFormer [8] have demonstrated that this Early approach can achieve more accurate localization. EarlyBird [9] extends the MVDet architecture by projecting camera features to the BEV and performing joint detection and tracking end-to-end using a unified network. TrackTacular [10] shown in Figure 2 also follows the Early Multi-View paradigm by fusing camera




Figure 2: Overview of the TrackTacular architecture. Camera-view features are projected to BEV space and fused before performing joint detection and tracking.

features in BEV space to achieve high performance in both detection and tracking. After aggregating the BEV projection and the features from all cameras, Tracktacular stores the BEV feature map before the detection decoder (denoted as History BEV($t-1$)) and reuses it in the next frame t , effectively addressing occlusion.

However, this advanced approach still faces its own challenge: the projection from 2D to BEV creates feature distortion and non-uniform density. This problem is particularly noticeable as the scale of objects changes with distance, which degrades the final detection quality. Our proposed SCFusion directly solves this projection problem to further enhance MVMOT performance.

3 Proposed Method

3.1 Overview of the Proposed Method: SCFusion

The overall architecture of our proposed SCFusion is illustrated in Figure 3. Our approach transforms features extracted from multiple camera through three key components.

1. **Sparse Perspective Transform (SPT):** To avoid the information distortion caused by conventional dense transformation methods, we sparsely project features into the BEV space as shown in Figure 4.
2. **Density-Aware Weighted Aggregation:** We aggregate the BEV features from each camera by weighting them according to their reliability (i.e., density). This process yields a feature representation that better reflects physical confidence, as visualized in Figure 5.
3. **Multi-View Consistency Loss:** We compute a detection loss (L_{single}) on the single-view BEV features before fusion and combine it with the loss (L_{multi}) from the final fused features. This encourages each view’s features to be independently discriminative, thereby improving overall robustness.

The following subsections detail these components.

3.2 Proposed Solution for Multi-View Feature Integration

We propose two techniques to address the challenges of multi-view feature integration. The overall architecture is illustrated in Figure 3. First, we introduce a **sparse transformation method** that accounts for the non-uniform density of information during the projection of camera features into the BEV space. This approach properly handles the variation in feature density caused by differences in object distance within the image, leading to more accurate feature representations.

Second, we propose a **multi-view consistency loss**, which performs independent detection learning on the BEV features of each camera. This encourages each camera’s features to become individually effective for BEV-based detection before the fusion stage, resulting in improved overall feature quality during multi-view integration.




Figure 3: Overview of the SCFusion. Each camera view is projected sparsely into BEV space, followed by confidence-based fusion and consistency supervision.




Figure 4: Comparison of two warping strategies: (a) bilinear warping, and (b) sparse warping, Sparse Perspective Transform (SPT).

3.3 Sparse Projection and Density-Aware Fusion

We focus on the problem of *information density distortion* in the projection from camera images to the BEV space, which has not been properly addressed by conventional bilinear interpolation-based methods. In perspective images, near objects are represented with higher pixel density than distant ones. When these are projected into the BEV space, sparse regions representing nearby objects may be unnaturally stretched. This stretching causes spatial misalignment and distorts the feature representation, harming the model’s ability to accurately localize objects.

To address this, we introduce a **sparse projection method** that selectively projects only valid feature points, preserving the natural density distribution of the scene. Figure 4 compares our sparse warping method against conventional bilinear warping. As shown in Figure 4(a), bilinear warping unnaturally stretches features and introduces distortion. In contrast,




Figure 5: Overview of Weighted Aggregation,

our method shown in Figure 4(b) selectively projects only valid feature points, preserving the scene’s structure more faithfully. To further support learning from sparse representations, we modify the network architecture immediately after feature fusion. Specifically, we use convolutional layers with larger kernels (from 3×3 to 5×5), and *dilated convolutions* [11] are used to expand the receptive field without sacrificing resolution.

Additionally, we incorporate **density-aware weighting** during multi-view feature fusion. Specifically, we assign higher confidence to features from nearby objects and lower confidence to those from distant regions, based on their depth in camera space. The effectiveness of this weighted aggregation is visualized in Figure 5. Unlike simple fusion (TrackTacular), which can result in information gaps in the feature map (circled in red), our SCFusion utilizes density maps as weights to generate a richer and more uniform feature representation. This yields a fused representation that better reflects the physical reliability of features.

Let $i_s \in \mathbf{R}^{C \times H \times W}$ denote the input image from the s -th camera, and $E(\cdot)$ be the feature extractor. The BEV feature f_s for each camera is obtained by projecting the camera-space feature f_s^C using a transformation function $T(\cdot)$.

$$f_s^C = E(i_s) \quad (1)$$

$$f_s = T(f_s^C, K_s, R_s, \mathbf{t}_s) \quad (2)$$

where K_s , R_s , and \mathbf{t}_s are the intrinsic matrix, rotation matrix, and translation vector of the s -th camera, respectively. A 3D point p^C in camera coordinates is projected to BEV coordinates p as

$$p = K_s R_s p^C + \mathbf{t}_s. \quad (3)$$

Instead of dense bilinear sampling, our sparse projection maps only valid features. A feature point is considered invalid if it falls outside the predefined BEV grid. Namely, $f_s = 0$ means that the corresponding pixel on the BEV map lies outside the target area on each camera. A sparse mask M_s is generated as

$$M_s = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } f_s \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We apply a *Gaussian filter* G_σ to the mask to produce a confidence map C_s . This filtering step allows the confidence to spread smoothly around the valid feature points, giving some weights to neighboring pixels instead of creating a hard boundary. This helps the network to learn more robustly from the sparse representation.

$$C_s = G_\sigma * M_s \quad (5)$$

Finally, the **multi-view fused feature** f_m is obtained by confidence-weighted summation of features from all camera views, aggregating the per-view features while emphasizing those with higher confidence

$$f_m = \sum_{s=1}^S (f_s \odot C_s) \quad (6)$$

where S indicates the number of cameras. This formulation enables the model to assign high confidence to dense and reliable regions, while naturally reducing the influence of sparse or uncertain areas.

3.4 Multi-View Consistency Loss

To ensure that each camera’s BEV feature learns independently useful representations for detection, we introduce a **multi-view consistency loss**. This loss encourages the robustness even for distant or occluded objects, and improves cross-camera consistency in detections.

The multi-view fused feature f is formed by concatenating individual BEV features f_s along the channel dimension. The detection is performed in BEV space using both the current and previous frame features for temporal consistency. Let $D(\cdot)$ be the detection head, we compute detection probabilities for both the single-view BEV features and the final fused multi-view features. Let p_s be the detection probability map from the s -th single-view feature f_s , and p_m be the probability map from the fused multi-view feature f_m . They are computed using both current and previous frame’s features for temporal consistency

$$p_s = D(f_s, f_s^{(t-1)}) \quad (7)$$

$$p_m = D(f_m, f_m^{(t-1)}). \quad (8)$$

We adopt the *Focal Loss* [12], which is robust to class imbalance. The loss is computed only at valid projected locations.

$$L_{\text{single}} = - \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_i \alpha_i (1 - p_{i,s})^\gamma [y_{i,s} \log p_{i,s} + (1 - y_{i,s}) \log(1 - p_{i,s})] \quad (9)$$

$$L_{\text{multi}} = - \sum_i \alpha_i (1 - p_i)^\gamma [y_i \log p_i + (1 - y_i) \log(1 - p_i)] \quad (10)$$

where α_i is the class-balancing weight, γ is the focusing parameter. As illustrated in Figure 3, our training objective combines the detection loss from single-view features (L_{single}) with the loss from the fused multi-view features (L_{multi}).

The final detection loss L_{det} is defined as

$$L_{\text{det}} = \beta L_{\text{single}} + L_{\text{multi}} \quad (11)$$

where β is a balance coefficient. This loss function allows each camera’s BEV features to learn detection-friendly representations independently, before multi-view fusion. Values of α , γ , β are given in section 4.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

In experiments, we evaluate our SCFusion on the WildTrack dataset [13], and MultiviewX dataset [14]. WildTrack is a large-scale multi-camera pedestrian detection and tracking dataset captured in a real-world outdoor environment. As shown in Figure 6(a), it includes seven static HD cameras with overlapping fields of view, each with a resolution of 1920×1080 pixels and a synchronized frame rate of 2 FPS. The dataset contains 400 annotated frames, total 2800 images across all views. The average number of pedestrians per frame is approximately 24. MultiviewX is a synthetic multi-view pedestrian detection and tracking dataset rendered using a game engine. As shown in Figure 6(b), it includes six virtual cameras with overlapping fields of view. The average number of pedestrians per frame is around 40. Ground-truth annotations are provided for both detection and tracking in the BEV space (640×1000 pixels). Ground-truth annotations are provided both in the image plane and on the BEV ground plane, allowing precise evaluation of detection and tracking in world coordinates.

Compared to MultiviewX which is rendered using a game engine, WildTrack provides a more realistic evaluation environment. It features real-world imagery from seven static HD cameras (1920×1080 resolution at 2 FPS) observing an average of 24 pedestrians per frame. Furthermore, WildTrack offers higher camera calibration accuracy, making



Figure 6: (a)WildTrack, and (b)MultiViewX dataset.

	Wildtrack				MultiviewX			
	MODA	MODP	Precision	Recall	MODA	MODP	Precision	Recall
RCNN & Cluster [15]	11.3	18.4	68	43	18.7	46.4	63.5	43.9
DeepMCD [16]	67.8	64.2	85	82	70.0	73.0	85.7	83.3
Deep-Occlusion [17]	74.1	53.8	95	80	75.2	54.7	97.8	80.2
MVDet [6]	88.2	75.7	94.7	93.6	83.9	79.6	96.8	86.7
SHOT [18]	90.2	76.5	96.1	94.0	88.3	82.0	96.6	91.5
MVDeTr [19]	91.5	<u>82.1</u>	97.4	94.0	93.7	<u>91.3</u>	<u>99.5</u>	94.2
Booster-SHOT [20]	92.8	84.9	97.5	95.3	94.4	92.0	99.4	94.9
EarlyBird [9]	91.2	81.8	94.9	96.3	94.2	90.1	98.6	95.7
TrackTacular [10]	<u>92.1</u>	76.2	97.0	95.1	96.5	75.0	99.4	97.1
SCFusion (Ours)	93.6	<u>82.1</u>	<u>97.4</u>	<u>96.2</u>	96.5	89.2	99.8	<u>96.7</u>

Table 1: Detection performance comparison on the WildTrack and MultiviewX datasets. Our method, SCFusion, achieved state-of-the-art performance on MODA on both datasets. All metrics are in %, where \uparrow indicates higher is better. The bold numbers indicate the best accuracy in each column, while the underlined ones represent the second best.

it particularly suitable for evaluating geometry-aware multi-view detection algorithms under realistic occlusion and lighting conditions.

For the Gaussian filter used in density estimation, we set the standard deviation to $\sigma = 1$ and the kernel size to 5×5 . The parameters for the Focal Loss are set as $\alpha = 2$ and $\gamma = 4$, following the same configuration as the baseline Tracktacular. The balancing coefficient β for the multi-view consistency loss is set to 0.1, as it showed the best validation accuracy among tested values 0.001, 0.1, 1.0, 10, 100. Experiments were run on a machine with RTX 4080 super GPU, Intel i7-14700K CPU. We conducted quantitative evaluation on the BEV detection map using standard 2D detection and tracking metrics. MODA measures detection accuracy considering false positives and false negatives. MODP evaluates the average localization precision of correct detections. MOTA reflects overall tracking accuracy, accounting for false positives, false negatives, and ID switches. MOTP indicates the average localization error of matched objects. IDF1 is the F1 score based on correctly identified detections.

4.2 Results and Analysis

The performance of SCFusion is benchmarked against state-of-the-art methods on the WildTrack and MultiviewX datasets, with results presented in Table 1 and Table 2. In particular, Table 1 shows a significant improvement in MODP, which reflects the precision of object localization. This improvement stems from the Sparse Perspective Transform (SPT), which enables BEV projections with less distortion. Accurate detection is the foundation for stable tracking, so we interpret SPT as the primary factor behind the improved IDF1 score. On the detection task, SCFusion also shows strong performance, reaching a MODA of 93.6% on WildTrack and 96.5% on MultiviewX. These improvements can be attributed to our robust feature integration strategy, which combines artifact reduction from sparse projection, confidence-based weighting, and consistency guidance from the multi-view loss.

Wildtrack					
	IDF1↑	MOTA↑	MOTP↑	MT↑	ML↓
KSP-DO [21]	73.2	69.6	61.5	28.7	25.1
KSP-DO-ptack [21]	78.4	72.2	60.3	42.1	14.6
DMCT [22]	77.8	72.8	79.1	61.0	4.9
DMCT Stack [22]	81.9	74.6	78.9	65.9	<u>4.9</u>
GLMB-YOLOv3 [23]	74.3	69.7	73.2	79.5	21.6
ReST [24]	86.7	84.9	84.1	87.8	4.9
EarlyBird [9]	92.3	89.5	<u>86.6</u>	78.0	<u>4.9</u>
TrackTacular [10]	95.3	91.8	<u>85.4</u>	87.8	<u>4.9</u>
MCBLT [25]	<u>95.6</u>	92.6	93.7	80.5	7.3
SCFusion (Ours)	95.9	<u>92.4</u>	86.3	<u>85.4</u>	4.8

MultiviewX					
	IDF1↑	MOTA↑	MOTP↑	MT↑	ML↓
EarlyBird [9]	82.4	88.4	86.2	82.9	1.3
TrackTacular [10]	85.6	<u>92.4</u>	80.1	92.1	<u>2.6</u>
SCFusion (Ours)	<u>85.0</u>	92.5	<u>85.4</u>	<u>85.5</u>	2.9

Table 2: Tracking performance comparison on the WildTrack and MultiviewX datasets. All metrics are in %, where ↑ indicates higher is better. The bold numbers indicate the best accuracy in each column, while the underlined ones represent the second best.

	Detection		Tracking		
	MODA	MODP	IDF1	MOTA	MOTP
Baseline	92.1	76.2	95.3	91.8	85.4
+ SPT	93.0	79.5	95.5	92.1	86.4
+ Weight Aggregation	93.4	80.9	95.8	92.5	86.6
+ MC loss	93.6	82.1	95.9	92.4	86.3

Table 3: Ablation study on WildTrack dataset.

To further evaluate the contribution of each component, we conduct an ablation study shown in Table 3. We evaluated three components individually and in combination: Sparse Perspective Transform (SPT), Weighted Aggregation, and Multi-View Consistency Loss (MCLoss). Adding SPT (+ SPT) improved all metrics, notably boosting MODP from 76.2% to 79.5%. This indicated that avoiding unnatural interpolation by projecting only valid features (as explained in Section 3.3) leads to more precise object localization, which is directly reflected in the MODP score. Adding Density-Aware Weighting (+ Weight Aggregation) further improved performance, especially on tracking metrics like IDF1 and MOTA. By assigning higher confidence to features from nearby objects, the model effectively mitigates distortions from distant, low-resolution regions. This results in a more reliable fused representation and, consequently, more stable tracking with fewer identity mismatches. Finally, including the Multi-View Consistency loss (+ MC loss) provides the largest boost to IDF1 (95.9%). This loss encourages each camera’s features to be more effective for detection before fusion. This pre-training of individual views makes the final representation more robust to occlusions and challenging scenarios.

In addition to the quantitative metrics, Figure 7 provides a qualitative comparison of tracking trajectories on the WildTrack dataset, visually confirming our method’s effectiveness. The baseline method, TrackTacular shown in Figure 7(a), exhibits several noticeable tracking errors. Some trajectories are fragmented, indicating that the tracker frequently loses objects. Other paths show abrupt color changes, which correspond to identity switches where the tracker confuses one person for another. In contrast, the trajectories generated by our SCFusion shown in Figure 7(b) are significantly more stable and consistent, closely mirroring the continuity of the ground truth shown in Figure 7(c). The tracks are longer with fewer fragments and color changes, providing clear visual evidence of improved identity preservation. This visual improvement attributes to our robust feature fusion mechanism. By mitigating feature




Figure 7: Qualitative comparison of tracking trajectories on the WildTrack dataset. (a) TrackTacular baseline shows several ID switches and fragmented tracks (e.g., yellow and blue lines). (b) Our SCFusion produces more consistent and longer trajectories, successfully tracking objects across the scene. (c) Ground Truth for reference. The bold numbers indicate the best accuracy in each column.

distortions through sparse projection and density-aware weighting, SCFusion maintains a more reliable representation of each object. This qualitative analysis indicates that SCFusion achieves more robust multi-object tracking.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we proposed SCFusion, a framework to address the feature distortion and non-uniform density that arise when multi-view features are projected into a single BEV space. Our approach integrates three key components: a sparse projection method to prevent interpolation artifacts, density-aware weighting to prioritize reliable features, and a multi-view consistency loss to ensure that each view learns a robust representation before fusion. Experimental results on standard benchmarks validated the effectiveness of our method. Notably, SCFusion set a new state-of-the-art in tracking on the WildTrack dataset, achieving a 95.9% IDF1 score. This demonstrated that our approach successfully integrates multi-view information to achieve robust and accurate scene understanding, mitigating the tracking inconsistencies caused by projection distortions.

Despite these improvements, promising directions for future work remain. Enhancing computational efficiency for applications that run in real time and developing methods that can operate without pre-calibrated camera parameters are key steps toward practical deployment. Our future research will focus on these areas to bring robust multi-view tracking closer to real situations.

References

- [1] Alex Bewley, Zongyuan Ge, Lionel Ott, Fabio Ramos, and Ben Upcroft. Simple online and realtime tracking. In *2016 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, pages 3464–3468. Ieee, 2016.
- [2] Nicolai Wojke, Alex Bewley, and Dietrich Paulus. Simple online and realtime tracking with a deep association metric. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 3645–3649, 2017.
- [3] R. Tsai. A versatile camera calibration technique for high-accuracy 3d machine vision metrology using off-the-shelf tv cameras and lenses. *IEEE Journal on Robotics and Automation*, 3(4):323–344, 1987.
- [4] Aleksandr Kim, Guillem Brasó, Aljoša Ošep, and Laura Leal-Taixé. Polarmot: How far can geometric relations take us in 3d multi-object tracking? In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 41–58. Springer, 2022.

- [5] Hung-Min Hsu, Jiarui Cai, Yizhou Wang, Jenq-Neng Hwang, and Kwang-Ju Kim. Multi-target multi-camera tracking of vehicles using metadata-aided re-id and trajectory-based camera link model. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 30:5198–5210, 2021.
- [6] Yunzhong Hou, Liang Zheng, and Stephen Gould. Multiview detection with feature perspective transformation. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, pages 1–18, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- [7] Tianyuan Zhang, Xuanyao Chen, Yue Wang, Yilun Wang, and Hang Zhao. Mutr3d: A multi-camera tracking framework via 3d-to-2d queries. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pages 4536–4545, 2022.
- [8] Zhiqi Li, Wenhai Wang, Hongyang Li, Enze Xie, Chonghao Sima, Tong Lu, Qiao Yu, and Jifeng Dai. Bevformer: learning bird’s-eye-view representation from lidar-camera via spatiotemporal transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [9] Torben Teepe, Philipp Wolters, Johannes Gilg, Fabian Herzog, and Gerhard Rigoll. Earlybird: Early-fusion for multi-view tracking in the bird’s eye view. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 102–111, 2024.
- [10] Torben Teepe, Philipp Wolters, Johannes Gilg, Fabian Herzog, and Gerhard Rigoll. Lifting multi-view detection and tracking to the bird’s eye view. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 667–676, 2024.
- [11] Fisher Yu and Vladlen Koltun. Multi-scale context aggregation by dilated convolutions. In *ICLR*, 2016.
- [12] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross B. Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. *CoRR*, abs/1708.02002, 2017.
- [13] Tatjana Chavdarova, Pierre Baqué, Stéphane Bouquet, Andrii Maksai, Cijo Jose, Louis Lettry, Pascal Fua, Luc Van Gool, and François Fleuret. The wildtrack multi-camera person dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09299*, 2017.
- [14] Yunzhong Hou, Liang Zheng, and Stephen Gould. Multiview detection with feature perspective transformation. In *ECCV*, 2020.
- [15] Yuanlu Xu, Xiaobai Liu, Yang Liu, and Song-Chun Zhu. Multi-view people tracking via hierarchical trajectory composition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4256–4265, 2016.
- [16] Tatjana Chavdarova and Francois Fleuret. Deep multi-camera people detection. pages 848–853, 12 2017.
- [17] Pierre Baqué, Francois Fleuret, and Pascal Fua. Deep occlusion reasoning for multi-camera multi-target detection. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 271–279, 2017.
- [18] Liangchen Song, Jialian Wu, Ming Yang, Qian Zhang, Yuan Li, and Junsong Yuan. Stacked homography transformations for multi-view pedestrian detection. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 6029–6037, 2021.
- [19] Yunzhong Hou and Liang Zheng. Multiview detection with shadow transformer (and view-coherent data augmentation). In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM ’21)*, 2021.
- [20] Jinwoo Hwang, Philipp Benz, and Pete Kim. Booster-shot: Boosting stacked homography transformations for multiview pedestrian detection with attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 363–372, January 2024.
- [21] Tatjana Chavdarova, Pierre Baqué, Stéphane Bouquet, Andrii Maksai, Cijo Jose, Timur Bagautdinov, Louis Lettry, Pascal Fua, Luc Van Gool, and François Fleuret. Wildtrack: A multi-camera hd dataset for dense unscripted pedestrian detection. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5030–5039, 2018.
- [22] Quanzeng You and Hao Jiang. Real-time 3d deep multi-camera tracking. *CoRR*, abs/2003.11753, 2020.
- [23] Jonah Ong, Ba-Tuong Vo, Ba-Ngu Vo, Du Yong Kim, and Sven Nordholm. A bayesian filter for multi-view 3d multi-object tracking with occlusion handling. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(5):2246–2263, 2022.
- [24] Cheng-Che Cheng, Mingfei Qiu, Chen-Kuo Chiang, and Shang-Hong Lai. Rest: A reconfigurable spatial-temporal graph model for multi-camera multi-object tracking. *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 10017–10026, 2023.

- [25] Yizhou Wang, Tim Meinhardt, Orcun Cetintas, Cheng-Yen Yang, Sameer Satish Pusegaonkar, Benjamin Missaoui, Sujit Biswas, Zheng Tang, and Laura Leal-Taixé. Mclbt: Multi-camera multi-object 3d tracking in long videos, 2025.