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Abstract

In this paper, we present LaSOT, a high-quality benchmark for Large-scale Single Object Tracking. LaSOT consists of 1,400 sequences with more than 3.5M frames in total. Each frame in these sequences is carefully and manually annotated with a bounding box, making LaSOT the largest, to the best of our knowledge, densely annotated tracking benchmark. The average sequence length of LaSOT is more than 2,500 frames, and each sequence comprises various challenges deriving from the wild where target objects may disappear and re-appear again in the view. By releasing LaSOT, we expect to provide the community a large-scale dedicated benchmark with high-quality for both the training of deep trackers and the veritable evaluation of tracking algorithms. Moreover, considering the close connections of visual appearance and natural language, we enrich LaSOT by providing additional language specification, aiming at encouraging the exploration of natural linguistic feature for tracking. A thorough experimental evaluation of 35 tracking algorithms on LaSOT is presented with detailed analysis, and the results demonstrate that there is still a big room to improvements. The benchmark and evaluation results are made publicly available at https://cis.temple.edu/lasot/.

1. Introduction

Visual tracking, aiming to locate an arbitrary target in a video with an initial bounding box in the first frame, has been one of the most important problems in computer vision with many applications such as video surveillance, robotics, human-computer interaction and so forth [31, 46, 53]. With considerable progresses in the tracking community, numerous algorithms have been proposed. In this process, tracking benchmarks have played a vital role in objectively evaluating and comparing different trackers. Nevertheless, further development and assessment of tracking algorithms are restricted by existing benchmarks with several issues:

(1) Small-scale. In the era of deep learning, more and more researchers have used deep features for object tracking, and demonstrated state-of-the-art performances. However, an issue with current tracking community is that it is difficult to train a deep tracker using tracking-specific videos due to the scarcity of a large-scale benchmark. As shown in Fig. 1, existing datasets seldom have more than 400 sequences. As a result, researchers are restricted to leverage either the pre-trained models (e.g., [45] and [18]) from image classification for deep feature extraction or the sequences from video object detection (e.g., [44] and [42]) for deep feature learning, which may result in suboptimal tracking performance because of the intrinsic differences among different tasks [54].

(2) Lack of high-quality dense annotations. For tracking, dense (i.e., per frame) annotations with high precision are of importance for several reasons. (i) They
ensure more accurate and reliable evaluations of different trackers; (ii) they offer desired training samples for the training of tracking algorithms; and (iii) they provide rich temporal contexts among consecutive frames which are of importance for tracking task. It is worth noting that there are recently proposed benchmarks toward large-scale and long-term tracking, such as (e.g., [40] and [50]), their annotations are however either semi-automatic (e.g., generated by a tracking algorithm) or sparse (e.g., labeled every 30 frames), limiting their usabilities.

(3) **Short-term tracking.** A desired tracker is expected to be capable of locating the target in a relative long period, in which the target may disappear and re-enter the view. However, most existing benchmarks have been focused on short-term tracking where the average sequence length is less than 600 frames (i.e., 20 seconds in the framerate of 30 fps, see again Fig. 1) and the target almost always appears in the video frame. The evaluations on such short-term benchmarks may not reflect the real performance of a tracker in real-world applications, and thus restrain the deployment in the wild.

(4) **Category bias.** A robust tracking system should exhibit stable performance insensitive to the category the target belongs to, which signifies that the category bias (or class imbalance) should be inhibited in both training and evaluating tracking algorithms. However, existing benchmarks usually comprise a few categories (see Tab. 1) with each consisting of different number of videos, hampering assessing and developing trackers.

In the literatures, many datasets have been proposed to deal with the issues above (e.g., [38] and [50] for long-term tracking, [40] for large-scale dataset, [51, 34, 24] for precise dense annotations). Nevertheless, none of them addresses all the problems, which motivates the proposal of LaSOT.

1.1. Contribution

With the goal of further advancing visual object tracking, we provide the community a novel benchmark for Large-scale Single Object Tracking (LaSOT) with multi-fold contributions:

- Our dataset contains 1,400 videos with an average sequence length of 2,512 frames. Each frame in each video is carefully inspected and manually labeled, and the result visually double-checked and corrected when needed. This way, we generate around 3.52 million high-quality bounding box annotations. Moreover, LaSOT contains 70 categories with each consisting of twenty sequences. To the best of our knowledge, LaSOT is the largest benchmark with high-quality manual dense annotations for object tracking to date. By releasing LaSOT, we expect it to offer a dedicated platform for the development and assessment of tracking algorithms.

- Different from existing datasets, LaSOT provides both visual bounding box annotations as well as rich natural language specification, which has recently been proven to be beneficial for various computer vision tasks (e.g., [21] and [30]) including visual tracking [33]. By doing so, we aim to encourage and facilitate explorations of integrating visual and lingual features for robust tracking performance.

- To assess existing trackers and provide extensive baselines for future comparisons on LaSOT, we evaluate 35 representative tracking algorithms under different protocols, and analyze their performances in details using different metrics.

2. Related Work

With considerable progresses in the tracking community, many tracking algorithms and benchmarks have been proposed in recent decades. In this section, we mainly focus on the tracking benchmarks that are relevant to our work, and refer the readers to surveys [31, 46, 53, 29] for tracking algorithms.

For a systematic review, we intentionally classify existing tracking datasets into two types: one with dense manual annotations (referred as dense benchmark for short) and the other one with sparse and/or (semi-)automatic annotations. In the following, we review each of these two categories.

2.1. Dense Benchmarks

Dense tracking benchmark provides dense bounding box annotations for each video sequence. To ensure high quality, the bounding boxes are usually manually labeled with careful inspection. For the visual tracking task, these highly precise annotations are desired for both training and assessing trackers. Currently, the popular dense benchmarks contain OTB [51, 52], TC-128 [34], VOT [24], NUS-PRO [27], UAV [38] and NfS [14].

**OTB.** OTB-2013 [51] firstly contributes a testing dataset by collecting 51 videos with manual annotated bounding box in each frame. The sequences are labeled with 11 attributes for further analysis of tracking performance. Later, OTB-2013 is extended to the larger OTB-2015 [52] by introducing extra 50 sequences.

**TC-128.** TC-128 [34] comprises 128 videos that are specifically designated to evaluate color-enhanced trackers. The videos in TC-128 are labeled with 11 similar attributes as in OTB [51].

**VOT.** VOT [24] introduces a series of tracking competitions with up to 60 sequences in each of them, aiming to evaluate the performance of a tracker in a relative short duration.
Each frame in the VOT datasets is annotated with a rotated bounding box with several attributes.

**NUS-PRO.** NUS-PRO [27] contains 365 sequences with a focus on human and rigid object tracking. Each sequence in NUS-PRO is annotated with both target location and occlusion level for evaluation.

**UAV.** UAV123 and UAV20L [38] are utilized for unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) tracking, comprising 123 short and 20 long sequences, respectively. Both UAV123 and UAV20L are labeled with 12 attributes.

**NFS.** NFS [14] provides 100 sequences with a high framerate of 240 fps, aiming to analyze the effects of appearance variations on tracking performance.

LaSOT belongs to the category of dense tracking dataset. Compared to others, LaSOT is the largest with 3.52 million frames and an average sequence length of 2,512 frames. In addition, LaSOT provides extra lingual description for each video while others do not. Tab. 1 provides a detailed comparison of LaSOT with existing dense benchmarks.

### 2.2. Other Benchmarks

In addition to the dense tracking benchmarks, there exist other benchmarks which may not provide high-quality annotations for each frame. Instead, these benchmarks are either annotated sparsely (e.g., every 30 frames) or labeled (semi-)automatically by tracking algorithms. Despite reduction of annotation cost, the evaluations on these benchmarks may not faithfully reflect the true performances of tracking algorithms. Moreover, it may cause problems for some trackers that need to learn temporal models from annotations, since the temporal context in these benchmarks may be either lost because of sparse annotations or inaccurate due to potential unreliable annotation (by tracking) results. Representatives of this type of benchmarks include ALOV [46], TrackingNet [40] and OxUvA [50].

ALOV [46] consists of 314 sequences labeled in 14 attributes. Instead of densely annotating each frame, ALOV provides annotations every 5 frames. TrackingNet [40] is a subset of the video object detection benchmark YT-BB [42] by selecting 30K videos, each of which is annotated by a tracker. Though the tracker used for annotation is proven to be reliable in a short period (i.e., 1 second) on OTB 2015 [52], it is difficult to guarantee the same performance on a harder benchmark. Besides, the average sequence length of TrackingNet does not exceed 500 frames, which may not demonstrate the performance of a tracker in long-term scenarios. OxUvA [50] also comes from YT-BB [42]. Different from TrackingNet, OxUvA is focused on the long-term tracking. It consists of 366 video sequences with an average length of around 4,200 frames. However, a problem with OxUvA is that it does not provide dense annotations in consecutive frames. Each video in OxUvA is annotated every 30 frames, ignoring rich temporal context between consecutive frames when developing a tracking algorithm.

Different from the aforementioned tracking benchmarks, LaSOT provides a large set of sequences with high-quality dense bounding box annotations, which makes it more suitable for developing deep trackers as well as evaluating long-term tracking in practical application.

### 3. The Proposed LaSOT Benchmark

#### 3.1. Design Principle

LaSOT aims to offer the community a dedicated dataset for training and assessing trackers. To such purpose, we follow five principles in constructing LaSOT, including large-scale, high-quality dense annotations, long-term tracking, category balance and comprehensive labeling.

- **Large-scale.** One of the key motivations of LaSOT is to provide a dataset for training data-hungry deep trackers, which requires a large set of annotated sequences. Accordingly, we expect such a dataset to contain at least a thousand videos with at least a million frames.

- **High-quality dense annotations.** As mentioned before, a tracking dataset is desired to have high-quality dense bounding box annotations, which are crucial for training robust trackers as well as for more faithful tracking evaluation. Following this principle, each se-
sequence in LaSOT is manually annotated with additional careful inspection and fine-tuning.

- **Long-term tracking.** In comparison with short-term tracking, long-term tracking can reflect more practical performance of a tracker in the wild. For this reason, we ensure that the shortest sequence comprises at least 1,000 frames, and the average sequence length of LaSOT is around 2,500 frames.

- **Category balance.** A robust tracker is expected to perform consistently regardless of the category the target object belongs to. For this purpose, in LaSOT we include a diverse set of objects from 70 classes and each class contains equal number of videos.

- **Comprehensive labeling.** As a complex task, tracking has recently seen improvements from natural language specification. To stimulate more explorations, a principle of LaSOT is to provide comprehensive labeling for videos, including both visual and lingual annotations.

### 3.2. Data Collection

Our benchmark covers a wide range of object categories in diverse contexts. Specifically, LaSOT consists of 70 object categories. Most of the categories are selected from the 1,000 classes from ImageNet [12], with a few exceptions, *e.g.*, *drone*, which are carefully chosen for popular tracking tasks. Different from existing dense benchmarks that have less than 30 categories and typically are unevenly distributed, LaSOT provides the same number of sequences for each category to alleviate potential category bias. Details of the dataset can be seen in the supplementary material.

After determining the 70 object categories in LaSOT, we have searched for the videos of each class from YouTube. Initially, we collect over 5,000 videos. With a joint consideration of the quality of videos for tracking and the design principles of LaSOT, we pick out 1,400 videos. However, these 1,400 sequences are not immediately available for the tracking task because of a large amount of irrelevant content. For example, for the video of *person* category (*e.g.*, a sporter), it often contains some introduction content of each sporter in the beginning, which is undesirable for tracking. Therefore, we carefully filter out these unrelated contents in each video and retain an usable clip for tracking. In addition, each category in LaSOT consists of 20 targets, reflecting the category balance and varieties of natural scenes.

Eventually, we have compiled a large-scale benchmark, LaSOT, for tracking by gathering 1,400 sequences with 3.52 million frames from YouTube with Creative Commons licence. The average video length of LaSOT is 2,512 frames (*i.e.*, 84 seconds based on a framerate of 30 fps). The short-
3.3. Annotation

In order to provide consistent bounding box annotation, we define a deterministic annotation strategy. Given a video with a specific tracking target, for each frame, if the target object appears in the frame, a labeler manually draw/edit its bounding box as the tightest up-right one to fit any visible part of the target; otherwise, the labeler gives an absent label, either out-of-view or full occlusion, to the frame. Note that, such strategy can not guarantee to minimize the background area in the box, as observed in any other benchmarks. However, the strategy does provide a consistent annotation that is relatively stable for learning the dynamics.

While the above strategy works great most of the time, exceptions exist. Some objects, e.g., a mouse, may have long and thin and highly deformable part, e.g., a tail, which not only causes serious noise in object appearance and shape, but also provides little information for localizing of the target object. We carefully identify such objects and associated videos in LaSOT, and design specific rules for their annotation (e.g., exclude the tails of mice when drawing their bounding boxes). An example of such cases is shown in the last row of Fig. 2.

The natural language specification of a sequence is represented by a sentence that describes the color, behavior and surroundings of the target in the whole video. For LaSOT, we provide 1,400 sentences for all the videos.

The greatest effort for constructing a high-quality dense tracking dataset is, apparently, the manual labeling, double-checking, and error correcting. For this task, we have assembled an annotation team containing several Ph.D. students working on related areas and about 10 volunteers. To guarantee high-quality annotation, each video is processed by teams: a labeling team and a validation team. A labeling team is composed of a volunteer and an expert (Ph.D. student). The volunteer manually draws/edits the target bounding box in each frame, and the expert inspects the results and adjusting them if necessary. Then, the annotation results are reviewed by the validation team, which are composed of several (typically three) experts. If an annotation result is not unanimously agreed by the members of validation team, it will be send back to the labeling team to revise.

To improve the annotation quality as much as possible, our team checks the annotation results very carefully and revises them frequently. Around 40% of the initial annotations fail in the first round of validation. Any many frames are revised more than three times. Some challenging examples of frames that are initially labeled incorrectly or inaccurately are given in Fig. 3. With all these efforts, we finally reach a benchmark with high-quality dense annotation, with some examples shown in Fig. 2.

![Figure 3. Examples of fine-tuning initial annotations. Best viewed in color.](image)

3.4. Attributes

To enable further performance analysis of trackers, we label each sequence with 14 attributes, including illumination variation (IV), full occlusion (FOC), partial occlusion (POC), deformation (DEF), motion blur (MB), fast motion (FM), scale variation (SV), camera motion (CM), rotation (ROT), background clutter (BC), low resolution (LR), viewpoint change (VC), out-of-view (OV) and aspect ration change (ARC). The definition of each attribute is shown in Tab. 2, and Fig. 4 (a) demonstrates the distribution of videos in each attribute.

From Fig. 4 (a), we observe that the most common challenge factors in LaSOT are scale changes (SV and ARC), occlusion (POC and FOC), deformation (DEF) and rotation (ROT), which are well-known challenges for tracking in real-world applications. Besides, Fig. 4 (b) demonstrates the distribution of attributes of LaSOT compared to OTB-2015 [52] and TC-128 [34] on overlapping attributes. From the figure we observe that more than 1,300 videos in LaSOT are involved with scale variations. Compared with OTB-2015 and TC-128 with less than 70 videos with scale changes, LaSOT is more challenging for scale changes. In addition, on the out-of-view attribute, LaSOT comprises 477 sequences, much larger than existing benchmarks.

3.5. Evaluation Protocols

Though there is no restriction to use LaSOT, we suggest two evaluation protocols for evaluating tracking algorithms, and conduct evaluations accordingly.

**Protocol I.** In protocol I, we use all 1,400 sequences to evaluate tracking performance. Researchers are allowed to employ any sequences except for those in LaSOT to develop tracking algorithms. Protocol I aims to provide large-scale evaluation of trackers.

**Protocol II.** In protocol II, we split LaSOT into training and testing subsets. According to the 80/20 principle (i.e., the Pareto principle), we select 16 out of 20 videos in each category for training, and the rest is for testing\(^1\). In specific, the training subset contains 1,120 videos with 2.83M frames, and the testing subset consists of 280 sequences with 69K frames.

\(^1\)Due to limited space, the details of training/testing split are illustrated in the supplementary material.
Table 2. Descriptions of 14 different attributes in LaSOT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Abrupt motion of the camera</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Viewpoint affects target appearance significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROT</td>
<td>The target rotates in the image</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>The ratio of bounding box is outside the rage [0.5, 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>The target is deformable during tracking</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>The background has the similar appearance as the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>The target is fully occluded in the sequence</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>The target region is blurred due to target or camera motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>The illumination in the target region changes</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>The ration of bounding box aspect ratio is outside the rage [0.5, 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>The target completely leaves the video frame</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>The target box is smaller than 1000 pixels in at least one frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>The target is partially occluded in the sequence</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>The motion of the target is larger than the size of its bounding box</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 4. Distribution of sequences in each attribute on LaSOT and comparison with other dense benchmarks. Best viewed in color.

frames. The evaluation of trackers is performed on the testing subset. Protocol II aims to provide a large set of videos for training and assessing trackers in the mean time.

4. Evaluation

4.1. Evaluation Metric

Following popular protocols (e.g. OTB-2015 [52]), we perform an One-Pass Evaluation (OPE) and measure the precision, normalized precision and success of different tracking algorithms under two protocols. The precision is computed by comparing the distance between the tracking result and the groundtruth bounding box in pixels. Different tracking algorithms are ranked with this metric on a threshold (e.g., 20 pixels). Since the precision metric is sensitive to target size and image resolution, we adopt the strategy as in [40] to normalize the precision. With the normalized precision metric, we rank tracking algorithms using the Area Under the Curve (AUC) between 0 to 0.5. Please refer to [40] for more about the normalized precision metric. The success is calculated as the Intersection over Union (IoU) between the tracking result and the groundtruth bounding box. The tracking algorithms are ranked using the AUC between 0 to 1.

4.2. Evaluated Trackers

We evaluate 35 algorithms on LaSOT to provide extensive baselines, comprising deep trackers (e.g., MDNet [41], TRACA [5], CFNet [49], SiamFC [4], StructSiam [58], DSIam [16], SINT [48] and VITAL [47]), correlation filter trackers with hand-crafted features (e.g., ECO_HC [7], DSST [8], CN [11], CSK [19], KCF [20], fDSST [9],
Figure 5. Evaluation results of trackers on LaSOT under protocol I using precision, normalized precision and success. Best viewed in color.

Figure 6. Performances of trackers over 14 challenges on LaSOT under protocol I using success. Best viewed in color and zoomed-in.
SAMF [32], SCT4 [6], STC [56] and Staple [3]) or deep features (e.g., HCFT [36] and ECO [7]) and regularization techniques (e.g., BACF [15], SRDCF [10], CSRDCF [35], Staple CA [39] and STRCF [28]), ensemble trackers (e.g., PTA V [13], LCT [37], MEEM [55] and TLD [23]), sparse schemes and search strategies in a chronological order. Tab. 3 summarizes these trackers with their representation.

4.3. Evaluation Results with Protocol I

Overall performance. Protocol I aims at providing large-scale evaluations of 35 trackers on all 1,400 videos in LaSOT. Each tracker is used as is for evaluation, without any modification. We report the evaluation results in OPE using precision, normalized precision and success, as shown in Fig. 5. MDNet achieves the best precision score of 0.374 and success score of 0.413, and VITAL obtains the best normalized precision score of 0.486. Both MDNet and VITAL are trained in an online fashion, resulting in expensive computation and slow running speeds. SiamFC tracker, which learns off-line a matching function from a large set of videos using deep network, achieves competitive results with 0.341 precision score, 0.449 normalized precision score and 0.358 success score, respectively. Without time-consuming online model adaption, SiamFC runs efficiently in real-time. Motivated by SiamFC, other Siamese trackers including StructSiam, DSiam show good performance as well. The best correlation filter tracker is ECO with 0.298 precision score, 0.358 normalized precision score and 0.34 success score.

Compared to the typical tracking performances on existing dense benchmarks (e.g., OTB-2015 [52]), the performances on LaSOT are severely degraded because of a large mount of non-rigid target objects and challenging factors involved in LaSOT. An interesting observation from Fig. 5 is that all the top seven trackers leverage deep feature, demonstrating its advantages in handling appearance changes.

Attribute-based performance. Fig. 6 shows the performances of trackers over 14 challenging attributes. Overall, the performances on attributes BC, POC, LR, ARC, FOC, FM, OV and MB are poorer than that on other six attributes. The sequences with fast motion and out-of-view are difficult since existing trackers usually perform localization from a small local region. The challenges full or partial occlusion, motion blur, aspect ration change and low resolution heavily change target appearance, leading to less effective representation. The videos with background clutter are prone to cause drift.

4.4. Evaluation Results with Protocol II

Under protocol II, we split LaSOT into training and testing sets. Researchers are allowed to leverage the sequences in training set to develop their trackers and assess their performances on testing set. In order to provide baselines and comparisons on the testing set, we evaluate the 35 tracking algorithms. Each tracker is used as is for evaluation without any modification or re-training. The evaluation results are shown in Fig. 7 using precision, normalized precision and success. We observe consistent results as in protocol I. MDNet and VITAL show top performances with precision scores of 0.373 and 0.36, normalized precision scores of 0.46 and 0.453 and success scores of 0.397 and 0.39. Next, SiamFC achieves the third-ranked performance with a 0.339 precision score, a 0.42 normalized precision score and a 0.336 success score, respectively. Despite a slightly slower performance than MDNet and VITAL, SiamFC runs due to limited space, please refer to supplementary material for detailed attribute-based evaluations of precision and normalized precision.
much faster and achieves real-time running speed, showing good balance between accuracy and efficiency. Likewise other Siamese trackers such as StructSiam and DSiam show competitive performances. For attribute-based evaluation of trackers on LaSOT testing set, we refer the readers to supplementary material because of limited space.

In addition to evaluating each tracking algorithm as it is, we conduct experiments by re-training two representative deep trackers, MDNet [41] and SiamFC [4], on the training set of LaSOT and assessing them. The evaluation results show similar performances for these trackers as without re-training. A potential reason is that our re-training may not follow the same configurations used by the original authors. Besides, since LaSOT are in general more challenging than previous datasets (e.g., all sequences are long-term), dedicated configuration may be needed for training these trackers. We leave this part as a future work since it is beyond the scope of this benchmark.

5. Conclusion

In this paper we present LaSOT with high-quality dense bounding box annotations for visual object tracking. To the best of our knowledge, LaSOT is the largest tracking benchmark with high quality annotations to date. By releasing LaSOT, we expect to provide the tracking community a dedicated platform for training deep trackers and assessing long-term tracking performance. Besides, LaSOT provides lingual annotations for each sequence, aiming to encourage the exploration on integrating visual and lingual features for robust tracking. By releasing LaSOT, we hope to narrow the gap between the increasing number of deep trackers and the lack of large dedicated datasets for training, and meanwhile provide more veritable evaluations for different trackers in the wild. Extensive evaluations on LaSOT under two protocols imply a large room to improvement for visual tracking.
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### Table 4. Details of 70 object categories in LaSOT and comparison with existing dense benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>class # entries</td>
<td>class # entries</td>
<td>class # entries</td>
<td>class # entries</td>
<td>class # entries</td>
<td>class # entries</td>
<td>class # entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person 193</td>
<td>person 36</td>
<td>person 45</td>
<td>person 48</td>
<td>person 19</td>
<td>ball 21</td>
<td>airplane 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head 60</td>
<td>head 26</td>
<td>head 16</td>
<td>car 30</td>
<td>head 5</td>
<td>person 20</td>
<td>baskertball 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car 31</td>
<td>car 12</td>
<td>sphere 8</td>
<td>drone 10</td>
<td>fish 4</td>
<td>animal 10</td>
<td>bear 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airplane 20</td>
<td>toy 8</td>
<td>2D print 5</td>
<td>wakeboard 10</td>
<td>motorcycle 4</td>
<td>vehicle 9</td>
<td>bicycle 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat 20</td>
<td>2D print 4</td>
<td>bicycle 5</td>
<td>boat 9</td>
<td>car 3</td>
<td>shuffleboard 8</td>
<td>bird 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helicopter 20</td>
<td>cuboid 3</td>
<td>car 5</td>
<td>building 5</td>
<td>drone 3</td>
<td>face 6</td>
<td>boat 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorcycle 20</td>
<td>bird 2</td>
<td>ball 4</td>
<td>truck 5</td>
<td>ant 2</td>
<td>cup 4</td>
<td>book 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drone 1</td>
<td>motorcycle 1</td>
<td>toy 4</td>
<td>bicycle 3</td>
<td>ball 2</td>
<td>dollar 4</td>
<td>bottle 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>deer 1</td>
<td>hand 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>toy 2</td>
<td>airboard 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>bottle 1</td>
<td>kite 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>bag 1</td>
<td>fish 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>panda 1</td>
<td>logo 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>book 1</td>
<td>motorcycle 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>can 1</td>
<td>boat 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>butterfly 1</td>
<td>drone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>dog 1</td>
<td>cup 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cable 1</td>
<td>bicycle 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>transformer 1</td>
<td>fish 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>crab 1</td>
<td>bird 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>bicycle 1</td>
<td>guitar 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cat 1</td>
<td>bag 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>bird 2</td>
<td>flamingo 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cup 1</td>
<td>yoyo 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>microphone 2</td>
<td>frisbee 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>torso 2</td>
<td>glove 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>motorcycle 2</td>
<td>hand 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>airplane 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>board 1</td>
<td>leaf 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>bottle 1</td>
<td>rabbit 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>can 1</td>
<td>sheep 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>deer 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>ring 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>torus 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Details of 70 Object Categories in LaSOT and Comparison with Existing Dense Benchmark

LaSOT consists of 70 object categories with each containing 20 videos, as shown in Tab. 4. Most of 70 classes are chosen from the 1,000 classes in ImageNet [12], with a few exceptions such as drone and gametarget, which are carefully selected by the experts for tracking. The selection of each category must be agreed upon by all the experts to ensure its usability for visual tracking. In addition, we also compare the object categories of different dense benchmarks. As shown in Tab. 4, the number of object categories in LaSOT is two times more than that of existing benchmarks (e.g., TC-128 [34] with 27 classes). Moreover, LaSOT eliminates the category bias of dataset for tracking while others do not.

2. Training/Testing Split in Protocol II

In protocol II, we split LaSOT into training and testing sets. The training set contains of 1,120 videos (i.e., 16 sequences for each category) with 2.83M frames in total. The rest 280 videos (i.e., 4 sequences for each category) with 69K frames are used for testing.

Table 5. Comparison between training and testing sets of LaSOT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Min frames</th>
<th>Mean frames</th>
<th>Median frames</th>
<th>Max frames</th>
<th>Total frames</th>
<th>Total duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LaSOT</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>11,397</td>
<td>283M</td>
<td>26.2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSOT</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>9,999</td>
<td>69K</td>
<td>6.3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSOT</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>11,397</td>
<td>3.52M</td>
<td>32.5 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Comparison of sequence distribution in each attribute between training and testing sets. Best viewed in color.

Tab. 5 reports the detailed comparison between the training and the testing sets of LaSOT. We observer that the min frames, mean frames, median frames and max frames are similar between these two subsets. In addition, as shown in Fig. 8, we can see that the ratios of sequences in all 14 attributes are similar. Both Tab. 5 and Fig. 8 evidence the consistency of our training/testing split.
3. Detailed Attribute-based Performance under Protocol I

Fig. 9 shows the performance of trackers on each attribute using precision under protocol I.
Fig. 10 shows the performance of trackers on each attribute using normalized precision under protocol I.

Figure 10. Performance of trackers on each attribute using precision under protocol I. Best viewed in color.
4. Detailed Attribute-based Performance under Protocol II

Fig. 11 shows the performance of trackers on each attribute using precision under protocol II.

Figure 11. Performance of trackers on each attribute using precision under protocol II. Best viewed in color.
Fig. 12 shows the performance of trackers on each attribute using normalized precision under protocol II.

Figure 12. Performance of trackers on each attribute using precision under protocol II. Best viewed in color.
Fig. 13 shows the performance of trackers on each attribute using success under protocol II.

Figure 13. Performance of trackers on each attribute using success under protocol II. Best viewed in color.