

Beyond Greedy Search: Tracking by Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning-based Beam Search

Xiao Wang, Zhe Chen, *Member, IEEE*, Jin Tang, Bin Luo, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Dacheng Tao, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Existing trackers usually select a location or proposal with the maximum score as tracking result for each frame. However, such greedy search scheme maybe not the optimal choice, especially when encountering challenging tracking scenarios like heavy occlusions and fast motion. Since the accumulated errors would make response scores not reliable anymore. In this paper, we propose a novel multi-agent reinforcement learning based beam search strategy (termed BeamTracking) to address this issue. Specifically, we formulate the tracking as a sample selection problem fulfilled by multiple parallel decision-making processes, each of which aims at picking out one sample as their tracking result in each frame. We take the target feature, proposal feature, and its response score as state, and also consider actions predicted by nearby agent, to train multi-agents to select their actions. When all the frames are processed, we select the trajectory with the maximum accumulated score as the tracking result. Extensive experiments on seven popular tracking benchmark datasets validated the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

Index Terms—Visual Tracking, Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning, Beam Search, Local and Global Search, Greedy Search

I. INTRODUCTION

THE goal of visual tracking is to search for target object in subsequent frames according to its initial state in the first frame. With great progress achieved in recent years, tracking techniques are widely used in many applications, such as video surveillance, robots and autopilot. Nevertheless, due to various challenging factors, such as heavy occlusion and fast motion, the performance of existing trackers in a complex environment is still far from satisfactory.

Existing trackers generally adopt either online or offline learning schemes to conduct tracking [1]–[6]. Online learning trackers update their appearance models on-the-fly, while offline learning trackers use the appearance models pre-trained on other datasets. However, according to our observation, both of existing online learning and offline learning trackers apply a greedy search strategy to perform tracking, that is, only the result with the highest confidence score predicted by the tracker at each frame will be considered as the final tracking result. Although this greedy search strategy can achieve good performance on simple videos, existing methods can be still very vulnerable to challenging factors like occlusions and motion blurs. For example, to update tracking models, online

learning trackers can only use the sample initialized in the first frame and noisy results obtained during tracking, making them difficult to identify and correct unreliable target appearances learned from inaccurate results. For the offline trained trackers, their parameters are fixed and thus can not depict the variations of the target object comprehensively. Therefore, existing methods that force the tracker to locate the target and learn the target appearance only based on the maximum response scores can be still prone to drifting. This inspired us to think *do we have to make the tracker predict the only one location for each frame in such a greedy manner?*

Recently, image captioning [7], [8], which takes an image as input and outputs a sentence to describe the contents of a given image, draws increasing attention among researchers. The relating algorithms mainly maintain multiple candidate words and utilize the beam search algorithm to select the best sentence. This motivates us to design a novel search strategy for visual tracking to handle various issues caused by regular greedy search as mentioned above. Although directly introducing the beam search into visual tracking is an intuitive approach, the vanilla beam search algorithm which selects the top- k candidates could still deliver similar effects with greedy algorithms. The top- k candidate samples in practical tracking can be very similar to each other. Therefore, the original beam search mechanism would not be superior on tracking comparing with the regular greedy search algorithms. As a result, how to design a more suitable beam search algorithm for visual tracking remains an open question.

In this paper, we introduce a novel multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) based beam search policy to magnify the benefits of beam search for tracking and alternate the commonly used greedy search-based strategy. The comparison between greedy search and the proposed MARL-based beam search is illustrated in Fig. 1. Specifically, we formulate the visual tracking as a sample selection problem. Different from the trackers [9]–[13] that also perform tracking based on sample selection, we introduce a multi-agent reinforcement learning framework for tracking the target. In the proposed framework, we employ different agents and apply a multi-agent decision making process to estimate the state of the target object based on candidate states in each frame. We define each candidate state according to a proposal (a bounding box area that potentially contains the target) and extracts its state representation based on the confidence score of the proposal, the CNN features within the proposal, and the CNN features of the target. Proposals and their confidences are obtained from a joint local and global search architecture according to previous tracking locations and target-aware attention regions [14]. A

Xiao Wang, Jin Tang and Bin Luo are with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Anhui University, Hefei 230601, China. Xiao Wang is also with Peng Cheng Laboratory, Shenzhen, China. Zhe Chen and Dacheng Tao are with The University of Sydney, Australia. Corresponding Author: Jin Tang and Zhe Chen. Email: wangxiaocvpr@foxmail.com, {tangjin, lubin}@ahu.edu.cn, {zhe.chen1, dacheng.tao}@sydney.edu.au.




Fig. 1. Comparison between greedy search and our proposed MARL based beam search for visual tracking.

recurrent neural network (bi-directional GRU [15]) is further utilized to comprehensively encode candidate states into a unified state feature. Then, we introduce parallel decision making processes which assign different policy networks for various agents. A policy network takes the unified state feature as input and selects the best candidate state as the tracking result for the agent in current frame. To boost the communication between nearby agents, we also feed the actions chosen by the previous agent into the subsequent one. After selecting different target states with different agents, we can then apply the beam search to update the maintained multiple tracking trajectories until current frame. These operations are executed until the end of video sequence. Lastly, the best-scored trajectory will be chosen as the tracking result of current video. Following reinforcement learning paradigm, we optimize the proposed multi-agent beam search network with the policy gradient method (Proximal Policy Optimization algorithm, PPO [16]). The overall pipeline of our tracker can be found in Fig. 2.

Comparing with existing visual trackers, the features and differences of this work can be concluded as follows: (1). **Frame-level vs Trajectory-level decision:** Different from previous algorithms which employ frame-level decision strategy for visual tracking, we adopt the MARL based beam search to exploit the trajectory-level decision. In practice, our tracker can realize a powerful reasoning procedure in a global view for some challenging frames. (2). **Ensemble of multi-trackers vs Beam search-based single tracker:** Traditional ensemble learning-based trackers usually adopt multiple trackers which may bring extremely high time and space complexity. In contrast, our proposed beam search can be integrated with only one tracker, but also achieves high-performance tracking. (3). **Single-agent vs Multi-agent RL:** Previous RL based tracking algorithms all follow a single-agent setting, while our tracker is developed based on a multi-agent RL paradigm. By cooperating multiple agents in our method, the tracking performance can be further improved.

To sum up, the contributions of this paper can be summarized in the following three aspects:

- We analyze the limitations of greedy search used in regular visual tracking framework and propose to conduct tracking with multi-agent reinforcement learning based beam search

strategy, termed BeamTracking. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to perform beam search based single object tracking task under a multi-agent reinforcement learning framework.

- We formulate the visual tracking task as a sample selection problem that can be tackled with multiple parallel Markov decision making processes. We propose a multi-agent reinforcement learning framework to fulfill the sequential decision-making problem.

- We integrate the MARL beam search strategy into multiple trackers and conduct experiments on multiple popular tracking benchmark datasets. These results fully validated the effectiveness and generalization of our proposed approach.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we will give a review on greedy search based, reinforcement learning based, and ensemble learning based trackers. Due to the limited space in this paper, the following survey papers [1]–[3], [17], [18] and paper list ¹ are recommended to find more related trackers.

Greedy Search based Tracking. The classification based trackers take the visual tracking as a binary classification problem, and they learn a classifier online and discriminate the given proposal is a target object or background. Some successfully trackers like traditional trackers Struck [9], SOWP [19] and deep learning trackers MDNet [10] are very popular in the tracking community. Pu et al. [20] propose a recurrent memory activation network (RMAN) to exploit the untapped temporal coherence of the target appearance for visual tracking. There are also some works that attempt to improve the overall performance from different perspectives, such as ensemble learning [21], improve tracking efficiency [11], meta-learning [22] and joint local and global search [14].

Benefiting from the offline training with large-scale datasets, the Siamese network based trackers achieve good performance on recent tracking benchmarks. SiamFC [23] and SINT [24] are early works to introduce the Siamese network by designing fully convolutional architecture and instance matching for tracking, respectively. Later, the modules proposed in object

¹https://github.com/wangxiao5791509/Single_Object_Tracking_Paper_List

detection community are modified for tracking task like RPN module [25], [26], re-detection module [27]–[30], anchor-free module [31], [32], adversarial training [33], [34], etc. Besides, there are also many works introduce new learning schemes, for example, meta-learning [22], [35], reinforcement learning [36]–[38], unsupervised learning [39]. Recent works demonstrate that the new architectures like Transformers [40] are also improve the Siamese tracker significantly [41], [42]. Although these trackers achieve good performance on some benchmarks, however, nearly all of these trackers adopt a greedy search strategy for final tracking (including the Correlation Filter based trackers [43]–[45]), which will make it difficult for the tracker to revise its past predictions based on future observations. In this paper, we propose a novel MARL-based beam search algorithm to achieve multiple-trajectory tracking, which demonstrates significant improvement compared with regular greedy search.

Reinforcement Learning based Tracking. Deep reinforcement learning (DRL) drawing more and more attention to computer vision researchers. There are already some works propose to introduce the DRL into the visual tracking community [33], [36], [38], [38], [46]–[51]. Specifically, Yun et al. [36] propose a tracker that is controlled by sequentially pursuing actions learned by deep reinforcement learning. The use of reinforcement learning enables even partially labeled data to be successfully utilized for semi-supervised learning. Chen et al. [51] take tracking as a continuous reinforcement learning problem and train an actor-critic network to move the bounding box directly to locate the target object. Zhang et al. [46] also treat the tracking problem as a sequential decision-making process and historical semantics encode highly relevant information for future decisions. They formulate their model as a recurrent convolutional neural network agent that interacts with video overtime and achieve good performance on tracking benchmark. James et al. [47] propose to learn an optimal decision-making policy by formulating tracking as a partially observable decision-making process. Hence, their agent can adaptively decide where to look, when to reinitialize, and when to update its appearance model for the tracked object. Wang et al. [33] utilize RL to learn to generate hard instance samples and integrate with Siamese tracker for robust tracking. Different from these trackers which utilize single agent to optimize their target and adopt greedy search for visual tracking, in this work, we formulate the visual tracking as multi-agent decision-making process and propose a novel beam search strategy to handle the issues caused by greedy search.

In contrast, multi-agent reinforcement learning attempts to achieve maximum reward through the communication of multiple agents. More interestingly, these agents may have different outcomes depending on what the other agents are doing [52]. MARL have been widely used in many computer vision tasks, such as multi-object tracking [48], [53], [54], action recognition [55] and traffic light control [56], [57]. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first work to introduce the idea of multi-agent reinforcement learning for visual tracking.

Ensemble Learning based Tracking. Seldom of ex-

isting trackers model visual tracking from the view of multi-trajectory analysis [58] [59]. Specifically, MTA is proposed in [58] to conduct tracking by trajectory selection in tracking procedure based on STRUCK [60]. Their tracking performance is limited by manual designed features and untrainable multi-trajectory analysis. Wang et al. proposed the DeepMTA [61] by introducing multi-trajectory analysis based on dynamic target-aware attention and trajectory evaluation networks. MHT [59] is developed based on empirically defined track tree construction and updating scheme. It also relies on hand-crafted features and detection results to solve multi-object tracking problems.

Some researchers resort to the ensemble learning for high-performance tracking by fusing multiple experts. Specifically, the MEEM [62] is developed to address the model drift issue with a multi-expert restoration scheme. CF2 [63] adaptively learn correlation filters on each convolutional layer to encode the target appearance and hierarchically infer the maximum response of each layer to locate targets. HDT [64] use different CNN features and hedge several CNN trackers into a stronger one with an adaptive Hedge method. Besides, the AdaBoost is used for tracking with ensemble learning, such as [65]–[67]. MCCT [68] is proposed by Wang et al. for accurate object tracking, called the Multi-Cue Correlation filter based Tracker. [69] fuses multiple trackers based on appropriately mixing the prior state of the trackers. It also updates the target appearance model according to the track-quality level. [70] first group trackers into clusters based on the spatio-temporal pair-wise correlation, then the reverse-time analysis is employed to select the high-quality clutters for late fusion. [71] presents a generic framework for combining or selecting online the different components of the processing chain of a set of trackers. HMMTxD is proposed in [72] which fuses observations from complementary out-of-the box trackers and a detector with a hidden Markov model. Wang et al. [73] jointly learn the unknown trajectory of the target and the reliability of each tracker for ensemble-based tracking, termed FHMM. Xie et al. [74] achieve multi-tracker fusion by removing the bad trajectories based on the pair-wise correlation, which can be obtained between different tracker pairs. Different from these works, we propose a novel multi-agent reinforcement learning based beam search strategy for visual tracking, which can maintain multiple tracking results for each frame. Our tracker can realize video-level decision which will be more beneficial for tracking.

III. TRACKING BY MARL BASED BEAM SEARCH

In this section, we first give an overview of our proposed visual tracking system. Then, we dive into the details of how we implement MARL based beam search for tracking. After that, we talk about the objective functions used in our tracking framework. Finally, we introduce the details in the tracking phase.

A. Overview

As shown in Fig. 2, we first collect candidate states of the target object for each frame based on binary classification




Fig. 2. Pipeline of the proposed MARL based beam search for visual tracking. The RT-MDNet [11] is adopted as an example.

based tracking framework. Specifically, the local and global proposals are extracted around previous tracking results and attention regions. The response scores of these proposals can be attained with an online learned classifier. Then, we concatenate the target object features, the features within proposals, and the response scores of proposals to form candidate states. Subsequently, a bi-directional GRU network is utilized to encode the states into one feature representation. Note that the historical candidate proposals are memorized to facilitate current prediction. For each frame, we employ policy networks, i.e., multiple agents, to output diverse actions for beam search-based tracking. The selections of different agents are enhanced by the communications between nearby agents. That is, we input the action chosen by the previous agent into the subsequent one. As a result, this multi-agent system generates multi-trajectory tracking results. After spanning the entire video sequence, the response score of an obtained trajectory can be computed by simply summarizing the scores of proposals that belong to the corresponding trajectory. We select the trajectory with the maximum accumulated response score as the final tracking result of testing video sequence.

B. Candidate States Generation via Local-Global-Search

To effectively apply beam search for tracking, we need multiple reliable but diverse tracking results. We achieve this goal by employing multiple agents and let each agent find the best state of the target from multiple candidate states. We generate candidate states based on joint local and global search results. The local search provides accurate tracking results for simple videos but can be extremely vulnerable to challenging factors, such as fast motion, heavy occlusion, and out-of-view, which are frequently occurred in a practical tracking environment. The global search then complements the local search to improve the tracking robustness in these challenging scenarios.

For local search-based tracking, we generate candidate states based on the binary classification-based multi-domain convolutional neural network, i.e., MDNet [10] and RT-MDNet [11]. In these trackers, dozens of proposals are sampled around previous tracking results. Then, these trackers feed sampled proposals into a binary classifier to select the best-scored proposal as the result of the current frame. After tracking, they generate positive and negative training samples and train their network on-the-fly. Different from MDNet,

the RT-MDNet greatly improves the tracking efficiency by introducing a fast adaptive RoI-Align scheme for feature extraction of sampled proposals. In practice, by applying these trackers to perform local search for the target, we can obtain a rich collection of proposals and their confidence scores, thus forming multiple candidate states.

For global search-based tracking, we mainly follow [14] and adopt Target-aware Attention Network (termed TANet) to locate the target object from the global view in this paper. In particular, we adopt ResNet-18 [75], which is pre-trained on ImageNet [76], to extract features of initial target object and global video frame. The features maps of target object are then utilized as convolutional filter and implement convolutional operation on the feature maps of global video frame. The processed feature maps will be fed into a decoder network gradually by skip-connections. The decoder network will generate the corresponding attention map where the target object related regions will be highlighted. With the generated attention of target, we can sample global search-based proposals for the target. These proposals are also fed into the local search tracker to obtain confidence scores. This procedure is illustrated in Fig. 2.

As mentioned in previous sections, the commonly used greedy search strategy that selects the proposal with maximum response score as the result of the current frame can already work well on simple videos. However, this mechanism still suffers from drifting in challenging scenarios under the tracking-by-detection framework. To address this issue, we propose to perform beam search on multi-trajectory information for more robust tracking. The multi-trajectory is obtained with a multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) framework, which will be introduced in the following sections.

C. Preliminaries of Reinforcement Learning

To achieve beam search-based tracking, we formulate visual tracking as a sample selection problem that can be tackled with Markov decision process (MDP). To describe a MDP, we introduce its basic elements: (S, A, T, R, γ) , where S is a set of states s_t , t is used to denote time step, A is a set of actions a_t , T is the transition probability of the next state given current state and action², R is the reward function

²In our case, given the current state and action, the transition probability is determined.

$r(s_t, a_t)$ for each intermediate time step t , and γ is the discount factor which usually set as 0.9. The actions are taken from a probability distribution called policy π given current state ($a_t \sim \pi(s_t)$). Under MDP, it is straight-forward to apply the reinforcement learning technique to learn the policy π or the tracking model. By maximizing the rewards, reinforcement learning can achieve better tracking performance. Many visual trackers are developed based on this idea [33], [36], [38], [38], [46]–[51]. Different from previous works, this paper develops a novel beam search-based policy with multi-agent reinforcement learning for visual tracking, which can track the target object by analyzing multiple tracking results.

D. MARL Framework

The introduction of MARL framework is to magnify the benefits of beam search for tracking. In general, the MARL employs different agents to perform tracking. Each agent follows a typical reinforcement learning framework. Therefore, we need to define the state representation, the action space, the decision making policy, and the reward function for training each agent. In this section, we will describe in details how we define these concepts to fulfill tracking.

1) **State Representation:** As described in the introduction, we obtain the state representation for each agent based on a collection of candidate state representations. Candidate state representations are generated according to proposals by the joint local and global search. Confidence scores and CNN features define candidate state representations.

Formally, we introduce the following symbols to help describe state representations. Given current frame from a video sequence, we first collect n proposals $\mathbf{P} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$. Each p_i is a 4-D vector describing the coordinates of the four corners of a bounding box area. For the collected proposals, we use the symbols $\mathbf{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ to represent corresponding confidence scores predicted by the local search tracker. Then, we denote $\mathbf{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n\}$ as the features extracted from CNN for all the collected proposals. Each F_i is originally a tensor with the size $C \times H \times W$, and we then reshape it into a 1-D vector. We also extract the visual feature (denoted as \hat{F}) of the target object initialized in the first frame. Many previous works have validated the importance of initial target object patch for practical tracking [14], [24], [25], [77]. Then, for the i -th proposal, we concatenate its confidence score s_i , the convolutional feature within its bounding box area F_i , and the initial target feature \hat{F} into a unified feature vector. We use $[\hat{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{S}]$ to represent the collection of this concatenation operation according to the collection of proposals \mathbf{P} .

After collecting the candidate state representations, we then extract a unified state representation for agents. In our MARL framework, each agent will learn a decision making policy to select a candidate state that best describes the target state in current frame. To learn a good decision making policy, it is important that each agent can observe more about the environment that surrounds the target. Rather than modeling the whole image that introduces excessive computational costs, we propose that the candidate representations already provides informative but diverse observation about the surrounding

environments, since proposals are generally close to the target. Accordingly, we apply a bi-directional GRU network on all the collected candidate representations to encode environments into an unified state representation:

$$h_t^+ = GRU([\hat{F}_0, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{S}]_t, h_{t-1}^+) \quad (1)$$

$$h_t^- = GRU([\hat{F}_0, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{S}]_t, h_{t+1}^-) \quad (2)$$

where h_t^+ and h_t^- denote the hidden state of the forward and backward GRUs at time t , respectively. The bi-directional states h_t^+ and h_t^- are concatenated together as the feature vector of unified state representation. We use $\mathbf{H} = [h_t^+, h_t^-]$ to represent this concatenation. In practice, the collected candidate state representations $[\hat{F}_0, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{S}]$, whose total feature dimension is 9218, are transformed into a 1-D feature vector with the dimension of 1024 using GRU.

2) **Action Selection:** By taking the unified state representation as input, we define that the action space of each agent is to predict the proposal index that indicates the proposal selected as the tracking result for current frame. We formulate this action space as a continuous action space and normalize the action values into $0 \sim 1$. Then, the true index of selected proposals can be obtained by multiplying the action value with the number of extracted proposals.

A decision making policy network is assigned to each agent to decide which action to take. The network directly predicts the action value. Besides, we also boost communication between decision making policy networks of different agents by devising a novel sequential action selection mechanism. More specifically, in addition to the unified state representation, we also input to each agent the action selected by the previous agent to encourage diversified proposals selection results. For the first agent, we input the action selected by the greedy search mechanism to start the action selection procedure, as shown in Fig. 2.

3) **Reward Function:** For the reward function, we take the IoU between selected proposals and ground truth bounding box as an evaluation metric to encourage the selected proposals to be as close to ground truth as possible. More specifically, if the agent selects the proposal whose IoU with the ground truth is larger than a pre-defined threshold value, then this agent is rewarded by +1; otherwise, it will be punished by -1. It is also worthy to note that all the agents share the same reward function. Following existing RL algorithms [78], [79], we also utilize accumulated discounted rewards, i.e., the rewards obtained in a more distant future contribute less to the current step. Therefore, the discounted return for each agent at time step t can be formulated as:

$$R_t = \sum_{k=0}^{T-t} \gamma^k r_{k+t}, \quad (3)$$

where γ is a discount factor and equal to 0.9 in all our experiments.

E. The Training

The objective of our proposed MARL framework is to maximize the expected reward. Although many reinforcement

learning algorithms can be adopted for this task, such as DQN [79] or REINFORCE [80], in this paper, we adopt the Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms (PPO) [16] to optimize the parameters of bi-directional GRU and policy network due to its stability and efficiency. Compared with regular policy gradient methods, PPO propose to force the ratio between the updated and previous policy to stay within an interval which can handle the issue of destructively large policy updates in the learning phase, as noted in [16]. Formally, given the action space, the objective of PPO can be expressed as:

$$J^{CLIP}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\min(\rho_t \hat{A}(s, a), \text{clip}(\rho_t, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}(s, a))] \quad (4)$$

where $\rho_t = \frac{\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a_t|s_t)}$ denote the ratio between two policies, π_θ is a stochastic policy and $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ is the policy before the update. The function $\text{clip}(\rho_t, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$ constrains the ratio within $[1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$ and ϵ is a hyper-parameter. $\hat{A}(s, a)$ is an estimator of the advantage function at time step t , which can be obtained by:

$$\hat{A}(s, a) = Q(s, a) - V(s); \quad (5)$$

where $V(s)$ is state-value functions which measures the expected return of states s ; $Q(s, a)$ is the action-value function similar to $V(s)$, but it is used to measure the expected return of a pair of state and action (s, a) .

In this paper, the PPO is implemented based on actor-critic architecture which contain two branches, i.e., the actor network (policy function) and critic network (value function). Following many works [55], [78], [79], [81] which utilize entropy regularization \mathcal{H} to prevent policies from becoming deterministic, we also adopt this technique to encourage *exploration* in the training phase. In other word, the agents are encouraged to select more diverse proposals with larger entropy. Therefore, the learning objective for actor network can be formulated as:

$$J^{actor}(\theta) = J^{CLIP}(\theta) + c_1 \mathcal{H}(s, \pi_\theta(.)) \quad (6)$$

where c_1 is a hyper-parameter. For the critic network, we compute the mean squared error between the discounted return R and estimated state-value $V(s)$ to update its parameters:

$$J^{critic}(\theta) = (R_t - V(s))^2 \quad (7)$$

The overall training process is summarized in **Algorithm 1**.

F. Beam Search-based Tracking

In our proposed beam search-based tracking strategy, multiple tracking results are selected in each frame and will be maintained until processing the whole video sequence. Different from vanilla beam search mechanism that selects results with top- k confidence scores, our strategy select results from the proposed MARL framework.

Before tracking the target in a test video, we first pre-train the local search tracker following the protocol of MDNet and RT-MDNet and pre-train the global search tracking following TANet. Note that we also follow MDNet and utilize the bounding box regression, short and long-term update strategy for more accurate tracking. When processing the test video,

Algorithm 1 Offline Training of the Beam Search Policy.

Input: Training videos C and its ground truth G

Output: Beam Search Policy

```

1: Initialize RT-MDNet with  $\theta^{RT}$ 
2: Initialize policy and value function parameters with  $\theta_0$  and  $\phi_0$ 
3: Initialize the replay buffer  $D$ , beam width  $B$ 
4: for episode = 1,  $M$  do
5:   # Training Sample Collection
6:   Randomly select a clip of frames  $\{X_k, X_{k+1}, \dots, X_{k+T}\}$ 
7:   Draw samples  $\{S_1^+, S_1^-\}$  to fine-tuning RT-MDNet
8:   for frame  $t = 2, T+1$  do
9:     Feed extracted proposals into RT-MDNet to get state
10:    Select  $B$  actions  $(a_t^1, a_t^2, \dots, a_t^B)$  according to current policy
    and exploration rate, recurrently
11:    Execute  $B$  actions, observe reward  $r_t$  and next states
12:    Store transitions in  $D$ 
13:  end for
14:  # Policy Optimization
15:  Sample mini-batch of  $N$  transitions  $D_k = \{\tau_i\}$  from  $D$ 
16:  Compute the Returns  $R_t$  and estimated advantage  $\hat{A}_t$  based on
    current value function  $V_{\phi_k}$ .
17:  Update policy by optimizing Eq. (6)
18:  Update value function by optimizing Eq. (7)
19: end for
```

in each coming frame, we conduct Gaussian sampling on both local and global search regions to obtain candidate state representations and the unified state representation. Then, we feed the state representation and other information as mentioned previously into different agents to select their own tracking results. After all the agents have selected their results, we maintain these results and conduct similar operations for subsequent frames until the end of testing video. Once all the video frames are processed, we can obtain multiple tracking trajectories. In this paper, we simply summarize all the scores of the corresponding trajectory and select the best scored one as the tracking result of the current video sequence.

It is worthy to note that it is not intuitive to apply aforementioned method for the Siamese network based trackers (DiMP [82] is tested in this work), due to the fact that these trackers directly predict a response map instead of proposals. Hence, we modify the output *action* of each agent as two values, i.e. the coordinates of selected location in current response map. We set the actions of previous agent and the response map as the *state* for the subsequent agent and the definition of *reward* remains the same.

IV. EXPERIMENT

A. Datasets and Evaluation Metric

We utilize **TLP** [83] and **DTB** [84] to train our multi-agent beam search network, which totally contain 120 video sequences. The following tracking datasets are used for inference and compare with other state-of-the-art trackers: **OTB2015** [85], **TC128** [86], **UAV123** [87], **LaSOT** [88], **GOT-10K** [89], **VOT2018-LT** [90], and **VOT2019-LT** [91].

PR (Precision Rate) and **SR** (Success Rate) are used for the evaluation which widely used in the tracking community. The first evaluation metric illustrates the percentage of frames where the center location error between the object location and ground truth is smaller than a pre-defined threshold (20 pixel

threshold are usually adopted). The second one demonstrates the percentage of frames the Intersection over Union (IoU) of the predicted and the ground truth bounding boxes is higher than a given ratio. In addition, the **AO** (Average Overlap) is also used for the evaluation of GOT-10K dataset which denotes the average of overlaps between all ground truth and estimated bounding boxes. As noted in [89], the AO is recently proved to be equivalent to the area under curve (AUC) metric employed in OTB-100 [85], and LaSOT [88]. For the VOT2018-LT and VOT2019-LT datasets, we adopt their default metrics as the evaluation criteria, i.e., **Precision**, **Recall**, and **F1-score**. Specifically, the definition of these metrics are:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad \text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{F1-score} = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (9)$$

where TP, FP and FN are used to denote the True Positive, False Positive and False Negative, respectively.

B. Implementation Details

For the training of TANet, the batch size is 20, initial learning rate is 0.0004, the maximum epoch is 15. The ground truth mask used for the training is obtained by filling the target and background regions with white and black pixels. For the beam search policy network, the learning rate for the actor network and critic network are 0.001 and 0.005, respectively, entropy weight c_1 is set as 0.005, γ is 0.9, τ is 0.8. The input dimension of bi-directional GRU is 9218 and the encoded hidden state is 1024. It is also worthy to note that the pre-trained RT-MDNet [11]³ is utilized in the training phase of our beam search policy network due to its high efficiency. But the learned beam search policy also works well when integrating with MDNet [10]⁴ according to our experimental results. To validate the generalization of our proposed beam search strategy, we also integrate it with strong tracker DiMP [82] to check the final results. The code will be released at <https://github.com/wangxiao5791509/BeamTracking>.

C. Comparison on Public Benchmarks

In this subsection, we report our tracking results and compare with other state-of-the-art trackers on seven popular tracking benchmark datasets.

Results on OTB-2015 [85]: OTB2015 is the first large-scale standard benchmarks for visual tracking proposed by Wu et al. It contains 100 video sequences which reflect 9 challenging attributes, such as *illumination variation*, *scale variation*, *occlusion*, *deformation*. We compare our tracker with PGNet [92], Ocean [31], PTAV [93], SiamRCNN [27], CREST [94], TANet [95], GCT [96], and MDNet [10] on this benchmark. From the Table I, we can find that the baseline method MDNet achieves 0.868|0.645 on the OTB-2015 tracking benchmark. Our approach can obtain 0.886|0.653 on this benchmark, which are significantly better than the baseline method and also other compared tracking algorithms,

such as PTAV, CREST, TANet, and GCT. The results on this benchmark dataset fully demonstrate the effectiveness and advantages of our tracker.

Results on TC128 [86]: TC128 is specifically designed for the evaluation of color related trackers which contains 129 testing video sequences. As shown in Table I, the baseline method MDNet achieves 0.797|0.569 on the PR/SR. In contrast, our proposed beam search policy achieves better results on this benchmark (0.806|0.583) than baseline method and other compared trackers, including GradNet [97], PTAV [93], ACT [51], MEEM [62], SINT [24], ADNet [36], and RT-MDNet [11]. These experimental results also demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed beam search strategy for visual tracking.

Results on UAV123 [87]: UAV123 is a dataset specifically designed for UAV tracking which contains 123 video sequences. From Table I, the MDNet achieves 0.747|0.528 on the PR/SR, while our tracker improve them to 0.773|0.668. Our tracker also outperform the DTNet [98], SiamRPN [25], and DaSiamRPN [99].

Results on GOT-10K [89]: GOT-10K is constructed based on the backbone of WordNet structure [100]. It populates the majority of over 560 classes of moving objects and 87 motion patterns. It contains 10,000 videos totally, with more than 1.5 million manually labeled bounding boxes. The authors select 280 videos as the test subset and the rest of videos are used for training. As we can see from Table I, our tracker achieves better results than the baseline method DiMP [82]. Specifically speaking, the DiMP achieves 0.673|0.785 on the $AO|SR_{0.50}$, respectively. When integrating the multi-agent beam search strategy, our tracker obtained 0.685|0.800 on the two metrics, respectively. Compared with other trackers including ATOM [101], GOTURN [102], SiamFC [23], SiamFC++ [32], Ocean [31], KYS [103], and D3S [104], our overall tracking performance are also better than theirs. This fully validated the effectiveness and advantages of our proposed multi-agent beam search policy for visual tracking.

Results on LaSOT [88]: LaSOT is the currently largest long-term tracking dataset which contains 1400 video sequences with more than 3.5M frames in total. The average video length is more than 2,500 frames and each video contains challenging factors deriving from the wild, e.g., out-of-view, scale variation. It provides both natural language and bounding box annotations which can be used for the explorations of integrating visual and natural language features for robust tracking. For the evaluation of LaSOT dataset, we test our tracker based on the *Protocol II* which contains 280 videos. As shown in Fig. 3, the baseline method MDNet achieves 0.351|0.381 on the PR and SR respectively on the LaSOT benchmark dataset. Our proposed tracker achieves better results than the baseline, i.e., 0.368|0.399 on the two evaluation metrics respectively. When integrated with strong trackers like DiMP, our proposed MARL based beam search strategy can also improve over this baseline. Specifically, the DiMP achieves 0.605|0.661|0.629 on Precision Plot, Normalized Precision Plot and Success Plot, while we attain 0.615|0.671|0.639 respectively. The experiments on this benchmark demonstrate the effectiveness and generalization

³<https://github.com/BossBobxuan/RT-MDNet>

⁴<https://github.com/HyeonseobNam/py-mdnet>

TABLE I
TRACKING RESULTS ON OTB-2015, TC-128, UAV123, GOT-10K, VOT2018-LT, AND VOT2019-LT DATASET.

Algorithm	PGNet	Ocean	PTAV	SiamRCNN	CREST	TANet	GCT	MDNet	Ours
OTB-2015	0.892 0.691	0.920 0.684	0.848 0.634	0.891 0.701	0.838 0.623	0.791 0.646	0.854 0.648	0.868 0.645	0.886 0.653
Algorithm	GradNet	PTAV	ACT	MEEM	SINT	ADNet	RT-MDNet	MDNet	Ours
TC-128	0.764 0.556	0.741 0.544	0.738 0.532	0.675 0.483	0.711 0.521	0.761 0.558	0.767 0.559	0.797 0.569	0.806 0.583
Algorithm	DTNet	SAMF	SRDCF	ECO	SiamRPN	DaSiamRPN	THOR	MDNet	Ours
UAV123	0.726 0.539	0.592 0.396	0.676 0.464	0.741 0.525	0.748 0.527	0.796 0.586	0.758 0.697	0.747 0.528	0.773 0.668
Algorithm	ATOM	GOTURN	SiamFC	SiamFC++	Ocean	KYS	D3S	DiMP	Ours
GOT-10K	0.556 0.634	0.347 0.375	0.348 0.353	0.595 0.695	0.611 0.721	0.636 0.751	0.597 0.676	0.673 0.785	0.685 0.800
Algorithm	PTAV+	SYT	SINT-LT	MMLT	DaSiam-LT	MBMD	SiamRPN++	DiMP	Ours
VOT2018-LT									
Precision	0.595	0.520	0.566	0.574	0.627	0.634	0.646	0.660	0.683
Recall	0.404	0.499	0.510	0.521	0.588	0.588	0.419	0.583	0.613
F1-score	0.481	0.509	0.536	0.546	0.607	0.610	0.508	0.619	0.646
Algorithm	ASINT	CooSiam	Siamfcos-LT	SiamRPNs-LT	mbdet	SiamDW-LT	SiamRPN++	DiMP	Ours
VOT2019-LT									
Precision	0.520	0.566	0.574	0.627	0.634	0.649	0.627	0.655	0.679
Recall	0.499	0.510	0.521	0.588	0.588	0.609	0.399	0.572	0.601
F1-score	0.509	0.536	0.546	0.607	0.610	0.629	0.488	0.611	0.638

of our proposed modules for tracking. Compared with other state-of-the-art trackers, such as SiamFC++ [32], LTMU [105], Ocean [31], and TANet [95], our results are also better than them. These results fully demonstrate the good performance of our tracker on the long-term dataset.

Results on VOT2018-LT [90]: VOT2018-LT is a long-term dataset which contains 35 videos with a total length of 146,817 frames. It is calculated that the target object will disappear for 12 times and each lasting on average 40 frames for each video. As shown in Table I, the baseline DiMP achieves 0.660, 0.583, 0.619 on the Precision, Recall and F1-score, while our method achieves 0.683, 0.613, 0.646, respectively. In addition, our tracker also outperforms other compared trackers by a large margin. This experiment validates that our MARL based beam search strategy are effective for visual tracking.

Results on VOT2019-LT [91]: VOT2019-LT totally contains 50 videos with 215,294 frames and each video contains on average 10 long-term target disappearances. Based on VOT2018-LT, this dataset introduces external 15 videos which are more challenging. We also evaluate our tracker on a more challenging VOT2019-LT dataset in Table I. The baseline tracker DiMP attains 0.655, 0.572, 0.611, while we achieve 0.679, 0.601, 0.638 on Precision, Recall and F1-score, respectively. Compared with other long-term trackers, our results are also better than them which demonstrate the advantages of our proposed MARL beam search strategy.

D. Ablation Study

1) *Component Analysis:* In this section, we conduct ablation studies on the GOT-10K and VOT-2016 dataset. The MDNet and RT-MDNet are adopted as the baseline tracker respectively. Various search strategies are discussed as described below:

- **Vanilla Greedy Search (VGS):** This inference approach is widely used in existing visual trackers. We take this search strategy as our baseline method.
- **Global Search (GS):** We take the global proposal into baseline tracker to achieve joint local and global search.
- **Single-Agent Greedy Search (SAGS):** Following greedy search used in popular tracking algorithms, we train a

greedy search policy with single agent based reinforcement learning. Then, we integrate it into the baseline tracker to discuss the difference between greedy select policy and our learning-based select policy.

- **Naive Beam Search (NBS):** We adopt beam search algorithm for tracking, which target at selecting and maintaining the top- k proposals for each video frame according to the classification score.
- **Multi-Agent Beam Search (MABS):** Following the idea of beam search algorithm, we utilize our multi-agent reinforcement learning based beam search policy for visual tracking.

TABLE II
COMPONENT ANALYSIS ON THE GOT-10K AND VOT-2016. AOISR AND AUC SCORE ARE REPORTED ON THE TWO DATASETS, RESPECTIVELY.

Index	VGS	GS	SAGS	NBS	MABS	GOT-10K	VOT-2016
①	✓					0.299 0.303	0.644
②	✓	✓				0.381 0.402	0.692
③		✓	✓			0.383 0.407	0.723
④		✓		✓		0.399 0.439	0.710
⑤		✓			✓	0.412 0.449	0.730

As shown in Table II, we can find that the baseline method which adopt Vanilla Greedy Search for visual tracking achieves 0.299|0.303 on AOISR, respectively. When combining the TANet model with baseline method for joint local and global search, the tracking performance can be significantly improved to 0.381|0.402. This experiment fully validated the effectiveness of our introduced TANet. When integrating with our single agent based search strategy, i.e., MDNet+GS+SAGS, we can further improve the result to 0.383|0.407. This result fully validated the effectiveness of our proposed non-greedy search algorithm (Comparing with regular classifier based trackers which always select the proposal with maximum score, our tracker select the proposal our agent recommended). On the basis of this implementation, we propose a novel beam search strategy for visual tracking based on MARL. As shown in Table II, we can find that our beam search achieves the best tracking performance on this benchmark compared with other search strategies, including




Fig. 3. Tracking results on LaSOT dataset. Best viewed by zooming in.

greedy search, single agent search. It is also worthy to note that our MARL based beam search (0.412|0.449) also achieves better results than naive beam search policy (0.399|0.439). It is because the naive beam search policy only select the top- k proposal for each frame, however, these proposals sometimes are nearly the same. Our beam search policy select the proposals recommended by various agents which will get rid of such *greedy* property, therefore, we can obtain better results.

In addition to aforementioned analysis, we also combine these search strategies with RT-MDNet and test them on the VOT-2016 dataset. Due to the fact that our proposed approach have multiple tracking results for each frame, therefore, the default evaluation metric of VOT-2016 is not suitable for the evaluation. In this experiment, we adopt the AUC score as the evaluation metric. From Table II, we can draw similar conclusions with the experimental results based on MDNet. Specifically, compared with naive beam search, our MARL based beam search scheme obtain +2% points improvement. These experimental results fully validate the effectiveness and advantages of our proposed MARL based beam search scheme for visual tracking task.

2) *Analysis on Number of Trajectories*: As shown in Fig. 4, it's easy to find that our model can obtain better results when increasing the beam width, i.e., the number of tracking trajectories. Specifically, we can obtain 0.383|0.407 on PRISR if the beam width is 1; when the beam width is increased to 2, 3, 5, we can attain 0.390|0.409, 0.412|0.449, 0.420|0.460, respectively.

3) *Attribute Analysis*: In this paper, we analyse the attribute results of our tracker based on LaSOT tracking benchmark. As shown in Fig. 5, it is intuitive to find that our tracker is robust to many challenging factors, such as *out-of-view*, *rotation*, *camera motion*, *low resolution* and *fast motion*, compared with other tracking algorithms. This experiment fully validated the effectiveness and robustness of our tracker when tracking in complex scenarios.

E. Efficiency Analysis

When integrating our proposed search scheme into MDNet and RT-MDNet, we can achieve 0.67 and 4.27 FPS, respectively. Although our tracker achieves lower running efficiency based on the two trackers, however, our tracker can improve




Fig. 4. Results with various number of trajectories on GOT-10k dataset.

corresponding tracking algorithms significantly on multiple benchmark dataset. When combining it with DiMP tracker [82], our tracker can run at 22.65 FPS, meanwhile, the overall results can also be improved.

F. Discussion

We compare our proposed algorithms with other state-of-the-art trackers on multiple benchmark datasets in previous sections. In this section, we focus on the comparison with RL based trackers and ensemble learning based trackers.

Compare with RL based trackers: In the experiments, we compare our tracker with other RL based tracking algorithm, including ADNet [36], ACT [51], DTNet [98]. Specifically, ADNet achieves 0.903|0.659, 0.880|0.646 on OTB-2013 and OTB-2015 dataset, respectively and our results are all better than theirs, i.e., 0.940|0.686, 0.886|0.653. On the TC128 dataset, we also outperform the ACT which is developed based on MDNet and RL (ACT: 0.738|0.532, Ours: 0.806|0.583). DTNet is developed by Song et al. for adaptive switch between detection and tracking based on hierarchical RL algorithm published in Neurips-2020. We also outperform this tracker (Integrated version: ACT+FCT+SiamFC) on UAV123 dataset, i.e., 0.773|0.668 vs 0.726|0.539, on PRISR respectively. From all the comparisons with RL trackers, we can find that our proposed MARL-based beam search strategy




Fig. 5. Attribute analysis of PR and SR on the LaSOT benchmark. Best viewed by zooming in.

indeed achieves better results and this fully demonstrate the leading performance in the family of single object tracking algorithms based on RL.

Compare with ensemble learning based trackers: The ensemble learning based trackers are also related with our proposed algorithms. The ensemble trackers reviewed in related work are used for the comparison, for example, MTA [58], DeepMTA [61], MEEM [62], CF2 [63], HDT [64], MCCT [68], Xie et al [74]. Specifically, the MTA achieves 0.838|0.595 on the OTB-2013 dataset, while we get 0.940|0.686 which are significantly better than theirs. Our results are also comparable with MCCT [68] (0.928|0.714) on this benchmark. The DeepMTA [61] further extend MTA with deep neural networks and achieve 0.799|0.650 on the OTB-2015 dataset, in contrast, we can attain 0.886|0.653 on this benchmark dataset. Our results are also better than CF2 [63] (0.837|0.562), HDT [64] (0.848|0.564). Xie et al. [74] (0.927|0.873) outperform ours on this benchmark, however, their tracker needs multiple trackers for final fusion which may needs more memory. In addition, their results on large-scale benchmarks are still unknown, in contrast, we can achieve good performance on both short and long-term tracking datasets. On the TC-128 dataset, the MEEM [62] achieve 0.675|0.483, while we can attain 0.806|0.583. Therefore, according to aforementioned analysis and com-

parison, we can find that our results are better than most of the ensemble trackers. These experimental results fully demonstrate the advantages over existing ensemble trackers.

G. Visualization

In this section, we demonstrate some illustrations of tracking results on the LaSOT benchmark dataset in Fig. 6. It is easy to find that our tracker can obtain better results in challenging environments than the compared method, including SiamRPN++ [26], SiamFC++ [32], TANet [95], DiMP [82] and Ocean [31]. It is also worthy to note that the TANet [95] also adopts local-global search scheme for tracking, however, it sometimes lose the target object. For example, the black rectangle (i.e., the TANet) fail to locate the *bike* in frame 395 (second row). It also predict the wrong scale of target object like the *car* in third row. These qualitative analysis fully demonstrate the good performance of our tracker which is developed based on MARL based beam search scheme. More tracking results can be found in our demo video on the project page.

H. Failed Cases

Although our tracker attains better results on many video sequences, however, it still suffers from the challenging factors, like *small object with dense distractors*, as shown in Fig.




Fig. 6. Visualization of tracking results of our and compared trackers. The corresponding demo videos can be found in our project page.




Fig. 7. Failed cases of our tracking algorithm in complex scenarios.

7. Due to the dense background objects, our tracker fail to locate the right object, for example, the *cow* and *coin* in the first and second row, respectively. In our future works, we will consider to adopt the graph matching algorithms to model the temporal relations of target object and background distractors between consecutive frames to help addressing this issue.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we propose a novel beam search policy for visual tracking based on multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. We attempt to select multiple candidate locations as tracking result of current frame instead of only one location predicted by greedy search. We formulate the multiple candidate locations selection as a multi-agent decision making problem and optimized with PPO algorithm. We also introduce the global search module TANet to handle the re-detection problem in long-term tracking task. Extensive experiments on multiple tracking benchmark datasets fully demonstrate the effectiveness and generalization of our beam search strategy for tracking. In our future works, we will consider to model

the relations between target object and the background objects to handle the issue of similar target objects for more accurate tracking.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Lu, P. Li, and D. Wang, "Visual object tracking: A survey," *Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 61–76, 2018.
- [2] P. Li, D. Wang, L. Wang, and H. Lu, "Deep visual tracking: Review and experimental comparison," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 76, pp. 323–338, 2018.
- [3] S. M. Marvasti-Zadeh, L. Cheng, H. Ghanei-Yakhdan, and S. Kasaei, "Deep learning for visual tracking: A comprehensive survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00535*, 2019.
- [4] Y. Zhang, H. Sheng, Y. Wu, S. Wang, W. Lyu, W. Ke, and Z. Xiong, "Long-term tracking with deep tracklet association," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 6694–6706, 2020.
- [5] Q. Guo, W. Feng, R. Gao, Y. Liu, and S. Wang, "Exploring the effects of blur and deblurring to visual object tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 1812–1824, 2021.
- [6] X. Wang, J. Li, L. Zhu, Z. Zhang, Z. Chen, X. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and F. Wu, "Visevent: Reliable object tracking via collaboration of frame and event flows," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.05015*, 2021.
- [7] J. Aneja, A. Deshpande, and A. G. Schwing, "Convolutional image captioning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 5561–5570.
- [8] M. Z. Hossain, F. Sohel, M. F. Shiratuddin, and H. Laga, "A comprehensive survey of deep learning for image captioning," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 1–36, 2019.
- [9] S. Hare, S. Golodetz, A. Saffari, V. Vineet, M.-M. Cheng, S. L. Hicks, and P. H. Torr, "Struck: Structured output tracking with kernels," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 2096–2109, 2015.
- [10] H. Nam and B. Han, "Learning multi-domain convolutional neural networks for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 4293–4302.
- [11] I. Jung, J. Son, M. Baek, and B. Han, "Real-time mdnet," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 83–98.
- [12] X. Wang, X. Shu, S. Zhang, B. Jiang, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and F. Wu, "Mfgnet: Dynamic modality-aware filter generation for rgb-t tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2022.

- [13] Z. Zhang, Y. Liu, X. Wang, B. Li, and W. Hu, "Learn to match: Automatic matching network design for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 13 339–13 348.
- [14] X. Wang, T. Sun, R. Yang, and B. Luo, "Learning target-aware attention for robust tracking with conditional adversarial network," in *30TH British Machine Vision Conference*, 2019.
- [15] J. Chung, C. Gulcehre, K. Cho, and Y. Bengio, "Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3555*, 2014.
- [16] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, "Proximal policy optimization algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [17] X. Li, W. Hu, C. Shen, Z. Zhang, A. Dick, and A. V. D. Hengel, "A survey of appearance models in visual object tracking," *ACM transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 58, 2013.
- [18] A. W. Smeulders, D. M. Chu, R. Cucchiara, S. Calderara, A. Dehghan, and M. Shah, "Visual tracking: An experimental survey," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis Machine Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 7, pp. 1442–68, 2014.
- [19] H. U. Kim, D. Y. Lee, J. Y. Sim, and C. S. Kim, "Sowp: Spatially ordered and weighted patch descriptor for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2016, pp. 3011–3019.
- [20] S. Pu, Y. Song, C. Ma, H. Zhang, and M.-H. Yang, "Learning recurrent memory activation networks for visual tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 725–738, 2020.
- [21] B. Han, J. Sim, and H. Adam, "Branchout: Regularization for online ensemble tracking with convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 2217–2224.
- [22] E. Park and A. C. Berg, "Meta-tracker: Fast and robust online adaptation for visual object trackers," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 569–585.
- [23] L. Bertinetto, J. Valmadre, J. F. Henriques, A. Vedaldi, and P. H. Torr, "Fully-convolutional siamese networks for object tracking," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 850–865.
- [24] R. Tao, E. Gavves, and A. W. Smeulders, "Siamese instance search for tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 1420–1429.
- [25] B. Li, J. Yan, W. Wu, Z. Zhu, and X. Hu, "High performance visual tracking with siamese region proposal network," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 8971–8980.
- [26] B. Li, W. Wu, Q. Wang, F. Zhang, J. Xing, and J. Yan, "Siamrpn++: Evolution of siamese visual tracking with very deep networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4282–4291.
- [27] P. Voigtlaender, J. Luiten, P. H. Torr, and B. Leibe, "Siam r-cnn: Visual tracking by re-detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 6578–6588.
- [28] B. Yan, H. Zhao, D. Wang, H. Lu, and X. Yang, "skimming-perusal/tracking: A framework for real-time and robust long-term tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 2385–2393.
- [29] Y. Qi, S. Zhang, F. Jiang, H. Zhou, D. Tao, and X. Li, "Siamese local and global networks for robust face tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 9152–9164, 2020.
- [30] X. Wang, X. Shu, Z. Zhang, B. Jiang, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and F. Wu, "Towards more flexible and accurate object tracking with natural language: Algorithms and benchmark," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2021, pp. 13 763–13 773.
- [31] Z. Zhang, H. Peng, J. F. B. Li, and W. Hu, "Ocean: Object-aware anchor-free tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020.
- [32] Y. Xu, Z. Wang, Z. Li, Y. Yuan, and G. Yu, "Siamfc++: Towards robust and accurate visual tracking with target estimation guidelines," in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 12 549–12 556.
- [33] X. Wang, C. Li, B. Luo, and J. Tang, "Sint++: Robust visual tracking via adversarial positive instance generation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 4864–4873.
- [34] Y. Song, C. Ma, X. Wu, L. Gong, L. Bao, W. Zuo, C. Shen, R. W. Lau, and M.-H. Yang, "Vital: Visual tracking via adversarial learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 8990–8999.
- [35] G. Wang, C. Luo, X. Sun, Z. Xiong, and W. Zeng, "Tracking by instance detection: A meta-learning approach," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 6288–6297.
- [36] S. Yun, J. Choi, Y. Yoo, K. Yun, and Y. C. Jin, "Action-decision networks for visual tracking with deep reinforcement learning," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 1349–1358.
- [37] L. Ren, X. Yuan, J. Lu, M. Yang, and J. Zhou, "Deep reinforcement learning with iterative shift for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 684–700.
- [38] W. Luo, P. Sun, F. Zhong, W. Liu, T. Zhang, and Y. Wang, "End-to-end active object tracking via reinforcement learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 3286–3295.
- [39] N. Wang, Y. Song, C. Ma, W. Zhou, W. Liu, and H. Li, "Unsupervised deep tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 1308–1317.
- [40] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 6000–6010.
- [41] X. Chen, B. Yan, J. Zhu, D. Wang, X. Yang, and H. Lu, "Transformer tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2021, pp. 8126–8135.
- [42] N. Wang, W. Zhou, J. Wang, and H. Li, "Transformer meets tracker: Exploiting temporal context for robust visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2021, pp. 1571–1580.
- [43] W. Zhang, L. Jiao, Y. Li, and J. Liu, "Sparse learning-based correlation filter for robust tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 878–891, 2020.
- [44] R. Han, W. Feng, and S. Wang, "Fast learning of spatially regularized and content aware correlation filter for visual tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 7128–7140, 2020.
- [45] Y. Zheng, X. Liu, X. Cheng, K. Zhang, Y. Wu, and S. Chen, "Multi-task deep dual correlation filters for visual tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 9614–9626, 2020.
- [46] D. Zhang, H. Maei, X. Wang, and Y.-F. Wang, "Deep reinforcement learning for visual object tracking in videos," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08936*, 2017.
- [47] J. Supancic III and D. Ramanan, "Tracking as online decision-making: Learning a policy from streaming videos with reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 322–331.
- [48] L. Ren, J. Lu, Z. Wang, Q. Tian, and J. Zhou, "Collaborative deep reinforcement learning for multi-object tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 586–602.
- [49] X. Dong, J. Shen, W. Wang, Y. Liu, L. Shao, and F. Porikli, "Hyperparameter optimization for tracking with continuous deep q-learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 518–527.
- [50] B. Luo, D. Liu, T. Huang, and D. Wang, "Model-free optimal tracking control via critic-only q-learning," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 27, no. 10, pp. 2134–2144, 2016.
- [51] B. Chen, D. Wang, P. Li, S. Wang, and H. Lu, "Real-time actor-critic tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 318–334.
- [52] G. Neto, "From single-agent to multi-agent reinforcement learning: Foundational concepts and methods," *Learning theory course*, 2005.
- [53] P. Rosello and M. J. Kochenderfer, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning for multi-object tracking," in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2018, pp. 1397–1404.
- [54] M. Jiang, T. Hai, Z. Pan, H. Wang, Y. Jia, and C. Deng, "Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for multi-object tracker," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 32 400–32 407, 2019.
- [55] W. Wu, D. He, X. Tan, S. Chen, and S. Wen, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning based frame sampling for effective untrimmed video recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 6222–6231.
- [56] B. Bakker, S. Whiteson, L. Kester, and F. C. Groen, "Traffic light control by multiagent reinforcement learning systems," in *Interactive Collaborative Information Systems*. Springer, 2010, pp. 475–510.

- [57] L. Kuyper, S. Whiteson, B. Bakker, and N. Vlassis, "Multiagent reinforcement learning for urban traffic control using coordination graphs," in *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 2008, pp. 656–671.
- [58] D.-Y. Lee, J.-Y. Sim, and C.-S. Kim, "Multihypothesis trajectory analysis for robust visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015, pp. 5088–5096.
- [59] C. Kim, F. Li, A. Ciptadi, and J. M. Rehg, "Multiple hypothesis tracking revisited," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015, pp. 4696–4704.
- [60] S. Hare, S. Golodetz, A. Saffari, V. Vineet, M.-M. Cheng, S. L. Hicks, and P. H. Torr, "Struck: Structured output tracking with kernels," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 2096–2109, 2016.
- [61] X. Wang, Z. Chen, J. Tang, B. Luo, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and F. Wu, "Dynamic attention guided multi-trajectory analysis for single object tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2021.
- [62] J. Zhang, S. Ma, and S. Sclaroff, "Meem: robust tracking via multiple experts using entropy minimization," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2014, pp. 188–203.
- [63] C. Ma, J.-B. Huang, X. Yang, and M.-H. Yang, "Hierarchical convolutional features for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2015, pp. 3074–3082.
- [64] Y. Qi, S. Zhang, L. Qin, H. Yao, Q. Huang, J. Lim, and M.-H. Yang, "Hedged deep tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 4303–4311.
- [65] S. Avidan, "Ensemble tracking," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 261–271, 2007.
- [66] Q. Bai, Z. Wu, S. Sclaroff, M. Betke, and C. Monnier, "Randomized ensemble tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2013, pp. 2040–2047.
- [67] H. Grabner, M. Grabner, and H. Bischof, "Real-time tracking via on-line boosting," in *Bmvc*, vol. 1, no. 5. Citeseer, 2006, p. 6.
- [68] N. Wang, W. Zhou, Q. Tian, R. Hong, M. Wang, and H. Li, "Multi-cue correlation filters for robust visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 4844–4853.
- [69] T. A. Biresaw, A. Cavallaro, and C. S. Regazzoni, "Tracker-level fusion for robust bayesian visual tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 776–789, 2014.
- [70] O. Khalid, J. C. SanMiguel, and A. Cavallaro, "Multi-tracker partition fusion," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1527–1539, 2016.
- [71] I. Leang, S. Herbin, B. Girard, and J. Droulez, "On-line fusion of trackers for single-object tracking," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 74, pp. 459–473, 2018.
- [72] T. Vojir, J. Matas, and J. Neskova, "Online adaptive hidden markov model for multi-tracker fusion," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 153, pp. 109–119, 2016.
- [73] N. Wang and D.-Y. Yeung, "Ensemble-based tracking: Aggregating crowdsourced structured time series data," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2014, pp. 1107–1115.
- [74] C. Xie, N. Wang, W. Zhou, W. Li, and H. Li, "Multi-tracker fusion via adaptive outlier detection," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 2227–2250, 2019.
- [75] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [76] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein *et al.*, "Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge," *International journal of computer vision*, vol. 115, no. 3, pp. 211–252, 2015.
- [77] Z. Zhang and H. Peng, "Deeper and wider siamese networks for real-time visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4591–4600.
- [78] V. Mnih, A. P. Badia, M. Mirza, A. Graves, T. Lillicrap, T. Harley, D. Silver, and K. Kavukcuoglu, "Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning," in *International conference on machine learning*, 2016, pp. 1928–1937.
- [79] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski *et al.*, "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, p. 529, 2015.
- [80] R. J. Williams, "Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning," *Machine learning*, vol. 8, no. 3–4, pp. 229–256, 1992.
- [81] R. J. Williams and J. Peng, "Function optimization using connectionist reinforcement learning algorithms," *Connection Science*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 241–268, 1991.
- [82] G. Bhat, M. Danelljan, L. V. Gool, and R. Timofte, "Learning discriminative model prediction for tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 6182–6191.
- [83] A. Moudgil and V. Gandhi, "Long-term visual object tracking benchmark," in *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2018, pp. 629–645.
- [84] S. Li and D.-Y. Yeung, "Visual object tracking for unmanned aerial vehicles: A benchmark and new motion models," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2017.
- [85] Y. Wu, J. Lim, and M.-H. Yang, "Object tracking benchmark," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 1834–1848, 2015.
- [86] P. Liang, E. Blasch, and H. Ling, "Encoding color information for visual tracking: Algorithms and benchmark," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 5630–5644, 2015.
- [87] M. Mueller, N. Smith, and B. Ghanem, "A benchmark and simulator for uav tracking," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 445–461.
- [88] H. Fan, L. Lin, F. Yang, P. Chu, G. Deng, S. Yu, H. Bai, Y. Xu, C. Liao, and H. Ling, "Lasot: A high-quality benchmark for large-scale single object tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 5374–5383.
- [89] L. Huang, X. Zhao, and K. Huang, "Got-10k: A large high-diversity benchmark for generic object tracking in the wild," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2019.
- [90] M. Kristan, A. Leonardis, J. Matas, M. Felsberg, R. Pflugfelder, L. ˇCehovin Zajc, T. Vojir, G. Bhat, A. Lukezic, A. Eldesokey *et al.*, "The sixth visual object tracking vot2018 challenge results," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 0–0.
- [91] M. Kristan, J. Matas, A. Leonardis, M. Felsberg, R. Pflugfelder, J.-K. Kamarainen, L. ˇCehovin Zajc, O. Drbohlav, A. Lukezic, A. Berg *et al.*, "The seventh visual object tracking vot2019 challenge results," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, 2019, pp. 0–0.
- [92] B. Liao, C. Wang, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, and J. Yin, "Pg-net: Pixel to global matching network for visual tracking," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 429–444.
- [93] H. Fan and H. Ling, "Parallel tracking and verifying: A framework for real-time and high accuracy visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 5486–5494.
- [94] Y. Song, C. Ma, L. Gong, J. Zhang, R. W. Lau, and M.-H. Yang, "Crest: Convolutional residual learning for visual tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2017, pp. 2555–2564.
- [95] X. Wang, J. Tang, B. Luo, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and F. Wu, "Tracking by joint local and global search: A target-aware attention based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2021.
- [96] J. Gao, T. Zhang, and C. Xu, "Graph convolutional tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4649–4659.
- [97] P. Li, B. Chen, W. Ouyang, D. Wang, X. Yang, and H. Lu, "Gradnet: Gradient-guided network for visual object tracking," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 6162–6171.
- [98] W. Zhang, R. Song, Y. Li *et al.*, "Online decision based visual tracking via reinforcement learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, 2020.
- [99] Z. Zhu, Q. Wang, B. Li, W. Wu, J. Yan, and W. Hu, "Distractor-aware siamese networks for visual object tracking," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 101–117.
- [100] G. A. Miller, "Wordnet: a lexical database for english," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 39–41, 1995.
- [101] M. Danelljan, G. Bhat, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Atom: Accurate tracking by overlap maximization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4660–4669.
- [102] D. Held, S. Thrun, and S. Savarese, "Learning to track at 100 fps with deep regression networks," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 749–765.
- [103] G. Bhat, M. Danelljan, L. Van Gool, and R. Timofte, "Know your surroundings: Exploiting scene information for object tracking," in

- European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 205–221.
- [104] A. Lukezic, J. Matas, and M. Kristan, “D3s-a discriminative single shot segmentation tracker,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 7133–7142.
- [105] K. Dai, Y. Zhang, D. Wang, J. Li, H. Lu, and X. Yang, “High-performance long-term tracking with meta-updater,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 6298–6307.