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Abstract

Surveillance anomaly detection searches for anomalous events, such as crimes or accidents, among normal scenes. Because it occurs rarely, most training data consists of unlabeled, normal videos, which makes the task challenging. Most existing methods use an autoencoder (AE) to learn reconstructing normal videos and detect anomalies by a failure to reconstruct the appearance of abnormal scenes. However, because anomalies are distinguished by appearance or motion, many previous approaches have explicitly separated appearance and motion information—for example, using a pre-trained optical flow model. This explicit separation restricts reciprocal representation capabilities between two information. In contrast, we propose an implicit two-path AE (ITAE), a structure in which two encoders implicitly model appearance and motion features, and a single decoder that combines them to learn normal video patterns. For the complex distribution of normal scenes, we suggest normal density estimation of ITAE features through normalizing flow (NF)-based generative models to learn the tractable likelihoods and find anomalies using out-of-distribution detection. NF models intensify ITAE performance by learning normality through implicitly learned features. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of ITAE and its feature distribution modeling in three benchmarks, especially on the Shanghai Tech Campus (ST) database composed of various anomalies in real-world scenarios.

1. Introduction

Surveillance anomaly detection finds abnormal events such as traffic monitoring, accidents, and crime using the petabytes of videos from CCTVs that are present in most places in our daily lives. This is directly related to real-world problems and critical task because it can replace inefficient human monitoring for anomalous events, which is time-consuming and laborious, with an automated system. However, there are several challenges. First, real-world anomalous events such as robberies and car accidents occur very infrequently compared with normal events, which brings a class imbalance problem between normal and abnormal data. Therefore, the training sets of most surveillance databases only contain normal videos, and the anomalous event only exists in the test set. This makes

Figure 1: Reconstruction error of (a) abnormal input from (b) AE and the proposed (c) ITAE, and (d) log-likelihood histogram of video clip. For a scene where a person throws a bag, where the motion factor is heavily abnormal, AE with only a static encoder reconstructs accurately, which fails to detect anomalies. In contrast, ITAE with static and dynamic encoder produces large errors, and each normality distribution histogram of the latent feature enables distinguishing anomalies.
it challenging to train in a general supervised manner that uses manually labeled data. Second, because anomalies are unbounded, it is impossible to define and collect all existing abnormal events, and labeling is extremely laborious. Therefore, detecting unseen and undefined anomalous events requires learning normality through abundant and easily obtained normal videos.

Since the advent of deep learning, studies on surveillance anomaly detection tasks with a large number of normal training videos have grown significantly \[43, 39, 33, 62\]. Frame reconstruction or prediction-based methods are used predominantly in unsupervised learning approaches \[20, 34, 49\]. Autoencoder (AE) \[4\] structured networks that learn reconstruction (or prediction) tasks with just normal scenes cannot reconstruct properly when abnormal scenes are input during testing, entailing large reconstruction errors between the input and output for anomaly detection. This approach enables training without labeled data and has made significant progress.

Anomalous events in a surveillance system can be distinguished from normal events by appearance, motion, or both. For example, the passing of non-pedestrian objects such as cars on the sidewalk has a different appearance to a normal scene; fighting or loitering people illustrate differences in motion; people throwing abnormal objects exhibit differences in both. It is essential to extract features that contain the appearance and motion of the input video for anomaly detection. Many AE-based methods use explicit motion information with a pre-trained network such as an optical flow network \[44, 34\], pose estimator \[42\], or action recognition backbone \[62\]. However, explicitly separating information forces inductive bias to the network and makes it dependent on the pre-trained model. This can degrade network capacity due to the strong prior and cannot fully exploit end-to-end spatio-temporal representations.

Therefore, we propose an implicit two-path AE (ITAE) that minimizes inductive bias and implicitly focuses on appearance and motion information. Because it is difficult to contain motion information with an single AE, we suggest a structure with two encoders and a single decoder, in which the two encoders capture relatively static and dynamic features, and the decoder learns to combine and reconstruct them together as original inputs. In contrast to other two encode and two decoder structure or framework with pre-trained feature extractors, we simply add one encoder path and design ITAE with few shallow layers to make it suitable for video anomaly detection. Inspired by the SlowFast network \[12\], which achieves satisfactory performance in action recognition tasks, the static and dynamic encoders of ITAE have different temporal and channel sizes to focus on appearance or motion information. In Fig. 1, we visualized the output results of AE when the appearance of the input frame looks normal (standing pedestrian) but the motion (throwing the bag) is abnormal. Compared with AE, ITAE illustrates a larger reconstruction error because the motion of the input frame differs from the learned normal frames. This large error leads to anomaly detection, which demonstrates that the dynamic encoder of ITAE is critical.

For complex and diverse scenes, AE becomes difficult to reconstruct and has limitations in detecting anomalies. We suggest compensating for this drawback by distribution learning of latent features extracted from ITAE using a normalizing flow (NF)-based generative model. The method of classifying real-reconstructed samples with a discriminator through adversarial learning \[52, 55\] has limitation on supporting data distribution and usually unstable due to its formulation (min-max). In contrast, the NF model \[10\] focuses on the density estimation of high-dimensional data with tractable exact log-likelihood. By directly maximizing the likelihood of the NF model, it is possible to learn high-dimensional normal video features. After training, abnormal events are found by out-of-distribution detection within ITAE feature likelihood (Fig. 1 (d)). For distribution modeling, instead of the original input frame, using latent features from the proposed ITAE that representing normal patterns produces satisfactory results, especially in the ST database \[34\] with the most diverse anomalies. The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- A proposed ITAE in which two encoders implicitly focus on static and dynamic features and a decoder learns to combine them to detect an event which appearance or motion is abnormal in surveillance video

- For complex distributions of normal scenes, with the features from ITAE, NF models estimate the density of normality

- Unsupervised learning without pre-trained models in the proposed approach and superior performance on three surveillance anomaly detection benchmarks

2. Related Works

Convolutional Networks for Video. As a basic network for video data, 3D convolution-based networks have been proposed \[56, 5, 19\] and used for feature extraction in video anomaly detection. For video recognition, two-stream networks also have been proposed to model motion features explicitly \[9, 13, 54, 58\]. However, these require the explicit extraction of temporal information, such as temporal differences or optical flows. Recently, for video recognition task, Feichtenhofer et al. \[12\] proposed slow and fast pathway networks that operate at different temporal and spatial resolutions to extract stationary and motion information. The slow-pathway is composed of a narrow temporal window, while the fast-pathway uses a higher temporal rate. In
this paper, to learn normal patterns through reconstructing frames, we propose ITAE which has two encoders and a single decoder composed of shallow layers, excluding residual blocks.

**Video Anomaly Detection.** With the powerful representation ability of deep convolutional networks, many anomaly detection algorithms based on frame reconstruction have been proposed. These algorithms exploit the structure of convolutional AEs [20, 44], recurrent neural networks [39, 38, 8, 43], or 3D convolutions [61]. Other algorithms have been proposed by learning reconstruction with other objectives [45], memory modules [16, 48], or reconstructing optical flows from frames [49, 14].

Frame prediction-based approaches have been proposed to increase the probability of unpredictability for abnormal samples [34, 37]. Some methods using bi-directional frame prediction have been proposed [31, 7]. However, prediction-based approaches generally require heavier structures or optical flows, and bi-directional models rely heavily on future frames.

As another category, anomaly detection method that consisting and learning the compactness of normal clusters has been proposed. Clusters are configured by removing the most discriminant features [57], removing small clusters of normal samples [25], features from the reconstruction objective [60], or extracting from a pre-trained object detector [24] or pose estimator [42].

**Generative Models.** Compared with discriminative models, generative models do not require either normal annotations or proxy tasks such as frame generation. Some approaches based on a Gaussian model [50, 51] or non-parametric density estimation [22] have been proposed based on either latent features or extracted features.

Deep generative models can be categorized into implicit and explicit density estimation models [17]. However, implicit density models, such as GANs [18], do not define the data likelihood and cannot use in-distribution estimation without modifying the discriminator for the likelihood estimator [52], whereas explicit models first define likelihoods and try to maximize them. An approximation-based model has been proposed to calculate likelihood [29] and used for anomaly detection [2]. To estimate the density more precisely, auto-regressive models [3, 15, 47, 46, 30] have shown promising results and have been adapted for anomaly detection [1]. However, these autoregressive models are not efficient for high-dimensional data, cannot be implemented with parallel processing, and are sensitive to the choice of sequence order.

Tractable density estimators using NFs have been proposed to alleviate these problems [23, 40, 10, 11, 28]. Dinh et al. [10, 11] proposed invertible networks using an affine coupling layer and calculated the tractable likelihood using the change of variable theorem. Kingma and Dhariwal proposed Glow [28] for further improvements using the activation normalization and invertible $1 \times 1$ convolution. In this paper, we suggest distribution learning with NF models using static and dynamic features obtained from ITAE, which helps to deal with the complex distribution of normal scenes. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to utilize NF models for surveillance anomaly detection.

3. Proposed Method

3.1. Overview

In surveillance anomaly detection, normal and anomalous scenes have differences in appearance (e.g., car driv-
ing down a sidewalk), motion (e.g., jumping), or both (e.g., chasing a person with an abnormal object). Therefore, to learn the appearance and motion normal patterns of both scene types, we propose an ITAE that implicitly focuses on static and dynamic features. With these learned features from ITAE, we suggest distribution modeling through NF models to learn complex and diverse normality.

The framework is trained in two steps with only normal training videos. In the first step, ITAE learned to reconstruct the normal frames. As depicted in Fig. 2, the sequence of frames is embedded through the ITAE with the static encoder ($E_{\text{static}}$) and dynamic encoder ($E_{\text{dynamic}}$). The embedding features of the two encoders are combined and reconstructed into original frames through a single decoder. In the second step, to estimate the density of the normal appearance and motion pattern, NF models ($F_{\text{static}}$ and $F_{\text{dynamic}}$) are learned with the two embedding features from the ITAE.

During testing, the abnormality score is calculated using the reconstruction error of the ITAE and the estimated likelihood of the NF models. When an abnormal scene is input, the ITAE learned with normal frames outputs a large error due to its poor reconstruction. Furthermore, with NF models, the static and dynamic embedding features obtained from ITAE differ from the features of the normal training set, which entails a low likelihood value.

### 3.2. Implicit two-path AE (ITAE)

**Two-path encoder.** We design the AE with a two-path encoder to capture appearance and motion information implicitly and mutually. Surveillance video has the characteristic of slightly changing static information such as background between frames, whereas dynamic information such as walking or running changes relatively quickly. The input sequence of two encoders is sampled with different frame rates, and information is transferred between the two encoders through a lateral connection. We input $T/\tau$ frames at a $\tau$ sampling rate to the static encoder, and input $T$ frames to the dynamic encoder (we use $\tau = 4$ in this paper). A lateral connection concatenates the static and dynamic feature by matching the temporal size with a $(5, 1, 1)$ kernel.

As the AE gets deeper and the parameter increases, the capacity becomes too powerful to reconstruct the anomalies accurately, we compose each path into four shallow layers. In Table 1, each encoder composed with different spatial and temporal size of kernels and output features. Furthermore, instead of a framework consisting of two encoder-decoder networks, ITAE fuses the features of two encoders into one latent feature, which the decoder uses to generate the original frame. These two encoders generate a higher reconstruction error than one-path encoder for scenes with abnormal motion or appearance and perform anomaly detection better (visualized error maps are depicted in Fig. 4).

#### Table 1: Instantiation of ITAE. Numbers in parentheses denote kernel size (temporal×spatial). Output size is in the order of {channel×temporal×spatial} size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Encoder</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Output size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conv1</td>
<td>(1, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>(5, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>S: 96 × 4 × 128$^2$ D: 12 × 16 × 128$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv2</td>
<td>(1, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>S: 128 × 4 × 64$^2$ D: 16 × 16 × 64$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv3</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>S: 256 × 4 × 32$^2$ D: 32 × 16 × 32$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv4</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>S: 256 × 4 × 32$^2$ D: 32 × 16 × 32$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Decoder</th>
<th>Output size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeConv1</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>256 × 4 × 32$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeConv2</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>128 × 8 × 64$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeConv3</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>96 × 16 × 128$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeConv4</td>
<td>(3, 3$^2$)</td>
<td>3 × 16 × 256$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in Section 5).

**Decoder.** The two embedding feature maps obtained from each encoder are reconstructed into original input frames through a decoder. Similar to the lateral connection between encoders, the two final features are channel-wise concatenated and reconstructed (Fig. 2). For the decoder to generate the output by grasping the relationships between the static and dynamic features, we do not use the skip connection between the encoder and decoder, which is used primarily in the U-Net AE structure. Through encoders that focus static and dynamic changes of input scenes and a decoder that fuses and reconstructs them by combining two embedded features, the network has the capacity to examine both sources of information implicitly. Without a complex structure, the ITAE that consists of four layers in each encoder and decoder is more powerful than the other proposed AE, even when using inception blocks or a convLSTM structure with a pre-trained network.

### 3.3. Learning Normality Distribution

We can learn normality from unlabeled normal training data by the unsupervised density estimation method. By using explicit likelihood generative models, it is possible to compute the likelihood of input data. An NF-based generative model can calculate the tractable likelihood via changes of variables toward a simple distribution (e.g., multivariate Gaussian). The likelihood is calculated by passing an invertible parametric function composed of multiple layers that maps the complex data distribution to the simple distribution. With an input variable $x \in X$, the distribution
of which is unknown, a simple known distribution \( z \sim p_z \) and a parametric function \( f_\theta : X \rightarrow Z \), the integral of the probability density function is

\[
\int_z p_z(z) \, dz = \int_x p_z(x) \, dx = \int_x p_z(f_\theta(x)) \, \left| \det \frac{\partial f_\theta}{\partial x} \right| \, dx
\]

where \( \left| \det \frac{\partial f_\theta}{\partial x} \right| \) is the Jacobian determinant of function \( f_\theta \) under change of variable theorem. When the generative model \( f \) with parameter \( \theta \) is \( f_\theta = f_1 \circ f_2 \circ \cdots \circ f_M \) and \( h_i = f_i(h_{i-1}) \) where \( h_0 = x \) and \( h_M = z \), the probability density function of \( x \) is as follows with Eq. 2.

\[
\log p_x(x) = \log p_z(z) + \sum_{i=1}^M \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial h_{i-1}} \right| \tag{2}
\]

If the density function of the latent variable \( z \) is tractable such as a Gaussian distribution and the Jacobian matrix \( \frac{\partial f}{} \) is triangular, the likelihood of input variable \( x \) can be obtained simply. We use the Glow model with \( L \) level multiscale architecture and \( K \) series of Actnorm, invertible convolution, and Affine layer for density estimation [28].

With maximizing the likelihood in Eq. 2, an NF model estimates the density of high-dimensional data through multiple layers of convolutional networks. Because the likelihood of a generative model heavily depends on the image complexity [53], unlike Glow, which begins from the image space, the intermediate latent feature of ITAE is used for complex density modeling of normal videos. After training the ITAE with frame reconstruction, we estimate the density of the static and dynamic embedding features obtained from each encoder. The max-pooling and average-pooling along the channel axis of the feature from each path are applied to reduce the dimensions and are concatenated and input into each NF model \( F_{\text{static}} \) and \( F_{\text{dynamic}} \) (Fig. 2). We also concatenate the resized intensity of the input frame to the \( F_{\text{static}} \) input, which provides additional sparse appearance information of the feature map (the ablation studies are conducted in Supplementary material). For abnormal scenes, static and dynamic NF models trained with latent features that embed each appearance and motion patterns of normal scenes illustrate low likelihood results.

### 3.4. Training and Testing

**Reconstruction loss function.** For reconstruction, the model is trained by minimizing the \( L2 \) loss of the input sequence of frames \( I \) (the ground truth) and the output frames \( \hat{I} \). Following [34], we also add a gradient loss \( L_{\text{grad}} \) to maintain the sharpness of the frames. It computes the difference of gradient at each pixel between the input and output frames. The total loss is the sum of \( L_2 \) and \( L_{\text{grad}} \) in Eq. 3.

\[
L_2 = \left\| I - \hat{I} \right\|_2^2, \quad L_{\text{recon}} = L_2 + L_{\text{grad}} \tag{3}
\]

**Log-likelihood loss function.** After training ITAE, the generative models \( F_{\text{static}} \) and \( F_{\text{dynamic}} \) are trained with the negative log-likelihood (nll) \( L_{\text{nll}} \) of the static and dynamic embedding feature \( x^s \) and \( x^d \) in Eq. 4. As in Eq. 2, the exact log-likelihood \( \log p_x(x; \theta) \) of the input feature is calculated through generative models, and the parameters \( \theta \) are updated to maximize this in Eq. 5.

\[
L_{\text{nll}} = \text{NLL}(x^s) + \text{NLL}(x^d) \tag{4}
\]

\[
\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \log p_x(x; \theta)
\]

\[
\text{NLL}(x) = -\log p_X(x) \tag{5}
\]

**Anomaly score.** Following [44], the anomaly score for the reconstruction error \( R(I_t, \hat{I}_t) \) of the \( t \)-th frame is the difference between input and the output frame of the ITAE within a sliding patch (in Eq. 6, \( P \) indicates an \( N \times N \) image patch and \( |P| \) is the pixel number of the patch). For each frame, we compute the mean of error values in all segments in which it appears. The score \( L(x^s_t, x^d_t) \) from the generative models is calculated by adding the nll values of each static and the dynamic feature as a ratio of intervals in Eq. 7.

\[
R(I_t, \hat{I}_t) = \arg \max_{\text{sliding}P} \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{i,j \in P} |I_t^{i,j} - \hat{I}_t^{i,j}| \tag{6}
\]

\[
L(x^s_t, x^d_t) = \frac{\lambda_1 \text{NLL}(x^s_t) + \lambda_2 \text{NLL}(x^d_t)}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}
\]

\[
\lambda_1 = \max(x^s) - \min(x^s), \quad \lambda_2 = \max(x^d) - \min(x^d)
\]

The total anomaly score \( S_t \) is computed by summing the normalized reconstruction error and nll in Eq. 8.

\[
S_t = \text{norm}(R(I_t, \hat{I}_t)) + \lambda_L \text{norm}(L(x^s_t, x^d_t)) \tag{7}
\]

where norm(\( \cdot \)) is normalization within a video clip \( I \),

\[
\text{norm}(R(I_t, \hat{I}_t)) = \frac{R(I_t, \hat{I}_t) - \min(R(I, \hat{I}))}{\max(R(I, \hat{I})) - \min(R(I, \hat{I}))}
\]

### 4. Experiments

For the evaluation, we compute the average area under curve (AUC) through the receiver operation characteristic (ROC) by gradually changing the threshold of anomaly score in a frame-level annotated database (the ROC curves are reported in the supplementary material).
Table 2: Ablation studies of two-path AE on CUHK database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE Model</th>
<th>SlowFast-18 AE</th>
<th>SlowFast-50 AE</th>
<th>ITAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one path two path</td>
<td>one path two path</td>
<td>one path two path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFLOPs</td>
<td>154.6 139.9</td>
<td>260.1 266.2</td>
<td>144.4 160.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>0.833 0.811</td>
<td>0.818 0.807</td>
<td>0.826 0.848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. Implementations

For training, we resize the input frame to $256 \times 256$ and set $T$ to 16. We use the Adam optimizer [27] and Cosine annealing scheduler [35]. In the first step training, the batch sizes are 2, 4, and 8, and the learning rates are $1e^{-3}, 1e^{-3},$ and $2e^{-4}$ for the UCSD, CUHK, and ST databases, respectively. For the second step, the batch sizes are 20, 32, and 16, and the learning rates are $5e^{-4}, 5e^{-4},$ and $1e^{-4}$. The Glow is used for the NF models with $K = 32$ and $L = 3$ ($L = 1$ for UCSD). For UCSD, which has a small foreground scale, we use the original frame size $(214 \times 360)$ with the $1/4$-sized latent feature map, and following [44, 37], multi-scale SSIM [59] is added to the reconstruction loss.

4.2. Databases

UCSD [32]. UCSD consists of two subsets, Ped1 and Ped2, which are composed of looking walkway scenes obtained through a mounted camera. Therefore, the foreground object size and movement changes are small, and videos are grayscale and low-resolution. Ped1 has a significantly low frame resolution, with an inconsistency issue; for example, some [49, 60] tested on only 16 videos, while others [20, 61] tested all videos. For these reasons, we conduct experiment only on Ped2 following [44, 55]. There are anomalies of non-pedestrian objects in the walkways, such as cars and skaters in the test set, and the density of pedestrians varies.

CUHK Avenue [36]. CUHK consists of normal videos in the training set with several outliers included and a slight camera shake. The test set includes anomalies of a person walking in the wrong direction, strange actions, has large motion, and foreground scale variation.

Shanghai Tech Campus (ST) [34]. ST is the largest-volume database containing 13 different scenes, whereas the two databases above contain 1 scene. This database includes diverse anomalous events such as brawling and loitering, including sudden motion in multiple scenes. It is challenging due to its complex angles and lighting conditions.

4.3. Ablation Studies

Structure of ITAE. In Table 2, we compare the two path networks SlowFast [12] and ITAE. In contrast to ITAE, SlowFast is a discriminative model proposed for action recognition that has deep ResNet [21]-style layers. For comparison, we train SlowFast AE (Backbone as ResNet18 and 50) by attaching a decoder with residual layers to the SlowFast (experiment conditions are the same as ITAE). In the SlowFast-18 and 50 AE results, the performance of the two-path encoder is worse than when there is only a one-path encoder. The deep and complex structure of SlowFast AE instead degrades the performance of detecting anomalies. In contrast, ITAE, with a shallow and non-residual network, performs better and improves markedly when both static and dynamic paths are together (Fig. 4). This result illustrates that ITAE is more suitable for video anomaly detection where motion and appearance information sources are important.

Distribution modeling with ITAE features. Our framework estimates the normality using the ITAE features instead of the raw frame for distribution modeling. In Table 3, without ITAE reconstruction score, NF models with ITAE static and dynamic features illustrate superior results to that with the raw frames ($128 \times 128$ input size), which proves the effectiveness of modeling with learned ITAE features for surveillance video data. Furthermore, in the ST dataset, the largest and most diverse among the three benchmarks (it has 13 scenes, whereas others have 1), the NF model exhibits excellent results without an ITAE score. With extensive and diverse data, NF performs more general distribution learning and responds to complex scenes.

Analysis according to the number of scenes. We compose a subset with 1, 6, and 13 scenes in the ST database and compared the performance as the scenes of the data become diverse and extensive. The sizes of the test sets are proportional, and the train-to-test set ratio in each subset is

Table 3: Normal density estimation using raw frames and ITAE features with NF models at three benchmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>NF on Frames</th>
<th>NF on ITAE features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCSD Ped2 [32]</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.853 0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUHK [36]</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.807 0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Tech [34]</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.721 0.747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 scene/ 28 clips, * 1 scene/ 38 clips, † 13 scenes/ 437 clips

Figure 3: Results of ITAE and NF models for 1, 6, and 13 scenes in ST database.
Table 4: Ablation studies of static and dynamic encoders in ITAE and NF models on three benchmark databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>UCSD Ped2* [32]</th>
<th>CUHK* [36]</th>
<th>Shanghai Tech Campus† [34]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITAE</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generative modeling</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1 scene/ 28 clips,  † 13 scenes/ 437 clips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison with state-of-the-art methods on three benchmarks; comparison result of our model is the performance of ITAE and static and dynamic NF models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>UCSD Ped2* [32]</th>
<th>CUHK* [36]</th>
<th>ST† [34]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPCA [20]</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPCA+SPA [41]</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDT [41]</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMDN [60]</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmasking [57]</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT-FRCN [22]</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame-Ped [34]</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC [54]</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mem-guided [48]</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNet-inte [55]</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-Conv2D [20]</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-Conv3D [61]</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC [39]</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StackRNN [39]</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbnormalGAN [49]</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HybridAE [45]</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-reg [1]</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemAE [16]</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mem-guided [48]</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD-AE [6]</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAE (ours)</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAE + NFs (ours)</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1 scene/ 28 clips,  † 1 scene/ 38 clips, † 13 scenes/ 437 clips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Comparison

A comparison with other methods on three benchmarks is presented in Table 5. Our approach presents competitive or superior results without using a pre-trained network, and ITAE significantly improves performance over the well-designed AE (AE-Conv3D [61], TSC [39], and StackRNN [39]). On the CUHK database, high performance is achieved by Mem-guided [48], a prediction-based method that stores and updates normal query features by memory module. However, in contrast to CUHK composed of a single scene, this approach demonstrates low performance on the ST database with complex and multiple scenes, which indicates that storing fixed numbers of scenes is not effective in coping with the complex normality distribution.
memory items may not suitable for the general problem.

Frame-Pred [34], AMC [44], and UNet-inte [55] also illustrate high performance dependent on a pre-trained optical flow network. On Ped2 and ST databases, the proposed approach exhibits superior performance at 97.3% and 74.7%, respectively. For all three databases, the results are superior to those of Auto-reg [1], which performs auto-regressive generative modeling that requires a causal network and data ordering to perform sequential operations.

5. Qualitative Results

Fig. 4 illustrates a comparison of AE (consisting of only a static encoder) and ITAE. Following [48], the error maps are visualized by marking the pixel that is larger than the average error value within the frame. The first row of the figure is a jumping child whose appearance is normal, which leads to low reconstruction error with one-path AE. In contrast, the ITAE, which focuses on motion as well as appearance, generates a significant error due to the poor reconstruction for inputs that differ from the normal learned motion. For the second row, a person throwing a paper, the abnormality of the paper appearance and flying motion produce a large error in ITAE.

Fig. 5 is a histogram of likelihood within a video clip from static and dynamic NF models. The first row (a) is a skateboarder and bikers on the walkway, and the second row (b) is a person riding a bike on the sidewalk. As depicted in the histogram, the likelihoods of both NF models are low in abnormal frames, with abnormal appearance and motion on the sidewalk.

With the two-path encoder and its static and dynamic

embedding features, we compute the anomaly score of each frame in Fig. 6. By adding the nll score (from NF models) to the reconstruction score in (b), the total score can detect anomalies more accurately. The two scores complement each other and achieve satisfactory results, even when the pedestrian density is high or low and the foreground scale is small or large.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an ITAE and the distribution modeling of normal features based on an NF model in an unsupervised manner for video anomaly detection. We designed the ITAE to implicitly capture representative static and dynamic information of normal scenes without using a pre-trained network. For the complex normality, using the latent features of ITAE, we modeled the distribution of appearance and motion normality with an NF model through the tractable likelihood. Through an experiment on standard benchmarks, ITAE demonstrated high effectiveness in scenes where motion is abnormal by learning dynamic information of normal scenes. Furthermore, the normality modeling of the ITAE feature achieved superior results, especially when the database is extensive and composed of diverse scenes. The proposed method can be expected to model a general distribution and solve practical problems through a vast number of real-world videos with unsupervised learning.
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