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Abstract

Recently, the dense correlation volume method achieves state-of-the-art performance in optical flow. However, the correlation volume computation requires a lot of memory, which makes prediction difficult on high-resolution images. In this paper, we propose a novel Patchmatch-based framework to work on high-resolution optical flow estimation. Specifically, we introduce the first end-to-end Patchmatch based deep learning optical flow. It can get high-precision results with lower memory benefiting from propagation and local search of Patchmatch. Furthermore, a new inverse propagation is proposed to decouple the complex operations of propagation, which can significantly reduce calculations in multiple iterations. At the time of submission, our method ranks 1\(^{\text{st}}\) on all the metrics on the popular KITTI2015 [34] benchmark, and ranks 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) on EPE on the Sintel [7] clean benchmark among published optical flow methods. Experiment shows our method has a strong cross-dataset generalization ability that the F1-all achieves 13.73\%, reducing 21\% from the best published result 17.4\% on KITTI2015. What’s more, our method shows a good details preserving result on the high-resolution dataset DAVIS [1] and consumes 2\times less memory than RAFT [45]. Code will be available at github.com/zihuazheng/DIP

1. Introduction

Optical flow, the 2D displacement field that describes apparent motion of brightness patterns between two successive images [17], provides valuable information about the spatial arrangement of the viewed objects and the change rate of the arrangement [48]. Since Horn and Schunck (HS) [17] and Lucas and Kanade (LK) [30] proposed the differential method to calculate optical flow in 1981, many extension algorithms [27, 36, 51] have been proposed. Hence, optical flow has been widely used in various applications such as visual surveillance tasks [52], segmentation [47], action recognition [40], obstacle detection [16] and image sequence super-resolution [31].

Recently, deep learning has made great progress in solving the problem of optical flow. Since FlowNetC [11], many methods have achieved state-of-the-art results. For deep learning, in addition to accuracy, performance and memory are also challenges especially when predicting flow at high-resolution. To reduce complexity of computation and usage of memory, previous approaches [21–23, 43, 55] use coarse-to-fine strategy, they may suffer from low-resolution error recovery problems. In order to maintain high accuracy on large displacements, especially for fast moving small targets, RAFT [45] constructs an all-pairs 4D correlation volume and look up with a convolution GRU block. However, it runs into memory problems when predicting high-resolution optical flow.

In order to reduce the memory while maintaining high accuracy, instead of using the sparse global correlation strategies like [24, 53] which suffer from loss of accuracy, we introduce the idea of Patchmatch to the computation of correlation. Patchmatch implements a random initialization, iterative propagation and search algorithm for approximate nearest neighbor field estimation [5, 6, 19]. It only needs to perform correlation calculations on nearby pixels and propagate its cost information to the next match-
2. Related Work

Deep Flow Methods  The first end-to-end CNN-based version for flow estimation can be traced back to [11], which proposed a U-net like architecture FlowNetS to predict flow directly. A correlation layer was included in a diverse version named FlowNetC. In FlowNet2, Ilg et al. [23] introduced a warping mechanism and stacked hourglass network to promote the performance on small motion areas. PWC-Net [43] used feature warping and a coarse-to-fine cost volume with a context network for flow refinement, further improving the accuracy and reducing the model size simultaneously. To address ambiguous correspondence and occlusion problem, Hui et al. [20] proposed LiteFlowNet3 with adaptive affine transformation and local flow consistency restrictions. RAFT [45] introduced a shared weight iterative refinement module to update the flow field retrieved from a 4D all-pair correlation volume. To reduce the computation complexity of 2D searching in high-resolution images, Xu et al. [53] factorized the 2D search to 1D in two directions combined with attention mechanism. Jiang et al. [25] proposed to construct a sparse correlation volume directly by computing the k-Nearest matches in one feature map for each feature vector in the other feature map. The memory consumption of them is less compare to RAFT but their accuracy is inferior. Another line of work is focused on joining image segmentation and flow estimation task together [8, 10, 42, 46], which propagated two different complementary features, aiming at improving the performance of flow estimation and vice versa.

Patchmatch Based Methods  Patchmatch has been originally proposed by Barnes et al. [5]. Its core work is to compute patch correspondences in a pair of images. The key idea behind it is that neighboring pixels usually have coherent matches. M Bleyer et al. [6] applied Patchmatch to stereo matching and proposed a slanted support windows method for computing aggregation to obtain sub-pixel disparity precision. In order to reduce the error caused by the motion discontinuity of Patchmatch in optical flow, Bao et al. [3] proposed the Edge-Preserving Patchmatch algorithm. Ho et al. [19] proposed a Coarse-to-Fine Patchmatch strategy to improve the speed and accuracy of optical flow. In deep learning, Baier et al. [2] regarded Patchmatch as a 2-classification problem and proposed a thresholded loss to improve the accuracy of classification. Shivam et al. [12] developed a differentiable Patchmatch module to achieve real-time in the stereo disparity estimation network. But this method is sparse and only works on the disparity dimension. Wang et al. [49] introduced iterative multi-scale Patchmatch, which used one adaptive propagation and differentiable warping strategy, achieved a good performance in the Multi-View Stereo problem.

3. Method

We start with our observation and analysis of different correlation volume in optical flow task. These methods require high memory usage and computation to compute the correlation volume. Inspired by the high efficiency of Patchmatch on the correspondence points matching, we use
it to reduce the search space of optical flow.

3.1. Observations

Local Correlation Volume In modern local correlation volume based optical flow approaches [11], the computation of it can be formulated as follows:

\[
Corr = \{ F_1(x) \cdot F_2(x + d) | x \in X, d \in D \}, \tag{1}
\]

where \( F_1 \) is the source feature map and \( F_2 \) is the target feature map, \( d \) is the displacement along the \( x \) or \( y \) direction. \( X = [0, h) \times [0, w), D = [-d_{max}, d_{max}]^2, h \) is the height of feature map, \( w \) is the width of feature map. So the memory and calculation of the correlation volume are linear to \( hw(2d_{max} + 1)^2 \) and quadratic to the radius of the search space. Limited by the size of the search radius, it is difficult to obtain high-precision optical flow in high-resolution challenging scenes.

Global Correlation Volume Recently, RAFT [45] proposed an all-pairs correlation volume which achieved the state-of-the-art performance. The global correlation computation at location \((i, j)\) in \( F_1 \) and location \((k, l)\) in \( F_2 \) can be defined as follows:

\[
Corr_{ijkl}^m = \frac{1}{2m^2} \sum_{p} \sum_{q} (F_1(i, j) \cdot F_2(2m k + p, 2m l + q)), \tag{2}
\]

where \( m \) is the pyramid layer number. \( 2m \) is the pooled kernel size. Compared with local correlation volume, global correlation volume contains \( N^2 \) elements, where \( N = hw \). When the \( h \) or \( w \) of \( F \) increases, the memory and calculation will multiply. So the global method suffers from insufficient memory when inferring at high-resolution.

Patchmatch Method Patchmatch is proposed by Barnes et al. [5] to find dense correspondences across images for structural editing. The key idea behind it is that we can get some good guesses by a large number of random samples. And based on the locality of image, once a good match is found, the information can be efficiently propagated to its neighbors. So, we propose to use the propagation strategy to reduce the search radius and use local search to further improve accuracy. And the complexity of Patchmatch method is \( hw(n + r^2) \), where \( n \) is the number of propagation, \( r \) is the local search radius, and both values are very small and do not change with the increase of displacement or resolution. Details are described in the next subsection.

3.2. Patchmatch In Flow Problem

The traditional Patchmatch methods [5, 6, 19, 28] has three main components. 1) Random initialization. It gets some good guesses by a large number of random samples. 2) Propagation. Based on image locality, once a good match is found, the information can be efficiently propagated from its neighbors. 3) Random search. It is used in the subsequent propagation to prevent local optimization and make it possible to obtain the good match when no good match exist in its neighbors.

Iterative propagation and search are the key points to solve the flow problem. In propagation stage, we treat a point of feature maps as a patch and select 4 neighbor seed points. So every point can get the flow candidates from its neighbors by shifting the flow map toward the 4 neighbors. Then we can compute a 5 dimension correlation volume based on the neighbor flow candidates and its flow. Given a shift \( \Delta p \) for all flow, the correlation calculation of propagation can be defined as:

\[
Corr = F_1 \cdot W(F_2, S(flow, \Delta p)), \tag{3}
\]

Where, \( S(flow, \Delta p) \) refers to shift flow according to \( \Delta p \), \( W \) refers to warp \( F_2 \) with shifted flow. There is no doubt that the more seed points are selected, the more operations are needed. When choosing \( n \) seed points for \( m \) iterations
of propagation, propagation needs to shift the optical flow $n \times m$ times and warp the source feature $n \times m$ times. This increases memory operations and interpolation calculations, especially when predicting high-resolution optical flow. In order to reduce the number of options, for the first time we replace propagation with inverse propagation. In the search stage, we change the random search to a local search method which is more suitable for end-to-end network and achieves higher accuracy. More details in patchmatch method can be seen in the supplementary.

3.3. Deep Inverse Patchmatch

**Inverse Propagation** In propagation, the optical flow shift and feature warping are serial and coupled, since the warping process depends on the shifted flow. Moreover, multiple flow shifts are necessary in each iteration, so the computations increase. In theory, the spatial relative position of shifting the flow to the down-right is the same as shifting the target to the top-left. And the correlation maps of the two methods have one pixel offset in the absolute space coordinates. We name the way of shifting targets as inverse propagation, and the inverse propagation can be formulated as follows:

$$Corr = F_1 \cdot S(F_2, -\Delta p),$$

and

$$F'_2 = W(S(F_2, \Delta p), flow)$$

In theory, combining Eq. (5) and Eq. (4) is completely equivalent to Eq. (3). Since $\Delta p$ is very small, we ignore the process of back propagation in our implementation. Then Eq. (4) can be replaced with:

$$Corr = F_1 \cdot F'_2$$

In inverse propagation, a target feature point is scattered to its seed points and warped by the optical flow of the seed points. Thus, we can shift and stack the target features in advance, then perform warping only once to obtain the warped target features in each iteration. The details of inverse propagation can be described in Fig. 3b.

In this work, the seed points is static and do not change with the increase of iterations. Hence target features only need to be shifted to seed points once and shifted target features can be reused in every iteration. In this way, if there are $n$ seed points for $m$ iterations of propagation, we only need to shift target features $n$ times and warp the shifted target features $m$ times. Fig. 2b shows the inverse propagation stage and whole the stage can be divided into two sub-stages:

- **Initialization Stage:** Input source feature, target feature. Shift the target feature according to the seed points, and then stack these shifted target features as shared target features along the depth dimension.

- **Running Stage:** Input a flow, warp shared target fea-
tures according to the flow, and compute correlation between source feature and warped target features.

**Local Search** It is difficult to obtain very accurate optical flow by patch propagation alone, since the range of randomly initialized flow values is very sparse. Therefore, a local neighborhood search is performed after each propagation in this work. Unlike [5], which performs a random search after each propagation and reduces the search radius with increasing iteration. We only perform a fixed small radius search after each propagation and call it local search. The entire local search block is shown in Fig. 3c. Given an optical flow increment \( \Delta f \), the local search can be formulated as:

\[
\text{Corr} = F_1 \cdot S(W(F_2, \text{flow}), \Delta f)
\]

In this work, we set the final search radius to 2 according to the experimental results. Details are described in Section 4.2.

To this end, the Inverse Patchmatch module, as shown in Fig. 3a, consists mainly of the Inverse Propagation Block and the Local Search Block. In each iteration, an inverse propagation is followed by a local search. It is worth noting that both blocks use GRU [45] for cost aggregation.

**3.4. Network Architecture**

In order to obtain high-precision optical flow on high-resolution images, we designed a new optical flow prediction framework named DIP. The overview of DIP can be found in Fig. 3. It can be described as two main stages: (1) feature extraction; (2) multi-scale iterative update.

**Feature Extraction** At first, a feature encoder network is applied to the input images to extract the feature maps at 1/4 resolution. Unlike previous works [24, 25, 45, 53] which use a context network branch to specifically extract the context. DIP directly activates the source feature map as a context map. Then we use the Average Pooling module to reduce the feature maps to 1/16 resolution. And we use the same backbone and parameters for both 1/4 resolution and 1/16 resolution. Therefore, DIP can be trained in two stages, and we use more stages for inference when processing large images.

**Multi-scale Iterative Update** Our method is based on neighborhood propagation and thus must iteratively update the optical flow. Our network consists of two modules, an inverse propagation module and a local search module. In the training stage, we start the network with a random flow of size 1/16 and then iteratively optimize the optical flow at both scale 1/16 and scale 1/4 using a pyramid method. During the inference stage, we can perform the same process as in the training stage. To obtain a more accurate optical flow, we can also refine the optical flow at scale 1/8 and then optimize the result at scale 1/4. More high-resolution detailed comparisons can be found in the supplementary material.

Our network also accepts the initialized optical flow as input in the inference stage. In this case, we adapt the number of inference layers of the pyramid according to the maximum value of the initialized optical flow. For example, the forward interpolation of the optical flow of the previous image is used as input for the current image when the optical flow of the video images is processed. With the information of the previous optical flow, we can use two or more pyramids for large displacements to ensure accuracy, and use one pyramid for small displacements to reduce inference time.

**4. Experiment**

In this section, we demonstrate the state-of-the-art performance of DIP on Sintel [7] and KITTI [34] leaderboards and show that it outperforms existing methods in the zero-shot generalization setting on Sintel and KITTI. The end-point error (EPE) is reported in the evaluation. For KITTI, another evaluation metric, F1-all, is also reported, which indicates the percentage of outliers for all pixels. For benchmark performance evaluation, \( d_{0-10} \) and \( d_{10-60} \) on Sintel are also used to estimate the optical flow in small motion regions. Here, \( d_{0-10} \) means the endpoint error over regions closer than 10 pixels to the nearest occlusion boundary.

**4.1. Training schedule**

DIP is implemented in Pytorch [35] with 16 RTX 2080 Ti GPUs. Following RAFT [45], we use the AdamW [29] optimizer and the OneCycle learning rate schedule [41] in the training process.

**Training Details** In the generalization experiment, we train our model on the datasets FlyingChairs [11] and FlyingThings3D [32] and evaluate the generalization ability on the training set of Sintel [7] and KITTI2015 [34]. In the pre-train stage, we divide to combine FlyingChairs and FlyingThings3D in a ratio of 1:10. First, the training size is set to 512 × 384, and the model is trained for 100k steps with a batch size of 32. Then, the model is finetuned on size of 768 × 384 for another 100k steps with batch size of 16. During training and inference of ablation studies, we use 6 iterations for DIP flow regression. And the number of iterations is set to 12 during benchmark performance evaluation.

We also performed fine-tuning on Sintel [7], KITTI [34] and HD1K [26] datasets. We perform fine-tuning on Sintel for 100k by combining data from Sintel and FlyingThings3D [32] and training size is 768 × 384. Finally, we perform fine-tuning using a combination of data from FlyingThings, Sintel, KITTI-15, and HD1K for 100k with a training size of 832 × 320.
Table 1. Ablation study concerning correlation volume. Models are trained on FlyingChairs [11] and FlyingThings3D [32]. Memory and inference time are measured on a RTX2080 Ti GPU. global means global correlation volume. only p(N=4), ls(r=1) means that only use propagation with seeds of 4 or local search with radius 1. pm(N=4, r=1) means Patchmatch that combines propagation and local search. The number of iterations is set to 6 for Patchmatch and 12 for other methods. The best results are marked with bold and the second best results are marked with underline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sintel (train)</th>
<th>KITTI-15 (train)</th>
<th>Params</th>
<th>448 × 1024</th>
<th>1088 × 1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>F1-all</td>
<td>Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparse global [25]</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>5.00M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense global</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td><strong>14.02</strong></td>
<td>3.40M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only p(N=4)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>2.78M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only ls(r=1)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>3.40M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm(N=4, r=1)</td>
<td><strong>1.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.89</strong></td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>5.10M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Ablation study of the number of seeds and the local search radius based on Patchmatch. Validated on Sintel and KITTI-15 training datasets and iteration is set to 6. The best results are marked with bold and the second best results are marked with underline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pm</th>
<th>Sintel</th>
<th>KITTI-15</th>
<th>1088 × 1920</th>
<th>1088 × 1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N r</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>F1-all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td><strong>4.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td><strong>2.79</strong></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ablation study of Patchmatch and inverse Patchmatch on Sintel and KITTI-15 training datasets. Where pm means Patchmatch and ipm means inverse Patchmatch. Among them, the seeds of propagation is 4. The radius of local search is 2. The best results are marked in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sintel</th>
<th>KITTI-15</th>
<th>1088 × 1920</th>
<th>1088 × 1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>F1-all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td><strong>4.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipm</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td><strong>2.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Ablation study

Correlation Volume We first analyze the accuracy, memory and inference time of key components in our proposed method in Tab. 1. In this comparative experiment, SCV(Sparse global) [25] is selected as a benchmark because it has low correlation volume in memory and state-of-the-art performance. In addition, we construct 4D correlation volumes with a resolution of (Dense global) 1/16 and 1/4 resolution respectively, and each iteration performs a lookup like RAFT [45]. Using these benchmarks, we have conducted a partial experimental comparison. In the experiment, we implement a propagation experiment with a seed point of 4 and a local search experiment with a radius of 1 respectively. The results are clearly that only propagation(only p) or local search(only ls) has great advantages in terms of memory and speed at large resolutions, but the accuracy is reduced compared to the global method. The combination of propagation and local search (pm) uses less time and memory to achieve comparable or better results than the global method. Especially, DIP consumes 10× less inference time than SCV on the size of 1088 × 1920.

Hyperparameters Based on Patchmatch, we further experiment with hyperparameters and present them in Tab. 2. At first, the number of propagation seed points is set to 4, and the radius of local search is changed from 1 to 3. We can see that the accuracy is further improved when the search radius is increased from 1 to 2. When it is increased to 3, the accuracy is basically the same as radius 2, but the model inference time increases by 21%. So the radius of the local search is fixed at 2. Then we change the number of propagation seed points from 4 to 8. However, the result is not improved significantly, but the model consumption in-
creases. So we set the number of seed points to 4 for further optimization.

**Patchmatch and Inverse Patchmatch** Finally, we verified the effectiveness of the inverse Patchmatch and showed it in Tab. 3. In this experiment, we replaced the calculation method of correlation from propagation to inverse propagation, and adopted the previous training and evaluation strategy. The experiment shows that inverse propagation can achieve almost the same results as propagation. With a size of $1088 \times 1920$, the inference time of inverse Patchmatch is reduced by 24% compared to Patchmatch.

In summary, based on our Patchmatch framework, we can achieve better performance with lower memory, and use inverse Patchmatch instead of Patchmatch to achieve the same performance with faster inference speed.

### 4.3. Comparison with Existing Methods

To demonstrate the superiority of our method, we have made a comprehensive comparison with the existing methods, including generalization, memory and special results.

**Generalization** In order to verify the generalization of the model, we choose to use FlyingChairs [11] and FlyingThings3D [32] for training and Sintel [7], KITTI [34] for test. Details are described in Section 4.1 and results are shown in Tab. 4. Experiments show that our method exhibits strong generalization and achieves state-of-the-art results in the KITTI-15 dataset. Among them, F1-all is 13.73%, reducing 21% from the best published result (17.4%). On the Sintel dataset, we have also achieved results comparable to the state-of-the-art methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sintel(Train)</th>
<th>KITTI-15(train)</th>
<th>EPE</th>
<th>F1-all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD3 [55]</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC-Net [43]</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiteFlowNet2 [22]</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>25.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCN [54]</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>25.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaskFlowNet [58]</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlowNet2 [23]</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICL [50]</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFT [45]</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td><strong>2.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow1D [53]</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCV [25]</td>
<td><strong>1.29</strong></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ours</td>
<td><strong>1.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Results on Sintel and KITTI. EPE refers to the average endpoint error and F1-all refers to the percentage of optical flow outliers over all pixels. The best results are marked with bold and the second best results are marked with underline. Missing entries `-` indicates that the result is not reported in the compared paper.

**Memory and High-resolution Results** We measure the accuracy and memory of different correlation volume algorithms at different resolutions in Fig. 5. Since there are few real and high-resolution datasets for the flow task, in the experiment we use the up-sampled kitti dataset for memory and accuracy evaluation. It can be seen that under the limitation of 11GB memory, the maximum output image scale of RAFT [45] is only 2.25. Moreover, the accuracy of SCV [25] is rapidly decreasing as the image scale increases. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our approach in sav-
Method | Sintel (test) | KITTI-15 (test) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>d0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlowNet2 [23]</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC-Net+ [44]</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiteFlowNet2 [22]</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD3 [55]</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCN [54]</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaskFlowNet [58]</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScopeFlow [4]</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICL [50]</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFT [45]</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow1D [53]</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCV [25]</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm-start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFT</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCV</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Benchmark performance on Sintel and KITTI Test datasets. Missing entries '-' indicates that the result is not reported in the compared paper and could not found on online benchmark. The best results are marked with bold and the second best results are marked with underline.

Benchmark Results The performances of our DIP on the Sintel and KITTI-15 benchmarks are shown in Tab. 5. We have achieved state-of-the-art results (1.72 → 1.67) on the Sintel-Clean dataset in the two-view case. Similar to RAFT, we also adopt the “warm-start” strategy which initialises current optical flow estimation with the flow estimates of the previous frame. On the Sintel-Clean benchmark our method ranks second for EPE. Compared with RAFT, we have improved the EPE from 1.61 to 1.44 (10.5% improvement). What’s interesting is that our method achieves the best results on the $d_{0-10}$ and $d_{10-60}$, which shows that our method has obvious advantages in estimating the optical flow in small motion areas. Fig. 4 shows qualitative results of DIP on Sintel. Compared with RAFT and SCV, our results are much closer to the ground truth in the fine structure area.

On the KITTI-15 benchmark, our method ranks first on all the metrics among the published optical flow methods. Compared with RAFT, we have improved the F1-all from 3.07% to 2.43% (20.8% improvement) on Non-occluded pixels and the F1-all from 5.10% to 4.21% (17.5% improvement) on all pixels.

5. Conclusion

We propose a deep inverse Patchmatch framework for optical flow that focuses on reducing the computational cost and memory consumption of dense correlation volume. By reducing the computational and memory overhead, our model can work at a high-resolution and preserve the details of fine-structure. We also show a good trade-off between performance and cost. At the same time, we achieve comparable results with the state-of-the-art methods on public benchmarks and good generalization on different datasets. We believe that our inverse Patchmatch scheme can be used
in more tasks, such as stereo matching, multi-view stereo vi-
ision and so on. In the future, more attention will be paid on
the motion blur, large occlusion and other extreme scenes.
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Appendix

A. Patchmatch in Flow


(a) Random Initialization

(b) Propagation

(c) Random Search

(d) Local Search

Figure A. A toy example for the Patchmatch in flow

In the initialization stage, the flow is initialized either randomly or based on some prior information. A toy example for this stage is shown in Fig. Aa, the flow is initialized randomly. So for a patch represented by the red box with its 4 neighbors represented by the white, blue, yellow and green box respectively in the source image, the random flow relation can be represented as the dotted arrows to the target patches. That is to say, the red box in the source image moves to the red box in the target image with a random flow.

In DIP, the flow is initialized randomly at the beginning and after getting the flow at a 1/16 resolution, we use it as an initial flow at the 1/4 stage.

In the propagation stage, every patch compares the costs of its own flow with that of its neighbors and updates them if the flow of its neighbors lead to a lower cost. As the Fig. Ab shows, after the initialization, for the red box, the flows from itself and its neighbors will be used to compute 5 correlation volume, and it is obvious that the flow candidate from the yellow box results in the maximum correlation. So the flow of the red box will be updated to the flow from the yellow box. In order to make the propagation stage friendly to the end-to-end pipeline, we shift the flow map toward the 4 neighbors(top-left, top-right, bottom-left, bottom-right) so that we can use the flow from the 4 neighbors to compute the corresponding correlation by a vectorization operator. For example, when shifting the flow to the down-right, the point(1,1) will get the flow of point(0,0), the correlation at point(1,1) actually is computed by the flow at point(0,0). After shifting 4 times, we can get 5 correlation coefficients for point(1, 1) based on the flow from point(1, 1), (0,0), (0,2), (2,0), (2,2). Then we can choose the best flow for point(1, 1) according to correlation volume.

The random search step is an essential step to make Patchmatch work. Propagation can converge very quickly but often end up in a local minimum. So it is necessary to introduce new information into the pipeline. In the random search stage, it is achieved by selecting a flow candidate randomly from an interval, whose length decreases exponentially with respect to the number of searches. Just like the Fig. Ab shows, the flow of the red box is updated and is closer to the good match, but it is not the best match. So it is necessary to add the random search stage to get more flow candidates further. As the Fig. Ac shows, the candidates can be searched in the target image by a binary random search method. Centered on the red box, the first random search will be done within the big yellow box whose radius is min(imagewidth/2, imageheight/2), and the better match can be found at the small yellow box(if the small yellow box gets a worse match, the flow won’t be updated). So the next random search will be done centered with the small yellow box within the big white box, and luckily the random search gets the small white box which is much better than the small yellow box and is extremely close to the best match. So after this stage, the flow for the red box is updated to the motion with the small white box which is represented by the white dotted arrows. However, random search is not friendly to the deep learning pipeline. So we replace this stage with a local search method, which aggregates the flow candidates from a 5x5 windows on the 1/16 resolution coarsely and the 1/4 resolution finely. It can be also represented by a toy example shown as the Fig. Ad, the good match can be found by aggregating within the yellow box. And experiments also confirm that this alternative
works well.

It is recommend to refer the work [28], they make a good summary of Patchmatch and application to stereo task.

**B. Domain-invariance in Stereo Matching**

In this supplementary document, we first applied DIP to Stereo to demonstrate the portability. The core of the stereo matching algorithm is to obtain a dense disparity map of a pair of rectified stereo images, where disparity refers to the horizontal relationship between a pair of corresponding pixels on the left and right images. Optical flow and stereo are closely related problems. The difference is that optical flow predicts the displacement of the pixel in the plane, while stereo only needs to estimate the displacement of the pixel in a horizontal line. Therefore, we improved the local search block in DIP to make it more relevant to stereo task. Specifically, we reduced the search range of local search block from 2D search to 1D search. The entire local search block for Stereo is shown in Fig. B.

In the main paper we have proved that inverse patchmatch and local search in optical flow not only obtain high-precision results but also have strong domain-invariance. In the stereo matching experiments, we follow the training strategy of DSMNet [57], which is to train only on the Sceneflow dataset [32], and other real datasets (such as Kitti [13, 33], Middlebury [37], and ETH3D [38]) are used to evaluate the cross-domain generalization ability of the network. Before training, the input images are randomly cropped to 384 × 768, and the pixel intensity is normalized to -1 and 1. We train the model on the Sceneflow dataset for 160K steps with a OneCycle learning rate schedule of initial learning rate is 0.0004.

![Figure B. Local Search block for Stereo.](image)

**Domain-invariance ability** The domain-invariance is an ability that generalizes to unseen data without training. In Tab. A, we compare our DIP with other state-of-the-art deep neural network models on the four unseen real-world datasets. All the models are trained on SceneFlow data. On the KITTI and ETH3D dataset our result far outperforms the previous methods. In the Middlebury dataset, our results only lag behind DSMNet better than all the other methods. Compared to DIP-Flow, DIP-Stereo has more domain-invariance capability, which indicates that our proposed local search block for Stereo is effective in handling Stereo tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>KITTI 2012</th>
<th>KITTI 2015</th>
<th>Middlebury half</th>
<th>Middlebury quarter</th>
<th>ETH3D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CostFilter  [18]</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PatchMatch  [6]</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGM [15]</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training set</td>
<td>Sceneflow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD3 [55]</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSMNet [9]</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwcnct [14]</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GANet [56]</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSMNet [57]</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td><strong>13.8</strong></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFNet [39]</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours-Flow</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours-Stereo</td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A. Comparing with other advanced methods on KITTI, Middlebury and ETH3D training sets. All methods were trained on SceneFlow. Errors are the percent of pixels with end-point-error greater than the specified threshold. We use the standard evaluation thresholds: 3px for KITTI, 2px for Middlebury, 1px for ETH3D.

**C. Adaptive Layers**

Because DIP uses the same process and parameters for each pyramid, we can define any pyramid layers to make predictions, instead of using only two layers pyramid as we trained. Experiments show that when multilayer pyramid prediction is used, a more accurate optical flow can be obtained. Especially for continuous optical flow prediction, the adaptive pyramid layers can be used to obtain better results.

DIP supports initializing optical flow input. In the optical flow prediction of consecutive frames of video, we can take the forward interpolation of the previous result as the initialization input of the current frame. If the maximum displacement of the initialized optical flow is large, the motion of the current frame may also be large, at which point we need to start from a low-resolution layer. And to ensure accuracy, the sampling rate of the pyramid is 2 instead of 4. If previous displacement is very small, the motion of the current frame may also be small, at which point we need only one layer of pyramid prediction. Fig. C shows the comparison between the two-layers pyramid and the adaptive layers pyramid, and both initialize using the "warm-start" strategy.
Two Layers
Adaptive Layers

Figure C. Results compare between fixed two layers and adaptive layers. The two-level pyramid adopts a strategy from 1/16 to 1/4 resolution. The adaptive way adaptively selects the initial resolution according to the initial optical flow, such as 1/16, 1/8, or 1/4 initial resolution.

Figure D. Comparison of results between normal scenes and motion blur scenes. Motion blur causes incorrect optical flow estimation.

D. More Results on High-Resolution

To verify the robustness of optical flow in different high-resolution real-world scenes, we first tested DIP on the free used public dataset\(^1\) with the resolution of 1080 × 1920 and showed results in Fig. E. Then, we further used our mobile phone to collect images with a larger resolution (1536 × 2048) for testing and showed results in Fig. F. Experiments show that even if only virtual data is used for training, DIP still shows strong detail retention ability in high-resolution real-world scenes, which further confirms the strong cross-dataset generalization ability of DIP.

E. Limitations

In the main paper, we observe that DIP is very friendly to the situations on fine-structure motions in the Sintel [7] clean dataset (such as the person in the palace). However, a special weakness of our method is dealing with blurry regions, which is due to the limitations of neighborhood propagation of DIP. The entropy of the propagated information is greatly reduced when the features of the neighborhood are blurred, which leads to a weakening of the overall optical flow quality. An incorrect case is shown in Fig. D. In the Sintel Clean images, DIP is able to estimate the optical flow that takes into account details and large displacement. However, in strong motion blur scenes of Sintel Final data, the propagation of incorrectly matched information in the neighborhood leads to incorrect predictions. In order to solve such problems, a non-local attention mechanism will be introduced in the further works.

\(^1\)https://www.pexels.com/videos/
Figure E. High-resolution optical flow results on public real-world images. The test resolution is $1080 \times 1920$. 
Figure F. High-resolution optical flow results on self-captured images. The test resolution is $1536 \times 2048$