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Abstract—This paper considers outdoor terrain mapping using RGB images obtained from an aerial vehicle. While feature-based localization and mapping techniques deliver real-time vehicle odometry and sparse keypoint depth reconstruction, a dense model of the environment geometry and semantics (vegetation, buildings, etc.) is usually recovered offline with significant computation and storage. This paper develops a joint 2D-3D learning approach to reconstruct a local metric-semantic mesh at each camera keyframe maintained by a visual odometry algorithm. Given the estimated camera trajectory, the local meshes can be assembled into a global environment model to capture the terrain topology and semantics during online operation. A local mesh is reconstructed using an initialization and refinement stage. In the initialization stage, we estimate the mesh vertex elevation by solving a least squares problem relating the vertex barycentric coordinates to the sparse keypoint depth measurements. In the refinement stage, we associate 2D image and semantic features with the 3D mesh vertices using camera projection and apply graph convolution to refine the mesh vertex spatial coordinates and semantic features based on joint 2D and 3D supervision. Quantitative and qualitative evaluation using real aerial images show the potential of our method to support environmental monitoring and surveillance applications.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in sensing, computation, storage and communication hardware have set the stage for mobile robot systems to impact environmental monitoring, security and surveillance, agriculture, and many other applications. Constructing terrain maps onboard an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) using online sensor measurements provides critical situational awareness in such applications. This paper considers the problem of building a metric-semantic terrain model, represented as a triangular mesh, of an outdoor environment using a sequence of overhead RGB images obtained onboard a UAV. Fig. 1 shows an example input and mesh reconstruction. We assume that the UAV is running a localization algorithm, based on visual-inertial odometry (VIO) [1] or simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) [2], which estimates its camera pose and the depths of a sparse set of tracked image keypoints. However, range sensors and, hence, dense depth information are not available during outdoor flight. One approach for terrain mapping is to recover depth images at each camera view using dense stereo matching, fuse them to generate a point cloud, and triangulate a mesh surface. While specialized sensors and algorithms exist for real-time dense stereo matching, they are restricted to a limited depth range, much smaller than the distances commonly present in aerial images. Moreover, due to limited depth variation, the recovered point cloud might not be sufficiently dense for accurate mesh reconstruction. Recently, depth completion methods [3], [4] using deep learning have shown promising performance on indoor [5] and outdoor datasets [6]. However, aerial images are different from ground RGBD images used to train these models. Due to the limited availability of aerial image datasets for supervision, learning-based methods have not yet been widely adopted for outdoor terrain mapping. Recently, there
has also been increasing interest in supplementing geometric reconstruction with semantic information because most of the challenging and meaningful robotics tasks require the semantic understanding of the environment. However, few of semantic reconstruction algorithms are applied on the mesh structure. Most works treat semantic classification as a post-processing step, decoupling it from the 3D geometric reconstruction process. The effect of semantic information on the geometric reconstruction accuracy and vice-versa remains to be analyzed.

This paper is an extension of our 2021 IEEE ICRA conference paper [7] on mesh reconstruction from aerial RGB images and sparse depth measurements. We propose a joint 2D-3D learning method for metric-semantic mesh reconstruction using RGB images and sparse depth measurements. Inspired by depth completion techniques, we propose a novel coarse-to-fine strategy, composed of mesh initialization and mesh refinement stages. In the initialization stage, we use only the sparse depth measurements to fit a coarse mesh surface. In the refinement stage, we extract deep convolutional 2D image features and associate them with the initial mesh 3D vertices through perspective projection. We also extract the mesh vertex semantic features from the 2D semantic segmentation model. The mesh is subsequently refined using a graph convolution model to predict both spatial coordinates and semantic features residuals of the vertices. With the designed 3D geometric surface loss and 2D rendered depth and semantic loss, the unique joint geometric-semantic training both enables per-vertex semantic feature prediction and regularizes the reconstruction of the mesh geometric shape. We conduct extensive evaluation on two realistic aerial datasets. The proposed mesh reconstruction method can be combined with any feature-based SLAM algorithm [8]. Given keyframe poses maintained by the SLAM algorithm, local meshes associated with each keyframe may be fused into a global terrain model.

The main extension of the journal compared to the conference is to introduce semantic information in the mesh reconstruction, which greatly enriches the reconstructed mesh model. Through the extensive experiments, we show that the joint geometric-semantic training can outperform the earlier geometric-only method proposed in the conference paper. We also derive a closed-form approximated solution for the mesh initialization which speeds up the reconstruction process. In summary, the contributions of this paper are as follows.

- We introduce a joint 2D-3D loss function, utilizing differentiable mesh rendering, for metric-semantic mesh reconstruction.
- We develop a two-stage coarse-to-fine mesh reconstruction approach, using a closed-form mesh vertex initialization from sparse depth measurements and a graph convolution network mesh vertex refinement from RGB, sparse depth measurements and semantic image features.
- We evaluate our metric-semantic mesh reconstruction algorithm on two photo-realistic aerial image datasets.

II. RELATED WORK

Depth Completion. Predicting depth from monocular RGB images allows single-camera perception systems to recover 3D environment structure [9], [10]. However, dense depth estimation from monocular images may be challenging, especially for aerial images, where the depth variation is small compared to the absolute depth values. In contrast, the depth of sparse visual keypoints may be obtained efficiently and accurately using triangulation [11] between tracked feature points from Kanade-Lucas-Tomasi tracking [12] or visual feature matching [13]. Depth completion is the task of reconstructing a dense depth image from an RGB image with sparse depth estimates. Ma et al. [3], [14] develop methods for supervised training, relying on ground-truth depth images, as well as self-supervised training, using photometric error from calibrated RGB image pairs. Chen et al. [15] pre-process sparse depth images by generating a Euclidean distance transform of the keypoint locations and a nearest-neighbor depth fill map. The authors propose a multi-scale deep network that treats depth completion as residual prediction with respect to the nearest-neighbor depth fill maps. Imran et al. [16] represent a depth map as a weighted-sum of pre-defined discretized depth values and learned depth coefficient weights. The depth coefficients are learned using a cross-entropy loss instead of mean-square error, which avoids depth mixing and separates foreground objects from the background. Chen et al. [4] design a 2D convolution branch to process stacked RGB and sparse depth images and a 3D convolution branch to process point clouds and fuse the outputs of the two branches. CodeVIO [17] uses a Conditional Variational Autoencoder (CVAE) to encode RGB and sparse depth inputs into a latent depth code and decode a dense depth image from the latent depth code. CodeVIO also uses the sparse depth measurements to perform incremental depth code updates, allowing the depth reconstruction to be coupled with visual odometry estimation in the MSCKF filter [18]. We approach depth completion using mesh reconstruction from RGB images and sparse depth measurements. While both dense depth completion and mesh reconstruction are challenging, a mesh model is more memory efficient than a depth image.

Mesh Reconstruction. Online terrain mapping requires efficient storage and updates of a 3D surface model. Storing dense depth information from aerial images requires significant memory and subsequent model reconstruction. An explicit surface representation using a polygonal mesh may be quite memory and computationally efficient but the vertices and faces need to be optimized to fit the environment geometry. FLaME [19] performs non-local variational optimization over a time-varying Delaunay graph to obtain a real-time inverse-depth mesh of the environment, using sparse depths from a VIO algorithm. Rosinol et al. [20] extend FLaME to optimize the mesh over dense depth image measurements in real-time with parallel implementation. Rosinol et al. detect vertical and horizontal planes to regularize mesh vertices [21], and optimize the mesh vertices and the camera poses using a factor graph. Voxelblx [22] incrementally builds a voxel-based truncated signed distance field and may generate a mesh reconstruction as a post-processing step using the Marching Cubes algorithm [23]. Terrain Fusion [24] performs real-time terrain mapping by generating digital surface model (DSM) meshes at selected keyframes. The local meshes are
converted into grid-maps and merged using multi-band fusion. Recently, learning methods have emerged as promising approaches for mesh reconstruction from limited or no 3D information. Bloesch et al. [25] propose a learning method to regress the image coordinates and depth of mesh vertices in a decoupled manner. This allows an in-plane 2D mesh to capture the image structure. Pixel2Mesh [26] treats a mesh as a graph and applies graph convolution [27] for vertex feature extraction and graph unpooling to subdivide the mesh for detailed refinement. Using differentiable mesh rendering [28], [29], the 3D mesh structure of an object can be learned from 2D images [30]–[32]. Mesh R-CNN [33] simultaneously detects objects and reconstructs their 3D mesh shape. A coarse voxel representation is predicted first and then converted into a mesh for refinement. Recent works [34], [35] can generate mesh reconstructions of complete scenes, including object and human meshes and their poses, from a single RGB image. In contrast with many mesh reconstruction approaches, our method uses visual and semantic features to refine the mesh geometry and generates mesh models with per-vertex semantic category distributions.

Semantic 3D Reconstruction. Semantic 3D reconstruction aims to estimate both the geometric structure and semantic content of a 3D environment from visual observations. Extending 2D semantic segmentation and depth prediction to a 3D multi-view consistent metric-semantic model is important in navigation and manipulation applications for ground mobile robots as well as in environmental monitoring and surveillance applications for aerial mobile robots. Valentín et al. [36] build a mesh from depth images or feature matching and bundle adjustment on image sequence. Then they learn mesh faces semantic labels using both geometric cues from the mesh and visual cues from RGB images. Häne et al. [37] formulate a joint segmentation and dense reconstruction problem using a voxel-based model and show that appearance likelihoods and class-specific geometric priors help each other. Kimera [38] is a metric-semantic visual-inertial SLAM system that annotates a 3D mesh reconstructed from a signed distance field [22] with semantic categories from 2D pixel-wise semantic segmentation. Leotta et al. [39] provide RGB, digital surface model, and normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) images generated from satellite images to a semantic segmentation model for building and bridge recognition. Wei et al. [40] combine a learning-based multi-view stereo (MVS) method to estimate depth maps for multiple images with a 2D segmentation model to obtain a semantic point-cloud reconstruction from aerial images. Herb et al. [41] achieve dense semantic mesh reconstruction from monocular video using semantic image segmentation and learned depth prediction. Each mesh surface is assigned with a semantic label and incremental fusion is performed to merge the current local mesh to the global mesh. Our approach is most closely related to the concurrent work on semantic mesh mapping [41]. Our formulation utilizes sparse depth measurements obtained from keyframe-based SLAM and emphasizes the interaction of geometric reconstruction and semantic segmentation in 3D reconstruction.

III. Problem Formulation

Consider a UAV equipped with an RGB camera flying outdoor. Let I denote an RGB image. Obtaining dense depth images during outdoor flight is challenging due to the large distances and relative small variation. However, a VIO or SLAM algorithm can track and estimate the depth of a sparse set of image feature points. Let D∗ be a sparse matrix that contains estimated depths at the image feature locations and zeros everywhere else. Let D denote the dense ground-truth depth image. Let S denote an associated ground-truth semantic segmentation image. Assuming there are s semantic classes in total, we model S as a tensor with the same width and height as the RGB image I and depth s. Each element S\textsubscript{i,j} ∈ [0, 1]\textsuperscript{s} is a one-hot vector with 0s in all elements, except for a single 1 indicating the true semantic class.

Our goal is to construct an explicit model of the camera view using a 3D semantic triangle mesh M := (V, C, E, F), where V ∈ \mathbb{R}^{n×3} are the vertex spatial coordinates, C ∈ \mathbb{R}^{n×s} are the vertex semantic features, \{1, \ldots, n\} is the set of vertex indices, E ⊆ [n] × [n] are the edges, and F ⊆ [n] × [n] × [n] are the faces. Each row of the vertex semantic features C is the unnormalized score vector for the s classes and we can derive a probability distribution vector over the s classes using the softmax function [42].

Problem. Given a finite set of RGB images \{I\}_k and corresponding sparse depth measurements \{D\}_k, define a semantic mesh reconstruction function M = f(I, D∗; \theta) and optimize its parameters \theta to fit the ground-truth depth \{D\}_k and semantic segmentation \{S\}_k, images:

\[
\min_\theta \sum_k \ell(f(I, D^*_k, \theta); D_k, S_k)
\]

where \ell(M; D, S) is a loss function measuring the error between a 3D semantic mesh M and a depth image D plus a semantic image S.

The choice of loss function \ell is discussed in Sec. IV. We develop a machine learning approach consisting of an offline training phase and an online mesh reconstruction phase. During training, the parameters \theta are optimized using a training set \mathcal{D} := \{I_k, D^*_k, D_k, S_k\}_k with known ground-truth depth images and semantic segmentation images. During testing, given streaming RGB images I and sparse depth measurements D∗, the optimized parameters \theta are used to construct mesh models M = f(I, D∗; \theta∗). When running a keyframe-based VIO or SLAM, we can get the keyframe position p and orientation R as well as the sparse depth measurements associated with the keyframe. We can first build a local mesh M = (V, C, E, F) for the keyframe and then convert it to the global frame by transforming the vertex coordinates to VR\textsuperscript{T} + 1p\textsuperscript{T}. Multiple meshes in the world frame can be assembled [43] to obtain a complete metric-semantic model of the environment.

IV. Loss Functions for Mesh Reconstruction

We develop several loss functions to measure the consistency between a semantic mesh M and corresponding depth
its minimization over $\rho$

Fig. 2: Loss function visualization: $\ell_2$ compares rendered mesh depth $\rho_D(M)$ to a depth image $D$, $\ell_3$ compares a mesh $M$ to an elevated mesh $M_D$ obtained from a depth image, and $\ell_S$ compares a rendered mesh semantic image $\rho_S(M)$ to a semantic segmentation image $S$.

image $D$ and semantic segmentation image $S$. Since our problem focuses on optimizing the mesh, the loss function must be differentiable with respect to the mesh vertex spatial coordinates $V$ and semantic features $C$. We keep the mesh edges $E$ and faces $F$ fixed during the mesh optimization.

A loss function can be defined in the 2D image plane by rendering a depth image from $M$ and comparing it with $D$. The differentiable mesh renderer [44], [45] makes the 3D mesh rendering, e.g., from a 3D mesh to a 2D image, differentiable. Therefore, we can back-propagate the loss measured on the 2D images to the 3D mesh vertices. We leverage a differentiable mesh renderer to generate a depth image $\rho_D(M)$ and define a 2D loss function:

$$\ell_2(M, D) := \text{mean}(|\rho_D(M) - D|),$$

where $\text{mean}(\cdot)$ is a function taking the mean over all the valid pixels where both $D$ and $\rho_D(M)$ have a depth value.

While $\ell_2$ is a natural choice of a loss function in the image plane, it does not emphasize two important properties for mesh reconstruction. First, since $\ell_2$ only considers a region in the image plane where both depth images have valid information, its minimization over $M$ may encourage the mesh $M$ to shrink to cover only a smaller image region. Second, $\ell_2$ does not emphasize regions of large depth gradient variation (e.g., the side surface of a building), which may lead to inaccurate 3D reconstruction. To address these limitations, we define an additional loss function in the 3D spatial domain using two point clouds $P_M$ and $Q_D$ obtained from $M$ and $D$, respectively:

$$\ell_3(M, D) := \frac{1}{2}d(P_M, Q_D) + \frac{1}{2}d(Q_D, P_M),$$

where $d$ is the asymmetric Chamfer point-cloud distance:

$$d(P, Q) := \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{p \in P} \|p - \arg\min_{q \in Q} \|p - q\|_2\|_2.$$ (4)

To generate $P_M$, we sample the faces of $M$ uniformly using PyTorch3D library [45]. The loss function is differentiable with respect to the mesh vertices because the samples on the mesh faces can be represented as linear combinations of the mesh vertices using the barycentric coordinate introduced in Sec. V-A. To generate $Q_D$, we may sample the depth image $D$ uniformly and project the samples to 3D space but this will not generate sufficient samples in the regions of large depth gradient variation. Instead, we first generate a pseudo ground-truth mesh $M_D$ by densely sampling pixel locations in $D$ as the mesh vertices and triangulating on the image plane to generate faces. We then sample the surface of $M_D$ uniformly to obtain $Q_D$.

We also define two regularization terms to measure the smoothness of the mesh $M$. The first is based on the Laplacian matrix $L := G - A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of $M$, where $G$ is the vertex degree matrix and $A$ is the adjacency matrix. We define a vertex regularization term based on the $\ell_2,1$-norm [46] of the degree-normalized Laplacian [47] $L_n = G^{-1}L = I_n - G^{-1}A$:

$$\ell_V(M) := \frac{1}{n} \| L_n V \|_{2,1},$$ (5)

where $n$ is the number of vertices. We also introduce a mesh edge regularization term to discourage long edges in the mesh

$$\ell_E(M) := \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \| v_i - v_j \|_2,$$ (6)

where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are the coordinates of the $i$-th mesh vertex.

We also define a semantic loss function that relates the 3D mesh semantic information to the 2D semantic segmentation image by rendering the semantic mesh similar to (2). We define a differentiable semantic rendering function $\rho_S(M)$ which can generate a same-sized image as $S$ with $s$ channels, where $s$ is the number of semantic classes. At each pixel, the $s$-dimensional vector stores the unnormalized scores representing the likelihoods of the $s$ classes. We use a softmax function [42] $\sigma_s(x) = \exp(x_i) / \sum_{j=1}^s \exp(x_j)$ to compute the probability distribution over the $s$ classes $\sigma(\rho_S(M))$. For the semantic segmentation task, we choose the Dice loss [48] :

$$\ell_S(M, S) := -\frac{2|\sigma(\rho_S(M)) \cdot S|}{|\sigma(\rho_S(M))| + |S|},$$ (7)

where $|\cdot|$ sums up all the absolute values of the elements. Note that $S$ contains one-hot vectors while $|\sigma(\rho_S(M))|$ stores probability vectors for the $s$ classes. Therefore, $|\sigma(\rho_S(M))| \cdot S$ is the probabilistic intersection between two semantic segmentation images. Finally, we apply Laplacian smoothing (5) to the vertex semantic features:

$$\ell_C(M) := \frac{1}{n} \| L_n C \|_{2,1}.$$ (8)
The complete loss function is:
\[
\ell(M, D, S) := w_2 \ell_2(M, D) + w_3 \ell_3(M, D) + w_V \ell_V(M) + w_C \ell_C(M)
\]
where the first two terms evaluate the error between \(M\) and \(D\), the following two terms encourage smoothness of the mesh structure, and the last two terms evaluate the error between \(M\) and \(S\) and regularize the semantic features, which affects both the geometric and semantic properties of the mesh. The scalars \(w_2, w_3, w_V, w_S, w_C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\) allow appropriate weighting of the different terms in (9). Fig. 2 illustrates the loss functions \(\ell_2\) in (2), \(\ell_3\) in (3), and \(\ell_S\) in (7).

V. 2D-3D LEARNING FOR SEMANTIC MESH RECONSTRUCTION

Inspired by depth completion techniques, we approach mesh reconstruction in two stages: initialization and refinement. In the initialization stage, we generate a mesh from the sparse depth measurements alone (Sec. V-A). In the refinement stage, we optimize the mesh vertex coordinates based on RGB image features (Sec. V-B) and assign semantic categories to each vertex using image segmentation features (Sec. V-C). An overview of our semantic mesh reconstruction model \(M = f(I, D^*; \theta)\) is shown in Fig. 3.

A. Mesh Initialization

Outdoor terrain structure can be viewed as a 2.5-D surface that is mostly flat with occasional height variations. Hence, we initialize a flat mesh and change the surface elevation based on the sparse depth measurements. The flat mesh is initialized with regular-grid vertices (1024 in our experiments) over the whole X-Y image plane, orthogonal to the gravity direction (Z axis). See Fig. 4 for an illustration. Subsequently, our mesh reconstruction approach only optimizes the mesh vertices and keeps the edge and face topology fixed. We initialize the vertex heights based on the sparse depth measurements \(D^*\) by solving an optimization problem with a weighted combination of the 2D rendered depth loss \(\ell_2\) in (2) and the Laplacian loss \(\ell_V\) in (5) as the objective function:

\[
V^* = \arg \min_V w_2 \ell_2(M(V), D^*) + w_V \ell_V(M(V)).
\]
The initialized mesh $M^{\text{init}} = (V^*, \emptyset)$ is used as an input to the mesh refinement stage, described in Sec. V-B, V-C. Since we do not update $E, F$, we will omit them for simplicity.

We obtain a closed-form approximate solution to the mesh initialization problem in (10). We constrain the mesh vertex deformation to the $z$-axis to change the vertex heights only. The coordinates of the $i$-th vertex of the flat mesh, $v_i = [v_i^x, v_i^y, 1]$, are divided by a scalar inverse depth $\lambda_i$ to obtain the $i$-th vertex coordinates $[v_i^x/\lambda_i, v_i^y/\lambda_i, 1/\lambda_i]$ of the initialized mesh. We concatenate all $\lambda_i$ to obtain a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of all vertex inverse depths. Any point $p$ on the mesh surface that lies in a specific triangle can be represented as a convex combination $p = b_i v_i + b_j v_j + b_k v_k$ of the triangle vertices $v_i, v_j, v_k$ with weights $b_i, b_j, b_k \in [0, 1]$ such that $b_i + b_j + b_k = 1$. The vector $[b_i, b_j, b_k]^\top$ is called the barycentric coordinates of $p$. Barycentric coordinates are useful for interpolating vertex properties. We use barycentric coordinates to relate the sparse depth measurements $D^s$ to the vertex inverse depths $\lambda$. Let the valid measurements in the sparse depth image $D^s$ be $\{(i,j), D^s_{ij}\}$, where $(i,j)$ are the pixel coordinates and $D^s_{ij}$ are the corresponding depth measurements. Each pixel $(i,j)$ falls within one triangle of the flat 2D mesh (see Fig. 4). Let $b_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the barycentric coordinates of pixel $(i,j)$, where at most three elements of $b_{ij}$, corresponding to the three triangle vertices, are non-zero. The inverse depth $1/D^s_{ij}$ is related to the vertex inverse depths $\lambda$ through the barycentric coordinates [49], $b_{ij}^\top \lambda = 1/D^s_{ij}$. Stacking these equations for all valid pixels $(i,j)$ in $D^s$, we obtain:

$$B\lambda = \rho,$$

where $\rho$ is a vector of the valid inverse depth measurements in $D^s$ with elements $1/D^s_{ij}$. To capture the Laplacian regularization in (5), we can add a linear equality constraint $L_n \lambda = 0$. Now, we can formulate a least-squares problem that is almost equivalent to (10), except that the 1-norm used in the 2D loss $\ell_2$ in (2) is replaced with a 2-norm and we use inverse depth instead:

$$\lambda^* = \arg\min_{\lambda} \|B\lambda - \rho\|_2^2 + \omega \|L_n \lambda\|_2^2.$$  

The problem in (12) has a closed-form solution:

$$\lambda^* = (B^\top B + \omega \lambda L_n \lambda_n)^{-1} B^\top \rho.$$  

The regularization term guarantees that the solution exists even when the number of sparse depth measurements is smaller than the number of mesh vertices. Since the 2D mesh projection and $L_n$ are pre-defined, the problem can be solved very efficiently, in less than 0.1 sec for a mesh with 1024 vertices. Given $\lambda^*$, we obtain an initialized mesh $M^{\text{init}}$ with vertex coordinates $[v_i^x/\lambda_i^*, v_i^y/\lambda_i^*, 1/\lambda_i^*]$.

**B. Geometric Mesh Refinement**

Initialization using the sparse depth measurements only provides a reasonable mesh reconstruction but many details are missing. In the geometric refinement stage, we use a learning approach to extract features from both the 2D image and 3D initial mesh and regress mesh vertex spatial coordinate residuals. The ground-truth depth maps are used for supervision.

The photometric image information is useful for mesh refinement since man-made objects have sharp vertical surfaces, while natural terrain has noisy but limited depth variation. The sparse depth measurements also provide information about areas with large intensity variation. Inspired by Mesh R-CNN [33], we design a network that extracts features from the 2D image, associates them with the 3D vertices of the initial mesh, and uses them to refine the vertex spatial coordinates. Our network has 3 stages: feature extraction, vertex-image feature alignment, and vertex graph convolution.

**Feature Extraction.** We extract features from three sources: the RGB image $I$, the rendered depth $\rho_D(M^{\text{init}})$ from the initial mesh, and a Euclidean distance transform (EDT) $E(D^s)$ of the sparse depth measurements, obtained by computing the Euclidean distance to the closest valid depth measurement from each pixel. The three images are concatenated to form a 5-channel 2D input:

$$F_{2D} = \text{concat}(I, \rho_D(M^{\text{init}}), E(D^s)).$$  

We use ResNet-18 [50] to extract 2D image features. Four layers of features with different resolution and channels are extracted:

$$[L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4] = \phi_{\text{res}}(F_{2D}),$$

where $\phi_{\text{res}}$ is the ResNet-18 model.

**Vertex-Image Feature Alignment.** Next, we construct 3D features for the mesh vertices by projecting each vertex to the image plane and interpolating the 2D image features. This idea is inspired by Pixel2Mesh [26], which projects mesh vertices onto the image plane and extracts features at the projected coordinates. To obtain multi-scale features, we associate the projected mesh vertices with the intermediate layer feature maps $[L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4]$ from (15). The vertex-image alignment step is illustrated in Fig. 5. All features corresponding to different channels are concatenated to form composite vertex features. We define align$(\cdot, \cdot)$ as the function that assigns 2D features to 3D mesh vertices:

$$V_{gn} = \text{align}(M, \phi_{\text{res}}(F_{2D})).$$
where $V_{in} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (l_1 + l_2 + l_3 + l_4)}$ are the vertex features and $l_i$ is the number of channels in feature map $L_i$.

**Vertex Graph Convolution.** After the feature assignment, the mesh can be viewed as a graph with vertex features $V_{in}$. Using the vertex features, a graph convolution network [27], [33] is a suitable architecture to predict coordinate deformation $\Delta V$ for the vertex spatial coordinates to optimize the agreement between the refined mesh $M^{ref} = (V + \Delta V)$ and the ground truth depth $D$ according to the loss in (9). To capture a larger region of feature influence, we use 3 layers of graph convolution $g^1, g^2, g^3$, as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
V^{in}_i &= \text{ReLU}(W^{1Y}_i V_{in}) \\
V^{out}_i &= \text{ReLU}(W^{1Y}_i V^{(1)}), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\
\Delta V &= W^{2Y} [V^{out}_i; V],
\end{align*}
$$

where $\Delta V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 3}$ is the matrix of spatial coordinate residuals, $W^1, W^2$ are two matrices as linear layers. ReLU is Rectified Linear Unit activation function $\text{ReLU}(x) = \max(0, x)$. It is possible to concatenate more stages of vertex-image feature alignment and graph convolution. At stage $i$, the previous stage’s refined mesh $M^{ref}_{i-1}$ is set as the initial mesh $M^{init}_{i}$ and new vertex features are extracted via vertex-image feature alignment and fed to new graph convolution layers. All refined meshes at different stages are evaluated using the ground-truth depth map $D$ using the loss functions defined in (9).

**C. Semantic Mesh Reconstruction**

To further enrich the environment representation, we introduce semantic information in the mesh reconstruction. By assigning per-vertex semantic features $C$, we can interpolate the semantic information over the whole mesh using barycentric coordinates (see Fig. 6). To obtain a 2D semantic segmentation image from the mesh, we use the differentiable semantic renderer $\rho_S$ introduced in (7). Both the vertex spatial coordinates $V$ and the semantic features $C$ can affect the rendered 2D semantic segmentation image $\rho_S(M)$. Hence, by optimizing the semantic loss in (7), we can refine both the semantic features and the geometric structure of the mesh.

We first obtain the 2D semantic segmentation features $\phi_{deep}(I)$ using the DeepLabv3 model [51]. Then, we align the mesh vertices to the 2D semantic feature map to get initial mesh vertex semantic features:

$$
C = \text{align}(M, \phi_{deep}(I)).
$$

Fig. 6 illustrates the mesh vertex alignment with respect to the 2D semantic segmentation features. In the semantic refinement stage, we regress a semantic residual $\Delta C$ for the semantic features. We use 3 layers of graph convolution $g^1, g^2, g^3$. We also use the $V_{in}$ extracted from ResNet-18 in (16) as an input to the first graph convolution layer. Additionally, we concatenate the initial mesh vertex semantic features $C$ in (18) to the graph convolution input:

$$
\begin{align*}
C^{in}_i &= \text{ReLU}(W^C_i V_{in}) \\
C^{out}_i &= C^{in}_i, \quad i = 2, 3, \\
C^{out}_i &= \text{ReLU}(g^i_C([C^{in}_i; V; C])), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\
\Delta C &= W^C_3 [C^{out}_3; V; C],
\end{align*}
$$

where $\Delta C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}$ is the matrix of semantic residuals and $W^C_1, W^C_2, W^C_3$ are two matrices as linear layers.

Now we can perform the joint geometric and semantic refinement. An illustration of the joint geometric and semantic refinement is provided in Fig. 7. For the initial mesh $M(V, 0)$, we first estimate the geometric residuals $\Delta V$ (17) from Sec-V-B. On the geometrically refined mesh $M(V + \Delta V, 0)$, we initialize the semantic features as in (18) to get $M(V + \Delta V, C)$. Then we estimate the semantic residuals $\Delta C$ (19). The final joint geometric and semantic refined mesh is $M^{ref} = (V + \Delta V, C + \Delta C)$.

**VI. EXPERIMENTS**

In this section, we evaluate our metric-semantic mesh reconstruction approach using aerial image sequences from two open-source 3D datasets: WHU MVS/Stereo [53] and SensatUrban [52]. We also conduct ablation studies to show the effectiveness of our choices in the model design.

**A. Datasets**

Our mesh reconstruction approach requires ground-truth depth and semantic segmentation data for supervised learning, which is generally not available and challenging to obtain from RGB aerial images. We used photo-realistic point cloud models covering several km$^2$ reconstructed from real aerial images in WHU MVS/Stereo and SensatUrban dataset to render RGB, depth, and semantic segmentation images. This provides accurate depth and semantic supervision data, while
Fig. 7: Mesh refinement stage: the mesh vertex spatial coordinate are refined to $V + \Delta V$ using graph convolution based on the RGB image features. Then, the semantic features $C$ of the mesh vertices are initialized by projecting the vertices to the image plane and associating them with 2D semantic segmentation feature. Finally, the vertex semantic features are refined to be $C + \Delta C$ using graph convolution.

**TABLE I:** Quantitative evaluation on the WHU dataset [53]. The second column shows the number of available sparse depth measurements per image and indicates whether the measurements are noisy (Sec. VI-A). The $SD$-tri method triangulates a mesh using all the sparse depth measurements as vertices. The Regular-$n$ model generates a regular mesh with $n$ vertices and performs initialization and refinement steps as we propose in Sec. V. The $Initialized$ model constructs a mesh from the sparse depth (Sec. V-A). The RGB, RGB+RD, RGB+RD+EDT methods refine the initialized mesh (Sec. V-B), using different inputs respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Meshing</th>
<th>SD-tri</th>
<th>Regular-576</th>
<th>Regular-1024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>(vert = SD)</td>
<td>Initialized RGB+RD</td>
<td>RGB+RD+EDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell_2$</td>
<td>500 w/o noise</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>1.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 w/o noise</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>1.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 w/o noise</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>1.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 w/o noise</td>
<td>6.494</td>
<td>17.762</td>
<td>12.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8: Left: Camera trajectory used to render RGBD images from a point cloud model generated from the SensatUrban dataset [52]. Right: Sparse depth points and camera poses estimated by ORB-SLAM3 [8]. The color indicate elevation.

keeping the RGB images realistic, which is important for real-world applications of our model. We divide the large point cloud model into different regions and generate different image sequences over them. Each camera trajectory follows a sweeping grid-pattern, which is common in drone flight planning (see Fig. 8). The camera trajectories are chosen to ensure enough image overlap for tracking and sparse depth reconstruction. RGBD images with resolution $512 \times 512$ are rendered along the trajectory from the ground-truth point cloud using PyTorch3D [45]. We keep the RGB aerial image resolution at around $0.2$ meter/pixel. When semantic labels are available in the point cloud model, we also render semantic segmentation images with the same size as the RGBD images.

**WHU.** The WHU MVS/Stereo dataset [53] provides geolocalized RGBD images rendered from a highly accurate 3D digital surface model of a $6.7 \times 2.2$ km$^2$ area over Meitan County, Guizhou Province, China. The 3D DSM model is not publicly available, so we recover a dense point cloud from the RGBD images as a ground-truth 3D model. Semantic labels are also not available in this dataset so we only perform geometric reconstruction using the WHU dataset. We obtain sparse depth measurements $D_s$ for each image by applying OpenSfM [54] to its four neighbor images with known camera intrinsic and extrinsic parameters. Since monocular SiM suffers from scale ambiguity, we rescale the reconstructed point cloud obtained from OpenSfM to align it with the real 3D model. In reality the scale can be recovered from other sensor measurements like GPS or IMU. The point features reconstructed by OpenSiM are treated as sparse noisy depth measurements. The noise is due to feature detection and matching as well as the bundle adjustment step. We also obtain noiseless depth measurements with the same 2D sparsity pattern from the ground-truth depth images $D$. We vary the

Fig. 10: Reconstructed meshes painted with RGB texture and colors indicating elevations. These are associated with the first two rows in Fig. 9. The sharp vertical transitions of the buildings are reconstructed accurately.

Fig. 11: Complete environment model obtained by transforming to the global frame and merging local meshes from 12 camera views.

number of available sparse depth measurements as 500, 1000, 2000. We generate 20 camera trajectory sequences with 200 images in each sequence, split into 14 for training, 2 for validation, and 4 for testing. The sequences can be found in the Supplementary Material.

SensatUrban. The SensatUrban dataset [52] is a point-cloud dataset obtained using photogrammetry in two urban areas in Birmingham and Cambridge, UK. Each 3D point in the dataset is labeled as one of 13 semantic classes. The Birmingham region covers an area of 1.2 km². The Cambridge region covers an area of 3.2 km². We only use the training set part of the data because point-cloud semantic labels are available. We keep 4 semantic categories (ground, vegetation, building, and traffic road) and merge or discard the remaining less-frequent categories. We used monocular ORB-SLAM3 [8] to estimate the camera poses and sparse feature depths on the SensatUrban dataset. Compared with OpenSfM, ORB-SLAM3 performs sequential optimization of the image sequences, instead of looping over all the images to find matching pairs. As a result, it runs faster (1-10 Hz) and may be deployed on an aerial robot directly. We also re-scale the reconstructed point-cloud and camera poses to align with the real 3D model. Finally, we project the point cloud to each camera frame to derive a sparse depth image. We vary the number of available sparse depth measurements as 500, 1000, 2000, 4000. We generate 13 camera trajectory sequences with 660 images in each sequence, split into 8 for training, 2 for validation, and 3 for testing. The sequences can be found in the Supplementary Material.

B. Implementation Details

During training, we use 1000 sparse depth measurements per image and generate a mesh model with 576/1024/2025 vertices. The ResNet-18 and GCN parameters of our model are optimized jointly during the mesh refinement training using the Adam optimizer [55] with initial learning rate of 0.0005 for 100 epochs. For the WHU dataset, the weights of the loss function in (9) are set to \([w_2, w_3, w_v, w_e, w_g, w_C] = [3, 1, 0.5, 0.01, 0, 0]\). For the SensatUrban dataset, the weights are set to \([w_2, w_3, w_v, w_e, w_g, w_C] = [5, 1, 0.5, 0.01, 5, 0.5]\) for the joint geometric-semantic training (Sec. V-C). For the geometric training (Sec. V-B), the last two weights are set to be 0. The Chamfer distance \(d\) in the \(\ell_3\) loss (3) is computed using 10000 point samples. For the semantic reconstruction task, we first train a DeepLabv3 [51] model alone for 2D
Fig. 12: Mesh reconstructions on SensatUrban dataset [52] visualized as rendered depth (colors indicate the relative depth values) and semantic images. The original 3D model is not fully complete so the RGB, GT Depth and GT Semantic may have little missing region. Column 1: RGB images. Column 2: sparse depth measurements (1000). Column 3: meshes reconstructed from sparse-depth triangulation. Column 4: meshes after initialization (Sec.V-A). Column 5: meshes after neural network refinement (Sec.V-B). Column 6: ground-truth depth images. Column 7: 2D semantic segmentation results. Column 8: meshes after neural network refinement (Sec.V-C). Column 9: ground-truth semantic segmentation maps.

Fig. 13: Reconstructed meshes painted with colors indicating elevations and semantic labels. These are associated with the three rows in Fig. 12. Column 1: initialized meshes. Column 2: refined meshes colored by elevation. Column 3: refined meshes colored by semantic categories.

Fig. 12: Mesh reconstructions on SensatUrban dataset [52] visualized as rendered depth (colors indicate the relative depth values) and semantic images. The original 3D model is not fully complete so the RGB, GT Depth and GT Semantic may have little missing region. Column 1: RGB images. Column 2: sparse depth measurements (1000). Column 3: meshes reconstructed from sparse-depth triangulation. Column 4: meshes after initialization (Sec.V-A). Column 5: meshes after neural network refinement (Sec.V-B). Column 6: ground-truth depth images. Column 7: 2D semantic segmentation results. Column 8: meshes after neural network refinement (Sec.V-C). Column 9: ground-truth semantic segmentation maps.

Fig. 13: Reconstructed meshes painted with colors indicating elevations and semantic labels. These are associated with the three rows in Fig. 12. Column 1: initialized meshes. Column 2: refined meshes colored by elevation. Column 3: refined meshes colored by semantic categories.

C. WHU - Geometric Reconstruction

Our experiments report the $\ell_2$ error in (2) and the $\ell_3$ error in (3) for the reconstructed meshes. The $\ell_2$ error emphasizes the accuracy of the projected depth, while $\ell_3$ emphasizes the regions of large depth variation.

For comparison, we define a baseline method that triangulates the sparse depth measurements directly to build a mesh. The baseline method performs Delaunay triangulation on the 2D image plane over the depth measurements and projects the flat mesh to 3D using the measured vertex depths. We refer to the baseline method as sparse-depth-triangulation (SD-tri). SD-tri defines vertices at all sparse depth measurements (500, 1000, or 2000) and, hence, may produce meshes with different number of vertices compared to other models.

The quantitative results from the comparison are reported in Table I. All models are trained with 1000 sparse depth measurements and directly generalize to different numbers of sparse depth measurements. We compared three options for the 2D inputs provided to the mesh refinement stage: an RGB image only (RGB, 3-channels), an RGB image plus rendered depth from the initial mesh (RGB+RD, 4-channels), and an RGB image plus rendered depth from the initial mesh plus Euclidean distance transform (EDT) obtained from of the sparse depth measurements (RGB+RD+EDT, 5-channels). The model using RGB-only does not perform as well as the other two. The RGB+RD+EDT model has the best performance according to the $\ell_2$ error metric. The RGB+RD method has similar performance in the $\ell_2$ metric and smaller $\ell_3$ error compared to RGB+RD+EDT. The RGB+RD model is used to generate our qualitative results in Fig. 9, 10, 11 with 1024-
vertex meshes because it offers good performance according to both error metrics.

At the bottom of Table I, we evaluate the mesh reconstruction accuracy when the sparse depth measurements are noisy. The baseline SD-tri method performs well in a noiseless setting but degenerates drastically when noise from the SfM feature reconstruction is introduced. In contrast, our model is more robust to noise due to two factors. First, our mesh initialization and refinement stages both include explicit mesh regularization terms (in (5) and (6)). Second, the image features extracted during the mesh refinement process help distinguish among different terrains and structures. The latter is clear from the improved accuracy of the refined, compared to the initialized, meshes. We also report the performance using a mesh with only 576 vertices. When the depth measurements are noisy, the 576-vertex mesh has lower $\ell_2$ loss compared with the baseline method with similar number of vertices. It even has lower $\ell_3$ loss compared with meshes with more vertices generated from the baseline method.

Qualitative results are presented in Fig. 9 and 10. Compared with SD-tri and initialized meshes, the refined meshes have smoother boundaries on the side surfaces of the buildings. The guidance from the image features allows the refined meshes to fit the 3D structure better. Fig. 11 shows a global mesh reconstruction obtained by transforming and merging 12 camera-view mesh reconstructions. The local meshes are transformed to global frame using the camera keyframe poses and no post-processing is used to merge them into a single global mesh.

**D. SensatUrban - Geometric & Semantic Reconstruction**

On the SensatUrban dataset, we first perform geometric reconstruction with the same settings as in the WHU dataset. We train three models with different numbers of mesh vertices: $576 = 24^2$, $1024 = 32^2$ and $2025 = 45^2$. The quantitative results are reported in Table II. As the number of sparse depth measurements increases, the baseline SD-tri method has better accuracy because the number of mesh vertices also increases. Our initialized meshes with fewer vertices are comparable with the SD-tri mesh, and the refined meshes are much better, especially according to the 3D metric $\ell_3$. This shows that the joint 2D-3D loss in (9) enables our model to capture 3D structure details. Comparing the number of input depth measurements, we find that around 2000 measurements on the $512 \times 512$ image provide the best performance, while more do not noticeably improve the results. Regarding the number of mesh vertices, all three mesh sizes perform well. While we can see that the 1024-vertex mesh is generally better than 576-vertex mesh, the 2025-vertex mesh does not show an advantage over the 1024-vertex mesh. This indicates that good accuracy can be achieved with a light-weight storage-efficient mesh model.

We choose the 1024-vertex mesh to perform joint geometric-semantic reconstruction using 1000 sparse depth measurements. To evaluate the semantic reconstruction, we render a 2D semantic image from the mesh reconstruction and calculate the per-class Intersection over Union (IoU). For comparison, we report the IoU of the DeepLabv3 2D semantic segmentation model (named 2D Seg), the direct projection of the 2D semantic segmentation image onto the initial mesh as in (18) (named Geo Init) and the semantic segmentation projection onto the geometrically-refined mesh (named Geo Refine). Only 2D Seg is using a dense semantic image while the other methods store semantic features on the mesh vertices and interpolate through the semantic mesh renderer. As we can see in Table III, our semantic residual refinement model improves the semantic segmentation performance compared to the direct projection of the 2D semantic segmentation image. Our approach also outperforms 2D Seg on most of the categories (ground, building, traffic Road) even thought it is using only 0.4% of the points to store the semantic information (1024 mesh vertices vs $512 \times 512$ segmentation image). Further, we investigate whether the semantic mesh refinement affects the geometric reconstruction quality. In Table IV, we can see that our joint geometric-semantic mesh reconstruction achieves better geometric accuracy compared with purely geometric training. This can be explained by the fact that the semantic category information serves as regularization for the geometric properties. The results show that the geometric and semantic information help each other. More qualitative results for single-image reconstruction are provided in Fig. 12 and 13. Compared with SD-tri and initialized mesh, the refined mesh achieves higher reconstruction accuracy. The semantic refinement can improve the 2D semantic segmentation results.
TABLE II: Quantitative evaluation on the SensatUrban dataset. The second column shows the number of available sparse depth measurements per image (Sec. VI-A). The baseline SD-tri method triangulates a mesh using all sparse depth measurements as vertices. The Regular-n model generates a regular mesh with \( n \) vertices and performs initialization and refinement steps (Sec. V).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Meshing</th>
<th>SD-tri</th>
<th>Regular-576</th>
<th>Regular-1024</th>
<th>Regular-2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \ell_2 )</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>(vert = SD)</td>
<td>Initialized</td>
<td>Refined</td>
<td>Initialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.843</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1.866</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1.647</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>1.662</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ell_3 )</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8.926</td>
<td>7.898</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>9.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>7.796</td>
<td>6.353</td>
<td>2.185</td>
<td>6.725</td>
<td>1.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6.908</td>
<td>6.176</td>
<td>2.439</td>
<td>5.217</td>
<td>2.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III: Semantic segmentation per-class IoU for different geometric-semantic models. The definitions of the different models can be found in Sec. VI-D and Sec. VI-E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ground</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geo Init</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Refine</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Residual</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Entropy</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaccard</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Model</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV: Geometric error for different geometric-semantic models. The definitions of the different models and loss functions can be found in Sec. VI-D and Sec. VI-E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Depth (( \ell_2 ))</th>
<th>Chamfer (( \ell_3 ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geo Init</td>
<td>1.866</td>
<td>6.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Refine</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Residual</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Entropy</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>1.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaccard</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Model</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that some noisy classification labels are removed after the refinement. In Fig. 14, we reconstruct several local metric-semantic meshes using the sparse depths from the tracked points from ORB-SLAM3. Then we transform them using estimated camera keyframe poses from ORB-SLAM3 to the global frame and combine them to form a global metric-semantic mesh without any further post-processing.

E. Ablation Studies

Sec. VI-C compared the effect of using RGB, rendered depth, and Euclidean distance transform as inputs for the mesh reconstruction model. This section reports additional ablation studies on the SensatUrban dataset. We use a 1024-vertex mesh model and 1000 sparse depth measurements for training and testing. We evaluate the effects of mesh initialization, types of 2D input data, and number of graph convolution stages on the geometric mesh reconstruction accuracy. We also evaluate the performance effect of joint metric-semantic training and the choice of a semantic loss function.

1) Mesh Initialization: An important aspect of our model in Sec. V is the separation of the mesh initialization stage from the mesh refinement stage. The mesh initialization stage allows the data-driven refinement stage to focus on learning the mesh vertex deformation residuals instead of absolute vertex coordinates. To demonstrate the effectiveness of this design, we compare our model to a baseline model which applies the refinement stage directly to a flat initial mesh. The baseline model, Flat Init, deforms a flat initial mesh with vertex depth specified by the mean of the sparse depth measurements. Table V shows that the Flat Init model makes the 2D-3D learning problem challenging, and the model performs even worse than purely geometric initialization as in Sec. V-A.

2) 2D Input Channels: In (14), we concatenate an RGB image \( I \) (RGB), rendered depth \( \rho_d(M^{int}) \) (RD) and a Euclidean distance transform \( E(D^s) \) (EDT) to form a 5-channel input image used for 2D feature extraction. Table V evaluates the role of the different 2D inputs on the overall mesh reconstruction performance. The results indicate that the RGB information plays the most important role in refining the initialized mesh. The model RD+EDT that does not use RGB features performs the worst. Adding RD and EDT inputs to the RGB gives an additional boost to the accuracy.

3) Number of graph convolution stages: Table V also evaluates the effect of one (1 Stage) vs two (Our Model) graph convolution stages in the geometric mesh refinement (Sec. V-B). The first GCN stage contributes the most to the geometric refinement, while the second GCN stage further refines the results.

4) Semantic Refinement: We investigate whether residual learning for the semantic feature prediction of the mesh vertices is important in the joint geometric-semantic refinement stage (Sec. V-C). For comparison, we use a baseline model (w/o Residual) to predict the per-vertex semantic features \( C \), without using 2D segmentation initialization, instead of the residuals \( \Delta C \) in (19). In Table III and IV, we see that the w/o Residual model works well for semantic reconstruction but does not improve the geometric reconstruction error. Hence, residual learning is beneficial for the semantic feature.
estimation too.

5) Semantic Loss Function: Finally, we discuss the choice of a semantic loss function $\ell_S$ in (7). Instead of the Dice loss in (7), three other semantic loss functions may be considered.

- The cross entropy loss is widely used for semantic segmentation. Given two stochastic vectors $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]^s$, the cross entropy loss is defined as:

$$CE(\alpha, \beta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{s} \beta_i \log(\alpha_i),$$

(20)

$\ell_{S1}(M, S):=\text{mean}(CE(\sigma(\rho_S(M)), S))$,

where CE is applied to the elements $\sigma(\rho_{S,i,j}(M)) \in [0, 1]^s$ and $S_{ij} \in [0, 1]^s$ of the tensors of predicted and ground-truth semantic class probabilities.

- The focal loss [56] is a variation of cross entropy, focusing on hard misclassified examples:

$$FL(\alpha, \beta) = -\sum_{i} \beta_i (1 - \alpha_i) \log(\alpha_i),$$

$$\ell_{S2}(M, S):=\text{mean}(FL(\sigma(\rho_S(M)), S)).$$

(21)

- The Jaccard loss [57] measures the negative Intersection over Union (IoU) between the ground-truth and predicted semantic segmentation:

$$\ell_{S3}(M, S):=\frac{-|\sigma(\rho_S(M)) \cdot S|}{|\sigma(\rho_S(M))| + |S| - |\sigma(\rho_S(M)) \cdot S|},$$

(22)

where, as in (7), $| \cdot |$ sums up all the absolute values of the elements.

In Table III, we see that the Jaccard loss in (22) leads to good segmentation performance, outperforming the Dice loss in (7) for some categories. The Cross Entropy and the Focal losses are not as good. In Table IV, we see that the Cross Entropy and the Jaccard loss both outperform the Focal loss when considering their effect on the geometric reconstruction accuracy. The Dice loss leads to the best geometric reconstruction accuracy. Considering the joint geometric and semantic performance, we elected to use the Dice loss for our final model.

F. Memory and Computation Complexity

The reconstructed mesh model is a more efficient representation than a dense depth image. A dense depth image requires $512 \times 512 \approx 0.26M$ parameters and a semantic image also requires the same number of parameters. Our mesh model with fixed face topology only needs storage of the 3D vertex coordinates and the semantic labels. With 1024 vertices, our semantic mesh model requires only 2% of the depth and semantic image parameters to obtain a high-fidelity reconstruction of a camera view. Regarding speed, the mesh initialization and refinement stages at test time take about 0.15 seconds per frame on a desktop computer with an NVIDIA 2080 Ti GPU.

VII. Conclusion

This work introduced an approach for 3D metric-semantic mesh reconstruction from RGB image and sparse depth measurements. Compared to methods that utilize only sparse depth for mesh initialization or triangulation, our approach provides more accurate geometric reconstruction by utilizing RGB image features. Compared to 2D semantic segmentation methods, our semantic reconstruction eliminates classification inaccuracies by inferring an underlying 3D mesh structure. The joint metric-semantic reconstruction approach improves geometric accuracy further by utilizing semantic information and provides memory savings compared to dense image depth and segmentation techniques. Employing our method in combination with feature- and keyframe-based odometry techniques allows reconstruction of global dense metric-semantic mesh models with utility in environmental monitoring and semantic navigation applications.
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