

### Bo Zhang <sup>1</sup>, Jiakang Yuan <sup>2</sup>, Botian Shi <sup>1</sup>, Tao Chen <sup>2</sup>, Yikang Li <sup>1</sup>, Yu Qiao <sup>1</sup>







### >Multi-dataset Domain Fusion:

- To learn robust representations that can generalize on multiple 3D perception datasets or tasks.
- To improve the reusability across different 3D datasets or domains or different manufacturers.
- To design an effective module which can easily be integrated into the existing 3D models such as PV-RCNN to enable them to train from multidatasets.



Figure 1. Challenges in training a detector from multiple datasets: 1) Only Waymo and Only nuScenes refer to the baseline detector trained on each individual dataset. 2) Direct Merging represents that we simply merge Waymo and nuScenes and train the detector on the merged dataset. 3) Ours denotes that the baseline detector is trained using the proposed method on the merged dataset.



### ≻Major Challenges:

- Point Range is different for different dataset
- ROI-size is different for different dataset



Figure 2. The statistical distribution differences of object size (Length, Width, and Height) across different datasets. For better illustrate the differences, we pick up the values within the range of [2.0, 7.0], [1.0, 3.0], and [0.5, 3.0] for Length, Width, and Height.

Datasets	Beam	VFOV	Point Range	Collection Location
			L=[-75.2, 75.2]m	
Waymo [21]	64	$[-18.0^{\circ}, 2.0^{\circ}]$	W=[-75.2, 75.2]m	USA
			H=[-2.0, 4.0]m	
			L=[0.0, 70.4]m	
KITTI [5]	64	$[-23.6^{\circ}, 3.2^{\circ}]$	W=[-40.0, 40.0]m	Germany
			H=[-3.0, 1.0]m	
			L=[-51.2, 51.2]m	
nuScenes [1]	32	$[-30.0^{\circ}, 10.0^{\circ}]$	W=[-51.2, 51.2]m	USA&Singapore
			H=[-5.0, 3.0]m	

Table 1. Overview of 3D autonomous driving dataset differences. VFOV denotes vertical field of view, and L, W, and H represent the length, width, and height of LiDAR range, respectively.

#### Standard dimensions of car parking spaces



Parallel parking space :

Width = 🜉 European / 💥 U.K. : 2,44 meters ; 💭 U.S. Compact : 8 ft ; 💭 U.S. Standard : 8'6" ; 💭 U.S. Standard Large : 9 ft Length = 🗃 European / 💥 U.K. : 4,88 meters ; 💭 U.S. Compact : 16 ft ; 💭 U.S. Standard : 18 ft ; 💭 U.S. Standard Large : 20 ft Minimum height = 📷 European : 2,13 meters ; 💭 U.S. Compact : 7 ft.



#### > Performance Drop with Inconsistent Point Range:



Methods	Waymo Range	KITTI Range	tested on Waymo	tested on KITTI	
Wiethous	waymo Range	Rifficunge	AP <sub>3d</sub> / APH <sub>3D</sub>	AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub>	
	L=[-75.2, 75.2]m	L=[0.0, 70.4]m			
Not Align.	W=[-75.2, 75.2]m	W=[-40.0, 40.0]m	26.93 / 26.56	89.56 / 83.14	
Not Alight $W = [-75.2, 75.2]$ M $W = [-40.0, 40.0]$ M $H = [-2.0, 4.0]$ M $H = [-3.0, 1.0]$ M $H = [-75.2, 75.2]$ M $H = [-75.2, 75.2]$ M $M = [-75.2, 75.2]$ M $W = [-75.2, 75.2]$ M $H = [-2.0, 4.0]$ M $H = [-2.0, 4.0]$ M					
	L=[-75.2, 75.2]m	L=[-75.2, 75.2]m			
Align. (w/ ours)	W=[-75.2, 75.2]m	W=[-75.2, 75.2]	74.83 / 74.33	<b>90.03</b> / 82.39	
-	H=[-2.0, 4.0]m	H=[-2.0, 4.0]			
N	C D		tested on nuScenes	tested on KITTI	
Methods	nuScenes Range	KITTI Range	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub>	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub>	
Methods	nuScenes Range L=[-51.2, 51.2]m	KITTI Range L=[0.0, 70.4]m	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub>	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub>	
Methods Not Align.	nuScenes Range L=[-51.2, 51.2]m W=[-51.2, 51.2]m	KITTI Range L=[0.0, 70.4]m W=[-40.0, 40.0]m	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 21.32 / 15.35	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 89.35 / 81.66	
Methods Not Align.	nuScenes Range L=[-51.2, 51.2]m W=[-51.2, 51.2]m H=[-5.0, 3.0]m	KITTI Range L=[0.0, 70.4]m W=[-40.0, 40.0]m H=[-3.0, 1.0]m	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 21.32 / 15.35	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 89.35 / 81.66	
Methods Not Align.	nuScenes Range L=[-51.2, 51.2]m W=[-51.2, 51.2]m H=[-5.0, 3.0]m L=[-75.2, 75.2]m	KITTI Range L=[0.0, 70.4]m W=[-40.0, 40.0]m H=[-3.0, 1.0]m L=[-75.2, 75.2]m	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 21.32 / 15.35	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 89.35 / 81.66	
Methods Not Align. Align. (w/ ours)	nuScenes Range L=[-51.2, 51.2]m W=[-51.2, 51.2]m H=[-5.0, 3.0]m L=[-75.2, 75.2]m W=[-75.2, 75.2]m	KITTI Range L=[0.0, 70.4]m W=[-40.0, 40.0]m H=[-3.0, 1.0]m L=[-75.2, 75.2]m W=[-75.2, 75.2]m	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 21.32 / 15.35 <b>59.25 / 41.51</b>	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 89.35 / 81.66 <b>90.09 / 83.10</b>	
Methods Not Align. Align. (w/ ours)	nuScenes Range L=[-51.2, 51.2]m W=[-51.2, 51.2]m H=[-5.0, 3.0]m L=[-75.2, 75.2]m W=[-75.2, 75.2]m H=[-2.0, 4.0]m	KITTI Range L=[0.0, 70.4]m W=[-40.0, 40.0]m H=[-3.0, 1.0]m L=[-75.2, 75.2]m W=[-75.2, 75.2]m H=[-2.0, 4.0]m	tested on nuScenes AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 21.32 / 15.35 <b>59.25 / 41.51</b>	tested on KITTI AP <sub>BEV</sub> / AP <sub>3D</sub> 89.35 / 81.66 <b>90.09 / 83.10</b>	

Table 2. Inconsistent LiDAR ranges will cause the multi-dataset detection accuracy drop. The baseline employs Voxel-RCNN [4], and please refer to Appendix for all-category results.



≻Major Challenges:

- Cross-dataset Point Data Distribution Differences
- Cross-dataset Semantic
   Taxonomy Differences



≻Our Solution:

- <u>Statistics-level Alignment:</u> We design a dataset-specific BN layer that can replace BN module in 3D or 2D Backbone, to achieve an effective distribution of point cloud representations.
- <u>Taxonomy-level Alignment:</u> We design a Semantic-level Feature Coupling-and-Recoupling (C.R.) module that insert the off-the-shelf 3D detector to achieve the taxonomy-level alignment.

#### ≻Uni3D Framework



Figure 3. The overview of Uni3D including: 1) point range alignment, 2) parameter-shared 3D and 2D backbones with data-level correction operation, 3) semantic-level feature coupling-and-recoupling module, and 4) dataset-specific detection heads. C.A. denotes Coordinate-origin Alignment to reduce the adverse effects caused by point range alignment, and S.A. is the designed Statistics-level Alignment.

#### Based on 3DTrans Codebase

#### Semantic-level Feature Coupling-and-Recoupling (C.R.) :

$$f_{cat}^{bev} = [f_i^{bev}, ..., f_j^{bev}],$$
  

$$\hat{f}_{shared}^{bev} = [M_{shared} \odot \phi_d(Conv(f_{cat}^{bev}))] f_{cat}^{bev},$$
(4)

$$\hat{f}_{i}^{bev} = SE_{i}(\hat{f}_{shared}^{bev}) + f_{i}^{bev}, 
\hat{f}_{j}^{bev} = SE_{j}(\hat{f}_{shared}^{bev}) + f_{j}^{bev},$$
(5)



Figure 4. Semantic-level feature coupling-and-recoupling during the multi-dataset training stage.

Model	Ontion	Tested on Waymo			Tested on nuScenes		
Widden	Option	Vehicle	Pedestrian	Cyclist	Car	Pedestrian	Cyclist
Voxel-RCNN (Direct Merging)	-	66.67 / 66.23	60.36 / 54.08	52.03 / 51.25	51.40/31.68	15.04 / 9.99	5.40 / 3.87
Voxel-RCNN ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.+C.R.)	<b>BEV feature copy</b>	75.26 / 74.77	75.46 / 68.75	65.02 / 63.12	60.18 / <b>42.23</b>	30.08 / 24.37	<b>14.60</b> / 12.32
oxel-RCNN (w/ $C.A.+S.A.+C.R.$ )	BEV feature mask	73.78 / 73.29	72.67 / 66.32	64.20 / 62.81	<b>60.37</b> / 40.66	29.57 / 23.51	14.13 / <b>12.42</b>

Table 11. Options for inference usage of the C.R. module: The model is jointly trained on Waymo and nuScenes, and evaluated on the validation of Waymo and nuScenes.

Model	Ensemble?	Vehicle	Pedestrian	Cyclist
Voxel-RCNN ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.)	No	75.16 / 74.67	74.83 / 68.07	64.68 / <b>63.73</b>
Voxel-RCNN ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.+E.N.)	Yes	70.59 / 70.07	73.56 / 66.86	62.75 / 61.82
Voxel-RCNN ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.+C.R.)	No	75.26 / 74.77	75.46 / 68.75	<b>65.02</b> / 63.12

Table 12. Comparisons against model ensemble: The model is trained on Waymo and nuScenes, and evaluated on the validation of Waymo.  $E \cdot N$  is the dataset-level model ensemble.

### >Our Results:

Baseline Model Design

- w/o P.T.(Single-dataset): Traditional Single-dataset 3D Object Detection Pipeline
- P.T.(Pre-training): Traditional Single-dataset 3D Object Detection Pipeline, Pretrained on Another Dataset
- D.M.(Direct Merging): Directly Merging Multi-datasets and Using the Above Singe-dataset Pipeline
- C.A.: Coordinate-origin Alignment,: To align point-cloud-range from different LiDAR sensor
- S.A.: Statistics-level Alignment: To reduce the data-level domain shift
- C.R.: Coupling-and-Recoupling baseline: To reduce the semantic-level domain shift



9

### >Jointly train Waymo and nuScenes:

Trained on	Baseline Detectors	Tested on Waymo			Tested on nuScenes		
Trained On	Baseline Detectors	Vehicle	Pedestrian	Cyclist	Car	Pedestrian	Cyclist
only Wayma	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/o P.T.)	75.08 / 74.60	75.17 / <b>68.76</b>	65.28 / 64.33	34.10 / 17.31	2.99 / 1.69	0.05 / 0.01
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/ P.T. on nuScenes)	75.46 / 74.99	74.58 / 68.06	65.92 / 64.98	34.34 / 21.95	2.84 / 1.57	0.09 / 0.02
only nu Coonce	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/o P.T.)	36.77 / 36.50	4.64 / 3.18	2.49 / 2.45	53.63 / 39.05	22.47 / 17.85	10.86 / 9.70
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/ P.T. on Waymo)	6.11 / 5.90	0.77 / 0.56	0.01 / 0.01	55.23 / 39.14	23.65 / 16.47	8.51 / 5.80
	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ / D.M.)	66.67 / 66.23	60.36 / 54.08	52.03 / 51.25	51.40 / 31.68	15.04 / 9.99	5.40 / 3.87
WaymalnyCoones	Voxel-RCNN [4] $(w/C.A.)$	69.40 / 68.86	63.43 / 56.49	52.83 / 51.93	51.39 / 29.04	16.24 / 10.96	4.55 / 3.13
waymo+nuscenes	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.)	75.16 / 74.67	74.83 / 68.07	64.68 / 63.73	58.41 / 40.84	26.52 / 20.98	9.19 / 7.65
	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.+C.R.)	74.56 / 74.05	74.29 / 67.04	63.14 / 62.21	59.10 / <b>42.25</b>	29.86 / 23.76	14.46 / <b>12.73</b>
	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.+C.R.)	75.26 / 74.77	<b>75.46</b> / 68.75	65.02 / 63.12	<b>60.18</b> / 42.23	30.08 / 24.37	<b>14.60</b> / 12.32
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/o P . T . )	74.97 / 74.46	73.41/66.57	64.58 / 63.49	32.99 / 17.55	3.34 / 1.94	0.02 / 0.01
only Waymo	PV-RCNN [17] (w/ P.T. on nuScenes)	74.77 / 74.26	73.32 / 66.31	64.06 / 63.05	33.86 / 17.47	2.88 / 1.53	0.04 / 0.01
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/o P.T.)	41.01 / 40.58	4.57 / 2.96	0.98 / 0.95	57.78/41.10	24.52 / 18.56	10.24 / 8.25
only nuScenes	PV-RCNN [17] (w/ P.T. on Waymo)	44.59 / 44.24	7.67 / 6.33	8.77 / 8.58	57.92 / 41.53	24.32 / 17.31	11.52 / 9.19
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/ D.M.)	66.22 / 65.75	55.41 / 49.29	56.50 / 55.48	48.67 / 30.43	12.66 / 8.12	1.67 / 1.04
Wayman	PV-RCNN [17] (w/C.A.)	66.90 / 65.61	56.41 / 51.06	56.00 / 55.00	48.93 / 31.21	14.47 / 10.31	1.70 / 1.07
waymo+nuscenes	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.+S.A)	74.24 / 73.71	67.38 / 60.79	60.20 / 59.16	59.49 / 42.05	<b>27.44</b> / 20.94	12.69 / 10.34
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.+C.R.)	74.88 / 74.36	73.39 / 66.02	62.84 / 61.79	59.01 / 41.16	26.59 / 20.49	9.86 / 7.60
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.+S.A.+C.R.)	75.54 / 74.90	74.12 / 66.90	63.28 / 62.12	60.77 / 42.66	27.44 / 21.85	13.50 / 11.87

Table 3. Results of joint training on Waymo and nuScenes datasets. Following the existing 3D object detection works [17, 29, 30], we report the car (Vehicle on Waymo), pedestrian, and cyclist results under IoU threshold of 0.7, 0.5, and 0.5, respectively, and utilize AP and APH of LEVEL 1 metric on Waymo, and AP<sub>BEV</sub> and AP<sub>3D</sub> over 40 recall positions on nuScenes. The best detection results are marked using **bold**. Due to the page limitation, the average accuracy of multiple datasets is reported in Appendix.



#### >(AVG) Jointly train Waymo and nuScenes:

Trained on	Baseline Detectors	Avg. on Waymo+nuScenes			
Trained on	Baseline Detectors	Vehicle&Car	Pedestrian	Cyclist	
only Wayma	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/o P.T.)	46.20	38.43	32.64	
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/ P.T. on nuScenes)	48.71	38.08	32.97	
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/o P.T.)	37.91	11.25	6.10	
only nuscenes	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/ P.T. on Waymo)	22.63	8.62	2.91	
	Voxel-RCNN [4] $(w/D.M.)$	49.18	35.18	27.95	
Waynaa LawSaanaa	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.)	49.22	37.20	27.98	
waymo+nuScenes	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.)	58.00	47.91	36.17	
	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.+C.R.)	58.41	49.03	37.94	
	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /C.A.+S.A.+C.R.)	58.75	49.92	38.67	
1 1 1 7	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/o P.T.)	46.26	37.68	32.30	
only Waymo	PV-RCNN [17] (w/ P.T. on nuScenes)	46.12	37.43	32.04	
only an Coores	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/o P.T.)	41.06	11.57	4.62	
only nuscenes	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/ P.T. on Waymo)	43.06	12.49	8.98	
	PV-RCNN [17] (w/ D.M.)	48.33	31.77	28.77	
Wayma I ny Caanaa	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.)	49.06	33.36	28.54	
waymo+nuScenes	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.+S.A)	58.15	44.16	35.27	
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.+C.R.)	58.02	46.94	35.22	
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.A.+S.A.+C.R.)	59.10	47.99	37.58	

Table 14. Average (Avg.) detection results of joint training on Waymo and nuScenes datasets. Here, we report the car (Vehicle on Waymo), pedestrian, and cyclist results under IoU threshold of 0.7, 0.5, and 0.5, respectively, and utilize AP of LEVEL 1 metric on Waymo, and  $AP_{3D}$  over 40 recall positions on nuScenes. The best detection results are marked using **bold**.



#### >Jointly train KITTI and nuScenes:

Trained on	Baseline Detectors	Tested on KITTI			Tested on nuScenes		
framed on	Dasenne Dettetors	Car	Pedestrian	Cyclist	Car	Pedestrian	Cyclist
only KITTI	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w/o P.T.$ )	89.34 / 80.91	59.67 / 56.88	61.10 / 60.49	11.37 / 4.64	0.15 / 0.11	0.01 / 0.00
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/ $P$ . $T$ . on nuScenes)	89.90 / 81.25	59.49 / 56.17	54.55 / 54.15	12.89 / 5.52	0.24 / 0.18	0.05 / 0.03
anly nyCoones	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/o P.T.)	69.41 / 33.48	28.06 / 19.20	0.44 / 0.43	53.63 / 39.05	22.47 / 17.85	10.86 / 9.70
only nuscenes	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/ P.T. on KITTI)	71.61 / 40.64	39.67 / 29.99	7.29 / 6.88	53.57 / 39.65	24.93 / 21.17	11.42 / 9.95
	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ / D.M.)	89.24 / 73.72	61.03 / 54.55	62.71 / 59.92	41.88 / 20.48	12.58 / 8.32	1.77 / 0.97
VITTLINNCOORCO	Voxel-RCNN [4] $(w/C.A.)$	89.35 / 76.77	59.01 / 53.67	43.45 / 42.41	49.95 / 28.43	16.63 / 11.93	3.84 / 3.12
KITTT+huscelles	Voxel-RCNN [4] ( $w$ /S.A.)	89.21 / 82.68	62.32 / 57.99	63.10/61.67	57.87 / 40.23	27.21 / 21.44	13.65 / 12.24
	Voxel-RCNN [4] $(w/C.R.)$	89.13 / 82.50	61.45 / 56.65	61.72 / 58.66	58.13 / 40.26	27.27 / 21.50	13.81 / 12.18
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (w/S.A.+C.R.)	90.09 / 83.10	62.99 / 58.30	70.20 / 68.10	59.25 / 41.51	29.12 / 23.18	15.16 / 13.16
1 1/1/0/01	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/o P.T.)	89.41 / 83.15	59.09 / 54.73	62.25 / 61.71	6.58 / 2.54	0.22 / 0.16	0.03 / 0.01
only KITTI	PV-RCNN [17] (w/ P.T. on nuScenes)	89.26 / 83.14	60.56 / 55.90	63.60 / 62.88	13.43 / 5.61	0.69 / 0.27	0.04 / 0.00
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/o P.T.)	74.37 / 36.54	39.30 / 29.07	0.58 / 0.55	57.78/41.10	24.52 / 18.56	10.24 / 8.25
only nuScenes	PV-RCNN [17] (w/ P.T on KITTI)	69.40 / 38.25	33.24 / 24.88	1.68 / 1.61	53.24 / 36.72	20.65 / 17.09	8.95 / 7.58
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/ D.M.)	87.79 / 77.95	55.52 / 48.29	59.15 / 55.10	41.29 / 21.57	10.21 / 7.08	1.23 / 1.15
	PV-RCNN [17] (w/C.A.)	88.53 / 77.20	47.13 / 39.53	44.22 / 41.64	46.34 / 25.28	12.70 / 9.64	2.18 / 1.34
KIIII+nuscenes	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/S.A.)	87.51 / 78.13	56.13 / 49.21	61.22 / 58.49	56.93 / 40.11	20.15 / 15.33	10.19 / 8.73
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/C.R.)	<b>90.93</b> / 83.56	58.96 / 55.78	60.92 / 58.13	57.76/41.31	24.65 / 18.96	12.19 / 10.13
	<b>PV-RCNN</b> [17] (w/S.A.+C.R.)	89.77 / <b>85.49</b>	60.03 / 55.58	69.03 / 66.10	59.08 / 41.67	25.27 / 19.26	12.26 / 10.83

Table 4. Results of joint training on KITTI and nuScenes datasets. The experiment and evaluation settings follow Table 3.

### **Uni3D:** Discussions



### Uni3D: Jointly train KITTI, nuScenes, and Waymo

Trained on	Tested on K	Tested on N	Tested on W	Avg. on KNW
Κ	89.34 / 80.91	11.37 / 4.64	6.81 / 6.75	35.84 / 30.77
Ν	69.41 / 33.48	53.63 / 39.05	36.77 / 36.50	53.27 / 36.34
W	67.07 / 19.80	34.10 / 17.31	75.08 / 74.60	58.75 / 37.23
K+N+W (Uni3D)	89.65 / 83.41	60.42 / 42.30	75.47 / 74.97	75.18 / 66.89

Table 6. Results for car class of jointly train on K (denoting KITTI), N (denoting nuScenes), and W (denoting Waymo) using Voxel-RCNN [4], and Avg. denotes the average detection accuracy evaluated on all the three datasets.

### **Uni3D:** Discussions



#### Uni3D: Reduce the Data Acquisition Cost

Trained on	Baseline Detectors	#nuScenes	Tested on KITTI			Tested on nuScenes		
france on	Dasenne Detectors	#nuscenes	Car	Pedestrian	Cyclist	Vehicle	Pedestrian	Cyclist
only nuScenes	Voxel-RCNN [4]	100%	-	-	-	53.63 / 39.05	22.47 / 17.85	10.86 / 9.70
only nuScenes	Voxel-RCNN [4]	10%	-	-	-	45.42/31.09	10.39 / 7.16	1.55 / 0.89
only nuScenes	Voxel-RCNN [4]	5%	-	-	-	30.01 / 16.15	4.70/2.56	0.06 / 0.05
only nuScenes	Voxel-RCNN [4]	1%	-	-	-	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00
KITTI+nuScenes	Voxel-RCNN [4] (ours)	100%	90.09 / 83.10	62.99 / 58.30	70.20 / 68.10	59.25 / 41.51	29.12/23.18	15.16/13.16
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (ours)	10%	88.81 / 81.75	60.09 / 56.61	70.03 / 68.54	52.08 / 34.40	20.40 / 15.60	8.42/7.40
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (ours)	5%	89.10/81.86	59.17 / 54.42	73.30 / 70.25	51.81 / 34.43	19.82 / 14.94	5.52/ 4.58
	Voxel-RCNN [4] (ours)	1%	89.06 / 81.55	56.74 / 52.28	71.11/69.06	44.74 / 28.28	15.94 / 11.11	1.28 / 0.99
only nuScenes	PV-RCNN [16]	100%	-	-	-	57.78/41.10	24.52 / 18.56	10.24 / 8.25
only nuScenes	PV-RCNN [16]	10%	_		_	50.39/31.68	13.64 / 8.75	0.85/0.51
only nuScenes	PV-RCNN [16]	5%	-	-	-	35.87 / 19.76	5.89/3.15	0.00 / 0.00
only nuScenes	PV-RCNN [16]	1%	-	-	-	0.08 / 0.01	0.02 / 0.01	0.00 / 0.00
KITTI+nuScenes	PV-RCNN [16] (ours)	100%	89.77 / 85.49	60.03 / 55.58	69.03 / 66.10	59.08 / 41.67	25.27 / 19.26	12.26 / 10.83
	PV-RCNN [16] (ours)	10%	88.99 / 83.12	57.06 / 52.48	71.14 / 70.60	51.75/33.85	15.60 / 10.78	3.33 / 2.09
	PV-RCNN [16] (ours)	5%	88.95 / 82.83	56.62 / 53.25	71.99 / 69.86	50.32/34.35	16.11/11.20	2.59 / 2.00
	PV-RCNN [16] (ours)	1%	88.92 / 82.81	55.22 / 51.84	71.12 / 69.73	41.09 / 25.38	11.27 / 7.00	0.60/0.33

Table 7. Results of reducing the number of samples in nuScenes dataset under the nuScenes-KITTI consolidation setting.

Only 5% nuScenes data is available

# **Thanks for Listening**



