Table 1: Dataset Details

| Settings                      | Value       |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Total Sequences              | 235         |
| Total Duration                | 235 minutes |
| One Sequence Duration         | 1 minute    |
| Total Triplets               | 141000      |
| Triples in a Sequence         | 600         |
| Subjects in Dataset           | 6           |
| Number of Actions             | 3           |
| Number of scenes              | 1           |
| Training Sequences            | 193         |
| Validation Sequences          | 21          |
| Test Sequences                | 21          |
| Subject Occluded              | No          |
| Single Subject in Sequence    | Yes         |

1. Dataset Details

Table 1 describes the details of our dataset. We collect a total of 235 sequences. There are 6 human subjects and one of them only appears in test sequences. In any given sequence, there is only one person performing an specific action. Our dataset contains three actions which are standing with fixed postures, standing with waving hand(s), and walking with waving hand(s). Each triplet has 3 component: RGB camera frame, horizontal radar frame, and vertical radar frame. We form a triplet by a process of synchronization over timestamps.

We use an economical and easily available mmWave radar module and a RGB camera to acquire our dataset. Our camera captures the images of resolution $512 \times 512$ and we downscale all of them into $256 \times 256$ as the input for the image-based HPE network to generate the ground-truths. We use a pre-trained image-based 2D pose network, HRNet [2], to label the training and test sequences. The labels generated by HRNet [2] are almost as accurate as manually generated labels; i.e., the image-based 2D pose network achieves the $AP$ of 99%. Our network shows very promising results on human pose estimation (HPE) task. To the best of our knowledge, Radar-based HPE has not been widely explored. We contribute our dataset to draw an attention of the community and look forward to seeing advancement.

1.1. Synchronization

In this section, we describe how we synchronize the camera with two radar sensors. Both radars can be triggered precisely with a digital sync signal provided by an external sync signal generator. We design a circuit that provides an accurate sync signal to trigger radar frame acquisition at precise timing, i.e., one frame is 100ms with our 10FPS setting to synchronize the FPS of our RGB camera. As both radars are operated at the same frequency band (77GHz-81GHz), we triggered them in an alternate switching mechanism to avoid interference, i.e., the horizontal radar is active only for the first 50ms of the frame, and the vertical radar is active for the next 50ms.

2. Experimental Details

Table 2 shows the accuracy of every keypoint. Our proposed method (VRDAEMap) still outperforms the traditional pre-processing method under a stricter evaluation metric $AP^{75}$. Our predicted keypoints, especially the fast-moving keypoints like wrists and elbows, achieving lower MPJPE than mmMesh [3]. However, the performance of torso keypoints such as head, neck, and shoulders is quite limited. The may because the radar signal is noisy, resulting in unstable predicted results. The pointcloud-based method, mmMesh, first performs denoising by converting the radar signal into point cloud, obtaining much lower MPJPE of head, neck, and shoulders (30.4, 23.3, and 31.7, respectively).
Table 2: Comparison of pre-processing methods. Total denotes the average precision over keypoints.

| Pre-processing | Model         | Head  | Neck  | Shoulder | Elbow | Wrist | Hip  | Knee  | Ankle | AP   | AP50 | AP75 |
|----------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| RAEMap         | RF-Pose [4]   | 64.3  | 67.7  | 51.0     | 13.6  | 6.0   | 72.7 | 66.8  | 60.8  | 40.6 | 86.5 | 31.0 |
| RAEMap         | Ours          | 80.6  | 84.6  | 75.1     | 40.9  | 17.4  | 86.9 | 80.7  | 70.1  | 61.6 | 98.6 | 71.0 |
| VRDAEMap       | Ours          | 79.9  | 82.3  | 69.7     | 45.6  | 23.5  | 85.0 | 81.9  | 72.5  | 64.3 | 98.5 | 76.7 |

Table 3: Comparison of 3D keypoint performance based on MPJPE in millimeters. Ours + VideoPose3D means that we adopt our proposed method to generate 2D keypoints, which are lifted to 3D by VideoPose3D.

| Model          | Head  | Neck  | Shoulder | Elbow | Wrist | Hip  | Knee  | Ankle | Total |
|----------------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| mmMesh [4]     | 30.4  | 23.3  | 31.7     | 112.9 | 218.2 | 18.4 | 33.6  | 57.4  | 71.3  |
| Ours + VideoPose3D [1] | 71.4  | 43.2  | 44.8     | 85.3  | 156.4 | 17.4 | 41.6  | 73.9  | 68.2  |
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