1. Calibration of our trinocular rig

In this section, we detail the calibration procedure needed to gather images and either i) annotate them with accurate ground-truth depth labels or ii) distill accurate proxy labels.

We define the three cameras of our setup as $\text{RGB}$, $\text{MS}$, and $\text{RGB}^2$, with $\text{RGB}$ and $\text{RGB}^2$ being the two RGB cameras with identical resolution ($W_{\text{RGB}} \times H_{\text{RGB}}$) and $\text{MS}$ the multi-spectral lower resolution device ($W_{\text{MS}} \times H_{\text{MS}}$). We define raw images acquired by the $\text{RGB}$, $\text{MS}$, and $\text{RGB}^2$ cameras as $\text{rgb}$, $\text{ms}$, and $\text{rgb}^2$ respectively.

First of all, we calibrate each camera independently, using the standard calibration procedure from OpenCV based on the detection of corners on a chessboard pattern. We found out empirically that we could detect corners with standard algorithms also in our MS images, simply by processing a grayscale image defined as the average across channels. This allows for straightforward calibration of the MS camera.

Then, following again the standard procedure from OpenCV, we calibrate the $\text{RGB} - \text{RGB}^2$ stereo system and rectify images. In this way we obtain rectified images $\text{rgb}_2, \text{rgb}_2^2$ for the $\text{RGB} - \text{RGB}^2$ stereo system.

Finally, we calibrate the unbalanced stereo system $\text{RGB} - \text{MS}$ following the procedure discussed below.

**Unbalanced Stereo Rectification.** To rectify images acquired by the $\text{RGB} - \text{MS}$ unbalanced stereo system, we follow the unbalanced rectification scheme sketched in [1], yielding images that are rectified when brought to the same resolution by means of up-sampling or down-sampling operations solely.

We denote the camera with the smaller $\text{HF OV}$ as $j$ while the other one as $i$.

$$\begin{cases} i = \text{RGB}, j = \text{MS} \quad \text{if} \quad H\text{FOV}_{\text{MS}} < H\text{FOV}_{\text{RGB}} \\ i = \text{MS}, j = \text{RGB} \quad \text{if} \quad H\text{FOV}_{\text{RGB}} < H\text{FOV}_{\text{MS}} \end{cases}$$

(1)

By modifying the intrinsic parameters of $i$, we simulate a crop and scale change so as to match the $H\text{FOV}$, Aspect Ratio ($AR$) and size of $j$. Then, we compute the rectification transformation based on these new parameters.

Hence, we compute the new width and height of $i$, $\hat{W}_i$ and $\hat{H}_i$, which we use to crop the image with the larger $H\text{FOV}$ so as to match the smaller $H\text{FOV}$ one while preserving the aspect ratio

$$\hat{W}_i = 2 \tan \frac{H\text{FOV}_j}{2} f_i$$

(2)

$$\hat{H}_i = \frac{H_j}{W_j} \hat{W}_i$$

(3)

Then, we change the intrinsic parameters of $i$ to simulate the crop and resize, and can thus match the resolution of $j$ as follows:
The rectification transformation is only a change of intrinsic parameters and a rotation, thus an homography. Finally, we can rectify the unbalanced pair obtaining two rectified images rgb₁, ms₁ for the RGB – MS stereo system. Fig. 1 shows an example of images before and after the rectification procedures described so far.

2. Disparity Warping

When using RGB², both during the proxy labels creation or the ground-truth acquisition, we need to warp the left ground-truth Disp₂ aligned with rgb₂ of the RGB – RGB² stereo system in order to obtain the ground-truth Disp₁ aligned with the rgb₁ of the RGB – MS stereo system.

We know that the rectification transformation is only a change of intrinsic parameters and a rotation, thus an homography. Therefore, we can compute the mapping between pixels of rgb₂ of the RGB – RGB² stereo system, with coordinate (u, v), and pixels of the left image rgb₁ of the RGB – MS stereo system, with coordinate (u’, v’) as:

\[
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u \\
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\tag{4}
\]

where \(A_1, R_1\) and \(A_2, R_2\) are the intrinsic and rectification rotation matrix of the camera RGB in the RGB – MS and RGB – RGB² stereo systems, respectively.

Once this mapping is known, we can perform a backward warping to obtain Disp₁ from Disp₂. However, we need to modify the disparity values according to the 3D rotation and baseline change before warping. Thus, given the disparity map Disp₂, we first transform it into the corresponding depth map \(D₂\)

\[
D₂ = \frac{f₂b₂}{\text{Disp₂}}
\tag{5}
\]

where \(f₂\) is the focal length of the rectified rgb₂ and \(b₂\) is the baseline of the stereo system RGB – RGB². Then, we back-project each pixel of rgb₂ into the 3D space using \(D₂\) and we rotate it, obtaining the pixel in the rgb₁ reference frame:

\[
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\tag{6}
\]

In this way we can create a depth map \(D₂→₁\) for which any pixel \((u, v)\) contains the depth value of the corresponding pixel aligned in the rgb₁ reference frame, \(z'\). At this point we perform the backward warping of the depth:

\[
D₁ = \phi(D₂→₁)
\tag{7}
\]
where $\phi$ is the backward warping operation that use the mapping defined at Eq. 4 and $D_1$ is the depth map aligned with $rgb_1$. Finally we transform it to the ground disparity map of $rgb_1$ as:

$$Disp_1 = \frac{f_1 b_1}{D_1}$$

where $f_1$ and $b_1$ are the focal length of $rgb_1$ and the baseline of the $RGB - MS$ stereo system.
3. Additional Qualitative Results

In this section, we present additional qualitative results. In Fig. 2 we show examples of RGB-MS pairs with available disparity ground-truths. In Fig. 3 we present examples of the images acquired in uncontrolled environments used to train our deep architecture by our proxy supervision approach. In particular, in the last two columns we show SGM proxy labels computed on a RGB image converted into grayscale and a single channel MS image attained by computing the mean across all channels at each pixel, as well as the SGM proxy labels obtained by two RGB images and then warped. Finally, in Fig. 4 we report additional qualitative results obtained by our network using PSM as backbone and trained also with auxiliary synthetic data (i.e., the best configuration of Tab. 1 and Tab 2. of the main paper).

4. Qualitative Registration Results.

To provide hints on the registration quality, in Fig. 5 we report qualitatives obtained by using either the disparity predicted by our network or the ground-truth to warp the low resolution MS image into the high-resolution RGB image. We notice how the two warped images appear very similar, which vouches for the effectiveness of our cross-modal registration architecture.

5. Additional Implementation Details

We provide here additional details regarding our deep cross-spectral network architecture as well as on the adopted continuous output representation.

5.1. Stereo Backbones

As for the stereo backbones, we follow the original implementation of two popular architectures: PSM [2] and GWC [3]. For both of them, we follow the idea proposed in [4] to exploit a different combination of feature maps computed at different spatial resolutions in order to capture both local and global context.

PSM [2]: For the PSM stereo backbone, we use the original deep feature extractor, consisting of Spatial Pyramid Pooling (SPP) modules as \( \Phi_\theta \) while the stereo matching cost probabilities are extracted from stacked hourglass 3D convolutions on the cross-spectral cost volume computed by \( \Psi_\theta \). More specifically, we perform bilinear interpolation on features of size...
Figure 4. **Additional Qualitative Results of our Network.** From left to right: input RGB image, input multi-channels MS image, disparity predicted by our network, ground-truth.

Figure 5. **Registration Results.** RGB image (a); MS image displayed as a channel average with color-map (b); predicted (c) and ground-truth (d) disparity maps; MS images warped based on the predicted (e) and ground-truth (f) disparities; absolute difference between registered images (g) and disparities (h).

$576 \times 960 \times 32$ computed by $\Phi_\theta$ and on matching cost probabilities of dimension $92 \times 160 \times 32$ computed by $\Psi_\theta$. It is worth noticing that, for the cost volume computation, we modify the original implementation of PSM such that the two feature
extractors for $L$ and $R$ do not share weights and accept 3 channels as input for the RGB branch whilst 10 channels for the multi-spectral branch.

**GWC** [3]: The GWC stereo backbone shares the same feature extractors as in PSM, while $\Psi_\theta$ incorporates group-wise correlation to build-up the cross-spectral cost volume. Specifically, we perform bilinear interpolation on convolutional features of size $576 \times 960 \times 332$ from $\Phi_\theta$ and matching cost probabilities of dimension $92 \times 160 \times 32$ from $\Psi_\theta$.

### 5.2. Continuous Output Representation

Our output representation follows the same implementation as proposed in [1], where two multi-layer perceptrons are in charge of estimating a categorical distribution over disparity values and a subpixel offset starting from interpolated features computed by the deep stereo backbone. More specifically, the number of neurons is $(D_\psi + F_\phi, 512, 256, 128, d_{max})$ for $MLP_C$ while $(D_\psi + F_\phi + 1, 128, 64, 1)$ for $MLP_R$, where $D_\psi = 32$ and $F_\phi = 32$ in case of the PSM stereo backbone while $D_\psi = 32$ and $F_\phi = 332$ for GWC. In our experiments, we always use $d_{max} = 768$. Notice both multi-layer perceptrons rely on Sine activation functions, except the last layer where Softmax and Tanh activations are used for $MLP_C$ and $MLP_R$, respectively.
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