

ReadMe first

- If you aim to compare to Fig.5 in the paper (matching accuracy), go to P.2.
- If you aim to compare to the Sect.5.2 (shape fidelity), go to P.3.
- Note that the format in P.2 is the special case of the one in P.3. In the matching experiment, trees are template-specific (so $N=1$) and I considered only the strongest mode (so no $\times 3$), while in the tracking experiment all 3 modes are used in the probabilistic deformation framework.
- Note that corres. files of these two experiments are not interchangeable with each other. Please refer to Table 2 in the paper for more on the experimental setting.

corres. format

- Each row: w_i, N, v_1, p_1
- w_i : confidence from the forest. $\in [0,1]$.
- N : number of (v, p) pairs.
- v : index in the specific tracking template.
- p : the probability. $\sum_{i=1}^N p = 1$.

corres. format

- Each row: $(w_i, N, (v_1, p_1), (v_2, p_2), \dots, (v_N, p_N))$ x3
- w_i : confidence from the forest. $\in [0,1]$.
- N : number of (v, p) pairs.
- v : index in the specific tracking template.
- p : the probability. $\sum_{i=1}^N p = 1$.