

©2019 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

arXiv:1912.00535v1 [cs.CV] 2 Dec 2019

Deep Learning for Visual Tracking: A Comprehensive Survey

Seyed Mojtaba Marvasti-Zadeh, *Student Member, IEEE*, Li Cheng, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Hossein Ghanei-Yakhdan, and Shohreh Kasaei, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Visual target tracking is one of the most sought-after yet challenging research topics in computer vision. Given the ill-posed nature of the problem and its popularity in a broad range of real-world scenarios, a number of large-scale benchmark datasets have been established, on which considerable methods have been developed and demonstrated with significant progress in recent years – predominantly by recent deep learning (DL)-based methods. This survey aims to systematically investigate the current DL-based visual tracking methods, benchmark datasets, and evaluation metrics. It also extensively evaluates and analyzes the leading visual tracking methods. First, the fundamental characteristics, primary motivations, and contributions of DL-based methods are summarized from six key aspects of: network architecture, network exploitation, network training for visual tracking, network objective, network output, and the exploitation of correlation filter advantages. Second, popular visual tracking benchmarks and their respective properties are compared, and their evaluation metrics are summarized. Third, the state-of-the-art DL-based methods are comprehensively examined on a set of well-established benchmarks of OTB2013, OTB2015, VOT2018, and LaSOT. Finally, by conducting critical analyses of these state-of-the-art methods both quantitatively and qualitatively, their pros and cons under various common scenarios are investigated. It may serve as a gentle use guide for practitioners to weigh on when and under what conditions to choose which method(s). It also facilitates a discussion on ongoing issues and sheds light on promising research directions.

Index Terms—Visual tracking, deep learning, computer vision, appearance modeling.

1 INTRODUCTION

GENERIC visual tracking aims to estimate the trajectory of an unknown visual target when only an initial state of the target (in a video frame) is available. Visual tracking is an open and attractive research field (see Fig. 1) with a broad extent of categories and applications; including self-driving cars [1]–[4], autonomous robots [5], [6], surveillance [7]–[10], augmented reality [11]–[13], unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) tracking [14], sports [15], surgery [16], biology [17]–[19], ocean exploration [20], to name a few. The ill-posed definition of the visual tracking (i.e., model-free tracking, on-the-fly learning, single-camera, 2D information) is more challenging in complicated real-world scenarios which may include arbitrary classes of target appearance and their motion model (e.g., human, drone, animal, vehicle), different imaging characteristics (e.g., static/moving camera, smooth/abrupt movement, camera resolution), and changes in environmental conditions (e.g., illumination variation, background clutter, crowded scenes). Although traditional



Fig. 1: An overview of visual target tracking.

visual tracking methods utilize various frameworks – like discriminative correlation filters (DCF) [21]–[24], silhouette tracking [25], [26], Kernel tracking [27]–[29], point tracking [30], [31], and so forth – these methods cannot provide satisfactory results in unconstrained environments. The main reasons are the target representation by handcrafted features (such as the histogram of oriented gradients (HOG) [32] and Color-Names (CN)) [33] and inflexible target modeling. Inspired by deep learning (DL) breakthroughs [34]–[38] in ImageNet large scale visual recognition competition (ILSVRC) [39] and also visual object tracking (VOT) challenge [40]–[46], DL-based methods have attracted considerable interest in visual tracking community to provide robust visual trackers. Although convolutional neural networks

- S. M. Marvasti-Zadeh is with the Digital Image and Video Processing Lab (DIVPL), Department of Electrical Engineering, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran, and he is also a member of the Image Processing Lab (IPL), Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran and the Visual Analysis of People Lab (VAP), Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark. E-mails: mojtaba.marvasti@stu.yazd.ac.ir
- L. Cheng is with the Vision and Learning Lab, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. E-mail: lcheng5@ualberta.ca
- H. Ghanei-Yakhdan is with the Digital Image and Video Processing Lab (DIVPL), Department of Electrical Engineering, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran. E-mail: hghaneiy@yazd.ac.ir
- S. Kasaei is with the Image Processing Lab (IPL), Department of Computer Engineering, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: kasaei@sharif.edu

Manuscript received ...; revised ...




Fig. 2: Timeline of deep visual tracking methods.

- 2015: Exploring and studying deep features to exploit the traditional methods.
- 2016: Offline training/fine-tuning of DNNs for visual tracking purpose, Employing Siamese network for real-time tracking, Integrating DNNs into traditional frameworks.
- 2017: Incorporating temporal and contextual information, Investigating various offline training on large-scale image/video datasets.
- 2018: Studying different learning and search strategies, Designing more sophisticated architectures for visual tracking task.
- 2019: Investigating deep detection and segmentation approaches for visual tracking, Taking advantages of deeper backbone networks.

(CNNs) have been dominant networks initially, the broad range of architectures such as Siamese neural networks (SNNs), recurrent neural networks (RNNs), auto-encoders (AEs), generative adversarial networks (GANs), and custom neural networks are currently investigated. Fig. 2 presents a brief history of the development of deep visual trackers in recent years. The state-of-the-art DL-based visual trackers have distinct characteristics such as exploitation of deep architecture, backbone network, learning procedure, training datasets, network objective, network output, types of exploited deep features, CPU/GPU implementation, programming language and framework, speed, and so forth. Besides, several visual tracking benchmark datasets have been proposed in the past few years for practical training and evaluating of visual tracking methods. Despite various properties, some of these benchmark datasets have common video sequences. Thus, a comparative study of DL-based methods, their benchmark datasets, and evaluation metrics are provided in this paper to facilitate developing advanced methods by the visual tracking community.

The visual tracking methods can be roughly classified into two main categories of before and after the revolution of DL in computer vision. The first category of visual tracking survey papers [47]–[50] mainly review traditional methods based on classical object and motion representations, and then examine their pros and cons systematically, experimentally, or both. Considering the significant progress of DL-based visual trackers, the reviewed methods by these papers are outdated. On the other hand, the second category reviews limited deep visual trackers [51]–[53]. The papers [51], [52] (two versions of a paper) categorize 81 and 93 handcrafted and deep visual trackers into the correlation filter trackers and non-correlation filter trackers, and then a further classification based on architectures and tracking mechanisms has applied. These papers study <40 DL-based method with limited investigations. Although the paper [54] particularly investigates the network branches, layers, and training aspects of nine SNN-based methods, it does not include state-of-the-art SNN-based trackers (e.g., [55]–[57]) and the custom networks (e.g., [58]) which exploit SNNs, partially. The last review paper [53] has categorized the 43 DL-based methods according to their structure, function, and training. Then, 16 DL-based visual trackers are evaluated with different hand-crafted-based visual tracking methods. From the structure perspective, these trackers are categorized into 34 CNN-based (including ten CNN-Matching and 24 CNN-Classification), five RNN-based, and four other architecture-based methods (e.g., AE). Besides,

from the network function perspective, these methods are categorized into the feature extraction network (FEN) or end-to-end network (EEN). While the FENs are the methods that exploit pre-trained models on different tasks, the EENs are classified in terms of their outputs; namely, object score, confidence map, and bounding box (BB). From the network training perspective, these methods are categorized into the NP-OL, IP-NOL, IP-OL, VP-NOL, and VP-OL categories, in which the NP, IP, VP, OL, and NOL are the abbreviations of no pre-trained, image pre-trained, video-pre-trained, online learning, and no online learning, respectively.

Despite all efforts, there is no comprehensive study to not only extensively categorize DL-based trackers, their motivations, and solutions to different problems, but also experimentally analyze the best methods according to different challenging scenarios. Motivated by these concerns, the main goal of this survey is to fill this gap and investigate the main present problems and future directions. The main differences of this survey and prior ones are described as follows.

Differences to Prior Surveys: Despite the currently available review papers, this paper focuses merely on 129 state-of-the-art DL-based visual tracking methods, which have been published in major image processing and computer vision conferences and journals. These methods include the HCFT [59], DeepSRDCF [60], FCNT [61], CNN-SVM [62], DPST [63], CCOT [64], GOTURN [65], SiamFC [66], SINT [67], MDNet [68], HDT [69], STCT [70], RPNT [71], DeepTrack [72], CNT [73], CF-CNN [74], TCNN [75], RDLT [76], PTAV [77], [78], CREST [79], UCT/UCT-Lite [80], DSiam/DSiamM [81], TSN [82], WECO [83], RFL [84], IBCCF [85], DTO [86], SRT [87], R-FCSN [88], GNET [89], LST [90], VRCPF [91], DCPF [92], CFNet [93], ECO [94], DeepCSRDCF [95], MCPF [96], BranchOut [97], DeepLMCF [98], Obli-RaFT [99], ACFN [100], SANet [101], DCFNet/DCFNet2 [102], DET [103], DRN [104], DNT [105], STSGS [106], TripletLoss [107], DSLT [108], UPDT [109], ACT [110], DaSiamRPN [111], RT-MDNet [112], StructSiam [113], MMLT [114], CPT [115], STP [116], Siam-MCF [117], Siam-BM [118], WAEF [119], TRACA [120], VITAL [121], DeepSTRCF [122], SiamRPN [123], SA-Siam [124], FlowTrack [125], DRT [126], LSART [127], RASNet [128], MCCT [129], DCPF2 [130], VDSR-SRT [131], FCSFN [132], FRPN2T-Siam [133], FMFT [134], IMLCF [135], TGGAN [136], DAT [137], DCTN [138], FPRNet [139], HCFTs [140], adaDDCF [141], YCNN [142], DeepHPFT [143], CFCF [144], CFSRL [145], P2T [146], DCDCF [147], FICFNet [148], LCTdeep [149], HSTC [150], DeepFWDCF [151], CF-FCsiam [152], MGNet [153], ORHF [154], ASRCF [155], ATOM [156], C-RPN [157], GCT [158], RPCF [159], SPM [160], SiamDW [56], SiamMask [57], SiamRPN++ [55], TADT [161], UDT [162], DiMP [163], ADT [164], CODA [165], DRRL [166], SMART [167], MRCNN [168], MM [169], MTHCF [170], AEPCF [171], IMM-DFT [172], TAAT [173], DeepTACF [174], MAM [175], ADNet [176], [177], C2FT [178], DRL-IS [179], DRLT [180], EAST [181], HP [182], P-Track [183], RDT [184], and SINT++ [58].

The trackers include 73 CNN-based, 35 SNN-based, 15 custom-based (including AE-based, reinforcement learning (RL)-based, and combined networks), three RNN-based, and three GAN-based methods. One major contribution and

novelty of this paper is the inclusion and comparison of SNN-based visual tracking methods that are of great interest in the visual tracking community at the present time. Moreover, the recent visual trackers based on GAN and custom networks (which includes RL-based methods) are reviewed. Although the methods in this survey are categorized into the exploitation of off-the-shelf deep features and deep features for visual tracking (similar to the FENs and EENs in [53]), detailed characteristics of these methods such as pre-trained or backbone networks, exploited layer(s), training datasets, objective function, tracking speed, used features, types of tracking output, CPU/GPU implementation, programming language, DL framework are also presented. From the network training perspective, this survey independently studies deep off-the-shelf features and deep features for visual tracking. Because deep off-the-shelf features (i.e., extracted from FENs) are mostly pre-trained on the ImageNet for object recognition tasks, their training details are reviewed, independently. Hence, the network training for visual tracking purposes is categorized to the DL-based methods that exploit only offline training, only online training, or both offline and online training procedures. Finally, this paper comprehensively analyses different aspects of 45 state-of-the-art visual tracking methods on four visual tracking datasets.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- 1) State-of-the-art DL-based visual tracking methods are categorized based on their architecture (i.e., CNN, SNN, RNN, GAN, and custom networks), network exploitation (i.e., off-the-shelf deep features and deep features for visual tracking), network training for visual tracking (i.e., only offline training, only online training, both offline and online training), network objective (i.e., regression-based, classification-based, and both classification and regression-based), and exploitation of correlation filter advantages (i.e., DCF framework and utilizing correlation filter/layer/functions). Such a study covering all of these aspects in detailed categorization of visual tracking methods has not been previously presented.
- 2) The main motivations and contributions of the DL-based methods to tackle the visual tracking problems are summarized. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper that investigates the primary problems and proposed solutions of visual tracking methods. This classification provides a proper insight in designing accurate and robust DL-based visual tracking methods.
- 3) Based on fundamental characteristics (including the number of videos, number of frames, number of classes or clusters, sequence attributes, absent labels, and overlap with other datasets), recent visual tracking benchmark datasets including OTB2013 [185], VOT [40]–[46], ALOV [48], OTB2015 [186], TC128 [187], UAV123 [188], NUS-PRO [189], NfS [190], DTB [191], TrackingNet [192], OxUvA [193], BUAA-PRO [194], GOT10k [195], and LaSOT [196] are compared.
- 4) Finally, extensive quantitative and qualitative experimental evaluations are performed on well-known OTB2013, OTB2015, VOT2018, and LaSOT visual tracking datasets, and the state-of-the-art visual trackers are analyzed based on different aspects. Moreover, this paper specifies the most

challenging visual attributes not only for the VOT2018 dataset, but also for the OTB2015 and LaSOT datasets for the first time. At last, the VOT toolkit [45] has been modified to qualitatively compare different methods according to the TraX protocol [197].

According to the comparisons, the following observations are made:

- 1) The SNN-based methods are the most attractive deep architectures due to their satisfactory balance between performance and efficiency for visual tracking. Moreover, the visual tracking methods recently attempt to exploit the advantages of RL and GAN methods to refine their decision making and alleviate the lack of training data. Based on these advantages, the recent visual tracking methods aim to design custom neural networks for visual tracking purposes.
- 2) The offline end-to-end learning of deep features appropriately adapts the pre-trained features for visual tracking. Although the online training of DNN increases the computational complexity such that most of these methods are not suitable for real-time applications, it considerably helps visual trackers to adapt with significant appearance variation, prevent from visual distractors, and improve the accuracy and robustness of visual tracking methods. Hence, exploiting both offline and online training procedures provides more robust visual trackers.
- 3) Leveraging deeper and wider backbone networks improves the discriminative power of distinguishing the target from its background.
- 4) The best visual tracking methods use both regression and classification objective functions not only to estimate the best target proposal but also to find the tightest BB for target localization.
- 5) The exploitation of different features enhances the robustness of the target model. For instance, most of the DCF-based methods fuse the deep off-the-shelf features and hand-crafted features (e.g., HOG and CN) for this reason. Also, the exploitation of complementary features such as temporal or contextual information has led to more discriminative and robust features for target representation.
- 6) The most challenging attributes for DL-based visual tracking methods are occlusion, out-of-view, and fast motion. Moreover, visual distractors with similar semantics may result in drifting problem.

The rest of this paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces our taxonomy of deep visual tracking methods. The visual tracking benchmark datasets and evaluation metrics are briefly compared in Section 3. Experimental comparisons of the state-of-the-art visual tracking methods are performed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 summarizes the conclusions and future directions.

2 TAXONOMY OF DEEP VISUAL TRACKING METHODS

In this section, three major components of: target representation/information, training process, and learning procedure are described. Then, the proposed comprehensive taxonomy of DL-based methods is presented.

One of primary motivations of DL-based methods is improving a target representation by utilizing/fusing deep




Fig. 3: Taxonomy of DL-based visual tracking methods.

hierarchical features, exploiting contextual information or motion information, and selecting more discriminative and robust deep features. Also, the DL-based methods aim to train DNNs for visual tracking systems, effectively. Their general motivations can be classified into either employing different network training (e.g., network pre-training, online training, or both) or handling some training problems (e.g., lacking training data, over-fitting on training data, and computational complexity). Unsupervised training is another recent scheme to use abundant unlabeled samples, which can be performed by clustering these samples according to contextual information, mapping training data to a manifold space, or exploiting consistency-based objective function. At last, the main motivations of DL-based trackers according to their learning procedures are classified to online update schemes, aspect ratio estimation, scale estimation, search strategies, and a providing long-term memory.

In the following, DL-based visual tracking methods are comprehensively categorized based on six main aspects of network architecture, network exploitation, network training for visual tracking purposes, network objective, network

output, and exploitation of correlation filter advantages. The proposed taxonomy of DL-based visual tracking methods is shown in Fig. 3. Furthermore, other important details including the pre-trained networks, backbone networks, exploited layers, type of deep features, the fusion of hand-crafted and deep features, training datasets, tracking output, tracking speed, hardware implementation details, programming language, and DL framework will be presented in this section. In this section, not only the state-of-the-art DL-based visual tracking methods are categorized, but also the main motivations and contributions of those methods are classified that can provide helpful perspectives to identify future directions.

2.1 Network Architecture

Although CNNs have been used in extensive DL-based methods, other architectures also have been mainly developed to improve the efficiency and robustness of visual trackers in recent years. According to the extent of techniques based on various deep structures, the taxonomy

consists of the CNN-based, SNN-based, GAN-based, RNN-based, and custom network-based methods.

2.1.1 Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)

Motivated by CNN breakthroughs in computer vision tasks and some attractive advantages such as parameter sharing, sparse interactions, and dominant representations, a wide range of methods utilize CNNs for visual tracking. The CNN-based visual trackers are mainly classified according to the following motivations.

- **Robust target representation:** Providing a powerful target representation is the main advantage of employing CNNs for visual tracking. To achieve the goal of learning generic representations for target modeling and constructing a more robust target models, the main contributions of methods are classified into:

- offline training of CNNs on large-scale datasets for visual tracking [63], [68], [80], [89], [97], [100], [101], [104], [112], [116], [135], [137], [142], [144], [153], [165], [168], [169], [173],
- designing specific deep convolutional networks instead of employing pre-trained models [63], [68], [70], [72], [73], [75], [76], [80], [82], [89], [97], [100], [101], [104], [105], [108], [112], [116], [127], [135], [137], [141], [142], [144], [146], [150], [153], [165], [167]–[169], [171], [173],
- constructing multiple target models to capture variety of target appearances [75], [116], [127], [129], [130], [143], [146], [172],
- incorporating spatial and temporal information to improve model generalization [79], [82], [106], [119], [122], [137], [151], [153],
- fusion of different deep features to exploit complementary spatial and semantic information [64], [101], [108], [109], [135],
- learning different target models such as relative model [104] or part-based models [116], [127], [146] to handle partial occlusion and deformation, and
- utilizing two-stream network [127] to prevent from overfitting and learn rotation information.

- **Balancing training data:** According to the definition of visual tracking, there is just one positive sample in the first frame that increases the risk of overfitting. Although the background information arbitrary can be considered as negative ones in each frame, target sampling based on imperfect target estimations may also lead to noisy/unreliable training samples. These problems dramatically affect the performance of visual tracking methods. To alleviate them, CNN-based methods propose:

- domain adaption mechanism (i.e., transferring learned knowledge from source domain to target domain with insufficient samples) [89], [165],
- various update mechanisms (e.g., periodic, stochastic, short-term, and long-term updates) [105], [129], [143], [149], [169],
- convolutional Fisher discriminative analysis (FDA) for positive and negative sample mining [141],
- multiple-branches CNN for online ensemble learning [97], and
- efficient sampling strategies to increase the number of training samples [171].

- **Computational complexity problem:** Despite significant progress of CNNs in terms of target estimation accuracy, the

CNN-based methods still suffer from high computational complexity. To reduce this limitation, CNN-based visual tracking methods exploit different solutions namely:

- disassembling a CNN into several shrunken networks [76],
- compressing or pruning training sample space [94], [115], [141], [153], [168] or feature selection [61], [154],
- feature computation via RoIAlign operation [112] (i.e., feature approximation via bilinear interpolation) or oblique random forest [99] for better data capturing,
- corrective domain adaption method [165],
- lightweight structure [72], [73], [167],
- efficient optimization processes [98], [155],
- exploiting advantages of correlation filters [59]–[61], [64], [69], [74], [77]–[80], [83], [85], [86], [92], [94]–[96], [98], [100], [106], [108], [109], [115], [119], [122], [126], [127], [129]–[131], [135], [140], [141], [143], [144], [149]–[151], [155], [159], [165], [167], [171], [172], [174] for efficient computations,
- particle sampling strategy [96], and
- utilizing attentional mechanism [100].

2.1.2 Siamese Neural Network (SNN)

To learn similarity knowledge and achieve real-time speed, SNNs are widely employed for visual tracking purposes in the past few years. Given the pairs of target and search regions, these twin networks compute the same function to produce a similarity map. The common aim of SNN-based methods is to overcome the limitations of pre-trained deep CNNs and take full advantage of end-to-end learning for real-time applications.

- **Discriminative target representation:** The ability of visual tracker to construct a robust target model majorly relies on target representation. For achieving more discriminative deep features and improving target modeling, SNN-based methods propose:

- learning distractor-aware [111] or target-aware features [161],
- fusing deep multi-level features [132], [157] or combining confidence maps [88], [90], [124],
- utilizing different loss functions in Siamese formulation to train more effective filters [57], [107], [161]–[163],
- leveraging different types of deep features such as context information [117], [124], [158] or temporal features/models [65], [81], [125], [133], [158], [175],
- full exploring of low-level spatial features [132], [157],
- considering angle estimation of target to prevent from salient background objects [118],
- utilizing multi-stage regression to refine target representation [157], and
- using deeper and wider deep network as the backbone to increase receptive field of neurons which is equivalent to capturing the structure of the target [56].

- **Adapting target appearance variation:** Using only offline training of the first generation of SNN-based methods caused a poor generalization of these methods to adapt to target appearance variations. To solve it, recent SNN-based methods have proposed:

- online update strategies [81], [90], [93], [103], [111], [152], [156], [163],
- background suppression [81], [111]],
- formulating tracking task as a one-shot local detection

task [111], [123], and

iv) giving higher weights to important feature channels or score maps [88], [124], [128], [148].

Alternatively, the DaSiamRPN [111] and MMLT [114] use a local-to-global search region strategy and memory exploitation to handle critical challenges such as full occlusion and out-of-view and enhance local search strategy, respectively.

• **Balancing training data:** As a same problem for the CNN-based methods, some efforts by SNN-based methods have been performed to address imbalance distribution of training samples. The main contributions of the SNN-based methods are:

i) exploiting multi-stage Siamese framework to stimulate hard negative sampling [157],

ii) adopting sampling heuristic such as fixed foreground-to-background ratio [157] or sampling strategies such as random sampling [111] or flow-guided sampling [133], and iii) taking advantages of correlation filter/layer into Siamese framework [77], [78], [81], [93], [102], [111], [123], [125], [128], [148], [152], [154], [156], [161], [162], [170].

2.1.3 Recurrent Neural Network (RNN)

Since visual tracking is related to both spatial and temporal information of video frames, RNN-based methods are employed to consider target motion/movement, simultaneously. Because of arduous training and a considerable number of parameters, the number of RNN-based methods is limited. Almost all these methods try to exploit additional information and memory to improve target modeling. Also, the second aim of using RNN-based methods is to avoid fine-tuning of pre-trained CNN models, which takes a lot of time and is prone to over-fitting. The primary purposes of these methods can be classified to the spatio-temporal representation capturing [84], [139], [175], leveraging contextual information to handle background clutters [139], exploiting multi-level visual attention to highlight target as well as background suppression [175], and use convolutional long short-term memory (LSTM) as the memory unit of previous target appearances [84]. Moreover, RNN-based methods exploit pyramid multi-directional recurrent network [139] or incorporate LSTM into different networks [84] to memorize target appearance and investigate time dependencies during the time. At last, the [139] encodes the self-structure of a target to reduce tracking sensitivity related to similar distractors.

2.1.4 Generative Adversarial Network (GAN)

Based on some attractive advantages such as capturing statistical distribution and generating desired training samples without extensive annotated data, the GANs have been intensively utilized in many research areas. Although GANs are usually hard to train and evaluate, some DL-based visual trackers employ them to enrich training samples and target modeling. These networks can augment positive samples in feature space to address the imbalance distribution of training samples [121]. Also, the GAN-based methods can learn general appearance distribution to deal with the self-learning problem of visual tracking [136]. Furthermore, the joint optimization of regression and discriminative networks will lead to taking advantage of both regression and classification tasks [164].

2.1.5 Custom Networks

Inspired by particular deep architectures and network layers, modern DL-based methods have combined a wide range of networks such as AE, CNN, RNN, SNN, and also deep RL for visual tracking. The primary motivation is to compensate deficiencies of ordinary methods by exploiting the advantages of other networks. The primary motivations and contributions are classified as follows.

• **Computational complexity problem:** As stated before, this problem limits the performance of online trackers in real-time applications. To control computational complexity of custom network-based visual trackers, the TRACA [120] and AEPCF [171] methods employ AEs to compress raw conventional deep features, the EAST [181] adaptively takes either shallow features for simple frames for tracking or expensive deep features for challenging ones [181], and the TRACA [120], CFSRL [145], and AEPCF [171] exploit the DCF computation efficiency.

• **Model update:** To maintain the stability of target model during the tracking process, different update strategies have been proposed; for instance, the CFSRL [145] updates multiple models in parallel, the DRRL [166] incorporates an LSTM to exploit long-range time dependencies, and the AEPCF [171] utilizes long-term and short-term update schemes to increase tracking speed. To prevent the erroneous model update and drift problem, the RDT [184] has revised the visual tracking formulation to a consecutive decision-making process about the best target template for the next localization. Moreover, efficient learning of good decision policies using RL [183] is another technique to take either model update or ignore the decision.

• **Limited training data:** The soft and non-representative training samples can disturb visual tracking if occlusion, blurring, and large deformation happen. The AEPCF [171] exploits a dense circular sampling scheme to prevent over-fitting problem caused by limited training data. To make diverse and challenging training data, the SINT++ [58] generates positive and hard training samples by positive sample generation network (PSGN) and hard positive transformation network (HPTN). To efficiently train DNNs without a large amount of training data, partially labeled training samples are utilized by an action-driven deep tracker [176], [177]. Also, the P-Track [183] uses active decision-making to interactively label videos while learning a tracker when limited annotated data are available.

• **Search strategy:** From the definition, visual tracking methods estimate the new target state in the search region of the next frame given an initial target state in the first frame. The selection of the best search region is dependent on the iterative search strategies that usually are not only independent from video content but also heuristic, brute-force, and hand-engineered. Despite classical search strategies based on sliding windows, mean shift, or particle filter, the state-of-the-art DL-based visual trackers exploit RL-based methods to learn data-driven searching policies. To exhaustively explore a region of interest and select the best target candidate, action-driven tracking mechanisms [176], [177] consider the target context variation and actively pursues the target movement. Furthermore, the ACT and DRRL have proposed practical RL-based search strategies

for real-time requirements by dynamic search process [110] and coarse-to-fine verification [166].

- **Exploiting additional information:** To enhance the target model by utilizing motion or contextual information, the DCTN [138] establishes a two-stream network, and the SRT [87] adopts multi-directional RNN to learn further dependencies of a target during visual tracking. To encode relevant information for better localization, previous semantic information and tracking proposals are modeled by a recurrent convolutional network [180]. Also, DRL-IS [179] has introduced an Actor-Critic network to estimate target motion parameters efficiently.

- **Decision making:** Online decision making has principal effects on the performance of DL-based visual tracking methods. The state-of-the-art methods attempt to learn online decision making by incorporating RL into the DL-based methods instead of hand-designed techniques. To gain effective decision policies, the P-Track [183] ultimately exploits data-driven techniques in an active agent to decide about tracking, re-initializing, or updating processes. Also, the DRL-IS [179] utilizes a principled RL-based method to select sensible action based on target status. Also, an action-prediction network has been proposed to adjust the continuous actions of a visual tracker to determine the optimal hyper-parameters for learning the best action policies and make satisfactory decisions [182].

2.2 Network Exploitation

Roughly speaking, there are two main exploitations of DNNs for visual tracking, including reusing a pre-trained model on partially related datasets or exploiting deep features for visual tracking, which is equivalent to train a DNN for visual tracking purposes.

2.2.1 Model Reuse or Deep Off-the-Shelf Features

Exploiting deep off-the-shelf features is the simplest way to transfer the power of deep features into the traditional visual tracking methods. These features provide a generic representation of visual targets and help visual tracking methods to construct more robust target models. Regarding topologies, DNNs include either a simple multi-layer stack of non-linear layers (e.g., AlexNet [34], VGGNet [35], [36]) or a directed acyclic graph topology (e.g., GoogLeNet [37], ResNet [128], SSD [198], Siamese convolutional neural network [199]) which allows designing more complex deep architectures that include layers with multiple input/output. The main challenge of these trackers is how to benefit the generic representations completely. Different methods employ various feature maps and models that have been pre-trained majorly on large-scale still images of ImageNet dataset [39] for the object recognition task. Numerous methods have studied the properties of pre-trained models and explored the impact of deep features in traditional frameworks (see Table 1). As a result, simultaneous exploitation of both semantic and fine-grained deep features has been preferred by the DL-based methods [59], [61], [64], [140], [157], [200], [201]. Fusion of deep features is also another motivation of these methods which is performed by different techniques to utilize multi-resolution deep features [59]–[61], [64], [69], [83], [109], [129], [130], [143], [152], [172] and independent fusion of deep features with shallow ones

at a later stage [109]. Exploiting motion information [92], [106], [172], [202], and selecting appropriate deep features for visual tracking tasks [61], [154] are two other interesting motivations for DL-based methods. The detailed characteristics of DL-based visual trackers based on deep off-the-shelf features are shown in Table 1. Needless to say, the network output for these methods are deep feature maps.

2.2.2 Deep Features for Visual Tracking Purpose

One trending part of new methods is how to design and train DNNs for visual tracking. Using deep off-the-shelf features limits the visual tracking performance due to inconsistency among the objectives of different tasks. Also, offline learned deep features may not capture target variations and tend to over-fit on initial target templates. Hence, DNNs are trained on large-scale datasets to specialize the networks for visual tracking purposes. Besides, applying a fine-tuning process during visual tracking can adjust some network parameters and produce more refined target representations. However, the fine-tuning process is time-consuming and prone to over-fitting because of a heuristically fixed iteration number and limited available training data. As it is shown in Table 2 to Table 4, these DL-based methods usually train a pre-trained network (i.e., backbone network) by either offline training or online training or both.

2.3 Network Training

The state-of-the-art DL-based visual tracking methods mostly exploit end-to-end learning with train/re-train a DNN by applying gradient-based optimization algorithms. However, these methods have differences according to their offline network training, online fine-tuning, computational complexity, dealing with lack of training data, addressing overfitting problem, and exploiting unlabeled samples by unsupervised training. The network training section in the previous review papers [51]–[53] consider both FENs and EENs, although the FENs were only pre-trained for other tasks, and there is no training procedure for visual tracking. In this survey, DL-based methods are categorized into only offline pre-training, only online training, and both offline and online training for visual tracking purposes. The training details of these methods are shown in Table 2 to Table 4.

2.3.1 Only Offline Training

Most of the DL-based visual tracking methods only pre-train their networks to provide a generic target representation and reduce the high risk of over-fitting due to imbalanced training data and fixed assumptions. To adjust the learned filter weights for visual tracking task, the specialized networks are trained on large-scale data to not only exploit better representation but also achieve acceptable tracking speed by preventing from training during visual tracking (see Table 2).

2.3.2 Only Online Training

To discriminate unseen targets which may consider as the target in evaluation videos, some DL-based visual tracking methods use online training of whole or a part of DNNs to adapt network parameters according to the large variety of target appearance. Because of the time-consuming process

of offline training on large-scale training data and insufficient discrimination of pre-trained models for representing tracking particular targets, the methods shown in Table 3 use directly training of DNNs and inference process alternatively online. However, these methods usually exploit some strategies to prevent over-fitting problem and divergence.

2.3.3 Both Offline and Online Training

To exploit the maximum capacity of DNNs for visual tracking, the methods shown in Table 4 use both offline and online training. The offline and online learned features are known as shared and domain-specific representations, which majorly can discriminate the target from foreground information or intra-class distractors, respectively. Because visual tracking is a hard and challenging problem, the DL-based visual trackers attempt to employ feature transferability and online domain adaption simultaneously.

2.4 Network Objective

After the training and inference stages, DL-based visual trackers localize the given target based on network objective function. Hence, the DL-based visual tracking methods are categorized into classification-based, regression-based, or both classification and regression-based methods as follows. This categorization is based on the objective functions of DNNs that have been used in visual tracking methods (see Fig. 3); hence, this sub-section does not include the methods that exploit deep off-the-shelf features because these methods do not design and train the networks and usually employ DNNs for feature extraction.

2.4.1 Classification-based Objective Function

Motivated by other computer vision tasks such as image detection, classification-based visual tracking methods employ object proposal methods to produce hundreds of candidate/proposal BBs extracted from the search region. These methods aim to select the high score proposal by classifying the proposals to the target and background classes. This two-class (or binary) classification involves visual targets from various class and moving patterns, and also individual sequences, including challenging scenarios. Due to the main attention of these methods on inter-class classification, tracking a visual target in the presence of the same labeled targets is intensely prone to drift-problem. Also, tracking the arbitrary appearance of targets may lead to problems in recognizing different targets with varying appearances. Therefore, the performance of the classification-based visual tracking methods is also related to their object proposal method, which usually produces a considerable number of candidate BBs. On the other side, some recent DL-based methods utilize this objective function to take the optimal action on BB [58], [166], [176]–[179], [181].

2.4.2 Regression-based Objective Function

Due to the continuous instinct of estimation space of visual tracking, regression-based methods usually aim to directly localize target in the subsequent frames by minimizing a regularized least-squares function. Generally, extensive training data are needed to train these methods effectively. The primary goal of regression-based methods is to refine the formulation of L2 or L1 loss functions such as

utilizing shrinkage loss in learning procedure [108], modeling both regression coefficients and patch reliability to optimize a neural network efficiently [127], or applying the cost-sensitive loss to enhance unsupervised learning performance [162].

2.4.3 Both Classification and Regression-based Objective Function

To take advantages of both foreground-background/category classification and ridge regression (i.e., regularized least-squares objective function), some methods employ both classification- and regression-based objective functions for visual tracking (see Fig. 3), which their goal is to bridge the gap between the recent tracking-by-detection and continuous localization process of visual tracking. Commonly, these methods utilize classification-based methods to find the most similar object proposal to target and then the estimated region will be refined by a BB regression method [55], [68], [75], [87], [101], [110]–[112], [123], [137], [153], [168], [173]. To enhance efficiency and accuracy, the target regions are estimated by classification scores and optimized regression/matching functions [56], [57], [134], [145], [146], [156], [157], [160], [163], [164], [167], [179]. The classification outputs are mainly inferred for confidence scores of candidate proposals, foreground detection, response of candidate window, actions, and so forth.

2.5 Network Output

Based on their network outputs, the DL-based methods are classified into six main categories (see Fig. 3 and Table 2 to Table 4), namely confidence map (also includes score map, response map, and voting map), BB (also includes rotated BB), object score (also includes probability of object proposal, verification score, similarity score, and layer-wise score), action, feature maps, and segmentation mask. According to the network objective, the DL-based methods generate different network outputs to estimate or refine the estimated target location.

2.6 Exploitation of Correlation Filters Advantages

The DCF-based methods aim to learn a set of discriminative filters that an element-wise multiplication of them with a set of training samples in the frequency domain determines spatial target location. Since DCF has provided competitive tracking performance along with computational efficiency compared to sophisticated techniques, DL-based visual trackers use correlation filter advantages. These methods are categorized based on how they exploit DCF advantages by using either a whole DCF framework or some benefits, such as its objective function or correlation filters/layers. Considerable visual tracking methods are based on the integration of deep features in the DCF framework (see Fig. 3). These methods aim to improve the robustness of target representation against challenging attributes, while other methods attempt to benefit the computational efficiency of correlation filter(s) [93], correlation layer(s) [125], [141], [148], [161], [170], and the objective function of correlation filters [80], [81], [102], [128], [156], [162].

3 VISUAL TRACKING BENCHMARK DATASETS

Visual tracking benchmark datasets have been introduced to provide fair and standardized evaluations of single-object tracking algorithms. The tracking datasets contain video sequences that include not only diverse target categories but also have different time durations and challenging attributes. These datasets contain a large variety of the numbers of video sequences, frames, attributes, and classes (or clusters). The attributes include illumination variation (IV), scale variation (SV), occlusion (OCC), deformation (DEF), motion blur (MB), fast motion (FM), in-plane rotation (IPR), out-of-plane rotation (OPR), out-of-view (OV), background clutter (BC), low resolution (LR), aspect ratio change (ARC), camera motion (CM), full occlusion (FOC), partial occlusion (POC), similar object (SOB), viewpoint change (VC), light (LI), surface cover (SC), specularity (SP), transparency (TR), shape (SH), motion smoothness (MS), motion coherence (MCO), confusion (CON), low contrast (LC), zooming camera (ZC), long duration (LD), shadow change (SHC), flash (FL), dim light (DL), camera shaking (CS), rotation (ROT), fast background change (FBC), motion change (MOC), object color change (OCO), scene complexity (SCO), absolute motion (AM), size (SZ), relative speed (RS), distractors (DI), length (LE), fast camera motion (FCM), and small/large objects (SLO). Table 5 compares the characteristics of visual tracking datasets, the existence of missing labeled data for unsupervised training, and the partial overlap of datasets. By different evaluation protocols, existing visual tracking benchmarks assess the accuracy and robustness of visual trackers in realistic scenarios. The homogenized evaluation protocols facilitate straightforward comparison and development of visual trackers. In the following, the most popular visual tracking benchmark datasets and evaluation metrics are briefly described.

3.1 Visual Tracking Datasets

One of the first object tracking benchmark datasets, called OTB2013 [185], is developed by 51 fully annotated video sequences to address the issues of reported tracking results based on a few video sequences or inconsistent initial conditions or parameters. The OTB2015 [186] is an extended OTB2013 dataset that includes 100 commonly used video sequences with the aim of unbiased performance comparisons. To provide the performance of visual tracking algorithms on color sequences, the Temple Color 128 (TColor128 or TC128) [187] collected a set of 129 fully annotated video sequences that 78 ones are different from the OTB datasets; however, its attributes are annotated same as attributes of the OTB ones. The Amsterdam library of ordinary videos (ALOV) dataset [48] has been gathered to cover diverse video sequences and attributes. By emphasizing on challenging visual tracking scenarios, the ALOV dataset composes of 304 assorted short videos and ten longer ones. The video sequences are chosen from real-life YouTube videos and have thirteen difficulty degrees. The videos of ALOV have been categorized according to one of its attributes (Table 5), although in the OTB dataset each video has been annotated by several visual attributes.

The unmanned aerial vehicle 123 (UAV123) [188] provides a sparse and low altitude UAV tracking dataset

which contains the realistic and synthetic HD video sequences captured by professional-grade UAV, a board-cam mounted on a small low-cost UAV, and UAV simulator. For tracking pedestrian and rigid objects, the NUS people and rigid objects (NUS-PRO) dataset [189] not only has been provided 365 video sequences from YouTube under twelve challenging factors but also annotated the level of occluded objects of each frame with no occlusion, partial occlusion, and full occlusion labels. It consists of five main categories (namely, face, pedestrian, sportsman, rigid object, and long sequences) and sixteen subcategories (including, hat, mask, interview, politician, sunglasses, basketball, gymnastics, handball, racing, soccer, tennis, airplane, boat, car, helicopter, and motorcycle) that majorly captured by moving cameras. By higher frame rate (240 FPS) cameras, the need for speed (Nfs) dataset [190] provides 100 video sequences from real-world scenarios to systematically investigate trade-off bandwidth constraints related to real-time analysis of visual trackers. These videos are either recorded by hand-held iPhone/iPad cameras or from YouTube videos. Also, it contains a wide range of visual targets, which are the vehicle, person, face, animal, aircraft, and boat.

Motivated by inequality of large dataset with useful one, the VOT dataset [40]–[46] aims to provide a diverse and sufficiently small dataset from existing visual tracking datasets, and per-frame annotate them by rotatable BBs and visual properties. To evaluate different visual tracking methods fast and straightforward, the VOT includes visual tracking exchange (TraX) protocol [197] that not only prepares data, runs experiments, and performs analyses but also can detect tracking failures (i.e., losing the target) and re-initialize the tracker five frames after each failure to assess tracking robustness. The drone tracking benchmark (DTB) [191] is the dataset captured by UAVs or drones that consists of 70 diverse RGB videos with massive displacement of target location due to abrupt camera motion. This dataset primary focuses on tracking people and cars and aims to concentrate on the performance of the motion model of visual trackers for non-stationary or slow-moving cameras, which have a higher degree of freedom. Despite some small and saturated tracking datasets in the wild, which are mostly provided for object detection task, the large-scale TrackingNet benchmark dataset [192] has been proposed to feed deep visual trackers properly. It includes 500 original videos, more than 14 million upright BB annotations, densely annotated data in time, rich distribution of object classes, and real-world scenarios by sampled YouTube videos. While the training and testing sets of the TrackingNet respectively consist of 30132 and 115 video sequences, it provides the same object class distributions in terms of video length, BB resolution, motion change, aspect ratio, and attribute distributions.

With the aim of long-term tracking of frequently disappearance targets, the OxUvA dataset [193] has selected 366 video sequences (14 hours of video) from YouTube-BoundingBoxes (or YTBB) [203] to provide development and test sets with continuous attributes. The annotated absent labels show that the target does not exist in the frame. Also, this dataset includes continuous attributes which their quantities have been measured by BB annotations and metadata. The BUAA-PRO dataset [194] is a segmentation-based

TABLE 5: Comparison of visual tracking datasets. The abbreviations are denoted as RN: row number, NoV: number of videos, NoF: number of frames, NoA: number of attributes, OD: overlapped datasets, AL: absent labels, NoC: number of classes or clusters, AD: average duration (s: seconds).

Year	Dataset	NoV	NoF	NoA	OD	AL	NoC	AD	Attributes
2013	OTB2013	51	29K	11	VOT, OTB2015, TC128	No	10	19.4s	IV, SV, OCC, DEF, MB, FM, IPR, OPR, OV, BC, LR
2013-2019	VOT2013-2019	16-60	6K-21K	12	OTB, ALOV++, TC128, UAV123, NUS-PRO	No	12-24	12s	IV, SV, OCC, DEF, MB, BC, ARC, CM, MOC, OCO, SCO, AM
2014	ALOV++	314	89K	14	VOT, YouTube	No	64	16.2s	OCC, BC, CM, LI, SC, SP, TR, SH, MS, MCO, CON, LC, ZC, LD
2015	OTB2015	100	59K	11	OTB2013, VOT, TC128	No	16	19.8s	IV, SV, OCC, DEF, MB, FM, IPR, OPR, OV, BC, LR
2015	TC128	129	55K	11	OTB, VOT	No	27	15.6s	IV, SV, OCC, DEF, MB, FM, IPR, OPR, OV, BC, LR
2016	UAV123	123	113K	12	VOT	No	9	30.6s	IV, SV, FM, OV, BC, LR, ARC, CM, FCM, FOC, POC, SOB, VC
2016	NUS-PRO	365	135K	12	VOT, YouTube	No	17	12.6s	SV, DEF, BC, FOC, POC, SOB, SHC, FL, DL, CS, ROT, FBC
2017	NfS	100	383K	9	YouTube	No	17	15.6s	IV, SV, OCC, DEF, FM, OV, BC, LR, VC
2017	DTB	70	15K	11	YouTube	No	15	7.2s	SV, OCC, DEF, MB, IPR, OPR, OV, BC, ARC, FCM, SOB
2018	TrackingNet	30643	14.43M	15	YTBB	No	27	16.6s	IV, SV, DEF, MB, FM, IPR, OPR, OV, BC, LR, ARC, CM, FOC, POC, SOB
2018	OxUvA	366	1.55M	6	YTBB	Yes	22	144s	SV, OV, SZ, RS, DL, LE
2018	BUAA-PRO	150	8.7K	12	NUS-PRO, YTBB	No	12	2s	SV, DEF, BC, FOC, POC, SOB, SHC, FL, DL, CS, ROT, FBC
2018	GOT10k	10000	1.5M	6	VOT, WordNet, ImageNet	Yes	563	16s	IV, SV, OCC, FM, ARC, SLO
2019	LaSOT	1400	3.5M	14	YouTube, ImageNet	Yes	70	84.3s	IV, SV, DEF, MB, FM, OV, BC, LR, ARC, CM, FOC, POC, VC, ROT

benchmark dataset to address the problem of inevitable non-target elements in BBs. It consists of 150 video sequences from NUS-PRO with three main categories of the rigid object (namely, airplane, boat, car, helicopter, and motorcycle), sportsman (includes basketball, gymnastics, handball, racing, soccer, and tennis), and pedestrian. It exploits not only the same attributes of NUS-PRO but also the segmentation mask-based version of level-based occlusion attribute (i.e., no occlusion, partial occlusion, and full occlusion). The large-scale single object tracking (LaSOT) benchmark dataset [196] has developed to address the problems of visual tracking datasets such as small scale, lack of high-quality, dense annotations, short video sequences, and category bias. The object categories are from the ImageNet and a few visual tracking applications (such as drones) with an equal number of videos per each category. According to the Pareto principle (80% for training and 20% for the test), the LaSOT data are divided into the training and testing subsets, including 1120 (2.3M frames) and 280 (690K frames) video sequences, respectively. The large high-diversity benchmark dataset, called GOT-10k [195], includes more than ten thousand videos from the semantic hierarchy of WordNet [204] splitting to train, validation, and test sets. The video sequences are classified to 563 classes of moving objects and 87 classes of motion to cover as many challenging patterns in real-world scenarios as possible. The GOT-10k has informative attributes similar to the OxUvA.

3.2 Evaluation Metrics

To perform experimental comparisons on large-scale datasets, the visual tracking methods are evaluated by two fundamental evaluation categories of performance measures and performance plots. These metrics are briefly described as follows.

3.2.1 Performance Measures

To reflect several views of a visual tracker, various performance measures have been proposed. These measures attempt to intuitively interpret performance comparisons in terms of complementary measures of accuracy, robustness, and tracking speed. In the following, these measures are concisely investigated.

- **Center location error (CLE):** The CLE is defined as the average Euclidean distance between the precise ground-truth locations of target and estimated locations by the visual tracking methods. The CLE is the oldest metric that not only is sensitive to dataset annotation and does not consider tracking failures but also ignores the targets BB and results in significant errors.

- **Accuracy:** To achieve visual tracking accuracy, first, the overlap score is calculated as $S = \frac{|b_t \cap b_g|}{|b_t \cup b_g|}$ which b_g , b_t , \cap , \cup and $|\cdot|$ represent the ground-truth BB, an estimated BB by a visual tracking method, intersection operator, union operator, and the number of pixels in the resulted region, respectively. By considering a certain threshold, the overlap score indicates the success of a visual tracker in one frame. Then, the accuracy is calculated by the average overlap scores (AOS) during the tracking when a visual tracker's estimations have overlap with the ground-truth ones. This metric jointly considers both location and region to measure the drift rate of the estimated target up to its failure.

- **Robustness/failure score:** The robustness or failure score is defined as the number of required re-initializations when a tracker loses (or drifts) a visual target during the tracking task. The failure is detected when the overlap score drops to zero.

- **Expected average overlap (EAO):** This score is interpreted as the combination of accuracy and robustness scores. Given N_s frames long sequences, the EAO score is calculated as $\hat{\Phi}_{N_s} = \left\langle \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \Phi_i \right\rangle$, where Φ_i is defined as the average of per-frame overlaps until the end of sequences, even if failure leads to zero overlaps.

- **Area under curve (AUC):** The AUC score has defined the average success rates (normalized between 0 and 1) according to the pre-defined thresholds. To rank the visual tracking methods based on their overall performance, the AUC score summarizes the AOS of visual tracking methods across a sequence.

3.2.2 Performance Plots

To figure out the performance of visual tracking methods, different methods are usually evaluated in terms of different thresholds to provide more intuitive quantitative comparisons. In the following, these metrics are summarized.

- **Precision plot:** Given the CLEs per different thresholds, the precision plot shows the percentage of video frames in which the estimated locations have at most the specific threshold with the ground-truth locations.

- **Success plot:** Given the calculated various accuracies per thresholds, success plot measures the percentage of frames in which the estimated overlaps and the ground-truth ones have larger overlap than a certain threshold.

- **Expected average overlap curve:** For an individual length of video sequences, the expected average overlap curve has resulted from the range of values in a specific interval $[N_{lo}, N_{hi}]$ as $\hat{\Phi} = \frac{1}{N_{hi} - N_{lo}} \sum_{N_s=N_{lo}}^{N_{hi}} \hat{\Phi}_{N_s}$.

- **One-pass evaluation with restart (OPER):** The OPER is a supervised system that continuously measures a tracking

TABLE 6: State-of-the-art visual tracking methods for experimental comparisons on visual tracking datasets.

Published in	Visual Tracking Method	Exploited Features	Test Datasets
ICCV 2015	HCFT [59]	DAF	OTB, LaSOT
ICCV 2015	DeepSRDCF [60]	DAF, HOG	OTB, VOT2018
ECCV 2016	CCOT [64]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
ECCVW 2016	SiamFC [66]	DAF	OTB, LaSOT
CVPR 2016	SINT [67]	DAF	OTB, LaSOT
CVPR 2016	MDNet [68]	DAF	OTB, LaSOT
CVPR 2016	HDT [69]	DAF	OTB
ICCV 2017, TIP 2019	PTAV [77], [78]	DAF, HOG	OTB, LaSOT
ICCV 2017	CREST [79]	DAF	OTB
ICCV 2017	Meta-CREST [79]	DAF	OTB
ICCV 2017	UCT [80]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
ICCV 2017	DSiam [81]	DAF	VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2017	CFNet [93]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2017	ECO [94]	DAF, HOG, CN	OTB, VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2017	DeepSRDCF [95]	DAF, HOG, CN	VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2017	MCPF [96]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
CVPR 2017	ACFN [100]	DAF, HOG, Color	OTB
arXiv 2017	DCFNet [102]	DAF	OTB
arXiv 2017	DCFNet2 [102]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
ECCV 2018	TripletLoss-CFNet [107]	DAF	OTB
ECCV 2018	TripletLoss-SiamFC [107]	DAF	OTB
ECCV 2018	TripletLoss-CFNet2 [107]	DAF	OTB
ECCV 2018	UPDT [109]	DAF, HOG, CN	VOT2018
ECCV 2018	DaSiamRPN [111]	DAF	VOT2018
ECCV 2018	StructSiam [113]	DAF	LaSOT
ECCVW 2018	Siam-MCF [117]	DAF	OTB
CVPR 2018	TRACA [120]	CDAF	OTB, VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2018	VITAL [121]	DAF	OTB, LaSOT
CVPR 2018	DeepSTRCF [122]	DAF, HOG, CN	OTB, VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2018	SiamRPN [123]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
CVPR 2018	SA-Siam [124]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
CVPR 2018	LSART [127]	DAF	VOT2018
CVPR 2018	DRT [126]	DAF, HOG, CN	VOT2018
NIPS 2018	DAT [137]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
PAMI 2018	HCFTs [140]	DAF	OTB
IJCV 2018	LCTdeep [149]	DAF	OTB
TIP 2018	CFCF [144]	DAF, HOG	VOT2018
CVPR 2019	C-RPN [157]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018, LaSOT
CVPR 2019	GCT [158]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
CVPR 2019	SiamMask [57]	DAF	VOT2018
CVPR 2019	SiamRPN++ [55]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
CVPR 2019	TADT [161]	DAF	OTB
CVPR 2019	ASRCF [155]	DAF, HOG	OTB, LaSOT
CVPR 2019	SiamDW-SiamRPN [56]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018
CVPR 2019	SiamDW-SiamFC [56]	DAF	OTB, VOT2018

method in terms of accuracy to re-initialize it when a failure occurs. Also, the SRER does the same OPER for numerous evaluations of SRE.

4 EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSES

To analyze the performance of state-of-the-art visual tracking methods, 45 different methods are quantitatively compared on four well-known datasets OTB2013 [185], OTB2015 [186], VOT2018 [45], and LaSOT [196]. Due to the page limitation, all experimental results are publicly available on <https://github.com/MMarvasti/Deep-Learning-for-Visual-Tracking-Survey>. The included 45 DL-based trackers in the experiments are shown in Table 6. The ECO, CFNet, TRACA, DeepSTRCF, and C-RPN are considered as baseline trackers to compare performances on various datasets. All evaluations are performed on an Intel I7-9700K 3.60GHz CPU with 32GB RAM with the aid of MatConvNet toolbox [205] that uses an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080Ti GPU for its computations. The OTB and LaSOT toolkits evaluate the visual tracking methods in terms of the well-known precision and success plots and then rank the methods based on AUC score [185], [186]. For performance comparison on the VOT2018 dataset, the visual trackers have been assessed based on the TraX evaluation protocol [197] using three primary measures of accuracy, robustness, and EAO to provide the Accuracy-Robustness (AR) plots, expected average overlap curve, and ordering plots according to five challenging visual attributes [45], [206], [207].

4.1 Quantitative Comparisons

According to the results shown in Fig. 4, the top-5 visual tracking methods in terms of precision metric are

the VITAL, MDNet, DAT, ASRCF, and SiamDW-SiamRPN on the OTB2013 dataset, the SiamDW-SiamRPN, ASRCF, VITAL, SiamRPN++, and MDNet on the OTB2015 dataset, and the C-RPN, MDNet/VITAL, SiamFC/StructSiam, ASRCF, and DSiam on the LaSOT dataset, respectively. In terms of success metric, the ASRCF, VITAL, MDNet, DAT, and SiamRPN++ on the OTB2013 dataset, the SiamRPN++, SANet, ASRCF, VITAL, and MDNet on the OTB2015 dataset, and the C-RPN, MDNet, VITAL, ASRCF, and SiamFC on the LaSOT dataset have achieved the best performance, respectively. On the VOT2018 dataset (see Fig. 5 and Table 7), the top-5 visual trackers are the SiamMask, SiamRPN++, DaSiamRPN, C-RPN, and SiamDW-SiamRPN in terms of accuracy measure while the UPDT, LSART, DeepSTRCF, SiamMask, and SiamRPN++/DRT have the best robustness, respectively. On the other hand, the best visual tracking methods based on both precision-success measures (see Fig. 4) are the VITAL, MDNet, ASRCF, DAT, and SiamRPN++ on the OTB2013 dataset, the SiamRPN++, ASRCF, VITAL, SiamDW-SiamRPN, and MDNet on the OTB2015 dataset, and the C-RPN, MDNet, VITAL, SiamFC, and ASRCF/StructSiam on the LaSOT dataset. On the VOT2018 dataset, the SiamRPN++, SiamMask, UPDT, DRT, and DeepSTRCF are the best performing trackers based on the EAO score. Moreover, the SiamRPN++, UPDT, MCPF, LSART, and DeepSTRCF have achieved the best AUC scores while the SiamRPN, SiamRPN++, CFNet, DAT, and DCFNet are the fastest visual trackers, respectively (see Table 7). According to the results (i.e., Fig. 4, Fig. 5, and Table 7), the best visual tracking methods that repeated their desirable performance on different visual tracking datasets are the VITAL [121], MDNet [68], DAT [137], ASRCF [155], SiamDW-SiamRPN [56], SiamRPN++ [55], C-RPN [157], StructSiam [157], SiamMask [57], DaSiamRPN [111], UPDT [109], LSART [127], DeepSTRCF [122], and DRT [126]. These methods will be investigated in Sec. 4.3.

4.2 Most Challenging Attributes per Benchmark Dataset

Following on the VOT challenges [43]–[45] which have specified the most challenging attributes for visual tracking, this survey not only determines these attributes for DL-based methods on the VOT dataset but also provides the most challenging attributes on the OTB and LaSOT datasets for the first time. These attributes are determined by the median accuracy and robustness per attribute on the VOT or equivalently the median precision and success per attribute on the OTB2015 and LaSOT datasets. Table 8 shows the first to fifth challenging attributes for each benchmark dataset. Also, the best-performing trackers to handle these attributes are investigated by Fig. 5 to Fig. 7. Based on the results in Table 8, the most challenging attributes on the VOT2018 dataset are the OCC, SV, and IV, according to the accuracy metric and the OCC, MOC, and IV, according to the robustness metric. Based on the precision metric, the OV, OCC, and LR on the OTB2015 and the FM, OV, and DEF on the LaSOT dataset are the most challenging attributes for visual tracking methods. At last, the DEF, OV, and LR on the OTB2015 dataset and the FM, OV, and FOC on the LaSOT dataset are the most challenging ones based on the success metric. To sum up, the OCC, OV, FM, DEF, IV, and




Fig. 4: Overall experimental comparison of state-of-the-art visual tracking methods on the OTB2013, OTB2015, and LaSOT visual tracking datasets.




Fig. 5: Performance comparison of visual tracking methods on VOT2018 dataset.

LR are selected as the most challenging attributes that can effectively impact on the performance of DL-based visual tracking methods.

On the other hand, the most accurate visual tracking methods on the VOT2018 dataset, according to the OCC, SV, and IV are the SiamRPN++ [55], SiamMask [57], and SiamMask, respectively. Also, the DRT [126], UPDT [109], and SiamMask [57]/CFCF [144] visual trackers are the most robust trackers on the VOT2018 dataset according to the OCC, MOC, and IV, respectively. In terms of success metric, the SiamRPN++ [55] is the best visual tracking method to tackle the DEF and OV attributes while the Siam-MCF [117] is the best one to deal with the visual tracking in LR videos on the OTB2015 dataset. The ASRCF [155], ECO [94], and SiamDW-SiamRPN [56] are the best trackers in terms of precision metric to face with OV, OCC, and DEF attributes on the OTB-2015 dataset. Except for the FM attribute that the MDNet [68] is the best method in terms of precision

metric, the C-RPN [157] has the superior performance on the other challenging attributes of the LaSOT benchmark dataset in terms of precision and success metrics. According to the overall and attribute-based comparisons, the C-RPN, MDNet, and VITAL are the top-3 trackers on the LaSOT dataset.

While the VOT2018 dataset provides frame-based attributes for individual video sequences, each video sequence has annotated with multiple attributes for the OTB and LaSOT datasets. According to this difference, the attribute-based comparisons on the VOT2018 are just investigated to infer the best strategies based on specific conditions. As shown in Fig. 5, the DCF-based methods have achieved fewer failures among the other methods, while the SNN-based methods have gained more overlap between the estimated BBs and ground-truth ones. The SiamRPN-based methods (i.e., [55]–[57], [111]) accurately handle scenarios under each of CM, IV, MC, OCC, or SC

TABLE 7: Performance overview of visual tracking methods on VOT2018 dataset.

Visual Tracking Methods	Baseline					Unsupervised				Real-time
	EAO	A-R rank		Speed	Overlap	Speed		EAO		
	EAO	Overlap	Failures	Normalized	FPS	AUC	Normalized	FPS	EAO	
ECO [94]	0.2809	0.4762	17.6628	0.8031	3.7056	0.4025	0.9916	4.5321	0.0776	
MCPF [96]	0.2477	0.5042	25.9600	0.0779	0.4195	0.4440	0.0821	0.4273	0.0598	
DCFNet [102]	0.1827	0.4646	35.2015	5.8744	27.2624	0.3269	7.3045	33.2206	0.1803	
UPDT [109]	0.3785	0.5302	10.4823	0.0810	0.4346	0.4546	0.0884	0.4697	0.0676	
DaSiamRPN [111]	0.3274	0.5673	21.4199	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TRACA [120]	0.1385	0.4306	53.6777	1.8143	10.0635	0.2587	3.4281	18.6393	0.1382	
DeepSTRCF [122]	0.3451	0.5165	13.1103	0.5193	2.9157	0.4365	0.5605	3.1144	0.0629	
SiamRPN [123]	0.2453	0.4910	28.6648	19.2695	104.4643	0.3586	19.5166	103.0445	0.2453	
SA-Siam [124]	0.2374	0.4999	27.8227	-	22.6941	0.4071	-	36.1594	0.2373	
LSART [127]	0.3247	0.4919	12.7929	0.2967	1.7182	0.4389	0.2306	1.3242	0.0548	
DRT [126]	0.3550	0.5076	12.7941	0.1175	0.4378	0.4240	0.1237	0.4568	0.0620	
DAT [137]	0.1443	0.4310	42.0946	6.4338	28.6446	0.2871	8.5054	36.8791	0.1390	
SiamMask [57]	0.3839	0.6040	16.2519	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SiamRPN++ [55]	0.4169	0.5964	14.8653	-	34.3602	0.5015	-	37.0633	0.4169	

TABLE 8: Five most challenging attributes of benchmark datasets. [first to fifth challenging attributes are shown by red, blue, green, orange, and yellow colors.]

Dataset	Metric	IV	DEF	MB	CM	OCC	POC	FOC	ROT	IPR	OPR	BC	VC	SV	FM	OV	LR	ARC	MC
OTB2015	Precision	0.7807	0.7382	0.7642	-	0.7347	-	-	-	0.7575	0.7611	0.7576	-	0.7471	0.7506	0.6911	0.7532	-	-
	Success	0.6330	0.5682	0.6466	-	0.6027	-	-	-	0.6154	0.6172	0.6144	-	0.6022	0.6268	0.5683	0.5906	-	-
VOT2018	Accuracy	0.5026	-	-	0.5258	0.4312	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4627	-	-	-	-	0.5044
	Robustness	0.1695	-	-	0.1423	0.2856	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1051	-	-	-	-	0.1802
LaSOT	Precision	0.2677	0.1607	0.1957	0.2480	-	0.2000	0.1804	0.1976	-	-	0.2241	0.2617	0.2315	0.1482	0.1581	0.2171	0.2020	-
	Success	0.2837	0.2271	0.2314	0.2839	-	0.2335	0.1733	0.2228	-	-	0.2405	0.2392	0.2538	0.1382	0.1720	0.1761	0.2319	-




Fig. 6: Performance comparison of state-of-the-art visual tracking methods in terms of the most challenging attributes of the OTB2015 dataset.

attributes by adopting deeper and wider backbone networks which include classification and regression branches, the following strategies lead to improve the robustness of DL-based methods under specific conditions of real-world scenarios. By considering the fusion of hand-crafted and deep features [109], [122], [126], temporal regularization term [122], reliability term [126], data augmentation [109], and exploitation of ResNet-50 model [109], the DCF-based methods have attained desirable robustness against CM attribute. To effectively deal with the IV attribute, focusing on the discrimination power between the target and its background is the primary problem. The strategies such as training a fully convolutional network for correlation filter cost function, spatial-aware KRR and spatial-aware CNN, and employing semi-supervised video object segmentation improve the robustness of DL-based trackers when significant IV occurs. To robustly deal with MC and OCC

attributes, the DCF-based and CNN-based methods have performed the best. However, the SNN-based methods with the aid of region proposal subnetwork and proposal refinement can robustly estimate the tightest BB under severe scale changes.

4.3 Discussion

The overall best methods (i.e., VITAL [121], MDNet [68], DAT [137], ASRCF [155], SiamDW-SiamRPN [56], SiamRPN++ [55], C-RPN [157], StructSiam [113], SiamMask [57], DaSiamRPN [111], UPDT [109], LSART [127], DeepSTRCF [122], and DRT [126]) belong to a wide range of network architectures. For instance, the MDNet, LSART, and DAT (uses the MDNet architecture design) utilize CNNs to localize a visual target while the ASRCF (using both VGG-M and VGG-16), UPDT (using ResNet-50), DRT (using both VGG-M and VGG-16), and DeepSTRCF (using VGG-M) just




Fig. 7: Performance comparison of state-of-the-art visual tracking methods in terms of the most challenging attributes of the LaSOT dataset.

exploit pre-trained CNN models for feature extraction. Besides the VITAL that is a GAN-based tracker, the others have the SNN architecture (i.e., C-RPN, StructSiam, SiamMask, DaSiamRPN, SiamDW, and SiamRPN++). Currently, the most attractive deep architecture for visual tracking is the SNN [55]–[57], [111], [113], [157] although the GAN-based and RL-based methods have been recently developing for some specific purposes such as addressing the imbalance distribution of training samples [121] or selecting an appropriate real-time search strategy [110], [166]. In addition to providing a desirable balance between the performance and speed of SNN-based methods, this architecture is modified to not only integrate with diverse deep structures, searching strategies, and learning schemes but also exploit fully convolutional networks, correlation layers, region proposal networks, video object detection modules (i.e., towards designing custom networks for visual tracking purposes). The interesting point is that five SNN-based methods including the SiamDW-SiamRPN, SiamRPN++, C-RPN, SiamMask, and DaSiamRPN are based on the fast SiamRPN method [123] which is consisted of Siamese subnetwork and region proposal subnetwork; these subnetworks are leveraged for feature extraction and proposal extraction on correlation feature maps to solve the visual tracking problem by one-shot detection task. The main advantages of the SiamRPN method are the time efficiency and precise estimations with integrating proposal selection and refinement strategies into a Siamese network.

Interestingly, the ASRCF, UPDT, DRT, and DeepSTRCF, which exploit deep off-the-shelf features, are among the top-performing visual tracking methods. Moreover, five methods of UPDT, DeepSTRCF, DRT, LSART, and ASRCF, which are among the best methods, take the advantages of the DCF framework. On the other side, most of the best performing visual trackers, namely the VITAL, MDNet, DAT, SiamDW, SiamRPN++, C-RPN, StructSiam, SiamMask, DaSiamRPN, and LSART exploit specialized deep features for visual tracking purpose. Although diversified backbone networks (i.e., AlexNet (for C-RPN, StructSiam, and DaSiamRPN),

VGG-M (for MDNet, VITAL, and DAT), VGG-16 (for LSART), and ResNet (for SiamMask, SiamDW-SiamRPN, and SiamRPN++)) are employed for these methods, the state-of-the-art methods have been leveraging deeper neural network such as the ResNet-50 to strengthen discriminative power of target modeling. From the network training perspective, the SiamDW-SiamRPN, SiamRPN++, C-RPN, StructSiam, SiamMask, and DaSiamRPN use only offline training while the LSART utilizes only online training (online two-stream training network to effectively learn filters and in-plane rotation of target). Most of these methods aim to learn offline dominant representations to achieve real-time tracking speed. Handling significant appearance variations needs to adapt to network parameters during tracking, but online training has the over-fitting risk because of limited training samples. Hence, the VITAL, MDNet, and DAT by employing adversarial learning, domain-independent information, and attention maps as regularization terms benefit both offline and online training of DNNs. However, these methods provide tracking speed about one frame per second (FPS) that is not suitable for real-time applications. From the perspective of objective function of DNNs, the VITAL [121] and StructSiam [113] are classification-based, the LSART [127] is regression-based, and the other best-performing methods [55]–[57], [68], [111], [137], [157] are based on both classification and regression. For instance, five modified versions of the SiamRPN [123] (i.e., SiamDW-SiamRPN [56], SiamRPN++ [55], C-RPN [157], SiamMask [57], and DaSiamRPN [111]) have two branches for classification and regression.

Based on the motivation categorization of the best methods, the recent advanced methods rely on 1) alleviating the imbalanced distribution of visual training data by the data augmentation [109], [111] and generative network from adversarial learning [121], 2) efficient training and learning procedures by reformulating classification/regression problems [109], [111], [121], [122], [126], [127], [155] and providing specified features for visual tracking [55]–[57], [68], [111], [113], [121], [137], [157], 3) exploiting state-

of-the-art deeper and wider neural networks to provide more discriminative representations by leveraging ResNet models as the backbone networks [55]–[57], [109], and 4) extracting complementary features by employing additional information such as contextual [56], [109], [111], [113] or temporal information [111], [121], [122], [137]. The VITAL, DaSiamRPN, and UPDT attempt to alleviate the imbalanced distribution of positive and negative samples of training data and extract more discriminative features. The VITAL uses adversarial learning to not only augment positive samples and decrease simple negative samples but also preserve the most discriminative and robust features during tracking. Furthermore, the DaSiamRPN utilizes both data augmentation and negative semantic samples to consider visual distractors and improve visual tracking robustness. Finally, the UPDT uses standard data augmentation and a quality measure for estimated states to effectively fuse shallow and deep features.

To improve the learning process of the best DL-based methods, the UPDT, DeepSTRCF, DRT, LSART, and ASRCF revise the conventional ridge regression of DCF formulation. Moreover, the DaSiamRPN and VITAL utilize the distractor-aware objective function and reformulated objective function of GANs using a cost-sensitive loss to improve the training process of these visual trackers, respectively. Furthermore, training of DL-based methods on large-scale datasets adapts their network function for visual tracking purposes. The SiamDW, SiamRPN++, and SiamMask methods have aimed to leverage state-of-the-art deep networks as a backbone network of Siamese trackers. While these methods exploit ResNet models, the SiamDW proposes new residual modules and architectures to prevent significant receptive field increase and simultaneously improve feature discriminability and localization accuracy. Also, the ResNet-driven SNN-based tracker proposed by the SiamRPN++ includes different layer-wise and depth-wise aggregations to fill the performance gap between SNN-based and CNN-based methods.

Despite some other computer vision tasks (e.g., object detection or recognition), visual tracking is performed on video sequences that include both spatial and temporal information. In addition to the spatial information, the DAT and DeepSTRCF also consider temporal information in different ways to provide more robust features. The DAT and DeepSTRCF employ reciprocative learning and online passive-aggressive (PA) learning, respectively. While reciprocative learning scheme with attention regularization term activates an attentive classifier to robustly select target region with the aid of temporal features, the spatial-temporal regularization of online PA learning helps reducing the sensitivity of tracker and better adapting to significant appearance variations. From the learning perspective, the four learning methods of the similarity learning (i.e., SiamDW, SiamRPN++, C-RPN, StructSiam, SiamMask, DaSiamRPN), multi-domain learning (i.e., MDNet, DAT), adversarial learning (i.e., VITAL), spatial-aware regressions learning (i.e., LSART), and DCF learning are utilized.

In the following, the best visual tracking methods are studied based on their advantages and disadvantage. Three SNN-based methods of the C-RPN, StructSiam, and DaSiamRPN exploit the shallow AlexNet as their backbone net-

work (see Table 2), which is the main weakness of these methods according to their discriminative power. To improve tracking robustness in the presence of significant scale change and visual distractors, the C-RPN cascades multiple RPNs in a Siamese network to exploit from hard negative sampling (to provide more balanced training samples), multi-level features, and multiple steps of regressions. To decrease the sensitivity of SNN-based methods specifically for non-rigid appearance change and POC attributes, the StructSiam detects contextual information of local patterns and their relationships and matches them by a Siamese network in real-time speed. By adopting the local-to-global search strategy and the non-maximum suppression (NMS) to re-detect target and reduce potential distractors, the DaSiamRPN correctly handles the FOC, OV, POC, and BC challenges. In contrast, the SiamMask, SiamDW-SiamRPN, and SiamRPN++ exploit the ResNet models. To rely on rich target representation, the SiamMask uses three-branch architecture to estimate the target location by a rotated BB, which includes the binary mask of the target. The most failure reasons of SiamMask are the MB and OV attributes that produce erroneous target masks. To reduce the performance margin of the SNN-based methods with state-of-the-art visual tracking methods, the SiamDW-SiamRPN and SiamRPN++ study the exploitation of deep backbone networks to reduce the sensitivity of these methods to the most challenging attributes.

The MDNet and the other methods based on it (e.g., DAT) are still among the best visual tracking methods. Because of specialized offline and online training of these networks on large-scale visual tracking datasets, these methods can handle a diverse variety of challenging situations, hardly miss the visual targets, and have a satisfactory performance to track LR targets. However, these methods suffer from high computational complexity, intra-class discrimination of targets with similar semantics, and performing discrete space for scale estimation. The VITAL can tolerate massive DEF, IPR, and OPR because it focuses on hard negative samples by a high-order cost-sensitive loss. However, it does not have a robust performance in case of significant SV due to the producing a fixed size of weight mask via a generative network. The LSART utilizes the modified Kernelized ridge regression (KRR) by the weighted combination of patch-wise similarities to concentrate on reliable regions of the target. Due to the consideration of rotation information and online adaptation of CNN models, this method provides promising responses to tackle the DEF and IPR challenges.

The DeepSTRCF, ASRCF, DRT, and UPDT are the DCF-based methods that not only exploit deep off-the-shelf features but also fuse them with shallow ones (e.g., HOG and CN) to improve the robustness of visual tracking (see Table 1). To reduce the adverse impact of the OCC and OV attributes, the DeepSTRCF adds a temporal regularization term to the spatially regularized DCF formulation. The revisited formulation helps the DeepSTRCF to not only endure some appearance variations such as the IV, IPR, OPR, and POC. Using object-aware spatial regularization and reliability terms, the ASRCF and DRT methods attempt to optimize models to learn more adaptive correlation filters effectively. Both these methods have studied major imperfections of DCF-based methods such as circular shifted




Fig. 8: Qualitative comparison of state-of-the-art visual tracking methods on the BMX, Crabs1, Gymnastics3, Motorcross2, and Singer3 video sequences along with #frame number and annotated attribute (the zoomed frames are provided for better comparison).

sampling process, same feature space of localization and scale estimation processes, the strict focus on discrimination, and sparse and non-uniform distribution of correlation responses. Hence, these methods handle the DEF, BC, and SV, suitably. Finally, the UPDT focuses on enhancing the visual tracking robustness through independently training a shallow feature-based DCF and a deep off-the-shelf feature-based DCF and considering augmented training samples with an adaptive fusion model. Although these methods demonstrate the competitive performance of well-designed DCF-based trackers compared to more sophisticated trackers, they suffer from the limitations of pre-trained models (e.g., the computational complexity of deep features), aspect ratio variation, model degradation, and considerable appearance variation.

To qualitatively compare the performance of the best methods, Fig. 8 shows the tracking results of the SiamRPN++ [55], SiamMask [57], C-RPN [157], SiamDW-SiamRPN [56], ECO [94], LSART [127], DRT [126], UPDT [109], and DeepSTRCF [122] on different video sequences of the VOT2018 dataset. According to these results, all these methods have failed in challenging scenarios that

consist of multiple critical visual attributes. For instance, the SiamMask misuses the semi-supervised video object segmentation when the OCC and SV co-occur, or the significant SV dramatically reduces the performance of the SiamRPN++. Despite considerable advances that are emerged in visual tracking, the state-of-the-art visual tracking methods are still unable to handle the real-world challenges; severe variations of target appearance, MOC, OCC, SV, CM, DEF, and even IV can not only have severe effects on their performance but also lead to the failure. These results demonstrate that the state-of-the-art methods are still not reliable for real-world application for the main reason of lacking the intelligence for scene understanding. Although visual tracking methods improve the ability of object-scene distinction, the DL-based visual trackers still cannot infer scene information, immediately recognize the global/configural structure of a scene or organize purposeful decisions based on space and acts within.

5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The state-of-the-art DL-based visual tracking methods were categorized into a broad taxonomy based on network archi-

tures, network exploitation, network training, network objective, network output, and the exploitation of correlation filter advantages. Moreover, the motivations and contributions of these methods were categorized according to the main problems and solutions that different methods have proposed. Furthermore, not only the recent visual tracking benchmark datasets and evaluation metrics were briefly investigated, but also the state-of-the-art visual tracking methods were compared in terms of various evaluation metrics on the OTB2013, OTB2015, VOT2018, and LaSOT benchmark datasets.

Recently, the DL-based visual tracking methods have investigated different exploitation of deep off-the-shelf features, fusion of deep features and hand-crafted features, various architectures and backbone networks, offline and online training of DNNs on large-scale datasets, update schemes, search strategies, contextual information, temporal information, and how to deal with lacking training data. However, many other problems need to be explored in the future. The current main concentration is to design custom neural networks for visual tracking, such that they may provide robustness, accuracy, and efficiency simultaneously. These trackers are primarily developed by integrating efficient network architectures with both classification and regression branches that not only are trained on large-scale datasets, but also are learned a robust representation against the most challenging visual attributes (e.g., OCC, OV, FM, IV, and LR). By analyzing different methods, the main problem is their deficiency is in scene understanding. The state-of-the-art visual tracking methods still cannot interpret dynamic scenes in a meaningful way, immediately recognize global structures, infer existing objects, and perceive basic level categories of different objects or events. Despite all efforts to devise sophisticated methods and time-consuming training procedures, these methods quickly lose the generic targets in real-world scenarios. For example, these methods still have the problems to simultaneously handle significant attributes such as OCC, DEF, SV, and FM. Although the SNN-based methods desirably reduce the computational complexity of visual trackers, these architectures can be modified to not only employ complementary features (e.g., temporal information) but also incorporate with the recent RL and adversarial learning. Finally, online training of DNNs can lead to a well adaption of the network filters to significant variations of target appearance. However, it requires more efficient strategies to reduce the computational complexity that is a necessity in real-time applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank Prof. Kamal Nasrollahi (Visual Analysis of People Lab (VAP), Aalborg University) for his beneficial comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.-f. Chang, J. Lambert, P. Sangkloy, J. Singh, B. Slawomir, A. Hartnett, D. Wang, P. Carr, S. Lucey, D. Ramanan, and J. Hays, "Argoverse: 3D tracking and forecasting with rich maps," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2019, pp. 8748–8757.
- [2] W. Luo, B. Yang, and R. Urtasun, "Fast and furious: Real-time end-to-end 3D detection, tracking and motion forecasting with a single convolutional net," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 3569–3577.
- [3] P. Girão, A. Asvadi, P. Peixoto, and U. Nunes, "3D object tracking in driving environment: A short review and a benchmark dataset," in *Proc. IEEE ITSC*, 2016, pp. 7–12.
- [4] C. Li, X. Liang, Y. Lu, N. Zhao, and J. Tang, "RGB-T object tracking: Benchmark and baseline," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 96, 2019.
- [5] H. V. Hoof, T. V. D. Zant, and M. Wiering, "Adaptive visual face tracking for an autonomous robot," in *Proc. Belgian/Netherlands Artificial Intelligence Conference*, 2011.
- [6] C. Robin and S. Lacroix, "Multi-robot target detection and tracking: Taxonomy and survey," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 729–760, 2016.
- [7] B. Risse, M. Mangan, B. Webb, and L. Del Pero, "Visual tracking of small animals in cluttered natural environments using a freely moving camera," in *Proc. IEEE ICCVW*, 2018, pp. 2840–2849.
- [8] Y. Luo, D. Yin, A. Wang, and W. Wu, "Pedestrian tracking in surveillance video based on modified CNN," *Multimed. Tools Appl.*, vol. 77, no. 18, pp. 24041–24058, 2018.
- [9] A. Brunetti, D. Buongiorno, G. F. Trotta, and V. Bevilacqua, "Computer vision and deep learning techniques for pedestrian detection and tracking: A survey," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 300, pp. 17–33, 2018.
- [10] L. Hou, W. Wan, J. N. Hwang, R. Muhammad, M. Yang, and K. Han, "Human tracking over camera networks: A review," *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, vol. 2017, no. 1, 2017.
- [11] G. Klein, "Visual tracking for augmented reality," *Phd Thesis*, pp. 1–182, 2006.
- [12] M. Klopschitz, G. Schall, D. Schmalstieg, and G. Reitmayr, "Visual tracking for augmented reality," in *Proc. IPIN*, 2010, pp. 1–4.
- [13] F. Ababsa, M. Maldi, J. Y. Didier, and M. Mallem, "Vision-based tracking for mobile augmented reality," in *Studies in Computational Intelligence*. Springer, 2008, vol. 120, pp. 297–326.
- [14] J. Hao, Y. Zhou, G. Zhang, Q. Lv, and Q. Wu, "A review of target tracking algorithm based on UAV," in *Proc. IEEE CBS*, 2019, pp. 328–333.
- [15] M. Manafifard, H. Ebadi, and H. Abrishami Moghaddam, "A survey on player tracking in soccer videos," *Comput. Vis. Image Und.*, vol. 159, pp. 19–46, 2017.
- [16] D. Bouget, M. Allan, D. Stoyanov, and P. Jannin, "Vision-based and marker-less surgical tool detection and tracking: A review of the literature," *Medical Image Analysis*, vol. 35, pp. 633–654, 2017.
- [17] V. Ulman, M. Maška, and et al., "An objective comparison of cell-tracking algorithms," *Nature Methods*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 1141–1152, 2017.
- [18] T. He, H. Mao, J. Guo, and Z. Yi, "Cell tracking using deep neural networks with multi-task learning," *Image Vision Comput.*, vol. 60, pp. 142–153, 2017.
- [19] D. E. Hernandez, S. W. Chen, E. E. Hunter, E. B. Steager, and V. Kumar, "Cell tracking with deep learning and the Viterbi algorithm," in *Proc. MARSS*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [20] J. Luo, Y. Han, and L. Fan, "Underwater acoustic target tracking: A review," *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 112, 2018.
- [21] D. S. Bolme, J. R. Beveridge, B. A. Draper, and Y. M. Lui, "Visual object tracking using adaptive correlation filters," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2010, pp. 2544–2550.
- [22] J. F. Henriques, R. Caseiro, P. Martins, and J. Batista, "High-speed tracking with kernelized correlation filters," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 583–596, 2015.
- [23] M. Danelljan, G. Hager, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Discriminative Scale Space Tracking," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1561–1575, 2017.
- [24] S. M. Marvasti-Zadeh, H. Ghanei-Yakhdan, and S. Kasaei, "Rotation-aware discriminative scale space tracking," in *Iranian Conf. Electrical Engineering (ICEE)*, 2019, pp. 1272–1276.
- [25] G. Boudoukh, I. Leichter, and E. Rivlin, "Visual tracking of object silhouettes," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2009, pp. 3625–3628.
- [26] C. Xiao and A. Yilmaz, "Efficient tracking with distinctive target colors and silhouette," in *Proc. ICPR*, 2016, pp. 2728–2733.
- [27] V. Bruni and D. Vitulano, "An improvement of kernel-based object tracking based on human perception," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. Syst.*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 1474–1485, 2014.
- [28] W. Chen, B. Niu, H. Gu, and X. Zhang, "A novel strategy for kernel-based small target tracking against varying illumination with multiple features fusion," in *Proc. ICICT*, 2018, pp. 135–138.

- [29] D. H. Kim, H. K. Kim, S. J. Lee, W. J. Park, and S. J. Ko, "Kernel-based structural binary pattern tracking," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1288–1300, 2014.
- [30] I. I. Lychkov, A. N. Alfmimtsev, and S. A. Sakulin, "Tracking of moving objects with regeneration of object feature points," in *Proc. GloSIC*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [31] M. Ighrayene, G. Qiang, and T. Benlefi, "Making Bayesian tracking and matching by the BRISK interest points detector/descriptor cooperate for robust object tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICSP*, 2017, pp. 731–735.
- [32] N. Dalal and B. Triggs, "Histograms of oriented gradients for human detection," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2005, pp. 886–893.
- [33] J. Van De Weijer, C. Schmid, and J. Verbeek, "Learning color names from real-world images," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2007, pp. 1–8.
- [34] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," in *Proc. NIPS*, vol. 2, 2012, pp. 1097–1105.
- [35] K. Chatfield, K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman, "Return of the devil in the details: Delving deep into convolutional nets," in *Proc. BMVC*, 2014, pp. 1–11.
- [36] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2014, pp. 1–14.
- [37] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich, "Going deeper with convolutions," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2015, pp. 1–9.
- [38] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [39] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, A. C. Berg, and L. Fei-Fei, "ImageNet large scale visual recognition challenge," *IJCV*, vol. 115, no. 3, pp. 211–252, 2015.
- [40] M. Kristan, R. Pflugfelder, A. Leonardis, J. Matas, F. Porikli, and et al., "The visual object tracking VOT2013 challenge results," in *Proc. ICCV*, 2013, pp. 98–111.
- [41] M. Kristan, R. Pflugfelder, A. Leonardis, J. Matas, and et al., "The visual object tracking VOT2014 challenge results," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2015, pp. 191–217.
- [42] M. Kristan, J. Matas, A. Leonardis, M. Felsberg, and et al., "The visual object tracking VOT2015 challenge results," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2015, pp. 564–586.
- [43] M. Kristan, J. Matas, A. Leonardis, M. Felsberg, R. Pflugfelder, and et al., "The visual object tracking VOT2016 challenge results," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2016, pp. 777–823.
- [44] M. Kristan, A. Leonardis, J. Matas, M. Felsberg, R. Pflugfelder, L. C. Zajc, and et al., "The visual object tracking VOT2017 challenge results," in *Proc. IEEE ICCVW*, 2017, pp. 1949–1972.
- [45] M. Kristan, A. Leonardis, J. Matas, M. Felsberg, R. Pflugfelder, and et al., "The sixth visual object tracking VOT2018 challenge results," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 3–53.
- [46] M. Kristan and et al., "The seventh visual object tracking VOT2019 challenge results," in *Proc. ICCVW*, 2019.
- [47] A. Yilmaz, O. Javed, and M. Shah, "Object tracking: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 38, no. 4, Dec. 2006.
- [48] A. W. Smeulders, D. M. Chu, R. Cucchiara, S. Calderara, A. Dehghan, and M. Shah, "Visual tracking: An experimental survey," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 36, no. 7, pp. 1442–1468, 2014.
- [49] H. Yang, L. Shao, F. Zheng, L. Wang, and Z. Song, "Recent advances and trends in visual tracking: A review," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 74, no. 18, pp. 3823–3831, 2011.
- [50] X. Li, W. Hu, C. Shen, Z. Zhang, A. Dick, and A. Van Den Hengel, "A survey of appearance models in visual object tracking," *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Tec.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 58:1–58:48, 2013.
- [51] M. Fiaz, A. Mahmood, and S. K. Jung, "Tracking noisy targets: A review of recent object tracking approaches," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.03098>
- [52] M. Fiaz, A. Mahmood, S. Javed, and S. K. Jung, "Handcrafted and deep trackers: Recent visual object tracking approaches and trends," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 43:1–43:44, 2019.
- [53] P. Li, D. Wang, L. Wang, and H. Lu, "Deep visual tracking: Review and experimental comparison," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 76, pp. 323–338, 2018.
- [54] R. Pflugfelder, "An in-depth analysis of visual tracking with Siamese neural networks," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.00569>
- [55] B. Li, W. Wu, Q. Wang, F. Zhang, J. Xing, and J. Yan, "SiamRPN++: Evolution of Siamese visual tracking with very deep networks," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.11703>
- [56] Z. Zhang and H. Peng, "Deeper and wider Siamese networks for real-time visual tracking," 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.01660>
- [57] Q. Wang, L. Zhang, L. Bertinetto, W. Hu, and P. H. S. Torr, "Fast online object tracking and segmentation: A unifying approach," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.05050>
- [58] X. Wang, C. Li, B. Luo, and J. Tang, "SINT++: Robust visual tracking via adversarial positive instance generation," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 4864–4873.
- [59] C. Ma, J. B. Huang, X. Yang, and M. H. Yang, "Hierarchical convolutional features for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2015, pp. 3074–3082.
- [60] M. Danelljan, G. Hager, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Convolutional features for correlation filter based visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICCVW*, 2016, pp. 621–629.
- [61] L. Wang, W. Ouyang, X. Wang, and H. Lu, "Visual tracking with fully convolutional networks," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2015, pp. 3119–3127.
- [62] S. Hong, T. You, S. Kwak, and B. Han, "Online tracking by learning discriminative saliency map with convolutional neural network," in *Proc. ICML*, 2015, pp. 597–606.
- [63] Y. Zha, T. Ku, Y. Li, and P. Zhang, "Deep position-sensitive tracking," *IEEE Trans. Multimedia*, no. 8, 2019.
- [64] M. Danelljan, A. Robinson, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Beyond correlation filters: Learning continuous convolution operators for visual tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, vol. 9909 LNCS, 2016, pp. 472–488.
- [65] D. Held, S. Thrun, and S. Savarese, "Learning to track at 100 FPS with deep regression networks," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2016, pp. 749–765.
- [66] L. Bertinetto, J. Valmadre, J. F. Henriques, A. Vedaldi, and P. H. Torr, "Fully-convolutional Siamese networks for object tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2016, pp. 850–865.
- [67] R. Tao, E. Gavves, and A. W. Smeulders, "Siamese instance search for tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 1420–1429.
- [68] H. Nam and B. Han, "Learning multi-domain convolutional neural networks for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 4293–4302.
- [69] Y. Qi, S. Zhang, L. Qin, H. Yao, Q. Huang, J. Lim, and M. H. Yang, "Hedged deep tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 4303–4311.
- [70] L. Wang, W. Ouyang, X. Wang, and H. Lu, "STCT: Sequentially training convolutional networks for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 1373–1381.
- [71] G. Zhu, F. Porikli, and H. Li, "Robust visual tracking with deep convolutional neural network based object proposals on PETS," in *Proc. IEEE CVPRW*, 2016, pp. 1265–1272.
- [72] H. Li, Y. Li, and F. Porikli, "DeepTrack: Learning discriminative feature representations online for robust visual tracking," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 1834–1848, 2016.
- [73] K. Zhang, Q. Liu, Y. Wu, and M. H. Yang, "Robust visual tracking via convolutional networks without training," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 1779–1792, 2016.
- [74] C. Ma, Y. Xu, B. Ni, and X. Yang, "When correlation filters meet convolutional neural networks for visual tracking," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 1454–1458, 2016.
- [75] H. Nam, M. Baek, and B. Han, "Modeling and propagating CNNs in a tree structure for visual tracking," 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1608.07242>
- [76] G. Wu, W. Lu, G. Gao, C. Zhao, and J. Liu, "Regional deep learning model for visual tracking," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 175, no. PartA, pp. 310–323, 2015.
- [77] H. Fan and H. Ling, "Parallel tracking and verifying: A framework for real-time and high accuracy visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2017, pp. 5487–5495.
- [78] H. Fan and H. Ling, "Parallel tracking and verifying," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 4130–4144, 2019.
- [79] Y. Song, C. Ma, L. Gong, J. Zhang, R. W. Lau, and M. H. Yang, "CREST: Convolutional residual learning for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICCV*, 2017, pp. 2574–2583.

- [80] Z. Zhu, G. Huang, W. Zou, D. Du, and C. Huang, "UCT: Learning unified convolutional networks for real-time visual tracking," in *Proc. ICCVW*, 2018, pp. 1973–1982.
- [81] Q. Guo, W. Feng, C. Zhou, R. Huang, L. Wan, and S. Wang, "Learning dynamic Siamese networks for visual object tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2017, pp. 1781–1789.
- [82] Z. Teng, J. Xing, Q. Wang, C. Lang, S. Feng, and Y. Jin, "Robust object tracking based on temporal and spatial deep networks," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2017, pp. 1153–1162.
- [83] Z. He, Y. Fan, J. Zhuang, Y. Dong, and H. Bai, "Correlation filters with weighted convolution responses," in *Proc. ICCVW*, 2018, pp. 1992–2000.
- [84] T. Yang and A. B. Chan, "Recurrent filter learning for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICCVW*, 2018, pp. 2010–2019.
- [85] F. Li, Y. Yao, P. Li, D. Zhang, W. Zuo, and M. H. Yang, "Integrating boundary and center correlation filters for visual tracking with aspect ratio variation," in *Proc. IEEE ICCVW*, 2018, pp. 2001–2009.
- [86] X. Wang, H. Li, Y. Li, F. Porikli, and M. Wang, "Deep tracking with objectness," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 660–664.
- [87] X. Xu, B. Ma, H. Chang, and X. Chen, "Siamese recurrent architecture for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 1152–1156.
- [88] L. Yang, P. Jiang, F. Wang, and X. Wang, "Region-based fully convolutional Siamese networks for robust real-time visual tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2017, pp. 2567–2571.
- [89] T. Kokul, C. Fookes, S. Sridharan, A. Ramanan, and U. A. J. Piniidiyaarachchi, "Gate connected convolutional neural network for object tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2017, pp. 2602–2606.
- [90] K. Dai, Y. Wang, and X. Yan, "Long-term object tracking based on Siamese network," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2017, pp. 3640–3644.
- [91] B. Akok, F. Gurkan, O. Kaplan, and B. Günsel, "Robust object tracking by interleaving variable rate color particle filtering and deep learning," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2017, pp. 3665–3669.
- [92] R. J. Mozhdzhehi and H. Medeiros, "Deep convolutional particle filter for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICIP*, 2017, pp. 3650–3654.
- [93] J. Valmadre, L. Bertinetto, J. Henriques, A. Vedaldi, and P. H. Torr, "End-to-end representation learning for correlation filter based tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 5000–5008.
- [94] M. Danelljan, G. Bhat, F. Shahbaz Khan, and M. Felsberg, "ECO: Efficient convolution operators for tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 6931–6939.
- [95] A. Lukežič, T. Vojí, L. ČehovinZajc, J. Matas, and M. Kristan, "Discriminative correlation filter tracker with channel and spatial reliability," *IJCV*, vol. 126, no. 7, pp. 671–688, 2018.
- [96] T. Zhang, C. Xu, and M. H. Yang, "Multi-task correlation particle filter for robust object tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 4819–4827.
- [97] B. Han, J. Sim, and H. Adam, "BranchOut: Regularization for online ensemble tracking with convolutional neural networks," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 521–530.
- [98] M. Wang, Y. Liu, and Z. Huang, "Large margin object tracking with circulant feature maps," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 4800–4808.
- [99] L. Zhang, J. Varadarajan, P. N. Suganthan, N. Ahuja, and P. Moulin, "Robust visual tracking using oblique random forests," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 5825–5834.
- [100] J. Choi, H. J. Chang, S. Yun, T. Fischer, Y. Demiris, and J. Y. Choi, "Attentional correlation filter network for adaptive visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 4828–4837.
- [101] H. Fan and H. Ling, "SANet: Structure-aware network for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPRW*, 2017, pp. 2217–2224.
- [102] Q. Wang, J. Gao, J. Xing, M. Zhang, and W. Hu, "DCFNet: Discriminant correlation filters network for visual tracking," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04057>
- [103] J. Guo and T. Xu, "Deep ensemble tracking," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 1562–1566, 2017.
- [104] J. Gao, T. Zhang, X. Yang, and C. Xu, "Deep relative tracking," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1845–1858, 2017.
- [105] Z. Chi, H. Li, H. Lu, and M. H. Yang, "Dual deep network for visual tracking," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 2005–2015, 2017.
- [106] P. Zhang, T. Zhuo, W. Huang, K. Chen, and M. Kankanhalli, "Online object tracking based on CNN with spatial-temporal saliency guided sampling," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 257, pp. 115–127, 2017.
- [107] X. Dong and J. Shen, "Triplet loss in Siamese network for object tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, vol. 11217 LNCS, 2018, pp. 472–488.
- [108] X. Lu, C. Ma, B. Ni, X. Yang, I. Reid, and M. H. Yang, "Deep regression tracking with shrinkage loss," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 369–386.
- [109] G. Bhat, J. Johnander, M. Danelljan, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Unveiling the power of deep tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 493–509.
- [110] B. Chen, D. Wang, P. Li, S. Wang, and H. Lu, "Real-time 'actor-critic' tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 328–345.
- [111] Z. Zhu, Q. Wang, B. Li, W. Wu, J. Yan, and W. Hu, "Distractor-aware Siamese networks for visual object tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, vol. 11213 LNCS, 2018, pp. 103–119.
- [112] I. Jung, J. Son, M. Baek, and B. Han, "Real-time MDNet," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 89–104.
- [113] Y. Zhang, L. Wang, J. Qi, D. Wang, M. Feng, and H. Lu, "Structured Siamese network for real-time visual tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 355–370.
- [114] H. Lee, S. Choi, and C. Kim, "A memory model based on the Siamese network for long-term tracking," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 100–115.
- [115] M. Che, R. Wang, Y. Lu, Y. Li, H. Zhi, and C. Xiong, "Channel pruning for visual tracking," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 70–82.
- [116] E. Burceanu and M. Leordeanu, "Learning a robust society of tracking parts using co-occurrence constraints," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 162–178.
- [117] H. Morimitsu, "Multiple context features in Siamese networks for visual object tracking," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 116–131.
- [118] A. He, C. Luo, X. Tian, and W. Zeng, "Towards a better match in Siamese network based visual object tracker," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 132–147.
- [119] L. Rout, D. Mishra, and R. K. S. S. Gorthi, "WAEF: Weighted aggregation with enhancement filter for visual object tracking," in *Proc. ECCVW*, 2019, pp. 83–99.
- [120] J. Choi, H. J. Chang, T. Fischer, S. Yun, K. Lee, J. Jeong, Y. Demiris, and J. Y. Choi, "Context-aware deep feature compression for high-speed visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 479–488.
- [121] Y. Song, C. Ma, X. Wu, L. Gong, L. Bao, W. Zuo, C. Shen, R. W. Lau, and M. H. Yang, "VITAL: Visual tracking via adversarial learning," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 8990–8999.
- [122] F. Li, C. Tian, W. Zuo, L. Zhang, and M. H. Yang, "Learning spatial-temporal regularized correlation filters for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 4904–4913.
- [123] B. Li, J. Yan, W. Wu, Z. Zhu, and X. Hu, "High performance visual tracking with Siamese region proposal network," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 8971–8980.
- [124] A. He, C. Luo, X. Tian, and W. Zeng, "A twofold Siamese network for real-time object tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 4834–4843.
- [125] Z. Zhu, W. Wu, W. Zou, and J. Yan, "End-to-end flow correlation tracking with spatial-temporal attention," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 548–557.
- [126] C. Sun, D. Wang, H. Lu, and M. H. Yang, "Correlation tracking via joint discrimination and reliability learning," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 489–497.
- [127] C. Sun, D. Wang, H. Lu, and M. Yang, "Learning spatial-aware regressions for visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 8962–8970.
- [128] Q. Wang, Z. Teng, J. Xing, J. Gao, W. Hu, and S. Maybank, "Learning attentions: Residual attentional Siamese network for high performance online visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 4854–4863.
- [129] N. Wang, W. Zhou, Q. Tian, R. Hong, M. Wang, and H. Li, "Multi-scale correlation filters for robust visual tracking," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 4844–4853.
- [130] R. J. Mozhdzhehi, Y. Reznichenko, A. Siddique, and H. Medeiros, "Deep convolutional particle filter with adaptive correlation maps for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 798–802.
- [131] Z. Lin and C. Yuan, "Robust visual tracking in low-resolution sequence," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 4103–4107.
- [132] M. Cen and C. Jung, "Fully convolutional Siamese fusion networks for object tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 3718–3722.
- [133] G. Wang, B. Liu, W. Li, and N. Yu, "Flow guided Siamese network for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 231–235.
- [134] K. Dai, Y. Wang, X. Yan, and Y. Huo, "Fusion of template matching and foreground detection for robust visual tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 2720–2724.

- [135] G. Liu and G. Liu, "Integrating multi-level convolutional features for correlation filter tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 3029–3033.
- [136] J. Guo, T. Xu, S. Jiang, and Z. Shen, "Generating reliable online adaptive templates for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICIP*, 2018, pp. 226–230.
- [137] S. Pu, Y. Song, C. Ma, H. Zhang, and M. H. Yang, "Deep attentive tracking via reciprocative learning," in *Proc. NIPS*, 2018, pp. 1931–1941.
- [138] X. Jiang, X. Zhen, B. Zhang, J. Yang, and X. Cao, "Deep collaborative tracking networks," in *Proc. BMVC*, 2018, p. 87.
- [139] D. Ma, W. Bu, and X. Wu, "Multi-scale recurrent tracking via pyramid recurrent network and optical flow," in *Proc. BMVC*, 2018, p. 242.
- [140] C. Ma, J. B. Huang, X. Yang, and M. H. Yang, "Robust visual tracking via hierarchical convolutional features," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 2018.
- [141] Z. Han, P. Wang, and Q. Ye, "Adaptive discriminative deep correlation filter for visual object tracking," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 2018.
- [142] K. Chen and W. Tao, "Once for all: A two-flow convolutional neural network for visual tracking," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 28, no. 12, pp. 3377–3386, 2018.
- [143] S. Li, S. Zhao, B. Cheng, E. Zhao, and J. Chen, "Robust visual tracking via hierarchical particle filter and ensemble deep features," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 2018.
- [144] E. Gundogdu and A. A. Alatan, "Good features to correlate for visual tracking," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 2526–2540, 2018.
- [145] Y. Xie, J. Xiao, K. Huang, J. Thiyagalingam, and Y. Zhao, "Correlation filter selection for visual tracking using reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 2018.
- [146] J. Gao, T. Zhang, X. Yang, and C. Xu, "P2T: Part-to-target tracking via deep regression learning," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 3074–3086, 2018.
- [147] C. Peng, F. Liu, J. Yang, and N. Kasabov, "Densely connected discriminative correlation filters for visual tracking," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1019–1023, 2018.
- [148] D. Li, G. Wen, Y. Kuai, and F. Porikli, "End-to-end feature integration for correlation filter tracking with channel attention," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 1815–1819, 2018.
- [149] C. Ma, J. B. Huang, X. Yang, and M. H. Yang, "Adaptive correlation filters with long-term and short-term memory for object tracking," *IJCV*, vol. 126, no. 8, pp. 771–796, 2018.
- [150] Y. Cao, H. Ji, W. Zhang, and F. Xue, "Learning spatio-temporal context via hierarchical features for visual tracking," *Signal Proc.: Image Comm.*, vol. 66, pp. 50–65, 2018.
- [151] F. Du, P. Liu, W. Zhao, and X. Tang, "Spatialtemporal adaptive feature weighted correlation filter for visual tracking," *Signal Proc.: Image Comm.*, vol. 67, pp. 58–70, 2018.
- [152] Y. Kuai, G. Wen, and D. Li, "When correlation filters meet fully-convolutional Siamese networks for distractor-aware tracking," *Signal Proc.: Image Comm.*, vol. 64, pp. 107–117, 2018.
- [153] W. Gan, M. S. Lee, C. hao Wu, and C. C. Kuo, "Online object tracking via motion-guided convolutional neural network (MGNet)," *J. VIS. COMMUN. IMAGE R.*, vol. 53, pp. 180–191, 2018.
- [154] M. Liu, C. B. Jin, B. Yang, X. Cui, and H. Kim, "Occlusion-robust object tracking based on the confidence of online selected hierarchical features," *IET Image Proc.*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 2023–2029, 2018.
- [155] K. Dai, D. Wang, H. Lu, C. Sun, and J. Li, "Visual tracking via adaptive spatially-regularized correlation filters," in *Proc. CVPR*, 2019, pp. 4670–4679.
- [156] M. Danelljan, G. Bhat, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "ATOM: Accurate tracking by overlap maximization," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.07628>
- [157] H. Fan and H. Ling, "Siamese cascaded region proposal networks for real-time visual tracking," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06148>
- [158] J. Gao, T. Zhang, and C. Xu, "Graph convolutional tracking," in *Proc. CVPR*, 2019, pp. 4649–4659.
- [159] Y. Sun, C. Sun, D. Wang, Y. He, and H. Lu, "ROI pooled correlation filters for visual tracking," in *Proc. CVPR*, 2019, pp. 5783–5791.
- [160] G. Wang, C. Luo, Z. Xiong, and W. Zeng, "Spm-tracker: Series-parallel matching for real-time visual object tracking," 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.04452>
- [161] X. Li, C. Ma, B. Wu, Z. He, and M.-H. Yang, "Target-aware deep tracking," 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.01772>
- [162] N. Wang, Y. Song, C. Ma, W. Zhou, W. Liu, and H. Li, "Unsupervised deep tracking," 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.01828>
- [163] G. Bhat, M. Danelljan, L. V. Gool, and R. Timofte, "Learning discriminative model prediction for tracking," 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.07220>
- [164] F. Zhao, J. Wang, Y. Wu, and M. Tang, "Adversarial deep tracking," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 1998–2011, 2019.
- [165] H. Li, X. Wang, F. Shen, Y. Li, F. Porikli, and M. Wang, "Real-time deep tracking via corrective domain adaptation," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 8215, 2019.
- [166] B. Zhong, B. Bai, J. Li, Y. Zhang, and Y. Fu, "Hierarchical tracking by reinforcement learning-based searching and coarse-to-fine verifying," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 2331–2341, 2019.
- [167] J. Gao, T. Zhang, and C. Xu, "SMART: Joint sampling and regression for visual tracking," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 3923–3935, 2019.
- [168] H. Hu, B. Ma, J. Shen, H. Sun, L. Shao, and F. Porikli, "Robust object tracking using manifold regularized convolutional neural networks," *IEEE Trans. Multimedia*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 510–521, 2019.
- [169] L. Wang, L. Zhang, J. Wang, and Z. Yi, "Memory mechanisms for discriminative visual tracking algorithms with deep neural networks," *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Devel. Syst.*, 2019.
- [170] Y. Kuai, G. Wen, and D. Li, "Multi-task hierarchical feature learning for real-time visual tracking," *IEEE Sensors J.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 1961–1968, 2019.
- [171] X. Cheng, Y. Zhang, L. Zhou, and Y. Zheng, "Visual tracking via Auto-Encoder pair correlation filter," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, 2019.
- [172] F. Tang, X. Lu, X. Zhang, S. Hu, and H. Zhang, "Deep feature tracking based on interactive multiple model," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 333, pp. 29–40, 2019.
- [173] X. Lu, B. Ni, C. Ma, and X. Yang, "Learning transform-aware attentive network for object tracking," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 349, pp. 133–144, 2019.
- [174] D. Li, G. Wen, Y. Kuai, J. Xiao, and F. Porikli, "Learning target-aware correlation filters for visual tracking," *J. VIS. COMMUN. IMAGE R.*, vol. 58, pp. 149–159, 2019.
- [175] B. Chen, P. Li, C. Sun, D. Wang, G. Yang, and H. Lu, "Multi attention module for visual tracking," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 87, pp. 80–93, 2019.
- [176] S. Yun, J. J. Y. Choi, Y. Yoo, K. Yun, and J. J. Y. Choi, "Action-decision networks for visual tracking with deep reinforcement learning," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2016, pp. 2–6.
- [177] S. Yun, J. Choi, Y. Yoo, K. Yun, and J. Y. Choi, "Action-driven visual object tracking with deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 2239–2252, 2018.
- [178] W. Zhang, K. Song, X. Rong, and Y. Li, "Coarse-to-fine UAV target tracking with deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Sci. Eng.*, pp. 1–9, 2018.
- [179] L. Ren, X. Yuan, J. Lu, M. Yang, and J. Zhou, "Deep reinforcement learning with iterative shift for visual tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 697–713.
- [180] D. Zhang, H. Maei, X. Wang, and Y.-F. Wang, "Deep reinforcement learning for visual object tracking in videos," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1701.08936>
- [181] C. Huang, S. Lucey, and D. Ramanan, "Learning policies for adaptive tracking with deep feature cascades," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2017, pp. 105–114.
- [182] X. Dong, J. Shen, W. Wang, Y. Liu, L. Shao, and F. Porikli, "Hyperparameter optimization for tracking with continuous deep Q-learning," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2018, pp. 518–527.
- [183] J. Supancic and D. Ramanan, "Tracking as online decision-making: Learning a policy from streaming videos with reinforcement learning," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2017, pp. 322–331.
- [184] J. Choi, J. Kwon, and K. M. Lee, "Real-time visual tracking by deep reinforced decision making," *Comput. Vis. Image Und.*, vol. 171, pp. 10–19, 2018.
- [185] Y. Wu, J. Lim, and M. H. Yang, "Online object tracking: A benchmark," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2013, pp. 2411–2418.

- [186] Y. Wu, J. Lim, and M. Yang, "Object tracking benchmark," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 1834–1848, 2015.
- [187] P. Liang, E. Blasch, and H. Ling, "Encoding color information for visual tracking: Algorithms and benchmark," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 5630–5644, 2015.
- [188] M. Mueller, N. Smith, and B. Ghanem, "A benchmark and simulator for UAV tracking," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2016, pp. 445–461.
- [189] A. Li, M. Lin, Y. Wu, M. H. Yang, and S. Yan, "NUS-PRO: A new visual tracking challenge," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 335–349, 2016.
- [190] H. K. Galoogahi, A. Fagg, C. Huang, D. Ramanan, and S. Lucey, "Need for speed: A benchmark for higher frame rate object tracking," in *Proc. IEEE ICCV*, 2017, pp. 1134–1143.
- [191] S. Li and D. Y. Yeung, "Visual object tracking for unmanned aerial vehicles: A benchmark and new motion models," in *Proc. AAAI*, 2017, pp. 4140–4146.
- [192] M. Müller, A. Bibi, S. Giancola, S. Alsubaihi, and B. Ghanem, "TrackingNet: A large-scale dataset and benchmark for object tracking in the wild," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2018, pp. 310–327.
- [193] J. Valmadre, L. Bertinetto, J. F. Henriques, R. Tao, A. Vedaldi, A. W. Smeulders, P. H. Torr, and E. Gavves, "Long-term tracking in the wild: A benchmark," in *Proc. ECCV*, vol. 11207 LNCS, 2018, pp. 692–707.
- [194] A. Li, Z. Chen, and Y. Wang, "BUAA-PRO: A tracking dataset with pixel-level annotation," in *Proc. BMVC*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://bmvc2018.org/contents/papers/0851.pdf>
- [195] L. Huang, X. Zhao, and K. Huang, "GOT-10k: A large high-diversity benchmark for generic object tracking in the wild," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11981>
- [196] H. Fan, L. Lin, F. Yang, P. Chu, G. Deng, S. Yu, H. Bai, Y. Xu, C. Liao, and H. Ling, "LaSOT: A high-quality benchmark for large-scale single object tracking," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.07845>
- [197] L. Čehovin, "TraX: The visual tracking exchange protocol and library," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 260, pp. 5–8, 2017.
- [198] W. Liu, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, C. Szegedy, S. Reed, C. Y. Fu, and A. C. Berg, "SSD: Single shot multibox detector," in *Proc. ECCV*, 2016, pp. 21–37.
- [199] G. Koch, R. Zemel, and R. Salakhutdinov, "Siamese neural networks for one-shot image recognition," in *Proc. ICML Deep Learning Workshop*, 2015.
- [200] G. Lin, A. Milan, C. Shen, and I. Reid, "RefineNet: Multi-path refinement networks for high-resolution semantic segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 5168–5177.
- [201] T. Y. Lin, P. Dollár, R. Girshick, K. He, B. Hariharan, and S. Belongie, "Feature pyramid networks for object detection," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 936–944.
- [202] S. Gladh, M. Danelljan, F. S. Khan, and M. Felsberg, "Deep motion features for visual tracking," in *Proc. ICPR*, 2016, pp. 1243–1248.
- [203] E. Real, J. Shlens, S. Mazzocchi, X. Pan, and V. Vanhoucke, "YouTube-BoundingBoxes: A large high-precision human-annotated data set for object detection in video," in *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, 2017, pp. 7464–7473.
- [204] G. A. Miller, "WordNet: A lexical database for English," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 39–41, 1995.
- [205] A. Vedaldi and K. Lenc, "MatConvNet: Convolutional neural networks for MATLAB," in *Proc. ACM Multimedia Conference*, 2015, pp. 689–692.
- [206] M. Kristan, J. Matas, A. Leonardis, T. Vojir, R. Pflugfelder, G. Fernandez, G. Nebehay, F. Porikli, and L. Čehovin, "A novel performance evaluation methodology for single-target trackers," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 2137–2155, 2016.
- [207] L. Čehovin, M. Kristan, and A. Leonardis, "Is my new tracker really better than yours?" in *Proc. IEEE WACV*, 2014, pp. 540–547.