## Errata for the paper

S. Sedai, M. Bennamoun, D. Q. Huynh: "Localized fusion of Shape and Appearance features for 3D Human Pose Estimation" in British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC) 2010

The errata listed below are all related to the error metric used in the paper being incompatible with those adopted in the papers of Poppe [8] and Okada and Soatto [7]. To ensure that our results are consistent with other approaches that use the HumanEva I dataset, we revise our results based on the error metric defined in Sigal and Black's technical report [10].

- On Page 2, the last sentence of the second last paragraph of Section 1 should be deleted.
- On Page 6, the sentences on the bottom two lines till the end of that paragraph on Page 7 should be replaced by:

We compute the mean 3D error, e, between the estimated pose  $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and the ground truth pose  $\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for each test image as  $e = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} ||m_i(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) - m_i(\hat{\mathbf{y}})||$ , where  $m_i(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  contains the 3D coordinates of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  joint location and L is the number of joints, i.e, L = d/3.

• Based on this new error metric, Table 2 on Page 7 should be replaced by:

Camera	Actions/Feature Types	Fusion	Shape	Appearance
	Walking	57.9(27.1)	84.15 (38.2)	67.2 (31.9)
C1	Jogging	<b>56.5</b> ( <b>26.9</b> )	101.8 (50.6)	61.6 (28.6)
	Boxing	66.7(28.6)	87.4 (38.2)	87.5 (45.6)
	Combined	60.9(29.4)	86.9 (44.7)	75.5 (31.8)
	Walking	${\bf 53.2(25.1)}$	85.4(51.0)	62.9(34.7)
C2	Jogging	55.1(34.0)	83.7(41.8)	63.3(29.2)
	Boxing	73.9(46.8)	93.4(49.5)	75.8(48.7)
	Combined	<b>59.7(31.0)</b>	82.4(46.4)	69.8(33.1)
	Walking	52.5(24.9)	79.8(47.2)	61.6(32.2)
C3	Jogging	${f 52.0 (25.3)}$	84.5(40.5)	64.1(35.9)
	Boxing	73.1(39.0)	91.8(47.9)	69.2(35.0)
	Combined	<b>62.2</b> ( <b>37.2</b> )	83.9(41.2)	69.1(29.7)

• Similarly, Table 3 on Page 7 should be replaced by:

Method/Subject	S1	S2	S3	test dataset used
Poppe [8]	41.24	39.56	55.27	test set
Okada and Soatto [7]	41.19	35.03	37.69	validation set
Our method	55.35	45.12	63.52	validation set

• On Page 8, The sentence on the 2<sup>nd</sup> line below Figure 3 should read as:

The results show that our method did not perform as well as those reported in [7,8]. We have yet to investigate the poorer performance of our method. The three methods are not completely comparable though, as (from our personal communication with the author) Poppe [8] used the test set (with no ground truth provided in HumanEva I) rather than the validation dataset (with ground truth) used by Okada and Soatto [7] and our method (see Table 3).