

# Supplementary material for RANSAC-Flow

Xi Shen<sup>1</sup>, François Darmon<sup>1,2</sup>, Alexei A. Efros<sup>3</sup>, and Mathieu Aubry<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> LIGM (UMR 8049) - Ecole des Ponts, UPE

<sup>2</sup> Thales Land and Air Systems

<sup>3</sup> UC Berkeley

## Dependency on $\lambda$ and $\mu$

Our training has 3 stages (Sec. 3.4): the model was firstly learned with the reconstruction loss  $\mathcal{L}_{rec}$  then added cycle-consistent flow loss  $\mathcal{L}_c$  and finally trained with all the losses (Equation 1). In Table 1, we provide an analysis on the weighting parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  on sparse correspondences evaluation on MegaDepth [37] and report the accuracy at 3 pixels. We can see the stage 2 is not very sensitive with respect to  $\mu$  (Table 1a), while the stage 3 with adding the mask loss is slightly more sensitive (Table 1b). Note that we then use the same parameters for fine-tuning on the different datasets.

Table 1: Dependency on  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , we evaluate on sparse correspondences on MegaDepth [37] and report the accuracy at 3 pixels. (a) Training stage 2: dependency on  $\mu$  with  $\lambda = 0$ ; (b) Training stage 3: dependency on  $\lambda$  with  $\mu = 1$  (optimal in Table 1a).

$\mu$	Acc. ( $\leq 3$ pixels, MegaDepth [37])	$\lambda$	Acc. ( $\leq 3$ pixels, MegaDepth [37])
2	78.2	0.02	83.0
1	<b>78.3</b>	0.01	<b>83.5</b>
0.5	<b>78.3</b>	0.005	80.5

(a) Training stage 2: dependency on  $\mu$  with  $\lambda = 0$ .

(b) Training stage 3: dependency on  $\lambda$  with  $\mu = 1$  (optimal in Table 1a).