

Swin3D: A Pretrained Transformer Backbone for 3D Indoor Scene Understanding

Yu-Qi Yang^{1*} Yu-Xiao Guo² Jian-Yu Xiong^{1*} Yang Liu^{2†}
 Hao Pan² Peng-Shuai Wang³ Xin Tong² Baining Guo²

¹Tsinghua University ²Microsoft Research Asia ³Peking University

{t-yuqyan, yuxgu, v-jixiong, yangliu}@microsoft.com

haopan@microsoft.com wangps@hotmail.com {xtong, bainguo}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Pretrained backbones with fine-tuning have been widely adopted in 2D vision and natural language processing tasks and demonstrated significant advantages to task-specific networks. In this paper, we present a pretrained 3D backbone, named SWIN3D, which first outperforms all state-of-the-art methods in downstream 3D indoor scene understanding tasks. Our backbone network is based on a 3D Swin transformer and carefully designed to efficiently conduct self-attention on sparse voxels with linear memory complexity and capture the irregularity of point signals via generalized contextual relative positional embedding. Based on this backbone design, we pretrained a large SWIN3D model on a synthetic Structured3D dataset that is 10 times larger than the ScanNet dataset and fine-tuned the pretrained model in various downstream real-world indoor scene understanding tasks. The results demonstrate that our model pretrained on the synthetic dataset not only exhibits good generality in both downstream segmentation and detection on real 3D point datasets, but also surpasses the state-of-the-art methods on downstream tasks after fine-tuning with +2.3 mIoU and +2.2 mIoU on S3DIS Area5 and 6-fold semantic segmentation, +2.1 mIoU on ScanNet segmentation (val), +1.9 mAP@0.5 on ScanNet detection, +8.1 mAP@0.5 on S3DIS detection. Our method demonstrates the great potential of pretrained 3D backbones with fine-tuning for 3D understanding tasks.

1. Introduction

Pretrained backbones with fine-tuning have been widely applied to various 2D vision and NLP tasks [13, 2, 10, 3], where a backbone network pretrained on a large dataset is concatenated with task-specific back-end and then fine-tuned for different downstream tasks. This approach demonstrates

its superior performance and great advantages in reducing the workload of network design and training, as well as the amount of labeled data required for different vision tasks.

In the work, we present a pretrained 3D backbone, named SWIN3D, for 3D indoor scene understanding tasks. Our method represents the 3D point cloud of an input 3D scene as sparse voxels in 3D space and adapts the Swin Transformer [30] designed for regular 2D images to unorganized 3D points as the 3D backbone. We analyze the key issues that prevent the naïve 3D extension of Swin Transformer from exploring large models and achieving high performance, *i.e., the high memory complexity, the ignorance of signal irregularity*. Based on our analysis, we develop a novel 3D self-attention operator to compute the self-attentions of sparse voxels within each local window, which reduces the memory cost of self-attention from quadratic to linear with respect to the number of sparse voxels within a window and computes efficiently; enhances self-attention via capturing various signal irregularities by our generalized *contextual relative positional embedding* [48, 26].

The novel design of our SWIN3D backbone enables us to scale up the backbone model and the amount of data used for pretraining. To this end, we pretrained a large SWIN3D model with 60M parameters via a 3D semantic segmentation task over a synthetic 3D indoor scene dataset [60] that includes 21K rooms and is about ten times larger than the ScanNet dataset. After pretraining, we cascade the pretrained SWIN3D backbone with task-specific back-end decoders and fine-tune the models for various downstream 3D indoor scene understanding tasks.

We evaluated the performance of our method on both 3D detection and semantic segmentation tasks on real ScanNet and S3DIS datasets. Experimental results show that our SWIN3D pretrained on the synthetic dataset exhibits good generality for all four tasks and outperforms all existing state-of-the-art methods with +8.1 mAP@0.5 on S3DIS detection, +2.2 mIoU on 6-fold S3DIS segmentation, +1.9 mAP@0.5

*Interns at Microsoft Research Asia. †Contact person.

on ScanNet detection and +0.8 mIoU on ScanNet segmentation (validation set) respectively. We carefully analyzed the contributions of different factors (*e.g.*, model size, data size, pretraining) to the performance of our model. Our studies indicate that our pretrained backbones with fine-tuning are superior to the same models trained from scratch. The large backbone model and the large amount of 3D data used for pretraining enabled by our backbone design are critical to the superior performance of our method in the downstream tasks. We believe that our work illustrates the great potential of a unified pretrained backbone to various 3D understanding tasks. To facilitate and inspire future research along this path, we will release our code and trained models at <https://github.com/microsoft/Swin3D>.

2. Related Work

Vision transformers Transformers based on the attention mechanism have been successfully applied to computer vision and exhibit high performance in many 2D vision tasks, such as image classification, semantic segmentation, object detection, and pose estimation (*c.f.* the comprehensive surveys [24, 18, 15]). The plain vision transformer [13] computes global self-attention over the whole image, thus offering long-range attention between image patches, but triggers high memory and computational cost due to quadratic complexity of self-attention. Local-window self-attention over small non-overlapping patches [19, 30] was introduced to address this issue. Various techniques have been proposed to improve the long-range attention of window-based self-attention, such as using window hierarchy [30], constructing nonlocal self-attention patterns [12, 40, 56, 49, 53, 27, 46, 8], and expanding the receptive field via convolution [5, 55]. Most vision transformers are pretrained with large-scale image datasets and serve as generic vision backbones for multiple purposes.

3D transformers for point cloud understanding Transformer architectures have rapidly adapted to 3D [25]. Guo *et al.* [14] applied global attention to points and achieved good performance on object classification and shape segmentation. Zhao *et al.* [59] introduced local attention to point clouds, thus reducing memory and computational complexity and making the point transformer applicable to point clouds at the scene level. Wu *et al.* [51] further improved the point transformer by using grouped vector attention and partition-based pooling. Fast Point Transformer [33] employed voxel hashing and a lightweight self-attention layer to improve network efficiency. Stratified Transformer [26] adapted the Swin Transformer design for 3D point clouds and proposed the stratified strategy to expand the reception field and employed contextual relative positional encoding [48] to strengthen self-attention with position information. The existing 3D transformers are mainly designed for specific tasks, and no




Figure 1. 2D illustration of sparse points in a 4×4 window. (a) A fully-occupied window. (b) A sparsely-occupied window, white cells are empty. (c) Regularly-distributed sparse points in a window. (d) Irregularly-distributed sparse points in a window and different circle colors encode the varied point-wise signal, such as point RGB color.

3D transformers were pretrained on large data as a generic 3D backbone.

Pretrained 3D backbones Self-supervised learning techniques have been adopted for 3D backbone pretraining. PointContrast [52] pretrained a sparse-convolution-based 3D U-Net using point-level losses. MID-Net [44] pretrained an Octree-based HRNet using multiresolution contrastive losses. Hou *et al.* [21] improves the efficiency of PointContrast by utilizing spatial information. DepthContrast [58] adopted depth maps to improve contrastive learning. Masked-signal-modeling-based transformer models, such as BEiT [2] and the masked autoencoder [20], was brought to 3D pretraining [29, 57, 54, 32]. Recently, pretrained image or CLIP models have been utilized for 3D learning [47, 11, 22, 23], becoming a new type of pretrained 3D backbones. ShapeNet [4] and ScannNet [9] are the main 3D data sources for the above pre-training work. Despite the rapid development of 3D pretraining, currently their performance on 3D indoor scene understanding falls behind state-of-the-art non-pretrained approaches.

3. SWIN3D Transformer

3.1. Naive 3D extension of Swin Transformer

As hierarchical window-based transformers, such as Swin Transformer [30], are widely used as generic vision backbones due to their high efficiency, multiscale feature learning, great scalability, and significant performance gain over 2D CNN backbones, it is a natural idea to extend Swin Transformer-like architectures for 3D point cloud learning. The implementation of window attention mechanism in 3D seems straightforward — to partition the input 3D point cloud into non-overlapped 3D windows and compute self-attention on nonempty-voxel features within regular and shifted windows. However, this naive extension does not lead to superior performance, as observed by Lai *et al.* [26] in their ablation study. We analyze this uninspiring performance and find two key issues: *memory complexity* and *signal irregularity*.




Figure 2. **Left:** The architecture of SWIN3D. It contains 5-stage transformer blocks that perform self-attention on sparse voxels within regular and shifted windows at different levels of a hierarchical sparse grid. The grids in the left are the illustration of sparse grids in 2D, gray cells represent nonempty voxels. N_i denotes the number of sparse voxels at i -th level and C_i is the feature channel dimension. **Right:** The detailed operations of each module.

Memory complexity The quadratic complexity of self-attention raises a high memory cost in 3D. For a 3D window with size $M \times M \times M$, the average number of non-empty voxels within the window is about $\mathcal{O}(M^2)$, thus the memory cost of performing vanilla self-attention within the window is about $\mathcal{O}(M^4)$. For a 3D scene, the number of windows N_w could be huge, depending on the size of 3D scenes. Thus, the total memory cost $\mathcal{O}(N_w M^4)$ in 3D could be much higher than its 2D counterpart, where the image size is usually low. This memory issue prevents the use of large windows and more Swin layers in 3D; thus difficult to design large models that can benefit from large data.

Signal irregularity 3D point locations can be highly irregular: points could appear anywhere inside its occupied voxel, while for 2D visual transformers, image pixels are regularly distributed at grid cell centers. Furthermore, since points are usually equipped with other raw signals, such as RGB colors, if we regard both point positions and other pointwise signals as voxel signals, the signal irregularity, *i.e.*, the relative signal variation between any two voxels in a window, could have large variations. Existing works [26] address point irregularity only using positional encoding in self-attention, but they are unaware of the variations of other signals. In Fig. 1, we illustrate sparse voxels in a window and signal irregularity on a 2D example.

3.2. Architecture overview

To tackle the above-mentioned issues, we carefully designed our SWIN3D backbone. SWIN3D has a hierarchical structure similar to the Swin Transformer. It consists of the following modules: *voxelization* module for discretizing an input point cloud into a multiscale sparse voxel grid (Section 3.3.1); *initial feature embedding* module that generates sparse voxel features at the finest voxel level for fea-

ture attention (Section 3.3.2); SWIN3D *block* that performs novel memory-efficient self-attention on sparse voxel features within regular and shifted windows and address signal irregularity by contextual relative signal encoding (Section 3.3.3); *downsample* module that aggregates the sparse voxel features at l -th level to $(l + 1)$ -th level (Section 3.3.4). SWIN3D contains 5-stage SWIN3D blocks, each of which operates at different voxel resolution. SWIN3D serves as a multiscale feature encoder for any input point cloud, and easily incorporates with task-specific decoders for various 3D tasks. Fig. 2 illustrates the architecture of our backbone. The detail of each module is introduced in the following subsections.

3.3. Module design

3.3.1 Voxelization

Point cloud input An input point cloud is usually associated with point-wise signals, such as point position, RGB color, and point normal. For a point p , the concatenation of these signals is denoted by $s_p \in \mathbb{R}^m$. A common setting is $m = 6$, *i.e.*, 3D point coordinates and RGB color (each color component is mapped inside the interval $[-1, 1]$).

Voxelization We use sparse voxels as point proxies in our backbone. A 5-level hierarchical sparse voxel grid is built upon the input point cloud. The sparse grid is illustrated in Fig. 2 using a 2D example. The voxel size at the finest level is set to 2 cm for indoor scenes, by default. The voxel size is doubled when the voxel level is increased by one. We store point information into the voxels from the finest level to the coarsest level as follows.

- For the voxel v at the finest level, we randomly choose one of the points inside v and set it as the *representative point* of v , denoted by r_v .

- For the voxel v at $(l + 1)$ -th level, we first select all representative points from its child voxels, then pick the representative point from them that is closest to the center of these points, and set it as the representative point of v .

The above voxelization step associates unstructured points with structured sparse voxel grids, and the representative point will be used to provide raw features to the initial feature embedding and offer contextual information to compute SWIN3D self-attention (see Section 3.3.3). For simplicity, we use s_v to represent the signal at the representative point of voxel v .

3.3.2 Initial feature embedding

Inspired by the observation [26] that using a linear layer or MLP to project raw features to a high dimension does not yield good performance for Swin-like transformer architectures. We propose to lift the raw feature via sparse convolution: at the finest voxel level, we apply one layer of sparse convolution with a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ kernel, and add a batch normalization (BN) and a ReLU layer, to lift the input voxel feature to \mathbb{R}^{C_1} . The input feature on voxel v is set as the concatenation of the positional offset: $r_v - c_v$ and other point signals stored at r_v , c_v is the center of v . Here, we do not use the absolute point position because we aim to learn local priors via convolution. Compared to KPConv [39] employed by [26], our initial feature embedding is lightweight and efficient.

3.3.3 SWIN3D block

Our SWIN3D block inherits the original design of Swin Transformer block: it operates on regular windows and shifted windows. In 3D, we partition the voxel grid at l level into non-overlapped windows, where the regular window size is $M \times M \times M$, and the shifted window is obtained by shifting a regular window with window offset $(\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor)$. We revise the vanilla multi-head self-attention to take into account memory efficiency and signal irregularity. The number of heads is denoted by N_H .

Vanilla self-attention For an input Swin window, assume that there are N non-empty voxels: $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$. The network features of these voxels are denoted by $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$. A vanilla multi-head self-attention on the input voxel features is defined as a weighted sum of projected voxel features:

$$f_{i,h}^* = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_{ij,h} \cdot f_j W_{V,h}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where $\{f_{i,h}^*\}_{i=1}^N$ are the output feature vectors at the h -th head. The weight coefficient $\alpha_{ij,h}$ is the SoftMax version of

$e_{ij,h}$, i.e., $\exp(e_{ij,h}) / \sum_{k=1}^N \exp(e_{ik,h})$, where $e_{ij,h}$ is in a scaled dot-product attention form:

$$e_{ij,h} = \frac{(f_i W_{Q,h})(f_j W_{K,h})^T}{\sqrt{d}}. \quad (2)$$

$W_{Q,h}$, $W_{K,h}$, $W_{V,h}$ are linear projection matrices for *Query*, *Key* and *Value* computation, d is the channel number of the h -th head.

Memory-efficient self-attention implementation The common multi-head self-attention implementation takes two passes to compute $\{\alpha_{ij,h}\}$: all $\exp(e_{ij,h})$ s are computed in the first pass and all their accumulated sums, i.e., $\{\sum_{k=1}^N \exp(e_{ik,h})\}$, are computed in the second pass. The implementation requires to store all $\alpha_{ij,h}$ s for computing Eq. (1), leading to $\mathcal{O}(N^2 \times N_H)$ memory complexity. For Swin-like Transformer architectures, this memory complexity is $\mathcal{O}(N^2 \times N_H \times N_w)$, where N_w is the number of windows. For a 3D Swin Transformer with window size $M \times M \times M$, $N = \mathcal{O}(M^2)$ and N_w could be very large if the scale of the input point cloud has a large variation. This high memory cost in 3D hinders the use of large windows and deeper networks; on the contrary, this issue is not significant in the 2D Swin Transformer because N_w is at least one order smaller than its 3D counterpart, and the input image usually has a fixed size.

Note that Eq. (1) can be rewritten in the following form:

$$f_{i,h}^* = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N (\exp(e_{ij,h}) f_j W_{V,h})}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(e_{ij,h})}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3)$$

we can postpone the SoftMax normalization and avoid constructing and storing $\{\alpha_{ij,h}\}$ explicitly. So we revise the second pass by calculating the denominator and numerator of Eq. (3) simultaneously. During computation, $\{\exp(e_{ij,h})\}_{j=1}^N$ for $f_{i,h}^*$ are calculated on the fly, without storage. In this way, the quadratic complexity of the memory cost of $\{\alpha_{ij,h}\}$ is completely eliminated. Here, for gradient propagation, each $\exp(e_{ij,h})$ is computed twice during the training stage. However, this additional computation cost is ignorable as the self-attention computation is a memory-intensive operation not a computation-intensive operation, thus our memory reduction does not slow down the computation and could reduce the execution latency as well (see evaluation in Section 4.1).

Contextual relative signal encoding Swin Transformer uses relative position bias [38] to improve backbone performance. Wu *et al.* [48] propose a novel contextual mode for relative positional encoding, called *contextual relative position encoding* (cRPE), which adds relative position encoding in both queries and keys. Lai *et al.* [26] use cRPE to capture fine-grained position information in 3D self-attention

computation. In our work, we extend cRPE to all kinds of signals, not limited to point positions, as other signals such as RGB color also exhibit high variation within a window and these variations should be captured by self-attention. We call this generalized version *contextual relative signal encoding*, in short, cRSE. The multi-head self-attention with cRSE is formulated as follows.

First, e_{ij} is revised to incorporate the difference of the voxel signals $\Delta s_{ij} := s_{v_i} - s_{v_j}$:

$$e_{ij,h} = \frac{(\mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{W}_{Q,h})(\mathbf{f}_j \mathbf{W}_{K,h})^T + b_{ij,h}}{\sqrt{d}}. \quad (4)$$

Here, $b_{ij,h}$ is the contextual signal encoding:

$$b_{ij,h} = (\mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{W}_{Q,h})(\mathbf{t}_{K,h}(\Delta s_{ij}))^T + (\mathbf{f}_j \mathbf{W}_{K,h})(\mathbf{t}_{Q,h}(\Delta s_{ij}))^T. \quad (5)$$

The output of self-attention is revised to:

$$\mathbf{f}_{i,h}^* = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(e_{ij,h})(\mathbf{f}_j \mathbf{W}_{V,h} + \mathbf{t}_{V,h}(\Delta s_{ij}))}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(e_{ij,h})}, \quad (6)$$

Here, $\mathbf{t}_{K,h}$, $\mathbf{t}_{Q,h}$ and $\mathbf{t}_{V,h}$ are trainable functions that map signal differences to \mathbb{R}^d .

To make these trainable functions lightweight, we follow [38, 26] to quantify signal differences by a set of learnable look-up tables: $\{t_1^{Q,h}, \dots, t_m^{Q,h}\}$, $\{t_1^{K,h}, \dots, t_m^{K,h}\}$, and $\{t_1^{V,h}, \dots, t_m^{V,h}\}$, where each table $t_i^{*,h}$ has a fixed length L_i , $*$ could be Q , K or V . For an input vector Δ , its table indices are defined as:

$$I_l(\Delta) = \lfloor \frac{(\Delta[l] - \text{minquat}[l])L_l}{\text{quat}[l]} \rfloor. \quad (7)$$

$\Delta[l]$ is the l -th component of Δ , $\text{quat}[l]$ and $\text{minquat}[l]$ are the quantification range and the lower bound of signal difference for the l -th signal, respectively. For common signal types, $\text{quat}[l]$ and $\text{minquat}[l]$ defined as follows.

- If the l -th signal corresponds to point position, $\text{quat}[l] = 2h$ and $\text{minquat}[l] = -h$. Here, h is the physical height of the cubic window.
- If the l -th signal corresponds to one of the RGB components, $\text{quat}[l] = 2$ and $\text{minquat}[l] = -1$.
- If the l -th signal corresponds to one of the point normal components, $\text{quat}[l] = 2$ and $\text{minquat}[l] = -1$.

With the look-up tables and index functions, we have $\mathbf{t}_{Q,h}(\Delta) = \sum_{l=1}^m t_{l,h}^Q[I_l(\Delta)]$, $\mathbf{t}_{K,h}(\Delta) = \sum_{l=1}^m t_{l,h}^K[I_l(\Delta)]$, $\mathbf{t}_{V,h}(\Delta) = \sum_{l=1}^m t_{l,h}^V[I_l(\Delta)]$. The use of look-up tables for cRSE introduces additional $3 \sum_{i=1}^m L_i \times N_H$ parameters. By default, we set $L_l = 4$ if the l -th signal corresponds to position, and $L_l = 16$ if the l -th signal corresponds to color or normal components. The efficacy of cRSE is evaluated extensively in Section 6.

Transformer block The above revised multi-head self-attention with other transformer components (LayerNorm and MLP layer) forms our SWIN3D transformer block, denoted by S-MSA3D (on regular windows) and SW-MSA3D (on shifted windows), as shown in Fig. 2-right.

3.3.4 Downsample

The voxel features at l -th level are downsampled to $(l+1)$ -th level as follows. First, all sparse voxel features at l -th level are lifted to $\mathbb{R}^{C_{l+1}}$ via a LayerNorm and an FC layer. Then, for any sparse voxel v at $(l+1)$ -level, we maxpool the voxel features of its k -nearest voxels at l -level, and assign the resulting feature to v . k is set to 16 by default. This downsample strategy is called KNNPooling.

4. Backbone pretraining

4.1. Backbone models

We create two versions of SWIN3D: SWIN3D-S and SWIN3D-L. Their default window size is set to $5 \times 5 \times 5$ for the first stage and $7 \times 7 \times 7$ for the rest stages, and the layer numbers are $\{2, 4, 9, 4, 4\}$ with downsample strides $\{3, 2, 2, 2\}$. Their feature dimensions (#FD) and head numbers (#HD) at each stage are:

- **SWIN3D-S**: #FD = $\{48, 96, 192, 384, 384\}$, #HD = $\{6, 6, 12, 24, 24\}$;
- **SWIN3D-L**: #FD = $\{80, 160, 320, 640, 640\}$, #HD = $\{10, 10, 20, 40, 40\}$.

By default, we assume that the input point signal contains positional and color information only. When the input signal contains point normals and cRSE uses normal signals, we use SWIN3D_n-S and SWIN3D_n-L to denote our backbone models.

Self-attention implementation We revised the self-attention module of Stratified Transformer [26] to improve its efficiency. The revision includes optimizing kernel scheduling, enabling half-precision, and reducing accesses of atomic operations, and we call this revision our vanilla implementation. We further extend cRPE to cRSE and integrate our memory-efficient design. The computational and memory efficiency of our approach is reported in Table 1. Compared with [26], our implementation significantly reduces computational and memory cost significantly, thus supporting training our large model. More details on the implementation are provided in the supplemental material.

4.2. Backbone pretraining

Dataset To pretrain our backbones with large 3D data and use them for understanding 3D indoor scenes, we choose to use the synthetic and annotated indoor scene dataset —

		Impl. of [26]		Our-Vanilla		Our-Efficient	
Block	#Pts	Time	Mem.	Time	Mem.	Time	Mem.
Stage-1	109.48 k	487.7	1380.1	25.7	555.4	20.3	268.68
Stage-2	15.05 k	122.9	467.4	16.0	180.4	14.1	95.4
Stage-3	4.01 k	56.5	233.6	9.3	104.8	7.1	47.9
Stage-4	1.01 k	29.0	120.5	6.5	60.0	4.8	24.4
Stage-5	0.25 k	9.6	36.7	4.3	21.2	2.4	8.7

Table 1. Comparison of self-attention efficiency. We report the average statistics of point number, execution time (ms) and memory footprint (MB) for a single forward-backward iteration. We selected 70 ScanNet point clouds [9] for benchmark. The implementation of [26] supports double-precision only.

Model	Params	Latency	Memory (Avg./Peak)
SWIN3D-S	23.57 M	377.98 ms	2.24/3.69 GB
SWIN3D-L	60.75 M	554.58 ms	4.11/6.73 GB

Table 2. Model parameters, inference latency, and memory footprint, evaluated on Structured3D segmentation.

Structured3D [60], which contains 21835 rooms in 3500 scenes and has rich and diverse high-quality 3D objects and layouts. It is one-order larger than other real indoor datasets including MatterportLayout [61] (2295 rooms) and ScanNet [9] (1613 rooms). We use the provided realistic RGBD and panoramic images of Structured3D to generate 3D point clouds. We also estimate point normals for training SWIN3D_n models. The details of data preparation are provided in the supplemental material.

Pretraining We choose 3D semantic segmentation as our pretext task for pretraining, and the number of semantic labels is 25. We follow the original data split: 18349 rooms for training, 1776 rooms for validation, and 1691 rooms for test. We use SWIN3D as the encoder and designed a simple decoder to output semantic labels of input points. The decoder is similar to the UNet decoder. We upsample the features from the coarsest level using interpolation, followed by a Linear Layer to align the dimension. Then we add fine-level features from the encoder using skip-connection. Here, we intend to use a simple decoder to enforce the backbone to play the key role in feature learning. The network was trained with 100 epochs with a batch size of 12 and the input data is augmented via random crop and rotation. We use the AdamW optimizer with a Cosine learning rate scheduler. Table 2 reports the network parameters including the decoder, the amortized inference latency measured in the Structured3D validation set, and the average and peak memory footprint of network training in a subset (600 samples) of the training dataset. The costs of training SWIN3D-S and SWIN3D-L are 488 and 703 GPU hours with NVidia V100 GPUs, respectively. We also pretrain SWIN3D_n-S and SWIN3D_n-L and use them only for the ScanNet segmentation task.




Figure 3. Model scalability with respect to different ratios of data for pretraining. **Left:** Test on Structured3D segmentation. **Right:** SWIN3D-L on downstream 6-fold S3DIS segmentation.

Fine-tuning strategy For applying our pretrained backbones to downstream tasks, we use our backbone as a multi-resolution feature encoder and attach it with a task-specific decoder. For network training, the pretrained network weights and the look-up tables are loaded for initialization, and the decoder weight is randomly initialized. Section 5 presents experiments on downstream tasks.

Model scalability Our backbone is scalable and benefits from large pretrained data, especially for our larger model. We evaluated the segmentation performance (mean IoU) of SWIN3D-T and SWIN3D-L on the test set of Structure3D, and trained the backbones with different training data ratios: 10%, 33% and 100%. The result shown in Fig. 3-left reveals that: (1) with more training data, the performance of both models increases significantly; (2) SWIN3D-L has more capacity to benefit from large data and performs better than SWIN3D-S. We also tested the fine-tuned model scalability on 6-fold S3DIS segmentation (see details in Section 5.1). The result (Fig. 3-right) confirms the above observations.

5. Experimental Analysis

To verify and demonstrate the efficacy of our pretrained backbones, we conducted experiments on ScanNet 3D semantic segmentation, S3DIS segmentation, ScanNet 3D detection, and S3DIS 3D detection.

5.1. Semantic segmentation

Indoor scene datasets ScanNet [9] contains 1613 indoor scans with 20 common semantic labels. we follow the original training/val/test data split, and report the mean IoU on validation and test datasets. S3DIS contains 272 rooms from 6 large-scale areas. One area is selected as the validation set, and other areas are used for training. We report mean IoU on Area-5 and 6-fold cross-validation results.

Network training We adapted the decoder structure of our pretraining by adding a SWIN3D block at each level after the skip-connection to improve the decoder capability. The minimum voxel size for ScanNet and S3DIS is 2 cm and 5 cm. As ScanNet point clouds possess point normal information, we use SWIN3D_n-S and SWIN3D_n-L for this

Method	Pre.	ScanNet Segmentation		S3DIS Segmentation	
		Val mIoU (%)	Test mIoU (%)	Area5 mIoU (%)	6-fold mIoU (%)
FastPointTransformer [33]	✗	72.4	-	70.4	-
[‡] LargeKernel3D [6]	✗	73.2	73.9	-	-
Mix3D [31]	✗	73.6	78.1	-	-
Stratified Transformer [26]	✗	74.3	74.7	72.0	-
PointConvFormer [50]	✗	74.5	74.9	-	-
O-CNN [43]	✗	74.5	76.2	-	-
[‡] PointMetaBase-XXL [28]	✗	72.8	71.4	72.0	77.0
PointTransformerV2 [51]	✗	75.4	75.2	71.6	-
PointNeXt-XL [34]	✗	-	-	71.1	74.9
PointMixer [7]	✗	-	-	71.4	-
[‡] WindowNorm [45]	✗	-	-	72.2	77.6
SWIN3D-S*	✗	75.2	-	72.5	76.9
SWIN3D-L*	✗	74.2	-	69.6	-
PointContrast [52]	✓	74.1	-	70.9	-
SceneContext [21]	✓	73.8	-	72.2	-
DepthContrast [58]	✓	71.2	-	70.6	-
SWIN3D-S	✓	75.7	-	73.0	78.2
SWIN3D-L	✓	76.2(77.5)	77.9	74.5	79.8

Table 3. Comparisons of semantic segmentation results on ScanNet and S3DIS. We report the maximal performance numbers of the compared methods. **Pre.** means that the method uses a pretrained backbone with fine-tuning. For ScanNet segmentation, we utilize our pretrained backbones: SWIN3D-S and SWIN3D-L; PointTransformerV2 [51], O-CNN [43] and ours have point normal input. The method names with symbol [‡] are concurrent works, and PointMetaBase has released the code. For SWIN3D-L on ScanNet(val), we also report the voted result via 12 rotation augmentation: 77.5 mIoU, for comparing with PointTransformerV2 that reports the voted result.

task. During the training stage, we augmented the data via random crop, scale and rotation. We fine-tuned our models (SWIN3D-S and SWIN3D-L) for 600 epochs for both ScanNet and S3DIS, with batch size 12. On the ScanNet benchmark (test data), we ensembled three trained models to vote the result on mesh over-segmented meshes.

Evaluation and comparison The quantitative evaluation of our models is reported in Table 3. Compared with state-of-the-art supervised approaches (Table 3-upper) and pretrained-based methods (Table 3-lower), SWIN3D-L surpasses previous state-of-the-art including concurrent works, by large margins: +2.1 mIoU (ScanNet val), +2.3 mIoU (S3DIS Area5), and +2.2 mIoU (S3DIS 6-fold). SWIN3D-S also presents superior performance: +0.3 mIoU (ScanNet val), +0.8 mIoU (S3DIS Area5), and +0.6 mIoU (S3DIS 6-fold).

We also noticed that other pretrained-based methods, such as PointContrast, which uses real 3D data for pretraining, cannot compete with our models and other SOTA supervised methods. Their poor performance indicates that developing better and scalable backbone architectures and utilizing the large scale of pretraining data are important.

We also trained SWIN3D-S and SWIN3D-L from scratch for comparison (600 epochs for ScanNet and 3000 epochs for S3DIS), denoted by SWIN3D-S*. SWIN3D-S* has a comparative performance to existing works, only inferior to PointTransformerV2 [51] on ScanNet(val), and WindowNorm [45] on S3DIS 6-fold. Due to the large model size, SWIN3D-L* exhibits overfitting problems, and its performance is worse than SWIN3D-S*: -1.0 mIoU (ScanNet val), -2.9 mIoU (S3DIS Area5). This issue also reflects that large data is critical for training large models, and the scale of ScanNet and S3DIS cannot support the training of large

models like SWIN3D-L.

5.2. 3D detection

Dataset ScanNet [9] dataset contains instance labels of 18 object categories. We used 1201 scans for training and 312 for validation. S3DIS [1] dataset contains instance labels of 7 categories including floor and ceiling. Following FCAF3D [37], we drop these two categories and train and validate our models in the other five categories. AP@0.25 and AP@0.5 are the evaluation metrics in our experiment.

Network design FCAF3D [37] is a recent 3D detection architecture that achieves high accuracy in the 3D detection on ScanNet and S3DIS. We used pretrained SWIN3D to replace the Sparse-Convolution-based ResNet in FCAF3D and keep other modules unchanged, which we named SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D and SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D. The work of CAGroup3D [42] achieves the first rank in ScanNet 3D detection; we use our pretrained encoder with upsample layers to replace its feature extractor (BiResNet) and keep other modules for proposal generation and the detection head unchanged. The networks are named as SWIN3D-S+CAGroup3D and SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D, and also used for ScanNet detection.

Network training We set the finest voxel size to 2 cm for both ScanNet and S3DIS, and use the same data augmentation as CAGroup3D and FCAF3D. On ScanNet 3D detection, We fine-tuned our SWIN3D-S+CAGroup3D, SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D for 200 epochs with batch size 12, and fine-tuned our SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D, SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D with batch size 8. On S3DIS 3D Detection, we fine-tuned

Method	Pre.	mAP@0.25	mAP@0.5
RepSurf [35]	✗	71.2	54.8
FCAF3D [37]	✗	71.5	57.3
SoftGroup [41]	✗	71.6	59.4
CAGroup3D [42]	✗	75.1	61.3
SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D	✗	72.1	56.8
SWIN3D-S+CAGroup3D	✗	73.3	58.6
Point-M2AE [57]	✓	50.1	33.2
PointContrast [52]	✓	59.2	37.3
RandomRooms [36]	✓	68.6	51.5
SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D	✓	74.2	59.5
SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D	✓	74.2	58.6
SWIN3D-S+CAGroup3D	✓	76.4	62.7
SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D	✓	76.4	63.2

Table 4. Comparisons of 3D detection results on ScanNet.

Method	Pre.	mAP@0.25	mAP@0.5
GSDN [16]	✗	47.8	25.1
FCAF3D [37]	✗	66.7	45.9
SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D	✗	64.6	40.7
SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D	✓	69.9	50.2
SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D	✓	72.1	54.0

Table 5. Comparisons of 3D detection results on S3DIS.

Backbone	Pre. dataset	Area5 mIoU (%)	6-fold mIoU (%)
SWIN3D-S	ScanNet	71.8	76.7
SWIN3D-S	Structure3D	73.0	78.2
SWIN3D-L	ScanNet	68.9	73.6
SWIN3D-L	Structure3D	74.5	79.8

Table 6. S3DIS segmentation results by using the backbones pretrained on different datasets.

our SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D for 200 epochs with batch size 8.

Evaluation and comparison On ScanNet 3D detection (Table 4), SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D and SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D improve FCAF3D by +2.7 points, on mAP@0.25. SWIN3D-S+CAGroup3D and SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D both surpass CAGroup3D. SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D improves CAGroup3D by +1.9 points on mAP@0.50, achieves new records on this Task. Table 5 reports the performance of our model on S3DIS. Compared to FCAF3D, using our pretrained backbones boosts the performance significantly: SWIN3D-S+FCAF3D get +4.3 points and SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D gets +8.1 points, on mAP@0.5.

For our models trained from scratch, their performance drops probably due to insufficient data for training, as their pretrained version can have much higher performance.

From the detection experiments, we also conclude that semantic segmentation is a good pretext task for 3D pretraining, as our pretrained backbone has remarkable transferability to the task of 3D detection.

6. Ablation study

Data for pretraining We compared our backbones pretrained on ScanNet or Structed3D on the downstream S3DIS

Input Point Signal	cRSE	Val mIoU (%)
pos+color	pos	73.1
pos+color	pos+color	74.5
pos+color+normal	pos	73.1
pos+color+normal	pos+color	74.4
pos+color+normal	pos+color+normal	75.2

Table 7. Efficacy evaluation of cRSE on ScanNet segmentation.

Backbone	loaded look-up tables	Val mIoU (%)
SWIN3D _n -L	pos	75.4
SWIN3D _n -L	pos+color	75.9
SWIN3D _n -L	pos+color+normal	76.2

Table 8. Ablation study of using the pretrained look-up tables on ScanNet segmentation.

segmentation task. Table 6 shows clearly that our backbones benefit from the large synthetic Structed3D data more than the real but small ScanNet data. It indicates that the scale of training data is the most important factor in 3D backbone training, despite the domain gap between real and synthetic data.

Efficacy of cRSE We designed two experiments to validate the efficacy of cRSE. In the first experiment, we trained SWIN3D-S from scratch for ScanNet segmentation in three different configurations: (1) use cRSE on point position only, similar to [26]; (2) use cRSE on point position and color; (3) use cRSE on point position, color, and point normal. We also dropped or kept the normal information from the input point cloud for training and testing. The reported performance (Table 7) shows that capturing color and normal variation via cRSE can improve the performance significantly. In the second experiment, we used the pretrained SWIN3D_n-L for ScanNet segmentation but did not load the pretrained look-up tables for color and/or normal components and trained these unloaded look-up tables from scratch during the network fine-tuning stage. The results in Table 8 show that the use of pretrained tables is essential for performance improvement.

7. Conclusion

We present a pretrained 3D backbone — SWIN3D for indoor scene understanding, whose scalability, transferability, and superior performance have been validated through extensive experiments. We believe that the capacity of SWIN3D can be extended further in the following directions. First, it would be interesting to revisit self-supervised pretraining schemes using our backbone and maximize its capability with more real and synthetic data, including outdoor 3D data. Second, as point clouds are usually accompanied by high-resolution multiview images supplied by 3D capture devices, it is promising to leverage image data and incorporate with both pretrained image backbones and 3D backbones to enhance the efficacy of 3D learning.

References

- [1] Iro Armeni, Ozan Sener, Amir Roshan Zamir, Helen Jiang, Ioannis K. Brilakis, Martin Fischer, and Silvio Savarese. 3D semantic parsing of large-scale indoor spaces. In *CVPR*, 2016. 7
- [2] Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Songhao Piao, and Furu Wei. BEiT: BERT pre-training of image transformers. In *ICLR*, 2022. 1, 2
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *NeurIPS*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 1
- [4] Angel X. Chang, Thomas Funkhouser, Leonidas Guibas, Pat Hanrahan, Qixing Huang, Zimo Li, Silvio Savarese, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Hao Su, Jianxiong Xiao, Li Yi, and Fisher Yu. ShapeNet: An information-rich 3D model repository. arXiv:1512.03012 [cs.GR], 2015. 2
- [5] Qiang Chen, Qiman Wu, Jian Wang, Qinghao Hu, Tao Hu, Errui Ding, Jian Cheng, and Jingdong Wang. MixFormer: Mixing features across windows and dimensions. In *CVPR*, pages 5249–5259, 2022. 2
- [6] Yukang Chen, Jianhui Liu, Xiaojuan Qi, Xiangyu Zhang, Jian Sun, and Jiaya Jia. Scaling up kernels in 3D CNNs. arXiv:2206.10555[cs.CV], 2022. 7
- [7] Jaesung Choe, Chunghyun Park, Francois Rameau, Jaesik Park, and In So Kweon. PointMixer: MLP-Mixer for point cloud understanding. In *ECCV*, 2022. 7
- [8] Xiangxiang Chu, Zhi Tian, Yuqing Wang, Bo Zhang, Haibing Ren, Xiaolin Wei, Huaxia Xia, and Chunhua Shen. Twins: Re-visiting the design of spatial attention in vision transformers. *NeurIPS*, 34:9355–9366, 2021. 2
- [9] Angela Dai, Angel X. Chang, Manolis Savva, Maciej Halber, Thomas Funkhouser, and Matthias Nießner. ScanNet: Richly-annotated 3D reconstructions of indoor scenes. In *CVPR*, 2017. 2, 6, 7
- [10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL*, 2019. 1
- [11] Runpei Dong, Zekun Qi, Linfeng Zhang, Junbo Zhang, Jianjian Sun, Zheng Ge, Li Yi, and Kaisheng Ma. Autoencoders as cross-modal teachers: Can pretrained 2D image transformers help 3D representation learning? In *ICLR*, 2023. 2
- [12] Xiaoyi Dong, Jianmin Bao, Dongdong Chen, Weiming Zhang, Nenghai Yu, Lu Yuan, Dong Chen, and Baining Guo. CSWin transformer: A general vision transformer backbone with cross-shaped windows. In *CVPR*, pages 12124–12134, 2022. 2
- [13] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*, 2021. 1, 2
- [14] Meng-Hao Guo, Jun-Xiong Cai, Zheng-Ning Liu, Tai-Jiang Mu, Ralph R Martin, and Shi-Min Hu. PCT: Point cloud transformer. *Computational Visual Media*, 7(2):187–199, 2021. 2
- [15] Meng-Hao Guo, Tian-Xing Xu, Jiang-Jiang Liu, Zheng-Ning Liu, Peng-Tao Jiang, Tai-Jiang Mu, Song-Hai Zhang, Ralph R Martin, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Shi-Min Hu. Attention mechanisms in computer vision: A survey. *Computational Visual Media*, pages 1–38, 2022. 2
- [16] JunYoung Gwak, Christopher Choy, and Silvio Savarese. Generative sparse detection networks for 3d single-shot object detection. In *ECCV*, pages 297–313. Springer, 2020. 8
- [17] JunYoung Gwak, Christopher B Choy, and Silvio Savarese. Generative sparse detection networks for 3D single-shot object detection. In *ECCV*, 2020. 14
- [18] Kai Han, Yunhe Wang, Hanting Chen, Xinghao Chen, Jianyuan Guo, Zhenhua Liu, Yehui Tang, An Xiao, Chun-jing Xu, Yixing Xu, et al. A survey on vision transformer. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 2022. 2
- [19] Qi Han, ZeJia Fan, Qi Dai, Lei Sun, Ming-Ming Cheng, Jiaying Liu, and Jingdong Wang. Demystifying local vision transformer: Sparse connectivity, weight sharing, and dynamic weight. In *ICLR*, 2022. 2
- [20] Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross B. Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *CVPR*, pages 15979–15988, 2022. 2
- [21] Ji Hou, Benjamin Graham, Matthias Nießner, and Saining Xie. Exploring data-efficient 3D scene understanding with contrastive scene contexts, 2021. 2, 7
- [22] Tianyu Huang, Bowen Dong, Yunhan Yang, Xiaoshui Huang, Rynson WH Lau, Wanli Ouyang, and Wangmeng Zuo. Clip2Point: Transfer clip to point cloud classification with image-depth pre-training. arXiv:2210.01055, 2022. 2
- [23] Xiaoshui Huang, Sheng Li, Wentao Qu, Tong He, Yifan Zuo, and Wanli Ouyang. Frozen CLIP model is efficient point cloud backbone. arXiv:2212.04098, 2022. 2
- [24] Salman Khan, Muzammal Naseer, Munawar Hayat, Syed Waqas Zamir, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. Transformers in vision: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 2021. 2
- [25] Jean Lahoud, Jiale Cao, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, Hisham Cholakkal, Rao Muhammad Anwer, Salman Khan, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. 3D vision with transformers: A survey, 2022. 2
- [26] Xin Lai, Jianhui Liu, Li Jiang, Liwei Wang, Hengshuang Zhao, Shu Liu, Xiaojuan Qi, and Jiaya Jia. Stratified transformer for 3D point cloud segmentation. In *CVPR*, pages 8500–8509, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13
- [27] Wei Li, Xing Wang, Xin Xia, Jie Wu, Xuefeng Xiao, Min Zheng, and Shiping Wen. SepViT: Separable vision transformer. arXiv:2203.15380[cs.CV], 2022. 2
- [28] Haojia Lin, Xiawu Zheng, Lijiang Li, Fei Chao, Shanshan Wang, Yan Wang, Yonghong Tian, and Rongrong Ji. Meta architecture for point cloud analysis. arXiv:2211.14462, 2022. 7
- [29] Haotian Liu, Mu Cai, and Yong Jae Lee. Masked discrimination for self-supervised learning on point clouds. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2

- [30] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *ICCV*, pages 10012–10022, 2021. 1, 2
- [31] Alexey Nekrasov, Jonas Schult, Or Litany, Bastian Leibe, and Francis Engelmann. Mix3D: Out-of-context data augmentation for 3D scenes. In *3DV*, pages 116–125. IEEE, 2021. 7
- [32] Yatian Pang, Wenxiao Wang, Francis E. H. Tay, W. Liu, Yonghong Tian, and Liuliang Yuan. Masked autoencoders for point cloud self-supervised learning. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2
- [33] Chunghyun Park, Yoonwoo Jeong, Minsu Cho, and Jaesik Park. Fast point transformer. In *CVPR*, pages 16949–16958, 2022. 2, 7
- [34] Guocheng Qian, Yuchen Li, Houwen Peng, Jinjie Mai, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Bernard Ghanem. PointNeXt: Revisiting PointNet++ with improved training and scaling strategies. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 7
- [35] Haoxi Ran, Jun Liu, and Chengjie Wang. Surface representation for point clouds. In *CVPR*, pages 18942–18952, 2022. 8
- [36] Yongming Rao, Benlin Liu, Yi Wei, Jiwen Lu, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Jie Zhou. RandomRooms: unsupervised pre-training from synthetic shapes and randomized layouts for 3D object detection. In *ICCV*, pages 3283–3292, 2021. 8
- [37] Danila Rukhovich, Anna Vorontsova, and Anton Konushin. FCAF3D: Fully convolutional anchor-free 3D object detection. In *ECCV*, 2021. 7, 8, 14
- [38] Peter Shaw, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Ashish Vaswani. Self-attention with relative position representations. In *NAACL*, 2018. 4, 5
- [39] Hugues Thomas, Charles R. Qi, Jean-Emmanuel Deschaud, Beatriz Marcotegui, François Goulette, and Leonidas J. Guibas. KPConv: Flexible and deformable convolution for point clouds. In *ICCV*, 2019. 4
- [40] Zhengzhong Tu, Hossein Talebi, Han Zhang, Feng Yang, Peyman Milanfar, Alan Bovik, and Yinxiao Li. MaxViT: Multi-axis vision transformer. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2
- [41] Thang Vu, Kookhoi Kim, Tung M Luu, Thanh Nguyen, and Chang D Yoo. SoftGroup for 3D instance segmentation on point clouds. In *CVPR*, pages 2708–2717, 2022. 8
- [42] Haiyang Wang, Lihe Ding, Shaocong Dong, Shaoshuai Shi, Aoxue Li, Jianan Li, Zhenguo Li, and Liwei Wang. CA-Group3D: Class-aware grouping for 3D object detection on point clouds. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 7, 8, 14
- [43] Peng-Shuai Wang, Yang Liu, Yu-Xiao Guo, Chun-Yu Sun, and Xin Tong. O-CNN: Octree-based convolutional neural networks for 3D shape analysis. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 36(4):72:1–72:11, 2017. 7
- [44] Peng-Shuai Wang, Yu-Qi Yang, Qian-Fang Zou, Zhirong Wu, Yang Liu, and Xin Tong. Unsupervised 3D learning for shape analysis via multiresolution instance discrimination. In *AAAI*, 2020. 2
- [45] Qi Wang, Sheng Shi, Jiahui Li, Wuming Jiang, and Xiangde Zhang. Window Normalization: Enhancing Point cloud understanding by unifying inconsistent point densities. arXiv:2212.02287, 2022. 7
- [46] Wenxiao Wang, Lu Yao, Long Chen, Binbin Lin, Deng Cai, Xiaofei He, and Wei Liu. Crossformer: A versatile vision transformer hinging on cross-scale attention. In *ICLR*, 2022. 2
- [47] Ziyi Wang, Xumin Yu, Yongming Rao, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. P2P: Tuning pre-trained image models for point cloud analysis with point-to-pixel prompting. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2
- [48] Kan Wu, Houwen Peng, Minghao Chen, Jianlong Fu, and Hongyang Chao. Rethinking and improving relative position encoding for vision transformer. In *ICCV*, pages 10033–10041, 2021. 1, 2, 4
- [49] Sitong Wu, Tianyi Wu, Haoru Tan, and Guodong Guo. Pale transformer: A general vision transformer backbone with pale-shaped attention. In *AAAI*, pages 2731–2739, 2022. 2
- [50] Wenxuan Wu, Qi Shan, and Li Fuxin. Point-ConvFormer: Revenge of the point-based convolution. arXiv:2208.02879[cs.CV], 2022. 7
- [51] Xiaoyang Wu, Yixing Lao, Li Jiang, Xihui Liu, and Hengshuang Zhao. Point Transformer V2: Grouped vector attention and partition-based pooling. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2, 7, 13
- [52] Saining Xie, Jiatao Gu, Demi Guo, Charles R Qi, Leonidas J Guibas, and Or Litany. PointContrast: Unsupervised pre-training for 3D point cloud understanding. *ECCV*, 2020. 2, 7, 8
- [53] Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Xiyang Dai, Bin Xiao, Lu Yuan, and Jianfeng Gao. Focal self-attention for local-global interactions in vision transformers. *NeurIPS*, 34:30008–30022, 2021. 2
- [54] Xumin Yu, Lulu Tang, Yongming Rao, Tiejun Huang, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Point-BERT: Pre-training 3D point cloud transformers with masked point modeling. In *CVPR*, pages 19313–19322, June 2022. 2
- [55] Yuhui Yuan, Rao Fu, Lang Huang, Weihong Lin, Chao Zhang, Xilin Chen, and Jingdong Wang. HRFormer: High-resolution vision transformer for dense prediction. *NeurIPS*, 34:7281–7293, 2021. 2
- [56] Qiming Zhang, Yufei Xu, Jing Zhang, and Dacheng Tao. VSA: Learning varied-size window attention in vision transformers. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2
- [57] Renrui Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Peng Gao, Rongyao Fang, Bin Zhao, Dong Wang, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. Point-M2AE: Multi-scale masked autoencoders for hierarchical point cloud pre-training. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2, 8
- [58] Zaiwei Zhang, Rohit Girdhar, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Self-supervised pretraining of 3D features on any point-cloud. In *ICCV*, pages 10252–10263, 2021. 2, 7
- [59] Hengshuang Zhao, Li Jiang, Jiaya Jia, Philip HS Torr, and Vladlen Koltun. Point transformer. In *ICCV*, pages 16259–16268, 2021. 2
- [60] Jia Zheng, Junfei Zhang, Jing Li, Rui Tang, Shenghua Gao, and Zihan Zhou. Structured3D: A large photo-realistic dataset for structured 3D modeling. In *ECCV*, pages 519–535. Springer, 2020. 1, 6, 12
- [61] Chuhan Zou, Jheng-Wei Su, Chi-Han Peng, Alex Colburn, Qi Shan, Peter Wonka, Hung-Kuo Chu, and Derek Hoiem.

A. Supplemental Material

The supplemental material is organized as follows. Appendix A.1 provides the details of our memory-efficient self-attention implementation. Appendix A.2 presents our backbone scalability in supporting large models. Appendix A.3 introduces our data preparation step for pretraining and other training details. Appendix A.4 lists the detailed performance report of downstream tasks and visualizes the result.

A.1. Memory-efficient self-attention implementation

In the main paper we report the computational and memory efficiency of our self-attention implementation in Table 1. Here, we present the details of our implementation.

Stratified Transformer [26] computes the sparse correspondence between key/value indices and the coefficient map indices, avoiding extensive memory allocation to fill empty voxels. In our vanilla version of self-attention, we follow its design and improve its efficiency in the following aspects.

Kernel scheduling Designing an optimal scheduling strategy of CUDA kernels is critical to fully utilize the memory bandwidth and computational capabilities of modern GPUs. To calculate the weight coefficients of self-attention, Stratified Transformer [26] builds CUDA blocks whose number is the number of points in the window and creates GPU threads whose number is the maximum number of points in the window. However, the varying number of points in each window makes CUDA compiler hard to optimize the execution speed. To address this issue, our kernel is scheduled to calculate the channel-wise contribution to the weight coefficients $c_{ij,h,d}$ (i, j are the indices of queries and keys, h is the index of the head, d is the index of the channel) per thread and binds blocks to a fixed number of threads (256 in our implementation). We use a local synchronized operation (`_shfl_down_sync`) to perform *reduce-sum* to acquire the coefficient weight $c_{ij,h}$. Due to compacted memory access between neighborhood threads and fixed and balanced operations per thread, our implementation results in higher memory bandwidth and efficient computation.

Half-precision support We enable half-precision for all implemented CUDA kernels. We also reorganize the memory layout of look-up tables from dimension-last to channel-last. Thus, a single thread could process two continuous elements with single 32-bit memory access for the query, key, and look-up tables, respectively.

Computation speedup We merge the computation of co-efficient weights and cRPE/cRSE into a single kernel, further reducing the memory access of queries and keys and accelerating GPU execution.

Reduction of atomic operations We use atomic operations to calculate the updated features and the gradients of the lookup tables. Atomic operators of half-precision are sometimes inefficient because of doubled writing/read conflicts. To solve it, we use share memory to merge two continuous 16-bit atomic operations into a single 32-bit atomic operation, which halves the atomic operations and accelerates GPU execution.

Memory-efficient self-attention As presented in the main paper (Section 3.3.3), we reduce the quadratic complexity of the memory cost of $\{\alpha_{ij,h}\}_s$.

A.2. Additional Evaluation of Model Scalability

Model scalability is crucial for training large models with big data. In the main paper (Table 1 and Figure 3), we demonstrate the latency efficiency and smaller memory footprint of our backbone design, and its scalability to large data and large model. In the following, we continue to evaluate the capability of our model design by exploring the GPU memory consumption for supporting large models. We choose our SWIN3D-S as the base model and test its GPU memory consumption on ScanNet data, by using wider & deeper networks, large head number, and larger window sizes. For comparison, our model without using memory-efficient self-attention, *i.e.*, the vanilla version, is also tested.

Wider networks We create five models based on SWIN3D-S by enlarging the feature channels with five different ratios: $\frac{2}{3}$, 1, $\frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{5}{3}$, 2, respectively. The model with ratio $\frac{5}{3}$ corresponds to SWIN3D-L.

Deeper networks We create five models based on SWIN3D-S by changing the number of Swin block layers at Stage-3 to 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, respectively. Here, the default SWIN3D-S uses 9 layers.

Large head number We create five models based on SWIN3D-S by increasing the number of heads by four different factors: 1, 2, 4, 8.

Large window size We test different window sizes: 5^3 , 7^3 , 9^3 , 11^3 , 13^3 , 15^3 .

We report the GPU memory consumption of the above test in Fig. 4. We can see that as the channel number and the block number are linear with respect to memory storage, the increasing rate of memory consumption is almost




Figure 4. Additional evaluation of model scalability. **Top-left:** GPU memory consumption of wider networks. **Top-right:** GPU memory consumption of deeper networks. **Bottom-left:** GPU memory consumption with respect to head numbers. **Bottom-right:** GPU memory consumption with respect to window size. The GPU memory is measured on a forward-and-backward iteration, averaged on all ScanNet data.

constant; and the models with our memory-efficient self-attention save around 25% memory compared to the models with the vanilla-version self-attention. The quadratic memory saving by our memory-efficient self-attention is clearly demonstrated when increasing the head number or the window size, compared to the models with the vanilla-version self-attention. Overall, the reduction of GPU memory enabled by our memory-efficient self-attention makes our backbone architecture well suited to design large backbones.

Remark Although our backbone design supports models with more capacity (larger than SWIN3D-L), we found experimentally that more larger models overfit our pretraining dataset — Structured3D. In the future, we would like to utilize more 3D data (indoor and outdoor) to enable large 3D pretrained models.

A.3. Model training

Pretraining data preparation To acquire the point cloud of a room in the Structured3D dataset [60], we gather all RGBD and panoramic images belonging to the room with the help of the official room description file, and project RGB and semantic labels of all images into 3D points based on their intrinsic and extrinsic camera parameters. To reduce the huge number of points, we voxelize the space with stride 1 cm and keep only a single point in each voxel. The remaining points form the point cloud of the room.

Segmentation labels On the created point cloud data, we use its associated pointwise segmentation labels to create our segmentation task for pretraining. Four original segmentation labels (counter, box, toilet, bathtub) are removed from this task, due to their extremely low occurrence. Table 9 lists the segmentation labels used in the pretraining. We also list the segmentation labels that appear in the downstream tasks, including ScanNet segmentation and detection, S3DIS segmentation and detection. We can see that there are some label overlaps between our pretraining data and the datasets of the downstream tasks, and some labels used in the downstream tasks do not exist in our pretraining data.

Data crop and augmentation During the network training stage, feeding multiple entire indoor scenes in batches to the network can cause a large GPU memory consumption and trigger network failure, as some scenes could be very large. We adopt the data cropping strategy of [26] to randomly crop a portion from the input scene for training, the maximal number of sparse voxels of a portion is set to 120 000. We also adopt the data augmentation of [26] for network training. For 3D detection, the cropping center is the center of a labeled object that is randomly chosen.

A.4. Experiment results

In Table 10 and Table 11, we provide semantic segmentation performance reports on all categories of ScanNet and S3DIS. For 6-fold cross validation of S3DIS, we fine-tuned

Datasets	Task	#C	wall	floor	cabinet	bed	chair	sofa	table	door	window	bookshelf	bookcase	picture	counter	desk	shelves	curtain	dresser	pillow	mirror	ceiling	refrigerator	television	shower curtain	nightstand	toilet	sink	lamp	bathub	garbagebin	board	beam	column	clutter	othersstructure	otherfurniture	otherprop	
Structured3D	Seg.	25	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓											✓	✓	✓
ScanNet	Seg. Det.	20 18	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓					✓	✓		✓	✓			✓									✓
					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓								✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓							
S3DIS	Seg. Det.	13 5	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓									✓										✓	✓	✓	✓				
							✓	✓	✓				✓																			✓							

Table 9. Lists of semantic labels of our pretraining dataset (Structured3D), and the datasets of the downstream tasks. “#C” is the number of segmentation labels. “Seg.” and “Det.” means the task of semantic segmentation and 3D detection, respectively.

Method	Pre.	mIoU	wall	floor	cabinet	bed	chair	sofa	table	door	window	bookshelf	picture	counter	desk	curtain	refrigerator	shower curtain	toilet	sink	bathub	otherfurniture
Stratified Transformer [26]	✗	74.3	86.2	95.1	66.4	80.9	90.0	82.9	76.6	69.0	71.7	82.2	30.1	66.0	71.1	75.8	66.5	68.6	94.6	67.6	88.3	56.3
PointTransformerV2 [51]	✗	75.4	86.1	95.4	67.4	81.9	91.9	86.5	77.5	68.8	68.7	84.5	34.1	66.7	71.1	78.7	69.2	71.2	94.5	65.6	89.1	60.5
SWIN3D _n -S	✓	75.7	86.7	95.0	72.5	80.9	90.7	80.4	75.9	69.7	72.7	83.5	39.9	66.4	70.5	79.0	71.1	67.8	93.3	69.3	88.8	60.7
SWIN3D _n -L	✓	76.2	86.4	94.5	72.9	83.1	90.7	79.3	76.9	72.4	72.9	82.0	34.3	69.9	69.7	81.7	71.4	75.0	93.8	69.9	86.0	61.6

Table 10. ScanNet segmentation results on the validation set.

Method	Pre.	6-fold mIoU	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
SWIN3D-S	✓	78.2	82.2	64.2	83.7	75.9	73.0	86.3
SWIN3D-L	✓	79.8	82.1	66.3	85.9	76.7	73.4	87.2
SWIN3D-S*	✓	77.1	81.5	62.8	83.4	73.5	72.4	84.1
SWIN3D-L*	✓	78.5	81.3	63.3	85.8	74.7	73.0	85.9

Table 11. 6-fold S3DIS segmentation results. “An” means that the n -th Area is the test data and other 5 Areas are used for training. The reported number is mIoU. Symbol * denotes the unvoted version of our method.

our models for 600 epochs only. And in the test phase, we voted our predictions across 12 rotation augmentations. We also report the unvoted results. As for Area 5, we can achieve 74.5 mIoU (voted) by fine-tuning our model for 3000 epochs. In Tables 12 and 13, we provide detailed performance reports on ScanNet and S3DIS 3D detection. We also choose some representative methods for comparison. Some segmentation and 3D detection results are illustrated in Figs. 5 to 7. Note that some methods have not released their checkpoints (best performance), so they are not included in the visual comparison. As shown in Fig. 7, Our SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D generates more compact and accurate proposals of table, sofa, and board, which are consistent with the result shown in Table 13.

Method	Pre.	mAP@0.5	cabinet	bed	chair	sofa	table	door	window	bookshelf	picture	counter	desk	curtain	refrigerator	shower curtain	toilet	sink	bathub	otherfurniture
FCAF3D[37]	✗	57.3	35.8	81.5	89.8	85.0	62.0	44.1	30.7	58.4	17.9	31.3	53.4	44.2	46.8	64.2	91.6	52.6	84.5	57.1
CAGroup3D[42]	✗	61.3	41.4	82.8	90.8	85.6	64.9	54.3	37.3	64.1	31.4	41.1	63.6	44.4	57.0	49.3	98.2	55.4	82.4	58.8
SWIN3D-S+CAGroup3D	✓	62.7	45.7	82.7	91.0	79.5	67.4	57.5	42.7	59.8	36.8	40.4	62.6	48.2	60.7	59.8	99.7	55.1	77.6	60.7
SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D	✓	63.2	46.1	85.5	91.0	81.1	64.5	52.9	42.4	57.8	38.2	47.2	63.4	46.0	59.3	61.7	98.3	54.2	85.4	63.6

Table 12. ScanNet 3D detection results.




Figure 5. Visual comparison of ScanNet segmentation. Left: Ground truth (points color in black are not labeled in the original dataset), Middle: Segmented Transformer’s results. Right: SWIN3D_n-L’s results. Note that the PointTransformerV2 paper does not release its checkpoint, so no visual results provided in this figure.

Method	Pre.	mAP@0.5	table	chair	sofa	bookcase	board
GSDN [17]	✗	25.1	36.6	75.3	6.1	6.5	1.2
FCAF3D[37]	✗	45.9	45.4	88.3	70.1	19.5	5.6
SWIN3D-S	✓	50.2	52.8	90.4	78.8	20.9	7.9
SWIN3D-L	✓	54.0	56.2	90.3	95.1	19.6	8.9

Table 13. S3DIS 3D detection results.



Figure 6. Visual comparison of ScanNet 3D detection. Left: Ground truth. Middle: FCAF3D’s result. Right: SWIN3D-L+CAGroup3D’s results. Note that the original CAGroup3D paper does not release its checkpoint, so no visual results provided in this figure.



Figure 7. Visual Comparison on S3DIS 3D detection. Left: Ground-truth. Middle: FCAF3D's result. Right: SWIN3D-L+FCAF3D's results.