

4D Human-Scene Reconstruction from Low-Overlap Captures

MINHYUK HWANG*, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

SANGMIN KIM*, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

SEUNGUK DO, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

DANEUL KIM, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

JAESIK PARK†, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea



Fig. 1. Given only as few as four sparse, low-overlap input videos (left), StudioRecon first reconstructs decoupled Gaussians for background and humans (right). The reconstructed Gaussians enable rendering from novel viewpoints, and our recursive enhancement module further refines the rendered output (bottom).

*Both authors contributed equally.

† Corresponding author.

Authors' Contact Information: Minhyuk Hwang, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, mhhlego@snu.ac.kr; Sangmin Kim, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, sm.kim@snu.ac.kr; Seunguk Do, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, seunguk.do@snu.ac.kr; Daneul Kim, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, carpedkm@snu.ac.kr; Jaesik Park, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, jaesik.park@snu.ac.kr.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

SIGGRAPH Conference Papers '26, Los Angeles, CA, USA

© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2554-8/26/07

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3799902.3811165>

Existing volumetric capture of dynamic human performance achieves high fidelity with dense camera arrays. However, in real-world scenarios, only a handful of low-overlap cameras are available, which degrades the output quality and leaves large areas unobserved. Recent 4D reconstruction methods have focused on low-overlap settings, yet they still produce noticeable artifacts in under-observed regions. Video diffusion models have emerged as another option, but they show geometrically inconsistent results for humans. To address these limitations, we propose StudioRecon, a pipeline that reconstructs 4D human scenes from sparse, low-overlap cameras by decoupling background and humans. We densify background supervision by synthesizing hundreds of camera-controlled novel views with a video diffusion model. We also robustly initialize deformable Gaussian humans with cross-view identity association and triangulated multi-view keypoint fitting. Finally, our recursive enhancement module with motion-adaptive consistency injection harmonizes the composed output, thereby further avoiding remaining artifacts. We achieve state-of-the-art

novel view synthesis across four real-world datasets and demonstrate applications such as novel trajectory rendering and human replacement. Project page: <https://sisyphm.github.io/studiocon-page/>.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Reconstruction**; *Rendering*.

ACM Reference Format:

Minhyuk Hwang, Sangmin Kim, Seunguk Do, Daneul Kim, and Jaesik Park. 2026. 4D Human-Scene Reconstruction from Low-Overlap Captures. In *Special Interest Group on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Conference Conference Papers (SIGGRAPH Conference Papers '26)*, July 19–23, 2026, Los Angeles, CA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3799902.3811165>

1 Introduction

High-fidelity 4D human capture has become essential for entertainment, sports broadcasting, and virtual production. Professional volumetric systems achieve compelling results but require dozens to hundreds of cameras in controlled environments. However, in environments such as gymnasiums and homes, only a handful of uncalibrated, low-overlap cameras are available, and these environments often involve multiple interacting people with frequent occlusions. We refer to these settings as *in-the-wild studio capture*.

Recent advances in 4D Gaussian Splatting have enabled high-quality dynamic scene reconstruction, but predominantly assume dense camera coverage with substantial view overlap [Li et al. 2024a; Wang et al. 2025c; Wu et al. 2024]. Some sparse-view methods [Kong et al. 2025; Li et al. 2024b; Liu et al. 2024a; Park et al. 2025] demonstrate the capability to operate with reduced camera requirements, but still rely on largely shared visibility between neighboring cameras for correspondence matching. Other works, such as MonoFusion [Wang et al. 2025a], target more challenging low-overlap scenarios (*i.e.*, cameras positioned 90 degrees apart around the scene), yet they still exhibit noticeable artifacts in under-observed regions, as errors in humans and backgrounds become entangled in the shared representation. Camera-controlled video diffusion models [Bai et al. 2025; Jin et al. 2025; Ren et al. 2025; Wu et al. 2025a] have emerged as an alternative by directly synthesizing novel views. However, in low-overlap, multi-person settings, they produce geometric inconsistencies for moving people (Appendix G).

To address these challenges, we present StudioRecon, a pipeline that achieves high-fidelity 4D human-scene reconstruction for in-the-wild studio capture. Our key insight is that backgrounds and humans benefit from different priors. For background, we must synthesize plausible content beyond the captured views while remaining consistent with the observed evidence, as photometric losses cannot supervise never-observed regions. Video diffusion models excel at synthesizing plausible static scenes from novel viewpoints by leveraging semantic priors learned from large-scale data. For humans, however, these models struggle to maintain consistent motion across views, as human motion is inherently complex. In contrast, parametric body models like SMPL [Loper et al. 2023] provide strong geometric priors that constrain human shape and articulation, enabling robust reconstruction even from sparse observations.

This motivates a decoupled reconstruction, avoiding the entanglement causing artifacts in joint methods [Wang et al. 2025d,a].

For background reconstruction, we leverage a prior from a camera-controlled video diffusion model [Ren et al. 2025], synthesizing hundreds of novel views from sparse inputs. This provides dense supervision for background Gaussians, preventing quality degradation caused by insufficient view coverage. For human reconstruction, we leverage the body model prior, such as SMPL [Loper et al. 2023]. Our geometry-driven multi-view SMPL estimation associates identities across views via combined spatial and pose affinity, and triangulates multi-view keypoints to recover accurate body parameters even when individual views are occluded.

Compositing separately rendered backgrounds and humans can yield unnatural results with artifacts in under-observed regions, since separate optimization can result in discordant backgrounds and humans. Therefore, we utilize a single-step diffusion model [Wu et al. 2025b] to remove static Gaussian artifacts, effectively removing them in under-observed regions and improving concordance between backgrounds and humans. However, directly using a single-step diffusion model can lead to temporal flickering, as this is optimized for per-image refinement. To address this issue, we build on this single-step diffusion model and propose motion-adaptive consistency injection, which blends each frame with previous outputs warped via optical flow to achieve temporally coherent enhancement. Experiments on EgoHumans [Khironkar et al. 2023], Harmony4D [Khironkar et al. 2024], Mobile Stage [Xu et al. 2024a], and SelfCap [Xu et al. 2024b] demonstrate state-of-the-art novel view synthesis quality. Our pipeline also enables applications such as novel camera trajectory rendering and human replacement. To the best of our knowledge, StudioRecon is the first pipeline to deliver both high-fidelity human-scene reconstruction and consistent rendering enhancement for in-the-wild studio capture.

In summary, our contributions are fourfold:

- **Decoupled reconstruction with complementary priors.** Under low-overlap constraints, we observe that backgrounds and humans benefit from different priors. We propose a decoupled approach that uses diffusion models to synthesize dense supervision for backgrounds, while parametric body models constrain human geometry.
- **Geometry-driven multi-view human estimation.** We establish cross-view human correspondences via combined spatial and pose affinity, and triangulate 2D keypoints to obtain 3D body pose, enabling robust human initialization.
- **Motion-adaptive diffusion enhancement.** We apply single-step diffusion with motion-adaptive consistency injection to harmonize separately rendered humans and backgrounds into temporally coherent outputs.
- **State-of-the-art results.** We substantially outperform existing methods across four real-world datasets (EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap) with diverse camera configurations. We also show applications such as novel camera trajectory rendering and human replacement.

2 Related Work

2.1 4D Scene Reconstruction

4D scene reconstruction aims to model the spatio-temporal movements in the scene. Traditional methods rely on dense multi-view




Fig. 2. Overview of the proposed StudioRecon. Our pipeline consists of four stages: (1) sparse-to-dense view synthesis using camera-controlled video diffusion, (2) multi-view human pose estimation, (3) decoupled Gaussian reconstruction for background and humans, and (4) a recursive enhancement module.

setups or RGB-D sensors, as in free-viewpoint video systems [Caranza et al. 2003] and Fusion4D [Dou et al. 2016]. With advances in neural rendering such as NeRF [Mildenhall et al. 2021], several works extended them to 4D by modeling space-time dynamics via planar factorization [Fridovich-Keil et al. 2023], multi-view feature aggregation [Li et al. 2023], and 4D neural voxels [Wu and Chen 2025]. More recently, 3D Gaussian Splatting (3DGS) [Kerbl et al. 2023] has emerged as a faster alternative, where subsequent works extended it to dynamic settings by deforming 3D Gaussians with a deformation field [Huang et al. 2024; Luiten et al. 2024; Wu et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2024a] or by representing the scene with 4D Gaussians defined in the spatio-temporal dimension [Duan et al. 2024; Li et al. 2024a; Wang et al. 2025c; Yang et al. 2024c]. Despite these advances, most methods assume sufficient view coverage, limiting practical deployment in real-world scenarios. MonoFusion [Wang et al. 2025a] addresses sparse-view inputs, yet artifacts remain in under-observed regions, motivating our decoupled approach with complementary priors for backgrounds and humans.

2.2 Human-Scene Reconstruction

Human-scene reconstruction recovers both humans and static scenes from video, enabling applications such as pose editing and novel view synthesis. Early studies explored disentangled representations, jointly optimizing humans and scenes from monocular video [Kocabas et al. 2024; Xue et al. 2024]. Subsequent work proposed online methods for simultaneous camera tracking, pose estimation, and reconstruction [Zhang et al. 2025], extended to multi-view and unconstrained inputs [Huang et al. 2025; Kim et al. 2025; Moon et al. 2024]. Zhan et al. [Zhan et al. 2025] model humans holding objects via compositional representations, though they require about 24 views. Diffusion-based approaches [Jin et al. 2025; Shao et al. 2024] generate multi-view consistent humans but focus on individual humans without background scenes.

2.3 Diffusion-Based Video Enhancement

Diffusion models provide strong priors for video enhancement, but temporal coherence remains challenging due to stochastic denoising, which causes flicker and texture drift. Prior work improves consistency by warping diffusion noise across time [Chang et al. 2024; Daras et al. 2024]. Task-specific methods incorporate temporal modules [Yang et al. 2024b; Zhou et al. 2024], while training-free approaches adapt image diffusion models via latent warping [Yeh et al. 2024]. Diffusion priors have also been used to enhance neural rendering outputs. 3DGS-Enhancer [Liu et al. 2024b] applies diffusion to enhance 3DGS, and Difx3D+ [Wu et al. 2025b] explores single-step diffusion for artifact removal.

However, two gaps remain: (i) in-the-wild studio capture suffers from missing view coverage before refinement, and (ii) free-viewpoint rendering requires efficient, temporally-stable enhancement where multi-step diffusion is costly and per-frame enhancement causes flicker. We address these by synthesizing dense novel views via video diffusion for background supervision, and applying single-step diffusion with motion-adaptive consistency injection for artifact-free rendering.

3 Method

We study the problem of reconstructing dynamic scenes with multiple humans from N synchronized cameras over T timesteps. What we aim to solve is *in-the-wild studio capture*, characterized by sparse camera layouts with low-overlap scenarios (*i.e.*, neighboring cameras observe largely disjoint regions), multiple interacting subjects, and occlusions. Such conditions commonly arise in sports venues, healthcare facilities, and home environments. Additionally, we do not assume pre-calibrated cameras; instead, camera parameters are estimated using a feed-forward reconstruction model (Section 3.1).

Given input videos $\{I_n^t\}_{n=1, t=1}^{N, T}$ where $I_n^t \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$, our goal is two-fold: (1) obtain disentangled 3DGS-based representations of static background and dynamic humans, and (2) produce consistent

video renderings from arbitrary camera trajectories. This setting introduces two key challenges: sparse viewpoint coverage leaves large portions of the scene unobserved, and reconstructing dynamic humans is ill-posed under limited observations with self-occlusions. Our insight is that these challenges are best addressed with distinct priors. Video diffusion models can synthesize dense viewpoints for backgrounds, while parametric body models (e.g., SMPL) impose geometric constraints on humans. This motivates a *decoupled reconstruction* strategy.

As illustrated in Figure 2, our pipeline consists of four stages: (1) sparse-to-dense view synthesis to compensate for insufficient viewpoint coverage from sparse cameras; (2) multi-view human pose estimation to establish geometric priors that constrain the ill-posed human reconstruction; (3) decoupled Gaussian reconstruction, optimizing backgrounds on synthesized views and humans on original videos, where each supervision source is most reliable; and (4) recursive enhancement module to harmonize separately optimized components and resolve remaining artifacts.

3.1 Sparse-to-Dense View Synthesis

Compared to the conventional reconstruction setting, sparse cameras provide insufficient viewpoint coverage for 3DGS. We synthesize dense novel views to augment the limited observations.

Preprocessing. Since cameras are static, we apply a feed-forward 3D reconstruction model [Wang et al. 2026] to the first frame ($t = 1$) from all N cameras to obtain dense point clouds, depth maps, and camera poses that are reused for all timesteps. For subsequent timesteps, we estimate depth using a monocular model [Wang et al. 2025b] aligned to the first-frame depth for scale consistency. To initialize background Gaussians without human contamination, we segment humans using a segmentation model [Carion et al. 2026] to obtain masks $\{M_n^1\}_{n=1}^N$, and extract the background point cloud by retaining only unmasked pixels with depth confidence above a threshold.

Camera Trajectory Generation. We interpolate between the N input viewpoints using spherical linear interpolation (SLERP) [Jang et al. 2024] for rotation and linear interpolation for translation, yielding L novel camera poses (Appendix A).

Novel View Synthesis. We use a video diffusion model [Ren et al. 2025] to synthesize novel views along the interpolated camera trajectory, taking N first-frame images, depth maps, and target poses as input. We also obtain human masks for each synthesized view, which are used to exclude human regions from these images during background Gaussian optimization (Section 3.3).

3.2 Multi-View Human Pose Estimation

Accurate human reconstruction requires estimating body pose in a unified world coordinate system, which requires establishing correspondence between detections of the same person across views. In in-the-wild studio capture, conventional appearance-based matching becomes unreliable as appearance varies significantly across viewpoints. We address this by detecting and tracking humans independently in each view, associating identities across views using




Fig. 3. Overview of our recursive enhancement module (Sec. 3.4).

geometric cues, and triangulating multi-view observations to estimate 3D body parameters.

3.2.1 Per-View Human Detection. For each view n , we apply a monocular pose estimator [Newell et al. 2025] that provides SMPL pose θ and shape β estimates, 2D keypoints, and within-view identity tracking across all timesteps. The monocular SMPL estimates are used to guide cross-view identity association, but not for final reconstruction, as direct 3D regression suffers from depth ambiguity.

3.2.2 Cross-View Identity Association. A central challenge of multi-view multi-human pose estimation is cross-view identity association. Unlike dense setups where visual overlap enables appearance matching, our cameras observe largely disjoint regions. We leverage calibrated camera geometry to lift detections to 3D and match based on spatial proximity and pose similarity.

For each detected person, we estimate their 3D world position $\mathbf{p}$ by unprojecting the 2D pelvis location (u, v) using the depth and camera parameters from Section 3.1.

We define the affinity between two detections a and b from different views as a weighted combination of spatial and pose similarities:

$$A(a, b) = w_p \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{p}^a - \mathbf{p}^b\|}{\sigma_p}\right) + w_\theta \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\|\theta^a - \theta^b\|}{\sigma_\theta}\right) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{p}$ denotes the 3D world position, θ the SMPL pose parameters, σ the scale parameters, and we set $w_p = 0.9$, $w_\theta = 0.1$. This combination provides robustness when depth is noisy or when people perform similar actions.

Starting from the reference timestep t_0 , we apply the Hungarian algorithm to assign cross-view correspondences based on the affinity measure, while applying a distance threshold to reject background false positives. This produces a mapping from global person identities to view-specific detection indices. For temporal consistency, we primarily rely on the within-view tracking provided by

the monocular estimator. When a person reappears after occlusion with a new track ID, we reassign the global identity using the affinity measure.

3.2.3 3D Pose Triangulation. Given cross-view correspondences, we triangulate the 2D keypoints across all views to obtain 3D joint and vertex positions for SMPL fitting. We use robust optimization with Huber loss to handle occlusions and detection noise. For each point k , we solve for the 3D world position that minimizes reprojection error across all N views:

$$\mathbf{P}_k^w = \arg \min_{\mathbf{X}} \sum_{n=1}^N \rho(\|\mathbf{x}_{n,k} - \pi_n(\mathbf{X})\|) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{P}_k^w$ denotes the triangulated 3D position, $\mathbf{x}_{n,k}$ is the corresponding 2D keypoint (joint or vertex) in view n , π_n is the projection function, and ρ is the Huber loss for robustness to outliers.

The triangulated 3D points are in the scene coordinate system. We compute a scale factor by matching SMPL skeleton template bone lengths against the triangulated bone lengths:

$$s^* = \arg \min_s \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{B}} \rho(\|\mathbf{J}_i^w - \mathbf{J}_j^w\| - s \cdot \|\mathbf{J}_i^s - \mathbf{J}_j^s\|) \quad (3)$$

where (i, j) are adjacent joint indices forming a bone, $\mathcal{B}$ is the set of reliable bone pairs, $\mathbf{J}^w$ are the triangulated world-space joints, and $\mathbf{J}^s$ are template SMPL joint positions. We compute a global scale per person by aggregating across frames.

3.2.4 SMPL Parameter Fitting. We fit SMPL parameters to the triangulated 3D keypoints (Section 3.2.3) using 3D-to-3D optimization [Javerliat et al. 2025], which avoids depth ambiguities inherent in 2D projection fitting. We optimize pose θ and shape β to minimize:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{fit} = & \sum_j \|s^* \mathbf{J}_j^s(\theta, \beta) - \mathbf{J}_j^w\|^2 \\ & + \sum_i \|s^* \mathbf{V}_i^s(\theta, \beta) - \mathbf{V}_i^w\|^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{J}^s(\theta, \beta)$ and $\mathbf{V}^s(\theta, \beta)$ are the joints and vertices produced by the SMPL body model, and $\mathbf{J}^w$ and $\mathbf{V}^w$ are the triangulated observations. The joint term aligns the skeleton pose, while the vertex term provides surface-level supervision, enabling body shape estimation. Finally, we apply exponential smoothing to the fitted pose parameters for temporal consistency.

3.3 Decoupled Gaussian Reconstruction

Having obtained camera parameters, dense novel views, and SMPL parameters, we reconstruct the scene as the composition of a static background and dynamic human Gaussians. Backgrounds and humans benefit from different optimization strategies: backgrounds require dense viewpoint coverage but only a single timestep, while humans require temporal supervision but can be constrained by SMPL priors despite partial observation. We decouple and reconstruct backgrounds and humans separately.

3.3.1 Background Reconstruction. Using the point cloud, L synthesized novel views, and corresponding human masks obtained in Section 3.1, we initialize and optimize background Gaussians at




Fig. 4. Schematic of motion-adaptive consistency injection. For each frame, RAFT computes backward flow to warp previous enhanced outputs, which are blended with the current input via per-pixel confidence-weighted EMA before single-step diffusion.

timestep $t = 1$. Since synthesized views contain humans, we mask these regions during optimization:

$$\mathcal{L}_{bg} = (1 - M) \odot (\mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_s \mathcal{L}_{SSIM} + \lambda_l \mathcal{L}_{LPIPS}) + \lambda_d \mathcal{L}_{den} \quad (5)$$

where M is the dilated human mask and $\mathcal{L}_{den}$ regularizes opacity to prevent floaters. We apply higher loss weights to views near original camera positions using cosine falloff based on angular distance, as these provide ground-truth supervision.

Iterative Refinement. The synthesized views may undersample certain regions, particularly floors and ceilings at oblique angles. At the midpoint of optimization, we create additional supervision by rendering the current Gaussians from novel viewpoints with height variation, adding sinusoidal vertical displacement, and compensating pitch rotation. Human masks are rendered from SMPL meshes. We refine these rendered images using the recursive enhancement module (Section 3.4), which applies single-step diffusion to correct artifacts. These refined images serve as additional supervision, improving quality in undersampled regions (Figure 9). We provide runtime analysis in Appendix F. After background optimization, the Gaussians are frozen for human reconstruction.

3.3.2 Human Reconstruction. Initialized with SMPL parameters from Section 3.2, we optimize human Gaussians on the original N input videos across all T timesteps, jointly refining pose and learning dynamic appearance from temporal variation.

Canonical Human Representation. Following recent work [Hu et al. 2024; Kocabas et al. 2024], each person is represented by Gaussians in a canonical pose, initialized on the SMPL mesh surface [Loper et al. 2023]. The canonical Gaussians capture person-specific appearance, while pose-dependent deformation is handled by skeletal skinning.

Skeletal Deformation. To render a person at timestep t , we deform the canonical Gaussians to the target pose using Linear Blend Skinning (LBS) [Loper et al. 2023]. For each Gaussian center μ_c in canonical space, the deformed position is computed as:

$$\mu_t = \sum_{b=1}^B w_b(\mu_c) \cdot \mathbf{G}_b^t \cdot \mu_c \quad (6)$$



Fig. 5. Qualitative comparison on 360° scenes (*Legoassemble*, *Grappling*, *Sword*, *Karate*). Our method produces sharper backgrounds and more robust human reconstructions than baselines.

where $w_b(\mu_c)$ are skinning weights queried from a precomputed voxel grid derived from the SMPL model, and $G_b^t \in SE(3)$ are the bone transformation matrices for timestep t . To capture fine-grained appearance changes, we employ a temporal MLP that predicts per-Gaussian color and opacity residuals. We jointly optimize Gaussian attributes and SMPL pose parameters using $\mathcal{L}_{hm}$, which combines photometric losses (L1, SSIM, LPIPS), silhouette supervision, density regularization to prevent spurious Gaussians, and temporal smoothness constraints on SMPL parameters. Details of the objective are provided in Appendix D.

3.4 Recursive Enhancement Module

Despite achieving superior reconstruction quality compared to existing methods [Li et al. 2024a; Luiten et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2025a], rendered outputs from the reconstructed Gaussians may still exhibit minor artifacts such as floaters, blurring in under-observed regions, and human artifacts from pose inaccuracies. Since humans and backgrounds are optimized separately, texture and lighting may also vary slightly when composited.

We address these using a single-step diffusion model designed for Gaussian refinement [Wu et al. 2025b], which takes two inputs: the rendered image and a reference image providing appearance guidance. For each frame, we use the rendered composite as input and a nearby raw frame as reference (Figure 3).

Motion-Adaptive Consistency Injection. Applying the model independently to each frame causes flickering. Inspired by shared noise priors for video generation [Wang et al. 2024], we observe that since the single-step model treats the input as the noise-corrupted sample at timestep $t = 200$, injecting information from previous

frames is equivalent to injecting a shared noise prior. As validated in our ablation study, we blend each rendered input with warped previous outputs using an exponential moving average (EMA) with motion-adaptive weighting:

$$\tilde{I}_t = (1 - w_{total}) \cdot \hat{I}_t + w_{total} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \tilde{w}_i \cdot c_i \cdot \text{warp}(O_{t-1-i}, F_{t \rightarrow t-1-i}) \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{I}_t$ is the blended input fed to the diffusion model, $\hat{I}_t$ is the rendered composite, and w_{total} is the overall injection strength. O_{t-1-i} denotes the refined output from $i + 1$ frames ago, with $\tilde{w}_i$ being normalized EMA weights that apply exponential decay over K previous frames. $F_{t \rightarrow t-1-i}$ is the backward optical flow computed using RAFT [Teed and Deng 2020], and $c_i = \max(0, 1 - e_i/\tau_e)$ is per-pixel confidence based on warp error e_i for each previous frame. The exponential decay prioritizes recent frames, which have better flow accuracy, while incorporating multiple frames provides robustness. Static regions where the warp aligns well receive full injection ($c_i \approx 1$), while moving regions where the warp fails receive minimal injection ($c_i \approx 0$) to prevent ghosting. Figure 4 illustrates the overall mechanism, and Figure 11 visualizes intermediate results on an example frame.

4 Experiment

4.1 Setup

We evaluate on two camera configurations: 360° coverage using EgoHumans [Khironkar et al. 2023] and Harmony4D [Khironkar et al. 2024], and 180° coverage using Mobile Stage [Xu et al. 2024a] and SelfCap [Xu et al. 2024b] where cameras cover only the frontal hemisphere. For all datasets, we select 4 training cameras spaced

Table 1. Quantitative comparison on 360° scenes. **red** : best, **yellow** : second best.

	EgoHumans									Harmony4D								
	Legoassemble			Tennis			Fencing			Sword			Karate			Grappling		
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
Dyn-3DGS [Luiten et al. 2024]	15.32	0.329	0.594	17.03	0.477	0.670	18.00	0.651	0.586	16.75	0.422	0.514	16.69	0.465	0.510	16.15	0.430	0.508
MonoFusion [Wang et al. 2025a]	16.12	0.406	0.624	17.08	0.526	0.733	20.09	0.598	0.472	17.01	0.405	0.506	15.44	0.400	0.598	16.48	0.410	0.514
STG [Li et al. 2024a]	15.88	0.416	0.551	17.80	0.511	0.505	18.84	0.692	0.517	16.44	0.514	0.503	16.94	0.579	0.485	16.55	0.516	0.399
Ours	18.58	0.569	0.251	19.27	0.578	0.339	22.75	0.748	0.164	20.14	0.648	0.206	19.90	0.688	0.160	19.50	0.646	0.204

Table 2. Quantitative comparison on 180° scenes. **red** : best, **yellow** : second best.

	Mobile Stage			SelfCap		
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
Dyn-3DGS [Luiten et al. 2024]	16.63	0.289	0.601	16.89	0.461	0.521
MonoFusion [Wang et al. 2025a]	16.73	0.298	0.516	17.49	0.436	0.452
STG [Li et al. 2024a]	16.52	0.336	0.563	18.72	0.609	0.289
Ours	21.74	0.575	0.145	21.63	0.740	0.115

approximately 90° apart and evaluate on 4 other cameras at intermediate angles (approximately 45°). Each sequence contains 121 frames with 1-3 people performing dynamic activities. We compare against Dyn-3DGS [Luiten et al. 2024], MonoFusion [Wang et al. 2025a], and STG [Li et al. 2024a], all trained on the 4 sparse input views. Since COLMAP [Schonberger and Frahm 2016] fails under sparse settings, we replace it with a feed-forward model [Wang et al. 2026] for baseline initialization. We report PSNR, SSIM [Nilsson and Akenine-Möller 2020], and LPIPS [Zhang et al. 2018] on held-out cameras. Implementation details are provided in Appendices A–E. Appendix H provides robustness analysis on multi-view pose refinement, temporal smoothing, and mask dilation.

4.2 Comparison

Tables 1 and 2 compare our method against baselines on 360° and 180° camera configurations, respectively. Our method consistently outperforms all baselines across all metrics, with particularly large LPIPS improvements indicating better perceptual quality. The largest improvements occur when cameras are placed relatively far apart, leaving portions of the scene poorly captured. Baselines suffer from insufficient viewpoint coverage, while our dense view synthesis addresses this limitation.

Qualitative comparisons are shown in Figure 5 (additional scenes in Figure 6). Baseline methods exhibit noticeable artifacts in background regions due to insufficient viewpoint coverage and unstable human geometry from limited multi-view constraints. In contrast, our method produces clean backgrounds and robust human reconstructions by leveraging dense synthesized views for scene modeling and explicit SMPL-guided human representation. See our project page for video results.

4.3 Ablation Study

Cross-View Association. Table 3 validates our hybrid cross-view identity association strategy. We evaluate across 8 scenes by comparing predicted associations against manual ground-truth annotations.

Table 3. Ablation on cross-view actor association strategy averaged across all 8 scenes (Tables 1, 2).

	Accuracy↑	Precision↑
Only spatial	93.3%	100%
Only pose	81.4%	99.7%
Ours	97.8%	100%

Table 4. Ablation on pipeline components averaged across all 8 scenes (Tables 1, 2).

	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
4-view baseline	18.13	0.567	0.429
+ ViewSynth	20.54	0.661	0.273
+ Enhance (ours)	20.44	0.649	0.198

Table 5. Ablation on motion-adaptive consistency injection averaged across all 8 scenes (Tables 1, 2). Warp-L2 measures the L2 error between consecutive frames after optical flow warping.

	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	Warp-L2↓
w/o Injection	20.44	0.654	0.194	0.119
w/ Injection	20.44	0.649	0.198	0.092

Using only spatial proximity fails when depth is unreliable (93.3%), while only pose similarity fails when humans perform similar actions (81.4%). Our hybrid approach combines both cues, achieving 97.8% accuracy with zero false positives.

Pipeline Components. Table 4 ablates our two key contributions: dense view synthesis via video diffusion and single-step diffusion enhancement. Dense view synthesis provides the largest gain (+2.4 PSNR, 36% LPIPS reduction), demonstrating that video diffusion effectively addresses sparse-view challenges. The enhancement further improves perceptual quality (27% LPIPS reduction), while the minor PSNR/SSIM drop reflects generative details that are not pixel-aligned with the ground truth. As shown in Figure 7, raw Gaussian outputs suffer from blur and instabilities in under-observed regions, and decoupled reconstruction can cause humans and backgrounds to appear disjointed. The enhancement resolves both issues, producing clean, harmonized outputs.

Motion-Adaptive Consistency Injection. When diffusion enhancement is applied independently per frame, ambiguous regions are

Table 6. Seen vs. unseen fidelity on 6 360° scenes (Table 1).

	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	Temporal L1↓
Seen	20.88	0.677	0.059
Unseen	18.55	0.556	0.178

Table 7. Sensitivity to input perturbation on 6 360° scenes (Table 1).

Config	PSNR↑	SSIM↑
Full pipeline	20.11	0.654
+ Mask erosion 5 / 10 px	20.04 / 20.03	0.653 / 0.653
+ SMPL noise $\sigma=3^\circ / 5^\circ$	20.02 / 19.97	0.652 / 0.651
+ 2D Keypoint noise $\sigma=3 / 5$ px	19.99 / 19.91	0.651 / 0.649

resolved differently across frames, causing flickering. Our motion-adaptive consistency injection blends warped previous outputs into the current input, encouraging consistent ambiguity resolution across time. Table 5 evaluates this design.

Motion-adaptive consistency injection reduces warp error by 23%, improving frame-to-frame consistency. The gains in temporal coherence and per-frame sharpness come at the cost of a slight LPIPS increase, but this trade-off favors viewing experience as human perception is sensitive to flickering. Figure 10 shows that injection eliminates inconsistencies in static regions.

Seen/Unseen Fidelity. To verify that generative priors preserve observed content, we classify each evaluation pixel as “seen” or “unseen.” For each evaluation pixel, we unproject it to 3D using estimated depth and project it into each training camera. If the projected depth matches the training camera’s depth map within 5% (i.e., the surface is visible and not occluded from that training view), the pixel is marked as seen (Table 6). The 2.3 dB PSNR gap shows that seen regions maintain higher fidelity to ground truth than unseen ones. Temporal consistency (measured by optical-flow-warped L1 between consecutive frames) is also notably better for seen regions (0.059 vs. 0.178), as unseen regions lack direct observation and must be recovered by the generative prior. Our sparse-to-dense view synthesis (Sec. 3.1) conditions on input images and depths in 3D, making it reliable for seen regions while inpainting only unseen areas. The recursive enhancement module (Sec. 3.4) is conditioned on reference images from training views, preserving ground-truth appearance for seen regions. This confirms that our generative priors improve perceptual quality without compromising geometric fidelity in observed regions.

Sensitivity to Input Noise. Our pipeline relies on pre-trained models for segmentation, SMPL estimation, and keypoint detection. To test robustness to their errors, we inject realistic perturbations into each module output and re-train the full pipeline (Table 7). We erode segmentation masks by 5 and 10 px to simulate boundary imprecision. Since our pipeline applies 21 px mask dilation, the erosion is fully compensated (0.07–0.08 dB drop). We add Gaussian noise to SMPL joint angles ($\sigma=3^\circ, 5^\circ$) to simulate pose estimation errors from occlusion. The pipeline’s joint optimization partially recovers from

the noisy initialization, limiting degradation to 0.09–0.14 dB PSNR. We add pixel noise to 2D keypoints ($\sigma=3, 5$ px at 1280×704) before multi-view triangulation to simulate detection inaccuracy. Multi-view triangulation averages out per-view noise, limiting degradation to 0.12–0.20 dB.

4.4 Applications

Novel Camera Trajectories. The Gaussian representation supports rendering from arbitrary camera trajectories. Figure 12 demonstrates two examples: *dolly zoom* (translating toward the subject while widening FOV) and *oscillating trajectory* (lateral periodic motion creating parallax), achieved by defining the desired camera path.

Human Replacement. Our decoupled pipeline with human parameters also enables actor replacement. Given a reference image, we generate a new human Gaussian using a feed-forward model [Qiu et al. 2025] and composite it into the existing background, transferring the original SMPL pose to the new identity. For rendering enhancement, we create a single reference image by editing the original frame to insert the new human. Since humans and backgrounds are reconstructed independently, this requires no modification to the scene (Figure 12). See our project page for video results.

4.5 Limitations

Our method has three limitations. (See Appendix I for visual examples.) First, fine details such as faces and hands remain challenging because high-frequency variations are difficult to capture from sparse views. Second, our SMPL-based pipeline does not handle dynamic objects such as basketballs or props, leading to their disappearance in rendered outputs. Third, shadows baked into the static background at $t=0$ do not follow human motion at later timesteps. Incorporating hand-held object models and dynamic shadow synthesis are promising future directions.

5 Conclusion

We present StudioRecon, a pipeline for high-fidelity 4D human-scene reconstruction for in-the-wild studio capture. Our key insight is that backgrounds and humans benefit from different priors. Diffusion models synthesize dense supervision for backgrounds, while parametric body models constrain human geometry from limited views. This decoupled approach enables high-quality reconstruction and applications such as novel camera trajectories and actor replacement. Combined with temporally coherent diffusion enhancement, our method achieves state-of-the-art results across diverse real-world datasets, bringing high-fidelity 4D human-scene capture from sparse, low-overlap cameras closer to practical deployment.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by IITP grants funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (RS-2021-II211343: AI Graduate School Program - Seoul National University (5%), RS-2025-25442338: AI star Fellowship Support Program (45%), and RS-2025-02303703: Real-world multi-space fusion and 6DoF free-viewpoint immersive visualization for extended reality (50%))



Fig. 6. Additional qualitative comparison (*Tennis*, *Fencing*, *Dance*, *Yoga*) from EgoHumans, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap. Our method produces sharper reconstructions with better human-scene separation. *Dance* © Xu et al. (Mobile Stage); *Yoga* © Xu et al. (SelfCap), used with permission.



Fig. 7. Ablation on recursive enhancement (Sec. 3.4). Raw renders (left) contain blur and geometric instabilities. Enhancement (right) produces clean, harmonized outputs.




Fig. 8. Qualitative results on EgoExo-4D [Grauman et al. 2024]. Our method applies to diverse activities and environments.




Fig. 9. Effect of iterative refinement on background reconstruction (Sec. 3.3). Before refinement (left), undersampled regions appear blurry. After refinement (right), clarity improves.




Fig. 10. Ablation on motion-adaptive consistency injection (Sec. 3.4). Without injection (top), enhanced frames exhibit flickering. With injection (bottom), consistency improves.




Fig. 11. Visualization of motion-adaptive consistency injection (Sec. 3.4). From left to right, top to bottom: rendered input, backward optical flow, per-pixel confidence map, and enhanced output.




Fig. 12. Applications. Top: human replacement with a different identity (right) while keeping the background (left). Bottom: novel trajectory rendering with oscillating motion (left) and dolly zoom (right).

References

- Jianhong Bai, Menghan Xia, Xiao Fu, Xintao Wang, Lianrui Mu, Jinwen Cao, Zuozhu Liu, Haoji Hu, Xiang Bai, Pengfei Wan, et al. 2025. ReCamMaster: Camera-controlled generative rendering from a single video. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision* (2025).
- Nicolas Carion, Laura Gustafson, Yuan-Ting Hu, Shoubhik Debnath, Ronghang Hu, Didac Suris, Chaitanya Ryal, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Haitham Khedr, Andrew Huang, et al. 2026. SAM 3: Segment anything with concepts. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2026).
- Joel Carranza, Christian Theobalt, Marcus A Magnor, and Hans-Peter Seidel. 2003. Free-viewpoint video of human actors. *ACM transactions on graphics (TOG)* 22, 3 (2003), 569–577.
- Pascal Chang, Jingwei Tang, Markus Gross, and Vinicius C Azevedo. 2024. How I Warped Your Noise: a Temporally-Correlated Noise Prior for Diffusion Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Giannis Daras, WeiLi Nie, Karsten Kreis, Alex Dimakis, Morteza Mardani, Nikola Kovachki, and Arash Vahdat. 2024. Warped diffusion: Solving video inverse problems with image diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 101116–101143.
- Mingsong Dou, Sameh Khamis, Yuri Degtyarev, Philip Davidson, Sean Ryan Fanello, Adarsh Kowdle, Sergio Orts Esolano, Christoph Rhemann, David Kim, Jonathan Taylor, et al. 2016. Fusion4D: Real-time performance capture of challenging scenes. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 35, 4 (2016), 1–13.
- Yuanxing Duan, Fangyin Wei, Qiyu Dai, Yuhang He, Wenzheng Chen, and Baoquan Chen. 2024. 4D-rotor Gaussian splatting: towards efficient novel view synthesis for dynamic scenes. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2024 Conference Papers*. 1–11.
- Sara Fridovich-Keil, Giacomo Meanti, Frederik Rahbæk Warburg, Benjamin Recht, and Angjoo Kanazawa. 2023. K-Planes: Explicit radiance fields in space, time, and appearance. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 12479–12488.
- Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Lorenzo Torresani, Kris Kitani, Jitendra Malik, Triantafyllos Afouras, Kumar Ashutosh, Vijay Baiyya, Siddhant Bansal, Bikram Boote, et al. 2024. Ego-Exo4D: Understanding skilled human activity from first- and third-person perspectives. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 19383–19400.
- Shoukang Hu, Tao Hu, and Ziwei Liu. 2024. GauHuman: Articulated Gaussian splatting from monocular human videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20418–20431.
- Junkai Huang, Saswat Subhrajyoti Mallick, Alejandro Amat, Marc Ruiz Olle, Albert Mosella-Montoro, Bernhard Kerbl, Francisco Vicente Carrasco, and Fernando De la Torre. 2025. Echoes of the Coliseum: Towards 3D Live streaming of Sports Events. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 44, 4 (2025), 1–17.
- Yi-Hua Huang, Yang-Tian Sun, Ziyi Yang, Xiaoyang Lyu, Yan-Pei Cao, and Xiaojuan Qi. 2024. SC-GS: Sparse-controlled Gaussian splatting for editable dynamic scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 4220–4230.
- Young Kyun Jang, Dat Huynh, Ashish Shah, Wen-Kai Chen, and Ser-Nam Lim. 2024. Spherical linear interpolation and text-anchoring for zero-shot composed image retrieval. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 239–254.
- Charles Javerliat, Pierre Raimbaud, and Guillaume Lavoué. 2025. Kineo: Calibration-Free Metric Motion Capture From Sparse RGB Cameras. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.24464* (2025).
- Yudong Jin, Sida Peng, Xuan Wang, Tao Xie, Zhen Xu, Yifan Yang, Yujun Shen, Hujun Bao, and XiaoWei Zhou. 2025. Diffuman4D: 4D consistent human view synthesis from sparse-view videos with spatio-temporal diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 11047–11057.
- Bernhard Kerbl, Georgios Kopanas, Thomas Leimkühler, and George Drettakis. 2023. 3D Gaussian splatting for real-time radiance field rendering. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 42, 4, Article 139 (2023), 14 pages.
- Rawal Khrodgar, Aayush Bansal, Lingni Ma, Richard Newcombe, Minh Vo, and Kris Kitani. 2023. EgoHumans: An ego-centric 3D multi-human benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 19807–19819.
- Rawal Khrodgar, Jyun-Ting Song, Jinkun Cao, Zhengyi Luo, and Kris Kitani. 2024. Harmony4D: A video dataset for in-the-wild close human interactions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 107270–107285.
- Sangmin Kim, Seunguk Do, and Jaesik Park. 2025. ShowMak3r: Compositional TV Show Reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 864–874.
- Muhammed Kocabas, Jen-Hao Rick Chang, James Gabriel, Oncel Tuzel, and Anurag Ranjan. 2024. HUGS: Human Gaussian splats. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 505–515.
- Hanyang Kong, Xingyi Yang, and Xinchao Wang. 2025. Generative sparse-view Gaussian splatting. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 26745–26755.
- Jiahe Li, Jiawei Zhang, Xiao Bai, Jin Zheng, Xin Ning, Jun Zhou, and Lin Gu. 2024b. DNGaussian: Optimizing sparse-view 3D Gaussian radiance fields with global-local depth normalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20775–20785.
- Zhan Li, Zhang Chen, Zhong Li, and Yi Xu. 2024a. Spacetime Gaussian feature splatting for real-time dynamic view synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 8508–8520.
- Zhengqi Li, Qianqian Wang, Forrester Cole, Richard Tucker, and Noah Snavely. 2023. DynIBAR: Neural dynamic image-based rendering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 4273–4284.
- Xinhang Liu, Jiaben Chen, Shiu-hong Kao, Yu-Wing Tai, and Chi-Keung Tang. 2024a. Deceptive-NeRF/3DGS: Diffusion-generated pseudo-observations for high-quality sparse-view reconstruction. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 337–355.
- Xi Liu, Chaoyi Zhou, and Siyu Huang. 2024b. 3DGS-Enhancer: Enhancing unbounded 3D Gaussian splatting with view-consistent 2D diffusion priors. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 133305–133327.
- Matthew Loper, Naureen Mahmood, Javier Romero, Gerard Pons-Moll, and Michael J Black. 2023. SMPL: A skinned multi-person linear model. In *Seminal Graphics Papers: Pushing the Boundaries, Volume 2*. 851–866.
- Jonathon Luiten, Georgios Kopanas, Bastian Leibe, and Deva Ramanan. 2024. Dynamic 3D Gaussians: Tracking by persistent dynamic view synthesis. In *2024 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*. IEEE, 800–809.
- Ben Mildenhall, Pratul P Srinivasan, Matthew Tancik, Jonathan T Barron, Ravi Ramamoorthi, and Ren Ng. 2021. NeRF: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis. *Commun. ACM* 65, 1 (2021), 99–106.
- GyeongSik Moon, Takaaki Shiratori, and Shunsuke Saito. 2024. Expressive whole-body 3D Gaussian avatar. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 19–35.
- Alejandro Newell, Peiyun Hu, Lahav Lipson, Stephan R Richter, and Vladlen Koltun. 2025. CoMotion: Concurrent Multi-person 3D Motion. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2025).
- Jim Nilsson and Tomas Akenine-Möller. 2020. Understanding SSIM. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13846* (2020).
- Hyunwoo Park, Gun Ryu, and Wonjun Kim. 2025. DropGaussian: Structural regularization for sparse-view Gaussian splatting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 21600–21609.
- Lingteng Qiu, Xiaodong Gu, Peihao Li, Qi Zuo, Weichao Shen, Junfei Zhang, Kejie Qiu, Weihao Yuan, Guanying Chen, Zilong Dong, et al. 2025. LHM: Large animatable human reconstruction model from a single image in seconds. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision* (2025).
- Xuanchi Ren, Tianchang Shen, Jiahui Huang, Huan Ling, Yifan Lu, Merlin Nimier-David, Thomas Müller, Alexander Keller, Sanja Fidler, and Jun Gao. 2025. GEN3C: 3D-informed world-consistent video generation with precise camera control. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 6121–6132.
- Johannes L Schonberger and Jan-Michael Frahm. 2016. Structure-from-motion revisited. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 4104–4113.
- Ruizhi Shao, Youxin Pang, Zerong Zheng, Jingxiang Sun, and Yebin Liu. 2024. 360-degree human video generation with 4D diffusion transformer. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 43, 6 (2024), 1–13.
- Zachary Teed and Jia Deng. 2020. RAFT: Recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 402–419.
- Qianqian Wang, Vickie Ye, Hang Gao, Weijia Zeng, Jake Austin, Zhengqi Li, and Angjoo Kanazawa. 2025d. Shape of motion: 4D reconstruction from a single video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 9660–9672.
- Ruicheng Wang, Sicheng Xu, Cassie Dai, Jianfeng Xiang, Yu Deng, Xin Tong, and Jialong Yang. 2025b. MoGe: Unlocking accurate monocular geometry estimation for open-domain images with optimal training supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 5261–5271.
- Yanhui Wang, Jianmin Bao, Wenming Weng, Ruoyu Feng, Dacheng Yin, Tao Yang, Jingxu Zhang, Qi Dai, Zhiyuan Zhao, Chunyu Wang, et al. 2024. MicroCinema: A divide-and-conquer approach for text-to-video generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 8414–8424.
- Yifan Wang, Peishan Yang, Zhen Xu, Jiaming Sun, Zhanhua Zhang, Yong Chen, Hujun Bao, Sida Peng, and XiaoWei Zhou. 2025c. FreeTimeGS: Free Gaussian Primitives at Anytime Anywhere for Dynamic Scene Reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 21750–21760.
- Yifan Wang, Jianjun Zhou, Haoyi Zhu, Wenzheng Chang, Yang Zhou, Zizun Li, Junyi Chen, Jiangmiao Pang, Chunhua Shen, and Tong He. 2026. Pi³: Permutation-Equivariant Visual Geometry Learning. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2026).
- Zihan Wang, Jeff Tan, Tarasha Khurana, Neehar Peri, and Deva Ramanan. 2025a. MonoFusion: Sparse-View 4D Reconstruction via Monocular Fusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 8252–8263.
- Chun-Tin Wu and Jun-Cheng Chen. 2025. 4D Neural Voxel Splatting: Dynamic Scene Rendering with Voxelized Gaussian Splatting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.00560* (2025).

- Guanjun Wu, Taoran Yi, Jiemin Fang, Lingxi Xie, Xiaopeng Zhang, Wei Wei, Wenyu Liu, Qi Tian, and Xinggang Wang. 2024. 4D Gaussian splatting for real-time dynamic scene rendering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20310–20320.
- Jay Zhangjie Wu, Yuxuan Zhang, Haitthem Turki, Xuanchi Ren, Jun Gao, Mike Zheng Shou, Sanja Fidler, Zan Gojcic, and Huan Ling. 2025b. Difx3D+: Improving 3D reconstructions with single-step diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 26024–26035.
- Rundi Wu, Ruiqi Gao, Ben Poole, Alex Trevithick, Changxi Zheng, Jonathan T Barron, and Aleksander Holynski. 2025a. CAT4D: Create anything in 4D with multi-view video diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 26057–26068.
- Zhen Xu, Sida Peng, Haotong Lin, Guangzhao He, Jiaming Sun, Yujun Shen, Hujun Bao, and Xiaowei Zhou. 2024a. 4K4D: Real-time 4D view synthesis at 4k resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20029–20040.
- Zhen Xu, Yinghao Xu, Zhiyuan Yu, Sida Peng, Jiaming Sun, Hujun Bao, and Xiaowei Zhou. 2024b. Representing long volumetric video with temporal Gaussian hierarchy. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 43, 6 (2024), 1–18.
- Lixin Xue, Chen Guo, Chengwei Zheng, Fangjinghua Wang, Tianjian Jiang, Hsuan-I Ho, Manuel Kaufmann, Jie Song, and Otmar Hilliges. 2024. HSR: holistic 3D human-scene reconstruction from monocular videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 429–448.
- Xi Yang, Chenhang He, Jianqi Ma, and Lei Zhang. 2024b. Motion-guided latent diffusion for temporally consistent real-world video super-resolution. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 224–242.
- Ziyi Yang, Xinyu Gao, Wen Zhou, Shaohui Jiao, Yuqing Zhang, and Xiaogang Jin. 2024a. Deformable 3D Gaussians for high-fidelity monocular dynamic scene reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20331–20341.
- Zeyu Yang, Hongye Yang, Zijie Pan, and Li Zhang. 2024c. Real-time Photorealistic Dynamic Scene Representation and Rendering with 4D Gaussian Splatting. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Zhendong Yang, Ailing Zeng, Chun Yuan, and Yu Li. 2023. Effective whole-body pose estimation with two-stages distillation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 4210–4220.
- Chang-Han Yeh, Hau-Shiang Shiu, Chin-Yang Lin, Zhixiang Wang, Chi-Wei Hsiao, Ting-Hsuan Chen, and Yu-Lun Liu. 2024. DiffIR2VR-Zero: Zero-shot video restoration with diffusion-based image restoration models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01519* (2024).
- Yifan Zhan, Qingtian Zhu, Muyao Niu, Mingze Ma, Jiancheng Zhao, Zhihang Zhong, Xiao Sun, Yu Qiao, and Yinqiang Zheng. 2025. Towards Explicit Exoskeleton for the Reconstruction of Complicated 3D Human Avatars. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 14259–14269.
- Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. 2018. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 586–595.
- Zetong Zhang, Manuel Kaufmann, Lixin Xue, Jie Song, and Martin R Oswald. 2025. ODHSR: Online Dense 3D Reconstruction of Humans and Scenes from Monocular Videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 21824–21835.
- Shangchen Zhou, Peiqing Yang, Jianyi Wang, Yihang Luo, and Chen Change Loy. 2024. Upscale-A-Video: Temporal-consistent diffusion model for real-world video super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2535–2545.

Appendix Overview

Video results for the baseline comparisons and applications shown in the main paper and this appendix are available on our project page: <https://sisyphm.github.io/studiorecon-page/>.

This appendix provides additional implementation details and results for StudioRecon. Appendix A describes the preprocessing pipeline, including segmentation, depth estimation, and view synthesis. Appendix B details the human pose estimation process with cross-view association and SMPL fitting. Appendices C and D provide optimization configurations for background and human Gaussian reconstruction, respectively. Appendix E explains the diffusion-based rendering enhancement. Appendix F analyzes runtime and scalability. Appendix G presents additional visualizations and evaluations. Appendix H provides robustness analysis. Finally, Appendix I discusses limitations.

A Preprocessing

We use $N = 4$ input cameras in all experiments. We employ SAM3 [Carion et al. 2026] with the text prompt “person” for actor segmentation. Camera parameters and per-frame depth maps are estimated using Pi3 [Wang et al. 2026] with a confidence threshold of 0.1 and 21-pixel mask dilation to ensure complete actor coverage. We synthesize $L = 481$ novel views at 1280×704 resolution using GEN3C [Ren et al. 2025] with guidance scale 1.0, where camera poses are interpolated via spherical linear interpolation (SLERP) for rotation and linear interpolation for translation.

B Human Pose Estimation

Per-view actor detection and tracking are performed using CoMotion [Newell et al. 2025], which provides SMPL pose and shape estimates, 2D keypoints, and within-view identity tracking.

Cross-view identity association employs the Hungarian algorithm on combined spatial and pose affinity at reference timestep $t_0 = 0$, with affinity weights $w_p = 0.9$ (spatial) and $w_\theta = 0.1$ (pose), and a distance threshold of 0.3m for valid matches. For each detected person, we estimate their 3D world position by unprojecting the pelvis location:

$$\mathbf{p}_{world} = R_n^{-1} \cdot \left(d \cdot K_n^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{t}_n \right) \quad (\text{S1})$$

where (u, v) is the 2D pelvis location, d is the depth value, and $(K_n, R_n, \mathbf{t}_n)$ are camera intrinsics and extrinsics. We then apply robust DLT triangulation with Huber loss to obtain 3D joint and vertex positions. SMPL parameters are fitted through 3D-to-3D optimization over 30 iterations with a β regularization coefficient of 10.0. Scale alignment to the pipeline’s coordinate system is performed via bone-length matching using L-BFGS optimization over 100 iterations. Temporal consistency of the fitted pose parameters is enforced through bidirectional exponential smoothing ($\alpha = 0.5$) followed by Gaussian filtering ($\sigma = 1$).

C Background Reconstruction

Background Gaussians are optimized for 7,000 iterations over the L synthesized views with spherical-harmonic degree 3. The loss

function combines L1 reconstruction ($\lambda = 0.7$), SSIM ($\lambda = 0.3$), LPIPS ($\lambda = 0.1$), and density regularization ($\lambda = 0.1$). Position learning rate decays from 1.6×10^{-4} to 1.6×10^{-6} . Densification is performed every 500 iterations up to iteration 3,000, with a gradient threshold of 0.0002.

Ground-Truth View Weighting. Views near original camera positions receive up to $3\times$ higher loss weight via cosine falloff, prioritizing ground-truth supervision over interpolated views:

$$w_i = 1 + \lambda_{gt} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \cos \left(\frac{\pi \cdot d_i}{d_{max}} \right) \right) \quad (\text{S2})$$

where d_i is the angular distance to the nearest original camera, d_{max} is the cutoff distance, and $\lambda_{gt} = 2$ controls the boost magnitude.

Iterative Refinement. At iteration 3,500, we create 240 additional views with $\pm 15\%$ height oscillation relative to the scene radius, which are refined using Difx3D+ [Wu et al. 2025b] and incorporated with a reduced loss weight of 0.7.

D Human Reconstruction

Human Gaussians are optimized for 10,000 iterations on the 4 input videos with spherical harmonics degree 2. The loss function combines multiple terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_{hn} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_s \mathcal{L}_{SSIM} + \lambda_l \mathcal{L}_{LPIPS} + \lambda_m \mathcal{L}_{mask} + \lambda_d \mathcal{L}_{den} + \lambda_p \mathcal{L}_{pose} \quad (\text{S3})$$

where L1 ($\lambda = 0.8$) and SSIM ($\lambda = 0.2$) measure photometric reconstruction, LPIPS ($\lambda = 0.1$) provides perceptual supervision, mask loss ($\lambda = 0.01$) supervises the rendered silhouette, density regularization ($\lambda = 0.1$) prevents spurious Gaussians, and pose regularization ($\lambda = 50.0$) enforces temporal smoothness of SMPL parameters. We jointly optimize Gaussian attributes and SMPL pose parameters. Position learning rate decays from 1.0×10^{-3} to 2.0×10^{-6} . Densification terminates at iteration 1,500, as actors are initialized from SMPL mesh vertices.

Linear Blend Skinning. We employ Linear Blend Skinning with SMPL weights computed from a 64^3 -voxel grid.

Temporal Deformation Network. Temporal deformation is enabled at iteration 3,000 using an 8-layer MLP with 256 hidden units and a skip connection at layer 4. The network predicts per-Gaussian residuals:

$$(\Delta c, \Delta \alpha) = f_\theta(\gamma(\mu_c), \gamma(t)) \quad (\text{S4})$$

where $\gamma(\cdot)$ denotes positional encoding with multires=10, yielding 63D for spatial coordinates μ_c and 21D for normalized time t . The residuals are added to the base Gaussian attributes before rendering.

E Recursive Enhancement Module

Consistency Injection. At inference time, we employ per-frame reference mode with single-step denoising at timestep $t = 200$. Temporal consistency is achieved through motion-adaptive EMA input injection over 3 previous frames with $\alpha = 0.3$ and decay factor 0.5. Injection strength is determined by warp quality: we compute the per-pixel RGB error between the warped previous output and the current input, with an error threshold $\tau_e = 30$ (on a 0–255 scale). Pixels with low warp error receive full injection, while misaligned regions (due to motion or occlusion) receive minimal injection. A

Table S1. Per-stage runtime breakdown on a single NVIDIA A6000 GPU.

Stage	Time
View Synthesis (GEN3C)	50 min
Human Pose Estimation	3 min
Background Reconstruction	30 min
Human Reconstruction	40 min
Recursive Enhancement	3.3 s/frame

Table S2. Camera configuration comparison with prior sparse-view work.

	Kong <i>et al.</i>	Ours
Training cameras	3	4
Position angle from center	17°	117°
Nearest-neighbor viewing angle	28°	70°

Gaussian blur with a kernel size of 11 smooths the confidence map, reducing sharp transitions.

F Runtime Analysis

Table S1 reports the per-stage runtime breakdown on a single NVIDIA A6000 GPU.

Bottleneck. View synthesis using GEN3C [Ren et al. 2025] constitutes the primary bottleneck due to the computational cost of video diffusion models. However, this stage is easily parallelized across multiple GPUs, as each trajectory segment can be processed independently. With 8 GPUs, the view synthesis time reduces to approximately 13 minutes.

Runtime Scaling. Human reconstruction time scales linearly with the number of actors (approximately 3 minutes per additional human), while other stages remain largely unaffected. Background reconstruction and human reconstruction can run in parallel once preprocessing completes.

Parallelization. Multi-GPU processing is supported for the preprocessing and view synthesis stages. Additionally, most preprocessing stages (segmentation, depth estimation, and pose estimation) can execute concurrently. Our pipeline is designed for offline processing, where diffusion-based rendering enhancement adds per-frame computation for the final output.

End-to-End Time. For a typical scene with 121 frames and 1-3 actors, the total time to produce a final rendered video is approximately 130 minutes on a single GPU, or 60 minutes with 8 GPUs.

G Additional Results

Camera Configuration. To quantify the difficulty of our setting across EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap, we compare against the camera selection protocol of Kong *et al.* [Kong et al. 2025], a recent sparse-view method (Table S2). Even with maximized spread, neighboring cameras in prior work still overlap substantially (28°). In our setting, each view observes a different part of the scene with heavy self-occlusion (70°).




Fig. S1. Augmented camera trajectory for iterative refinement. We interpolate between synthesized camera poses while adding sinusoidal height variation and compensating pitch rotation, providing additional supervision from elevated and lowered vantage points.

Augmented Camera Trajectory. Figure S1 visualizes the augmented camera trajectory used for iterative refinement during background reconstruction. Starting from the 481 synthesized camera poses, we create 240 additional viewpoints by interpolating positions while adding sinusoidal height variation ($\pm 15\%$ of scene radius) and compensating pitch rotation. This provides supervision from elevated and lowered vantage points, improving reconstruction quality in undersampled regions such as floors and ceilings.

Human Pose Estimation. Figure S3 shows the initialized human poses from our multi-view SMPL fitting pipeline, visualized as point clouds with overlaid SMPL meshes. The accurate alignment between the fitted body models and the scene geometry demonstrates the effectiveness of our cross-view association and 3D pose estimation.

Cross-View Identity Association. In our low-overlap setting, cameras observe largely disjoint regions, making appearance-based matching infeasible. We instead lift each detection to 3D using estimated depth, and compute a pairwise affinity combining spatial proximity and SMPL pose similarity. The Hungarian algorithm assigns cross-view correspondences based on this affinity. Figure S2 visualizes the results, where consistent bounding box colors indicate the same person matched across 4 cameras.

Video Diffusion for Human Novel View Synthesis. Camera-controlled video diffusion models are designed for general novel view synthesis but degrade on dynamic humans. We validate this by comparing 2D pose accuracy between GEN3C [Ren et al. 2025] outputs and our Gaussian reconstruction. Since GEN3C is not designed for multi-view video, we run it at key timesteps with 4 input views to perform static scene novel view synthesis. Using DWPose [Yang et al. 2023] on 8 scenes across all four datasets (EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, SelfCap) with 46 person instances, we compute PCK (Percentage of Correct Keypoints) against ground truth frames. As shown in Table S3 and Figure S4, GEN3C produces geometrically inconsistent humans with significantly lower pose accuracy, while our method maintains accurate body geometry.




Fig. S2. Cross-view identity association. Each color represents the same person matched across 4 cameras with low overlap. Our method achieves 97.8% association accuracy across all 8 scenes from EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap (Table 3).

Table S3. Pose accuracy of novel view synthesis methods on human subjects.

Method	PCK@0.05↑	PCK@0.1↑	Detection Rate↑
GEN3C	55.6%	71.4%	97.6%
Ours	93.1%	97.7%	100%

Enhancement on Baseline Methods. Our recursive enhancement module is designed to be generally applicable. To evaluate its effectiveness beyond our pipeline, we apply it to baseline methods (Dyn-3DGS [Luiten et al. 2024], MonoFusion [Wang et al. 2025a], STG [Li et al. 2024a]) by using their rendered outputs as input to Difix3D+ [Wu et al. 2025b] with consistency injection. Table S4 reports the results averaged across all 8 scenes from EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap.

The enhancement improves perceptual quality across all baselines (LPIPS reduces by 20–31%), demonstrating that single-step diffusion can effectively suppress common rendering artifacts such as floaters and blur. However, the gains in reconstruction fidelity (PSNR, SSIM) are modest, and the enhanced baselines remain substantially below our full pipeline (PSNR 20.44, LPIPS 0.198). This reflects an inherent limitation: diffusion-based enhancement cannot recover geometric information lost during reconstruction. When the underlying 3D representation is degraded due to insufficient viewpoint coverage, enhancement can only improve surface appearance, not correct structural errors.

Baselines with Dense GEN3C Supervision. To test whether baselines benefit from dense video diffusion supervision, we synthesized GEN3C views at 30 timesteps (481×30 images, 30× our diffusion budget) and trained baselines on these. Table S5 reports full-image and foreground metrics across 3 EgoHumans scenes (Legoassemble, Tennis, Fencing).

Dense GEN3C supervision largely improves baselines through better background coverage, but for foreground humans, ours achieves 18.08 vs. 17.14 FG PSNR with STG+GEN3C despite 30× less diffusion. GEN3C-supervised humans also exhibit pose inconsistency




Fig. S3. Initialized human pose visualization across four scenes. Point clouds are rendered with overlaid SMPL meshes, demonstrating accurate body pose estimation from sparse multi-view inputs.



Fig. S4. Video diffusion models [Ren et al. 2025] produce geometrically inconsistent humans (left), while our explicit reconstruction maintains accurate body shape (right).

Table S4. Effect of applying our recursive enhancement module to baseline methods. All metrics averaged across all 8 scenes from EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap.

Method	Original			+ Enhancement (Ours)		
	PSNR $\uparrow$	SSIM $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	PSNR $\uparrow$	SSIM $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$
Dyn-3DGS	16.68	0.441	0.563	17.66 (+0.98)	0.522 (+.081)	0.396 (-.167)
MonoFusion	17.06	0.435	0.552	17.68 (+0.62)	0.480 (+.045)	0.383 (-.169)
STG	17.21	0.522	0.477	17.72 (+0.51)	0.542 (+.020)	0.380 (-.097)

Table S5. Baselines trained with dense GEN3C supervision (481 $\times$ 30 views) vs. ours using GEN3C only at $t=0$.

Method	PSNR $\uparrow$	SSIM $\uparrow$	LPIPS $\downarrow$	FG PSNR $\uparrow$
Dyn-3DGS (4-view)	16.57	0.421	0.486	-
Dyn-3DGS+GEN3C	17.05	0.581	0.549	15.09
STG (4-view)	17.83	0.516	0.426	-
STG+GEN3C	18.72	0.630	0.377	17.14
Ours w/o enh.	20.39	0.657	0.286	18.08

(Table S3), confirming dense diffusion alone cannot replace SMPL-guided geometric constraints for dynamic regions.

GEN3C vs. Ours (Rendering Quality). Since GEN3C cannot directly consume multi-view video, we run it independently at each timestep. Across all 8 scenes from EgoHumans, Harmony4D, Mobile Stage, and SelfCap, our rendering on held-out evaluation cameras (PSNR/SSIM/LPIPS: 20.13/0.656/0.215) surpasses GEN3C’s raw synthesized views (19.05/0.612/0.329) despite using GEN3C only at $t=0$, as our decoupled pipeline avoids propagating GEN3C’s geometric inconsistencies into dynamic regions (Figure S4).

H Robustness Analysis

We analyze the robustness of our pipeline by disabling individual components and measuring the impact on reconstruction quality. We evaluate across all 6 scenes from Table 1 (Legoassembly, Tennis, Fencing from EgoHumans; Sword, Karate, Grappling from Harmony4D). All qualitative comparisons in this section are shown without the recursive enhancement module for fair evaluation.

Multi-View Pose Refinement. Our multi-view human pose estimation (Sec. 3.2) refines initial per-view SMPL estimates through cross-view triangulation and 3D-to-3D SMPL fitting. We ablate this by using the initial fused per-view SMPL directly without multi-view refinement. As shown in Figure S5, less accurate poses cause Gaussians to misalign with the actual human regions, resulting in blurry or semi-transparent body parts in the rendered output.

Table S6. Effect of temporal smoothing on SMPL pose stability across 6 360° scenes (Table 1). Jitter is measured as the mean joint acceleration across all actors and frames.

	Translation (mm/f ²) $\downarrow$	Pose ($^\circ$ /f ²) $\downarrow$
w/o smoothing	2.74	40.67
w/ smoothing	1.29	13.95



Fig. S5. Effect of multi-view pose refinement. Without refinement (left), inaccurate SMPL poses cause blurry or semi-transparent body parts. With refinement (right), poses are corrected via cross-view triangulation, producing a sharper human reconstruction.

Temporal Smoothing. We enforce temporal consistency of SMPL parameters through bidirectional exponential smoothing and Gaussian filtering. Table S6 shows that removing both significantly increases pose jitter, which appears as flickering in rendered video.

Mask Dilation. During background reconstruction, we dilate actor masks by 21 pixels to ensure human regions are fully excluded. Without dilation, tight masks leave residual human pixels in the background Gaussians, causing ghosting artifacts near human boundaries (Figure S6). With dilation, the masked regions are under-supervised and may contain minor artifacts, but these are within the range that our recursive enhancement module can effectively correct.




Fig. S6. Effect of mask dilation. Without dilation (left), insufficiently masked human regions at $t=0$ are baked into the static background Gaussians, leaving ghosting artifacts as humans move. With 21px dilation (right), the background is cleanly separated.

I Limitations

As shown in Figure S7, dynamic objects manipulated by actors are not reconstructed. This stems from our reliance on the SMPL body model, which represents only the human body surface and does not model held objects or accessories. Additionally, since shadows are baked into the static background at $t=0$, they remain fixed and do not follow human motion, resulting in incorrect shadows as humans move (Figure S8).




Fig. S7. Limitations of our method. Comparing ground truth (left) with our reconstruction (right), dynamic objects held by actors are not reconstructed because they lie outside the SMPL body model.



Fig. S8. Shadow artifacts. Shadows baked into the static background at $t=0$ (left) remain fixed and do not follow human motion at later timesteps (right).