Figure 1 and Figure 2 show qualitative results for a few representative frames of sub-J-HMDB and Penn-Action dataset, respectively. Some failure cases are also depicted in Figure 3 and Figure 4 for both datasets, respectively.
Fig. 1: Qualitative results on some frames of sub-J-HMDB as compared to our baseline with CCF.
Fig. 2: Qualitative results on some frames of the Penn-Action dataset as compared to our baseline with CCF. The left part of the images corresponds to the baseline while the right part shows improved poses obtained by the proposed ACPS.
Fig. 3: Few typical failure cases on the sub-J-HMDB due to large scale variations, rare poses with motion blur, large amount of body part occlusions, multiple persons, and bad illumination conditions.

Fig. 4: Few typical failure cases on the Penn-Action dataset due to large scale variations, motion blur, large amount of body part occlusions and truncations, and multiple persons.