

Improving Online Source-free Domain Adaptation for Object Detection by Unsupervised Data Acquisition

Xiangyu Shi, Yanyuan Qiao, Qi Wu, Lingqiao Liu and Feras Dayoub

Abstract—Effective object detection in mobile robots is challenged by deployment in diverse and unfamiliar environments. Online Source-Free Domain Adaptation (O-SFDA) offers model adaptation using a stream of unlabeled data from a target domain in online manner. However, not all captured frames contain information that is beneficial for adaptation, particularly when there is a strong class imbalance. This paper introduces a novel approach to enhance O-SFDA for adaptive object detection in mobile robots via unsupervised data acquisition. Our methodology prioritizes the most informative unlabeled frames for inclusion in the online training process. Empirical evaluation on a real-world dataset reveals that our method outperforms existing state-of-the-art O-SFDA techniques, demonstrating the viability of unsupervised data acquisition for improving adaptive object detection in mobile robots.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mobile robots operating in diverse and ever-changing real-world environments require robust object detection systems that can adapt to new surroundings. However, the object detection systems used in these robots are trained with big datasets that aim to cover all kinds of environments where the robots might be used. In fact, the real world is seldom so accommodating and the environments encountered may vary widely in their characteristics, thereby presenting a domain shift that can severely compromise the performance of a pre-trained object detection model. This is a challenging task and many existing approaches focus on solving it [1], [2], [3], [4], [5].

The challenge lies in equipping mobile robots with the ability to adapt to new domains “on-the-fly”, without the need for manually labeling new data or undergoing an exhaustive re-training process. Online source-free domain adaptation (O-SFDA) [1], [6], [7] offers a promising avenue to address this challenge by transferring knowledge from a source domain to a target domain in an online manner. This means that the adaptation occurs concurrently with the deployment in the target domain. This contrasts with traditional methods, which may require source data batch or offline processing [8], [9], [10].

Current O-SFDA for object detection methods [1] offer a path towards domain adaptation but are limited when it comes to mobile robotics. Specifically, these methods may suffer from high computational costs, or an overreliance on data that does not provide unique adaptation-worthy information. Adapting using every frame in the stream can




Fig. 1. **Up:** Online Source-Free Domain Adaptation (O-SFDA) without Data Acquisition. It utilizes the whole sequential frame to do the adaptation, which may contain redundant frames. **Bottom:** O-SFDA with Data Acquisition. It selects highly informative keyframes for adaptation, which is more efficient and effective.

expose the model to a severe class imbalance, such as seeing more cars and people and fewer motorbikes. This can lead to poorer object detection results for the rare classes.

To address these issues, we employ an unsupervised data acquisition strategy based on incremental online clustering to dynamically identify and integrate both the most informative unlabeled frames and frames that contain rare categories. We augment this strategy within the optimization of a dual architecture consisting of a teacher model and a student model based on the Mean Teacher framework [11]. Our method is designed to reduce the use of computational resources while enhancing object detection adaptivity in previously unencountered deployment environments. Fig. 1 shows the difference between O-SFDA with/without data acquisition.

We conduct extensive experiments span four datasets, Cityscapes [12], Sim10k [13], Cityscapes-Foggy [14], and SHIFT [15] with three domain adaptation processes that include real-world scenarios with varying complexities. The results demonstrate that our method consistently outperforms existing state-of-the-art O-SFDA techniques in object detection [1] for 2.3 mAP under Cityscapes to Cityscapes-Foggy, 9.0 mAP under Sim10k to Cityscapes, and 9.3 mAP under SHIFT to Cityscapes.

In summary, we propose a novel approach to improve O-SFDA for object detection on mobile robots via an unsupervised data acquisition methodology based on incremental online clustering. The data acquisition selects the most informative and category-rare frames for online training. To solve the overlapping frame and class imbalance issues, our proposed data acquisition contains two stages, Acquisition

Unsim Frame (AUF) and Acquisition Rare Category (ARC) where AUF aims at acquiring the dissimilar frame, and ARC aims to acquire frame that contains a rare category. We evaluate our model based on three domain adaptation benchmarks, and the result surpasses the current SOTA.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Unsupervised Domain Adaptation for Object Detection

Unsupervised Domain Adaptation (UDA) aims to mitigate the domain-shift problem without requiring labeled target data [16], [17], by aligning source and target distributions. The field has seen significant contributions specifically in object detection [2], [3], [8], [18], [19], [20]. For instance, Chen et al. [2] pioneered this space by proposing domain adaptation via both image-level and instance-level alignments. Later, Zhu et al. [19] focused on the alignment of congruent regions between source and target domains. Xu et al. [18] presented a framework that involves categorical regularization at the image level and consistency regularization for categories to address complex challenges in this domain. While these approaches have yielded impressive results, they inherently rely on the availability of source data during adaptation, limiting their applicability in real-world scenarios such as robotics where source data may not always be accessible.

B. Online Source-free Domain Adaptation for Object Detection

In environments where source data is not readily available, such as in autonomous vehicles, the specialized domain of Source-Free Unsupervised Domain Adaptation (SFDA) has garnered interest [21], [22]. SFDA uniquely operates without the source data during the adaptation phase, typically focusing on offline model adaptation [11], [23], [24], [25]. The significance of online adaptation in such settings cannot be overstated. Vibashan et al. [1] ventured into this area by proposing a cross-attention transformer-based model for both online and offline SFDA in object detection. They extended the Mean Teacher framework with a MemXformer that pairs features from the teacher and student models [11]. Despite these advancements, existing methods have not addressed the importance of keyframe selection for adaptation.

Our work fills this gap by emphasizing online adaptation in SFDA for object detection, with a particular focus on selective adaptation through keyframe selection. This not only makes the adaptation process more efficient but also provides superior adaptation performance. Notably, Colomer et al. [26] considered frame selection by evaluating the domain gap in semantic segmentation. However, their approach accessed the source data which is not SFDA.

III. METHOD

In this section, we outline our method for Online Source-Free Domain Adaptation (O-SFDA) for object detection in mobile robotics. We begin with problem formulation, followed by an overview of our base model, which leverages the Mean Teacher framework [11]. We also introduce our

data acquisition strategy by incremental online clustering and detail our model optimization approach. Our overall framework is illustrated in Fig. 2.

A. Problem Formulation

In the domain of O-SFDA for object detection in mobile robotics, we consider an online scenario where access to the original source domain dataset D_s is restricted. Only a pretrained model Θ_s on D_s is available. The aim is to adapt Θ_s to a target domain D_t , represented by a stream of unlabeled data $\{X_t\}$. The model is updated using only frames from D_t that are deemed adaptation-worthy.

B. Model Optimization

We build our method upon the framework of online adaptation of the Mean Teacher model [11], specialized for the Faster-RCNN object detector [27]. The Mean Teacher framework employs two models: a student model (Θ_S) and a teacher model (Θ_T), both initialized using the pretrained source model Θ_s .

For each incoming frame f_t , we employ two forms of data augmentation: the weak augmentation $\mathcal{A}_w(\cdot)$ and the strong augmentation $\mathcal{A}_s(\cdot)$. To be more specific, weak augmentation involves modifying the frame’s colour attributes, such as brightness and contrast. On the other hand, strong augmentation involves randomly masking an area of the frame. The weakly augmented frame f_t^w is fed through the teacher model to generate pseudo-labels, denoted as \hat{y}_T . Conversely, the strongly augmented frame f_t^s is processed by the student model to predict labels y_S .

To improve the model’s reliability, we select only those pseudo-labels \hat{y}_T , that have a confidence score exceeding 0.9, as supported by prior research [1]. Given this criterion, the loss function within the Faster-RCNN framework can be defined as:

$$L_{\text{FRCNN}} = L_{\text{RPN}}(y_S, \hat{y}_T) + L_{\text{RCNN}}(y_S, \hat{y}_T) \quad (1)$$

A Kullback–Leibler divergence loss L_{S-T} also applied to align the Θ_S classification embedding same as the Θ_T classification results based on the Θ_T ’s proposals as follows:

$$L_{S-T} = L_{\text{KL}}(E_S^{\text{CLS}}, E_T^{\text{CLS}}) \quad (2)$$

where E_S^{CLS} and E_T^{CLS} respectively denote the classification embeddings for the student and teacher models.

Then, the final loss function L for the update of the student model is a composite loss:

$$L = L_{\text{FRCNN}} + L_{S-T} \quad (3)$$

After the student model has been updated by minimizing L , we do Exponential Moving Average (EMA) to update the teacher model. To update the teacher model’s weights (Θ_T) using the student model (Θ_S), we use two key parameters: α_1 for the adaptation phase and α_2 for the final update. Specifically, α_1 is used in the iterative update during the online process, while α_2 is employed for the final model update:




Fig. 2. For streaming frames, the system continuously evaluates whether to keep the current frame using a similarity measure. There are two stages of data acquisition, named Acquisition Unsim Frame (AUF) and Acquisition Rare Category (ARC). For streaming frame’s embedding e_t , it first decides frame similarity by AUF, if similar but detects rare category after the warm-up stage, w , e_t will continue to decide frame similarity into ARC for another similar frame detection. The “z” in the figure means identify does AUF’s similar frame detects rare category after the warm-up stage. If e_t detects dissimilar in any data acquisition stages, current frame f_t will be treated as a keyframe and updated to the student model, guided by insights from the teacher model.

$$\Theta_{T,t} = \alpha_1 \Theta_{T,t-1} + (1 - \alpha_1) \Theta_{S,t-1} \quad (4)$$

$$\Theta_{T,\text{final}} = \alpha_2 \Theta_{T,N} + (1 - \alpha_2) \Theta_{S,N} \quad (5)$$

C. Data Acquisition

We present our clustering method to choose frames for adapting the model, especially when data from the source domain is not available. Our data acquisition approach targets two types of data: dissimilar frames and frames containing the rare category. To do this, we divide the process into two stages: the first stage focuses on identifying dissimilar frames by Acquisition Unsim Frame (AUF), and the second stage targets the rare category by Acquisition Rare Category (ARC).

1) *Acquisition Unsim Frame (AUF)*: Leveraging the image encoder E from the static teacher model Θ_{ST} , which is based on the initial parameters of the teacher model, the clustering starts by initializing the first frame f_0 embedding as e_0 as the centroid p_{11} of the first cluster c_{11} .

Subsequent frames produce embeddings e_t which are compared against existing centroids $\{p_{11}, \dots, p_{1n}\}$ using cosine similarity. Based on a predefined similarity threshold γ , a frame is identified as a keyframe to start a new cluster or is added to an existing cluster, which then updates its centroid.

The selection criterion is mathematically defined by:

$$\text{Score}_{\max} = \max(\text{Cosine}(e_t, \{p_{11}, \dots, p_{1n}\})) \quad (6)$$

Frames that meet the criterion $\text{Score}_{\max} < \gamma$ are considered keyframes and trigger model updates.

2) *Acquisition Rare Category (ARC)*: In an online setting, where we adapt to each current frame, the model tends to improve at recognizing these frequent objects while performing worse on rarer ones. This issue is known as class imbalance. To address this issue, we propose the Acquire Rare Category (ARC) approach. It uses an additional clustering mechanism to give frames with the rare category a second chance for data acquisition. To ensure the stability of the rare category identified, we propose the implementation of a warm-up phase. This phase is designed to stabilise the rare category prior to activating the ARC mechanism.

To be specific, during warm-up stage, we only activate AUF and collect the distribution of pseudo labels to identify which category is rare for ARC. After warm-up stage w , if the e_t labelled as similar in AUF, but \hat{y}_T contains rare class, e_t will also process into the ARC for second selection. Similar to the operation in AUF, the selection criterion is mathematically defined by:

$$\text{Score}_{\max2} = \max(\text{Cosine}(e_t, \{p_{21}, \dots, p_{2n}\})) \quad (7)$$

Frames that meet the criterion $\text{Score}_{\max2} < \gamma$ are considered as keyframes and trigger model updates. This scheme ensures

Algorithm 1 Algorithm of Overall Process.

```
1: Initialize: Pretrained source model  $\Theta_s$ , Student model  $\Theta_S$ , Teacher model  $\Theta_T$ , Empty Cluster centroids1  $\{\}$ , Empty Cluster centroids2  $\{\}$ , Pseudo Label Count  $[0, 0, \dots, 0]$ , Fixed Teacher Embedding Extractor  $E$ ,  
   'number_class'  
   warm-up stage  $w$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$ ,  $\gamma$   
2: START  
3: for each time  $t$  do  
4:   Receive incoming frame  $f_t$   
5:    $f_t^w \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_w(f_t)$   
6:    $\hat{y}_T \leftarrow \text{Inference}(\Theta_T, f_t^w)$   
7:    $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, \text{number\_class}\}$   
8:   Pseudo_Label_Count $[i]_+ = \sum_j \mathbb{I}(\hat{y}_T[j] = i)$   
9:    $e_t \leftarrow E(f_t)$   
10:  if Algorithm2( $e_t$ , Cluster centroids1) == False then  
11:    if  $t > w$  and  
      Current_Pseudo_Label_Count $[\text{np.argmax}$   
      (Pseudo_Label_Count)]  $\neq 0$  then  
12:      Algorithm2( $e_t$ , Cluster centroids2)  
13:    else  
14:      Continue  
15:    end if  
16:  end if  
17: end for  
18: Final Model Update:  $\Theta_{T,\text{final}} = \alpha_2 \Theta_{T,N} + (1 - \alpha_2) \Theta_{S,N}$   
19: END
```

Algorithm 2 Algorithm of Data Acquisition.

```
1: Parameters: Cluster centroids  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ ,  $e_t$ ,  
2: if Cluster centroids are empty then  
3:   Set  $e_t$  as  $p_1$  of the first cluster  $c_1$   
4:   Identify  $f_t$  as  $f_{\text{key}}$   
5:   Create new cluster  $c_1$  with  $e_t$  as  $p_1$   
6:    $f_t^s \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_s(f_t)$   
7:    $y_S \leftarrow \text{Inference}(\Theta_S, f_t^s)$   
8:    $L = L_{\text{FRCNN}} + L_{S-T}$   
9:    $\Theta_{T,t} = \alpha_1 \Theta_{T,t-1} + (1 - \alpha_1) \Theta_{S,t-1}$   
10:  return True  
11: else  
12:   $\text{Score}_{\text{max}} \leftarrow \max(\text{Cosine}(e_t, \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}))$   
13:  if  $\text{Score}_{\text{max}} < \gamma$  then  
14:    Identify  $f_t$  as  $f_{\text{key}}$   
15:    Create new cluster  $c_{n+1}$  with  $e_t$  as  $p_{n+1}$   
16:     $f_t^s \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_s(f_t)$   
17:     $y_S \leftarrow \text{Inference}(\Theta_S, f_t^s)$   
18:     $L = L_{\text{FRCNN}} + L_{S-T}$   
19:     $\Theta_{T,t} = \alpha_1 \Theta_{T,t-1} + (1 - \alpha_1) \Theta_{S,t-1}$   
20:    return True  
21:  else  
22:    Append  $e_t$  to closest existing cluster  $c_k$   
23:    Update centroid  $p_k$  using  $\text{ave}(c_k)$   
24:    return False  
25:  end if  
26: end if
```

efficient and effective model adaptation by focusing on frames that differ significantly from previous instances. Notably, the ARC cluster is separate from the AUF cluster, with their frames and centroid points not sharing any information.

The detailed algorithm is provided in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2.

IV. EXPERIMENT SETTING

A. Datasets

We evaluate our model using four rigorously selected datasets: Cityscapes [12], Cityscapes-Foggy [14], Sim10k [13], and SHIFT [15]. Each dataset was selected to study how various weather and environmental conditions affect mobile robot movement.

- **Cityscapes:** Geared towards urban street environments, Cityscapes consists of 2,975 training images and 500 validation images. An additional sequence of 106,917 images from Frankfurt allows for comprehensive evaluations in online sequential adaptation scenarios. We excluded the labelled 267 frames from the Frankfurt sequence to evaluate our model’s performance in the target domain. The performance on these 267 frames is reported as “mAP Frankfurt” in the results section.
- **Cityscapes-Foggy:** This dataset augments the original Cityscapes set with simulated fog, making it an excellent benchmark for evaluating adaptation to adverse weather conditions.
- **Sim10k:** Originating from the video game Grand Theft Auto V, this dataset comprises 10,000 training frames and tests our model’s ability to adapt to substantially different source domains.
- **SHIFT:** Created in a simulator, SHIFT encompasses a variety of weather conditions, providing an ideal landscape for assessing the robustness of our model across diverse environments.

B. Evaluation Scenarios

Our approach is evaluated under two distinct, yet interrelated, scenarios:

Online Sequential Adaptation: Our primary objective is an online adaptation for mobile robots navigating through sequences of overlapping frames. We employ datasets SHIFT, Cityscapes and Sim10k to assess this feature. Detailed evaluation setups include:

- 1) Sim10k to Seq-Cityscapes with car category only: Utilizing Sim10k as the source domain, we evaluate our model’s adaptability using the sequential Frankfurt set of the Cityscapes dataset. Since there is only one category, we only activate AUF.
- 2) SHIFT to Seq-Cityscapes with four categories: In this experiment, SHIFT serves as the source domain to evaluate the model on the sequential Cityscapes dataset.

Weather Adaptation: This scenario scrutinizes the model’s resilience to sudden environmental changes, particularly shifts in weather conditions. Cityscapes and Cityscapes-

TABLE I
SIM10K TO SEQUENTIAL CITYSCAPES (CAR ONLY)

Method	Car
Source-Only	31.9
Tent [†] [28]	33.1±0.3
MemCLR [1]	37.0±0.2
Ours	46.0±0.2

TABLE II
SHIFT TO SEQUENTIAL CITYSCAPES ON FRANKFURT VALIDATION SET

Method	Person	Car	Mcycle	Bike	mAP Frankfurt
Source-Only	16.1	17.1	4.5	6.1	10.9
Tent [†] [28]	16.5±0.3	18.0±0.0	8.1±2.2	6.5±2.4	12.3±1.1
MemCLR [1]	22.1±0.5	25.3±0.5	9.9±1.2	8.7±0.8	16.5±0.4
Ours	30.2±0.8	39.5±0.9	21.9±3.4	11.7±1.2	25.8±0.8

Foggy serve as key evaluation grounds. In addition, we introduce an extra evaluation set from the Cityscapes validation set to assess the model’s robustness in unseen urban settings. Another reason for this experiment is that Memclr did not mention the sequential scenario. This table aims for a fair comparison with the existing dataset in MemCLR. We use these results to demonstrate that data acquisition is effective in weather adaptation. Weather adaptation is non-sequential and involves only 500 frames, making it challenging to stabilize rare category initially for ARC. Therefore, we only consider AUF.

C. Baseline Methods for Comparison

We evaluate our approach against two baseline methods, one of which is the current state of the art in O-SFDA for object detection:

- 1) **MemCLR [1]**: This student-teacher-based method specializes in learning Region of Interest (RoI) features by Transformer-based Memory bank.
- 2) **Tent [28]**: Tent employs entropy minimization to boost model performance in classification and semantic segmentation tasks. We deploy the entropy minimization in object detection by disambiguating the Θ_S classification result based on Θ_T proposals.

It is noteworthy that neither of these baseline methods incorporates mechanisms for selecting keyframes for adaptation, a critical feature addressed in our proposed method.

D. Implementation Details

Our implementation builds upon the Faster-RCNN framework [27] with a ResNet50 backbone [29], following the baseline established by MemCLR [1]. The ResNet50 model is pre-trained on ImageNet [30].

Operating within the O-SFDA framework, the experiment settings are as follows:

- **Batch Size and Epochs:** We employ a batch size of 1 and run the experiment for 1 epoch to ensure online adaptation capabilities.
- **Pseudo Labeling:** The student model relies heavily on the teacher’s predictions for adaptation. To guarantee

robustness and keep the same setting with Baseline [1], we only consider teacher-generated pseudo labels with a confidence score exceeding 0.9 as Ground Truth for guiding the student model.

- **EMA Parameter:** The Exponential Moving Average (EMA) parameter is set to 0.996 for α_1 and 0.9 for α_2 .
- **Learning Rate and Optimizer:** The learning rate is set to 0.001, and warm-up learning rate is set to 0.0001. The optimization is performed using the SGD optimizer.
- **Acquisition Threshold:** Our method for acquiring data involves extracting features from the Fix-Teacher model, using a similarity threshold, γ set at 0.975.
- **Parameter of warm-up:** The warm-up period adjusted to suit different environments. To build a category occurrence distribution, we run the warm-up until the ratio of the rarest category to the most popular reaches 0.3% when the total pseudo label counts more than 10000.

Evaluation Metric: We assess model performance using the mean Average Precision (mAP) calculated via the AP50 metric. The Intersection over Union (IoU) threshold for this evaluation is set at 0.5.

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Comparison with state-of-the-art methods

We evaluate our model’s performance in three specific settings: two types of Online Sequential Adaptation and one Weather Adaptation, along with an ablation study to understand the impacts of various model components. For each experiment, I used random seeds and run for five times, calculating the mean with standard deviation.

1) *Online Sequential Adaptation with car only:* As shown in TABLE I. When testing the model that was trained on the source data directly, the average precision (AP) for car detection was 31.9, which was the lowest score, as expected. Our model demonstrates a marked improvement over the state-of-the-art method, MemCLR [1], in car detection, achieving an AP score of 46.0±0.2. This is achieved using 345 frames for adaptation, accounting for only about 0.32% of the total available frames.

2) *Online Sequential Adaptation with share categories:* As shown in TABLE II, we focus on four share categories: person, car, motorcycle, and bicycle, reporting results in terms of mAP. Our model surpasses MemCLR in performance by 9.3 mAP while utilizing only approximately 384 frames. Significantly, our method greatly improved the detection of motorcycles, a rare category, by achieving 12 AP higher than MemCLR [1].

3) *Weather Adaptation Scenario:* As shown in TABLE III, our model significantly outperforms MemCLR with an mAP score of 32.1, improving by 2.3 points. Notably, the AP score for the car category increased by 7 points compared to MemCLR’s performance.

B. Qualitative study

Figure 3 displays the visualization results from the Cityscapes validation set for Frankfurt city, showing bound-

TABLE III
CITYSCAPES TO FOGGY CITYSCAPES

Method	Person	Rider	Car	Truck	Bus	Train	Mcycle	Bike	mAP
Source-Only	29.3	34.1	35.8	15.4	26.0	9.09	22.4	29.7	25.2
Tent [28]	31.2	38.6	37.1	20.2	23.4	10.1	21.7	33.4	26.8
MemCLR [1]	32.1	41.4	43.5	21.4	33.1	11.5	25.5	32.9	29.8
Ours	35.2±0.7	44.3±1.3	50.5±0.4	18.5±3.1	30.7±3.7	16.1±4.3	23.9±1.9	37.6±0.3	32.1±1.3



Fig. 3. The four qualitative results demonstrate the performance of each baseline and our method on the Cityscapes validation set. The colors of the bounding boxes indicate different objects: red for **Person**, green for **Car**, blue for **Mcycle**, and yellow for **Bike**.

TABLE IV
ABLATION OF CONTRIBUTION OF EACH COMPONENT

Method	Person	Car	Mcycle	Bike	mAP Frankfurt
No acquire	0.0±0.0	5.0±6.8	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	1.3±1.7
AUF	29.5±1.0	36.0±5.3	16.4±4.0	9.0±1.6	22.7±2.4
AUF+ARC	30.2±0.8	39.5±0.9	21.9±3.4	11.7±1.2	25.8±0.8

ing boxes with confidence scores above 0.5. We compare Source-only, Tent, and MemCLR with our method. Bounding boxes are color-coded: red for the person, green for the car, blue for the motorcycle, and yellow for the bike. The comparison of these four images clearly demonstrates the superior performance of our model.

C. Ablation Study

Our study places significant emphasis on sequential datasets, particularly the transition from the SHIFT to the Cityscapes dataset, to simulate real-world conditions more effectively. This section elucidates the effects of various

experimental components on the final performance metrics of our model.

Table IV offers insights into the effects of various configurations on the overall model performance. The term “No acquire” refers to our method when using all the frames for adaptation. Resulting in a severe collapse of the performance, likely due to frame overlaps and redundant information.

The configuration labeled “AUF” involves the use of dissimilar frame acquisition alone and achieved a mean Average Precision (mAP) of 22.7, which is an improvement of 21.4 mAP over the “No acquire” setup.

The “AUF+ARC” configuration, which incorporates both dissimilar frame acquisition and rare category acquisition, demonstrated superior performance compared to “AUF”. Specifically, it showed notable improvement in the rare category, with motorcycles achieving an AP of 5.5. Moreover, the overall mAP increased by 3.1 compared to the “AUF” configuration.

D. Efficiency and time cost

Data acquisition not only enhances model performance in the target domain but also reduces the time needed for adaptation. We evaluated the performance speed of MemCLR and our method on the sequential Cityscapes dataset, measuring the average processing time per frame in milliseconds (ms). Our method demonstrated an efficiency of 12.7 ms per frame, compared to MemCLR's 21.3 ms, with both methods tested on RTX 4090 GPU. This is because MemCLR requires both inference and adaptation for each frame, while our method only performs inference and selects key frames, avoiding constant adaptation.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduce an unsupervised data acquisition method in O-SFDA object detection tailored to mobile robots in diverse and dynamic settings. This approach operates in two stages: initially, it selects highly informative frames, and then it gives extra attention to those frames that also include the rare category to reduce class imbalance and frame overlap. Experimental results on multiple datasets show the effectiveness of our method and outperform existing methods in terms of object detection performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. VS, P. Oza, and V. M. Patel, "Towards online domain adaptive object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 478–488.
- [2] Y. Chen, W. Li, C. Sakaridis, D. Dai, and L. Van Gool, "Domain adaptive faster r-cnn for object detection in the wild," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 3339–3348.
- [3] K. Saito, Y. Ushiku, T. Harada, and K. Saenko, "Strong-weak distribution alignment for adaptive object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 6956–6965.
- [4] V. A. Sindagi, P. Oza, R. Yasarla, and V. M. Patel, "Prior-based domain adaptive object detection for hazy and rainy conditions," in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIV 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 763–780.
- [5] G. Eskandar, R. A. Marsden, P. Pandiyan, M. Döbler, K. Guirguis, and B. Yang, "An unsupervised domain adaptive approach for multimodal 2d object detection in adverse weather conditions," in *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 2022, pp. 10 865–10 872.
- [6] S. Yang, Y. Wang, L. Herranz, S. Jui, and J. van de Weijer, "Casting a BAIT for offline and online source-free domain adaptation," *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, vol. 234, p. 103747, 2023.
- [7] S. Suzuki, T. Yamane, N. Makishima, K. Suzuki, A. Ando, and R. Masumura, "Onda-detr: Online domain adaptation for detection transformers with self-training framework," in *International Conference on Image Processing*, 2023, pp. 1780–1785.
- [8] V. VS, D. Poster, S. You, S. Hu, and V. M. Patel, "Meta-uda: Unsupervised domain adaptive thermal object detection using meta-learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 1412–1423.
- [9] T. Kim, M. Jeong, S. Kim, S. Choi, and C. Kim, "Diversify and match: A domain adaptive representation learning paradigm for object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 12 456–12 465.
- [10] A. RoyChowdhury, P. Chakrabarty, A. Singh, S. Jin, H. Jiang, L. Cao, and E. Learned-Miller, "Automatic adaptation of object detectors to new domains using self-training," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 780–790.
- [11] A. Tarvainen and H. Valpola, "Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [12] M. Cordts, M. Omran, S. Ramos, T. Rehfeld, M. Enzweiler, R. Benenson, U. Franke, S. Roth, and B. Schiele, "The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 3213–3223.
- [13] M. Johnson-Roberson, C. Barto, R. Mehta, S. N. Sridhar, K. Rosaen, and R. Vasudevan, "Driving in the matrix: Can virtual worlds replace human-generated annotations for real world tasks?" in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2017, pp. 746–753.
- [14] C. Sakaridis, D. Dai, and L. Van Gool, "Semantic foggy scene understanding with synthetic data," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 126, pp. 973–992, 2018.
- [15] T. Sun, M. Segu, J. Postels, Y. Wang, L. Van Gool, B. Schiele, F. Tombari, and F. Yu, "SHIFT: a synthetic driving dataset for continuous multi-task domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, June 2022, pp. 21 371–21 382.
- [16] Z. Zhengl, Y. Chen, B.-S. Hua, and S.-K. Yeung, "Compuda: Compositional unsupervised domain adaptation for semantic segmentation under adverse conditions," in *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 2023, pp. 7675–7681.
- [17] Y. Li, L. Yuan, and N. Vasconcelos, "Bidirectional learning for domain adaptation of semantic segmentation," in *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019, pp. 6936–6945.
- [18] C.-D. Xu, X.-R. Zhao, X. Jin, and X.-S. Wei, "Exploring categorical regularization for domain adaptive object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 724–11 733.
- [19] X. Zhu, J. Pang, C. Yang, J. Shi, and D. Lin, "Adapting object detectors via selective cross-domain alignment," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 687–696.
- [20] Y. Zhu, P. Guo, H. Wei, X. Zhao, and X. Wu, "Disentangled discriminator for unsupervised domain adaptation on object detection," in *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 2023, pp. 5685–5691.
- [21] Q. Peng, Z. Ding, L. Lyu, L. Sun, and C. Chen, "Toward better target representation for source-free and black-box domain adaptation," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2208.10531, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2208.10531>
- [22] D. Shenaj, E. Fani, M. Toldo, D. Caldarola, A. Tavera, U. Michieli, M. Ciccone, P. Zanuttigh, and B. Caputo, "Learning across domains and devices: Style-driven source-free domain adaptation in clustered federated learning," in *Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 444–454. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/WACV56688.2023.00052>
- [23] V. VS, P. Oza, and V. M. Patel, "Instance relation graph guided source-free domain adaptive object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 3520–3530.
- [24] X. Li, W. Chen, D. Xie, S. Yang, P. Yuan, S. Pu, and Y. Zhuang, "A free lunch for unsupervised domain adaptive object detection without source data," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 10, 2021, pp. 8474–8481.
- [25] J. Huang, D. Guan, A. Xiao, and S. Lu, "Model adaptation: Historical contrastive learning for unsupervised domain adaptation without source data," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, 2021, pp. 3635–3649.
- [26] M. B. Colomer, P. L. Dovesi, T. Panagiotakopoulos, J. F. Carvalho, L. Härenstam-Nielsen, H. Azizpour, H. Kjellström, D. Cremers, and M. Poggi, "To adapt or not to adapt? real-time adaptation for semantic segmentation," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2307.15063, 2023.
- [27] S. Ren, K. He, R. Girshick, and J. Sun, "Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [28] D. Wang, E. Shelhamer, S. Liu, B. Olshausen, and T. Darrell, "Tent: Fully test-time adaptation by entropy minimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

- [29] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [30] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 84–90, 2017.