

Probabilistic Sampling	Soft Weighting	mAP@.25	mAP@.5
–	–	37.4	13.2
✓	–	50.0	24.8

Table 1. R1-N557/Q2: No probabilistic sampling or soft weighting. Follow-up comparison in Tab.3 of our main paper.

Method	mAP@.25	mAP@.5
Photometric Loss	56.1	30.0
Ours	56.2	31.3

Table 2. R1-N557/Q3: Compare with photometric loss on ScanNet.

M	Gaussian Splatting	mAP@.25	mAP@.5
8	–	53.8	28.2
12	–	56.0	29.7
16	–	55.8	31.1

Table 3. R1-N557/Q4: Performance with different number of planes on ScanNet.

Method	mAP@.25	mAP@.5
GS=5	56.2	31.7
Ours	56.2	31.3

Table 4. R1-N557/Q5: Performance under more views on ScanNet.

Method	mAP@.25	mAP@.5
No offset	55.3	29.6
Ours	56.0	29.7

Table 5. R2-YYFF/Q1: Removing offset in Tab.3 of main paper.

method	mAP@.25	mAP@.5
GT Depth	57.2	31.9
Ours	56.2	31.3

Table 6. R2-YYFF/Q2: Supervising model with ground-truth depth on ScanNet dataset. ‘GT Depth’ denotes the using ground-truth depth to supervise model instead of Gaussian Splatting.

Method	Train		Test	
	Time(hrs)	Memory(GB)	Time(min)	Memory(GB)
CN-RMA	121	43	10	12
Ours	18	35	3	28
NeRF-Det	7	13	2	12

Table 7. R3-ZuP3/Q4: Time and memory comparison in training and testing stages on ScanNet dataset, respectively.