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Fig. 1. Unlike current face reenactment approaches that only modify the expression of a target actor in a video, our novel deep video portrait approach enables full control over the target by transferring the rigid head pose, facial expression and eye motion with a high level of photorealism.

We present a novel approach that enables photo-realistic re-animation of portrait videos using only an input video. In contrast to existing approaches that are restricted to manipulations of facial expressions only, we are the first to transfer the full 3D head position, head rotation, face expression, eye gaze, and eye blinking from a source actor to a portrait video of a target actor. The core of our approach is a generative neural network with a novel space-time architecture. The network takes as input synthetic renderings of a parametric face model, based on which it predicts photo-realistic video frames for a given target actor. The realism in this rendering-to-video transfer is achieved by careful adversarial training, and as a result, we can create modified target videos that mimic the behavior of the synthetically-created input. In order to enable source-to-target video re-animation, we render a synthetic target video with the reconstructed head animation parameters from a source video, and feed it into the trained network – thus taking full control of the target. With the ability to freely recombine source and target parameters, we are able to demonstrate a large variety of video rewrite applications without explicitly modeling hair, body or background. For instance, we can reenact the full head using interactive user-controlled editing, and realize high-fidelity visual dubbing. To demonstrate the high quality of our output, we conduct an extensive series of experiments and evaluations, where for instance a user study shows that our video edits are hard to detect.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Synthesizing and editing video portraits, i.e., videos framed to show a person’s head and upper body, is an important problem in computer graphics, with applications in video editing and movie post-production, visual effects, visual dubbing, virtual reality, and tele-presence, among others. In this paper, we address the problem of synthesizing a photo-realistic video portrait of a target actor that mimics the actions of a source actor, where source and target can be different subjects. More specifically, our approach enables a source actor to take full control of the rigid head pose, face expressions and...
eye motion of the target actor; even face identity can be modified to some extent. All of these dimensions can be manipulated together or independently. Full target frames, including the entire head and hair, but also a realistic upper body and scene background complying with the modified head, are automatically synthesized.

Recently, many methods have been proposed for face-interior reenactment [Liu et al. 2001; Olszewski et al. 2017; Suwajanakorn et al. 2017; Thies et al. 2015, 2016; Vlasic et al. 2005]. Here, only the face expression can be modified realistically, but not the full 3D head pose, including a consistent upper body and a consistently changing background. Many of these methods fit a parametric 3D face model to RGB(D) video [Thies et al. 2015, 2016; Vlasic et al. 2005], and re-render the modified model as a blended overlay over the target video for reenactment, even in real time [Thies et al. 2015, 2016]. Synthesizing a complete portrait video under full 3D head control is much more challenging. Averbuch-Elor et al. [2017] enable mild head pose changes driven by a source actor based on image warping. They generate reactive dynamic profile pictures from a static target portrait photo, but not fully reenacted videos. Also, large changes in head pose cause artifacts (see Section 7.3), the target gaze cannot be controlled, and the identity of the target person is not fully preserved (mouth appearance is copied from the source actor).

Performance-driven 3D head animation methods [Cao et al. 2015, 2014a, 2016; Hu et al. 2017; Ichim et al. 2015; Li et al. 2015; Olszewski et al. 2016; Weise et al. 2011] are related to our work, but have orthogonal methodology and application goals. They typically drive the full head pose of stylized 3D CG avatars based on visual source actor input, e.g., for games or stylized VR environments. Recently, Cao et al. [2016] proposed image-based 3D avatars with dynamic textures based on a real-time face tracker. However, their goal is full 3D animated head control and rendering, often intentionally in a stylized rather than a photo-realistic fashion.

We take a different approach that directly generates entire photo-realistic video portraits in front of general static backgrounds under full control of a target’s head pose, facial expression, and eye motion. We formulate video portrait synthesis and reenactment as a rendering-to-video translation task. Input to our algorithm are synthetic renderings of only the coarse and fully-controllable 3D face interior model of a target actor and separately rendered eye gaze images, which can be robustly and efficiently obtained via a state-of-the-art model-based reconstruction technique. The input is automatically translated into full-frame photo-realistic video output showing the entire upper body and background. Since we only track the face, we cannot actively control the motion of the torso or hair, or control the background, but our rendering-to-video translation network is able to implicitly synthesize a plausible body and background (including some shadows and reflections) for a given head pose. This translation problem is tackled using a novel space-time encoder–decoder deep neural network, which is trained in an adversarial manner.

At the core of our approach is a conditional generative adversarial network (cGAN) [Isola et al. 2017], which is specifically tailored to video portrait synthesis. For temporal stability, we use a novel space-time network architecture that takes as input short sequences of conditioning input frames of head and eye gaze in a sliding window manner to synthesize each target video frame. Our target and scene-specific networks only require a few minutes of portrait video footage of a person for training. To the best of our knowledge, our approach is the first to synthesize full photo-realistic video portraits of a target person’s upper body, including realistic clothing and hair, and consistent scene background, under full 3D control of the target’s head. To summarize, we make the following technical contributions:

- A rendering-to-video translation network that transforms coarse face model renderings into full photo-realistic portrait video output.
- A novel space-time encoding as conditional input for temporally coherent video synthesis that represents face geometry, reflectance, and motion as well as eye gaze and eye blinks.
- A comprehensive evaluation on several applications to demonstrate the flexibility and effectiveness of our approach.

We demonstrate the potential and high quality of our method in many intriguing applications, ranging from face reenactment and visual dubbing for foreign language movies to user-guided interactive editing of portrait videos for movie postproduction. A comprehensive comparison to state-of-the-art methods and a user study confirm the high fidelity of our results.

2 RELATED WORK

We discuss related optimization and learning-based methods that aim at reconstructing, animating and re-writing faces in images and videos, and review relevant image-to-image translation work. For a comprehensive overview of current methods we refer to a recent state-of-the-art report on monocular 3D face reconstruction, tracking and applications [Zollhöfer et al. 2018].

**Monocular Face Reconstruction.** Face reconstruction methods aim to reconstruct 3D face models of shape and appearance from visual data. Optimization-based methods fit a 3D template model, mainly the inner face region, to single images [Blanz and Vetter 1999], unstructured image collections [Kemelmacher-Shlizerman 2013; Kemelmacher-Shlizerman et al. 2011; Roth et al. 2017] or video [Cao et al. 2014b; Fyffe et al. 2014; Garrido et al. 2016; Ichim et al. 2015; Shi et al. 2014; Suwajanakorn et al. 2014; Thies et al. 2016; Wu et al. 2016]. Recently, Booth et al. [2018] proposed a large-scale parametric face model constructed from almost ten thousand 3D scans. Learning-based approaches leverage a large corpus of images or image patches to learn a regressor for predicting either 3D face shape and appearance [Richardson et al. 2016; Tewari et al. 2017; Tran et al. 2017], fine-scale skin details [Cao et al. 2015], or both [Richardson et al. 2017; Sela et al. 2017]. Deep neural networks have been shown to be quite robust for inferring the coarse 3D facial shape and appearance of the inner face region, even when trained on synthetic data [Richardson et al. 2016]. Tewari et al. [2017] showed that encoder–decoder architectures can be trained fully unsupervised in on-the-wild images by integrating physical image formation into the network. Richardson et al. [2017] trained an end-to-end regressor to recover facial geometry at a coarse and fine-scale level. Sela et al. [2017] use an encoder–decoder network to infer a detailed depth image and a dense correspondence map, which serve as a basis for non-rigidly deforming a template mesh.
Still, none of these methods creates a fully generative model for the entire head, hair, mouth interior, and eye gaze, like we do.

**Video-based Facial Reenactment.** Facial reenactment methods rewrite the face content of a target actor in a video or image by transferring facial expressions from a source actor. Facial expressions are commonly transferred via dense motion fields [Averbuch-Elor et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2001; Suwajanakorn et al. 2015], parameters [Thies et al. 2016, 2018; Vlasic et al. 2005], or by warping candidate frames that are selected based on the facial motion [Dale et al. 2011], appearance metrics [Kemelmacher-Shlizerman et al. 2010] or both [Garrido et al. 2014; Li et al. 2014]. The methods described above first reconstruct and track the source and target faces, which are represented as a set of sparse 2D landmarks or dense 3D models. Most approaches only modify the inner region of the face and thus are mainly intended for altering facial expressions, but they do not take full control of a video portrait in terms of rigid head pose, facial expression, and eye gaze. Recently, Wood et al. [2018] proposed an approach for eye gaze redirection based on a fitted parametric eye model. Their approach only provides control over the eye region.

One notable exception to pure facial reenactment is Averbuch-Elor et al.’s approach [2017], which enables the reenactment of a portrait image and allows for slight changes in head pose via image warping [Fried et al. 2016]. Since this approach is based on a single target image, it copies the mouth interior from the source to the target, thus preserving the target’s identity only partially. We take advantage of learning from a target video to allow for larger changes in head pose, facial reenactment, and joint control of the eye gaze.

**Visual Dubbing.** Visual dubbing is a particular instance of face reenactment that aims to alter the mouth motion of the target actor to match a new audio track, commonly spoken in a foreign language by a dubbing actor. Here, we can find speech-driven [Bregler et al. 1997; Chang and Ezzat 2005; Ezzat et al. 2002; Liu and Ostermann 2011; Suwajanakorn et al. 2017] or performance-driven [Garrido et al. 2015; Thies et al. 2016] techniques. Speech-driven dubbing techniques learn a person-specific phoneme-to-viseme mapping from a training sequence of the actor. These methods produce accurate lip sync with visually imperceptible artifacts, as recently demonstrated by Suwajanakorn et al. [2017]. However, they cannot directly control the target’s facial expressions. Performance-driven techniques overcome this limitation by transferring semantically-meaningful motion parameters and re-rendering the target model with photo-realistic reflectance [Thies et al. 2016], and fine-scale details [Garrido et al. 2015, 2016]. These approaches generalize better, but do not edit the head pose and still struggle to synthesize photo-realistic mouth deformations. In contrast, our approach learns to synthesize photo-realistic facial motion and actions from coarse renderings, thus enabling the synthesis of expressions and joint modification of the head pose, with consistent body and background.

**Image-to-image Translation.** Approaches using conditional GANs [Mirza and Osindero 2014], such as Isola et al.’s “pix2pix” [2017], have shown impressive results on image-to-image translation tasks which convert between images of two different domains, such as maps and satellite photos. These combine encoder–decoder architectures [Hinton and Salakhutdinov 2006], often with skip-connections [Ronneberger et al. 2015], with adversarial loss functions [Goodfellow et al. 2014; Radford et al. 2016]. Chen and Koltun [2017] were the first to demonstrate high-resolution results with 2 megapixel resolution, using cascaded refinement networks without adversarial training. The latest trends show that it is even possible to train high-resolution GANs [Karras et al. 2018] and conditional GANs [Wang et al. 2018] at similar resolutions. However, the main challenge is the requirement for paired training data, as corresponding image pairs are often not available. This problem is tackled by CycleGAN [Zhu et al. 2017], DualGAN [Yi et al. 2017], and UNIT [Liu et al. 2017] – multiple concurrent unsupervised image-to-image translation techniques that only require two sets of unpaired training samples. These techniques have captured the imagination of many people by translating between photographs and paintings, horses and zebras, face photos and depth as well as correspondence maps [Sela et al. 2017], and translation from face photos to cartoon drawings [Taigman et al. 2017]. Ganin et al. [2016] learn photo-realistic gaze manipulation in images. Olszewski et al. [2017] synthesize a realistic inner face texture, but cannot generate a fully controllable

---

Fig. 2. Deep video portraits enable a source actor to fully control a target video portrait. First, a low-dimensional parametric representation (left) of both videos is obtained using monocular face reconstruction. The head pose, expression and eye gaze can now be transferred in parameter space (middle). We do not focus on the modification of the identity and scene illumination (hatched background), since we are interested in reenactment. Finally, we render conditioning input images that are converted to a photo-realistic video portrait of the target actor (right). Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain).
output video, including person-specific hair. Lassner et al. [2017] propose a generative model to synthesize people in clothing, and Ma et al. [2017] generate new images of persons in arbitrary poses using image-to-image translation. In contrast, our approach enables the synthesis of temporally-coherent video portraits that follow the animation of a source actor in terms of head pose, facial expression and eye gaze.

3 OVERVIEW

Our deep video portraits approach provides full control of the head of a target actor by transferring the rigid head pose, facial expression, and eye motion of a source actor, while preserving the target’s identity and appearance. Full target video frames are synthesized, including consistent upper body posture, hair and background. First, we track the source and target actor using a state-of-the-art monocular face reconstruction approach that uses a parametric face and illumination model (see Section 4). The resulting sequence of low-dimensional parameter vectors represents the actor’s identity, head pose, expression, eye gaze, and the scene lighting for every video frame (Figure 2, left). This allows us to transfer the head pose, expression, and/or eye gaze parameters from the source to the target, as desired. In the next step (Figure 2, middle), we generate new synthetic renderings of the target actor based on the modified parameters (see Section 5). In addition to a normal color rendering, we also render correspondence maps and eye gaze images. These renderings serve as conditioning input to our novel rendering-to-video translation network (see Section 6), which is trained to convert the synthetic input into photo-realistic output (see Figure 2, right). For temporally coherent results, our network works on space-time volumes of conditioning inputs. To process a complete video, we input the conditioning space-time volumes in a sliding window fashion, and assemble the final video from the output frames. We evaluate our approach (see Section 7) and show its potential on several video rewrite applications, such as full-head reenactment, gaze redirection, video dubbing, and interactive parameter-based video control.

4 MONOCULAR FACE RECONSTRUCTION

We employ a state-of-the-art dense face reconstruction approach that fits a parametric model of face and illumination to each video frame. It obtains a meaningful parametric face representation for the source \( \mathcal{V}_s = \{ I_f^s \mid f = 1, \ldots, N_s \} \) and target \( \mathcal{V}_t = \{ I_f^t \mid f = 1, \ldots, N_t \} \) video sequence, where \( N_s \) and \( N_t \) denote the total number of source and target frames, respectively. Let \( \mathcal{P}^* = \{ \mathcal{P}_f^* \mid f = 1, \ldots, N_f \} \) be the corresponding parameter sequence that fully describes the source or target facial performance. The set of reconstructed parameters encode the rigid head pose (rotation \( R^G \in \text{SO}(3) \) and translation \( t^G \in \mathbb{R}^3 \)), facial identity coefficients \( a^G \in \mathbb{R}^{N_u} \) (geometry, \( N_u = 80 \)) and \( b^G \in \mathbb{R}^{N_b} \) (reflectance, \( N_b = 80 \)), expression coefficients \( \delta^G \in \mathbb{R}^{N_s} \) (\( N_s = 64 \)), gaze direction for both eyes \( e^* \in \mathbb{R}^4 \), and spherical harmonics illumination coefficients \( y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{2^7} \). Overall, our monocular face tracker reconstructs \( N_f = 261 \) parameters per video frame. In the following, we provide more details on the face tracking algorithm as well as the parametric face representation.

**Parametric Face Representation.** We represent the space of facial identity based on a parametric head model [Blanz and Vetter 1999], and the space of facial expressions via an affine model. Mathematically, we model geometry variation through an affine model \( v \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} \) that stacks per-vertex deformations of the underlying template mesh with \( N \) vertices, as follows:

\[
v(\alpha, \delta) = a_{geo} + \sum_{k=1}^{N_u} \alpha_k b^geo_k + \sum_{k=1}^{N_b} \delta_k b^exp_k.
\]

Diffuse skin reflectance is modeled similarly by a second affine model \( r \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} \) that stacks the diffuse per-vertex albedo:

\[
r(\beta) = a_{ref} + \sum_{k=1}^{N_f} \beta_k b^ref_k.
\]

The vectors \( a_{geo} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} \) and \( a_{ref} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} \) store the average facial geometry and corresponding skin reflectance, respectively. The geometry basis \( \{ b^geo_k \}_{k=1}^{N_u} \) has been computed by applying principal component analysis (PCA) to 200 high-quality face scans [Blanz and Vetter 1999]. The reflectance basis \( \{ b^ref_k \}_{k=1}^{N_f} \) has been obtained in the same manner. For dimensionality reduction, the expression \( \{ b^exp_k \}_{k=1}^{N_b} \) has been computed using PCA, starting from the blendshapes of Alexander et al. [2010] and Caor et al. [2014b]. Their blendshapes have been transferred to the topology of Blanz and Vetter [1999] using deformation transfer [Sumner and Popovic 2004].

**Image Formation Model.** To render synthetic head images, we assume a full perspective camera that maps model-space 3D points \( v \) via camera space \( \hat{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) to 2D points \( p = \Pi(\hat{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) on the image plane. The perspective mapping \( \Pi \) contains the multiplication with the camera intrinsics and the perspective division. We assume a fixed and identical camera for all scenes, i.e., world and camera space are the same, and the face model accounts for all the scene motion. Based on a distant illumination assumption, we use the spherical harmonics (SH) basis functions \( B_k : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) to approximate the incoming radiance \( B \) from the environment:

\[
B(r_i, n_i, p) = r_i \cdot \sum_{b=1}^{B^2} y_b B_b(n_i).
\]

Here, \( B \) is the number of spherical harmonics bands, \( y_b \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) are the SH coefficients, and \( r_i \) and \( n_i \) are the reflectance and unit normal vector of the \( i \)-th vertex, respectively. For diffuse materials, an average approximation error below 1 percent is achieved with only \( B = 3 \) bands, independent of the illumination [Ramamoorthi and Hanrahan 2001], since the incident radiance is in general a smooth function. This results in \( B^2 = 9 \) parameters per color channel.

**Dense Face Reconstruction.** We employ a dense data-parallel face reconstruction approach to efficiently compute the parameters \( \mathcal{P}^* \) for both source and target videos. Face reconstruction is based on an analysis-by-synthesis approach that maximizes photo-consistency between a synthetic rendering of the model and the input. The reconstruction energy combines terms for dense photo-consistency, landmark alignment and statistical regularization:

\[
E(X) = w_{photo} E_{photo}(X) + w_{land} E_{land}(X) + w_{reg} E_{reg}(X),
\]
with $X = \{R^*, t^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*, \delta^*, \gamma^*\}$. This enables the robust reconstruction of identity (geometry and skin reflectance), facial expression, and scene illumination. We use 66 automatically detected facial landmarks of the True Vision Solution tracker\(^1\), which is a commercial implementation of Saragih et al. [2011], to define the sparse alignment term $E_{\text{land}}$. Similar to Thies et al. [2016], we use a robust $\ell_1$-norm for dense photometric alignment $E_{\text{photo}}$. The regularizer $E_{\text{reg}}$ enforces statistically plausible parameter values based on the assumption of normally distributed data. The eye gaze estimate $e^*$ is directly obtained from the landmark tracker. The identity is only estimated in the first frame and is kept constant afterwards. All other parameters are estimated every frame. For more details on the energy formulation, we refer to Garrido et al. [2016] and Thies et al. [2016]. We use a data-parallel implementation of iteratively re-weighted least squares (IRLS), similar to Thies et al. [2016], to find the optimal set of parameters. One difference to their work is that we compute and explicitly store the Jacobian $J$ and the residual vector $F$ to global memory based on a data-parallel strategy that launches one thread per matrix/vector element. Afterwards, a data-parallel matrix/matrix/matrix/vector multiplication computes the right- and left-hand side of the normal equations that have to be solved in each IRLS step. The resulting small linear system $\begin{pmatrix} 97 \times 97 \end{pmatrix}$ in tracking mode, $6$ DoF rigid pose, $64$ expression parameters and $27$ SH coefficients) is solved on the GPU using Cholesky factorization in each IRLS step. The reconstruction of a single frame takes $670$ ms (all parameters) and $250$ ms (without identity, tracking mode). This allows the efficient generation of the training corpus that is required by our space-time rendering-to-video translation network (see Section 6). Contrary to Garrido et al. [2016] and Thies et al. [2016], our model features dimensions to model eyelid closure, so eyelid motion is captured well.

5 SYNTHETIC CONDITIONING INPUT

Using the method from Section 4, we reconstruct the face in each frame of the source and unmodified target video. Next, we obtain the modified parameter vector for every frame of the target sequence, e.g., for full-head reenactment, we modify the rigid head pose, expression and eye gaze of the target actor. All parameters are copied in a relative manner from the source to the target, i.e., with respect to a neutral reference frame. Then we render synthetic conditioning images of the target actor’s face model under the modified parameters using hardware rasterization. For higher temporal coherence, our rendering-to-video translation network takes a space-time volume of conditioning images $\{C_f \mid \phi = 0, \ldots, 10\}$ as input, with $f$ being the index of the current frame. We use a temporal window of size $N_w = 11$, with the current frame being at its end. This provides the network a history of the earlier motions.

For each frame $C_f \mid \phi$ of the window, we generate three different conditioning inputs: a color rendering, a correspondence image, and an eye gaze image (see Figure 3). The color rendering shows the modified target actor model under the estimated target illumination, while keeping the target identity (geometry and skin reflectance) fixed. This image provides a good starting point for the following rendering-to-video translation, since in the face region only the
delta to a real image has to be learned. In addition to this color input, we also provide a correspondence image encoding the index of the parametric face model’s vertex that projects into each pixel. To this end, we texture the head model with a constant unique gradient texture map, and render it. Finally, we also provide an eye gaze image that solely contains the white region of both eyes and the locations of the pupils as blue circles. This image provides information about the eye gaze direction and blinking to the network.

We stack all $N_w$ conditioning inputs of a time window in a 3D tensor $X$ of size $W \times H \times 9N_w$ (3 images, with 3 channels each), to obtain the input to our rendering-to-video translation network. To process the complete video, we feed the conditioning space-time volumes in a sliding window fashion. The final generated photo-realistic video output is assembled directly from the output frames.

6 RENDERING-TO-VIDEO TRANSLATION

The generated conditioning space-time video tensors are the input to our rendering-to-video translation network. The network learns to convert the synthetic input into full frames of a photo-realistic target video, in which the target actor now mimics the head motion, facial expression and eye gaze of the synthetic input. The network learns to synthesize the entire actor in the foreground, i.e., the face for which conditioning input exists, but also all other parts of the actor, such as hair and body, so that they comply with the target head pose. It also synthesizes the appropriately modified and filled-in background, including even some consistent lighting effects between foreground and background. The network is trained for a specific target actor and a specific static, but otherwise general scene background. Our rendering-to-video translation network follows an encoder–decoder architecture and is trained in an adversarial manner based on a discriminator that is jointly trained. In the following, we explain the network architectures, the used loss functions and the training procedure in detail.

Network Architecture. We show the architecture of our rendering-to-video translation network in Figure 4. Our conditional generative adversarial network consists of a space-time transformation network $T$ and a discriminator $D$. The transformation network $T$ takes the $W \times H \times 9N_w$ space-time tensor $X$ as input and outputs a photo-real image $\hat{Y}(X)$ of the target actor. The temporal input enables the network to take the history of motions into account by inspecting previous conditioning images. The temporal axis of the input tensor is aligned along the network channels, i.e., the convolutions in the first layer have $9N_w$ channels. Note, we store all image data in normalized $[-1, +1]$-space, i.e, black is mapped to $[−1, −1, −1]^T$ and white is mapped to $[+1, +1, +1]^T$.

\(^1\)http://truevisionsolutions.net

![Diffuse Rendering](Image 318x669 to 380x713)

![Correspondence](Image 382x669 to 444x713)

![Eye and Gaze Map](Image 446x669 to 559x713)

Fig. 3. The synthetic input used for conditioning our rendering-to-video translation network: (1) colored face rendering under target illumination, (2) correspondence image, and (3) the eye gaze image.
Our network consists of two main parts, an encoder for computing a low-dimensional latent representation, and a decoder for synthesizing the output image. We employ skip connections [Ronneberger et al. 2015] to enable the network to transfer fine-scale structure. To generate video frames with sufficient resolution, our network also employs a cascaded refinement strategy [Chen and Koltun 2017]. In each downsampling step, we use a convolution (4 × 4, stride 2) followed by batch normalization and a leaky ReLU non-linearity. The upsampling module is specifically designed to produce high-quality output, and has the following structure: first, the resolution is increased by a factor of two based on deconvolution (4 × 4, upsampling factor of 2), batch normalization, dropout and ReLU. Afterwards, two refinement steps based on convolution (3 × 3, stride 1, stays on the same resolution) and ReLU are applied. The final hyperbolic tangent non-linearity (TanH) brings the output tensor to the normalized [−1, +1]-space used for storing the image data. For more details, please refer to Figure 4.

The input to our discriminator D is the conditioning input tensor X (size $W \times H \times 9N_w$), and either the predicted output image T(X) or the ground-truth image, both of size $W \times H \times 3$. The employed discriminator is inspired by the PatchGAN classifier, proposed by Isola et al. [2017]. We extended it to take volumes of conditioning images as input.

**Objective Function.** We train in an adversarial manner to find the best rendering-to-video translation network:

$$T^* = \arg\min_T \max_D E_{\text{GAN}}(T, D) + \lambda E_{\ell_1}(T).$$

This objective function comprises an adversarial loss $E_{\text{GAN}}(T, D)$ and an $\ell_1$-norm reproduction loss $E_{\ell_1}(T)$. The constant weight of $\lambda = 100$ balances the contribution of these two terms. The adversarial loss has the following form:

$$E_{\text{GAN}}(T, D) = \mathbb{E}_{X, Y} [\log D(X, Y)] + \mathbb{E}_{X} [\log (1 - D(X, T(X)))] .$$

We do not inject a noise vector while training our network to produce deterministic outputs. During adversarial training, the discriminator D tries to get better at classifying given images as real or synthetic, while the transformation network T tries to improve in fooling the discriminator. The $\ell_1$-norm loss penalizes the distance between the synthesized image T(X) and the ground-truth image Y, which encourages the sharpness of the synthesized output:

$$E_{\ell_1}(T) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [ \| Y - T(X) \|_1 ] .$$

**Training.** We construct the training corpus $T = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}$ based on the tracked video frames of the target video sequence. Typically, two thousand video frames, i.e., about one minute of video footage, are sufficient to train our network (see Section 7). Our training corpus consists of $N_t - (N_w - 1)$ rendered conditioning space-time volumes $X_i$ and the corresponding ground-truth image $Y_i$ (using a window size of $N_w = 11$). We train our networks using the TensorFlow [Abadi et al. 2015] deep learning framework. The gradients for back-propagation are obtained using Adam [Kingma and Ba 2015]. We train for 31,000 iterations with a batch size of 16 (approx. 250 epochs for a training corpus of 2000 frames) using a base learning rate of 0.0002 and first momentum of 0.5; all other parameters have their default value. We train our networks from scratch, and initialize the weights based on a Normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.2)$.

### 7 RESULTS

Our approach enables full-frame target video portrait synthesis under full 3D head pose control. We measured the runtime for training and testing on an Intel Xeon E5-2637 with 3.5 GHz (16 GB RAM) and an NVIDIA GeForce GTX Titan Xp (12 GB RAM). Training our network takes 10 hours for a target video resolution of 256 × 256 pixels, and 42 hours for 512 × 512 pixels. Tracking the source actor takes 250 ms per frame (without identity), and the rendering-to-video conversion (inference) takes 65 ms per frame for 256 × 256 pixels, or 196 ms for 512 × 512 pixels.

In the following, we evaluate the design choices of our deep video portrait algorithm, compare to current state-of-the-art reenactment approaches, and show the results of a large-scale web-based user study. We further demonstrate the potential of our approach on several video rewrite applications, such as reenactment under full head and facial expression control, facial expression reenactment only, video dubbing, and live video portrait editing under user control. In total, we applied our approach to 14 different target sequences of 13 different subjects and used 5 different source sequences; see Appendix A for details. A comparison to a simple nearest-neighbor retrieval approach can be found in Figure 6 and in the supplemental video. Our approach requires only a few minutes of target video footage for training.

#### 7.1 Applications

Our approach enables us to take full control of the rigid head pose, facial expression, and eye motion of a target actor in a video portrait, thus opening up a wide range of video rewrite applications. All parameter dimensions can be estimated and transferred from a source video sequence or edited manually through an interactive user interface.
Fig. 5. Qualitative results of full-head reenactment: our approach enables full-frame target video portrait synthesis under full 3D head pose control. The output video portraits are photo-realistic and hard to distinguish from real videos. Note that even the shadow in the background of the second row moves consistently with the modified foreground head motion. In the sequence at the top, we only transfer the translation in the camera plane, while we transfer the full 3D translation for the sequence at the bottom. For full sequences, please refer to our video. *Obama* video courtesy of the White House (public domain).

Fig. 6. Comparison to a nearest-neighbor approach in parameter space (pose and expression). Our results have higher quality and are temporally more coherent (see supplemental video). For the nearest-neighbor approach, it is difficult to find the right trade-off between pose and expression. This leads to many results with one of the two dimensions not being well-matched. The results are also temporally unstable, since the nearest neighbor abruptly changes, especially for small training sets.

Reenactment under full head control. Our approach is the first that can photo-realistically transfer the full 3D head pose (spatial position and rotation), facial expression, as well as eye gaze and eye blinking of a captured source actor to a target actor video. Figure 5 shows some examples of full-head reenactment between different source and target actors. Here, we use the full target video for training and the source video as the driving sequence. As can be seen, the output of our approach achieves a high level of realism and faithfully mimics the driving sequence, while still retaining the mannerisms of the original target actor. Note that the shadow in the background moves consistently with the position of the actor in the scene, as shown in Figure 5 (second row). We also demonstrate the high quality of our results and evaluate our approach quantitatively in a self-reenactment scenario, see Figure 7. For the quantitative analysis, we use two thirds of the target video for training and one third for testing. We capture the face in the training and driving video with our model-based tracker, and then render the conditioning images, which serve as input to our network for synthesizing the output. For further details, please refer to Section 7.2. Note that the synthesized results are nearly indistinguishable from the ground truth.

Facial Reenactment and Video Dubbing. Besides full-head reenactment, our approach also enables facial reenactment. In this experiment, we replace the expression coefficients of the target actor with those of the source actor before synthesizing the conditioning input to our rendering-to-video translation network. Here, the head pose and position, and eye gaze remain unchanged. Figure 8 shows facial reenactment results. Observe that the face expression in the synthesized target video nicely matches the expression of the source actor in the driving sequence. Please refer to the supplemental video for the complete video sequences.

Our approach can also be applied to visual dubbing. In many countries, foreign-language movies are dubbed, i.e., the original voice of an actor is replaced with that of a dubbing actor speaking in another language. Dubbing often causes visual discomfort due to the discrepancy between the actor’s mouth motion and the new audio track. Even professional dubbing studios achieve only approximate audio alignment at best. Visual dubbing aims at altering the mouth motion of the target actor to match the new foreign-language audio track spoken by the dubber. Figure 9 shows results where we modify the facial motion of actors speaking originally in German to adhere to an English translation spoken by a professional dubbing actor, who was filmed in a dubbing studio [Garrido et al. 2015]. More precisely, we transfer the captured facial expressions...
Fig. 7. Quantitative evaluation of the photometric re-rendering error. We evaluate our approach quantitatively in a self-reenactment setting, where the ground-truth video portrait is known. We train our rendering-to-video translation network on two thirds of the video sequence, and test on the remaining third. The error maps show per-pixel Euclidean distance in RGB (color channels in $[0, 255]$); the mean photometric error of the test set is shown in the top-right. The error is consistently low in regions with conditioning input, with higher errors in regions without conditioning, such as the upper body. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain). Putin video courtesy of the Kremlin (CC BY). May video courtesy of the UK government (Open Government Licence).

Fig. 8. Facial reenactment results of our approach. We transfer the expressions from the source to the target actor, while retaining the head pose (rotation and translation) as well as the eye gaze of the target actor. For the full sequences, please refer to the supplemental video. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain). Putin video courtesy of the Kremlin (CC BY). Reagan video courtesy of the National Archives and Records Administration (public domain).

Fig. 9. Dubbing comparison on two sequences of Garrido et al. [2015]. For visual dubbing, we transfer the facial expressions of the dubbing actor (‘input’) to the target actor. We compare our results to Garrido et al.’s. Our approach obtains higher quality results in terms of the synthesized mouth shape and mouth interior. Note that our approach also enables full-head reenactment in addition to expression transfer. For the full comparison, we refer to the supplemental video.

of the dubbing actor to the target actor, while leaving the original target gaze and eye blinks intact, i.e., we use the original eye gaze images of the tracked target sequence as conditioning. As can be seen, our approach achieves dubbing results of high quality. In fact, we produce images with more realistic mouth interior and more emotional content in the mouth region. Please see the supplemental video for full video results.

Interactive Editing of Video Portraits. We built an interactive editor that enables users to reanimate video portraits with live feedback by modifying the parameters of the coarse face model rendered into the conditioning images (see our live demo in the supplemental video). Figure 10 shows a few static snapshots that were taken while the users were playing with our editor. Our approach enables changes of all parameter dimensions, either independently or all together, as shown in Figure 10. More specifically, we show independent changes of the expression, head rotation, head translation, and eye gaze (including eye blinks). Please note the realistic and consistent generation of the torso, head and background. Even shadows or reflections appear very consistently in the background. In addition, we show user edits that modify all parameters simultaneously. Our interactive editor runs at approximately 9 fps. While not the focus of this paper, our approach also enables modifications of the geometric facial identity, see Figure 11. These combined modifications show as a proof of concept that our network generalizes beyond the training corpus.

7.2 Quantitative Evaluation

We performed a quantitative evaluation of the re-rendering quality. First, we evaluate our approach in a self-reenactment setting, where the ground-truth video portrait is known. We train our rendering-to-video translation network on the first two thirds of a video sequence and test it on the remaining last third of the video, see Figure 7. The photometric error maps show the per-pixel Euclidean distance in RGB color space, with each channel being in $[0, 255]$. We performed this test for three different videos and the mean photometric errors are 2.88 (Vladimir Putin), 4.76 (Theresa May), and 4.46 (Barack Obama). Our approach obtains consistently low error in regions
Interactive editing. Our approach provides full parametric control over video portraits (by controlling head model parameters in conditioning images). This enables modifications of the rigid head pose (rotation and translation), facial expression and eye motion. All of these dimensions can be manipulated together or independently. We also show these modifications live in the supplemental video. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain).

Identity modification. While not the main focus of our approach, it also enables modification of the facial shape via the geometry shape parameters. This shows that our network picks up the correspondence between the model and the video portrait. Note that the produced outputs are also consistent in regions that are not constrained by the conditioning input, such as the hair and background.

Comparison to the image reenactment approach of Averbuch-Elor et al. [2017] in the full-head reenactment scenario. Since their method is based on a single target image, they copy the mouth interior from the source to the target, thus not preserving the target’s identity. Our learning-based approach enables larger modifications of the rigid head pose without apparent artifacts, while their warping-based approach distorts the head and background. In addition, ours enables joint control of the eye gaze and eye blinks. The differences are most evident in the supplemental video. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain).

Comparison to Suwajanakorn et al. [2017]. Their approach produces accurate lip sync with visually imperceptible artifacts, but provides no direct control over facial expressions. Thus, the expressions in the output do not always perfectly match the input (box, mouth), especially for expression changes without audio cue. Our visual dubbing approach accurately transfers the expressions from the source to the target. In addition, our approach provides more control over the target video by also transferring the eye gaze and eye blinks (box, eyes), and the rigid head pose (arrows). Since the source sequence shows more head-pose variation than the target sequence, we scaled the transferred rotation and translation by 0.5 in this experiment. For the full video sequence, we refer to the supplemental video. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain).

We evaluate our space-time conditioning strategy in Figure 16. Without space-time conditioning, the photometric error is significantly higher. The average errors over the complete sequence are 4.9 without vs. 4.5 with temporal conditioning (Barack Obama) and 5.3 without vs. 4.8 with temporal conditioning (Theresa May).
We also evaluate the importance of the training set size. In this experiment, we train our rendering-to-video translation network with 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000 frames of the target sequence, see Figure 15. As can be expected, larger training sets produce better results, and the best results are obtained with the full training set.

We also evaluate different image resolutions by training our rendering-to-video translation network for resolutions of 256, 512, and 1024 pixels. We evaluate the quality in the self-reenactment setting, as shown in Figure 17. Generative networks of higher resolution are harder to train and require significantly longer training times: 10 hours for 256×256, 42 hours for 512×512, and 110 hours for 1024×1024 (on a Titan Xp). Therefore, we use a resolution of 256×256 pixels for most results.

7.3 Comparisons to the State of the Art

We compare our deep video portrait approach to current state-of-the-art video and image reenactment techniques.

Comparison to Thies et al. [2016]. We compare our approach to the state-of-the-art Face2Face facial reenactment method of Thies et al. [2016]. In comparison to Face2Face, our approach achieves expression transfer of similar quality. What distinguishes our approach is the capability for full-head reenactment, i.e., the ability to also transfer the rigid head pose, gaze direction, and eye blinks in addition to the facial expressions, as shown in Figure 14. As can be seen, in our result, the head pose and eye motion nicely matches the source sequence, while the output generated by Face2Face follows the head and eye motion of the original target sequence. Please see the supplemental video for the video result.

Comparison to Suwajanakorn et al. [2017]. We also compare to the audio-based dubbing approach of Suwajanakorn et al. [2017], see Figure 13. Their AudioToObama approach produces accurate lip sync with visually imperceptible artifacts, but provides no direct control over facial expressions. Thus, the expressions in the output do not always perfectly match the input (box, mouth), especially for expression changes without an audio cue. Our visual dubbing approach accurately transfers the expressions from the source to the target. In addition, our approach provides more control over the target video by also transferring the eye gaze and eye blinks (box, eyes) and the general rigid head pose (arrows). While their approach is trained on a huge amount of training data (17 hours), our approach only uses a small training dataset (1.3 minutes). The differences are best visible in the supplemental video.

Comparison to Averbuch-Elor et al. [2017]. We compare our approach in the full-head reenactment scenario to the image reenactment approach of Averbuch-Elor et al. [2017], see Figure 12. Their approach does not preserve the identity of the target actor, since they copy the teeth and mouth interior from the source to the target sequence. Our learning-based approach enables larger modifications of the head pose without apparent artifacts, while their warping-based approach significantly distorts the head and background. In addition, we enable the joint modification of the gaze direction and eye blinks; see supplemental video.

7.4 User Study

We conducted two extensive web-based user studies to quantitatively evaluate the realism of our results. We prepared short 5-second video clips that we extracted from both real and synthesized videos (see Figure 18), to evaluate three applications of our approach: self-reenactment, same-person-reenactment and visual dubbing. We opted for self-reenactment, same-person-reenactment (two speeches of Barack Obama) and visual dubbing to guarantee that the motion types in the evaluated real and synthesized video pairs are matching. This eliminates the motion type as a confounding factor from the statistical analysis, e.g., having unrealistic motions for a public speech in the synthesized videos would negatively bias the outcome of the study. Our evaluation is focused on the visual quality of the synthesized results. Most video clips have a resolution of 256×256 pixels, but some are 512×512 pixels. In our user study, we presented one video clip at a time, and asked participants to respond to the statement "This video clip looks real to me" on a 5-point Likert scale (1—strongly disagree, 2—disagree, 3—don’t know, 4—agree, 5—strongly agree). Video clips are shown in a random order, and each video clip is shown exactly once to assess participants’ first impression. We recruited 135 and 69 anonymous participants for our two studies, largely from North America and Europe.
Fig. 15. Quantitative evaluation of the training set size. We train our rendering-to-video translation network with training corpora of different sizes. The error maps show the per-pixel distance in RGB color space with each channel being in \([0, 255]\); the mean photometric error is shown in the top-right. Smaller training sets have larger photometric errors, especially for regions outside of the face. For the full comparison, we refer to the supplemental video. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain). May video courtesy of the UK government (Open Government Licence).

Fig. 16. Quantitative evaluation of the influence of the proposed space-time conditioning input. The error maps show the per-pixel distance in RGB color space with each channel being in \([0, 255]\); the mean photometric error is shown in the top-right. Without space-time conditioning, the photometric error is higher. Temporal conditioning adds significant temporal stability. This is best seen in the supplemental video. Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain). May video courtesy of the UK government (Open Government Licence).

Fig. 17. Quantitative comparison of different resolutions. We train three rendering-to-video translation networks for resolutions of 256×256, 512×512 and 1024×1024 pixels. The error maps show the per-pixel distance in RGB color space with each channel being in \([0, 255]\); the mean photometric error is shown in the top-right. For the full comparison, see our video. May video courtesy of the UK government (Open Government Licence).

Fig. 18. We performed a user study to evaluate the quality of our results and see if users can distinguish between real (top) and synthesized video clips (bottom). The video clips include self-reenactment, same-person-reenactment, and video dubbing. Putin video courtesy of the Kremlin (CC BY). Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain). Elizabeth II video courtesy of the Governor General of Canada (public domain).

The results in Table 1 show that only 80% of participants rated real 256×256 videos as real, i.e. (strongly) agreeing to the video looking real; it seems that in anticipation of synthetic video clips, participants became overly critical. At the same time, 50% of participants consider our 256×256 results to be real, which increases slightly to 52% for 512×512. Our best result is the self-reenactment of Vladimir Putin at 256×256 resolution, which 65% of participants consider to be real, compared to 78% for the real video. We also evaluated partial and full reenactment by transferring a speech by Barack Obama to another video clip of himself. Table 2 indicates that we achieve better realism ratings with full reenactment comprising facial expressions and pose (50%) compared to transferring only facial expressions (38%). This might be because full-head reenactment keeps expressions and head motion synchronized. Suwajanakorn et al.’s speech-driven reenactment approach [2017] achieves a realism rating of 64% compared to the real source and target video clips, which achieve 70–86%. Our full-head reenactment results are considered to be at least as real as Suwajanakorn et al.’s by 60% of participants. We finally compared our dubbing results to VDub [Garrido et al. 2015] in Table 3. Overall, 57% of participants gave our results a higher realism rating (and 32% gave the same rating). Our results are again considered to be real by 51% of participants, compared to only 21% for VDub.
While we have demonstrated highly realistic reenactment results in a large variety of applications and scenarios, our approach is also subject to a few limitations. Similar to all other learning-based approaches, ours works very well inside the span of the training corpus. Extreme target head poses, such as large rotations, or expressions far outside this span can lead to a degradation of the visual quality of the generated video portrait, see Figure 19 and the supplemental video. Since we only track the face with a parametric model, we cannot actively control the motion of the torso or hair, or control the background. The network learns to extrapolate and finds a plausible and consistent upper body and background (including some shadows and reflections) for a given head pose. This limitation could be overcome by also tracking the body and using the underlying body model to generate an extended set of conditioning images. Currently, we are only able to produce medium-resolution output due to memory and training time limitations. The limited output resolution makes it especially difficult to reproduce fine-scale detail, such as individual teeth, in a temporally coherent manner. Yet, recent progress on high-resolution discriminative adversarial networks [Karras et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2017] is promising and could be leveraged to further increase the resolution of the generated output. On a broader scale, and not being a limitation, democratization of advanced high-quality video editing possibilities, offered by our and other methods, calls for additional care in ensuring verifiable video authenticity, e.g., through invisible watermarking.

### 9 CONCLUSION

We presented a new approach to synthesize entire photo-real video portraits of a target actors in front of general static backgrounds. It is the first to transfer head pose and orientation, face expression, and eye gaze from a source actor to a target actor. The proposed method is based on a novel rendering-to-video translation network that converts a sequence of simple computer graphics renderings into photo-realistic and temporally-coherent video. This mapping is learned based on a novel space-time conditioning volume formulation. We have shown through experiments and a user study that our method outperforms prior work in quality and expands over their possibilities. It thus opens up a new level of capabilities in many applications, like video reenactment for virtual reality and telepresence, interactive video editing, and visual dubbing. We see our approach as a step towards highly realistic synthesis of full-frame video content under control of meaningful parameters. We hope that it will inspire future research in this very challenging field.
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**Table 1.** User study results for self-reenacted videos ($n=69$, mean of 4 clips).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Real videos</th>
<th>Our results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘real’</td>
<td>‘real’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2 8 10 62 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putin</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2 11 10 58 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth II</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2 6 12 59 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2 8 10 60 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** User study results for expression and full head transfer between two videos of Barack Obama compared to the input videos and Suwajanakorn et al.’s approach ($n=135$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 ‘real’</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 ‘real’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source video</td>
<td>0 8 6 43 42</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target video</td>
<td>1 14 14 23</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwajanakorn et al. [2017]</td>
<td>2 20 14 47 17</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression transfer</td>
<td>9 37 17 29 9</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full head transfer</td>
<td>3 31 16 37 13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** User study results for dubbing comparison to VDub ($n=135$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Garrido et al. [2015]</th>
<th>Our results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ‘real’</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ‘real’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingmar (3 clips)</td>
<td>21 36 21 20 2</td>
<td>22% 4 21 25 42 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas (3 clips)</td>
<td>33 36 11 16 4</td>
<td>20% 7 25 17 42 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (6 clips)</td>
<td>27 36 16 8 3</td>
<td>21% 6 23 21 42 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, across all scenarios and both studies, our results are considered to be real by 47% of the participants (1,767 ratings), compared to only 80% for real video clips (1,362 ratings). This suggests that our results already fool about 60% of the participants—a good result given the critical participant pool. However, there is some variation across our results: lower realism ratings were given for well-known personalities like Barack Obama, while higher ratings were given for instance to the unknown dubbing actors.
A Appendix

This appendix describes all the used datasets, see Table 4 (target actors) and Table 5 (source actors).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Video Name</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malou</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>18,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putin</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>4,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth II</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>6,984</td>
<td>30,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Source videos: Name and length of sequences (in frames). Obama video courtesy of the White House (public domain).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obama3</th>
<th>David1</th>
<th>David2</th>
<th>DB5</th>
<th>DB6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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