MM-Mixing: Multi-Modal Mixing Alignment for 3D Understanding

Jiaze Wang^{*1}, Yi Wang^{*2}, Ziyu Guo¹, Renrui Zhang¹, Donghao Zhou¹, Guangyong Chen³, Anfeng Liu², Pheng-Ann Heng¹

¹ The Chinese University of Hong Kong ² Central South Unversity ³ Zhejiang Lab

Abstract

We introduce MM-Mixing, a multi-modal mixing alignment framework for 3D understanding. MM-Mixing applies mixing-based methods to multi-modal data, preserving and optimizing cross-modal connections while enhancing diversity and improving alignment across modalities. Our proposed two-stage training pipeline combines feature-level and input-level mixing to optimize the 3D encoder. The first stage employs feature-level mixing with contrastive learning to align 3D features with their corresponding modalities. The second stage incorporates both feature-level and input-level mixing, introducing mixed point cloud inputs to further refine 3D feature representations. MM-Mixing enhances intermodality relationships, promotes generalization, and ensures feature consistency while providing diverse and realistic training samples. We demonstrate that MM-Mixing significantly improves baseline performance across various learning scenarios, including zero-shot 3D classification, linear probing 3D classification, and cross-modal 3D shape retrieval. Notably, we improved the zero-shot classification accuracy on ScanObjectNN from 51.3% to 61.9%, and on Objaverse-LVIS from 46.8% to 51.4%. Our findings highlight the potential of multi-modal mixing-based alignment to significantly advance 3D object recognition and understanding while remaining straightforward to implement and integrate into existing frameworks.

Introduction

In the field of 3D vision, integrating multiple data modalities such as text, images, and point clouds has shown great potential for enhancing object recognition and scene understanding. This multi-modal approach is vital for applications in mixed reality (Dargan et al. 2023; Mendoza-Ramírez et al. 2023), autonomous navigation (Chen et al. 2020a; Tan, Robertson, and Czerwinski 2001) and 3D scene understanding (Armeni et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2021; Vu et al. 2022), where accurate 3D perception is crucial. Recent advancements in multi-modal learning have underscored their capability in this domain, with notable contributions from seminal works like PointCLIP (Zhang et al. 2022d; Zhu et al. 2023), CLIP² (Zeng et al. 2023), ULIP (Xue et al. 2023a,b), OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024), and TAMM (Zhang, Cao, and Wang 2024). These studies have demonstrated the effective-



Figure 1: **Performance comparison with previous meth-ods**. MM-Mixing achieves better performance than previous pre-training methods across various datasets with the same backbone Point-BERT. "ModelNet40-ShapeNet" represents the model is pretrained on ShapeNet and evaluated on Mod-elNet40, similarly for other dataset combinations.

ness of leveraging text, images, and point clouds to improve 3D object recognition and understanding.

However, a significant challenge remains in effectively aligning and utilizing these heterogeneous data sources to optimize model performance. With recent advancements in 3D vision, there's a growing emphasis on multi-modal learning approaches. These frameworks are becoming increasingly crucial, especially when it comes to processing and learning from multi-modal data, which integrates textual information, 2D images, and 3D point cloud data. Despite the success of these approaches, there is a notable gap in the literature regarding multi-modal data augmentation. The cohesive augmentation of triplets has the potential to unlock further performance improvements by enriching the diversity of data and promoting better alignment across modalities. This presents a promising avenue for research to explore comprehensively the benefits of multi-modal learning frameworks.

In previous studies, many mixing-based data augmentation methods have been proposed for point cloud (Kim et al. 2021; Rao et al. 2021; Lee et al. 2022). Mixing-based methods like PointCutMix (Zhang et al. 2022b) and Point-Mixup (Chen et al. 2020b) enhance training data diversity

^{*}These authors contributed equally.

through techniques such as region splicing and feature interpolation. By introducing controlled perturbations and heterogeneity into the training process, these approaches enable models to learn invariant and discriminative features, thereby improving their robustness and generalization to diverse and unseen data distributions (Umam et al. 2022; Kim et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2024).

However, the potential of mixing-based methods in multimodal scenarios remains largely unexplored. Integrating mixing-based techniques with multi-modal alignment could enhance multi-modal learning by generating diverse feature spaces, fostering robust cross-modal correspondences, and revealing invariant features across modalities. This leads to an important question: *Can we design a simple yet effective framework that improves alignment quality and stability while enhancing model generalization through augmented, coherent multi-modal representations*?

To address this issue, we introduce MM-Mixing, a multi-modal approach for 3D understanding that integrates mixing-based methods with multi-modal triplet data. Our two-stage training pipeline combines feature-level and input-level mixing to optimize the 3D encoder, enhancing intermodality relationships and promoting generalization. In the first stage, MM-Mixing leverages feature-level mixing and contrastive learning to align mixed 3D features with their corresponding modalities. This mixing-based alignment strategy fosters consistency across different modalities and significantly enhances the 3D encoder's cross-modal understanding. Specifically, by aligning point cloud mixed features with text mixed features, we capture semantic information that provides a contextual understanding of the 3D shapes. Additionally, aligning point cloud mixed features with image mixed features bolsters the capture of intricate visual details and spatial relationships. This dual alignment of mixed features not only ensures cross-modal consistency but also amplifies the 3D encoder's ability to understand and represent complex, multi-modal data effectively. The second stage incorporates feature-level and input-level mixing, introducing mixed point cloud inputs to refine 3D feature representations further. By aligning mixed point cloud features with feature-level mixed point cloud features, we enhance the network's ability to capture and represent variations and nuances within the data, resulting in more robust and discriminative feature representations. This stage generates diverse and realistic samples that enhance the 3D encoder's ability to generalize across different datasets.

By seamlessly integrating these methods, MM-Mixing significantly boosts the baseline model's performance across various settings, including zero-shot 3D classification, linear probing 3D classification, and cross-modal 3D shape retrieval, while remaining straightforward to implement and integrate into existing 3D understanding frameworks. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce MM-Mixing, a novel multi-modal mixing alignment framework specifically designed for multimodal data, addressing a previously unexplored issue in 3D understanding, which can be easily integrated with existing frameworks.
- · An efficient two-stage framework is proposed that inte-

grates feature-level and input-level augmentation to optimize the 3D encoder, enhance cross-modal relationships, and promote generalization.

 Our MM-Mixing not only strengthens the 3D understanding of models but also significantly enhances cross-dataset generalization, demonstrating exceptional performance in downstream tasks such as zero-shot 3D classification, linear probing 3D classification, and cross-modal retrieval.

Related Works

3D Understanding. Understanding 3D structures is a crucial aspect of computer vision (Peng et al. 2023; Qi et al. 2023; Rozenberszki, Litany, and Dai 2022; Zhang et al. 2022a; Zhang, Dong, and Ma 2023). Recent developments in 3D understanding have largely focused on leveraging advanced representation learning techniques (Abdelreheem et al. 2023; Achituve, Maron, and Chechik 2021; Achlioptas et al. 2018; Aneja et al. 2023; Deng, Birdal, and Ilic 2018; Hess et al. 2023; Guo et al. 2023b). Three primary methodologies have emerged: projecting-based methods where 3D point clouds are projected into various image planes (Su et al. 2015; Kanezaki, Matsushita, and Nishida 2018; Goyal et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2017), voxel-based methods which transform the point clouds with 3D voxelization (Song et al. 2017; Riegler, Osman Ulusoy, and Geiger 2017; Canfes et al. 2023), and direct modeling of 3D point clouds with pointcentric architectures (Qian et al. 2022; Ma et al. 2022). These approaches highlight the use of specialized models like SparseConv (Choy, Gwak, and Savarese 2019) for efficiently handling sparse voxel data, and Transformer-based models (Guo et al. 2023a; Zhang et al. 2023b) such as Point-MAE (Pang et al. 2022), Point-M2AE (Zhang et al. 2022c) and Point-BERT (Yu et al. 2022) for leveraging self-supervised learning paradigms. Moreover, the integration of image-language models like CLIP (Radford et al. 2021) into 3D shape understanding represents a significant trend (Zhang et al. 2022d; Zhu et al. 2023; Zeng et al. 2023; Huang et al. 2023; Liu et al. 2024; Zhang, Cao, and Wang 2024; Chen et al. 2023; Wang, Chen, and Dou 2021; Zhang et al. 2023a; Zhu et al. 2024). Models are trained to align 3D shape embeddings with CLIP's language and/or image embeddings through multimodal contrastive learning (Yuan et al. 2021; Ding et al. 2023; Ha and Song 2022; Hegde, Valanarasu, and Patel 2023; Hong et al. 2022; Huang et al. 2024; Jatavallabhula et al. 2023; Chen et al. 2024; Liang et al. 2022; Liu et al. 2023; Zhang et al. 2023b). This allows for zero-shot 3D classification and improves the robustness of shape representations. Notably, advancements such as ULIP (Xue et al. 2023a,b), I2P-MAE (Zhang et al. 2023b), and OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024) have sought to refine this approach by optimizing the distillation of CLIP features into 3D representations and expanding training datasets for more generalizable learning outcomes.

3D Mixing-based Augmentation. In the realm of 3D mixing-based methods, significant strides have been made to enhance the diversity and quality of augmented point cloud data. Traditional techniques primarily involved simple transformations such as rotation, scaling, and jittering at the point level (Ren, Pan, and Liu 2022; Qi et al. 2017a,b;

Goyal et al. 2021). However, recent innovations have introduced more sophisticated methods that preserve or even enhance the structural integrity of point clouds while introducing variability. For instance, PointAugment (Li et al. 2020) optimizes both enhancer and classifier networks to generate complex samples, while techniques like Mixing-based augmentation (Chen et al. 2020b; Zhang et al. 2022b; Wang et al. 2024; Lee et al. 2021) employ strategies from the 2D domain, such as optimal linear interpolation and rigid transformations, to mix multiple samples effectively. Furthermore, the advent of Transformer-based methods and attention mechanisms in point cloud processing has opened new possibilities for data augmentation. PointWOLF (Kim et al. 2021) introduces multiple weighted local transformations, and PointMixSwap (Umam et al. 2022) utilizes an attentionbased method to swap divisions across point clouds, adding a layer of complexity and diversity. Additionally, with the development of PointPatchMix (Wang et al. 2024), point cloud mixing occurs at the patch level, which can generate more realistic data with the self-attention mechanism.

Method

The overall MM-Mixing pipeline is shown in Figure 2. We first review the problem definition to establish the context of our approach. Then, we introduce our mixing-based alignment strategy specifically designed for point clouds, images, and texts, which enhances the variability and robustness of the training data. Finally, we detail the MM-Mixing framework, demonstrating how our method integrates seamlessly into existing frameworks.

Problem Definition

Given a set of K triplets $\{(P_i, I_i, T_i)\}_{i=1}^K$, where P_i is a 3D point cloud, I_i represents the corresponding image produced by projecting the 3D point cloud P_i into 2D from an arbitrary perspective, and T_i denotes the associated text generated using advanced vision-language models such as BLIP (Li et al. 2022), the objective is to learn high-quality 3D representations from these triplets. Following ULIP (Xue et al. 2023a) and OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024) which leverage the CLIP (Radford et al. 2021) model, we enhance this framework by incorporating mixing-based methods. Specifically, the 3D features of the mixed point cloud $m_i^M = E_P(I_M(P_i, P_j))$ are obtained by passing two point clouds sequentially through the input-level mixing I_M and the 3D encoder E_P . The corresponding mixed features of the point cloud modality $m_i^P = F_M(E_P(P_i), E_P(P_j))$, the mixed features of the image modality $m_i^I = F_M(E_I(I_i), E_I(I_j))$, and the mixed features of the text modality $m_i^T = F_M(E_T(T_i), E_T(T_j))$ are generated by passing the features produced by the trained modality-specific encoders E_P , E_I and E_T through the feature-level mixing F_M , respectively. During the optimization of the 3D encoder E_P , contrastive learning is used to align the 3D features of the mixed point cloud m_i^M with the mixed features of the three modalities m_i^P, m_i^I, m_i^T .

Multi-Modal Mixing

We adopt two kinds of mixing methods for multi-model data, including feature-level mixing and input-level mixing. **Feature-level mixing**. Feature-level mixing augments the features by combining features from two different inputs. This process involves first passing each input through the network independently to extract their respective features. Specifically, the first input is fed into the network, which processes it and extracts its feature vector f_i . Similarly, the second input is also passed through the network, resulting in the extraction of its feature vector f_j . Then the features are combined using a mixing operation to create a new, combined feature vector m_i , which can be expressed as:

$$m_i = \lambda f_i + (1 - \lambda) f_j. \tag{1}$$

Input-level mixing. For input-level mixing, we follow PointCutMix (Zhang et al. 2022b), which generates a new training point cloud \tilde{p} from a pair of point clouds p_1 and p_2 . The combination process of input-level augmentation is defined as follows:

$$M = S \odot P_1 + (1 - S) \odot P_2, \tag{2}$$

$$\lambda = \sum S/N,\tag{3}$$

where M is the mixed point cloud, $S \in \{0,1\}^N$ indicates which sample each point belongs to, \odot represents elementwise multiplication, and λ is sampled from a beta distribution $Beta(\beta,\beta)$. This implies that $\lfloor \lambda N \rfloor$ points are selected from p_1 , and $N - \lfloor \lambda N \rfloor$ points are selected from p_2 .

Feature-level mixing operates on the encoded feature vectors, inducing implicit changes in the high-dimensional space. This allows for efficient data augmentation under cross-modal conditions, ensuring consistency of the augmented features across different modalities. In contrast, input-level augmentation directly manipulates the raw data, generating concrete and intuitive mixed samples. These realistic samples, which are both challenging and diverse, help the model better understand 3D shapes in downstream tasks. MM-Mixing combines these two augmentation strategies, achieving dual enhancement between raw data and latent features, thereby significantly improving the model's generalization ability.

MM-Mixing Framework

MM-Mixing refines feature representations through a combination of contrastive learning and mixing-based augmentation techniques, which improves the encoder's ability to generalize and discriminate between different classes through a two-stage training framework.

As shown in Figure 2, in the first stage, the point cloud Feature Mixing Encoder (FM-Encoder) is trainable, we freeze the image and text Feature Mixing Encoders (FM-Encoders), which are a combination of a single-modal encoder from CLIP (Radford et al. 2021) with a feature mixing module. Initially, point clouds are fed into the trainable point cloud Feature Mixing Encoder (FM-Encoder) to obtain 3D mixed feature embeddings. Concurrently, corresponding images and text and text Feature Mixing Encoders (FM-Encoders) to extract image and text mixed feature embeddings. These extracted 3D, image, and text features are then



Figure 2: **The overall scheme of MM-Mixing.** MM-Mixing consists of two stages. In the first stage, the point cloud FM-Encoder is trainable, while the image and text FM-Encoders are pre-trained and frozen. Feature embeddings are extracted for contrastive learning with the 3D features. In the second stage, we initialize a new trainable 3D encoder. All FM-Encoders remain frozen. Two input point clouds are mixed using FPS and point-level mixing, and then fed into the 3D encoder. Then we adopt contrastive learning to align the features of mixed point clouds with mixed feature representations of all three modalities.

combined to mixed feature triplets. Employing a contrastive learning objective, the mixed 3D features are aligned with the image and text mixed features. This encourages the point cloud Feature Mixing Encoder (FM-Encoder) to learn a feature space that is consistent with the representations of the frozen encoders from other modalities, enhancing its ability to discriminate between different 3D objects. The Stage 1 corresponding contrastive loss L^{S1} is calculated as:

$$F(x,y) = \log \frac{\exp(x \cdot y/\tau)}{\sum_{j} \exp(x_j \cdot y_j/\tau)},$$
(4)

$$L^{S1} = -\frac{1}{4n} \sum_{i} (F(m_{i}^{P}, m_{i}^{I}) + F(m_{i}^{I}, m_{i}^{P}) + F(m_{i}^{P}, m_{i}^{T}) + F(m_{i}^{T}, m_{i}^{P})),$$
(5)

where n is the number of mixed features in a batch, τ is a learnable temperature, and m_j^P, m_j^I, m_j^T denote normalized projected features of the mixed features of point clouds, images, and text respectfully. Because the image encoder and text encoder are frozen, we extract and cache the features before training for acceleration.

In the second stage, We initialize a new trainable 3D encoder. All Feature Mixing Encoders (FM-Encoders) remain frozen in this stage. Then we introduce a mixed point cloud input to further refine the 3D feature representations. Two input point clouds are selected and processed using farthest point sampling (FPS) and point-level mixing to create a novel mixed point cloud. The mixed point cloud is input

to the new trainable 3D encoder to obtain mixed 3D feature embeddings. Simultaneously, the frozen Feature Mixing Encoders (FM-Encoders), are used to extract mixed features from their respective inputs. Using a contrastive learning objective, the 3D features of the mixed point cloud are aligned with the mixed features from the frozen encoders, ensuring that the new 3D encoder learns robust and discriminative mixed feature representations from different modalities. The Stage 2 contrastive loss L^{S2} is calculated as:

$$L^{S2} = -\frac{1}{6n} \sum_{i} (F(m_{i}^{M}, m_{i}^{I}) + F(m_{i}^{I}, m_{i}^{M}) + F(m_{i}^{M}, m_{i}^{T}) + F(m_{i}^{T}, m_{i}^{M}) + F(m_{i}^{M}, m_{i}^{P}) + F(m_{i}^{P}, m_{i}^{M})),$$
(6)

where m_j^M denotes normalized projected features of the mixed point clouds M.

By leveraging these two stages, the MM-Mixing training pipeline fully exploits the complementary advantages of image and text encoders, integrating multi-modal information to develop a 3D encoder capable of producing highly discriminative features. In the first stage, the point cloudimage-text feature-level mixing ensures the consistency of augmented features across different modalities, facilitating the 3D encoder's cross-modal understanding. The second stage introduces input-level mixing, providing a vast array of complex and realistic samples that enhance the 3D encoder's generalization ability. Under the constraints of contrastive learning, MM-Mixing maintains the consistency between the features of the mixed point clouds and the mixed features of the point clouds.

Experiments

Experimental Setup

Pre-training datasets. In our experimental setup, we utilize datasets following the approach outlined by the state-of-theart OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024). Our model is pre-trained using triplets generated from four key datasets: ShapeNet-Core (Chang et al. 2015), 3D-FUTURE (Fu et al. 2021), ABO (Collins et al. 2022), and Objaverse (Deitke et al. 2023). Specifically, the "ShapeNet" training set is composed entirely of triplets from the ShapeNetCore dataset, which includes 52,470 3D shapes along with their associated images and text descriptions. The comprehensive "Ensembled" dataset includes a total of 875,665 triplets, encompassing data from all four datasets, thereby providing a rich source of varied 3D shapes and their corresponding images and texts. Evaluation datasets. For the evaluation of our model, we use a set of datasets that ensures a thorough assessment across different types of 3D data. The Objaverse-LVIS dataset (Deitke et al. 2023), which is part of our evaluation, contains an extensive variety of categories with 46,832 highquality shapes distributed across 1,156 LVIS (Gupta, Dollar, and Girshick 2019) categories, offering a diverse and challenging environment for testing. Additionally, we include ModelNet40 (Wu et al. 2015) in our evaluation process, a well-known synthetic indoor 3D dataset consisting of 40 categories with a test split of 2,468 shapes. The ScanObjectNN (Uy et al. 2019) dataset, which includes scanned objects from 15 common categories, provides multiple variants such as OBJ-BG, OBJ-ONLY, and PB-T50-RS, each presenting unique challenges (Qi et al. 2023; Wu et al. 2022). Our experiments are conducted across several distinct tasks: zero-shot 3D classification, linear probing 3D classification, and cross-modal 3D shape retrieval to highlight the capabilities and versatility of our model. Further details regarding the implementation specifics for pre-training and evaluation are provided in the Appendix.

Zero-shot 3D Classification

Zero-shot classification refers to the process where a pretrained model is directly employed to classify a target dataset without any supervision or prior knowledge from that specific dataset. This task presents a considerable challenge for the model, requiring it to exhibit robust knowledge generalization, deep understanding of 3D shapes, and efficient cross-modal alignment. We conduct extensive experiments to validate the effectiveness and robustness of our proposed MM-Mixing on three benchmark datasets: Model-Net40, ScanObjectNN, and Objaverse.

As shown in Table 1, MM-Mixing consistently outperforms state-of-the-art methods under the same configurations (e.g., pre-trained datasets, training epochs, 3D backbones) and enhances the performance of various 3D models across all datasets. For instance, when pre-trained on ShapeNet, MM-Mixing boosts the accuracy of Point-BERT from 51.3% to 61.9% on the real-world dataset ScanObjectNN, even surpassing the 52.2% achieved by OpenShape pre-training on the Ensembled dataset. It indicates that MM-Mixing makes full use of limited multi-modal data to improve the model's understanding of 3D shapes and shows strong performance in handling complex noise interference.

Moreover, on the challenging long-tail dataset, Objaverse, Point-BERT pre-trained with MM-Mixing achieves the accuracy of 51.4%, outperforming OpenShape's 46.8%. Another 3D backbone, SparseConv, also showed a 2.8% improvement in accuracy with our pre-training method. It indicates that existing 3D encoders can be easily incorporated into MM-Mixing framework, leading to a significant enhancement in 3D shape understanding.

When the pre-training data is expanded from ShapeNet to a larger Ensembled dataset, the performance gains from MM-Mixing are slightly diminished. However, it still provides consistent accuracy gains to the models, underscoring the effectiveness of MM-Mixing on large-scale datasets.

Linear Probing 3D Classification

To better adapt the model to the specific classification of downstream tasks, we train a dataset-dependent learnable linear layer to process the 3D features generated by the pretrained model. Since only the linear layer is activated in this process, the training is lightweight.

The linear probing results are illustrated in Table 2. When pre-trained on ShapeNet, MM-Mixing achieves 90.6% accuracy on ModelNet40, outperforming OpenShape by 2.1%. On ScanObjectNN, MM-Mixing shows significant improvements, surpassing OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024) by 5.5%, 6.5% and 9.1% on OBJ-BG, OBJ-ONLY, and PB-T50-RS, respectively. When using the Ensembled dataset for pretraining, MM-Mixing maintains its lead with 91.7% accuracy on ModelNet40 and consistent superiority on ScanObjectNN three subsets, with accuracies of 86.9%, 86.2%, and 79.3% respectively. These findings emphasize that MM-Mixing has learned robust and discriminative 3D feature representations during pre-training, which can be efficiently applied to downstream specific classification tasks through a simple linear layer.

Ablation Study

We systematically study the impact of different components in MM-Mixing on the model's performance, including the mixing level, alignment stage, modality loss function, and training costs analysis. All results are the classification accuracy (%) of SparseConv pre-trained on ShapeNet.

Mixing levels in alignment. We investigate the impact of different mixing levels, including Feature-level Mixing (FM), Input-level Mixing (IM), and their combination (FM+IM). Compared to the baseline without mixing, all three strategies consistently improve the performance across all datasets. In Table 3, Feature-level Mixing (FM) and Input-level Mixing (IM) individually contribute to the performance gains, and their combination (FM+IM) further improves the results. It confirms that the two mixing levels complement each other: Feature-level Mixing (FM) ensures cross-modal consistency in the feature latent space, while Table 1: Zero-shot 3D classification on ModelNet40, ScanObjectNN and Objaverse-LVIS. We report the top-1, top-3 and top-5 classification accuracy (%) for different 3D backbones pre-trained on ShapeNet and Ensembled.

Pre-training	3D	Dre training Mathad	M	odelNet	40	Sca	anObject	NN	Objaverse		
Dataset	Backbone	Pie-training Method	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5
Projected		PointCLIP (Zhang et al. 2022d)	19.3	28.6	34.8	10.5	20.8	30.6	1.9	4.1	5.8
images	-	PointCLIP v2 (Zhu et al. 2023)	63.6	77.9	85.0	42.2	63.3	74.5	4.7	9.5	12.9
		ReCon (Qi et al. 2023)	61.2	73.9	78.1	42.3	62.5	75.6	1.1	2.7	3.7
	Transformer	CG3D (Hegde, Valanarasu, and Patel 2023)	48.7	60.7	66.5	42.5	57.3	60.8	5.0	9.5	11.6
		CLIP2Point (Huang et al. 2023)	49.5	71.3	81.2	25.5	44.6	59.4	2.7	5.8	7.9
		OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024)	72.9	87.2	89.5	52.7	72.7	83.6	11.6	21.8	27.1
ShapeNet	SparseConv	MM-Mixing (Ours)	75.2	88.9	91.9	60.7	79.0	87.3	13.0	23.4	28.6
-		↑ Improve	+2.3	+1.7	+2.4	+8.0	+6.3	+3.7	+1.4	+1.6	+1.5
	Doint BEDT	ULIP (Xue et al. 2023a)	60.4	79.0	84.4	51.5	71.1	80.2	6.2	13.6	17.9
		OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024)	70.3	86.9	91.3	51.3	69.4	78.4	10.8	20.2	25.0
	I UIIII-DEKI	MM-Mixing (Ours)	74.1	88.8	91.6	61.9	83.0	91.8	13.0	22.9	27.9
		↑ Improve	+3.8	+1.9	+0.3	+10.6	+13.6	+13.4	+2.2	+2.7	+2.9
		OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024)	83.4	95.6	97.8	56.7	78.9	88.6	43.4	64.8	72.4
	SparseConv	MM-Mixing (Ours)	86.7	97.7	98.7	58.4	79.5	89.4	46.2	68.2	75.8
Ensembled		↑ Improve	+3.3	+2.1	+0.9	+1.7	+0.6	+0.8	+2.8	+3.4	+3.4
		ULIP (Xue et al. 2023a)	75.1	88.1	93.2	51.6	72.5	82.3	26.8	44.8	52.6
	Doint REPT	OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024)	84.4	96.5	98.0	52.2	79.7	88.7	46.8	69.1	77.0
	I Unit-DEKI	MM-Mixing (Ours)	86.0	96.6	98.4	54.3	79.9	89.1	51.4	73.1	80.1
		↑ Improve	+1.6	+0.1	+0.4	+2.1	+0.2	+0.4	+4.6	+4.0	+3.1

Table 2: Linear probing 3D classification results. We report the classification accuracy (%) of Point-BERT on ModelNet40 and three splits of ScanObjectNN.

Pre-training	Pre-training	M-40	ScanObjectNN					
Dataset	Method		OBJ-BG	OBJ-ONLY	PB-T50-RS			
	ULIP	90.6	75.4	75.4	64.8			
	OpenShape	88.5	77.8	78.5	64.1			
Shapenet	MM-Mixing	90.6	83.3	85.0	73.2			
	↑ Improve	+2.1	+5.5	+6.5	+9.1			
	OpenShape	91.3	85.9	85.4	78.0			
Ensembled	MM-Mixing	91.7	86.9	86.2	79.3			
	↑ Improve	+0.4	+1.0	+0.8	+1.3			

Table 3: Ablation studies on Mixing level in alignment. "FM" represents feature-level mixing. "IM" represents input-level mixing.

Mixing	Model	lNet40	ScanO	bjectNN	Objaverse		
level	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5	
Baseline	72.9	89.5	52.7	83.6	11.6	27.1	
FM	74.1	90.1	56.4	84.7	12.2	27.3	
IM	73.8	90.4	58.9	85.2	12.4	27.5	
FM+IM	75.2	91.9	60.7	87.3	13.0	28.6	

Table 4: **Ablation studies on Alignment stage.** "One stage" represents all learnable networks are trained simultaneously.

Stage	Mode	Net40	ScanO	bjectNN	Obja	verse
	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5
One stage	73.6	90.2	59.5	85.8	12.3	27.7
Two stages	75.2	91.9	60.7	87.3	13.0	28.6

Table 5: Ablation studies on Modality loss function. $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}}$ represents the text loss. $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$ represents the image loss. $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}$ represents the point cloud loss.

C	C	C	Mode	Net40	ScanO	bjectNN	Objaverse		
$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}}$	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$	\mathcal{LP}	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5	
\checkmark			72.6	89.2	58.9	85.4	11.4	24.7	
\checkmark	\checkmark		73.8	90.8	60.7	85.4	12.5	27.9	
\checkmark		\checkmark	73.9	89.7	60.4	85.6	11.7	25.7	
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	75.2	91.9	60.7	87.3	13.0	28.6	

Input-level Mixing (IM) refines the realistic point cloud representation with challenging samples. Together, they enhance the model's ability of 3D understanding.

Alignment stages. As shown in Table 4, we evaluate the effectiveness of our two-stage alignment design. Feature-level Mixing(FM) is first employed to align 3D features with their corresponding modalities. In the second stage, mixed point cloud inputs are introduced to further align the four kinds of mixed features across the three modalities. The other approach is to align the mixed features of two levels simultaneously in one stage. Compared to one-stage alignment, the two-stage alignment method can better utilize diverse mixed samples to enhance cross-modal consistency.

Modality loss functions. Our ablation studies on different modality loss functions are shown in Table 5. The text loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}}$ provides a strong foundation for learning 3D representations with semantic information, while the image loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$ and point cloud loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}$ offer complementary visual and shape information, enhancing the model's performance. The combination of all three modality loss functions consistently achieves the best results across all datasets, demonstrating the effectiveness of our framework.

Training costs analysis. Notably, the epochs of one-stage methods are the same as the two-stage training epochs of MM-Mixing for a fair comparison. Both 3D encoders are trained independently for the duration of one stage without shared weights. The experimental results demonstrate that the performance gains of MM-Mixing primarily stem from our mixing-based alignment framework, and the two-stage training framework further enhances the effectiveness of dual-level mixing. Moreover, for previous methods like OpenShape, adding additional training costs (e.g. training time and training parameters) does not significantly improve the performance of the 3D backbone (See Appendix for more details).

Qualitative Analysis

Hard sample recognition. In real-world scenarios, numerous objects exhibit similar morphological or visual characteristics despite belonging to distinct categories. We designate these challenging instances as "hard samples." There are some such category pairs in ModelNet40, such as: "vase & cup", "table & desk", "TV stand & dresser", and "plant & flower pot". As illustrated in Figure 3, MM-Mixing demonstrates the capability to capture subtle differences between objects that may appear similar but have different categories. For instance, MM-Mixing can distinguish between cups and vases by accurately understanding the correspondence between the appearance and function of the objects. Additionally, it can leverage detailed features (e.g. the presence of a drawer) to prevent misidentifying a table as a desk. It can be confirmed that MM-Mixing enhances model performance in 3D object recognition, particularly in scenarios with confusing samples and noise interference.

Cross-modal 3D shape retrieval. The visualization in Figure 4 illustrates the superior performance of our method, MM-Mixing, compared to OpenShape in various cross-modal retrieval tasks. For PC-to-PC retrieval, MM-Mixing demonstrates a finer capture of shape details, as seen with the more accurate symmetrical guitar shape. In Image-to-PC retrieval, our method excels in preserving color details, which can retrieve more rational and approximate point clouds, such as the cake example. Additionally, in text-to-PC retrieval, MM-Mixing shows enhanced compatibility with complex textual descriptions, accurately reflecting shape, color, and material details, as evidenced by the "single fabric sofa" example. These results highlight MM-Mixing's effectiveness in improving shape fidelity, color accuracy, and textual comprehension in cross-modal retrieval.

Conclusion

In this paper, we propose **MM-Mixing**, a multimodal mixing alignment approach that addresses the challenges of multi-modal alignment and enhances model generation for 3D understanding. By integrating the mixing-based method with multimodal data through a two-stage training pipeline, MM-Mixing enhances the performance and generalization capabilities of the models, which ensures a cohesive enhancement of features from different modalities. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of MM-Mixing, significantly boosting baseline performance across various settings, including zero-shot 3D classification, linear probing 3D classification, and cross-modal 3D shape retrieval. Moreover, MM-Mixing addresses the previously unexplored issue of multimodal mixing alignment, offering a simple yet effective solution that can be easily integrated into existing frameworks. As 3D vision continues to evolve and find applications in various domains, MM-Mixing represents a significant step forward in meeting the challenges of robust and generalizable models. Our methodology will contribute to further advancements in the field, supporting the ongoing evolution of 3D understanding within multimodal learning.

References

Abdelreheem, A.; Skorokhodov, I.; Ovsjanikov, M.; and Wonka, P. 2023. Satr: Zero-shot semantic segmentation of 3d shapes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 15166–15179.

Achituve, I.; Maron, H.; and Chechik, G. 2021. Selfsupervised learning for domain adaptation on point clouds. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, 123–133.

Achlioptas, P.; Diamanti, O.; Mitliagkas, I.; and Guibas, L. 2018. Learning representations and generative models for 3d point clouds. In *International conference on machine learning*, 40–49. PMLR.

Aneja, S.; Thies, J.; Dai, A.; and Nießner, M. 2023. Clipface: Text-guided editing of textured 3d morphable models. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2023 Conference Proceedings*, 1–11.

Armeni, I.; Sener, O.; Zamir, A. R.; Jiang, H.; Brilakis, I.; Fischer, M.; and Savarese, S. 2016. 3d semantic parsing of large-scale indoor spaces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 1534–1543.

Canfes, Z.; Atasoy, M. F.; Dirik, A.; and Yanardag, P. 2023. Text and image guided 3d avatar generation and manipulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 4421–4431.

Chang, A. X.; Funkhouser, T.; Guibas, L.; Hanrahan, P.; Huang, Q.; Li, Z.; Savarese, S.; Savva, M.; Song, S.; Su, H.; et al. 2015. Shapenet: An information-rich 3d model repository. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03012*.

Chen, H.; Wang, J.; Guo, Z.; Li, J.; Zhou, D.; Wu, B.; Guan, C.; Chen, G.; and Heng, P.-A. 2024. SignVTCL: Multi-Modal Continuous Sign Language Recognition Enhanced by Visual-Textual Contrastive Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11847*.

Chen, R.; Liu, Y.; Kong, L.; Zhu, X.; Ma, Y.; Li, Y.; Hou, Y.; Qiao, Y.; and Wang, W. 2023. Clip2scene: Towards labelefficient 3d scene understanding by clip. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 7020–7030.

Chen, S.; Liu, B.; Feng, C.; Vallespi-Gonzalez, C.; and Wellington, C. 2020a. 3d point cloud processing and learning for autonomous driving: Impacting map creation, localization, and perception. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 38(1): 68–86.



Figure 3: Hard sample recognition on ModelNet40. Compared to OpenShape, MM-Mixing enables the model to better capture typical features across different categories and the ability to distinguish hard samples.



Figure 4: Cross-modal 3D shape retrieval on Objaverse. Compared to OpenShape, MM-Mixing enhances the model's understanding of point cloud shapes, image colors, and textual descriptions, effectively improving cross-modal 3D shape retrieval capabilities. PC represents Point Cloud.

Chen, X.; Ma, H.; Wan, J.; Li, B.; and Xia, T. 2017. Multiview 3d object detection network for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1907–1915.

Chen, Y.; Hu, V. T.; Gavves, E.; Mensink, T.; Mettes, P.; Yang, P.; and Snoek, C. G. 2020b. Pointmixup: Augmentation for point clouds. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III 16,* 330–345. Springer.

Choy, C.; Gwak, J.; and Savarese, S. 2019. 4d spatiotemporal convnets: Minkowski convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3075–3084.

Collins, J.; Goel, S.; Deng, K.; Luthra, A.; Xu, L.; Gundogdu, E.; Zhang, X.; Vicente, T. F. Y.; Dideriksen, T.; Arora, H.; et al. 2022. Abo: Dataset and benchmarks for real-world 3d object understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 21126–21136.

Dargan, S.; Bansal, S.; Kumar, M.; Mittal, A.; and Kumar, K. 2023. Augmented reality: A comprehensive review.

Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering, 30(2): 1057–1080.

Deitke, M.; Schwenk, D.; Salvador, J.; Weihs, L.; Michel, O.; VanderBilt, E.; Schmidt, L.; Ehsani, K.; Kembhavi, A.; and Farhadi, A. 2023. Objaverse: A universe of annotated 3d objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 13142–13153.

Deng, H.; Birdal, T.; and Ilic, S. 2018. Ppf-foldnet: Unsupervised learning of rotation invariant 3d local descriptors. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision* (*ECCV*), 602–618.

Ding, R.; Yang, J.; Xue, C.; Zhang, W.; Bai, S.; and Qi, X. 2023. Pla: Language-driven open-vocabulary 3d scene understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 7010–7019.

Fu, H.; Jia, R.; Gao, L.; Gong, M.; Zhao, B.; Maybank, S.; and Tao, D. 2021. 3d-future: 3d furniture shape with texture. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129: 3313–3337.

Goyal, A.; Law, H.; Liu, B.; Newell, A.; and Deng, J. 2021. Revisiting point cloud shape classification with a simple and effective baseline. In International Conference on Machine Learning, 3809–3820. PMLR.

Guo, Z.; Zhang, R.; Qiu, L.; Li, X.; and Heng, P.-A. 2023a. Joint-mae: 2d-3d joint masked autoencoders for 3d point cloud pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.14007*.

Guo, Z.; Zhang, R.; Zhu, X.; Tang, Y.; Ma, X.; Han, J.; Chen, K.; Gao, P.; Li, X.; Li, H.; et al. 2023b. Point-bind & point-llm: Aligning point cloud with multi-modality for 3d understanding, generation, and instruction following. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00615*.

Gupta, A.; Dollar, P.; and Girshick, R. 2019. Lvis: A dataset for large vocabulary instance segmentation. In *Proceedings* of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 5356–5364.

Ha, H.; and Song, S. 2022. Semantic abstraction: Openworld 3d scene understanding from 2d vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11514*.

Hegde, D.; Valanarasu, J. M. J.; and Patel, V. 2023. Clip goes 3d: Leveraging prompt tuning for language grounded 3d recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2028–2038.

Hess, G.; Jaxing, J.; Svensson, E.; Hagerman, D.; Petersson, C.; and Svensson, L. 2023. Masked autoencoder for self-supervised pre-training on lidar point clouds. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, 350–359.

Hong, F.; Zhang, M.; Pan, L.; Cai, Z.; Yang, L.; and Liu, Z. 2022. Avatarclip: Zero-shot text-driven generation and animation of 3d avatars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08535*.

Huang, R.; Pan, X.; Zheng, H.; Jiang, H.; Xie, Z.; Wu, C.; Song, S.; and Huang, G. 2024. Joint representation learning for text and 3D point cloud. *Pattern Recognition*, 147: 110086.

Huang, T.; Dong, B.; Yang, Y.; Huang, X.; Lau, R. W.; Ouyang, W.; and Zuo, W. 2023. Clip2point: Transfer clip to point cloud classification with image-depth pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 22157–22167.

Jatavallabhula, K. M.; Kuwajerwala, A.; Gu, Q.; Omama, M.; Chen, T.; Maalouf, A.; Li, S.; Iyer, G.; Saryazdi, S.; Keetha, N.; et al. 2023. Conceptfusion: Open-set multimodal 3d mapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07241*.

Kanezaki, A.; Matsushita, Y.; and Nishida, Y. 2018. Rotationnet: Joint object categorization and pose estimation using multiviews from unsupervised viewpoints. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 5010–5019.

Kim, S.; Lee, S.; Hwang, D.; Lee, J.; Hwang, S. J.; and Kim, H. J. 2021. Point cloud augmentation with weighted local transformations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 548–557.

Lee, D.; Lee, J.; Lee, J.; Lee, H.; Lee, M.; Woo, S.; and Lee, S. 2021. Regularization strategy for point cloud via rigidly mixed sample. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 15900–15909.

Lee, S.; Jeon, M.; Kim, I.; Xiong, Y.; and Kim, H. J. 2022. Sagemix: Saliency-guided mixup for point clouds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 23580–23592.

Li, J.; Li, D.; Xiong, C.; and Hoi, S. 2022. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified visionlanguage understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, 12888–12900. PMLR.

Li, R.; Li, X.; Heng, P.-A.; and Fu, C.-W. 2020. Pointaugment: an auto-augmentation framework for point cloud classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 6378–6387.

Liang, V. W.; Zhang, Y.; Kwon, Y.; Yeung, S.; and Zou, J. Y. 2022. Mind the gap: Understanding the modality gap in multi-modal contrastive representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 17612–17625.

Liu, M.; Shi, R.; Kuang, K.; Zhu, Y.; Li, X.; Han, S.; Cai, H.; Porikli, F.; and Su, H. 2024. Openshape: Scaling up 3d shape representation towards open-world understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Liu, M.; Zhu, Y.; Cai, H.; Han, S.; Ling, Z.; Porikli, F.; and Su, H. 2023. Partslip: Low-shot part segmentation for 3d point clouds via pretrained image-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 21736–21746.

Liu, Z.; Zhang, Z.; Cao, Y.; Hu, H.; and Tong, X. 2021. Group-free 3d object detection via transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2949–2958.

Loshchilov, I.; and Hutter, F. 2017. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*.

Ma, X.; Qin, C.; You, H.; Ran, H.; and Fu, Y. 2022. Rethinking network design and local geometry in point cloud: A simple residual MLP framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07123*.

Mendoza-Ramírez, C. E.; Tudon-Martinez, J. C.; Félix-Herrán, L. C.; Lozoya-Santos, J. d. J.; and Vargas-Martínez, A. 2023. Augmented reality: survey. *Applied Sciences*, 13(18): 10491.

Pang, Y.; Wang, W.; Tay, F. E.; Liu, W.; Tian, Y.; and Yuan, L. 2022. Masked autoencoders for point cloud self-supervised learning. In *European conference on computer vision*, 604–621. Springer.

Peng, S.; Genova, K.; Jiang, C.; Tagliasacchi, A.; Pollefeys, M.; Funkhouser, T.; et al. 2023. Openscene: 3d scene understanding with open vocabularies. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 815–824.

Qi, C. R.; Su, H.; Mo, K.; and Guibas, L. J. 2017a. Pointnet: Deep learning on point sets for 3d classification and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 652–660.

Qi, C. R.; Yi, L.; Su, H.; and Guibas, L. J. 2017b. Pointnet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30. Qi, Z.; Dong, R.; Fan, G.; Ge, Z.; Zhang, X.; Ma, K.; and Yi, L. 2023. Contrast with reconstruct: Contrastive 3d representation learning guided by generative pretraining. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 28223–28243. PMLR.

Qian, G.; Li, Y.; Peng, H.; Mai, J.; Hammoud, H.; Elhoseiny, M.; and Ghanem, B. 2022. Pointnext: Revisiting pointnet++ with improved training and scaling strategies. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 23192–23204.

Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Hallacy, C.; Ramesh, A.; Goh, G.; Agarwal, S.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Mishkin, P.; Clark, J.; et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, 8748–8763. PMLR.

Rao, Y.; Liu, B.; Wei, Y.; Lu, J.; Hsieh, C.-J.; and Zhou, J. 2021. Randomrooms: Unsupervised pre-training from synthetic shapes and randomized layouts for 3d object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 3283–3292.

Ren, J.; Pan, L.; and Liu, Z. 2022. Benchmarking and analyzing point cloud classification under corruptions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 18559–18575. PMLR.

Riegler, G.; Osman Ulusoy, A.; and Geiger, A. 2017. Octnet: Learning deep 3d representations at high resolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3577–3586.

Rozenberszki, D.; Litany, O.; and Dai, A. 2022. Languagegrounded indoor 3d semantic segmentation in the wild. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 125–141. Springer.

Song, S.; Yu, F.; Zeng, A.; Chang, A. X.; Savva, M.; and Funkhouser, T. 2017. Semantic scene completion from a single depth image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 1746–1754.

Su, H.; Maji, S.; Kalogerakis, E.; and Learned-Miller, E. 2015. Multi-view convolutional neural networks for 3d shape recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 945–953.

Tan, D. S.; Robertson, G. G.; and Czerwinski, M. 2001. Exploring 3D navigation: combining speed-coupled flying with orbiting. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, 418–425.

Umam, A.; Yang, C.-K.; Chuang, Y.-Y.; Chuang, J.-H.; and Lin, Y.-Y. 2022. Point mixswap: Attentional point cloud mixing via swapping matched structural divisions. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 596–611. Springer.

Uy, M. A.; Pham, Q.-H.; Hua, B.-S.; Nguyen, T.; and Yeung, S.-K. 2019. Revisiting point cloud classification: A new benchmark dataset and classification model on real-world data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 1588–1597.

Vu, T.; Kim, K.; Luu, T. M.; Nguyen, T.; and Yoo, C. D. 2022. Softgroup for 3d instance segmentation on point clouds. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2708–2717.

Wang, J.; Chen, K.; and Dou, Q. 2021. Category-level 6d object pose estimation via cascaded relation and recurrent reconstruction networks. In 2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 4807–4814. IEEE.

Wang, Y.; Wang, J.; Li, J.; Zhao, Z.; Chen, G.; Liu, A.; and Heng, P. A. 2024. Pointpatchmix: Point cloud mixing with patch scoring. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

Wu, X.; Lao, Y.; Jiang, L.; Liu, X.; and Zhao, H. 2022. Point transformer v2: Grouped vector attention and partitionbased pooling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 33330–33342.

Wu, Z.; Song, S.; Khosla, A.; Yu, F.; Zhang, L.; Tang, X.; and Xiao, J. 2015. 3d shapenets: A deep representation for volumetric shapes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 1912–1920.

Xue, L.; Gao, M.; Xing, C.; Martín-Martín, R.; Wu, J.; Xiong, C.; Xu, R.; Niebles, J. C.; and Savarese, S. 2023a. Ulip: Learning a unified representation of language, images, and point clouds for 3d understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1179–1189.

Xue, L.; Yu, N.; Zhang, S.; Li, J.; Martín-Martín, R.; Wu, J.; Xiong, C.; Xu, R.; Niebles, J. C.; and Savarese, S. 2023b. Ulip-2: Towards scalable multimodal pre-training for 3d understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08275*.

Yu, X.; Tang, L.; Rao, Y.; Huang, T.; Zhou, J.; and Lu, J. 2022. Point-bert: Pre-training 3d point cloud transformers with masked point modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 19313–19322.

Yuan, X.; Lin, Z.; Kuen, J.; Zhang, J.; Wang, Y.; Maire, M.; Kale, A.; and Faieta, B. 2021. Multimodal contrastive training for visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 6995–7004.

Zeng, Y.; Jiang, C.; Mao, J.; Han, J.; Ye, C.; Huang, Q.; Yeung, D.-Y.; Yang, Z.; Liang, X.; and Xu, H. 2023. Clip2: Contrastive language-image-point pretraining from realworld point cloud data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 15244–15253.

Zhang, H.; Zhang, P.; Hu, X.; Chen, Y.-C.; Li, L.; Dai, X.; Wang, L.; Yuan, L.; Hwang, J.-N.; and Gao, J. 2022a. Glipv2: Unifying localization and vision-language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 36067–36080.

Zhang, J.; Chen, L.; Ouyang, B.; Liu, B.; Zhu, J.; Chen, Y.; Meng, Y.; and Wu, D. 2022b. Pointcutmix: Regularization strategy for point cloud classification. *Neurocomputing*, 505: 58–67.

Zhang, J.; Dong, R.; and Ma, K. 2023. Clip-fo3d: Learning free open-world 3d scene representations from 2d dense clip. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2048–2059.

Zhang, R.; Guo, Z.; Gao, P.; Fang, R.; Zhao, B.; Wang, D.; Qiao, Y.; and Li, H. 2022c. Point-m2ae: multi-scale masked autoencoders for hierarchical point cloud pre-training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27061–27074.

Zhang, R.; Guo, Z.; Zhang, W.; Li, K.; Miao, X.; Cui, B.; Qiao, Y.; Gao, P.; and Li, H. 2022d. Pointclip: Point cloud understanding by clip. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 8552– 8562.

Zhang, R.; Wang, L.; Guo, Z.; Wang, Y.; Gao, P.; Li, H.; and Shi, J. 2023a. Parameter is not all you need: Starting from non-parametric networks for 3d point cloud analysis. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2303.08134.

Zhang, R.; Wang, L.; Qiao, Y.; Gao, P.; and Li, H. 2023b. Learning 3d representations from 2d pre-trained models via image-to-point masked autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 21769–21780.

Zhang, Z.; Cao, S.; and Wang, Y.-X. 2024. TAMM: Tri-Adapter Multi-Modal Learning for 3D Shape Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18490*.

Zhu, X.; Zhang, R.; He, B.; Guo, Z.; Liu, J.; Xiao, H.; Fu, C.; Dong, H.; and Gao, P. 2024. No Time to Train: Empowering Non-Parametric Networks for Few-shot 3D Scene Segmentation. *CVPR 2024 Highlight*.

Zhu, X.; Zhang, R.; He, B.; Guo, Z.; Zeng, Z.; Qin, Z.; Zhang, S.; and Gao, P. 2023. Pointclip v2: Prompting clip and gpt for powerful 3d open-world learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2639–2650.

Appendix

Training Details

Our training setup utilizes four A100 GPUs, with each training batch consisting of 200 examples. In alignment with the methodologies employed by OpenShape (Liu et al. 2024), we enhance the efficiency of our training process by precaching the CLIP (Radford et al. 2021) embeddings for both text and images corresponding to all the shapes. This optimization significantly speeds up the training, enabling the model to converge in approximately 400 A100 GPU hours. We use the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter 2017) and adopt an exponential learning rate schedule and conduct a range test to determine the optimal initial learning rate. Specifically, we set the learning rate at 5e-4 for Point-BERT (Yu et al. 2022) and at 1e-3 for all other models.

Experiment Results

Reviewing pre-training cost. It is generally assumed that a simple two-stage pre-training framework will inherently bring performance gains. In this context, the contribution of the dual-level mixed alignment method might be questioned. To address this, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between training costs and model performance, focusing on pre-trained model parameters and pre-training epoch, as shown in Table 6. Our

Table 6: **The impact of pre-training cost.** We report the classification accuracy (%) of Point-BERT pre-trained on ShapeNet.

Pre-Training	Pre-Training	Pre-Training	Mode	lNet40	ScanO	bjectNN	Obja	verse
Param. (M)	Epoch	Method	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5	Top1	Top5
		OpenShape	72.2	89.1	52.4	82.3	10.8	26.0
	500	MM-Mixing	72.5	91.2	58.3	83.4	11.7	26.7
41.3		↑ Improve	+0.3	+2.1	+5.9	+1.1	+0.9	+0.7
		OpenShape	72.9	89.5	52.7	83.6	11.6	27.1
	1000	MM-Mixing	73.6	90.2	59.5	85.8	12.3	27.7
		↑ Improve	+0.7	+0.7	+6.8	+2.2	+0.7	+0.6
		OpenShape	73.0	89.1	52.6	84.5	11.4	27.2
	500	MM-Mixing	74.4	91.6	60.6	87.0	12.7	28.4
82.6		↑ Improve	+1.4	+2.5	+8.0	+2.5	+1.3	+1.2
-210		OpenShape	73.2	89.4	53.1	83.9	11.8	27.4
	1000	MM-Mixing	75.2	91.9	60.7	87.3	13.0	28.6
		↑ Improve	+2.0	+2.5	+7.6	+3.4	+1.2	+1.2

findings demonstrate that MM-Mixing consistently outperforms OpenShape across all datasets, irrespective of the pretraining configuration. Notably, when pre-training epochs are set to 1000, MM-Mixing achieves superior performance with only 41.3M parameters compared to OpenShape, which requires twice the number of parameters. This suggests that the core of MM-Mixing's enhanced 3D understanding capability lies in its mixed-based alignment method, a feature absent in OpenShape. Furthermore, our results indicate that the two-stage pre-training approach yields more substantial performance gains for MM-Mixing compared to the single-stage framework. This improvement can be attributed to the enhanced consistency of the dual-level mixing process. These findings underscore the significance of our proposed method in advancing 3D understanding capabilities.

Zero-shot 3D classification on ScanObjectNN. To further validate the effectiveness of MM-Mixing in enhancing the generalization ability of 3D representation learning models, we conduct zero-shot classification experiments on the real-world ScanObjectNN (Uy et al. 2019) dataset. As shown in Table 7, MM-Mixing significantly improves the performance of both SparseConv(Xue et al. 2023a) and Point-BERT. For SparseConv, MM-Mixing boosts the average accuracy from 51.4% to 62.0%, achieving an improvement of 10.6 percentage points. Similarly, for Point-BERT, MM-Mixing enhances the average accuracy from 48.5% to 61.6%, resulting in an improvement of 13.1 percentage points.

Notably, MM-Mixing brings improvements in most object categories. For SparseConv, all categories except chair and toilet witness accuracy gains, with the most significant improvements in the display and pillow categories, reaching 25.5 and 29.5 percentage points, respectively. For Point-BERT, all categories except bag experience performance enhancements, with the pillow category showcasing the most remarkable improvement of 53.2 percentage points. However, some categories remain challenging. For instance, the cabinet category exhibits extremely low accuracy (below 5%) in all cases, indicating that this category may be particularly difficult to recognize and require further exploration of alternative strategies to boost its performance. Comparing the two 3D backbones, although Point-BERT initially underperforms SparseConv, MM-Mixing elevates Point-BERT's performance to a level comparable to SparseConv (61.6%

Table 7: Zero-shot 3D classification results by category on real-world ScanObjectNN dataset. We report the classification accuracy(%) of each category and the mean accuracy of all categories.

	Model	Aug	Avg	bag	bin	box	cabinet	chair	desk	display	door	shelf	table	bed	pillow	sink	sofa	toilet
Top1	SparseConv	OpenShape MM-Mixing ↑ <i>improve</i>	51.4 62.0 10.6	58.4 68.8 10.4	20.9 39.8 18.9	11.9 30.8 18.9	0.0 0.6 0.6	90.9 87.1 -3.8	61.1 76.5 15.4	51.9 77.4 25.5	94.1 99.1 5.0	63.7 64.0 0.3	51.4 66.8 15.4	57.0 70.4 13.4	41.0 70.5 29.5	51.7 60.2 8.5	46.0 47.6 1.6	72.0 70.7 -1.3
TopT	Point-BERT	Openshape MM-Mixing <i>↑improve</i>	48.5 61.6 13.1	53.2 53.3 0.1	11.4 32.2 20.8	18.8 43.6 24.8	1.4 4.6 3.2	83.0 92.2 9.2	74.5 81.9 7.4	64.6 76.8 12.2	93.7 97.3 3.6	58.4 76.8 18.4	49.8 51.5 1.7	58.5 72.6 14.1	12.5 65.7 53.2	44.9 48.3 3.4	43.5 59.5 16.0	58.5 67.8 9.3
Top3	SparseConv	Openshape MM-Mixing <i>↑improve</i>	73.9 82.7 8.8	84.4 94.8 10.4	54.7 78.6 23.9	47.8 65.8 <mark>18.0</mark>	9.8 8.9 -0.9	95.2 94.4 -0.8	85.2 89.3 4.1	88.4 99.5 11.1	98.2 100 1.8	85.0 86.1 1.1	87.5 87.1 -0.4	74.0 89.6 15.6	60.0 90.5 30.5	74.6 80.5 5.9	73.6 83.1 9.5	91.5 92.7 1.2
	Point-BERT	Openshape MM-Mixing <i>↑improve</i>	70.1 82.8 12.7	90.9 92.0 1.1	38.3 57.5 19.2	54.7 84.6 29.9	4.0 28.5 24.5	89.3 96.9 7.6	87.9 87.9 <mark>0.0</mark>	98.9 97.2 -1.7	96.8 99.6 2.8	79.4 95.9 16.5	83.8 84.4 <mark>0.6</mark>	73.3 89.6 16.3	36.1 81.9 45.8	70.3 71.6 1.3	67.7 90.5 22.8	80.4 83.5 3.1
Top5	SparseConv	Openshape MM-Mixing ↑ <i>improve</i>	84.9 90.7 5.8	93.5 100.0 6.5	77.6 90.1 12.5	70.9 89.7 <mark>18.8</mark>	32.5 38.6 6.1	97.2 96.0 -1.2	91.9 91.3 - <mark>0.6</mark>	99.3 100.0 0.7	99.5 100.0 <mark>0.5</mark>	92.1 95.1 3.0	94.1 88 -6.1	83.7 97.8 14.1	76.1 98.1 22.0	83.9 86.4 2.5	86.6 90.9 4.3	93.9 98.7 4.8
-spo	Point-BERT	Openshape MM-Mixing <i>↑improve</i>	81.2 91.7 10.5	98.7 98.9 0.2	59.2 77.5 18.3	83.7 97.4 13.7	22.7 60.7 38.0	91.9 98.0 6.1	92.6 92.8 0.2	99.8 100.0 0.2	98.6 100.0 1.4	91.0 99.3 8.3	90 90.8 0.8	80.7 99.3 18.6	55.2 90.5 35.3	83.9 85.1 1.2	83.8 94.5 10.7	86.5 90.5 4.0

Table 8: **The impact of the number of FC layers.** We report the classification accuracy (%) of SparseConv and Point-BERT on ModelNet40 and three splits of ScanObjectNN.

	<i>a</i> 1	,	N. 1 1N. 40		ScanObjectNN					
Pre-training Dataset	method	layers	ModelNet40	OBJ-BG	OBJ-OŇLY	PB-T50_RS				
		1	90.0	83.6	85.9	74.4				
	SparseConv	2	90.3	86.6	87.1	75.5				
ShaneNet		3	90.6	85.9	86.7	75.1				
Shaperver		1	90.6	83.3	85.0	73.2				
	Point-BERT	2	91.1	88.7	88.6	78.6				
		3	92.0	89.3	89.0	78.4				
		1	91.5	86.6	85.6	78.7				
	SparseConv	2	91.7	87.3	86.7	78.9				
Ensembled		3	91.8	88.0	87.3	79.0				
Ensembled		1	91.7	86.9	86.2	79.3				
	Point-BERT	2	92.6	88.2	88.0	81.9				
		3	93.4	90.4	89.3	83.2				

vs. 62.0%). This observation reinforces the notion that it may be particularly well-suited for Transformer-based models like Point-BERT. It is worth noting that MM-Mixing leads to performance degradation in a few categories. For example, in SparseConv, the chair and toilet categories experience a drop of 3.8 and 1.3 percentage points, respectively. This suggests that MM-Mixing may have negative impacts on certain categories, warranting further investigation into the underlying reasons and the development of targeted improvement strategies.

The impact of the number of FC layers. Table 8 provides a comprehensive analysis of the impact of varying the number of fully connected (FC) layers on the performance of linear probing in different pre-training and evaluation scenarios.

When pre-trained on ShapeNet (Chang et al. 2015), the SparseConv model shows a progressive improvement in performance on ModelNet40 (Wu et al. 2015) and ScanObjectNN datasets as the number of FC layers increases from 1 to 3. Specifically, the optimal performance on ModelNet40 (90.6%) and ScanObjectNN subsets (OBJ-BG: 86.6%, OBJ-ONLY: 87.1%, PB-T50_RS: 75.5%) is achieved with two FC layers, indicating that a moderate complexity in the FC layer structure can yield significant gains. For the Point-BERT model pre-trained on ShapeNet, an increase in the number of FC layers consistently enhances performance across all



Figure 5: Hard sample recognition similarity scores on ModelNet40. Compared to OpenShape, MM-Mixing not only provides the correct top categoriy, but also obtains higher similarity scores.

datasets, with the highest accuracy observed at three layers (ModelNet40: 92.0%, OBJ-BG: 89.3%, OBJ-ONLY: 89.0%, PB-T50_RS: 78.4%). This suggests that Point-BERT benefits more substantially from deeper FC layers compared to SparseConv. In the case of the ensembled pre-training dataset, similar trends are observed. The SparseConv model achieves its best performance with three FC layers (ModelNet40: 91.8%, OBJ-BG: 88.0%, OBJ-ONLY: 87.3%, PB-T50_RS: 79.0%), while the Point-BERT model significantly outperforms with three FC layers as well (ModelNet40: 93.4%, OBJ-BG: 90.4%, OBJ-ONLY: 89.3%, PB-T50_RS: 83.2%). The results indicate that ensembling pre-training data and increasing the FC layer depth synergistically enhance the model's ability to generalize and accurately clas-



Figure 6: Point Cloud to 3D Shape Retrieval on Objaverse.



Figure 7: Image to 3D Shape Retrieval on Objaverse.

sify 3D objects.

Overall, our findings underscore the importance of optimizing the FC layer depth in linear probing to achieve superior model performance, with Point-BERT demonstrating a greater propensity for performance improvement with increased layer depth compared to SparseConv.

Hard Sample Recognition

Hard sample recognition qualitative results on the ModelNet40 dataset in Figure 5 clearly demonstrate the superior performance of MM-Mixing compared to the previous method, OpenShape. MM-Mixing consistently achieves higher similarity scores and more accurate top predictions across various categories. For instance, in the case of a "mantel," MM-Mixing correctly identifies it as the top category with a similarity score of 0.1741, while OpenShape incorrectly labels it as a "radio." Similar trends are observed for other categories such as "plant", "night stand", and "dresser", where MM-Mixing not only provides the correct top category but also achieves higher similarity scores, indicating a stronger alignment with the true categories.

These results highlight the robustness and effectiveness of MM-Mixing in accurately classifying point cloud data. Its strong ability to distinguish challenging samples positions it as a more reliable framework for zero-shot 3D classification tasks, unlocking greater potential in practical applications



Figure 8: Text to 3D Shape Retrieval on Objaverse.

that demand precise 3D shape recognition.

Cross-modal Retrieval

Point cloud to 3D shape retrieval. Figure 6 shows the experimental results on the Objaverse dataset for point cloud to 3D shape retrieval. As we can see, MM-Mixing successfully matches the input point clouds to their corresponding 3D shapes with high accuracy in most cases, highlighting its advantage in 3D shape understanding. However, in some complex shapes, such as pianos, there is a slight discrepancy in detail accuracy, indicating that while MM-Mixing excels in overall shape matching, there is room for improvement in handling intricate and detailed structures. Overall, MM-Mixing significantly enhances retrieval accuracy, showcasing its potential in accurate 3D shape recognition.

Image to 3D shape retrieval. Figure 7 shows the experimental results on the Objaverse dataset for image to 3D shape retrieval. The input images, ranging from everyday objects like a donut to more complex items like bicycles and sharks, are effectively represented in the retrieved 3D shapes, which demonstrate the exceptional capability of MM-Mixing in accurately matching 2D images to their 3D counterparts. For instance, the retrieval of the "pink frosted donut with sprinkles" shows meticulous attention to texture and color, which are critical for recognizing food items. Similarly, the retrieval of the "brown boot" captures the detailed design and structure, showcasing our proposed method's proficiency in handling objects with intricate patterns. Therefore, our MM-Mixing effectively bridges the gap between 2D representations and 3D shapes.

Text to 3D shape retrieval. Figure 8 shows the retrieval results on the Objaverse dataset for text to 3D shape retrieval. The retrieved 3D shapes exhibit a high degree of congruence with the given textual descriptions, effectively capturing both the general structure and specific details. For example, the description "wooden four-tier dresser" yields 3D shapes that accurately reflect the specified material and tier structure. Similarly, the "red mushroom with spots" retrieval demonstrates precise adherence to both shape and color details. The retrieval of "table with books and fruit on it" shows MM-Mixing's capability to capture complex arrangements and specific object placements. These text-to-3D shape ex-



Figure 9: Feature distribution visualization on ModelNet40. Top: An overview of the evolution of feature distributions across all 40 classes. Bottom: Detailed depiction of the evolution of feature distributions for select typical classes.

amples demonstrate that MM-Mixing significantly enhances retrieval accuracy, providing robust and detailed matches that affirm its efficacy in multimodal retrieval tasks.

Point Cloud Feature Distribution

Figure 9 illustrates the evolution of high-level feature distributions of the Point-BERT pre-trained on the Ensembled dataset during the training process via t-SNE. In the early stage feature distribution, the feature space is highly scattered with overlapping clusters, indicating that 3D backbone has not yet learned to effectively discriminate between different classes. As the 3D backbone starts to learn more features based on mixing alignment, the transitional feature distribution shows a notable improvement, with clusters becoming more distinct. However, there still remains some inter-class overlap.

In the final feature distribution, the clusters are wellseparated and compact, reflecting a highly discriminative feature space. 3D backbone has successfully learned to distinguish between different classes with a high degree of accuracy. The representative clusters at the bottom of each visualization further emphasize this progression, showing a clear transition from mixed and overlapping clusters in the early stages to well-defined and isolated clusters in the final stage. These visualizations highlight the effectiveness of the MM-Mixing pre-training process, demonstrating a clear trajectory of improvement in feature discrimination, culminating in a robust and well-defined feature space.

Limitations Discussion

While our proposed MM-Mixing method combines inputlevel and feature-level mixing alignment to balance crossmodal consistency and realistic data variation, there are several limitations to consider.

On the one hand, dual-level mixing, despite its benefits in generating realistic variations, demands significant computational resources, which might not be feasible for all applications, especially those with limited hardware capabilities. On the other hand, single-feature-level mixing, while computationally efficient, may introduce abstract changes that are less intuitive and might not always capture the full complexity of the raw data. Secondly, our approach assumes the availability of sufficient and diverse training data, which might not be the case in every scenario. Additionally, as faced by many deep learning works, the pre-training performance is somewhat limited by the setting of hyperparameters, and finding the best value is challenging. Lastly, the integration of multiple datasets, as proposed in Open-Shape, can introduce inconsistencies and require careful pre-processing to ensure data quality and compatibility.

These limitations highlight areas for further research and development to enhance the robustness and applicability of our method.

Potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts

The advancements in triplet generation for point clouds and the integration of multimodal learning frameworks hold significant positive societal impacts. Enhanced 3D data alignment with other modalities can improve various applications, including autonomous driving, medical imaging, and virtual reality. For instance, better 3D shape descriptions can lead to more accurate medical diagnoses and advanced treatment planning. In the realm of education, these technologies can facilitate more immersive and interactive learning experiences.