IDIAP RESEARCH REPORT

# Robust Face Verification using Skin Color and Neural Networks

Sébastien Marcel [a]

IDIAP–RR 02-49

November 2002

SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION

Dalle Molle Institute for Perceptual Artificial Intelligence • P.O.Box 592 • Martigny • Valais • Switzerland

phone +41 – 27 – 721 77 11
fax +41 – 27 – 721 77 12
e-mail secretariat@idiap.ch
internet http://www.idiap.ch

[a] Dalle Molle Institute for Perceptual Artificial Intelligence (IDIAP)

IDIAP Research Report 02-49

# Robust Face Verification using Skin Color and Neural Networks

Sébastien Marcel

November 2002

submitted for publication

**Abstract.** The performance of face verification systems has steadily improved over the last few years. State-of-the-art methods often use the gray-scale face image as input. In this paper, we use an additional feature to the face image: the skin color. The feature set is tested on a benchmark database, namely XM2VTS, using a simple discriminant artificial neural network. Results show that the proposed model achieves robust state-of-the-art results.

# 1 Introduction

Identity verification is a general task that has many real-life applications such as access control, transaction authentication (in telephone banking or remote credit card purchases for instance), voice mail, or secure teleworking.

The goal of an *automatic identity verification system* is to either accept or reject the identity claim made by a given person. Biometric identity verification systems are based on the characteristics of a person, such as its face, fingerprint or signature. A good introduction to identity verification can be found in [11]. Identity verification using face information is a challenging research area that was very active recently, mainly because of its natural and non-intrusive interaction with the authentication system.

In this paper, we use skin color information in addition to the gray-level face image in order to train face verification systems using artificial neural networks. In the next section, we first introduce the reader to the problem of identity verification, based on face image (face verification). We present the model and the feature set used. We then compare our approach to state-of-the-results on the well-known benchmark database XM2VTS using its associated Lausanne protocol. Finally, we analyze the results and conclude.

# 2 Face Verification

An identity verification system has to deal with two kinds of events: either the person claiming a given identity is the one who he claims to be (in which case, he is called a *client*), or he is not (in which case, he is called an *impostor*). Moreover, the system may generally take two decisions: either *accept* the *client* or *reject* him and decide he is an *impostor*.

The classical face verification process can be decomposed into several steps, namely *image acquisition* (grab the images, from a camera or a VCR, in color or gray levels), *image processing* (apply filtering algorithms in order to enhance important features and to reduce the noise), *face detection* (detect and localize an eventual face in a given image) and finally *face verification* itself, which consists in verifying if the given face corresponds to the claimed identity of the client.

In this paper, we assume (as it is often done in comparable studies, but nonetheless incorrectly) that the detection step has been performed perfectly and we thus concentrate on the last step, namely the face verification step. A good survey on the different methods used in face verification can be found in [2, 13].

# 3 The Proposed Approach

In face verification, we are interested in particular objects, namely faces. The representation used to code input images in most state-of-the-art methods are often based on gray-scale face image. In this paper, we use an additional feature to the face image: the skin color.

## 3.1 The Face Image as a Feature

In a real application, the face bounding box will be provided by an accurate face detector [10, 3], but here the bounding box is computed using manually located eyes coordinates, assuming a perfect face detection.

The face is cropped and the extracted sub-image is downsized to a 30x40 image. After enhancement and smoothing, the face image becomes a feature vector of dimension 1200. It is then possible to use this feature vector as the input of a face verification system (Fig. 1). The objective of image enhancement is to modify the contrast of the image in order to enhance important features. On the other hand, smoothing is a simple algorithm which reduces the noise in the image (after image enhancement for example) by applying a Gaussian to the whole image.

### 3.2 The Skin Color as a Feature

Skin color has already been used successfully for face detection [3]. Also, it has been used recently to improve face verification [8]. In the present study, we use this new feature set and evaluate it on a benchmark database according to a strict protocol.

Skin color pixels are filtered, from the sub-image corresponding to the extracted face, using a look-up table of skin color pixels. The weak point of this method is the color similarity of hair pixels and skin pixels. For better results, the face bounding box should thus avoid as much hair as possible.

As often done in skin color analysis studies [12], we compute the histogram of R, G and B pixel components for different face images. Such histograms are characteristic for a specific person, but are also discriminant among different persons.

Hence, we propose to use this characteristic information for a face verification system. In realistic situations, the use of normalized chrominance spaces (r-g) would yield more robust results. However, as a first valid attempt, the skin color feature for face verification is chosen to be simply the RGB color distribution of filtered pixels inside the face bounding box. Furthermore, images used in this study were recorded in controlled environment (blue background) with constant lighting conditions. Thus, we are not facing the problem of color identification under changes in illumination.

For each color channel, an histogram is built using 32 discrete bins. Hence, the feature vector produced by the concatenation of the 3 histograms (R, G and B) has 96 components (Fig. 1).

### 3.3 The Model: a Discriminant Neural Network

The problem of face verification has been addressed by different researchers and with different methods. The aim of this section is not to propose a new model for face verification, but to present the model used to evaluate the new feature set.

Our face verification method is based on Multi-Layer Perceptrons (MLPs) [1, 4]. For each client, an MLP is trained to classify an input to be either the given client or not. The input of the MLP is a feature vector corresponding to the face image with or without its skin color. The output of the MLP is either 1 (if the input corresponds to a client) or -1 (if the input corresponds to an impostor). The MLP is trained using both client images and impostor images, often taken to be the images corresponding to other available clients. In the present study, we used the other 199 clients of the XM2VTS database (see next section).

Finally, the decision to accept or reject a client access depends on the score obtained by the corresponding MLP which could be either above (accept) or under (reject) a given threshold, chosen on a separate validation set to optimize a given criterion.




Figure 1: An MLP for face verification using the image of the face and its skin color

# 4 Experimental Results

In this section, we present experimental[1] results obtained by an MLP trained with the additional skin color information. These experiments have been done using the multi-modal XM2VTS database and its associated experimental protocol, the **Lausanne Protocol** (LP) [7].

## 4.1 The Database and the Protocol

The XM2VTS database contains synchronized image and speech data recorded on 295 subjects during four sessions taken at one month intervals. On each session, two recordings were made, each consisting of a speech shot and a head rotation shot.

The database was divided into three sets: a training set, an evaluation set, and a test set. The training set was used to build client models, while the evaluation set was used to compute the decision (by estimating thresholds for instance, or parameters of a fusion algorithm). Finally, the test set was used only to estimate the performance of the two different features.

The 295 subjects were divided into a set of 200 clients, 25 evaluation impostors, and 70 test impostors. Two different evaluation configurations were defined. They differ in the distribution of client training and client evaluation data. Both the training client and evaluation client data were drawn from the same recording sessions for Configuration I (LP1) which might lead to biased estimation on the evaluation set and hence poor performance on the test set. For Configuration II (LP2) on the other hand, the evaluation client and test client sets are drawn from different recording sessions which might lead to more realistic results. This led to the following statistics:

- Training client accesses: 3 for LP1 and 4 for LP2
- Evaluation client accesses: 600 for LP1 and 400 for LP2
- Evaluation impostor accesses: $40,000$ (25 * 8 * 200)
- Test client accesses: 400 (200 * 2)
- Test impostor accesses: $112,000$ (70 * 8 * 200)

Thus, the system may make two types of errors: *false acceptances* (FA), when the system accepts an *impostor*, and *false rejections* (FR), when the system rejects a *client*. In order to be independent on the specific dataset distribution, the performance of the system is often measured in terms of these two different errors, as follows:

$$\mathrm{FAR} = \frac{\text{number of FAs}}{\text{number of impostor accesses}} , \tag{1}$$

$$\mathrm{FRR} = \frac{\text{number of FRs}}{\text{number of client accesses}} . \tag{2}$$

A unique measure often used combines these two ratios into the so-called *Half Total Error Rate* (HTER) as follows:

$$\mathrm{HTER} = \frac{\mathrm{FAR} + \mathrm{FRR}}{2} . \tag{3}$$

Most verification systems output a score for each access. Selecting a threshold over which scores are considered genuine clients instead of impostors can greatly modify the relative performance of FAR and FRR. A typical threshold chosen is the one that reaches the *Equal Error Rate* (EER) where FAR=FRR on a separate validation set.

[1] The machine learning library used for all experiments is Torch http://www.torch.ch.

### 4.2 Experimental Comparison to State-of-the-art

We have trained an MLP (using face image and skin color) for each client using all the XM2VTS training set on both configurations.

For each client model, the training database is composed of a client training set (3 images for LP1, 4 images for LP2) and an impostor training set. As often done in comparable studies, the client training set is enlarged by shifting (8 directions and 4 pixel shifts), scaling (2 scales) and mirroring the original face bounding box.

Hence, the client training set contains 990 patterns ($3 * P$) for LP1 and 1320 patterns ($4 * P$) for LP2. The extended number of pattern $P$ is computed such that $P = 2 * A * B$, i.e. the mirrored number of shifted and scaled face patterns. $A$ = number of shifts $* 8 + 1$ is the total number of shifts, in 8 directions, including the original frame, for each scale. $B$ = number of scales $* 2 + 1$ is the total number of scales, in 2 directions (sub-scaling and over-scaling), including the original scale. On the other hand, the impostor training set contains 1194 patterns for LP1 and 1592 patterns for LP2 (the mirrored 4 original patterns of each of the 199 other clients).

The chosen MLP architecture was selected by cross-validation and is also the one selected in [8]: an MLP with 90 hidden units. Then, all training sets are used to train the 200 MLPs (one for each client).

The trained model is used on the LP evaluation set to evaluate the global threshold that optimized the EER. This threshold is then used with the same trained model on the LP test set to compute the HTER.

Results are shown for both configurations in Figures 2 and 3. In these figures, the corresponding table provides the FAR, FRR and HTER on the test set. The HTER is lower than **1.9** on both configurations.

| Model | FAR | FRR | HTER |
|---|---|---|---|
| NC | 3.46 | 2.75 | 3.1 |
| MLP | 1.75 | 2.00 | **1.87** |




Figure 2: Comparative results (left) and DET curves (right) on the configuration 1 of NC and the proposed MLP using the image of the face and its skin color.

These results are competitive when compared to recent results published on the same database and the same protocol. In [9] for instance, the best face HTER (with global thresholds) was obtained using Normalized Correlation (NC) [6] and 61x57 face images from all the XM2VTS training set, i.e images 3 times bigger than proposed in this paper. Our MLP yields better results than NC on LP1 and slightly worse results on LP2. However, the proposed model is robust over both configurations and achieves state-of-the-art average results: 1.86 HTER for the MLP versus 2.3 HTER for NC.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed to use the skin color information in addition to the face image and a simple discriminant Neural Network to improve face verification systems. Experimental comparisons have been carried out using the XM2VTS benchmark database. Results have shown that the proposed model is robust in all configurations and achieves state-of-the-art results.

More recently, using a special combination algorithm, ECOC [5], normally designed for robust multi-class classification tasks, researchers were able to obtain an HTER as low as 0.80 on the face

| Model | FAR | FRR | HTER |
|---|---|---|---|
| NC | 1.26 | 1.75 | **1.50** |
| MLP | 1.46 | 2.25 | 1.85 |




Figure 3: Comparative results (left) and DET curves (right) on the configuration 2 of NC and the proposed MLP using the image of the face and its skin color.

verification task using configuration I of XM2VTS and only a 28x28 face image, but no comparable results were published for configuration II. The use of such a model with the feature proposed in this paper should probably lead to further performance improvements.

**Acknowledgments** The author want to thank the Swiss National Science Foundation for supporting this work through the National Center of Competence in Research (NCCR) on "Interactive Multimodal Information Management (IM2)". This work was also funded by the European project "CIMWOS", through the Swiss Federal Office for Education and Science (OFES).

# References

[1] C. Bishop. *Neural Networks for Pattern Recognition.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.

[2] R. Chellappa, C.L Wilson, and C.S Barnes. Human and machine recognition of faces: A survey. Technical Report CAR-TR-731, University of Maryland, 1994.

[3] Raphaël Féraud, Olivier Bernier, Jean-Emmanuel Viallet, and Michel Collobert. A fast and accurate face detector based on neural networks. *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 23(1), 2001.

[4] S. Haykin. *Neural Networks, a Comprehensive Foundation, second edition.* Prentice Hall, 1999.

[5] J. Kittler J, R. Ghaderi, T. Windeatt, and G. Matas. Face verification via ECOC. In *British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC01)*, pages 593–602, 2001.

[6] Y. Li, J. Kittler, and J. Matas. On matching scores of LDA-based face verification. In T. Pridmore and D. Elliman, editors, *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference BMVC2000.* British Machine Vision Association, 2000.

[7] J. Lüttin and G. Maître. Evaluation protocol for the extended M2VTS database (XM2VTSDB). Technical Report RR-21, IDIAP, 1998.

[8] S. Marcel and S. Bengio. Improving face verification using skin color information. In *Proceedings of the 16th ICPR (to appear).* IEEE Computer Society Press, 2002.

[9] J. Matas, M. Hamouz, K. Jonsson, J. Kittler, Y. Li, C. Kotropoulos, A. Tefas, I. Pitas, T. Tan, H. Yan, F. Smeraldi, J. Bigun, N. Capdevielle, W. Gerstner, S. Ben-Yacoub, Y. Abdeljaoued, and E. Mayoraz. Comparison of face verification results on the XM2VTS database. In A. Sanfeliu, J. J. Villanueva, M. Vanrell, R. Alqueraz, J. Crowley, and Y. Shirai, editors, *Proceedings of the 15th ICPR*, volume 4, pages 858–863. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2000.

[10] Henry A. Rowley, Shumeet Baluja, and Takeo Kanade. Neural network-based face detection. *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 20(1), 1998.

[11] P. Verlinde, G. Chollet, and M. Acheroy. Multi-modal identity verification using expert fusion. *Information Fusion*, 1:17–33, 2000.

[12] Jie Yang, Weier Lu, and Alex Waibel. Skin color modeling and adaptation. In *Proceedings of the $3^{rd}$ Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, volume 2, pages 687–694, 1998.

[13] J. Zhang, Y. Yan, and M. Lades. Face recognition: Eigenfaces, elastic matching, and neural nets. In *Proceedings of IEEE*, volume 85, pages 1422–1435, 1997.