# Auto Arrangement and Threshold to Database for Face Recognition

Mu Chien Hsu<sup>†</sup> Waseda University<sup>†</sup> Jui Chun Shyur<sup>‡</sup> Compal Electronics<sup>‡</sup>

Hiroshi Watanabe<sup>†</sup> Waseda University<sup>†</sup>

**Abstract**: We are given a real face database for analysis and process to improve the performance of 1:1 recognition (P1) and 1:N identification (P2) face recognition problems[1]. We identified that Euclidian distances among face embeddings are normal distributions. Base on the statistical result, we can simply use normal distribution model to replace clusters of photos, and meanwhile determine a statistically meaningful threshold according to different requirement. We now use normal distribution model to auto-arrange database and auto-determine threshold according to different requirements. Results show that we can achieve equivalent recognition accuracies (P1 AUC = 0.999, P2 top-1 accuracy = 98.88%) with 90 times faster, and the prediction error of P1 true positive rate (TPR) is only 1.14% and P2 false positive rate (FPR) only 0.05% on average in the meaningful threshold range.

## 1 Introduction

The face set ( $\mathscr{F}$ ) is from a real unconstrained environment [2,3] with 1,903 persons, 190,033 images, each person p has 20 ~ 250 faces in a cluster  $C_p$ . For convenience, we use face and face embedding interchangeably. In this section, we will show how normal distributions are observed as insights for auto-arrangement and threshold to take effect. For  $C_p$ , we define:

- $f_{pc}$ : *center face*, the projection from the mean of  $f_{p,i}$  to the hyper sphere surface
- $D_{p,intra} = \{ \| f_{pc} f_{p,i} \|_{2} \}$ : the set of *intra-personal distance*
- $D_{p,extra} = \{ \|f_{pc} f_{q,i}\|_2 \}$  for all  $f_{q,i}$  of  $C_q$ ,  $q \neq p$ : the set of extra-personal distance
- $\epsilon_{p,intra} = \overline{\|f_{pc} f_{p,l}\|_2}$ ,  $\epsilon_{p,extra} = \overline{\|f_{pc} f_{q,l}\|_2}$ : the mean of  $D_{p,intra}$  and  $D_{p,extra}$
- $\sigma_{p,intra}, \sigma_{p,extra}$ : the standard deviation associated with  $\epsilon_{p,intra}$ and  $\epsilon_{p,extra}$

Note that  $D_{p,intra}$  or  $D_{p,extra}$  of different persons have different scale of mean and std, they are normalized to the same base and scale for comparison, i.e., the mean is offset by  $\epsilon_p$  to be 0, and the std divided by  $\sigma_p$ . A few examples of the normalized distance distribution obtained are shown in Fig.1.

We then unite all these normalized  $D_{p,intra}$  and  $D_{p,extra}$  for all persons to obtain global set  $D_{intra}$  and set  $D_{extra}$ . By displaying their distribution in the same figure (Fig.2), we are able to see two perfect normal distributions:

**F1:**  $D_{intra}$  on the left, is a normal distribution where  $(\epsilon_i, \sigma_i) = (0.18, 1.17)$ ,  $\epsilon_i, \sigma_i$  are mean and std associated with  $D_{intra}$ 

F2:  $D_{extra}$  on the right, is a normal distribution where  $(\epsilon_e, \sigma_e) = (10.04, 3.05), \epsilon_e, \sigma_e$  are mean and std associated with  $D_{extra}$ 

From Fig.2, the problem of effective feature representations to reduce intra-personal variations while enlarging inter-personal

differences [4] becomes an easier one by finding ways to push  $D_{intra}$  to the left, and  $D_{extra}$  to the right as far as possible, while keeping the normalization distributions. This can be optimized by our auto-arrangement in the next section. Meanwhile,  $n_1$  in Fig.2 will predict P1 TPR and P2 FPR and form the basis of our auto-threshold process, explained in the next section.



Fig.1 Six normalized ( $\epsilon_p = \theta$ ) personal  $D_{p,intra}$  (left) &  $D_{p,extra}$  (right) examples





## 2 Our Approach

We separate the face set into a test set  $\mathscr{F}_{i}$  by randomly removed  $7 \sim 10$  faces from each  $C_p$  to get  $C'_p$  and use the remaining  $\mathscr{F}_{-} \mathscr{F}_{i}$  for auto-arrangement and auto-threshold. Test set  $\mathscr{F}_{i}$  is used for experimental results.

We want to remove those faces either too far from center, or repeatedly sampled ones, thus to have a distribution moving more to the left side in Fig.2, with smaller std. To achieve this, for each  $C_{p}^{*}$ , we repeatedly calculate  $f_{pc}$ ,  $\epsilon_{p}$ ,  $\sigma_{p}$  and prune those  $f_{p,i}$  with  $\|f_{pc} - f_{p,i}\|_{2} > \epsilon_{p} + 2\sigma_{p}$ . The arranged cluster is then used to obtain the normalized  $D_{p,intra}$  and  $D_{p,extra}$  which completes the auto-arrangement process.

#### A2: Auto-threshold and prediction for P1 TPR and P2 FPR

The procedure "A1" will also results in the global sets  $D_{intra}$  and  $D_{extra}$  as mentioned in Introduction. Referring to Fig.2 which is used to determine P1 personal thresholds and predict P1 TPR by  $\alpha$  and P2 FPR by  $\beta$ , with a given  $n_1$  (number of std), we have  $T_p = \epsilon_p + n_1 \times \sigma_p$  as the personal threshold for every  $C_p$ . Also noted that  $\epsilon_i + n_1 \times \sigma_i = \epsilon_e - n_2 \times \sigma_e$ ,  $n_2$  for P2 can be calculated from  $n_1$ . According to the characteristic of normal distributions,  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  will one-to-one map to  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Thus by choosing  $n_1$ , say in a range from 2.0 to 3.0, we can have  $T_p$  for all persons, and derive the prediction of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . This completes the auto-threshold and  $\alpha$   $\beta$  prediction process.

### 3 Experiment Result

The tests for P1 and P2 for p are performed according to the following criteria:

- 1) **P1** : positive if  $\|f_{pc} f_t\|_2 < t_p$  for  $f_t \in C_p \cap \mathscr{F}_t$
- 2) **P2** : negative: if  $\|f_{pc} f_t\|_2 < t_p$ , for  $f_t \in \mathscr{F}_t C_p$ .
- 3) **P2:** positive, if  $\min_{q} ||f_{pc} f_t||_2 < t_p$ , q = p, that is, the top-1 accuracy, for all  $f_t \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ ,  $f_t$  corresponds to q's embedding.

We feed  $\mathscr{F}_{4}$  for tests of different  $n_{1}$  as in Table.1 A good result for P1 is achieved by n1 = 4.1, with TPR = 99.21%, FPR = 0.84%; and for P2, a good one is by n1 = 6.9, with TPR = 98.88%, FPR = 1.12%. Our prediction  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are accurately matching the test results as shown in Fig.3. The P1 AUC is 0.9996 to show it is an excellent classifier. As we only compare the test face against the center face, we only need 1 comparison and reduce 90% other comparisons.

## 4 Conclusion and Future Work

We fully utilize the normal distribution characteristic to simplify the face recognition problems with promising results in accuracy, computation, and accuracy prediction. We use the global sets  $D_{intra}$ and  $D_{extra}$  to help determine personal thresholds for individual persons. Though  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  can accurately predict P1 TPR and P2 FPR, they are limited in certain ranges. We observed these can be caused by: 1) arranged model has a smaller  $\sigma$  than it should have, 2) the  $d_{p,extra}$  is not arranged and is less normal distribution like, 3) the face quality in  $\mathscr{F}_{4}$  is not good enough, such as blurred and misaligned are observed and lower down P1 TPR. In the future, we will enhance on 1) face image preprocessing, and 2) Use personalized  $n_{p}$  instead of identical for all, to increase P1 true positive rate (TPR) and decrease P2 false positive rate (FPR), and to have a better prediction  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .



Fig. 3 Prediction accuracy of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ 

Table 1 Test Result with Predictions  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ 

<i>n</i> <sub>1</sub>	P2 TPR	P2 FPR	β	P1 TPR	α	P1 FPR
2.0	93.36%	0.36%	0.43%	93.45%	93.94%	0.01%
2.5	96.53%	0.76%	0.68%	96.07%	97.61%	0.03%
3.0	97.91%	1.02%	1.07%	97.62%	99.20%	0.10%
3.5	98.14%	1.25%	1.61%	98.47%	99.85%	0.29%
4.1	98.51%	1.36%	2.62%	99.21%	99.96%	0.84%
6.9	98.88%	1.12%	15.39%	100.00%	100.00%	17.29%

## 5 References

- [1] NIST FRVT( https://www.nist.gov/programs-projects/ face-recognition-vendor-test-frvt-ongoing)
- [2] O. M. Karkhi, A. Vedaldi, and Z. Zieerman: "Deep face recognition," Proc. British Machine Vision, pp.41.1-41.12 Sep. 2015.
- [3] Y. Taigman, M. Yang, M. Ranzato, and L. Wolf: "Deepface: closing the gap to human-level performance in face verification," Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR 2014), pp.1701-1708 June 2014.
- [4] Y. Sun, Y. Chen, X. Wand, and X. Tang: "Deep learning face representation by joint identification-verification," Proc. NIPS, Dec. 2014.
- [5] F. Schroff, D. Kalenichenko, and J. Philbin: "Facenet: A unifiedembedding for face recognition and clustering," Proc. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR 2015), pp.815-823 June 2015.

Dept. of.Communications and Computer Eng., School of Fundamental Science and Eng. Shillman Hall 401, 3-14-9 Okubo, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-0072 Phone: 03-5286-2509 michael.hsu@asagi.waseda.jp