

# Boosting Color Feature Selection for Color Face Recognition

Jae Young Choi, Yong Man Ro, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Konstantinos N. Plataniotis, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper introduces the new color face recognition (FR) method that makes effective use of boosting learning as color-component feature selection framework. The proposed boosting color-component feature selection framework is designed for finding the best set of color-component features from various color spaces (or models), aiming to achieve the best FR performance for a given FR task. In addition, to facilitate the complementary effect of the selected color-component features for the purpose of color FR, they are combined using the proposed weighted feature fusion scheme. The effectiveness of our color FR method has been successfully evaluated on the following five public face databases (DBs): CMU-PIE, Color FERET, XM2VTSDB, SCface, and FRGC 2.0. Experimental results show that the results of the proposed method are impressively better than the results of other state-of-the-art color FR methods over different FR challenges including highly uncontrolled illumination, moderate pose variation, and small resolution face images.

**Index Terms**—Boosting learning, color face recognition, color space, color-component, feature selection, weighted feature fusion.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**R**ECENTLY, considerable research work in face recognition (FR) has shown that facial color information can be used to considerably improve FR performance, compared to the FR methods relying only on grayscale information [1]–[7]. In particular, it has been reported in [5] and [6] that the effectiveness of color information can become significant for improving FR performance when face images are taken under strong variations in illumination, as well as with low spatial resolutions.

In general, the three components of a color can be defined in many different ways leading to a wide variety of color spaces [8]. In addition, it has been observed in [8]–[10] that different color spaces (or color models) possess distinct characteristics and effectiveness in terms of discriminating power for visual

classification task. This suggests that different color components can often provide different complementary information to the specific classification task [9], [10]. Hence, an optimal subset of color components may not be unique for different classification or pattern recognition problems.

Most of the existing color FR methods (including our previous work [5]) are restricted to using a fixed color-component configuration comprising of only “two” or “three” color components (like  $YQC_r$  [1] from  $YC_bC_r$  and  $YIQ$  color spaces). In particular, currently used color-component choices are mostly made through a combination of intuition and empirical comparison [1]–[3], [5]–[7], without any systematic selection strategy. As such, existing methods may have a limitation to attaining the best FR result for given FR task. This is because specific color components effective for a particular FR problem could not work well for other FR problems under other FR operating conditions (e.g., illumination variations) that differ from those considered during the process of determining specific color components. Hence, the important issue in color FR is: how can one select the color components from various color models in order to achieve the best FR performance for the specific FR task?

In this paper, to cope with the aforementioned issue, we propose a new color FR method. Our method takes advantage of “boosting” learning [13] as a feature selection mechanism, aiming to find the optimal set of color-component features for the purpose of achieving the best FR result. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first attempt to incorporate feature selection scheme underpinning boosting learning into FR methods using color information.

Fig. 1 shows overall framework of the proposed color FR method which largely consists of two parts: 1) color-component feature selection with boosting, and 2) color FR solution using selected color component features. To determine the best color component feature at each boosting round for recognizing the hard-to-classify sample subset of a training set, termed “learning set,” the effective selection criterion is proposed. The proposed selection criterion is in the form of penalty-based objective function with its associated weighting parameter for the purpose of selecting color-component features which not only produce small classification errors, but also keep their mutual dependence low. As demonstrated by the experimental results in Section IV-C, the proposed selection criterion is highly useful for achieving a low generalization classification error. In addition, to perform color FR, the color-component features chosen via our boosting framework are combined at the feature level. Specifically, selected color-component features are fused

Manuscript received May 27, 2010; revised September 15, 2010; accepted October 01, 2010. Date of publication November 18, 2010; date of current version April 15, 2011. This research was supported in part by the Research and Development Project of the Archives Preservation Technology and in part by the National Archives of Korea, the Ministry of Public Administration and Security. The associate editor coordinating the review of this manuscript and approving it for publication was Dr. Arun Ross.

J. Y. Choi and Y. M. Ro are with the Image and Video Systems Lab, Department of Electrical Engineering, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, (KAIST), Daejeon, Republic of Korea (e-mail: jychoi@kaist.ac.kr; ymro@ee.kaist.ac.kr).

K. N. Plataniotis is with the Multimedia Lab, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S3G4, Canada (e-mail: kostas@comm.utoronto.ca).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TIP.2010.2093906




Fig. 1. Proposed color FR framework. (a) Note that a learning set  $\mathbf{R}_t$  is “most informative (or difficult)” subset of training samples given the currently selected color-component features. At each boosting round “ $t$ ,” the best color-component feature for classifying a learning set  $\mathbf{R}_t$  is determined. (b)  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t=1}^M$  denote a set of  $M$  different feature extractors associated with  $M$  selected color-component features.

based on weighted feature fusion scheme—depending upon the associated confidence of each color-component feature—for achieving better FR performance.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed color FR method, comparative and extensive experiments have been carried out. For this, five public face databases (DB) CMU-PIE [19], Color FERET [20], XM2VTSDB [21], SCface [22], and FRGC 2.0 [24] are used. Experimental results show that the results of the proposed method are impressively better than the results of other state-of-the-art color FR methods over different FR challenges including highly uncontrolled illumination, moderate pose variation, and small resolution face images.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. Section II describes our color-color component feature selection method within boosting learning framework. In particular, this section details the proposed selection criterion. In Section III, we explain the proposed weighted feature fusion approach to combining selected color-component features for a FR purpose. In Section IV, we present extensive and comparative experimental results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed color FR method. Conclusions and directions for future research are presented in Section V.

## II. BOOSTING COLOR-COMPONENT FEATURE SELECTION

In this paper, a multiclass boosting “Adaboost.M2” [12] framework is adapted to implement color-component feature selection. Differing from other boosting learning frameworks, the key advantage of Adaboost.M2 framework is to force the weak learners to concentrate not only on the hard instances (or patterns), but also on the incorrect class labels that are hardest to classify [12]. As such, this boosting framework would fit well into our color-component feature selection that is devised for FR belonging to multiclassification problems. Further, this boosting framework is more flexible because the determination of error bound of the final hypothesis is free of the requirement that every weak hypothesis should have classification error less than  $1/2$  [12].

We now present the proposed color-component feature selection procedure. Let  $\mathbf{L} = \{1, \dots, C\}$  be the class label set, where  $C$  denotes maximum class label (or the number of classes). Also let  $\mathbf{T}$  be a training set composed of  $N$  red-green-blue (RGB) color face images each denoted by  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(i)}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) of size  $H \times W$  pixels with a corresponding class label  $\ell_i$ , where  $\ell_i \in \mathbf{L}$ . For each of the RGB color images in  $\mathbf{T}$ , color conversion can

be done from the *RGB* color space to a number of different prespecified color spaces. Assuming that a total of “ $K$ ” different color components are yielded from the color conversions under consideration, we then denote the  $m$ th color component by  $f_m$  (e.g.,  $C_b$  or  $C_r$  from  $YC_bC_r$  color space) comprising a color-component pool denoted by  $\mathbf{F}$  for which  $f_m \in \mathbf{F}$ .

In our method, the best color-component feature (at each boosting round) for classifying a weighted version of  $\mathbf{T}$  (i.e., weighted training samples) is determined based on selection criterion. To maintain a set of weights over the  $\mathbf{T}$ , the distribution denoted by  $D_t(i)$  [12] for each training sample  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(i)}$  can be determined at every boosting round. Initially, values of  $D_t(i)$  are set equally, but on each round, they are newly updated in such a way that weak learners is forced to focus on the hard training samples.

Before presenting the entire color-component feature selection algorithm proposed, the way of constructing weak learners (so-called FR learners) and the proposed selection criterion will be described in detail in the following subsections.

#### A. Construction of FR Learners

To construct weak learners at each round, the learning set  $\mathbf{R}_t (\mathbf{R}_t \subset \mathbf{T})$  is formed by choosing the  $r$  hardest-to-classify training samples per class from the  $\mathbf{T}$  according to distribution  $D_t(i)$ . Subsequently, a corresponding feature extractor  $\Phi_m$  is constructed using  $\mathbf{R}_t$  along with the  $m$ th color-component  $f_m (m = 1, \dots, K)$ . Specifically, to form  $\Phi_m$ , the  $\Phi_m$  is trained with a set composed of the  $m$ th color-component images that are generated from  $\mathbf{R}_t$  via an associated color conversion. Here,  $\Phi_m : \mathbb{R}^{H \times W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$  takes as input the  $m$ th color component image of size  $H \times W$  pixels and produces as output a corresponding  $J$ -dimensional feature. It is important to note that  $\Phi_m$  can be obtained using any face feature extraction algorithm (e.g., using global- or local-based feature methods [14]). As opposed to conventional learners in the original boosting methods [12], [13], the learning focus in our method lies on the feature extractor rather than the classifier. As such, it differs from the original boosting design in that only pure classifiers are generally used as the weak learners (termed “FR learner” hereafter) without considering feature extraction. This is mainly because the training process of typical FR algorithms is with emphasis on constructing a feature extractor instead of an associated classifier [14], [18].

Using  $\Phi_m$ , a corresponding FR learner  $h_{t,m}$  (at the  $t$ th boosting round) is defined as follows:

$$h_{t,m}(\mathbf{x}, n) = \frac{(d_{\max} - d_m^{(n)})}{(d_{\max} - d_{\min})} \quad (1)$$

where  $d_m^{(n)} = S(\Phi_m(\mathbf{x}), \Phi_m(\mathbf{x}_g^{(n)}))$ ,  $S(\cdot)$  is a metric function that measure distance between two input vectors in  $J$ -dimensional feature subspace,  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_g^{(n)} (n \in \mathbf{L})$  denotes the *RGB* color image to be recognized and the  $n$ th enrolled *RGB* color gallery image, respectively,  $d_{\max} = \max \left( \left\{ d_m^{(n)} \right\}_{n=1}^C \right)$ ,

and  $d_{\min} = \min \left( \left\{ d_m^{(n)} \right\}_{n=1}^C \right)$ . Note that in (1), outputs of FR learner  $h_{t,m}(\cdot)$  are in the range  $[0, 1]$  for which it has the form  $h_{t,m} : \mathbb{R}^{H \times W} \times \mathbf{L} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Hence, it can satisfy the functional requirement of the general boosting algorithm [13] (including AdaBoost.M2 [12]), representing the degree (or confidence) for labeling  $\mathbf{x}$  as the class  $n$  namely, class label estimation.

#### B. Proposed Selection Criterion

At each boosting round, the best FR learner (i.e., the best color-component feature) should be determined from among  $K$  constructed FR learners  $h_{t,m} (m = 1, \dots, K)$ , each of which depends upon a single color-component feature. To this end, a selection criterion plays a crucial role in determining the “goodness” of feature selection. Referring to [11], in ensemble classification (including boosting), it has been shown that, to achieve the lowest generalization error, we need to create ensembles (or classifiers) with low training classification error, while at the same time their mutual dependence should be kept minimal. In particular, in our feature selection problem, mutual dependence between color-component features have to be carefully considered as different color channels may have similar properties from the view-point of classification. For instance, the  $V$  and  $G$  channels (from *HSV* and *RGB* color spaces, respectively) both encode the intensity information for green colors. Therefore, before a FR learner is selected, mutual dependence between the new FR learner and each of the selected FR learners should be examined to ensure that the complementary information (that improves classification) carried by the new FR learner is not captured by the preceding FR learners before.

To address the aforementioned issue, we develop an effective selection criterion which aims at making optimal balance between classification error and the degree of mutual dependence among selected FR learners. Here, using (1), classification error for  $h_{t,m}$  is calculated based on “pseudo-loss” [12]

$$\varepsilon_{h_{t,m}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N D_t(i) \times \left( 1 - h_{t,m}(\mathbf{x}_t^{(i)}, \ell_i) + \sum_{\ell \neq \ell_i} r_t(i, \ell) h_{t,m}(\mathbf{x}_t^{(i)}, \ell) \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $r_t(i, \ell)$  is the mislabel weight vector (for details on the computation and implication of  $r_t(i, \ell)$ , please refer to [12]). Note that for computing  $\varepsilon_{h_{t,m}}$ , both hard-to-classify samples and hard-to-separate pairs of class labels are taken into account at the same time [12].

To quantify mutual dependence, one natural choice is to compute “mutual information” in the theory of probability between pairs of the outputs of FR learners. However, this method requires accurate estimation of joint distributions over the outputs of FR learners; joint probabilities need to be computed over  $|\mathbf{L}|^2$  bins, where  $|\mathbf{L}|$  denote the number of class labels. Hence, measuring mutual information may be ineffective in terms of simplicity for implementation, especially for general FR problems which often have to handle a large number of classes (usually hundreds or thousands of subjects). To cope with this, a simple

but effective alternative way to measure mutual dependence between a pair of two FR learners has been devised as follows:

$$I(h_a, h_b) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(h_a, h_b, \mathbf{x}_t^{(i)}) \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta(\cdot)$  denotes an indicator function that returns “one” only when, for  $i$ th training sample, the class label predicted by  $h_a$  is equal to that predicted by  $h_b$ , otherwise returns zero and  $0 \leq I(h_a, h_b) \leq 1$ . Note that in (3), mutual dependence can be measured by investigating agreement of the outputs of two FR learners considered. Based on (3), we then examine the mutual dependence between the candidate FR learner  $h_{t,m}$  (i.e., candidate color-component feature) and the already selected FR learners to avoid redundant FR learners in the following way:

$$\pi_{h_{t,m}} = \max_{h_{\hat{t}}} I(h_{t,m}, h_{\hat{t}}), \quad h_{\hat{t}} \in \mathbf{H}_M \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}_M$  denotes the set of the best  $M$  selected FR learners before current boosting round.

Using (2) and (4), the best FR learner (at the  $t$ th boosting round) is determined as follows:

$$h_t = \arg \min_{h_{t,m}} J_{h_{t,m}} \quad (5)$$

where

$$J_{h_{t,m}} = \varepsilon_{h_{t,m}} + \lambda \pi_{h_{t,m}} \quad (6)$$

and  $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ . Note that in (6), objective function value  $J_{h_{t,m}}$  of each  $h_{t,m}$  has a penalty term  $\pi_{h_{t,m}}$  and a weighting parameter  $\lambda$  that controls a tradeoff between  $\varepsilon_{h_{t,m}}$  and  $\pi_{h_{t,m}}$  in order to enforce low mutual dependence between selected FR learners. Considering FR performance in our experiments, a good compromise has been found by setting  $\lambda$  in the range of  $[0.3, 0.5]$ .

### C. Summary for Color-Component Feature Selection Algorithm

At the  $t$ th boosting round, the corresponding best FR learner  $h_t$  (determined through using (5) and (6)) is then added to  $\mathbf{H}_M$  at a time, subject to condition that objective function value  $J_{h_t}$  for  $h_t$  (such that  $J_{h_t} = \min_{h_{t,m}} J_{h_{t,m}}$ ) should be lower than predefined acceptance threshold  $\zeta^*$ . It should be noted that the purpose of setting  $\zeta^*$  is to provide better generalization classification error (see Section IV-C for further details).

The proposed color-component feature selection algorithm is summarized in Fig. 2. After terminating our boosting feature selection,  $M$  pairs of  $\{(f_t, \Phi_t)\}_{t=1}^M$  associated with the chosen  $M$  FR learners contained in final  $\mathbf{H}_M$  are used for performing color FR discussed in the next section.

## III. COLOR FR USING SELECTED COLOR-COMPONENT FEATURES

Following from the original design of boosting framework [12], given  $M$  FR learners  $h_t \in \mathbf{H}_M$  as its output, the traditional

form of the final classifier for recognizing an unknown probe  $\mathbf{x}_p$  is

$$h_{\text{com}}(\mathbf{x}_p) = \arg \max_{n \in \mathbf{L}} \sum_{h_t \in \mathbf{H}_M} \log \left( \frac{1}{\beta_t} \right) h_t(\mathbf{x}_p, n). \quad (7)$$

Note, by using (1),  $h_t(\mathbf{x}_p, n)$  can be readily computed and the confidence parameter  $\beta_t$  is a function of  $\varepsilon_t$  as described in Step 2. Equation (6) in Fig. 2. In (7),  $h_{\text{com}}(\mathbf{x}_p)$  takes a weighted majority vote of the class predictions of  $M$  selected FR learners.

However, it should be emphasized that the ultimate goal of our boosting framework discussed in Section II is to select a subset of color-component features for achieving the best FR performance. Further, the learning focus of FR learners in this paper is stressed on feature extractors each constructed with a learning set of corresponding color-component images. Moreover, in the areas of multimodal fusion, fusing multiple features of the same biometric (or pattern) at the feature level can generally show better classification result than fusion methods working on other levels [15]. Based upon the facts mentioned above, we decide to combine  $M$  selected color-component features at the feature level to achieve better FR performance. The following subsection provides a detailed description of proposed fusion method.

### A. Weighted Color-Component Feature Fusion

Given  $M$  pairs of color component and associated feature extractor  $\{(f_t, \Phi_t)\}_{t=1}^M$  of the chosen  $M$  FR learners  $h_t \in \mathbf{H}_M$ , the low-dimensional features of  $\mathbf{x}_p$  and  $\mathbf{x}_g^{(n)}$  along with  $f_t$  are obtained as follows (using the corresponding  $\Phi_t$ ):

$$\mathbf{f}_p^{(t)} = \Phi_t(\mathbf{x}_p) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{f}_g^{(n,t)} = \Phi_t(\mathbf{x}_g^{(n)}) \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{f}_p^{(t)}, \mathbf{f}_g^{(n,t)} \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and  $t = 1, \dots, M$ . In order to generate the combined features for  $\mathbf{x}_p$  and  $\mathbf{x}_g^{(n)}$ ,  $M$  weighted low-dimensional features, given by (8), are combined at the level of the features (by stacking low-dimensional features in column order):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}_p &= \left[ \log \left( \frac{1}{\beta_1} \right) (\mathbf{f}_p^{(1)})^T \dots \log \left( \frac{1}{\beta_M} \right) (\mathbf{f}_p^{(M)})^T \right]^T \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{f}_g^{(n)} &= \left[ \log \left( \frac{1}{\beta_1} \right) (\mathbf{f}_g^{(n,1)})^T \dots \log \left( \frac{1}{\beta_M} \right) (\mathbf{f}_g^{(n,M)})^T \right]^T \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $T$  denotes the transpose operator of a matrix and  $\mathbf{f}_p, \mathbf{f}_g^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{MJ}$ . Note that, for the same representation format,  $\mathbf{f}_p^{(t)}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_g^{(n,t)}$  should be individually normalized to have zero mean and unit variance before concatenation [15]. In (9), depending on the confidence (in terms of classification accuracy) of  $M$  color-component features chosen through boosting, we give some color-component features more weight than others when computing distance between  $\mathbf{f}_p$  and  $\mathbf{f}_g^{(n)}$ . As such, weighted feature fusion shown in (9) allows for effectively facilitating a complementary effect between its different components, leading to positively affect the classification performance.

**0. (Input)**

- (1) Color-component pool  $\mathbf{F} = \{f_m, m=1, \dots, K\}$ ;
- (2) A set of training *RGB* color images  $\mathbf{T} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \ell_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  with class labels  $\ell_i \in \mathbf{L}$ , where  $\mathbf{L} = \{1, \dots, C\}$ ;
- (3) The acceptance threshold  $\zeta^*$ ;
- (4) Total number of boosting rounds  $T$ ;

**1. (Initialization)**

- (1) Distribution  $D_0(i) = 1/N$ , for  $i=1, \dots, N$ ;
- (2) Weight vector  $w_i(i, \ell) = D_0(i)/(|\mathbf{L}| - 1)$ , for  $i=1, \dots, N, \ell \in \mathbf{L} - \{\ell_i\}$ ;
- (3)  $M=0$  and  $\mathbf{H}_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ ;

**2. (Repeat for  $t=1, \dots, T$ )**

- (1) Set the mislabel weight vector for each training sample:

$$r_i(i, \ell) = \frac{w_i(i, \ell)}{\sum_{\ell \neq \ell_i} w_i(i, \ell)}, \text{ for } i=1, \dots, N, \ell \in \mathbf{L} - \{\ell_i\};$$

- (2) Update the distribution for each training sample:

$$D_t(i) = \frac{\sum_{\ell \neq \ell_i} w_i(i, \ell)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\ell \neq \ell_i} w_i(i, \ell)}, \text{ for } i=1, \dots, N, \ell \in \mathbf{L} - \{\ell_i\};$$

- (3) Select ‘ $r$ ’ hardest training samples per class according to  $D_t(i)$  to form a learning set  $\mathbf{R}_t$  ( $\mathbf{R}_t \subset \mathbf{T}$ );

- (4) For  $m=1, \dots, K$

- Train a face feature extractor  $\Phi_m$  using  $\mathbf{R}_t$  along with the  $m$ -th color component (i.e.,  $f_m$ );
- Construct a FR learner  $h_{t,m}$  based on  $\Phi_m$  using Eq. (1) and get back a corresponding FR learner  $h_{t,m} : R^{H \times W} \times L \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ;
- Using Eq. (2), calculate the classification error  $\varepsilon_{h_{t,m}}$  produced by  $h_{t,m}$  over the whole weighted training set  $\mathbf{T}$ ;
- Calculate ‘mutual dependence degree’  $\pi_{h_{t,m}}$  using Eq. (4) between  $h_{t,m}$  and already selected FR learners included in a set  $\mathbf{H}_M$ ;

- (5) Determine the best FR learner  $h_t$  according to selection criterion with Eq. (5) and Eq. (6);

- (6) Define  $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon_{h_t}$  and set  $\beta_t = \varepsilon_t / (1 - \varepsilon_t)$ . If  $\beta_t = 0$ , then abort loop;

- (7) Add the best FR learner at the  $t$ -th boosting round to the selected FR learner set if and only if  $J_{h_t} < \zeta^*$ ;

- $M \leftarrow M + 1$ ;
- $\mathbf{H}_M = \mathbf{H}_{M-1} \cup \{h_t\}$ ;

- (8) Update the weight vector:

$$w_{t+1}(i, \ell) = w_t(i, \ell) \beta_t^{\frac{1}{2} [1 + h_t(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \ell_i) - h_t(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \ell)]} \text{ for } i=1, \dots, N, \ell \in \mathbf{L} - \{\ell_i\};$$

**3. (Output)**

$M$  pairs of associated color component and feature extractor  $\{(f_t, \Phi_t)\}_{t=1}^M$  of the chosen  $M$  FR learners  $h_t \in \mathbf{H}_M$ .

Fig. 2. Proposed algorithm for color-component feature selection.

To perform FR tasks (identification or verification) on  $\mathbf{x}_p$ , a NN classifier is then applied to determine the identity of  $\mathbf{x}_p$  as follows:

$$l(\mathbf{x}_p) = l(\mathbf{x}_g^{(n^*)}) \quad \text{and} \quad n^* = \arg \min_{n \in \mathbf{L}} S(\mathbf{f}_p, \mathbf{f}_g^{(n)}) \quad (10)$$

where  $l(\cdot)$  returns the identity label of a face image.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

Five public CMU-PIE [19], Color FERET [20], XM2VTSDB [21], SCface [22], and FRGC 2.0 [24] face DBs were used to evaluate the proposed method. All facial images used in our experiments were manually cropped from original images based on the locations of the two eyes. Each cropped facial image was rescaled to the size of  $64 \times 64$  pixels (see Fig. 3).

To construct a face feature extractor  $\Phi_m(\cdot)$  (described in Section II), four popular low-dimensional feature extraction techniques were used: principal component analysis (PCA)

[16], Fisher’s linear discriminant analysis (FLDA) [17], regularized linear discriminant analysis (RLDA) [18], and enhanced Fisher linear discriminant model (EFM) [3]. As for the  $S(\cdot)$  in (1) and (10), the Euclidean distance was used for FLDA and RLDA, while the Mahalanobis and cosine distance measures for PCA and EFM, respectively. In addition, in all experiments, the frontal-view images with neutral illumination and expression were used to build the gallery set.

To form the color-component pool  $\mathbf{F}$  used for color-component feature selection process described in Fig. 2, the 36 different color components from the following 12 different color spaces were used:<sup>1</sup> “ $YC_bC_r$ ,” “ $YIQ$ ,” “ $HSV$ ,” “ $JPEG\text{-}XR$ ” ( $C_o$ ,  $C_g$ , and  $Y$ ), “ $RGB$ ,” “ $YUV$ ,” “ $XYZ$ ,” “ $CIE L^*a^*b^*$ ,” “ $YP_bP_r$ ,” “ $YD_bD_r$ ,” “ $CIE L^*u^*v^*$ ,” and “ $CIE L^*ch$ .” Note that the color spaces used can be derived from the *RGB* color space by means of either linear or nonlinear transformations. A detailed description for the color spaces used can be found in [8].

<sup>1</sup>The color space conversion is performed using the “Color Space Converter” Matlab toolbox available at: <http://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/7744>.

### A. Evaluation of our Method Under Different Challenges

In this section, we present comparative experimental results to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method under different FR challenges. For comparison purpose, the following state-of-the-art color FR methods are implemented: hybrid color and frequency feature (CFF) method [4], color space normalization (CSN) method [7], color image discriminant model (CID) method [2], independent color space (ICS) method [3], hybrid color configuration  $RQC_r$  method [5].

For the CFF method, the hybrid  $RIQ$  color space was used as proposed in [4]. In addition, as recommended by [4], the same size of masks used to select frequency sets in frequency domain was used. For the CSN method, the normalized hybrid  $ZRG$  color space using across-color-component normalization technique [7] was used as this method achieves the best FR performance of all normalized color spaces evaluated in [7]. For the CID method, we implemented its extended version based on the  $RGB$  color space [2]. In addition, following the same parameter values as used in [2], the initial value of the CID algorithm and convergence threshold were set to  $[1/3, 1/3, 1/3]$  and 0.1, respectively. The ICS defines statistically independent component images that are created using a blind source separation technique; in our experiment, Comon's ICA algorithm [23] was used to compute mutual information between color components and high-order statistics as suggested in [3]. The ICS shows the best FR performance of all color image representations evaluated in [3]. In [5], the authors show that the hybrid  $RQC_r$  color configuration is considerably effective for recognizing low-resolution face images. In addition, in the proposed method, the acceptance threshold  $\zeta^*$  in Fig. 2 and the weighting parameter  $\lambda$  in (6) were empirically set to 0.6 and 0.4, respectively, across all experiments in this section. However, it should be emphasized that varying  $\zeta^*$  in the range of  $[0.55, 0.65]$  did not much alter the FR performance of the proposed method in our experiments. Further, in order to validate the advantage of using different weights for all selected color components as proposed in (9), we also present the results using uniform weights (i.e., all components have the same weights when computing distance).

Comparative experimental results under variations of illumination, pose, and spatial resolution are presented as follows:

1) *Under Illumination Variation:* We compare the robustness of the proposed color FR with other color FR methods against extensive variations in illumination using CMU-PIE and XM2VTSDB face DB. In this experiment, 1,428 frontal images of 68 subjects (21 images per subject) were collected from the CMU-PIE; the facial images for each subject have 21 different illumination variations (using the "room lighting of" condition). From the XM2VTSDB, 900 frontal images of 100 subjects were obtained; each subject included nine facial images captured with no control on severe illumination variations. Fig. 3(a) and (b) shows examples of facial images used in this experiment. By using random partition, the training set consisted of (6 images  $\times$  168 subjects), while the remaining 1,320 images were used to create a probe set. Table I shows the rank-one identification rates of six different color FR methods. To guarantee stable experimental results, 20 independent runs of aforementioned random partitions were executed. Thus, all results presented in Table I




Fig. 3. (a) Examples of the facial images with flash illumination from the CMU-PIE DB. (b) Examples of facial images with uncontrolled illumination condition from the XM2VTSDB. (c) Examples of facial images with pose variations from the Color FERET DB. (d) Examples of facial images with variation in face resolutions from the SCface DB. (e) Example of facial images from the FRGC 2.0 DB.

were averaged over 20 runs. The results show that our method (using different weights) outperforms the other five color FR methods for all feature extraction techniques. For instance, for the case of using RLDA, our method can attain about 14.71%, 12.71%, 9.70%, 8.91%, and 7.70% improvement, compared to ICS,  $RQC_r$ , CFF, CID, and CSN methods, respectively.

2) *Under Pose Variation:* We further assess the usefulness of the proposed method under moderate pose variations. A total of 1,378 face images of 107 subjects were collected from the Color FERET face DB. It should be noted that the rotated face images that both eyes can be reliably identified for normalization were only collected. The facial images used include five different pose angles ranging from  $-45^\circ$  to  $+45^\circ$  [see Fig. 3(c)]. Also note that all the images have neutral expression and illumination. By using random partition, the training set consisted of (5 images  $\times$  107 subjects), while the probe set contained the remaining 843 images of the same 107 subjects. The comparison results are described in Table II. It is shown that the proposed method attains the highest recognition accuracies for all feature extraction methods followed by the CSN, CFF, and CID color FR methods. In particular, compared to the second best method CSN, identification rates can be improved by 5.37%, 6.99%, and 7.39% for PCA, FLDA, and RLDA, respectively. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our method under pose variations.

3) *Under Spatial Resolution Variation:* In this experiment, we further evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed method against small resolution face images. To this end, 2,080 face



TABLE I

RANK-ONE IDENTIFICATION RATES (%) [20] OBTAINED FOR SIX DIFFERENT COLOR FR METHODS ON THE CMU-PIE AND THE XM2VTSDB FACE IMAGES HAVING ILLUMINATION VARIATION. NOTE THAT, FOR THE PROPOSED METHOD, FOUR HARDEST TRAINING IMAGES PER SUBJECT (I.E.,  $r = 4$ ) ARE SELECTED FROM A TRAINING SET AT EACH BOOSTING ROUND TO FORM A LEARNING SET

Color FR method	Used color information fusion method	Feature extraction method		
		PCA	FLDA	RLDA
Proposed	FL fusion with different weights	<b>82.27 ±1.01</b>	<b>93.85 ±2.45</b>	<b>98.27 ±1.17</b>
Proposed	FL fusion with uniform weights	78.34 ±0.11	88.05 ±0.92	93.30 ±1.54
CFF	Weighted similarity score fusion [4]	72.41 ±1.98	84.97 ±0.83	88.57 ±1.05
CSN	IL fusion [7]	74.73 ±1.11	88.97 ±2.42	92.57 ±1.43
ICS	IL fusion [3]	68.98 ±2.99	79.23 ±2.03	83.56 ±1.77
CID	IL fusion [2]	73.58 ±2.56	86.23 ±3.42	89.36 ±2.11
<i>RQCr</i>	IL fusion [5]	70.87 ±2.19	81.32 ±0.32	85.00 ±1.01

Note that FL correspond to the feature-level, while IL to the input-level. In addition, bold value denotes the best result of FR approaches in each low-dimensional feature extraction technique and the similar notations are also used in the following tables.

TABLE II

RANK-ONE IDENTIFICATION RATES (%) OBTAINED FOR SIX DIFFERENT COLOR FR METHODS ON THE COLOR FERET FACE IMAGES HAVING POSE VARIATION. NOTE THAT, FOR THE PROPOSED METHOD, WE SET  $r = 3$  TO FORM A LEARNING SET

Color FR method	Used color information fusion method	Feature extraction method		
		PCA	FLDA	RLDA
Proposed	FL fusion with different weights	<b>69.90 ±1.61</b>	<b>84.09 ±2.63</b>	<b>87.53 ±2.78</b>
Proposed	FL fusion with uniform weights	67.31 ±1.68	80.92 ±1.77	83.24 ±1.86
CFF	Weighted similarity score fusion [4]	54.30 ±0.65	69.90 ±1.37	72.80 ±0.75
CSN	IL fusion [7]	64.53 ±0.59	77.10 ±1.50	80.14 ±0.46
ICS	IL fusion [3]	51.56 ±1.68	59.58 ±0.75	69.52 ±1.79
CID	IL fusion [2]	52.41 ±3.01	71.45 ±2.68	70.38 ±3.11
<i>RQCr</i>	IL fusion [5]	49.79 ±1.86	61.12 ±2.44	66.76 ±0.89

TABLE III

RANK-ONE IDENTIFICATION RATES (%) OBTAINED FOR SIX DIFFERENT COLOR FR METHODS ON THE 'SCFACE' IMAGES HAVING SPATIAL RESOLUTION VARIATION. NOTE THAT, FOR THE PROPOSED METHOD, WE SET  $r = 3$  TO FORM A LEARNING SET

Color FR method	Used color information fusion method	Feature extraction method		
		PCA	FLDA	RLDA
Proposed	FL fusion with different weights	<b>42.56</b>	<b>56.06</b>	<b>62.78</b>
Proposed	FL fusion with uniform weights	38.81	51.68	59.09
CFF	Weighted similarity score fusion [4]	28.88	39.31	43.55
CSN	IL fusion [7]	34.86	48.70	53.51
ICS	IL fusion [3]	26.78	37.78	41.89
CID	IL fusion [2]	37.76	49.54	54.70
<i>RQCr</i>	IL fusion [5]	34.85	46.34	49.61

images of 130 subjects were selected from SCface DB. This dataset has been designed to test the FR algorithms in *real-world surveillance* setup [22]. Different quality face images were taken with five different commercially available surveillance cameras of various quality and resolution. There are three images per subject for each camera, captured at three different distances (4.20, 2.60, and 1.00 m) as described in [22]. As shown in Fig. 3(d), some of these surveillance images are of extremely low quality and resolution. In real-life surveillance-like FR applications, it is reasonable to assume that high-resolution face images are chosen as training and gallery images. On the other hand, the probe to be tested may have lower and various face resolutions [5]. Hence, in our experiments, gallery set

TABLE IV

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER STATE-OF-THE-ART COLOR FR METHODS ON THE "FRGC 2.0 EXPERIMENT 4." NOTE THAT Z-SCORE NORMALIZATION IS USED TO COMPUTE FVR AND FAR. ALSO NOTE THAT, FOR OUR METHOD, WE SET  $r = 7$  TO FORM A LEARNING SET

Color FR Method	FVR (ROC III) when FAR = 0.1%
Proposed (using different weights)	<b>86.97%</b>
CFF in [4]	80.30%
CSN in [7]	72.86%
ICS in [3]	73.69%
CID in [2]	78.26%




Fig. 4. Impact of weighting parameter  $\lambda$  on generalization classification performance. Note that RLDA was used for feature extractor and the acceptance threshold values for all of the three different weighting values were set to 0.6 for fair comparisons.

consisted of one frontal mug shot (per subject) image, and the training set consisted of five face images with distance label "3" per subject (i.e., captured with five different surveillance cameras at a distance of 1.00 m), while the probe set consisted of ten face images (per subject) with distance labels "1" or "2" (i.e., captured at a distance 2.60 and 4.20 m). Note that, to match a low-resolution probe to a high-resolution gallery face, the probe has been upsampled to be matched with template size of  $64 \times 64$  pixels by using a cubic interpolation technique before




Fig. 5. Effectiveness of using acceptance threshold  $\zeta^*$  on selecting an optimal subset of color-component features. Note that RLDA was used for feature extractor and, for the case of using  $\zeta^*$ , we set  $\zeta^* = 0.6$ .

FR. The experimental results of six different color FR methods on the varying face resolutions are described in Table III. From Table III, we can see that recognizing face images (with much lower resolution) collected from SCface DB is significantly challenging. The rank-one identification rate averaged over all of the color FR and feature extraction methods is less than around 45%. However, it should be noted that the proposed method can achieve the best FR performance of up to around 63% when using RLDA.

#### B. Comparison With Other Color FR Methods

In this section, we conduct comparative experiments on the FRGC 2.0 dataset to further evaluate our method. Here, the “FRGC Experiment 4” is chosen to assess the proposed method because the FRGC Experiment 4 has been reported to be the most challenging FRGC experiment [3], [24]. Note that direct comparisons are made with other state-of-the-art results reported recently by other researchers on these FRGC 2.0 dataset. As such, all the results for comparison are directly cited from papers published recently. Note that, in this experiment, the performance measurement is face verification rate (FVR) at false accept rate (FAR) equal to 0.1%, which corresponding to ROC III curve [24]. In addition, note that the EFM is adopted for a face feature extractor in our method because all other methods (to be compared) make use of EFM for extracting low-dimensional features. From the comparison shown in Table IV, we can see that our method has made impressive improvements, which further validate the effectiveness of our method.

#### C. Effectiveness of Weighting Parameter and Acceptance Threshold

Note that in (6), the weighting parameter  $\lambda$  has been introduced aiming to consider both mutual dependence between selected color-component features and their classification errors in our boosting based color-component feature selection. In addition, as described in Fig. 2, the acceptance threshold  $\zeta^*$  is used to prevent the color-component features having either much lower classification errors or much higher mutual dependences from being selected. It should be noted that main objective of using both  $\lambda$  and  $\zeta^*$  is to achieve better generalization classification

(or recognition) performance. To validate the effectiveness of using  $\lambda$  and  $\zeta^*$  in the proposed method, experimental analysis has been performed using the face image dataset collected from the Color FERET. A detailed description of the experimental dataset used is given in Section IV-A.

Fig. 4 shows the impact of weighting parameter  $\lambda$ , on generalization classification performance of the proposed method. Note that in Fig. 4, the selected color-component features determined at each boosting round were used to compute the classification errors by using (9) and (10). Also note that  $\lambda = 0$  means that the classification error defined in (2) is only taken into account during color-component feature selection process. As shown in Fig. 4, the training errors for all of the three different weighting parameter values can be reduced as the number of boosting rounds is increased and finally converged to nearly same constant value. However, for the case of generalization classification error, we can see that generalization errors for both  $\lambda = 0.3$  and  $\lambda = 0.5$  converge to much lower values (after passing the tenth boosting round) than that obtained for  $\lambda = 0$ . This result ensures that considering both mutual dependence and classification errors by using  $\lambda$  for color-component feature selection allows achieving a low generalization error.

Fig. 5 shows the effectiveness of using acceptance threshold  $\zeta^*$  on selecting an optimal subset of color-component features. In Fig. 5, the number of selected color-component features corresponding to each boosting round is also presented. As shown in Fig. 5, when using  $\zeta^*$  our method stops adding color-component features at boosting round (i.e., the eleventh boosting round) where the lowest generalization classification error has been attained. This is done by protecting addition of color-component features whose objective function values defined in (6) are lower than predetermined value of  $\zeta^*$ . On the other hand, when not using  $\zeta^*$ , as more color-component features are added, generalized classification error decreases, which then arrives at minimum error (at the number of features 10 through 12), and eventually increases again. These results demonstrate that making use of  $\zeta^*$  with appropriate value is useful for determining the best number of color-component features as well as the types of color-component features (“best” in the sense that generalization classification error is minimized).



## V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In this paper, a novel and effective color FR method is proposed. It is based on the selection of the best color-component features (from various color models) using the proposed variant of boosting learning framework. These selected color-component features are then combined into a single concatenated color feature using weighted feature fusion. Our results clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method in terms of both absolute performance and comparative performance against state-of-the-art color FR methods.

In this paper, the extraction of color-component features is restricted to using global-based feature extraction methods (such as PCA and LDA). However, other face features (or descriptors) can be readily incorporated into the proposed selection framework, aiming to find the most suitable features for a given FR task. In particular, for the future work, we will extend our work by applying popular local-based feature extraction techniques, such as Gabor wavelets [14] or local binary pattern (LBP) [25], to construct the FR learners defined in (1). For instance, color LBP (CLBP) feature extraction technique proposed in [26] can be easily applied to the construction of FR learners. This extension will allow for finding better color-component features via the proposed boosting feature selection algorithm in terms of achieving the best face recognition results. In addition, even though standard color spaces (such as  $RGB$  and  $YCbCr$ ) are only considered during boosting feature selection process in this paper, our method will be readily extended by incorporating new color spaces [2], [3], [7] (e.g., normalized  $ZRG$  color space proposed in [7]) devised for a color FR purpose. This is expected to yield better performance. In addition, for the future work, we will exploit which combinations of color components generalize well across the illumination variations in the context of FR.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the FERET Technical Agent, the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) for providing the FERET database, and the University of Zargreb, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing for providing the database of facial images. In addition, portions of the research in this paper use the SCface database of facial images.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Shih and C. Liu, "Improving the face recognition grand challenge baseline performance using color configurations across color spaces," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Image Process.*, 2006, pp. 1001–1004.
- [2] J. Wang and C. Liu, "Color image discriminant models and algorithms for face recognition," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 2088–2097, Dec. 2008.
- [3] C. Liu, "Learning the uncorrelated, independent, and discriminating color spaces for face recognition," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 213–222, Jun. 2008.
- [4] Z. Liu and C. Liu, "A hybrid color and frequency features method for face recognition," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 1975–1980, Oct. 2008.
- [5] J. Y. Choi, Y. M. Ro, and K. N. Plataniotis, "Color face recognition for degraded face images," *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man, Cybern. B, Cybern.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1217–1230, Oct. 2009.
- [6] M. Rajapakse, J. Tan, and J. Rajapakse, "Color channel encoding with NMF for face recognition," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Image Process.*, 2004, pp. 2007–2010.

- [7] J. Yang, C. Liu, and L. Zhang, "Color space normalization: Enhancing the discriminating power of color spaces for face recognition," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 615–625, 2010.
- [8] R. Likac and K. N. Plataniotis, *Color Image Processing: Methods and Application*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2007.
- [9] H. Stokman and T. Gevers, "Selection and fusion of color models for image feature detection," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 371–381, Mar. 2007.
- [10] R. L. Hsu, M. Abdel-Mottaleb, and A. K. Jain, "Face detection in color images," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 696–796, May 2002.
- [11] A. Mura, "Upper bounds for error rates of linear combinations of classifiers," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 591–602, May 2002.
- [12] Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire, "A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting," *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 119–139, 1997.
- [13] R. E. Schapire, "The boosting approach to machine learning: An overview," in *Proc. MSRI Workshop Nonlinear Estimation and Classification*, 2002, pp. 149–172.
- [14] Y. Su, S. Shan, X. Chen, and W. Gao, "Hierarchical ensemble of global and local classifiers for face recognition," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 1885–1886, Aug. 2009.
- [15] A. Jain, K. Nandakumar, and A. Ross, "Score normalization in multimodal biometric systems," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 2270–2285, 2005.
- [16] M. A. Turk and A. P. Pentland, "Eigenfaces for recognition," *J. Cogn. Neurosci.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 71–86, 1991.
- [17] P. N. Belhumeur, J. P. Hespanha, and D. J. Kriegman, "Eigenfaces vs. Fisherfaces: Recognition using class specific linear projection," *IEEE Trans. Pattern. Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 711–720, Jul. 1997.
- [18] J. Lu, K. N. Plataniotis, and A. N. Venetsanopoulos, "Regularized discriminant analysis for the small sample size problem in face recognition," *Pattern Recognit. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 16, pp. 3079–3087, 2003.
- [19] T. Sim, S. Baker, and M. Bsat, "The CMU pose, illumination, and expression database," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 1615–1618, Dec. 2003.
- [20] P. J. Phillips, H. Moon, S. A. Rizvi, and P. J. Rauss, "The FERET evaluation methodology for face recognition algorithms," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. AVBPA*, 1999, pp. 137–143.
- [21] K. Messer, J. Mastas, J. Kittler, J. Luettin, and G. Maitre, "XM2VTSDB: The extended M2VTS database," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. AVBPA*, 1999, pp. 72–77.
- [22] M. Grgic, K. Delac, and S. Grgic, "SCface—Surveillance cameras face database," *Multimedia Tools Appl. J.*, pp. 863–879, 2011.
- [23] P. Comon, "Independent component analysis, a new concept?," *Signal Process.*, vol. 36, pp. 287–314, 1994.
- [24] P. J. Phillips, P. J. Flynn, T. Scruggs, K. W. Bowyer, J. Chang, K. Hoffman, J. Marques, J. Min, and W. Worek, "Overview of the face recognition grand challenges," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2005, pp. 947–954.
- [25] T. Ahonen, A. Hadid, and M. Pietikainen, "Face description with local binary pattern: Application to face recognition," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 28, no. 12, pp. 2037–2041, 12 2006.
- [26] J. Y. Choi, Y. M. Ro, and K. N. Plataniotis, "Using color local binary pattern features for face recognition," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Image Process.*, 2010, pp. 4541–4544.



**Jae Young Choi** received the B.S. degree from Kwangwoon University, Seoul, South Korea, in 2004 and the M.S. degree from the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), Daejeon, South Korea, in 2008, and is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree at KAIST.

In 2007, he worked as an intern researcher for the Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute (ETRI) in South Korea. In 2008, he was a visiting researcher at the University of Toronto in Canada.

His research interests include face recognition/detection/tracking, medical image processing, pattern recognition, machine learning, computer vision, and the Social Web. He is the author or co-author of over 30 refereed research publications in the aforementioned research areas.

Mr. Choi was the recipient of the Samsung HumanTech Thesis Prize in 2010.



**Yong Man Ro** (M'92–SM'98) received the B.S. degree from Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), Daejeon, South Korea.

He is currently a Full Professor at KAIST, where he is directing the Image and Video Systems Lab. In 1987, he was a Visiting Researcher at Columbia University, New York, and from 1992 to 1995, he was a Visiting Researcher at the University of California, Irvine, and KAIST. He was a Research Fellow at the

University of California, Berkeley, and a Visiting Professor at the University of Toronto, ON, Canada, in 1996 and 2007, respectively. He participated in the MPEG-7 and MPEG-21 international standardization efforts, contributing to the definition of the MPEG-7 texture descriptor, the MPEG-21 DIA visual impairment descriptors, and modality conversion. His research interests include image/video processing, multimedia adaptation, visual data mining, image/video indexing, and multimedia security.

Dr. Ro received the Young Investigator Finalist Award of ISMRM in 1992 and the Scientist Award in Korea in 2003. He served as a TPC member of international conferences such as IWDW, WIAMIS, AIRS, and CCNC, and he was the co-program chair of IWDW 2004."



**Konstantinos N. (Kostas) Plataniotis** ((S'93–M'95–SM'03) received the B. Eng. degree in computer engineering from University of Patras, Greece, in 1988 and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the Florida Institute of Technology (Florida Tech), Melbourne, FL, in 1992 and 1994, respectively.

He is currently a Professor with The Edward S. Rogers Sr. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada, an Adjunct Professor with the School of

Computer Science at Ryerson University, Canada. He is the Director of the Knowledge Media Design Institute (KMDI), University of Toronto, and the Director of Research for the University of Toronto's Identity, Privacy, and Security Institute. His research interests include biometrics, communications systems, multimedia systems, and signal and image processing.

Dr. Plataniotis is the Editor in Chief (2009–2011) for the *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, a registered professional engineer in the province of Ontario, and a member of the Technical Chamber of Greece. He is the 2005 recipient of IEEE Canada's Outstanding Engineering Educator Award "for contributions to engineering education and inspirational guidance of graduate students" and the co-recipient of the 2006 IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NEURAL NETWORKS Outstanding Paper Award for the published in 2003 paper entitled "Face Recognition Using Kernel Direct Discriminant Analysis Algorithms."