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**Introduction**

The goal of this literature review is to look at the vast advances in computer visions algorithms and how they work. Then further go into why certain algorithms might be better suited to compare and test to see if there exists a bias towards race and gender. The paper follows a thematic structure and concludes with my thoughts on feasibility as well as the current landscape of facial analysis.

**Gender and Race bias**

There are many notable cases of facial analysis algorithms performing in a biased way and with the rise of this emerging technology it feels like the number of these cases is also increasing significantly. A recent example of this was in 2017 when the then new iPhone X was being called out due to its facial recognition software being unable to distinguish Chinese faces in China. This high-profile case wasn’t the only one from a large company as Amazon’s face recognition coined “Rekognition” mismatched members of the American congress to mugshots. The reason this was criticised was because 40% of the mismatches belonged to the 20% of people of colour. This obvious bias is something that has to be researched and fixed because the use of these technologies is becoming more widespread, we are seeing them being used in airports and banks as well as public monitoring systems for the police (Singh *et al.*, 2020), and if these system are biased then they will have a detrimental effect on the lives of those who are judged wrongly by them. There have been made attempts to reduce the gender and racial bias of these algorithms but the questions remains of whether the algorithms themselves are biased or the datasets they are trained upon are biased or maybe even both (Singh *et al.*, 2020).

**How they work**

There are many algorithms and methods out there to detect faces through the use of machine learning. In general, these methods can be broken down into a couple of steps to better understand them . Firstly, for face detection an appropriate data set will have to be chosen which contains faces. Here we can settle for controlled data like the Chicago faces dataset (Ma, Correll and Wittenbrink, 2015) which contains photos of individuals in a controlled environment with consistent lighting and angle or conversely a dataset like the 300W faces in the wild (Sagonas *et al.*, 2013) dataset which contains a mixture of different angles, lighting and pose for faces. The choice of dataset has an impact on robustness and accuracy of the algorithm. The next step would be the extraction of different parts of the face that are of interest to the algorithm. These would include facial features like eyes, mouth and nose using pixel coordinates, another goal would be to create a bounding box around the facial region to distinguish it as a face. These early stages to detect the face are very important for the algorithm to get right. The final stage is to choose a model and give it a training methodology. It uses some assessment criteria and tries to minimise the difference between it and the ground truth already supplied.

I will be looking at the earlier stages of this process that being the dataset provided and the face detection method used to recognise the bounding box and landmark coordinate values. It is important to state that for some algorithms they use different ways to train the network or different structures, but the face detection step could be shared across these algorithms.

**Datasets**

There are many datasets available to train models for facial recognition some of these are unlabelled data sets but most are labelled. A very notable dataset is the 300W faces in the wild (Sagonas *et al.*, 2013) dataset. This was released in 2013 and had a large impact on the facial recognition scene as it provided a new benchmark to aim for as the dataset contained many faces of different characteristics and those algorithms able to score a high accuracy with this dataset are said to be robust. The dataset itself has more than 13,000 faces collected online. An interesting disclaimer provided on the LFIW website is that they mention that many groups are not well represented in the dataset; babies, elderly, women and more so they mention that many ethnicities have very minor or zero representation. This is shocking as the benchmark dataset on which many models are tested on has little ethnic diversity which implies that yes, the models that score highly may be robust with poses and angles but are not robust when considered against ethnic minorities.

WIDER FACE (Yang *et al.*, 2016)is another popular dataset used which has 393703 faces that are labelled. The dataset is widely used and looks to contain many faces according to different categories. Scale, Pose, Occlusion, Expression, Makeup and Illumination. None of these include ethnic diversity or even between genders from what I can tell in the literature.

Datasets must be rich with uncontrolled and controlled data to robustly train the models but this doesn’t take into account richness in terms or race but instead richness in terms of poses and angles. I think datasets are a large part of why certain models perform in a biased way. I think this because most of the models are only as good as the environment and data they are trained with and if there is a fundamental flaw to this data then of course the model will perform in a biased way. That’s not to say that some of the algorithms themselves aren’t intrinsically biased as there could be an underlying structure that makes them function in a biased way. I will have to do more research on this and perhaps train my own models and fine tune them to see any evidence of this bias within the algorithm.

**OpenCV, DLIB, MTCNN, Faster R-CNN and Retina Face**

The start of facial recognition relies on detecting the faces to identify the landmark locations and the bounding box for the face. The two foundational methods are looking at HAAR like features and HOG. The OpenCV library uses a HAAR-like features and a cascaded classifier structure (Viola and Jones, 2001). This means that the classifiers are applied to a region of interest in the picture and if the classifier passes then another classifier which consists of the previous simpler classifier is used to check the image. This cascading effect allows the parts of the image to be refined through the cascading effect of the classifiers or to be rejected early on by the simpler classifiers as not to waste processing power. The Haar-like features looks at rectangular regions that are adjacent to each other, it adds up the pixel intensities in the regions then looks at the difference between the sums. This value is then used to describe the region of the image. The cascades are necessary as using only a simple Haar-like feature classifier isn’t robust, to create a stronger classifier they must be cascaded and combined together using an adaboost bosting technique to gain better accuracy (Rahmad *et al.*, 2020). The original Viola and Jones algorithm which uses Haar-like features for object detection can be implemented through the use of OpenCV (Naveenkumar, 2016).

DLIB [10] takes a state of the art approach and uses a HOG feature descriptor with a linear SVM machine learning algorithm (Surasak *et al.*, 2018). It works by splitting the image into a grid first and for every grid square it assigns it’s a histogram based on direction of gradients. Next all the histograms are brough together to form one histogram which can uniquely describe each face. This is used with a linear SVM classifier to provide face detection. More recently CNN have started to be used as facial detection methods as the it provides better accuracy for faces that are not full frontal facing.

MTCNN (Zhang *et al.*, 2016) is another method proposed for facial detection it stands for multitask cascaded neural network. It works using 3 networks; P-Net, R-Net and O-net. P-Net is the proposal network and its job is to find the bounding box of faces based on estimations of the bounding box. The next stage is the refinement network, which is where false candidates are rejected, and calibration is performed. The final stage like the previous stage also performs refinement but is called the output stage as it proposes the facial landmarks. The model learns by backpropagating the error and changing the weights. The reason this algorithm is an interesting one to look at, is that it doesn’t use a pre-existing face detection method and instead uses its own shallow network and refinement to gather the information.

Faster R-CNN (Ren *et al.*, 2017) is another method for object detection, it’s a family of algorithms that span through speed and efficiency. It works by leveraging the idea of Region Proposal Networks to reduce the number of candidates. Facial detection through CNN’s can be very expensive in terms of computational power so it is in best interest that the amount of work required be reduced by removing certain candidates. The original R-CNN algorithm works by using a selective search algorithm to break down the images into smaller sections and then bringing them together to create objects. This is based on the texture, colour, size and shape, these become our region proposals which then form a feature length vector. A SVM similar to that in DLIB is used to classify the objects and then to gain a more accurate bounding box, regression is done. Fast R-CNN was built upon this by instead of generating region proposals for the CNN, now the CNN is fed the image and a convolutional feature map is generated from this. This map is then used to identify regions, it reduces the need to feed in 2000 separate region proposals which greatly improves the performance. The Faster R-CNN algorithm takes the previous and replaces the selective search with a network to predict region proposals. This is extremely fast compared to the previous ones and can be used for real time detection.

Single Stage Detectors are a class of algorithms that work through only one stage, i.e they don’t use region proposals like the R-CNN algorithms. The YOLO v3 (Redmon *et al.*, 2016) algorithm is a popular one, it stands for ‘You Only Look Once’. It works by using a single deep neural network to predict where the bounding boxes are and the classification of them at the same time. This algorithm is quick as it removes the need for identifying region proposals and instead combines this and classification into the same step within the network.

Another single stage detection algorithm is Retina Face (Deng *et al.*, 2019) which can predict the face score, face box and facial landmarks at the same time. Its based-on pixel-wise location and feature pyramids to predict the face regions.

**Feasibility**

The feasibility of this project is determined on many factors, these being availability, computational power and ease of use.

In terms of availability I am referring to the availability of the facial detection algorithms. In my case I would require open source algorithms as these would be free and ideally well supported because they are so widely available. Fortunately, there are many libraries available that provide an open source solution and implementation of many face detection algorithms that I can use.

Computation power is a concern to me during this project as my personal set up is a laptop that may be able to run older algorithms like Viola and Jones but with only an integrated graphics card I really lack computational power to run these CNN algorithms on multiple image groups. If I have to train models, then this will wont be feasible as I don’t have the power or time to achieve this. This being said I am able to use Google Collab to run the more expensive algorithms, Google Collab is a cloud based python notebook which allows me to connect to more powerful GPU’s to help tackle my machine learning and facial detection tasks. I think this would be the sensible platform for me to run any code required for my project on as it greatly helps my computational power and reduces unnecessary setup complexities on my local machine.

Since I am not an expert in computer vision algorithms or CNN’s I would avoid choosing algorithms that are too complicated for the project as I feel like I wouldn’t be able to draw effective results from these. I do wish to find a middle ground between the cutting edge algorithms and algorithms that are easier to use and implement as this would allow me to more successfully analyse the sensitivity of the algorithm to race and gender. With my selection of open source algorithms I feel like I have got a suitable range of algorithms that represent the landscape of facial analysis and are still easy enough to implement.

**Conclusion**

The different methods require different computational power to run and the differing data sets might make it difficult to provide a comparison across models with the same dataset. Working from home it might not be feasible to train a model myself with thousands of images, but most algorithms come with pretrained models I could use. This means I wouldn’t entirely be comparing algorithms but instead looking for a race and gender bias within the algorithms which I think is more feasible.

Certain algorithms are more feasible to be used such as MTCNN, HOG, Viola and Jones and Retina Face. These are accessible through open source technology and provide 3 techniques in facial analysis that are varied enough to describe the industries conception to its current state. I also think it would be fair to look at the different datasets each model is trained with and compare these in terms of representation.
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