Quantitative Analysis of PCA, ICA, LDA and SVM in Face Recognition
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Abstract—Face recognition is a technique to automatically identify or verify individuals. It receives a great attention in identification, authentication, security and many more applications. Diverse methods had been proposed for this purpose and also a lot of comparative studies were performed. However, researchers could not reach unified conclusion. In this paper, we are reporting an extensive quantitative accuracy analysis of four most widely used face recognition algorithms: Principal Component Analysis (PCA), Independent Component Analysis (ICA), Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) and Support Vector Machine (SVM) using AT&T, Sheffield and Bangladeshi people face databases under diverse situations such as illumination, alignment and pose variations.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Identification of human from face images is very necessary as it is very easy to convey identity and emotion. Still human identification is not completely perfect in various situations such as scale, orientation, illumination, emotion and noise variations [1]. A good number of methods had been proposed for this purpose and also a lot of comparative studies were performed by the researchers to evaluate the best algorithm for recognition [2] - [8]. But it is interesting that there are often contradictory and confusing claims being made in these comparisons. For example, Bartlett et al [9] and Liu et al [10] state that Independent Component Analysis (ICA) outperforms Principal Component Analysis (PCA), while Baek et al [11] state that PCA is better. But Moghaddam [12] states that there is no significant difference. Beveridge et al. [13] states that Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) performed worse than PCA, Martinez [14] states that LDA is better for some tasks, Belhumeur et al [15] and Navarrete et al [8] state that LDA outperforms PCA. Becker et al [16] states that Support Vector Machine (SVM) performs well compared to above-mentioned algorithms. All these conclusions hold a good degree of truth, but different factors surrounding each conclusion i.e. the actual task statement, the subspace distance metrics, dimensionality retention and the non-standardized database choices etc. Hence these produced too much debate and confusion over the years, particularly for an individual who is new in the field of face or object recognition and who seeks a good comparative understanding of the available techniques. This paper tries to remove these contradictions through an extensive experimentation. Four most widely used methods such as PCA, ICA, LDA, SVM are taken into consideration. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The recognition methodologies are described in section II. Section III contains the experimental results and discussions. Finally conclusions are drawn in Section IV.

II. RECOGNITION METHODS

A generic schematic flow diagram of a face recognition algorithm is shown in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1: Schematic diagram of face recognition.

A brief explanation of the investigated face recognition algorithms is given below.

A. Principal Component Analysis (PCA)

PCA [8] is one of the oldest face recognition methods. It finds t-dimensional subspace from an n-dimensional vector of each face in a training set of M images, where t < n. The dimensionality reduction is based on the basis vectors corresponding to the maximum variance direction in the original image space. All the images of known (training) faces are projected onto the face space to find a set of weights that describes the contribution of each vector. To identify an unknown (test) face, it is projected onto the face space to obtain its set of weights. By comparing set of weights for the unknown face to set of weights of known face, the face is identified. The PCA basis vectors are defined as eigenvectors of the scatter matrix \( S_T \) defined as:

\[
S_T = \sum_{i=0}^{M} (x_i - \mu)(x_i - \mu)^T
\]

where \( \mu \) is the mean of all faces of the training set and \( x_i \) is the \( i \)-th face.
B. Independent Component Analysis (ICA)

Independent component analysis [9] is a technique to find a linear transform for the input data using a basis as statistically independent as possible. Hence, ICA can be considered as a special case of PCA.

C. Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA)

LDA [17], [18] is a method that works on the basis of Fisher criterion. It finds the vectors that best discriminate among classes. For all samples and classes, let $S_B$ is the between class scatter matrix and $S_W$ is the within class scatter matrix. The goal is to maximize $S_B$ while minimizing $S_W$, in other words, maximize the ratio $\det(S_B)/\det(S_W)$.

D. Support Vector Machine (SVM)

SVM [19] is mainly a linear machine terms as discriminative classifier consisting of two separated classes. However, it can be extended to multiclass separation. In this paper, we are using a multiclass SVM that works on the basis of total face. Given a group of labeled training data the algorithm outputs an optimal hyperplane, which categorizes new examples.

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

For our experiment, we used three databases; the Sheffield Face Database [20], AT&T Database [21] and a face database (developed by us) including 20 different Bangladeshi people under various illuminations, poses and alignments.

The Sheffield (previously UMIST) Face Database consists of 564 images of 20 individuals (with multiple images of each person under different races, appearances, illuminations and alignments). The images are of size 220 × 220 pixels. AT&T database consists of 400 images of 40 individuals with 10 images of each person under distinct subjects. For some subjects, the images were taken at multiple times, varying the lighting, facial expressions (open / closed eyes, smiling / not smiling) and facial details (glasses / no glasses). All the images were taken against a dark homogeneous background with an upright frontal position.

In Bangladeshi people face database, there are 200 different images of 20 distinct people with 10 images of each person under varying illumination, alignment and pose. These images are manually cropped and preprocessed.

Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 are the images of a subject from different database.

It is observed that recognition rate of the Sheffield database is higher as compared to AT&T and Bangladeshi people database.

Table I shows the comparative performance of PCA, ICA, LDA and SVM methods for rotated (both clockwise and anti-clockwise) images. This comparative result confirms that SVM matches for more degrees than PCA, ICA and LDA.
TABLE I. RECOGNITION UNDER DIFFERENT ROTATIONAL SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Recognized for maximum rotation by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T, Sheffield, Bangladeshi People</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II presents the comparative performance of PCA, ICA, LDA and SVM methods for images with Salt and Pepper noise. This comparative result confirms that LDA and SVM performs better (on the basis of noise density) than PCA and ICA. Table III shows the similar result for Gaussian noise and it confirms that LDA performs better (on the basis of noise variance) than PCA and ICA. However, SVM exhibits the best performance.

TABLE II. RECOGNITION UNDER NOISY SITUATIONS (FOR SALT AND PEPPER NOISE WITH DENSITY, \(d\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Recognized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T, Sheffield, Bangladeshi People</td>
<td>(d &lt; 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. RECOGNITION UNDER NOISY SITUATIONS (FOR GAUSSIAN NOISE WITH MEAN=0 AND VARIANCE, \(v\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Recognized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T, Sheffield, Bangladeshi People</td>
<td>(v &lt; 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV. RECOGNITION (WITHOUT ANY CONTRAST STRETCHING) UNDER DIFFERENT ILLUMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Recognized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T, Sheffield, Bangladeshi People</td>
<td>Average intensity (I_{avg} &gt; 140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV shows the recognition result under different illuminations. LDA and SVM perform better compared to PCA and ICA for darker images. Table V presents the overall recognition accuracy for different methods. In finding the overall recognition accuracy, illumination variation is compensated using selective histogram equalization (for average intensity values mentioned in Table IV) approach. It confirms that SVM outperforms PCA, ICA and LDA. Some visual data are shown in Fig. 8 and Fig. 9.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper a quantitative analysis of PCA, ICA, LDA and SVM is performed. The experimental results show that SVM gives better accuracy (i.e. most robust) in comparison with other face recognition algorithms in terms of diverse illumination, alignment, noise and pose.

The methods have been implemented with Matlab (R2009a) using a Intel Core i5 processor with 4 GB RAM in Windows 8.1 platform. Processing time depends on number of images (along with image resolution) in the database and recognition accuracy depends on image quality and variations of illumination, alignment, noise and pose.
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