

Attention-Set based Metric Learning for Video Face Recognition

Yibo Hu, Xiang Wu, Ran He

Center for Research on Intelligent Perception and Computing,
Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences

yibo.hu@cripac.ia.ac.cn, alfredxiangwu@gmail.com, rhe@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

Abstract

Face recognition has made great progress with the development of deep learning. However, video face recognition (VFR) is still an ongoing task due to various illumination, low-resolution, pose variations and motion blur. Most existing CNN-based VFR methods only obtain a feature vector from a single image and simply aggregate the features in a video, which less consider the correlations of face images in one video. In this paper, we propose a novel Attention-Set based Metric Learning (ASML) method to measure the statistical characteristics of image sets. It is a promising and generalized extension of Maximum Mean Discrepancy with memory attention weighting. First, we define an effective distance metric on image sets, which explicitly minimizes the intra-set distance and maximizes the inter-set distance simultaneously. Second, inspired by Neural Turing Machine, a Memory Attention Weighting is proposed to adapt set-aware global contents. Then ASML is naturally integrated into CNNs, resulting in an end-to-end learning scheme. Our method achieves state-of-the-art performance for the task of video face recognition on the three widely used benchmarks including YouTubeFace, YouTube Celebrities and Celebrity-1000.

1. Introduction

Video face recognition (VFR) has attracted a significant attention in computer vision community in recent years [19, 41, 39, 23, 26, 5, 2, 12, 13, 34, 9]. That is mainly due to the availability of large amounts of video data. In contrast to conventional face recognition where each gallery or probe instance refers to a single image, video face recognition aims to identify and verify face videos. Moreover, each video can be treated as an image set of faces without taking temporal information into account. Obviously, more images offer us more beneficial information to represent faces and to better recognize subjects. However, it is still challenging to exploit such rich information of videos or image sets as they are usually captured in unrestricted

environments with large appearance variations incurred by occlusions, pose shifts, expression deformations and illumination changes. Generally, there three core issues in VFR: how to alleviate sample biases and noise within a video or an image set, how to construct appropriate face representations, such that it can effectively incorporate extra information available in videos or image sets, and how to define a suitable distance metric for calculating the similarity between these representations.

There has been a variety of methods on video face recognition including dictionary learning, manifold metric learning and convolutional neural network. Over the past few years, dictionary learning [19, 41, 2] achieves desirable capability on VFR, where face videos are modeled as dictionaries learned by sparse reconstruction. Chen *et al.* [2] partition each face video into several clusters with different variations and learn a series of sub-dictionaries for each cluster. This method learns the image representations and dictionaries separately. In contrast, Lu *et al.* [19] propose Simultaneous Feature and Dictionary Learning (SFDL) to learn them simultaneously. Besides, [41] shows Simultaneous Feature and Sample Reduction (SFSR) that jointly learns compact binary codes and removes redundant samples. Although, pose variations, illumination changes and expression deformations in face videos can be implicitly embedded into the learned dictionaries, these methods are unsupervised leading to less discrimination among different face videos.

Manifold metric learning [8, 12, 11, 13, 34, 9] gradually appeals more attention in this regime because it intends to learn general distance metrics and the embedded manifolds where similar face videos (or face image sets) are projected to be near and dissimilar ones are far apart. Among these methods, Grassmann Discriminant Analysis (GDA) [8] and Grassmann Embedding Discriminant Analysis (GEDA) [9] formulate the face image sets as linear subspace on Grassmann manifold and learn this manifold by principal angles. Besides, a Projection Metric Learning (PML) approach is presented to directly learn the projection on Grassmann manifold rather than in Hilbert space [12]. To bet-




Figure 1. An illustration of our proposed approach. Different colors in attention blocks indicate different significance of the corresponding face features. The Attention-Set based Metric Learning (ASML) can push the probability distributions of similar face videos closely and pull the probability distributions of dissimilar face videos far apart simultaneously.

ter model nonlinear appearance variations in face videos, more sophisticated nonlinear manifolds are employed such as Euclidean-and-Riemannian Manifold [11], Symmetric Positive Definite Manifold [13] and Gaussian Riemannian Manifold [34]. These modeling methods require strong assumptions on the category of manifolds. Therefore, if these assumptions are violated especially when there are large appearance variations of faces in videos, the recognition performance will decrease.

Recently, with the prominent success of Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) in various vision applications, some works [25, 39, 35, 23, 32, 29, 30, 26, 5] directly train CNNs to automatically learn the mapping from the input face images to a discriminative embedding with supervised signals and no prior assumptions on the potential geometry of face images. The superiority of CNN is that the network can learn the face representations and the discriminative embeddings jointly in an end-to-end manner. Current CNN based face recognition approaches [25, 35, 23, 32, 29, 30] are originally designed for single face images rather than videos. On the one hand, due to the low-resolution and motion blur in videos, the performance of these approaches for VFR will decrease. To alleviate them, Random Faces-guided Sparse Many-to-one Encoder (RF-SME) [26] and

Trunk-Branch Ensemble Convolutional Neural Networks (TRE-CNN) [5] add some randomly noise to blur the training data and concatenate holistic and local patch features for recognition. It can encourage CNN to learn blur-insensitive, pose-invariant and occlusion-robust face features. On the other hand, original face recognition methods often extract features for each image in a video and then simply aggregate them as a representation or fuse the matching results across all pairs of images between two videos. However, in this way, it doesn't consider the correlations of images in videos. Therefore, Yang *et al.* [39] design a novel attention-based feature aggregation strategy named Neural Aggregation Network (NAN). It adaptively aggregates the face features in a video by advocating high-quality face images and suppressing low-quality ones. However, to the best of our knowledge, the existing CNN based methods for VFR either take shuffled single images or randomly selected pairs or hard sampled triplets as training batches, which can not make full use of rich information of face videos (or face image sets) in the CNN training stage.

In this paper, we propose an Attention-Set based Metric Learning (ASML) approach for video face recognition. It addresses the above challenges and can be integrated into general CNN frameworks seamlessly with end-to-end train-

able parameters. ASML is a promising and generalized extension of Maximum Mean Discrepancy [24] with memory attention weighting. It can push the probability distributions of similar face videos closely and pull the probability distributions of dissimilar face videos far apart simultaneously. Each training instance is consisted of three parts: an anchor image set, a positive image set and a negative image set, where the first two are different face video clips from the same subject and the last one comes from different subject. Based on these triple-set instances, a siamese CNN with three branches is trained by supervision of ASML. ASML has powerful abilities to drive the CNN to learn more discriminative and set-aware face representations. Memory attention weighting is employed to correct sample biases in the triple-set instances. This policy can effectively maintain and focus on beneficial information while suppress and discard noisy information in network training. The proposed method is evaluated on three widely used datasets including YouTubeFace [36], YouTube Celebrities [15] and Celebrity-1000 [18] and achieves the best performance compared to state-of-the-art methods. The basic framework of our approach is illustrated in Figure 1.

Specially, the main contributions of this paper are three-folds:

- A novel Attention-Set based Metric Learning (ASML) method is proposed to correct sample biases and measure the correlations among face image sets. It shrinks the gap between the probability distributions of the same sets and enlarges the gap between the different sets simultaneously.
- We introduce an end-to-end trainable deep Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) assembled with ASML, which learns more discriminative deep representations for reliable face recognition. Each training instance of this framework is consisted of three subsets of different face videos.
- Extensive experiment results show that our method is superior to its competitors, and achieves the state-of-the-art recognition performance on the challenging video face recognition benchmarks.

2. Our Approach

In this section, we first introduce ASML, and then embed it into a general CNN framework via a simplified Neural Turing Machine [7]. Finally, we depict the whole network architecture.

2.1. Attention-Set based Metric Learning

Generally, the key component in video face recognition is image set representations, more specifically is the image features [19, 10, 41]. Since the images from the same sets

are generally similar, we expect they have similar (or same) feature distributions. On the other hand, the images from the different sets are always divergent and should have disparate feature distributions. ASML has the ability to learn such kind of features. It can enforce CNNs to learn set-aware and more discriminative image representations for video face recognition. ASML is a promising and generalized extension of Maximum Mean Discrepancy with memory attention weighting.

Maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) [24] was primitively proposed to measure the distance between two distributions based on the mean features of data sets in a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS). Let p and q be distributions defined on a domain \mathcal{X} . Assuming two data sets $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ are drawn i.i.d. from p and q respectively, the MMD criterion determines whether $p = q$ or $p \neq q$ in RKHS.

Definition 1 (from [24]) Let \mathcal{F} be a class of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let p, q, X, Y be defined as above. The MMD and its empirical estimate as:

$$\text{MMD}[\mathcal{F}, p, q] := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (E_{x \sim p}[f(x)] - E_{y \sim q}[f(y)]) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{MMD}[\mathcal{F}, X, Y] := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f(y_i) \right) \quad (2)$$

When \mathcal{F} is a unit ball in RKHS which is defined on compact metric space \mathcal{X} , the equation $\text{MMD}[\mathcal{F}, X, Y] = 0$ satisfies if and only if $p = q$ [24]. Intuitively, the smaller MMD the more correlative between distributions of X and Y , thus the features of the two sets are similar. Accordingly, the larger MMD the more discrepant between the distributions, and the features are disparate. Taken in this sense, we propose the following Mean-Set based Metric Learning (MSML),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSML}(X, Y, Z) = & \|E_{x \sim p}[f(x)] - E_{y \sim p}[f(y)]\|_2 \\ & + [\alpha - \|E_{x \sim p}[f(x)] - E_{z \sim q}[f(z)]\|_2]_+ \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $[\cdot]_+$ indicates $\max(\cdot, 0)$ and α is a constant margin. X, Y, Z represent image sets. Among them, X and Y are drawn from the same class, but different from Z . Minishing the quantity of MSML, one can increase the correlation and discrepancy between the similar and dissimilar sets respectively.

Although MMD can be applied to arbitrary dimensions and domains, it doesn't take into consideration the sample biases and outliers (or noise) in the sets, which is ubiquitous in real world applications. Consequently, it is inferior to VFR. To address it, from the proposition 1 in [4], we obtain that the following optimization problem is convex and has

the unique solution $\omega(x) = p(x)/\hat{p}(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\omega(x) \geq 0}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|E_p[f(x)] - E_{\hat{p}}[\omega(x)f(x)]\|_2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad E_{\hat{p}}[\omega(x)] = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where \hat{p} is a distribution whose support corresponds with p . Obviously, it is reasonable to believe that $\omega(x)$ can correct sample biases and remove outliers (or reduce noise), if it is well selected. Introducing $\omega(x)$ as a correction term of sample biases into MMD, we have Rectified Mean Discrepancy (RMD) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RMD}(X, Y) &= \|E_{\omega(x)}[f(x)] - E_{\omega(y)}[f(y)]\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \omega(x_i) f(x_i) - \sum_{j=1}^m \omega(y_j) f(y_j) \right\|_2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \omega(x_i) = 1, \quad \sum_{j=1}^m \omega(y_j) = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Combining Eq.(3) and Eq.(5), we couple Mean-Set based Metric Learning with the rectified term and obtain a superior metric learning method named Attention-Set based Metric Learning (ASML) for video face recognition,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ASML}(X, Y, Z) &= \|E_{\omega(x)}[f(x)] - E_{\omega(y)}[f(y)]\|_2 \\ &+ [\alpha - \|E_{\omega(x)}[f(x)] - E_{\omega(z)}[f(z)]\|_2]_+ \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum \omega(x) = 1, \quad \sum \omega(y) = 1, \quad \sum \omega(z) = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Obviously, it has the same characteristics with MSML, pushing the distributions of same sets closely and pulling the distributions of different sets far apart simultaneously. Additionally, the rectified term is equipped in it to correct biases and reduce noise.

2.2. Memory Attention Weighting

Weights in ASML indicate the significance of images in a set. If a face image is frontal, well-illuminated and legible, a high weight should be assigned. Otherwise, if it is lateral, bad-illuminated and blurred, a low weight is applied. From this perspective, three primary principles must be considered for weighting: First, the weighting method is easily integrated in basic CNN frameworks and its parameters are end-to-end trainable by means of supervised manner. Second, the weights should be global-content-based and set-aware, since we construct a training instance as a special image set to make better use of set information. Third, the learnt weights must be invariant to image order, as one weight per image and the images in a training instance are orderless.

The memory attention mechanism [39, 27, 1, 7] is suitable for the above requirements. The core concept is to

couple neural models with external memory and to be interacted by attentional addressing processes. This mechanism is extensively studied in neuroscience and cognitive science, and is widely used in Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) for a variety of sequential tasks [27, 1, 6, 38]. In this paper, we regard the weighting as a Neural Turing Machine (NTM) [7], where the face feature sets are treated as memory and the weights are deemed to address to read from and write to memory attentively.

A NTM involves three basic components: a read vector, an erase vector and an add vector. In our memory attention weighting method, we set all the elements in erase and add vectors are equal to 1 to omit writing operation, and adaptively learn the read vector in reading operation as the final weights. Different from the approaches in [39, 27, 1, 7], we don't implicitly obtain weights by dot-producting the feature vectors with a key vector found inside of the convex hull spanned by all the face features. Conversely, we explicitly learn the weights from the whole feature vectors in the feature sets. As a consequence, our weighting is global-content-based and set-aware. Let $\{f_i\}$ be a face feature set and $\{s_i\}$ be the corresponding significance, which will be learnt adaptively. A softmax operation is applied on s_i to form normalized weights ω_i . The operation and the reformulated $E_{\omega}[f(x)]$ in Eq.(6) are as follows.

$$\omega_i = \frac{\exp(s_i)}{\sum_j \exp(s_j)} \quad (7)$$

$$E_{\omega}[f(x)] = \sum_i \left[\frac{\exp(s_i)}{\sum_j \exp(s_j)} \cdot f_i \right] \quad (8)$$

Obviously, the weights $\{\omega_i\}$ are orderless and the $\{s_i\}$ are differentiable, allowing them to be learnt end-to-end.

2.3. Network Architecture

We introduce the lightened CNN [37] as our primary network. It contains 29 convolution layers with residual blocks and Max-Feature-Map (MFM) operations. Based on the primary network, ASML and Memory Attention Weighting are coupled for video face recognition. Moreover, we find Softmax is an important supervised signal for our method. Thus we obtain the following object function:

$$L = \lambda_1 \text{Softmax} + \lambda_2 \text{ASML} \quad (9)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are trade-offs between these two terms. The softmax function is used for standard face recognition tasks, and ASML penalizes to increase the correlations and the discrepancies between the probability distributions of similar and dissimilar face sets respectively. All the parameters in our network are differentiable and the gradients can be calculated by

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta} = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \text{Softmax}}{\partial \theta} + \lambda_2 \frac{\partial \text{ASML}}{\partial \theta} \quad (10)$$



Figure 2. Some face samples in three experimental datasets. Each row in a subgraph represents one person. There are large appearance variations incurred by occlusions, expressions and poses.

Algorithm 1 Attention-Set based Metric Learning

Input: Training set: anchor image set X , positive image set Y , negative image set Z , the margin α and the trade-off parameters λ_1, λ_2 .

Output: The CNN parameters θ and the significance scores s .

- 1: Initialize parameters θ by pre-trained model and set s to be equal to 1;
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3: Forward propagation to obtain $Softmax, ASML$;
 - 4: Compute gradients according to Eq. (10) and Eq. (11);
 - 5: Backward propagation for θ, s ;
 - 6: Fix θ and update s by Eq. (11);
 - 7: Fix s and update θ by Eq. (10);
 - 8: **end for**;
 - 9: **Return** θ, s ;
-

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial s} = \lambda_2 \frac{\partial ASML}{\partial \omega} \cdot \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial s} \quad (11)$$

where θ represents the network parameters. The details of training is shown in Algorithm 1.

3. Experiments

The performance of our proposed approach is evaluated on three publicly available video face recognition datasets including YouTubeFace [36], YouTube Celebrities [15] and Celebrity-1000 [18]. In this section, we first briefly introduce these datasets and the experimental settings, followed by the evaluation and comparison with state-of-the-art methods. Finally, we detail an ablation study on different supervised signals of our approach.

3.1. Datasets

YouTubeFace (YTF) contains 3,425 unconstrained videos varying from 48 to 6070 frames of 1,595 different subjects download from YouTube. This dataset is constructed for video face verification task with the standard

testing protocol [36] to perform ten-fold cross validation tests. Each fold contains 500 video pairs where half of them are inter-subject pairs and half are intra-subject pairs. So, there are 5,000 video pairs in total. With the provided facial detection results, we use the method in [28] to localize facial landmarks and further obtain the aligned face images by similarity transformation. Some samples are displayed in Figure 2(a).

YouTube Celebrities (YTC) is composed of 1,910 video clips of 47 subjects, which is also collected from YouTube website. It is a quite challenging dataset for video face identification task due to the high compression rate and large appearance variations. Moreover, there are many tracking errors in this dataset, leading to low-quality and noisy face images. Following the standard evaluation protocol, five-fold cross validation is conducted on it. Each fold contains 423 video clips (9 per subject), wherein 141 clips (3 per subject) are randomly selected as gallery sets and the remaining 282 clips (6 per subject) form the probe sets. The faces in YTC are pre-processed by histogram equalization to moderate the effect of illumination variations. We directly utilize the original face images without any landmark localization and alignment process because of the low quality. As shown in Figure 2(b).

Celebrity-1000 (C-1000) is a large-scale unrestricted video dataset downloaded from YouTube and Youku. It is designed for video face identification task and consisted of 159,726 video sequences of 1000 subjects covering various resolution, illumination and poses. There are two types of protocols on this dataset: close-set and open-set. In the close-set protocol, four overlapping subsets are created with an incremental number of subjects: 100, 200, 500 and 1000. Each subset is further divided into a training (gallery) part and a testing (probe) part with disjoint video sequences. In the open-set protocol, 200 subjects are used for training, the rest 800 subjects are used as gallery and probe with four settings: 100, 200, 400 and 800 subjects. We leverage the provided five facial landmarks to align the faces and Figure 2(c) shows some examples.

3.2. Experimental Settings

Training schema: The network training includes three stages. First, the primary CNN is trained on the MS-Celeb-1M dataset followed by the instructions in [37]. Then we remove the last fully connected layer and append a dataset-specific fully connected layer with randomly initialized. Fixing all the other network parameters and training parameters, we fine-tune this layer with $1e-3$ learning rate under the softmax supervised signal. At the third stage, the whole network framework is fine-tuned on the above three datasets. In this stage, for all experiments, we set the learning rate to $1e-4$ with fixed policy and initialize the memory attention weights to be equal with the summation to be 1. The coefficients of momentum and weight decay are set to 0.9 and $5e-4$ respectively. The trade-off parameters λ_1 (for Softmax term) and λ_2 (for ASML term) are assigned to 1 and 0.01, the margin α is set to 25. Note that the face images in YTC are poor quality and low-resolution (20×20). Accordingly, they may lead to over-fitting if the large network parameters are learnt. To address this problem, we enlarge the weight decay to $5e-3$ and the margin to 60 while shrink λ_2 to 0.004 for experiments on YTC. All the colored face images are transformed to gray-scale and normalized to 144×144 . Then they are randomly cropped into 128×128 and mirrored with 50% probability to augment the training data. The batch size is set to 72, and each batch contains three equal-sized subsets of face images to form a triplet-set, including an anchor subset X , a positive subset Y and a negative subset Z . We use the hard sampling approach to construct these triplet-sets.

Evaluation criteria: Given a face video, we extract the output of FC1 layer as the face representations, then averagely pool them over this video to obtain a face video feature. For each pair of face videos, a similarity score is calculated by cosine distance metric. Based on these scores, the performance is measured in terms of Rank-1 accuracy and Verification Accuracy Rate for identification and verification tasks respectively.

Reproducibility: Our method is implemented by the open source deep learning framework Caffe [14]. The source codes and the models will be released latter.

3.3. Results on YouTubeFace

We evaluate the video face verification performance of our method on the YTF dataset. Following the standard verification protocol (described in Sec.3.1), we report the average Verification Accuracy Rate (VAR) under 10-fold cross validation. For every testing pair of face videos, we select top-50 detected face images from each one if the number of images is larger than 50. Otherwise, we use all the contained face images. The similarity is measured by cosine distance. If it is greater than the critical threshold, the two video sequences are treated as the same subject. Otherwise,

Method	VAR \pm SD (%)
DeepFace[32]	91.40 \pm 1.10
VGG-Face[23]	92.80
DeepID2+[29]	93.20 \pm 0.20
Sparse ConvNet[30]	93.50
VGG-CRF-SME[26]	93.80 \pm 1.30
Wen <i>et al.</i> [35]	94.90
TBE-CNN[5]	94.96 \pm 0.31
FaceNet[25]	95.12 \pm 0.39
GoogleNet+AvePool[39]	95.20 \pm 0.76
GoogleNet+NAN[39]	95.72 \pm 0.64
VGG-Face+Embedding[23]	97.30
Our(Baseline)	95.54 \pm 1.12
Our(Softmax)	96.74 \pm 0.78
Our(Softmax+ASML)	97.58\pm0.79

Table 1. Comparison of Verification Accuracy Rate (\pm Standard Variation) (VAR \pm SD) with other state-of-the-art methods on the YouTubeFace dataset.

they are regarded as different ones. By enumerating thresholds, we obtain the maximum accuracy as VAR.

We compare our method with DeepFace [32], VGG-Face [23], DeepID2+ [29], Sparse ConvNet [30], VGG-CRF-SME [26], Wen *et al.* [35], TBE-CNN [5], FaceNet [25], GoogleNet [31] and NAN [39]. The results are presented in Table 1. Our proposed method obtains 97.58% VAR, which beats the recently popular image face recognition methods with large margins, such as DeepFace, DeepID2+ and FaceNet. It outperforms the previous best method VGG-Face (97.3%) and the feature aggregation method NAN (95.72%). It worth nothing that VGG-Face not only chooses the top-50 detected faces of each face video for video face verification, but also extracts each face feature by averaging 30 cropped patches (three scales, five random positions, and horizontal mirror), whereas our method only uses 1 patch.

Figure 3 shows same false negative pairs on YTF. It is obvious that the errors are mainly caused by bad alignment and low-resolution. Note that the pre-trained CNN model is for high-resolution images.

3.4. Results on YouTube Celebrities

In this subsection, we report the results of our proposed method on YTC, following the standard 5-fold cross validation for identification task. All face images of gallery/probe videos are used due to the low-resolution of images and small number of faces in each gallery/probe video.

Table 2 reports the comparisons of our method with Localized Multi-Kernel Metric Learning (LMKML) [21], Multi-Manifold Deep Metric Learning (MMDML) [20], Mean Sequence Sparse Representation-based Classification (MSSRC) [22], Simultaneous Feature and Sample Reduction (SFSR) [41], Recurrent Regression Neural Network



Figure 3. Two false negative pairs on the YouTubeFace dataset. Each two rows are different face videos of the same subject.

(RRNN) [17], Covariate-Relation Graph (CRG) [3] and VGG-Face [23]. It is obvious that Softmax+ASML obtains the best performance compared with other methods. What is more, It improves the accuracy of non CNN-based methods by more than 11% and reduces the error rate of CNN-based methods by about 60%. This significant improvement indicates Softmax+ASML can drive CNNs to generate more robust and discriminative features for VFR.

3.5. Results on Celebrity-1000

We compare the performance of our method with other state-of-the-art methods, including Multi-task Joint Sparse Representation (MTJSR) [40], Eigen Probabilistic Elastic Part (Eigen-PEP) [16], Deep Extreme Learning Machines (DELM) [33], GoogleNet [31] and Neural Aggregation Network (NAN) [39] on the close-set and open-set protocols of C-1000. In both protocols, the testing is to identify the subject of a probe face video given the gallery face video set. Each subject in C-1000 has various number of video sequences and each video sequence contains massive face images, thus we randomly extract 200 face features from all available images in all the video sequences of a specific gallery subject, and aggregate them by average pooling. As for the probe video sequences, all the images in a sequence are assembled to form a video feature. The similarity scores are calculated between video features and subject features. Further, we can identify the subject of the probe video by the maximum score.

close-set protocol: The evaluation results on the close-set setting are shown in the left of Table 3. The proposed Softmax+ASML outperforms the state-of-the-art methods on Subject-100 (90.84% vs 90.44%), Subject-200 (86.71% vs 83.33%), Subject-500 (84.09% vs 82.27%) and Subject-1000 (81.92% vs 77.17%). It improves the performance of the baseline network by large margins, because ASML exploits the typical information in videos based on memory attention mechanism.

open-set protocol: The right side of Table 3 displays the

Method	Rank-1 (%)
LMKML[21]	78.20
MMDML[20]	78.50
MSSRC[22]	80.75
SFSR[41]	85.74
RRNN[17]	86.60
CRG[3]	86.70
VGG-Face[23]	93.62
Our(Baseline)	94.18
Our(Softmax)	95.39
Our(Softmax+ASML)	97.52

Table 2. Average Rank-1 accuracy (%) on the YouTube Celebrities dataset with standard 5-fold cross validation.

results on the open-set protocol. DELM is not evaluated on this protocol in the published paper [33], thus we remove it from this table. As expected, Softmax+ASML achieves the best results, performing 89.88%, 85.94%, 83.83% and 80.02% for the settings of 100, 200, 400 and 800 subjects respectively. It indicates that our method has superior generalization capability and can better recognize the subjects that are not seen in training.

Note that, the proposed ASML has huge distinctions with NAN. ASML focuses on learning more discriminative and robust face image representations via a CNN framework and utilizes average pooling to aggregate them. In contrast, NAN pays more attentions on the aggregation process. It employs GoogleNet as the feature extractor and the extracted face features are treated as new training samples to train a Neural Aggregation Network (NAN) independently of the previous GoogleNet. The outputs of NAN are significant scores of the corresponding features. Based on these scores, the final face video features are obtained by significantly weighting summation. From this perspective, ASML can be further combined with NAN seamlessly because they are two independent parts. Intuitively, the performance of our method can be further improved when embedding NAN into it.

3.6. Ablation Study

In this subsection, we analysis the effect of different supervised signals (see Sec.2.1) on the Celebrity-1000 dataset. The results are presented in Table 4. As shown in Table 4, RMD has better performance than MMD, and ASML is superior to MSML on both the close-set and open-set protocols. It indicates that the memory attention weighting for sample biases correction is effective for video face recognition. Then, comparing with ASML and RMD, the former has an improvement of Rank-1 accuracy by average 0.96%, which is consistent with the results between MSML and MMD. It means that pulling the feature distributions of different subjects (MSML and ASML) is effective for

Method	Close-Set				Open-Set			
	100	200	500	1000	100	200	400	800
MTJSR[40]	50.60	40.80	35.46	30.04	46.12	39.84	37.51	33.50
DELM[33]	49.80	45.21	38.88	28.83	-	-	-	-
Eigen-RER[16]	50.60	45.02	39.97	31.94	51.55	46.15	42.33	35.90
GoogleNet+AvePool[39]	84.46	78.93	77.68	73.41	84.11	79.09	78.40	75.12
GoogleNet+NAN[39]	90.44	83.33	82.27	77.17	88.76	85.21	82.74	79.87
Our(Baseline)	87.25	81.70	78.37	74.76	86.77	80.20	81.12	76.87
Our(Softmax)	88.45	84.01	80.80	79.12	87.94	83.17	82.28	78.00
Our(Softmax+ASML)	90.84	86.71	84.09	81.92	89.88	85.94	83.83	80.02

Table 3. Comparison of Rank-1 accuracy (%) with other state-of-the-art methods on the Celebrity-1000 dataset.

Supervised Signal	Close-Set				Open-Set			
	100	200	500	1000	100	200	400	800
Baseline	87.25	81.70	78.37	74.76	86.77	82.38	81.12	76.87
Softmax	88.45	84.01	80.80	79.12	87.94	83.17	82.28	78.00
Softmax+MMD	89.24	84.97	82.99	80.48	88.33	84.15	82.87	78.64
Softmax+RMD	89.64	85.36	83.07	80.87	88.72	84.55	83.25	78.94
Softmax+MSML	90.04	86.13	83.78	81.37	89.11	85.35	83.54	79.43
Softmax+ASML	90.84	86.71	84.09	81.92	89.88	85.94	83.83	80.02

Table 4. Comparison of Rank-1 accuracy (%) with different supervised signals on the Celebrity-1000 dataset.

video face recognition. Note that the improvements of each supervised signal on the close-100 and open-100 protocols are similar. It is mainly because the amount of probe face videos is small in these two scenarios.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced an Attention-Set based Metric Learning (ASML) method for video face recognition. By exploiting memory attention weighting, our proposed method corrects the sample biases in the training face videos, and can be embedded into CNNs seamlessly with end-to-end training. Specifically, ASML drives CNNs to generate more discriminative face representations containing small intra-set and large inter-set distance. Extensive experiments on three popular benchmarks have demonstrated that our proposed method is superior to the other state-of-the-art approaches.

References

- [1] D. Bahdanau, K. Cho, and Y. Bengio. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [2] Y.-C. Chen, V. M. Patel, P. J. Phillips, and R. Chellappa. Dictionary-based face recognition from video. In *ECCV*, 2012.
- [3] Z. Chen, B. Jiang, J. Tang, and B. Luo. Image set representation and classification with covariate-relation graph. In *ACPR*, 2015.
- [4] C. Cortes, M. Mohri, M. Riley, and A. Rostamizadeh. Sample selection bias correction theory. In *ICALT*, 2008.
- [5] C. Ding and D. Tao. Trunk-branch ensemble convolutional neural networks for video-based face recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.05427*, 2016.
- [6] A. Graves and N. Jaitly. Towards end-to-end speech recognition with recurrent neural networks. In *ICML*, 2014.
- [7] A. Graves, G. Wayne, and I. Danihelka. Neural Turing machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5401*, 2014.
- [8] J. Hamm and D. D. Lee. Grassmann discriminant analysis: a unifying view on subspace-based learning. In *ICML*, 2008.
- [9] M. T. Harandi, C. Sanderson, S. Shirazi, and B. C. Lovell. Graph embedding discriminant analysis on grassmannian manifolds for improved image set matching. In *CVPR*, 2011.
- [10] M. Hayat, M. Bennamoun, and S. An. Learning non-linear reconstruction models for image set classification. In *CVPR*, 2014.
- [11] Z. Huang, R. Wang, S. Shan, and X. Chen. Face recognition on large-scale video in the wild with hybrid euclidean-and-riemannian metric learning. *IEEE PR*, 48(10):3113–3124, 2015.
- [12] Z. Huang, R. Wang, S. Shan, and X. Chen. Projection metric learning on grassmann manifold with application to video based face recognition. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [13] Z. Huang, R. Wang, S. Shan, X. Li, and X. Chen. Log-euclidean metric learning on symmetric positive definite manifold with application to image set classification. In *ICML*, 2015.
- [14] Y. Jia, E. Shelhamer, J. Donahue, S. Karayev, J. Long, R. Girshick, S. Guadarrama, and T. Darrell. Caffe: Convolutional architecture for fast feature embedding. In *ACM MM*, 2014.

- [15] M. Kim, S. Kumar, V. Pavlovic, and H. Rowley. Face tracking and recognition with visual constraints in real-world videos. In *CVPR*, 2008.
- [16] H. Li, G. Hua, X. Shen, Z. Lin, and J. Brandt. Eigen-pep for video face recognition. In *ACCV*, 2014.
- [17] Y. Li, W. Zheng, and Z. Cui. Recurrent regression for face recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06999*, 2016.
- [18] L. Liu, L. Zhang, H. Liu, and S. Yan. Toward large-population face identification in unconstrained videos. *IEEE TCSVT*, 24(11):1874–1884, 2014.
- [19] J. Lu, G. Wang, W. Deng, and P. Moulin. Simultaneous feature and dictionary learning for image set based face recognition. In *ECCV*, 2014.
- [20] J. Lu, G. Wang, W. Deng, P. Moulin, and J. Zhou. Multi-manifold deep metric learning for image set classification. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [21] J. Lu, G. Wang, and P. Moulin. Image set classification using holistic multiple order statistics features and localized multi-kernel metric learning. In *ICCV*, 2013.
- [22] E. G. Ortiz, A. Wright, and M. Shah. Face recognition in movie trailers via mean sequence sparse representation-based classification. In *CVPR*, 2013.
- [23] O. M. Parkhi, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman. Deep face recognition. In *BMVC*, 2015.
- [24] B. Scholkopf, J. Platt, and T. Hofmann. A kernel method for the two-sample-problem. In *NIPS*, 2008.
- [25] F. Schroff, D. Kalenichenko, and J. Philbin. Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [26] M. Shao, Y. Zhang, and Y. Fu. Collaborative random faces-guided encoders for pose-invariant face representation learning. *IEEE T NEUR NET LEAR*, 2017.
- [27] S. Sukhbaatar, J. Weston, R. Fergus, et al. End-to-end memory networks. In *NIPS*, 2015.
- [28] Y. Sun, X. Wang, and X. Tang. Deep convolutional network cascade for facial point detection. In *CVPR*, 2013.
- [29] Y. Sun, X. Wang, and X. Tang. Deeply learned face representations are sparse, selective, and robust. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [30] Y. Sun, X. Wang, and X. Tang. Sparsifying neural network connections for face recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- [31] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [32] Y. Taigman, M. Yang, M. Ranzato, and L. Wolf. Deepface: Closing the gap to human-level performance in face verification. In *CVPR*, 2014.
- [33] M. Uzair, F. Shafait, B. Ghanem, and A. Mian. Representation learning with deep extreme learning machines for efficient image set classification. *NEURAL COMPUT APPL*, pages 1–13, 2015.
- [34] W. Wang, R. Wang, Z. Huang, S. Shan, and X. Chen. Discriminant analysis on riemannian manifold of gaussian distributions for face recognition with image sets. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [35] Y. Wen, K. Zhang, Z. Li, and Y. Qiao. A discriminative feature learning approach for deep face recognition. In *ECCV*, 2016.
- [36] L. Wolf, T. Hassner, and I. Maoz. Face recognition in unconstrained videos with matched background similarity. In *CVPR*, 2011.
- [37] X. Wu, R. He, Z. Sun, and T. Tan. A light cnn for deep face representation with noisy labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02683*, 2016.
- [38] S. Xiong, Y. Zhang, D. Ji, and Y. Lou. Distance metric learning for aspect phrase grouping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.08672*, 2016.
- [39] J. Yang, P. Ren, D. Chen, F. Wen, H. Li, and G. Hua. Neural aggregation network for video face recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.05474*, 2016.
- [40] X.-T. Yuan, X. Liu, and S. Yan. Visual classification with multitask joint sparse representation. *IEEE TIP*, 21(10):4349–4360, 2012.
- [41] M. Zhang, R. He, D. Cao, Z. Sun, and T. Tan. Simultaneous feature and sample reduction for image-set classification. In *AAAI*, 2016.