Overview

training data for that face. The algorithm looks at the closeness of features not use a template to seek out facial features. CGM uses only data that is in the training set to form features. This makes the algorithm completely

neural network to compare positive and negative matches. Ten training images were condensed to one image via CGM, and compared against one positive image (the same person), and one negative image (a different person). In the experiment, each trial was run for 100 iterations. The hard to find or represent. The algorithm does not need to know what it is looking for to make associations, which makes it a good candidate for

Background

Comparative Graph Model for Facial Recognition **Systems**

Timothy Zee, Mehdi Ghayoumi Kent State University

Algorithm



Comparative Graph Model decides on important fainters by examining but often fainters and a conduct throughout the is is checked if fainters, GCM makes decisions on whether or not a fainter cancinative prepresent the person. CRO doupts a may of points that the criteria will end up in the final map of fainters. *Proprocessing* The first step of GCM is to preprocess the data to find fatures in the issue of the criteria will end up in the final map of fainters. *Proprocessing* tearters to identify fatures in a facial image. The last step of the transfer of the step of features in the stand constant fature is and constant fature step in the step of the ste

 $\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}$

Figure 4. After a Sobel Line Detecto and SURF Detecto have been utilized, CGM displays the filtered result.



Future Work

Efficiencv

EITICIENCY Comparative Graph Model can benefit from improved efficiency by reducing the amount of comparisons computed. If features all belonged to specific regions, regions can be compared to the same regions across other images. This would reduce the amount of computation significantly. To ensure features near the border of



Convolutional Neutral Network The results achieved from this study were done with a one-layer perceptron neural network. Perceptron neural networks cannot achieve more than 80% - 85% accuracy. In order to truly test how accurate CGM can be, using a more accurate machine learning technique needs to be used. The next step is to use a convolutional neural network that can achieve up to 95% - 95% accuracy to see how accurate CGM can be to the use of facial recognition and

Conclusion

features found within the training set. This method allows for a fuller node map than template-based other approaches. Overall, in this experiment, the algorithm was able to achieve an overall accuracy of 61%, with 71% correctness of matching a person to

By using a deep learning algorithm, such as a convolutional neural network, CGM will not be bounded shown by the experimental results, the resulting accuracy is a balancing act of the tolerable distance and this algorithm shows viable results, and with continuing efforts, may be a useful algorithm for discovering patterns in training data due to the unsupervised nature of the algorithm.

Comparison

 Completely unsupervised Gives all found features equal opportunity Finds all distinct features within the training set 	 Much slower due to comparative nature of the algorithm Currently cannot be used for real-time systems

Template-Based Approach

Experimental Results

Allowable Distance and Z

parameter becomes more restrictive, the optimal point is shifted more right (where TDT allows for a larger gap between nodes). Thus, TDT and Z have an inverse relationship to one another. As one parameter becomes more restrictive, the other

these two parameters that will create the optimal value for the algorithm. This study shows that the value for the algorithm. This study shows that the optimal value may be found around TDT = 2.00% and the Z parameter = 40%. At this point, the overall accuracy achieved was around 61% with a perceptron neural network. As either parameter



Mehdi Ghayoumi, Advisor

KENT STATE Choose **Ohio** First

facial recognition, we have tested the tolerable distance threshold from 1% - 4% with quarter trained, to test false matches. The resulting overall accuracy for Z = $\{40, 50, 60, \text{ and } 70\}$ with each allowable distance threshold of TDT = $\{1.00, 1.25, 1.50, 1.75, 2.00, 2.25, 2.75, 3.00, 3.25, 3.50, 1.50, 1.75, 1.50, 1.75, 2.75, 3.00, 3.25, 3.50, 1.50,$

Z Values (%)