

# SREFI: Synthesis of Realistic Example Face Images

Anonymous IJCB 2017 submission

## Abstract

We propose a novel face synthesis approach that can generate an arbitrarily large number of synthetic images of real identities and also synthetic images of synthetic identities. Thus a face dataset can be expanded both in terms of the number of identities represented and the number of images per identity. Our approach starts with actual face images, that we call the “base faces, from a manually prepared dataset. To measure the visual fidelity and uniqueness of the synthetic face images and identities, we conducted face matching experiments with both human participants and a CNN pre-trained on a dataset of 2.6M real face images. To evaluate the stability of these synthetic faces, we trained a CNN model with an augmented dataset containing close to 200,000 synthetic faces. We used a snapshot of this trained CNN to recognize extremely challenging frontal real face images. Experiments showed training with the synthetic faces boosted the face recognition performance of the CNN. Our approach provides a means to generate a large face image dataset without the identity-labeling and privacy complications that come from downloading images from the web, and this dataset can be used to improve accuracy of CNN face recognition.

## 1. Introduction

Researchers have assembled and shared face image datasets downloaded from the web, ranging from thousands to millions of images [?, ?, ?]. The VGG-Face dataset (2.6M images) [?] and the recently released MS-Celeb-1M dataset (10M images) [?] are the most notable among these. However, industrial giants like Facebook [?] and especially Google [?] have private face image datasets with over 200M images at their disposal. Given the tremendous resource overhead for compiling such a dataset by selectively downloading images from the internet, it is difficult to amass such large datasets.

Recent results motivating the need for even larger datasets involve data augmentation for CNN training. It is common practice to augment any dataset before using it to train a CNN. Augmentation is done to reduce the chance




Figure 1. The motivation behind our work: while traditional augmentation methods have explored face image cropping, translation and scaling (left column), we can augment a dataset by creating synthetic face images of existing identities (middle column) and new synthetic identities altogether (right column). This augments both the depth and breadth of a dataset.

of the CNN over-fitting the training data. Typically, researchers use simple methods like image translation, cropping and rescaling to augment the training data, as illustrated in the left column of Figure ???. Despite these augmentation methods, CNNs still tend to over-fit the training data, if each training class does not contain considerable number of samples [?]. For publicly available face datasets, a related reason for over-fitting is disparity in the number of images per subject. Often there are a few persons with a large number of images each, and a large number of persons with few images each. This is termed the ‘long-tail’ problem in [?, ?]. One result of this is that the CNN may fail to learn a feature representation that adequately represents the subjects with few images. Consequently, a CNN trained on such an unbalanced dataset might not be as effective as a CNN trained on a well-balanced dataset in face recognition tasks [?].

There is a need to be able to create face image datasets that (1) contain an arbitrarily large number of persons, (2) have a balanced number of varied images per person, and (3) do not run into potential issues of invasion of privacy. We solve these problems with a system for automatically

generating synthetic face images, of either a known real identity or of a synthetic identity not corresponding to any real person. When face images are generated for synthetic identities rather than any real person, privacy issues are avoided. Datasets can be generated to have a balanced number of images per identity, avoiding the long-tail problem. Also, the computation and communication burden of downloading from the web is avoided. Finally, our synthesis method can be applied to generate additional images of a real person as well as to generate images of a synthetic identity. Combining these two modes, our approach can augment an existing dataset by increasing the number of face images per real identity, and by increasing the total number of (real + synthetic) identities. This is a significant improvement over traditional face augmentation methods (Figure ??).

Our approach, “SREFT”, constructs synthetic face images from a donor set of face images of real identities. The process of generating a synthetic face image starts with a real face image, the “base face”. This face is divided into various region-specific triangles, and then a synthetic face image is generated by stitching together corresponding triangles from other (real) face images. The other real face images used (the “donor images”) are those proximal to the base face in a CNN feature representation space. To obtain new synthetic images of a real identity, the donor images are selected from that real identity. To obtain images of a synthetic identity, the donor images are selected from a set of different real identities. Our approach adjusts the color distribution of the triangles from the donor face images, and blends them together to generate a natural-looking synthetic face image.

We have performed two types of face-matching experiments, to validate our approach to generating synthetic face images, on a synthetic face image dataset constructed using this technique. One used human evaluators and the other used a pre-trained snapshot of the VGG-FACE model [?]. These experiments show low intra-class variance between different images of a given synthetic identity, and high inter-class variance between different synthetic identities. We performed another experiment with VGG-FACE to demonstrate the value of our synthetic image datasets in improving face recognition accuracy. We trained the VGG-FACE model from scratch on a batch of over 200,000 combined real and synthetic face images and over 260,000 real face images from the CASIA-WebFace (CW) dataset [?]. We used these trained CNNs to recognize face images from the most challenging ‘Ugly’ partition of the ‘Good, Bad and Ugly (GBU) dataset [?]. The CNN trained with the synthetic face images outperformed the CNN trained with the CW face images.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Prior related research is discussed in Section 2. Section 3

describes the preparation of the set of base images. The synthesis pipeline is explained in detail in Section 4. Section 5 presents experimental results that assess the realism, uniqueness and stability of the synthetically generated face images and identities. Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2. Related Work

Previous related work can be categorized into three broad groups as below.

**Face Recognition** - Like many other vision tasks, face recognition performance is improving rapidly with the proliferation of face data and deep CNN models. State-of-the-art face recognition algorithms have achieved near-perfect accuracy on the once-challenging LFW dataset [?]. While some research focuses on creating novel CNN architectures [?, ?, ?], other focus on feeding a large pool of training data [?, ?]. However, LFW with its 13,000 images is an under-representation of the diverse population of faces a human encounters. The effect of this wide gap in data size on the recognition performance of the above methods has been documented in [?]. Most of the recognition methods which produced near-perfect results on LFW (13k images) performed poorly in verification tasks on the MegaFace dataset (over 1M images) [?].

**Face Synthesis** - One of the earliest face synthesis methods [?] used a combination of neighborhood patches from a set of images for hallucinating new faces. A more robust method was proposed in [?], where the authors automatically selected a group of face images similar in appearance and pose to a source image. Each face in that group was overlaid on top of the source image and the combination with the lowest deviation from the original image was blended to give the final result. Others have implemented a model-based learning approach for different applications like swapping of aligned faces, expression flow across images of the same person and hallucination of new faces [?, ?, ?, ?, ?]. An inverse rendering approach for synthesizing a 3D structure of the face was proposed in [?], and more recently a one-shot version of the same was described in [?]. The method proposed in [?], which divides the source face into four different parts and replaces each part from a gallery image before blending, is thematically closer to our approach. Recently, researchers have used generative adversarial nets (GANs) [?] to change facial attributes like hair, mouth, eyeglasses [?, ?] or for artificially aging a face [?]. However, GANs require a lot of training data and the synthetic face images are relatively low resolution and do not appear very realistic.

**Data Augmentation** - Dataset augmentation has been known to help the learning of CNN models as it reduces overfitting on the training data [?]. However, some popular augmentation methods at present are simply over-sampling or mirroring the training images. For re-identification

Table 1. SREFI donor set distribution

Ethnicity	Male images (subjects)	Female images (subjects)
Caucasian	7108 (678)	5510 (600)
Asian	1903 (100)	1286 (74)
African American	67 (9)	65 (10)

purposes, another mode of augmentation proposed was to change the image background [?]. Hassner proposed an augmentation method for faces [?, ?] which generates frontal versions of the face images to reduce recognition errors. This idea was extended in [?] by augmenting the CASIA-WebFace dataset [?], synthesizing new images with multiple pose, shape and expressions. However, a major difference between our method and these methods is that our system can generate multiple synthetic faces of a new non-existent identity as well as new images of an existing identity. Our method has the capability of increasing the number of training classes, by synthesizing new identities, while maintaining the number of images per subject.

### 3. Collection of the SREFI Donor Set

The donor set for SREFI could in principle be based on any dataset of real face images of a sufficient number of different persons. We use a dataset of donor face images created from an existing publicly-available dataset [?]. Multiple frontal images of each subjects were acquired in different sessions. Subjects varied in gender, age and ethnicity. We created cropped, 2D-aligned and resized (to 512x512) versions of the images for our experiments. For the sake of generating realistic synthetic face images, the donor set was subdivided by race and gender. To eliminate any major visual artifacts in the synthetic faces, images with very thick facial hair or glasses were removed from the donor set. Table ?? shows the image count and subject breakdown of the donor set by race and gender. Figure 3 shows some example face images.

## 4. Our Synthesis Method - SREFI

The steps in our synthesis method, the workflow of which is depicted in Figure ??, are described below.

### 4.1. Landmarking & Triangulation

In order to replace the existing target face with one assembled from donor faces, the base face is first divided into triangular regions using a subset of the 68 facial landmark points acquired using the method from [?], available in the ‘Dlib software [?]. This set of points for the initial triangulation can be seen in Figure ??a. Since these landmark points occur at important locations of the face such as eye,




Figure 2. Example set of six images from the donor set. A male and female of each race in the donor set are shown.

nose, and mouth corners, inaccuracies in detecting them initially would lead to multiple eye, nose or mouth corners appearing in the newly synthesized faces. To address this issue, we developed a triangulation that moved important facial features away from triangle corners, resulting in more visually stable regions. Using the points provided by Dlib and our initial triangulation of the face (Figure ??b), we obtained centroids using the three vertices of the original triangle. We created a new triangulation of the face by joining a centroid with the adjoining centroids of the triangles in its neighborhood (Figure ??c). This allowed each region to be replaced in the target face using the region shape from the donors. Additionally, the outer part of the image was triangulated in order to allow the outer shape of the face to be modified. Our triangulation method is different from the one proposed in [?], as they used pre-defined points from the barycentric averages of landmark points extracted using the method from [?], to create masks of only three main facial regions.

### 4.2. Selection of the Donor Pool

We selected faces for the donor pool by finding proximal face images to the base face image in a lower-dimensional feature space. For this purpose, we extracted the 4096-dimensional feature vector for each original face image in our SREFI dataset from the fc7 layer of a snapshot of the VGG-FACE CNN model [?], available in the Caffe [?] model zoo<sup>1</sup> pre-trained on 2.6M face images in the VGG-FACE dataset [?]. Then, we computed the mean feature vector for each subject of the dataset by averaging the feature vectors for each image of that subject.

The similarity score between two images was calculated using these features. Any distance function can be used

<sup>1</sup>Caffe model zoo: <https://github.com/BVLC/caffe/wiki/Model-Zoo>




Figure 3. Workflow of the SREFI method on a high level.

for scoring: we chose cosine similarity as it has been extensively used to match VGG-FACE features by other researchers [?]. The similarity score  $S(v_1, v_2)$  between feature vectors  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  is calculated as:-

$$S(v_1, v_2) = \frac{v_1 \cdot v_2}{\|v_1\|_2 \|v_2\|_2} \quad (1)$$

where  $S(v_1, v_2)$  is the similarity score between two vectors  $v_1 = [f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots, f_{4096}]$  and  $v_2 = [f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots, f_{4096}]$ . If  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are perfectly alike (0 angle), then  $S(v_1, v_2)$  is 1. In our case, a score closer to 1 indicated proximal subjects in the feature space. For each subject, we stored the face images of its  $N$  such proximal subjects as the potential selection pool. To generate synthetic images of existing subjects, *i.e.* expanding a real identity, we simply created the selection pool with all the real face images of that subject. So our algorithm generated synthetic face images of existing subjects by recombining parts of real face images of that subject.

### 4.3. Attribute based Reshaping of Facial Parts

Once the donor pool was selected, we implemented a reshaping step before the triangle replacement. Due to variations in face shape and structure, positioning facial regions from the donor on their relative position in the base face could give the resulting synthetic face a distinctly non-real appearance (overly stretched or compressed). In order to address this we looked into reshaping the synthetic face using natural face shape ratios.

Previous work on face shape ratios focused on ratios in relation to perceived beauty of the subject and used ratios based on the height of the full head or hand marked forehead points [?]. As we did not have facial landmarks for forehead or head top points, we instead obtained our own distribution of face shape ratios from the real subjects in our donor set. For each ethnic group for a specific gender, we

constructed a rank ordered list of the ratio of the facial regions like the eyes, nose and the mouth from the subjects in the donor pool. Then we computed the inter-quartile range (IQR) from this list for each group. When synthesizing a new face for that group, the eyes, nose, and mouth regions were positioned on the target face so as to adhere as closely as possible to this IQR value. Using these face ratio ranges, the vertical positioning of the parts of the face generally becomes much more natural in appearance.

### 4.4. Triangle Replacement

After the facial regions were reshaped, we replaced those regions with corresponding triangles from the face images in the donor pool for the base face. The number of donor face images,  $C_{donor}$ , were chosen from the donor pool randomly. To preserve the visual uniformity of the vital facial regions, such as the mouth, nose and the eyes, we designated all triangles in that region to come from the same donor. Without this restriction, the mouth, nose and eyes appear as an amalgamation of multiple donors. This was not a concern for the rest of the face, however, so the triangles in the cheek and jaw area were chosen randomly from the available donor set separately. Therefore, during the synthesis process, the value of  $C_{donor}$  can be tuned by the user depending on the faces available in the donor pool and the degree of distinctiveness sought in the synthetic face. A smaller value of  $C_{donor}$  ensures the uniformity of each facial part, while a higher value makes the synthetic face appear more distinctive. For our experiments and donor pool, we found the synthetic faces looked more realistic when  $C_{donor}$  was set between 7 (for smaller donor pool size) and 10.

#### 4.5. Adjusting the Color Distribution of Replacement Triangles

After the donor triangles are selected, their color distributions are individually adjusted to be closer to that of the base face triangles. This deals with intensity changes across the face due to lighting. This is done by simply shifting the color distribution of the donor triangle so that it has the same mean as the base triangle that it replaces. At first, the difference in mean intensities between the base and the corresponding donor triangles is computed for each color channel. This difference is used as an offset to the intensities of the corresponding channels in the donor triangle.

Without this color readjustment, the synthetic face can appear splotchy in places, but with this color adjustment step, these patches are no longer noticeable. Adjustment in the HSV space tends to leave a pinkish tint to some faces and does not perform well for darker skin tones. For this reason SREFI currently uses color adjustment in RGB space.

#### 4.6. Blending in the Replaced Triangles

Placing the triangles together on reshaped facial parts does make the synthetic face look significantly different from the base face, but it seems unnatural as the transition of intensity across the donor triangles may not be smooth. This can be seen in Figure ??e, where the un-blended version of the synthetic face is presented. To make the synthetic face look more natural, the last step of our method blends the triangles together using Laplacian pyramids [?].

The blending process starts with the original base face image, a mask image to specify the position of the triangle on the face to be replaced, and the donor face, after reshaping and color adjustment. Then, Gaussian pyramids are created for each color channel of these three images. The images at each level of the pyramid were scaled down by a factor of 4 from that to a level below it by applying a Gaussian blur using a  $5 \times 5$  kernel. Each pyramid was built with 4 such levels. We created two Laplacian pyramids from the base face and donor face Gaussian pyramids. This was done by storing the intensity difference between the image at a level of the Gaussian pyramid and the expanded version of the image, by a factor of 4 ( $2 \times 2$ ) using the same  $5 \times 5$  kernel, at the level immediately above it. The image at the top-most level of the Gaussian pyramid was stored as it is at the top-most level of the corresponding Laplacian pyramid.

A third Laplacian pyramid was generated for the blended face using the triangular mask values as a switch. For each level of the Gaussian pyramid of the mask, we added pixel values from that level of the base face Laplacian pyramid if the mask value was 1, or from that level of the donor face pyramid if the mask value was 0, to the third Laplacian pyramid. This was done as follows:-

$$\begin{aligned} p1 &= (g_{mask})_i * (l_{base})_i \\ p2 &= (1 - g_{mask})_i * (l_{donor})_i \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $(g_{mask})_i$  is the image at the Gaussian pyramid of the mask at the  $i$ -th level and  $(l_{base})_i$  and  $(l_{donor})_i$  are the images at the  $i$ -th level of the Laplacian pyramids of the base face and donor face respectively.  $p1$  and  $p2$  are the images generated using only the base face and donor face pixels in their corresponding positions in the mask respectively. Once these two images are obtained, the image at the  $i$ -th level of the new Laplacian pyramid for the blended face,  $(l_{blend})_i$ , was generated by simply adding them together.

To integrate these blended images of different resolutions in the new Laplacian pyramid, we collapsed them together level-by-level from top-to-bottom. This was done by adding the expanded version of the image at the  $i$ -th level  $expand((lap_{blend})_i)$  and the image at the  $(i-1)$ -th level *i.e.*  $(lap_{blend})_{i-1}$ . The blended image was further normalized with pixel intensities less than 0 changed to 0 and those greater than 255 changed to 255. Once the collapsed blended image was obtained for the three channels, we merged them together to get the final blended synthetic face image. The result after the multi-resolution blending looks significantly better as shown in Figure ??f. Interestingly, this method achieves better regional blending for human faces than methods like Poisson blending (seamless blending) [?], which tries to incorporate pixels from both the source and destination in the local blended region, which generates faces with an overlapping second nose or mouth.

## 5. Experiments and Results

The experiments described in this section are meant to assess the realism, uniqueness and stability of the synthetic faces.

### 5.1. Human Rater Study

One way that we used to assess the realism of the synthetic faces was a human rater study. The experiment had 20 raters who were novices at the task, and had not previously seen any of our synthetic faces. Each rater participated in three different experiments where they had to rate the realism of a face image (experiment 1) and decide if two face images came from the same subject (experiments 2 and 3). The experiments used the PsychoPy psycho-physics framework to present stimuli and record the responses [?].

**Experiment 1:** Participants were shown either a real or a synthetic face image, and asked to rate whether it is a real face, using a three-valued Likert scale [?]. We selected 100 real and 100 synthetic frontally posed, 2D aligned face images ( $512 \times 512$  in size), 50 male and 50 female each,




Figure 4. Sample face images used in the three sessions of the human study respectively - (a) TOP: two real face images, BOTTOM: two synthetic face images; (b) TOP: true match pair, BOTTOM: non-match pair; (c) TOP: real and synthetic face images of an existing identity, BOTTOM: two synthetic face images of the same real identity.

which belonged to 3 ethnic groups (Caucasian, Asian and African American). Some example images can be seen in Figure ??a. Before starting the experiments, raters were shown two practice trials - a real face image labeled as real and a synthetic face image labeled as synthetic. Each participant was shown the 200 images in a random order with each image being shown for two seconds (as in [?, ?]) and asked the question - “Is this face image real?”. The rater had to respond by pressing a key for “Yes”, “No” and “Cannot decide”. Although the face image disappeared after the two seconds, the next frame (image) appeared only after the participant had registered their response. The participants performed well in this experiment, marking the face images correctly 92% of the time on average. The scores also suggest that the raters had less difficulty in detecting synthetic faces in female subjects than male subjects. Furthermore, we found the participants to be slightly more inclined towards marking a real face synthetic than a synthetic face real.

**Experiment 2:** The goal of this experiment was to evaluate how reliably a pair of images of the same (different) synthetic identity are rated by a human observer as being of the same (different) person. For this experiment, 200 pairs of frontally posed and 2D aligned synthetic face images ( $512 \times 512$  in size) were generated. For the authentic-pair trials, one pair of images was generated for each of 50 synthetic male identities and 50 synthetic female identities. For the impostor-pair trials, 50 different-identity male image pairs and 50 different-identity female image pairs were generated. All different-identity pairs were of the same ethnicity. Before the actual trials, raters were shown two practice trials, one with a pair of images from the same synthetic identity, labeled as such, and a second pair from two different identities, labeled as such. For each image rater, the

200 image pairs were shown in a random order for two seconds each. For each pair, the image rater responded to the question - “Are these two images of the same person?” by pressing a key for “Yes”, “No” or “Cannot decide”. This is similar in theme to the study described in [?]. The human ratings from this experiment, with 82% average accuracy, suggested participants found it relatively harder to correctly match synthetic face images than the simpler detection task. Additionally, we found the participants to be slightly more inclined towards marking a true match pair a non-match than vice versa.

**Experiment 3:** The goal of this experiment was to evaluate the degree to which synthetic images of a real identity are interchangeable with real images of the same identity in a matching context. Three sets of 100 face image pairs were used in this experiment: one pair of real images of each of 100 real identities, one (real image, synthetic image) pair of each of 100 real identities, and one synthetic image pair of each of 100 identities. In all three cases, the 100 pairs were split evenly between male and female. The real image pairs came from different day acquisitions. Each rater was shown the 300 image pairs in a random order. For each trial, the image rater answered the question - “Are these two images of the same person?” by pressing a key for “Yes”, “No” or “Cannot decide”. Before starting the experiments, the image raters were shown three practice trials, one corresponding to each of the three conditions. The participants did better in this experiment, with the average accuracy of 90%. However, they tended to make incorrect decisions more frequently for female face pairs compared to male face pairs. We also calculated the average matching accuracy of the 20 participants in matching a pair of real images (RvR), a real image to a synthetic one (SvR) and a pair of synthetic images (SvS) for the same subject for male




Figure 5. Average matching accuracy, standard deviations indicated with error bars, of session 3 participants for each pair type - real vs real (RvR), synthetic vs real (SvR) and synthetic vs synthetic (SvS).

and female subjects separately, as shown in Figure ???. The error bars suggest that there is no discernable difference in performance between the three pair types. This means we can interchange a real face image with a synthetic face image of the same real identity for face pair matching without any significant drop in recognition performance.

## 5.2. Uniqueness - Face Matching Experiments with VGG-FACE

To evaluate the uniqueness, of the synthetic face images and identities generated using our method, we performed face matching experiments using the VGG-FACE CNN model [?] pre-trained on 2.6M face images. We prepared two augmented versions of the original SREFI donor set, which had 15,939 real face images (cropped and 2D aligned) of 1471 real subjects. The first augmented dataset contained 15,939 synthetic face images of the same 1471 real subjects as in the SREFI donor set (*i.e.* we artificially expanded each identity (expand ID)). The second augmented set comprised of 31,878 synthetic images of 2942 synthetic identities generated by selectively recombining elements from the SREFI donor pool (synth ID).

Each of the face images of these three datasets, original donor pool (real ID), augmented dataset with real identities (expand ID) and augmented dataset with synthetic identities (synth ID), was supplied to the pre-trained VGG-FACE model. The 4096-D vector from its fc7 layer was stored for




Figure 6. ROC curves for the four matching experiments performed with pre-trained VGG-FACE and cosine similarity.

each image as its feature representation. We performed four independent matching experiments, using cosine similarity as our scoring scheme, with these feature representations - 1) real ID with real ID, 2) synth ID with real ID, 3) expand ID with expand ID, and 4) expand ID with real ID. The ROC curves generated for each of the experiments can be seen in Figure ???. Although the matching accuracy while matching only real subjects is the highest, the augmented dataset generated from these real subjects matched well with each other and the real dataset as well.

The proximity in verification performance for all the three datasets suggests that these synthetic images can be used to supplement existing face image datasets by not only increasing the number of images per subject but also generating different face images of entirely new synthetic subjects without any significant loss in recognition performance. Therefore, this augmentation process can aid researchers looking to augment face datasets that are modest in size.

## 5.3. Stability - Training VGG-FACE & Testing on the GBU Dataset

To test the stability of the synthetic faces created using our method for augmenting smaller datasets for CNN training, we prepared two augmented datasets from the original SREFI donor pool. We used these datasets for training the VGG-FACE CNN model from scratch and use the trained CNN to recognize extremely challenging face images from the ‘Ugly’ partition of the ‘‘Good, Bad and Ugly’’ dataset (GBU) [?]. Since some subjects were present in both the SREFI donor pool and the GBU dataset, we removed the face images of the GBU subjects from the SREFI donor pool. This reduced the donor pool to 10,692 face images from 1296 real subjects.




Figure 7. ROC curves for the matching experiments performed by training VGG-FACE with the two augmented datasets generated from our method and a subset of the CASIA-WebFace dataset.

The first augmented dataset had 10,692 real images of 1296 real subjects, 10,692 synthetic images of the same 1296 subjects and 84,636 synthetic images of 10,440 synthetic subjects generated from the original donor pool. The second augmented dataset contained 10,692 real and 21,384 synthetic images of the 1471 original subjects from the SREFI donor pool and 176,098 synthetic face images from 21,538 synthetic subjects. Therefore, the smaller and bigger augmented datasets contained 106,020 and 208,174 face images respectively. To gauge the effectiveness of these augmented datasets, we prepared a third dataset by selecting 260,882 (real) face images from the CASIA-WebFace (CW) dataset [?]. All the images in these three datasets were 2D aligned about their eye-centers extracted using the method in [?], cropped and resized to  $224 \times 224$ . We trained the VGG-FACE model from scratch with these three datasets independently for 50 epochs, using the Caffe deep learning framework [?]. To maintain consistency, we used the same set of hyper-parameters, learning function (Stochastic Gradient Descent) and the same NVIDIA Titan X GPU for all three training sessions.

Once training for all three sessions terminated, we used the saved snapshots to extract 4096 dimensional feature representations from the fc7 layer of the CNN for the face images in the ‘Ugly’ partition of GBU. We normalized the feature vectors between a range of 0 and 1 using linear min-max normalization. After normalization, we computed matching scores, using cosine similarity, between feature vectors of the query and target face images in the GBU ‘Ugly’ partition. The ROC curves generated from these three matching experiments can be seen in Figure ??.

Interestingly, the CNNs trained with the two augmented datasets, generated using our method, significantly outper-

formed the snapshot trained with the face images from CW. This might be due to the fact that face images in CW vary in facial pose and illumination while the original and synthetic images in our augmented datasets and the GBU face images were frontally posed. Moreover, the CNN trained with the larger augmented dataset (208k) performed better than the CNN trained with the smaller dataset (106k). This suggests that increasing the number of synthetic face images and using the augmented dataset for CNN training might further boost the CNN’s performance in recognition experiments.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel method for generating realistic synthetic face images for existent and non-existent subjects. This method can benefit face biometric research in two ways: 1) it can replace the manual collection of face image datasets, which require abundant time and resource, and 2) it can augment existing face image datasets to create larger and deeper supersets for training CNN models and improving their face representation capability.

To test the fidelity of synthetic face images and identities generated with our method, we performed a human evaluation study where human raters 1) correctly detected real and synthetic face images once shown an example, 2) correctly matched a pair of face images from the same person (real or synthetic). To test the uniqueness of these synthetic faces, we used the pre-trained VGG-FACE model’s [?] feature representations. The ROC curves generated for matching a synthetic image pair or a real and a synthetic image pair was found to be proximal to the ROC curve for matching a pair of real face images. Finally, we trained the VGG-FACE model from scratch with two augmented datasets (208k images and 106k images) generated using our method and a subset of the CASIA-WebFace dataset (260k images) [?] independently. We found the CNN trained with the larger dataset to outperform the CNNs trained on the smaller dataset and the CASIA-WebFace subset while recognizing face images from the ‘Ugly’ partition in the GBU dataset [?]. This suggests the synthetic face images and identities generated using our method are stable for CNN training and can boost its face recognition performance.

As possible extensions to our work, we would like to - 1) evolve our method to generate synthetic face images with various facial poses, 2) select the donor pool using parameters derived from a generative model instead of the current CNN based clustering, 3) generate an augmented dataset, with millions of synthetic face images, comparable in size to the VGG-FACE dataset [?] and test the performance of a CNN trained with that augmented dataset, and 4) use faces extracted from video frames in the donor pool along with still images.