

## View Reviews

**Paper ID**

57

**Paper Title**

Open-set Face Recognition with Neural Ensemble, Maximal Entropy Loss and Feature Augmentation

**Reviewer #1****Questions****1. Novelty & relevance**

3 = Good

**2. Clarity of exposition, bibliographical references & quality of written English**

3 = Good

**3. Technical quality & experimental evaluation**

3 = Good

**4. Ease of implementation**

3 = Good

**5. === Recommendation ===**

3 = Probably Accept - I would like to see this paper accepted

**6. Reviewer confidence & expertise**

3 = High - I am reasonably confident about my evaluation, I know the literature and I did my best to carefully check all aspects of the paper, but I may have missed some small details.

**8. Paper Summary and Novelty - please summarize in your own words what the paper is about and what is the novel contribution that the paper brings to SIBGRAPI.**

This paper presents a new method for open-set face recognition. The approach uses an ensemble of compact neural networks with data augmentation at the feature level and an entropy-based cost function. Deep neural networks pre-trained on large face datasets are utilized for initial feature extraction, and the neural adapter ensemble incorporates binary models trained on original feature representations along with negative synthetic embeddings to handle unknown identities. The authors provide experiments in well-known benchmarks.

**9. Paper Strengths - positive aspects of the paper. Be sure to comment on the paper's technical correctness, clarity, and experimental evaluation. Notice that different papers may need different evaluation levels, e.g., a theory paper vs. an application paper.**

- The paper, in general, is well-written.
- It tackles an important and hard problem.
- The Optimized Mix-Up (OMU) is very interesting and simple to implement.

**10. Paper Weaknesses - discuss the negative aspects: lack of novelty or clarity, technical errors, insufficient experimental evaluation, etc. Please justify your comments in great detail. If you think the paper is not novel, explain why and provide evidence. Please be constructive in your comments to the authors.**

- The motivation in the Introduction is a bit confusing. The described scenario "immigration control offices at airports that take advantage of electronic gates with automated face recognition" is not necessarily open set. There is also a discussion about low quality images but it not clear at this point why this is being discussed. This only becomes clear when the problem is addressed in Section II. The Introduction needs to be better structured and describe the task being solved with clarity.
- Solving the open-set problem with negative training samples is not always straightforward. In this case, I think a better ablation study would be necessary. This approach can affect the capacity or ability of the network to learn, as it now needs to learn patterns that are not necessarily useful and may not be representative. Also, the strategy used to select the negative samples can affect the training. For example, is hard negative mining important?
- ArcFace is not a face recognition network, but a loss function. This should be rectified and better explained. If Arcface was used as a loss function, the authors need to describe the architecture.
- It is not clear how the negative samples affect inference. What happens if a probe is similar to one of the identities used as negative sample?

**Reviewer #2****Questions****1. Novelty & relevance**

3 = Good

**2. Clarity of exposition, bibliographical references & quality of written English**

3 = Good

**3. Technical quality & experimental evaluation**

3 = Good

**4. Ease of implementation**

2 = Below par

**5. === Recommendation ===**

3 = Probably Accept - I would like to see this paper accepted

**6. Reviewer confidence & expertise**

3 = High - I am reasonably confident about my evaluation, I know the literature and I did my best to carefully check all aspects of the paper, but I may have missed some small details.

**8. Paper Summary and Novelty - please summarize in your own words what the paper is about and what is the novel contribution that the paper brings to SIBGRAPI.**

The authors propose a method, Open-set face recognition problem, that involves using an ensemble of compact neural networks combined with data augmentation at the feature level and an entropy-based cost function. Initially, deep neural networks pre-trained on large face datasets are used for feature extraction. The neural adapter ensemble consists of binary models trained on the original feature representations and negative synthetic mix-up embeddings. The experiments were conducted on widely used LFW and IJB-C datasets.

**9. Paper Strengths - positive aspects of the paper. Be sure to comment on the paper's technical correctness, clarity, and experimental evaluation.**

Notice that different papers may need different evaluation levels, e.g., a theory paper vs. an application paper.

Presents a well-structured paper with a good evaluation of the experiments through three approaches: a neural ensemble, a cost function, and a feature augmentation algorithm.

10. Paper Weaknesses - discuss the negative aspects: lack of novelty or clarity, technical errors, insufficient experimental evaluation, etc. Please justify your comments in great detail. If you think the paper is not novel, explain why and provide evidence. Please be constructive in your comments to the authors.

Abstract (line 7): The word "novel" brings a strong affirmation to the sentence.

Reviewer #3

Questions

1. Novelty & relevance

3 = Good

2. Clarity of exposition, bibliographical references & quality of written English

3 = Good

3. Technical quality & experimental evaluation

3 = Good

4. Ease of implementation

3 = Good

5. === Recommendation ===

3 = Probably Accept - I would like to see this paper accepted

6. Reviewer confidence & expertise

2 = Medium - I am not confident about my evaluation as I did not carefully check all the details such as the mathematics, experiments, or references. I am not an expert on this topic.

8. Paper Summary and Novelty - please summarize in your own words what the paper is about and what is the novel contribution that the paper brings to SIBGRAPI.

The manuscript addresses the issue of Open-set Face Recognition by developing mechanisms to improve existing models. The authors claim that combining neural ensemble (NAE), maximal entropy loss (MEL), and feature augmentation (OMU) can improve results in the open-set face recognition task. The experiments presented in the manuscript support that the NAE, MEL, and OMU mechanisms combined improve the method's performance in terms of accuracy.

9. Paper Strengths - positive aspects of the paper. Be sure to comment on the paper's technical correctness, clarity, and experimental evaluation. Notice that different papers may need different evaluation levels, e.g., a theory paper vs. an application paper.

Relatively well-written article.

Results presented in III are promising

10. Paper Weaknesses - discuss the negative aspects: lack of novelty or clarity, technical errors, insufficient experimental evaluation, etc. Please justify your comments in great detail. If you think the paper is not novel, explain why and provide evidence. Please be constructive in your comments to the authors.

Authors did not present a comparison of the results regarding the computational cost with the pre-existing methods.

Reviewer #4

Questions

1. Novelty & relevance

4 = Excellent

2. Clarity of exposition, bibliographical references & quality of written English

3 = Good

3. Technical quality & experimental evaluation

4 = Excellent

4. Ease of implementation

2 = Below par

5. === Recommendation ===

3 = Probably Accept - I would like to see this paper accepted

6. Reviewer confidence & expertise

2 = Medium - I am not confident about my evaluation as I did not carefully check all the details such as the mathematics, experiments, or references. I am not an expert on this topic.

8. Paper Summary and Novelty - please summarize in your own words what the paper is about and what is the novel contribution that the paper brings to SIBGRAPI.

The authors propose a method based on an ensemble of deep learning models for open-set face recognition. This method uses a feature augmentation approach to increase the number of negative samples for training. Furthermore, it also uses an maximal-entropy loss function to better distinguish the known samples from unknown ones. The proposed method is one of the possible directions to reduce the gap between the experimental and the real face recognition scenarios.

9. Paper Strengths - positive aspects of the paper. Be sure to comment on the paper's technical correctness, clarity, and experimental evaluation. Notice that different papers may need different evaluation levels, e.g., a theory paper vs. an application paper.

- The paper is clear, well written, and exposes the problems in the research area;

- The authors performed plenty of experiments to explain each aspect of the proposed method;

- The proposed method is one of the possible directions to reduce the gap between the experimental and the real face recognition scenarios.

10. Paper Weaknesses - discuss the negative aspects: lack of novelty or clarity, technical errors, insufficient experimental evaluation, etc. Please justify your comments in great detail. If you think the paper is not novel, explain why and provide evidence. Please be constructive in your comments to the authors.

- Page 5, Figure 2b: Please avoid placing the legend over the plotted data;

- Page 6, Line 451: Please keep your future works explicit in your conclusion;