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ABSTRACT

Face Presentation Attack Detection (PAD) is an important measure to prevent spoof attacks for face biometric systems. Many works based on Convolution Neural Networks (CNNs) for face PAD formulate the problem as an image-level binary classification task without considering the context. Alternatively, Vision Transformers (ViT) using self-attention to attend the context of an image become the mainstreams in face PAD. Inspired by ViT, we propose a Video-based Transformer for face PAD (ViTransPAD) with short/long-range spatio-temporal attention which can not only focus on local details with short attention within a frame but also capture long-range dependencies over frames. Instead of using coarse image patches with single-scale as in ViT, we propose the Multi-scale Multi-Head Self-Attention (MsMHSA) architecture to accommodate multi-scale patch partitions of Q, K, V feature maps to the heads of transformer in a coarse-to-fine manner, which enables to learn a fine-grained representation to perform pixel-level discrimination for face PAD. Due to the lack of inductive biases of convolutions in pure transformers, we also introduce convolutions to the proposed ViTransPAD to integrate the desirable properties of CNNs by using convolution patch embedding and convolution projection. The extensive experiments show the effectiveness of our proposed ViTransPAD with a preferable accuracy-computation balance, which can serve as a new backbone for face PAD.

Index Terms— Video-based transformer, multi-scale multi-head self-attention, face presentation attack detection

1. INTRODUCTION

Face Presentation Attack Detection (PAD) [1] is an important measure to prevent spoof attacks for biometric user authentication when using face biometric systems. Many works based on Convolution Neural Networks (CNNs) for face PAD formulate the problem as an image-level binary classification task to distinguish the bona fide from Presentation Attacks (PAs) [2, 3].

Fig. 1: The short/long-range spatio-temporal attention of the proposed ViTransPAD, which can not only focus on local spatial details with short attention within a frame but also capture long-range temporal dependencies over frames.

The image-based methods are simple and high-efficient. Nevertheless, these methods neglect the context information being useful to improve the generalization performance of face PAD models [4]. Due to the limited receptive field, 3D convolution-based face PAD [5] also suffers from difficulty in learning long-range dependency.

Alternatively, Vision Transformers (ViT) [6] using self-attention to attend the global context of an image is becoming a new mainstream in face PAD [7, 8]. However, ViT is also incapable to model the long-range dependencies over all frames in a video [9].

Inspired by ViT, we propose a Video-based Transformer for face PAD (ViTransPAD) with short/long-range spatio-temporal attention, which can not only focus on local spatial details with short attention within a frame but also model long-range temporal dependencies over frames (see Figure 1). The visualisation of attention maps (in Section 4.5) shows that the proposed ViTransPAD based on short/long-range dependencies can gain a consistent attention being less affected by the noise. Instead of factorizing the spatio-temporal attention [9], we jointly learn spatio-temporal dependencies in our ViTransPAD.

Due to the use of coarse image patches with a single in-
Thanks to self-attention, ViT and the variants [21, 22] show their superiority in image classification and in downstream tasks [23]. However, these image-based vision transformers only consider the spatial attention in a frame without integrating temporal attention over frames. ViViT [9] model the long-range dependencies over frames with pure transformers. In order to introduce inductive bias of convolutions in pure transformers, [11] propose to use embedded convolution patches. Multi-scale patches are applied in hierarchical stacking transformers [10] to adapt vanilla ViT to pixel-level dense prediction tasks. In this work, we design a simple MsMHSA architecture within a single video-based transformer allowing pixel-level fine-grained discrimination to satisfy the requirement of face PAD.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Overall Architecture

An overview of the proposed ViTransPAD is depicted in Figure 2 (a). Unlike hierarchical stacking transformers using multi-scale patches in [10], we only use a single transformer to apply the multi-scale self-attention with different heads in each layer of transformer.

Convolutional token embedding (CTE). Instead of partitioning each frame into patches and then tokenize patches with linear projection layer, we introduce a convolutional layer to tokenize each frame without partition. Given an input video \( X_{in} \) of size \( T \times 3 \times H \times W \), the obtained token map is \( X_m \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times C_m \times H_m \times W_m} \), where \( T \) is the number of frames.

Convolutional projection (CP). As well as CTE, we use convolutional projection rather than linear projection to encode \( Q/K/V \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times C_A \times H_A \times W_A} \) feature maps.

Then the obtained \( Q, K \) and \( V \) are fed into the proposed Multi-scale Multi-Heads Self-Attention (MsMHSA) module to learn the short/long-range dependencies over frames in a video. The details are described in Section 3.2. Finally, we add Feed-Forward Network (FFN) with Norm layers at the end of transformer. In this work, linear projection layers in FFN are also replaced by convolution layers. As in ViT, an MLP Head is connected to the transformer to generate the classification embeddings \( Z \) for face PAD. Given an input video \( X_{in} \), the proposed ViTransPAD can be described as:

\[
X_m = CTE(X_{in}) \tag{1}
\]

\[
Q, K, V = CP(X_m) \tag{2}
\]

\[
H = MsMHSA(Q, K, V) \tag{3}
\]

\[
Y = H + X_m \tag{4}
\]

\[
Z = MLP(FFN(Norm(Y)) + Y) \tag{5}
\]
3.2. Multi-scale Multi-Head Self-Attention (MsMHSA)

The goal of MsMHSA, as shown in Figure 2(b), is to introduce a pyramid structure into the self-attention module to generate multi-scale feature maps which can be used for pixel-level fine-grained image discrimination required by face PAD. The proposed MsMHSA is applied on different heads of each layer of our transformer. All the heads share the similar protocol to calculate the self-attention. In particular, the feature maps $Q/K/V$ are equally divided to each head along the dimension before inputting them to MsMHSA.

Given a transformer with three heads fed by an input feature maps $Q/K/V$ of size $T \times C_A \times H_A \times W_A$, the feature maps for each head are $Q_i/K_i/V_i \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times H_A \times W_A}$. For the first head $Head_1$, we take a full-size patch $q_1/k_1/v_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times H_A \times W_A}$ to calculate a global self-attention feature map for the first head $Head_1$. We can obtain the self-attention feature map $h_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times H_A \times W_A}$ of $Head_1$. Then for $Head_2$, we divide $Q_2/K_2/V_2$ into $2^2$ patches, each patch $q_2/k_2/v_2$ of size $T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times \frac{H_A}{2} \times \frac{W_A}{2}$. We obtain the self-attention feature map $h_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times \frac{H_A}{2} \times \frac{W_A}{2}}$ of $Head_2$. We continue to divide $Q_3/K_3/V_3$ into $4^2$ patches to calculate the self-attention feature map $h_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times \frac{H_A}{4} \times \frac{W_A}{4}}$ of $Head_3$. Finally, we concatenate the obtained self-attention feature maps $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$ to generate the final multi-scale attention feature map $H \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \frac{C_A}{3} \times H_A \times W_A}$ in layer $L_i$ (We need to reshape $h_2, h_3$ to be consistent with $h_1$):

$$H = \text{Concat}(h_1, \text{Reshape}(h_2), \text{Reshape}(h_3)).$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The self-attention feature map $h_i$ is given by:

$$h_i = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \text{Softmax}(\frac{q_{i,m}k_{i,n}^T}{\sqrt{d_{\text{head}_i,m}}})v_{i,n},$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $i$ is corresponding to the $i$th head $Head_i$, $q_{i,m}$ is the $m$th patch partitioned from feature map $Q_i$ for the $i$th head $Head_i$, $k_{i,n}/v_{i,n}$ are the $n$th patches partitioned from feature maps $K_i/V_i$ for the $i$th head $Head_i$, then, $q_{i,m}/k_{i,n}/v_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{C_A}{3} \times \frac{H_A}{2l} \times \frac{W_A}{2l}}, l \in [1, 2, 4]$, and $N$ is the total number of patches of $i$th head, i.e., $N = T \times l^2, l \in [1, 2, 4]$. $d_{\text{head}_i,j}$ is the dimension of the $q_{i,m}$. For each head $Head_i$, we stack the partitioned patches $q_i/k_i/v_i$ from all frames of a video together to calculate the self-attention feature map of the video (see Figure 2(b)), thus the self-attention of each head $Head_i$ always considers simultaneously the short attention focusing on local spatial information when $q_{i,m}/k_{i,n}$ from the same frame of a video (see the red dotted line in Figure 1 denoting the short attention) and long attention capturing spatio-temporal dependencies over frames when $q_{i,m}/k_{i,n}$ from the different frames (see the violet dotted line Figure 3 denoting the long-range attention). We can also jointly learn the spatio-temporal attention in a unified framework without learning the spatio-temporal attention independently as in [9].

3.3. Loss function for face PAD

Instead of adding a classification token to learn the representation of image as in ViT, we learn the representation of video based on all patch tokens without adding an extra classification token. In practice, the output of MLP Head servers as...
the classification embedding $\mathbf{Z}$ in this work (see Figure 2). Then, the learned embedding $\mathbf{Z}$ is input in the cross-entropy loss function to train our model:

$$
    L(\mathbf{Z}; \Theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} -y_k \log P(y_k = 1 | \mathbf{Z}, \Theta)
$$

where $\Theta$ are the parameters of model to be optimized and $K$ is the number of categories, i.e., $K = 2$, which is the classes for face PAD being either bonafide or attack.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Datasets and setup

Datasets **OULU-NPU (O)** [12], **CASIA-MFSD (C)** [15], **Idiap Replay Attack (I)** [14] and **MSU-MFSD (M)** [13] are used in our experiments. Attack Presentation Classification Error Rate (APCER), Bona Fide Presentation Classification Error Rate (BPCER), Average Classification Error Rate (ACER) [20] and Half Total Error Rate (HTER) [21] are used as evaluation metric in the intra/cross-datasets tests. In intra-dataset test, we follow the evaluation protocols of Oulu-NPU as in [12]. In cross-datasets test, we conduct the evaluation on four datasets **OULU-NPU (O)**, **CASIA-MFSD (C)**, **Idiap Replay Attack (I)** and **MSU-MFSD (M)**. We follow the OCIM protocols proposed in [24] for cross-datasets test in which we randomly choose three of four datasets as source datasets for training the model, and the remaining one is set as the target domain to evaluate the model. So, we have four experimental modes: ‘O&C&I’ to ‘M’, ‘O&M&I’ to ‘C’, ‘O&C&M’ to ‘I’, ‘I&C&M’ to ‘O’.

4.2. Implementation Details

All models are trained on 3 RTX 6000 GPUs with an initial learning rate of 1e-5 for 200 epochs following the cosine schedule (50 epochs for warmup). Adam optimizer and a mini-batch size of 16 videos (8 frames per video sampled uniformly or with random interval) are applied during training. Data augmentations including horizontal flip and color jitter are used. 224x224 facial images cropped by MTCNN [25] are used for both training and testing models.

4.3. Ablation study

All ablation studies are conducted on the Protocol-2 (different displays and printers between training and testing sets) of OULU-NPU dataset unless otherwise specified. **Effectiveness of convolutions in transformer** demonstrates a good computation-accuracy balance (ACER 1.19% with GFLOPs 7.88) comparing to the pure CNNs or transformer (ViT/ViT(P)), which shows the effectiveness in introducing convolutions into transformers for face PAD. Comparing to convolutional token embedding, ViT is less effective for tokenizing patches (see ViT+T/ViT(P)+T). The comparison experiments also show that the pretraining (denoted as P) is quite important for face PAD especially for the transformer-based architectures.

**Effectiveness of multi-scale MHSA.** From Table 2, we can see that all of the results using multi-scale patches are better than the ones using single-scale patch. The best result is achieved when using multi-scale patches of size $28 \times 28$ and $14 \times 14$. However, the performance degrades when applying all three patches, which may be due to the overfitting on relative small dataset.

![Fig. 3: Study on short/long-range spatio-temporal attention.](image)

Table 1: Ablation study on effectiveness of convolutions introduced in transformer (P-Pretrained, T-Transformer).

| Model      | APCER(%) | BPCER(%) | ACER(%) | GFLOPs   | Params |
|------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|--------|
| CNN        | 5.43     | 1.08     | 3.26    | 0.63     | 65M    |
| CNN(P)     | 2.12     | 3.30     | 2.71    | 0.63     | 65M    |
| Vit(P)     | 2.38     | 0.76     | 1.57    | 55.5     | 166M   |
| Vit(T)     | 11.32    | 0.87     | 8.99    | 134.39   | 87M    |
| Vit(T)+P   | 5.82     | 0.94     | 3.38    | 134.39   | 87M    |
| CNN+T      | 14.60    | 7.12     | 10.86   | 7.38     | 66M    |
| CNN(P)+T   | 1.98     | 0.40     | 1.19    | 7.88     | 66M    |

Table 2: Ablation study on the proposed Multi-scale MHSA.

| Model     | 28*28 | 14*14 | 7*7 | ACER(%) |
|-----------|-------|-------|-----|---------|
| √         |       |       |     | 2.81    |
| √         | √     |       |     | 2.60    |
| √         | √     | √     |     | 2.32    |
| √         | √     | √     | √   | 1.19    |
| √         | √     | √     | √   | 2.06    |
| √         | √     | √     | √   | 2.12    |
| √         | √     | √     | √   | 2.30    |
Table 3: The results of the evaluation on the OULU-NPU dataset. Best results are marked in bold and second best in underline.

| Prot | Method          | APcer(%) | BPCer(%) | ACer(%) |
|------|-----------------|----------|----------|---------|
| 1    | Auxiliary [17]  | 1.6      | 1.6      | 1.6     |
|      | SpoofTrace [2]  | 1.3      | 1.3      | 1.3     |
|      | FAS-SGTDT [4]   | 1.0      | 1.0      | 1.0     |
|      | CDCN [26]       | 0.4      | 1.7      | 1.0     |
|      | DC-CDN [3]      | 0.3      | 0.3      | 0.3     |
|      | ViTransPAD (Ours) | 0.4 | 0.2     | 0.3     |
| 2    | Auxiliary [17]  | 2.7      | 2.7      | 2.7     |
|      | SpoofTrace [2]  | 1.6      | 1.6      | 1.6     |
|      | FAS-SGTDT [4]   | 1.3      | 1.3      | 1.3     |
|      | CDCN [26]       | 1.5      | 1.5      | 1.5     |
|      | DC-CDN [3]      | 0.7      | 0.7      | 1.3     |
|      | ViTransPAD (Ours) | 2.0 | 2.0     | 1.2     |
| 3    | Auxiliary [17]  | 2.7±1.3  | 3.1±1.7  | 2.9±1.5 |
|      | SpoofTrace [2]  | 1.6±1.6  | 4.0±5.4  | 2.8±3.3 |
|      | FAS-SGTDT [4]   | 3.2±2.0  | 2.2±1.4  | 2.7±0.6 |
|      | CDCN [26]       | 2.4±1.3  | 2.2±2.0  | 2.3±1.4 |
|      | DC-CDN [3]      | 2.2±2.8  | 1.6±2.1  | 1.9±1.1 |
|      | ViTransPAD (Ours) | 3.1±3.0 | 1.0±1.3 | 2.0±1.5 |
| 4    | Auxiliary [17]  | 9.3±5.6  | 10.4±6.0 | 9.5±6.0 |
|      | CDCN [26]       | 4.6±4.6  | 9.2±8.0  | 6.9±2.9 |
|      | FAS-SGTDT [4]   | 6.7±7.5  | 3.3±4.1  | 5.0±2.2 |
|      | DC-CDN [3]      | 5.4±3.3  | 2.5±4.2  | 4.0±3.1 |
|      | SpoofTrace [2]  | 2.3±3.6  | 5.2±5.4  | 3.8±2.3 |
|      | ViTransPAD (Ours) | 4.4±4.8 | 0.2±0.6 | 2.3±2.4 |

Table 4: The results of cross-dataset testing protocol on OULU-NPU, CASIA-MFSD, Replay-Attack, and MSU-MFSD.

| Method                  | O&C&M to M HTER(%) | O&M&M to C HTER(%) | O&C&M to I HTER(%) | I&C&M to O HTER(%) |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Color Texture [27]     | 28.08               | 30.58               | 40.40               | 63.59               |
| LBP-TOP [28]           | 36.90               | 42.60               | 49.45               | 53.15               |
| Auxiliary(Depth) [17]  | 22.72               | 33.52               | 29.14               | 30.17               |
| MMD-AAA [29]           | 27.08               | 44.59               | 31.58               | 40.98               |
| MADDG [24]             | 17.69               | 24.5                | 22.19               | 27.98               |
| MDRL [30]              | 17.02               | 19.68               | 20.87               | 25.02               |
| SSDG-M [31]            | 16.67               | 23.11               | 18.21               | 25.17               |
| ANRL [25]              | 10.83               | 17.85               | 16.83               | 15.63               |
| ViTransPAD w/o A (Ours) | 16.80               | 21.27               | 18.50               | 20.60               |
| ViTransPAD w/A (Ours)  | 8.39                | 23.12               | 16.83               | 15.63               |

4.4. Intra-/cross-dataset Testing

Table 3 and Table 4 compare the performance of our method with the state-of-the-art methods on OULU-NPU [12] and cross-dataset [24] protocols. We can see that our proposed method ranks first on most protocols of OULU-NPU (i.e., Protocols 1, 2, and 4) and the ‘O&C&M to M’, ‘I&C&M to O’ of cross-dataset testing (‘O&C&M to I’ is the second best closing to the first). Please note that our ViTransPAD can be also integrated in the framework of meta-learning as used in ANRL [25] to further improve the cross-dataset generalization ability. The superior performance shows that our ViTrans can server as an effective new backbone for face PAD.

4.5. Visualization

Due to lack the long-range spatio-temporal dependencies over frames, the short-range attention within a frame is vulnerable to the noise which results its attention maps are less consistent than the ones of long-range attention either for the liveness or attacks detection as shown in Figure 4. For instance, the upper row of (a) shows that the long-range attention always focus on the left half faces for liveness detection. However, the first attention map of short-range attention (the bottom row of (a)) attends the hairs on the forehead but the succeeding frames switch to focus on the left half faces. The same results can be also observed in the attacks detection as shown in (b).

Fig. 4: Attention maps obtained by GradCAM [32]. Upper row illustrates attention maps of long-range attention over frames and the bottom row shows the ones of short-range attention within a frame.

5. CONCLUSION

We design a Video-based Transformer for face PAD with short/long-range spatio-temporal attention which can not only focus on local details but also the context of a video. The proposed Multi-scale Multi-Head Self-Attention enables the model to learn a fine-grained representation to perform pixel-level discrimination required by face PAD. We also introduce convolutions to our ViTransPAD to integrate desirable properties of CNNs which can gain a good computation-accuracy balance. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first approach using video-based transformer for face PAD which can serve as a new backbone for further study.
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