**Abstract**

Recent years have witnessed a growing interest in developing methods for 3D face recognition. However, 3D scans often suffer from the problems of missing parts, large facial expressions, and occlusions. To be useful in real-world applications, a 3D face recognition approach should be able to handle these challenges. In this paper, we propose a novel general approach to deal with the 3D face recognition problem by making use of multiple keypoint descriptors (MKD) and the sparse representation-based classification (SRC). We call the proposed method 3DMKDSRC for short. Specifically, with 3DMKDSRC, each 3D face scan is represented as a set of descriptor vectors extracted from keypoints by meshSIFT. Descriptor vectors of gallery samples form the gallery dictionary. Given a probe 3D face scan, its descriptors are extracted at first and then its identity can be determined by using a multitask SRC. The proposed 3DMKDSRC approach does not require the pre-alignment between two face scans and is quite robust to the problems of missing data, occlusions and expressions. Its superiority over the other leading 3D face recognition schemes has been corroborated by extensive experiments conducted on three benchmark databases, Bosphorus, GavabDB, and FRGC2.0. The Matlab source code for 3DMKDSRC and the related evaluation results are publicly available at http://sse.tongji.edu.cn/linzhang/3dmkdsrcface/3dmkdsrchr.htm.

**Introduction**

Recognizing the identity of a person with high confidence is a critical issue in various applications, such as e-banking, access control, passenger clearance, national ID card, etc. The need for reliable user authentication techniques has significantly increased in the wake of heightened concerns about security, and rapid advancement in networking, communication and mobility [1]. Biometrics, which refers to automatic identification of individuals based on their measurable physiological or behavioral attributes, is of great interest and has received considerable attention because of their high accuracy and convenience to use in the modern e-world. Due to the natural and non-intrusive nature of data acquisition, the face has many benefits when compared to other biometric identifiers.

Face recognition has received substantial attention over the last three decades. To date, the majority of implemented face recognition systems are based on 2D images. Unfortunately, despite the great efforts made over the last decades, face recognition using 2D images is still a great challenge due to kinds of adverse factors, such as illumination variation, pose changes, makeup, or facial expressions. The emergence of reliable and inexpensive 3D scanners has provided new opportunities for researchers to use 3D shape information of the face to obtain better performance [2]. 3D scanning has a major advantage over 2D imaging in that those nuisance factors have a relatively smaller influence. The 3D face recognition algorithms identify faces from the 3D shape of a person’s face. In the literature, some works in this field attempt to integrate discriminating information from 2D and 3D modalities simultaneously [3] and others depend solely on 3D information. In this paper, our discussions are confined only to the latter ones.

**Previous Work**

The task of recognizing 3D face scans have been approached in various ways, leading to varying level of successes. Some representative and prominent works will be briefly reviewed here. The existing 3D face recognition algorithms can be roughly classified into “holistic-based” and “local-based” techniques.

The holistic techniques employ information from the whole face or at least from large regions of the 3D face. Many early-stage 3D face recognition algorithms were simply extended versions of holistic 2D approaches, in which the portrait images are replaced by range images. Typically, the input range images are aligned and then reformatted into feature vectors. After that, some statistical dimensionality reduction techniques, such as the principal component analysis (PCA) [4–8], the linear discriminant analysis (LDA) [9,10], and the independent component analysis...
curves will definitely be affected. In [23], Mahoor and Abdel-
tip is automatically selected and then 28 face regions around the face are extracted. When matching a gallery-probe pair, corresponding regions are matched at first using ICP and then the overall matching score is obtained as the fusion of the local matching results. Such an idea of part-based matching [30] was also explored in some other works, such as [31–36]. In [37], Elaiwat et al. explored the curvelet transform to detect salient points on the face scan and to build multi-scale local surface descriptors. Inspired by SIFT [38], which is a quite successful method for matching 2D images, Smeets et al. [39] developed a meshSIFT algorithm which could detect keypoints and build local descriptors for 3D meshes. Such an algorithm has been applied to 3D face recognition and promising results were reported on Bosphorus database [40].

Overview of Our Approach

When missing data, large facial expressions, or occlusions exist in 3D face scans, it would be difficult for an approach based on holistic representations to succeed. Instead, methods resorting to local representations seem more appealing. For most state-of-the-art local representation based methods, it is imperative to detect some semantic fiducial points at first, such as the nose tip, the eye corners, the mouth corners, etc. However, it is nontrivial to design an approach that can automatically and robustly detect fiducial points when missing data, self-occlusions, or large expressions exist in face scans.

In this paper, we propose a novel general 3D face recognition scheme based on local representations. In such an approach, we require neither the alignment of facial range images nor the detection of meaningful fiducial points. Our approach is highly motivated by the success of a recent work designed for 2D partial face matching, namely MKDSRC (Multiple Keypoint Descriptors and Sparse Representation based Classification) [41]. MKDSRC proposed by Liao et al. [41] is an alignment-free 2D partial face matching approach, in which each face is represented by a set of descriptor vectors extracted from keypoints and a multi-task SRC is used for classification. Such a method can address the problem of 2D partial face matching pretty well.

Specifically in our approach, for each 3D face scan F, we at first use meshSIFT [39] to extract from it multiple keypoints and then build the associated local descriptors. By using meshSIFT, keypoints are detected as mean curvature extrema in the scale space. The set of local descriptors derived from F can be used as a representation of F. In order to build the gallery dictionary, all the local descriptors extracted from gallery samples are concatenated together. Given a probe face scan, its local descriptors are extracted at first and then its identity can be determined by using a multi-task SRC. The proposed method is called 3DMKDSRC (3D Multiple Keypoint Descriptors and Sparse Representation based Classification). 3DMKDSRC uses a variable-sized description and accordingly each face scan is represented by a set of descriptors. Since the MKD dictionary comprises a large number of gallery descriptors, it is highly possible to sparsely represent descriptors from a probe scan, irrespective of whether it is a holistic, partial, or occluded one. 3DMKDSRC is particularly appropriate for matching 3D scans with missing parts, facial expressions, or occlusions. Its efficacy has been validated on three widely used benchmark databases.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews meshSIFT, based on which we extract from 3D face scans interest points and construct local descriptors. Section 3 presents
our 3DMKDSRC approach in details. Section 4 reports the experimental results while Section 5 concludes the paper.

**meshSIFT**

In our 3DMKDSRC approach, each 3D face scan is represented by a set of local descriptors extracted from keypoints. With respect to the scheme for keypoint detection and local descriptor construction for 3D scans, we resort to meshSIFT [39], which is an effective method designed for these particular tasks proposed quite recently. MeshSIFT was highly motivated by SIFT [38], which is now a widely used method to build scale invariant local descriptors for 2D gray-scale images. In this section, we briefly review the key steps of meshSIFT.

1. **Keypoint Detection**

The keypoint detection step in meshSIFT is similar to SIFT. A scale space containing smoothed versions of the input mesh is constructed at first as:

\[
M_s = \begin{cases} 
M, & \text{if } s = 0 \\
G_{\bar{s}_i} \otimes M, & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( M \) stands for the original mesh, \( \otimes \) stands for the convolution operation, and \( G_{\sigma_i} \) stands for the approximated Gaussian filter with scale \( \sigma_i \). These scales \( \{\sigma_i\} \) vary exponentially as \( \sigma_i = 2^{i/k} \sigma_0 \), where \( k \) stands for the number of total scales. Since the number of convolutions is discrete, \( \sigma_i \) is approximated as:

\[
\bar{s}_i = \sqrt[3]{2^{2i} \bar{e}^2} \tag{2}
\]

with \( \bar{e} \) the average edge length. Fig. 1 shows the shapes of two face scans in the scale space.

To detect keypoints in the scale space, the mean curvature is computed for each vertex \( i \) at each scale \( s \) as:

![Figure 4. If a query descriptor has a matched descriptor in gallery, the coefficient would be very sparse. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100120.g004](image-url)
Figure 5. An example of a coefficient vector which is not sparse.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100120.g005

Figure 6. The overall flowchart of 3DMKDSRC.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100120.g006
where $k_{i,1}$ and $k_{i,2}$ respectively stand for the maximum and minimum curvatures for each vertex $i$ at scale $s$. The difference between subsequent scales could be computed as:

$$dH^s_i = H^{s+1}_i - H^s_i$$

A vertex is selected as a keypoint only when its value $dH^s_i$ is larger or smaller than all its neighboring vertices in all upper, current, and lower scales. The scale $s$, at which the extremum is obtained, is assigned to each keypoint. Fig. 2 shows an example of keypoint detection results of 3 face scans collected from the same person.

### 2. Local Descriptor

Having detected keypoints, the next step is to describe them with local descriptors which actually summarize the local neighborhood information around them. In order to obtain an orientation-invariant descriptor, each keypoint is assigned a canonical orientation. With such a canonical orientation, it is possible to construct a local reference frame in which the vertices of the neighborhood can be expressed independent of the facial pose.

For a keypoint $P$, all vertices within a spherical region of radius $9\sigma_i$ around it are its neighboring points. For each neighboring point, its normal vector is computed and its geodesic distance to $P$ is determined based on the fast marching algorithm [42]. The normal vectors of these points are projected onto the tangent plane of the mesh containing $P$. The projected normal vectors are gathered in a weighted histogram with 360 bins. Each histogram entry is Gaussian weighted with the geodesic distances to $P$. The highest peak in the histogram and the peaks above 80% of this highest peak value are selected as canonical orientations. For a keypoint which has more than one canonical orientations, it can be regarded as multiple keypoints, each assigned one of the canonical orientations.

The generation of a local descriptor for $P$ is based on 9 sub-regions. As described in Fig. 3, the locations of these 9 regions are based on the canonical orientation of $P$. The geodesic distances from the centers of regions 2, 4, 6 and 8 to $P$ are all $4.5\sqrt{2}\sigma_i$, while the geodesic distances from the centers of regions 3, 5, 7 and 9 to $P$ are all $4.5\sqrt{2}\sigma_i$.

For each of the 9 regions, two histograms $p_S$ and $p_h$ are used for generating the descriptor. The first histogram contains the shape index which is expressed as:

$$S_i = \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{k_{i,1} + k_{i,2}}{k_{i,1} - k_{i,2}} \right)$$

where $k_{i,1}$ and $k_{i,2}$ are the maximum and the minimum curvatures, respectively. The second histogram contains the slant angles, which are defined as the angles between the projected normals and the canonical orientation. Both the shape index and the slant angle histograms are Gaussian weighted with the geodesic distances to $P$.

### Table 1. Rank-1 recognition rates on Bosphorus.

| Approach              | Size of gallery set | Size of probe set | Rank-1 RR   |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| 3DMKDSRC (all)        | 315                 | 4351              | 95.03%      |
| 3DMKDSRC (frontal)    | 315                 | 3543              | 98.65%      |
| meshSIFT (all)        | 315                 | 4351              | 92.99%      |
| meshSIFT (frontal)    | 315                 | 3543              | 96.56%      |
| ICP [6] (frontal)     | 47                  | 1508              | 72.4%       |
| PCA [6] (frontal)     | 47                  | 1508              | 70.6%       |
| Alyuz et al. [32] (frontal) | 47          | 1508              | 95.3%       |
| Dibekli glu et al. [33] (frontal) | 47        | 1527              | 89.2%       |
| Hajati et al. [34] (all) | –              | –                 | 69.1%       |

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100120.t001

### Table 2. Rank-1 recognition rates on GavabDB.

| Approach               | Size of gallery set | Size of probe set | Rank-1 RR   |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| 3DMKDSRC (neutral)     | 183                 | 61                | 100%        |
| 3DMKDSRC (all)         | 183                 | 244               | 92.62%      |
| meshSIFT (neutral)     | 183                 | 61                | 98.36%      |
| meshSIFT (all)         | 183                 | 244               | 86.22%      |
| Moreno et al. [7] (all) | 305               | 122               | 77.9%       |
| Moreno et al. [35] (neutral) | 60          | 60                | 78%         |
| Mousavi et al. [8] (neutral) | 61          | 61                | 91%         |
| Mahoor et al. [23] (neutral) | 61          | 183               | 95%         |

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100120.t002
Finally, the histograms are concatenated in a vector form as \( f = [f_{p,1}, \ldots, f_{p,9}]^T \) and \( f \) is regarded as the descriptor of \( P \). Consequently, each 3D face scan can be represented as a set of descriptor vectors \( F = [f_1, \ldots, f_n] \), where each \( f_i \) is a local descriptor vector.

### 3DMKDSRC

In this section, the proposed 3D face recognition scheme 3DMKDSRC will be presented in details.

1. Construction of the Gallery Dictionary

   For each sample 3D face scan in the gallery set, its local descriptors could be computed by meshSIFT. Then, the gallery dictionary is constructed by concatenating these descriptors together. Suppose that there are \( C \) subjects in gallery and for each subject \( i \) there are totally \( n_i \) derived descriptors. Usually, these \( n_i \) descriptors are obtained from multiple samples of the subject \( i \). For the \( i^{th} \) subject, let

   \[
   D_i = \{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{in_i}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_i}
   \]  

   (6)

   where \( m \) here stands for the descriptor dimension. The gallery dictionary \( D \) can be simply constructed by concatenating these \( D_i \)s as:

   \[
   D = [D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_C] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times K}
   \]  

   (7)

   where \( K \) here represents the total number of descriptors in the gallery set. Typically, \( K \) is very large, making \( D \) an over-complete description space of the \( C \) classes. According to the theory of compressed sensing, a sparse solution is possible for an over-complete dictionary \([43]\); therefore, any descriptor from a probe face scan can be expressed by a sparse linear combination of the items from the dictionary \( D \).

2. Multi-Task Sparse Representation

   Given a probe 3D face scan, we first compute from it a set of local descriptors:

   \[
   Y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n)
   \]  

   (8)

   with \( n \) the number of keypoints detected from this scan. Then, the sparse representation problem is formulated as:

   \[
   \hat{X} = \arg\min_{X} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_i\|_0, \text{ s.t. } Y = DX
   \]  

   (9)

   where \( X = [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times n} \) is the sparse coefficient matrix, and \( \| \cdot \|_0 \) denotes the \( l_0 \)-norm of a vector. However, the solution to this problem is NP-hard. As suggested by the research results of compressed sensing \([44]\), sparse signals can be well recovered with a high probability via the \( l_1 \)-minimization. Therefore, Eq. (9) can be approximated by:

   \[
   \hat{X} = \arg\min_{X} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_i\|_1, \text{ s.t. } Y = DX
   \]  

   (10)

   where \( \| \cdot \|_1 \) represents the \( l_1 \)-norm of the vector. This is a multi-task problem as both \( X \) and \( Y \) have multiple columns. Equivalently, we can solve the following set of \( n \) \( l_1 \)-minimization problems, one for each probe descriptor \( y_i \):

   \[
   \hat{x}_i = \arg\min_{x_i} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_i\|_1, \text{ s.t. } y_i = Dx_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n
   \]  

   (11)

   To solve Eq. (11), several prominent algorithms have been developed in the last few years, including Homotopy \([45]\), FISTA \([46]\), DALM \([47]\), SpaRSA \([48]\), l_1-ls \([49]\), etc. In our implementation, we use the Homotopy algorithm proposed in \([45]\). Usually, if the identity of the probe face scan is covered by the gallery set, the coefficient vectors of its local descriptors would be very sparse as illustrated in Fig. 4.

   Inspired by \([41, 50]\), we adopt the following multi-task SRC to determine the identity of the probe face scan:

   \[
   \text{identity}(Y) = \arg\min_{C} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|y_i - D\delta(c(x_i))\|_2
   \]  

   (12)

   where \( \delta(c) \) is a function which selects only the coefficients corresponding to class \( c \). Eq. (12) makes use of the sum of reconstruction residuals of the \( n \) descriptors with respect to each class to determine the identity of the input face scan.

3. Dictionary Shrinking and Sparsity Criterion

   In practice, the size \( K \) of the dictionary can be extremely large, making it difficult to solve Eq. (11). Hence, we adopt a similar idea as \( \text{Liao et al.} \ [41] \) to derive a fast approximate solution. For each probe descriptor \( y_i \), we first compute:

   \[
   d_i = D^T y_i
   \]  

   (13)

   Then, for each \( y_i \), we only keep \( L \) \( l_i \ll K \) descriptors of \( d_i \) according to the \( L \) largest values of \( d_i \), resulting in a small sub-dictionary \( D^{(i)}_{m \times L} \). Then, \( D \) is replaced by \( D^{(i)} \) in Eq. (11) and Eq. (12) is adjusted accordingly. In our implementation, \( L \) is set to 400.

   In addition, we assume that if the identity of the probe face scan belongs to the \( j^{th} \) subject of the gallery, the entries of \( y_j \) should be small except those associated with the \( j^{th} \) subject. If the coefficients \( x_i \) are not concentrated on any subject and instead values of \( x_i \) spread evenly over all the gallery subjects, \( y_i \) is likely to be a noisy

---

**Table 3. Rank-1 recognition rates on FRGC2.0.**

| Approach      | Size of gallery set | Size of probe set | Rank-1 RR |
|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 3DMKDSRC      | 1259                | 2748              | 89.29%    |
| meshSIFT      | 1259                | 2748              | 87.85%    |

(10.1371/journal.pone.0100120.t003)
descriptor and it can provide little discriminative information. Thus, such \( x_i \) will not be considered when computing Eq. (12).

To evaluate the sparsity of \( x_i \), we use,

\[
\text{sparsity}(x_i) = \frac{k \cdot \text{Main}(x_i) / ||x_i|| - 1}{k - 1}
\]

where \( k \) is the number of subjects in \( D^0 \) and \( \text{Main}(x_i) \) stands for the summation of absolute values of coefficients in \( x_i \) corresponding to the first 5 percent of subjects with highest sums of absolute coefficients. If \( \text{sparsity}(x_i) \) is larger than a threshold (0.8 in our implementation), we consider that \( x_i \) is sparse enough and it will be involved in the further determination of identity (see Eq. (12)). Fig. 5 shows an example of the distribution of a coefficient vector which is not sparse.

The overall pipeline of our proposed 3DMKDSRC algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 6.

**Experimental Results and Discussions**

In this section, we will provide a comparative performance analysis of our method with the other state-of-the-art or representative approaches using three public datasets, Bosphorus, GavabDB, and FRGC2.0.

1. **Experiments on Bosphorus**

   The Bosphorus database [40] consists of 4666 facial range scans from 105 different subjects and is acquired by an Inspeck Mega Capturer 3D scanner leading to 3D point clouds of approximately 35000 points. In Bosphorus, facial expression variations, pose variations, and occlusions are present. The majority of the subjects are aged between 25 and 35.

   In our experiment, we chose 3 face scans with neutral expressions to form the gallery set, making the gallery set have 315 samples. When forming the test set, two cases were considered. In the first case, the test set included all the remaining samples, while in the second case the test set only contained remaining frontal samples. Besides 3DMKDSRC, meshSIFT was also evaluated under the same experimental settings. The identification results in terms of rank-1 recognition rate are summarized in Table 1. In addition, results of several other algorithms are also reported. They include ICP based method [6], PCA based method [6], Alyuz et al.’s method [32], Dibeklioglu et al.’s method [33], and Hajati et al.’s method [34].

   From the results listed in Table 1, it can be seen that the proposed 3DMKDSRC performs much better than the other methods evaluated.

2. **Experiments on GavabDB**

   GavabDB [51] is designed to be the most expression rich and noise prone 3D face database. The database consists of the Minolta Vi-700 laser range scans from 61 subjects. For each subject, 9 scans are collected, covering different poses and various facial expressions. We skipped those 2 types of scans which are largely rotated (±90 degrees). For each subject, we chose 3 neutral faces to build the gallery set. When forming the test set, two cases were considered. In the first case, the test set included all the remaining samples, while in the second case the test set only contained remaining neutral samples. Besides 3DMKDSRC, meshSIFT was also evaluated using the same experimental protocol. The rank-1 recognition rates are summarized in Table 2. In addition, results of several other representative algorithms, including Moreno et al.’s method [7,35], Mousavi et al.’s method [8], and Mahoor et al.’s method [23], are also reported in Table 2 for comparison.

   The superiority of 3DMKDSRC over the other competitors can be clearly observed from the results listed in Table 2. Particularly, when the test set only contains samples with neutral expressions, the rank-1 recognition rate of 3DMKDSRC can reach 100%, which is quite amazing.

3. **Experiments on FRGC2.0**

   FRGC2.0 [52] database contains 4007 640×480 3D range scans which were taken under controlled illumination conditions by a Minolta Vivid 900/910 series 3D sensor. The face scans came from 466 different subjects.

   In this experiment, we randomly chose 3 face scans for each subject to form the gallery set. For the subject which has less than 3 samples, we just put all its samples in the gallery. The rest of the faces in the database were used for testing. The rank-1 recognition rates obtained under those settings by 3DMKDSRC and meshSIFT are listed in Table 3. Actually, some state-of-the-art methods, such as [24], could achieve higher recognition accuracy than 3DMKDSRC on FRGC2.0. However, it should be noted that those methods would usually apply a complicated data preprocessing procedure (e.g., hole filling) on the face scans in FRGC2.0 to improve the data quality. By contrast, in our experiments, no extra data preprocessing was performed. That’s the main cause accounting for the lower recognition accuracies of 3DMKDSRC and meshSIFT reported here. 3D data preprocessing is an independent area and in the future we may try to give deeper investigations in this field.

**Conclusions**

In this paper, we have addressed the problem of 3D face recognition and proposed a novel approach, namely 3DMKDSRC. 3DMKDSRC represents each 3D face scan by a set of keypoint descriptor vectors extracted by meshSIFT and constructs a large dictionary from all the gallery descriptors. At the testing stage, descriptors of a probe face scan can be sparsely represented by the dictionary, and its identity can be determined accordingly by solving a multi-task SRC problem. 3DMKDSRC is particular appropriate for matching range scans with missing parts, large expressions, or occlusions. Its efficacy has been corroborated by the extensive experiments conducted on various benchmark databases.
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