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Abstract

In this paper, we focus on face recognition over image sets, where each set is represented by a linear subspace. Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) is adopted for discriminative learning. After investigating the relation between regularization on Fisher Criterion and Maximum Margin Criterion, we present a unified framework for regularized LDA. With the framework, the ratio-form maximization of regularized Fisher LDA can be reduced to the difference-form optimization with an additional constraint. By incorporating the empirical loss as the regularization term, we introduce a generalized Square Loss based Regularized LDA (SLR-LDA) with suggestion on parameter setting. Our approach achieves superior performance to the state-of-the-art methods on face recognition. Its effectiveness is also evidently verified in general object and object category recognition experiments.

1. Introduction

Face recognition has been studied in computer vision for decades. Depending on the data available, face recognition can be performed on a single image or an image set. Recently attention has been shifted towards image set based recognition, as it is easy to acquire and handle large quantities of image data nowadays. By exploring information from multiple images, better performance can be achieved compared to recognition based on a single image. Many of the previous work exploited the temporal continuity between images \([12, 19]\), assuming the images were recorded from consecutive observations. Following recent work \([9]\), in this paper we focus on face recognition over sets of images that may be unordered.

By representing each image set as a linear subspace, Kim et al. \([9]\) exploited canonical correlations for comparing face image sets. They proposed Discriminant Analysis of Canonical Correlations (DCC), which extends Fisher Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) \([4]\) for learning over image sets that maximizes canonical correlations of within-class sets and minimizes canonical correlations of between-class sets. By mapping the subspaces into an empirical feature space using the kernel method, Hamm and Lee \([7]\) recently proposed Grassmann Discriminant Analysis (GDA) for image set classification, which applies regularized Fisher LDA to the subspace data.

In this work, we also represent each set of face images by a linear subspace \([9, 17]\). LDA is adopted for discriminative learning, where Fisher Criterion and Maximum Margin Criterion (MMC) \([11]\) are discussed. We investigate the relation between regularization on Fisher Criterion and MMC, and present a unified framework for regularized LDA. With the framework, the ratio-form maximization of regularized Fisher LDA can be reduced to the difference-form optimization with an additional constraint. By incorporating the empirical loss as the regularization term, we introduce a generalized Square Loss based Regularized LDA (SLR-LDA) with suggestion on appropriate parameter setting. We apply SLR-LDA over image sets for face recognition, which achieves superior performance to the state-of-the-art methods. Its effectiveness is also evidently verified in general object and object category recognition experiments.

2. Key Ingredients of Our Approach

2.1. Subspace Representation of Image Sets

An image (or vector) set can be considered to span a linear subspace, and represented by the orthonormal basis matrix. Figure 1 illustrates some face images from one image set, and the corresponding subspace representation using the first 5 leading bases. To measure the similarity between image sets, a distance measure of linear subspaces is needed. Most of the used distances are based on canonical correlations \([9]\), which are cosines of principal angles \(0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \ldots \leq \theta_d \leq \pi/2\) between two linear subspaces. Given the orthonormal basis matrices of two subspaces, \(B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}\), where \(m\) is the dimension of fea-
ture vectors and \(d\) is the number of basis vectors, canonical correlations are the singular values of \(B_1^T B_2\). In [7], Hamm and Lee discussed several distances and adopted the Projection metric

\[
d_p(B_1, B_2) = (d - \sum \cos^2 \theta_i)^{0.5}
\]

which produces a positive definite kernel function

\[
k(B_1, B_2) = \sum \cos^2 \theta_i = \|B_1^T B_2\|_F^2
\]

thus it can be easily used for kernel methods in Hilbert spaces (see details in [7]). This distance is also computationally efficient, as only the Frobenius norm needs to be calculated, without explicitly computing the canonical correlations. Therefore, we also use this distance in our work.

### 2.2. Linear Discriminant Analysis

LDA seeks a linear transformation \(f(x) = W^T x\) that maximizes the between-class distance \(d_B\) and minimizes the within-class distance \(d_W\) simultaneously, where \(x \in R^m\) is a data sample and \(W = (w_1, \ldots, w_r) \in R^{m \times r}(r \leq m)\) is the transformation matrix. There are mainly two criteria to implement this idea. Fisher LDA is to maximize the Fisher Criterion [4]

\[
\frac{d_B}{d_W} = \frac{tr(W^T S_B W)}{tr(W^T S_W W)}
\]

where \(S_B\) and \(S_W\) are the between-class and within-class scatter matrices respectively. The solution is the eigenvectors of the generalized eigen-problem \(S_B W = \lambda S_W W\) associated with the largest eigenvalues. The main problem of Fisher Criterion is that the matrix inverse \(S_W^{-1}\) is involved, while \(S_W\) could be singular, especially in small sample size problems or in kernel methods [14]. To address this problem, PCA is usually adopted to reduce the dimension of the data [1]; however, this step may remove discriminative information.

The other criterion is Maximum Margin Criterion introduced in [11], which is to maximize the difference \(d_B - d_W\).

With the constraint \(w^T w = 1\), the solution is obtained by solving the eigen-problem \((S_B - S_W)w = \lambda w\). Compared to Fisher Criterion, no matrix inverse is involved in MMC, thus it avoids the singularity problem and is more computationally efficient. MMC is closely related to Fisher Criterion, which can be derived from MMC by incorporating the constraint \(tr(W^T S_W W) = 1\). Recent papers [18, 20] have further extended MMC to weighted MMC, that is, to maximize \(\beta d_B - \alpha d_W\).

### 2.3. Regularized LDA

Regularization has been considered to address the singularity problem in Fisher LDA. A common approach is adding \(\mu I\) to \(S_W\) [5, 14]. In [8], a diagonal matrix was introduced into \(S_W\). Lu et al. [13] further modified \(S_W\) to \(\eta S_W + S_B\). On the contrary, few studies have considered regularization on MMC, since MMC does not have the singularity problem. In a more recent work [16], Xue et al. presented Discriminatively Regularized Least-Squares Classification (DRLSC), which aims to maximize \(d_B\), while at the same time minimize \(d_W\) and the square loss \(L_{sq} = \sum \|f(x_i) - y_i\|^2\). Specifically, DRLSC is to minimize

\[
J_{DR} = L_{sq} + \eta d_W - (1 - \eta)d_B
\]

so can be regarded as the regularized (weighted) MMC.

An important but unsolved problem is, is there any relation between regularization on Fisher Criterion and MMC? As discussed above, with a suitable constraint MMC leads to Fisher LDA. Considering MMC doesn’t have the singularity problem and is more computationally feasible, it is necessary to explore the relation between regularized Fisher LDA and regularized MMC. This can result in better understanding on regularized LDA. In the next section, we investigate their relation and present a general framework for regularized LDA, which unifies both regularized Fisher LDA and regularized MMC as a constrained optimization problem. A main problem of DRLSC is how to set the weighting coefficients of \(d_W\) and \(d_B\). Without sound theoretical analysis, an ad hoc setting \(\eta\) and \(1 - \eta\) were used [16], and the authors failed to provide a solution on how to determine \(\eta\). With the proposed unified framework, we obtain the relation of the weighting coefficients, leading to a flexible approach to parameter setting.

### 3. A Unified Framework for Regularized LDA

Regularized Fisher LDA aims to maximize

\[
J_{FC}(v) = \frac{d_B(v)}{d_W(v) + \frac{reg(v)}{\alpha}}
\]

s.t. \(v \in \Omega\)
where \( v \) is the variable, for example \( v \) can be \( W \) and \( b \) in the transformation \( f(x) = x^T W + b \), \( reg(v) \geq 0 \) represents the regularization term, \( \alpha > 0 \) is the regularization parameter, and \( \Omega \) is a closed set. We use \( reg/\alpha \) instead of \( \alpha \cdot reg \) for the simplicity of the subsequent analysis. Denote the maximum of \( J_{FC}(v) \) as \( J_{FC,max} = \max_{v \in \Omega} J_{FC} \). We have Theorem 3.1 (with proof in Appendix A).

**Theorem 3.1.** (1) The maxima of \( J_{FC}(v) \) also minimizes \( J(v) \), and \( \min J(v) = 0 \), where

\[
J(v) = reg + \alpha d_W - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}} d_B
\]

subject to \( v \in \Omega \)

(2). The minima of \( J(v) \) also maximizes \( J_{FC}(v) \).

(3). \( J_{min}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \) if and only if \( \beta = \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}} \), where

\[
J_{min}(\alpha, \beta) = \min_v (reg + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B)
\]

subject to \( v \in \Omega \)

According to Theorem 3.1(1)(2), maximizing \( J_{FC} \) is equivalent to minimizing \( J \). Thus we can reformulate the problem as

\[
\min J(v) = reg + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B
\]

subject to \( v \in \Omega \)

\[
\beta = \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}}
\]

\( J(v) \) can be viewed as the regularization on weighted MMC, so regularized Fisher Criterion is equivalent to regularized weighted MMC with the constraint \( \beta = \alpha / J_{FC,max} \). Therefore, regularized Fisher LDA and regularized MMC can be unified in a framework. In this way, the ratio-form maximization of regularized Fisher LDA can be reduced to the difference-form optimization with an additional constraint, which is easy to be solved to a certain extend. Our framework also sheds some insight on the relationship between parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), rather than an ad hoc setting \( \alpha + \beta = 1 \) in [16]. Furthermore, the parameter setting becomes more flexible. That is, instead of predefining \( \alpha \) and finding the optimal \( \beta \), we can also predefine \( \beta \) and solve

\[
\min J(v) = reg + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B
\]

subject to \( v \in \Omega \)

\[
\alpha = \beta J_{FC,max}
\]

This is very useful, as in some cases it is easy to predefine one of \( \alpha \) or \( \beta \).

Given \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), \( J(v) = reg + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B \) can be minimized. However, only \( \alpha \) is predefined, and \( \beta = \alpha / J_{FC,max} \) depends on the unknown \( J_{FC,max} \) (or vice versa). To derive the optimal \( \beta \), we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.**

\[
\beta = \arg_{\beta} \{ J_{\min}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \}
\]

**Proof.** From Theorem 3.1(3), we know \( J_{\min}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \) if and only if \( \beta = \alpha / J_{FC,max} \). Thus the optimal \( \beta \) satisfies \( J_{\min}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \), and any other \( \beta \) makes it nonzero. \( \square \)

Similarly, if \( \beta \) predefined, the optimal \( \alpha \) can be obtained from

\[
\alpha = \arg_{\alpha} \{ J_{\min}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \}
\]

Whether \( \alpha \) or \( \beta \) predefined depends on which one is easy to select. In a specific application, if \( J_{\min}(\alpha, \beta) \) can be formulated explicitly (for example, SLR-LDA in Section 4), we can obtain the optimal \( \beta \) according to Theorem 3.2 (or \( \alpha \) from Eqn. (11)). In cases where \( J_{\min}(\alpha, \beta) \) cannot be explicitly formulated, we have an iterative approach to compute the optimal \( \beta \) (or \( \alpha \)). Due to the page limit, we omit the discussion in this paper.

**4. Square Loss Regularized LDA (SLR-LDA)**

For regularized LDA, it is critical to choose a suitable regularization term \( reg \). As discussed above, a common approach is adding \( \mu I \) to \( S_W \) [5, 14]. This kind of regularization term is helpful for smoothing the function. However, for classification purposes, a smoothness constraint is not always useful. In supervised learning, the empirical loss \( L = \sum V(f(x_i), y_i) \) between the desired and actual outputs provides the discriminative information for classification. Following DRLSC [16], we take the empirical loss as \( reg \) in this work. As shown above, DRLSC is regularized MMC \( reg + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B \), and can be unified in our framework. The main problems of DRLSC include using an ad hoc setting \( \alpha + \beta = 1 \), and how to select the parameter \( \eta \). Here, with the proposed framework, we provide a generalized Square Loss based Regularized LDA (SLR-LDA). We also give suggestion on how to choose the parameter. Our approach can be extended for image set classification using the kernel technique.

For \( C \)-class problems, let \( y_i \in R^{1 \times C} \) be the class label for sample \( x_i \in R^m \). The indicator matrix \( Y \) is defined with its \( i \)-th row as \( y_i \). If \( x_i \) is in class \( c \), \( y_i \) can be defined as a vector of all zeros except that its \( c \)-th element is one. For a linear classifier \( f(x) = x^T W + b \), where \( W \in R^{m \times C} \) and \( b \in R^{1 \times C} \), the square loss is defined as

\[
L_{sq} = \sum \| f(x_i) - y_i \|^2 = \| X^T W + b_N - Y \|^2_F
\]
where the $i$-th column of $X \in R^{m \times N}$ is the sample $x_i$, $N$ is the number of samples, and all the rows of $B \in R^{N \times C}$ are $b$. Denote $I_N \in R^N$ as the vector with all ones, we have $b_N = 1_N b$. The scatter distances $d_B$ and $d_W$ are defined using the $k$NN method [2, 16], which gives the distances as
\begin{align}
    d_B &= tr(W^T X L_B X^T W) \\
    d_W &= tr(W^T X L_W X^T W)
\end{align}

See [16] for details. SLR-LDA is to maximize $\frac{d_B}{d_W + L_{sq}/\alpha}$, with a predefined $\alpha$, which is reduced to minimizing
\begin{align}
    J &= L_{sq} + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B \\
    s.t. \quad \beta &= \alpha J F_{C, \text{max}}
\end{align}

We first provide the explicit form of $J_{\text{min}}(\alpha, \beta) = \min_{W, b}(L_{sq} + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B)$. Based on $\|A\|_F^2 = tr(A^T A)$, we have
\begin{align}
    J &= L_{sq} + \alpha d_W - \beta d_B \\
    &= \|X^T W + b_N - Y\|_F^2 \\
    &+ tr(W^T X (\alpha L_W - \beta L_B) X^T W) \\
    &= tr(W^T X (I_N + \alpha L_W - \beta L_B) X^T W) \\
    &- 2 tr(W^T X (b_N - Y)) + \|b_N - Y\|_F^2
\end{align}

where $I_N \in R^{N \times N}$ is the identity matrix. The derivatives with respect to $b$ and $W$ are
\begin{align}
\begin{aligned}
    \frac{\partial J}{\partial b} &= X^T W + b_N - Y \\
    \frac{\partial J}{\partial W} &= X L_{\alpha, \beta} X^T W - X (Y - b_N)
\end{aligned}
\end{align}

where $L_{\alpha, \beta} := I_N + \alpha L_W - \beta L_B$. By setting the derivatives to zeros, we get the minima as
\begin{align}
\begin{aligned}
    \tilde{b} &= \frac{1}{\alpha}(R_{\alpha, \beta} - I_N) Y \\
    \tilde{W} &= (X L_{\alpha, \beta} X^T)^\dagger X (Y - b_N)
\end{aligned}
\end{align}

where $R_{\alpha, \beta} := X^T (X L_{\alpha, \beta} X^T)^\dagger X$, and $\dagger$ denotes Moore-Penrose pseudo inverse. By substituting the minima back into $J$, we obtain the minimum
\begin{align}
    J_{\text{min}}(\alpha, \beta) = tr(Y^T (R_{\alpha, \beta} - I_N) (1_N 1_N^T (R_{\alpha, \beta} - I_N) Y) 1_N (R_{\alpha, \beta} - I_N) Y) - Y))
\end{align}

Given the predefined $\alpha$, the optimal $\beta$ can be obtained from Theorem 3.2. Similarly, we can also derive the optimal $\alpha$ with the predefined $\beta$.

### 4.1. Parameter $\beta$ Selection

In reality, the minimum of $J$ should not be $-\infty$. We show in Appendix B that this can be achieved by setting $\beta \lambda_{\text{max}}(L_B) \leq 1$, where $\lambda_{\text{max}}(L_B)$ is the maximal eigenvalue of the matrix $L_B$. Considering $\beta \geq 0$ for the discrimination purpose, we have
\begin{align}
    \beta = \frac{1 - \sigma}{\lambda_{\text{max}}(L_B)} \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma \in [0, 1]
\end{align}

So in this case $\beta$ can be easily predefined. With the defined $\beta$, the optimal $\alpha$ is solved from Eqn. (11).

### 4.2. SLR-LDA over Image Sets

Using the kernel trick, we extend SLR-LDA for image set classification using the subspace representation. Assume the classifier can be represented as $f(x) = b + \sum W_i k(x, x)$, we have
\begin{align}
    L_{sq} &= \|K^T W + b_N - Y\|_F^2 \\
    d_B &= tr(W^T K L_B K^T W) \\
    d_W &= tr(W^T K L_W K^T W)
\end{align}

where $K$ is the kernel matrix. The solution is
\begin{align}
\begin{aligned}
    \tilde{b} &= \frac{1}{\alpha}(R_{\alpha, \beta} - I_N) Y \\
    \tilde{W} &= (K L_{\alpha, \beta} K^T)^\dagger K (Y - b_N)
\end{aligned}
\end{align}

where $R_{\alpha, \beta} = K^T (K L_{\alpha, \beta} K^T)^\dagger K$. In our experiments, $K$ is calculated using Eqn. (2).

### 5. Experiments

#### 5.1. Face Recognition

We evaluate the proposed SLR-LDA for image set based face recognition, where the task is to classify an unknown set of face images to one of the training classes, each of which also represented by face image sets. 

**Database of Face Image Sets** — Since there is no large database of face image sets public available, we built our own face database. The database consists of face images extracted from various videos, including movies, TV programs, etc. We captured about researchers in our group. There are in total 115 subjects with 62 females, and totally 1,862 image sets in our database. Each person has 4 to 40 image sets and each set has about 45 to 60 images. Some example face images from three sets are shown in Figure 2. All the faces were automatically detected using the Viola-Jones cascaded face detector [15], without any further processing such as alignment or background segmentation. As can be observed, the faces exhibit great variations in terms of head pose, illumination, expression, resolution, and occlusion. So our database is

---

2mi.eng.cam.ac.uk/~oa214/academic
3www.perceptual-vision.com/db/video/faces/cvglab
much closer to the conditions for face recognition in real-life environments. In our experiments, following [9], each face image is first histogram equalized, and then re-scaled to $20 \times 20$ pixels, thus represented by a 400-dimensional feature vector.

**Experimental Settings and Comparative Methods** — In our experiments, $p (=2, 3, 4, 5)$ image sets were randomly selected for training and the rest were used for testing$^4$. For each $p$, we run experiments with 50 random splits and report the average performance. For each image set, PCA was performed to obtain the subspace representation. The subspace dimension was set as 15, which preserves about 98% of the data energy of each set.

We compare SLR-LDA with the state-of-the-art methods, including DRLSC [16], GDA1 [7], and DCC [9]. As discussed above, DRLSC is a special case of our approach with an ad hoc parameter setting. GDA1 is Kernel LDA with a smoothing regularization term $\mu I$, while DCC extends LDA for image sets using canonical correlations. For SLR-LDA, we use $\sigma = 0.5$ and thus $\beta = 0.5/\lambda_{\text{max}}(L_B)$ in all experiments. For DRLSC, the optimal $\eta = 0.999$ was found by scanning through $[0, 1]$, which was used in our experiments. The number of nearest neighbors used in DRLSC and SLR-LDA is $k = 10$. For DCC, as recommended in [9], we reduced the dimension of the data using PCA: for training with 5 image sets, the reduced dimension was 150; for training with 2-4 sets, the reduced dimension was 120. The DCC experiments were repeated 20 times, because it is very time consuming.

**Experimental Results** — The recognition rates of different methods are shown in Figure 3. As can be observed, all the methods examined perform better when using more image sets for training. This is because, with more image sets used, face variations can be better represented, resulting in better discriminative functions. SLR-LDA consistently outperforms DCC and GDA1 with a clear margin. The main reason could be that the SLR-LDA incorporates the useful discriminative information by taking the loss as regularization term. In contrast, GDA1 adopts a smoothness regularization constraint that may not be sufficient for discrimination among classes, and DCC reduces the data dimension using PCA to avoid the singularity problem, which may remove the discriminative information. The benefit of using the loss as regularization term is also illustrated by DRLSC. With a properly chosen $\eta$, DRLSC also provides better performance than GDA1 and DCC. It is observed that SLR-LDA performs lightly better than DRLSC. This validates our theoretical analysis in Section 3, where we show that the relation should be $\beta = \alpha/J_{FC,\text{max}}$ rather than $\alpha + \beta = 1$ in DRLSC. We further illustrate in the next paragraph that DRLSC is sensitive to $\eta$, while SLR-LDA is robust to $\sigma \in [0, 1]$.

**Effect of Parameters in SLR-LDA and DRLSC** — In Section 4.1, we make the suggestion $1 - \beta \lambda_{\text{max}}(L_B) = \sigma \in [0, 1]$; $\sigma$ was set as 0.5 in all the experiments. Here we verify our suggestion, and investigate the performance with different $\sigma$ in SLR-LDA. The performance of SLR-LDA w.r.t different $\sigma$ is shown in Figure 4. For comparison,
we also show the performance of DRLSC w.r.t $\eta$ in Figure 5. We have several observations. (1) The suggestion $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ holds. For $\sigma < 0$ or $\sigma > 1$, the performance of SLR-LDA deteriorates sharply. (2) SLR-LDA is not sensitive to $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, and provides consistently stable results. While DRLSC is sensitive to the parameter $\eta \in [0, 1]$. (3) DRLSC performs well with $\eta$ close to 1. In this case DRLSC is reduced to minimizing $L_{sq} + d_W$, which is conflict with the basic idea to maximize $d_B$. This is possibly due to the ad hoc setting $\alpha + \beta = 1$.

5.2. Object Recognition On ALOI Database

To further verify its effective, we also apply SLR-LDA for general object or object category recognition. ALOI database [6] contains 1000 objects captured from 72 views. In our experiments, we used images of 100 objects, which were segmented from the background using the masks provided in the database. For each object, every 12 images with consecutive view angles were set as an image set, resulting 6 image sets per object. The images were processed using the same procedure on the face database. The dimension of subspace representation was 10. Again $p (=2, 3, 4, 5)$ image sets were randomly selected for training and the rest were used for testing. For each $p$, we run experiments with 50 random splits and report the average performance. We also compare SLR-LDA with DRLSC, GDA1, and DCC. In SLR-LDA, $\sigma$ is set to 0.5, while in DRLSC, the optimal $\eta = 0.995$ was used.

Figure 7 shows the recognition results of different methods. Again, all the methods achieve higher recognition rates when more sets are used for training. Once more, SLR-LDA performs slightly better than the optimal DRLSC. Both SLR-LDA and DRLSC perform better than GDA1 and DCC, due to taking the empirical loss into account in the regularization term. We also show the effect of parameters in SLR-LDA and DRLSC in Figure 7. It is observed that SLR-LDA achieves stable performance with $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, but its performance deteriorates sharply for $\sigma < 0$ or $\sigma > 1$. For DRLSC, it also provides good performance with $\eta$ close to 1, which is conflict with the basic idea to maximize $d_B$. Compared with the results on the face database, the recognition rates are much lower on the ALOI database. This is possibly because the images in ALOI have great variation on view angle, and each set contains much fewer images.

5.3. Object Category Recognition on ETH80

ETH80 database [10] contains 8 object categories, each of which has 10 image sets. Each set is composed of 41 images taken from different views. The dimension of the subspace representation was 10. Similarly, $p (=2, 3, 4, 5)$ image sets were randomly selected for training and the rest were used for testing. For each $p$, we run experiments with 50 random splits and report the average performance. We also compare SLR-LDA with DRLSC, GDA1, and DCC. In SLR-LDA, $\sigma$ is set to 0.5 in all experiments. In DRLSC, we examined different values of $\eta \in [0, 1]$ and use the optimal setting of 0.995. The experimental results are shown in Figure 8. Again, SRL-LDA performs comparably or slightly better than the optimal DRLSC. Both SLR-LDA and DRLSC provide superior performance to GDA1 and DCC, and this reinforces our findings in experiments on face and ALOI databases. In most cases, GDA1 outperforms DCC, which is consistent with the observation in [7]. While 5 sets in each category are used for training, the performance among these methods is small. This is because the ETH80 database is built under well controlled conditions, and as more sets are used for training, characteristics of different categories could be well captured. The recognition rates are much higher than that on the ALOI database, mainly due to a smaller number of classes. The observed effect of parameters in SLR-LDA and DRLSC is also similar to our findings on face database and ALOI database.
6. Conclusions

Face recognition over image sets is addressed in this paper. A general framework for regularized LDA is presented, which unifies both Fisher Criterion and Maximum Margin Criterion. The ratio-form maximization of regularized Fisher LDA can now be reduced to the difference-form optimization with an additional constraint. By incorporating the empirical loss as the regularization term, we introduce a generalized Square Loss based Regularized LDA with suggestion on appropriate parameter setting. Our approach achieves superior performance to the state-of-the-art methods in face recognition and object (category) recognition experiments on several databases.

Appendix

A. Proof to Theorem 3.1

Eqn. (5) can be reformulated as the following equation

\[ \text{reg}(v) + \alpha d_W(v) - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC}(v)} d_B(v) = 0 \]  

which will be used in the following analysis.

(1) Suppose \( u \in \Omega \) maximizes \( J_{FC} \), for \( \forall v \in \Omega \) we have

\[ J(u) = \text{reg}(u) + \alpha d_W(u) - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}} d_B(u) \]

(26)

\[ = \text{reg}(u) + \alpha d_W(u) - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC}(u)} d_B(u) = 0, \]  

(27)

\[ J(v) = \text{reg}(v) + \alpha d_W(v) - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}} d_B(v) \]

(28)

\[ \geq \text{reg}(v) + \alpha d_W(v) - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC}(v)} d_B(v) = 0. \]  

(29)

So \( u \) also minimizes \( J \) and

\[ \min J = J(u) = 0. \]  

(30)

(2) Suppose \( u \in \Omega \) minimizes \( J \), we have

\[ 0 = J(u) = \text{reg}(u) + \alpha d_W(u) - \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}} d_B(u) \]

(31)

\[ \Leftrightarrow \text{reg}(u) + \alpha d_W(u) = \frac{\alpha}{J_{FC,max}} d_B(u) \]

(32)

\[ \Leftrightarrow J_{FC}(u) = \frac{d_B(u)}{d_W(u)} + \frac{\text{reg}(u)}{\alpha} = J_{FC,max}. \]  

(33)
This suggests that we can require \( \lambda \) is also PSD, we just need to choose distances. According to Eqn. (16), we use \( -\infty \) is the minima, we need to prove \( \beta' = \alpha/J_{FC,max} \). For \( \forall v \in \Omega \) we have

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{reg}(v) + \alpha d_W(v) - \beta' d_B(v) \geq 0 \\
\iff &\text{reg}(v) + \alpha d_W(v) \geq \beta' d_B(v) \\
\iff &\frac{\alpha}{\beta'} \geq \frac{d_B(v)}{d_W(v) + \text{reg}(v)/\alpha} = J_{FC}(v)
\end{align*}
\]

The equality holds for the minima \( u \), which means \( \alpha/\beta' = J_{FC}(u) \). So we have \( J_{FC}(v) \leq \alpha/\beta' = J_{FC}(u) \), which means \( J_{FC}(u) = J_{FC,max} \). Thus \( \beta' = \alpha/J_{FC,max} \).

### B. Suggestion on Parameter Selection

In order that it makes sense to minimize \( J \) in Eqn. (16), the minimum should not be \( -\infty \). This suggests us to require that \( L_{\alpha,\beta} \) is positive semi-definite (PSD).

The definition of a PSD matrix \( H \) is that \( z^T H z \geq 0, \forall z \). According to Eqn. (16), \( J \) is quadratic. For simplicity we use \( v = [W^T b]^T \) to represent the variables \( b \) and \( W \). Using Eqn. (17), we obtain the Hessian matrix

\[
H := \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial v^2} = \begin{bmatrix} X L_{\alpha,\beta} X^T & X 1_N \\ 1_N^T X^T & 1_N^T 1_N \end{bmatrix}
\]

\( H \) should be PSD; otherwise if \( \lim_{z \to 0} z^T H z < 0 \), then \( \lim_{\mu \to 0} \mu^{-1} H \mu z_z = -\infty \). So now for \( \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^C \) and \( z = [p^T 0]^T \), we have \( z^T H z \geq 0 \). This suggests that we can require \( L_{\alpha,\beta} = I_N + \alpha L_W - \beta L_B \) to be PSD.

As \( I_N, L_W \) and \( L_B \) are all PSD (remember that scatter distances \( d_W \geq 0 \) and \( d_B \geq 0 \), and the addition of two PSD matrices is also PSD, we just need to choose \( \beta \) so that \( I_N - \beta L_B \) is PSD, which means \( z^T (I_N - \beta L_B) z \geq 0, \forall z \). This can be achieved by selecting \( \beta \lambda_{\max}(L_B) \leq 1 \), where \( \lambda_{\max}(L_B) \) is the maximal eigen-value of matrix \( L_B \).
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