

# Face Alignment Robust to Pose, Expressions and Occlusions: Supplementary Material

Vishnu Naresh Boddeti, Myung-Cheol Roh, Jongju Shin, Takaharu Oguri, Takeo Kanade

## 1 Experiments and Analysis

Due to lack of space in the main manuscript, we report additional quantitative results of our face alignment approach here. Figure 1 shows the cumulative landmark error distribution curves as a function of the Normalized Landmark Error on the AFW, LFPW, HELEN and IBUG datasets, both including (68) and excluding (51) the landmarks on the jawline.

We also report face alignment results of ERCLM on the 300W [1] dataset and compare with multiple participants of the 300W Face Alignment Challenge. ERCLM trained only on facial images captured under a laboratory setting exhibits a high degree of generalization and outperforms all but Deng et. al.[2], that has been trained on "in-the-wild" images similar to those in the 300W challenge.

## 2 Ablation Study

We report a comprehensive set of quantitative results of our ablation study on the following datasets: AFW, HELEN TEST, HELEN, LFPW TEST, LFPW, IBUG, 300W INDOOR, 300W OUTDOOR and 300W ALL. Table 1 and Table 2 report the Mean Normalized Landmark Error and the face alignment Failure Rate evaluated on 68 (includes jawline) and 51 (excludes jawline) landmarks respectively.

We make the following observations from our ablative study, 1) modeling the multiple pose and expression modes accounts for the largest gains in alignment performance, 2) modeling the different types of landmarks, contours and points, improves alignment, especially on challenging datasets like the 300W and IBUG both in terms of the MNLE and the failure rate, 3) hypotheses generated by sampling, both random and detector confidence based, consistently results in lower alignment failure rate and lower landmark localization error in comparison to greedily selecting hypotheses to evaluate, and 4) while hypotheses generated by random sampling exhibit better robustness to challenging facial images than the detector confidence based samples, the latter provides a good trade-off between performance and computational complexity.

## References

- [1] C. Sagonas, E. Antonakos, G. Tzimiropoulos, S. Zafeiriou, and M. Pantic, "300 faces in-the-wild challenge: Database and results," *Image and Vision Computing*, 2015.
- [2] J. Deng, Q. Liu, J. Yang, and D. Tao, "M 3 csr: Multi-view, multi-scale and multi-component cascade shape regression," *Image and Vision Computing*, 2015.
- [3] X. Zhu and D. Ramanan, "Face detection, pose estimation, and landmark localization in the wild," in *CVPR*, 2012.
- [4] X. Cao, Y. Wei, F. Wen, and J. Sun, "Face alignment by explicit shape regression," in *CVPR*, 2012.
- [5] X. P. Burgos-Artizzu, P. Perona, and P. Dollár, "Robust face landmark estimation under occlusion," in *ICCV*, 2013.
- [6] X. Xiong and F. De la Torre, "Supervised descent method and its applications to face alignment," in *CVPR*, 2013.
- [7] J. Čech, V. Franc, M. Uříčář, and J. Matas, "Multi-view facial landmark detection by using a 3d shape model," *Image and Vision Computing*, 2015.
- [8] H. Fan and E. Zhou, "Approaching human level facial landmark localization by deep learning," *Image and Vision Computing*, 2015.
- [9] B. Martinez and M. F. Valstar, "L 2, 1-based regression and prediction accumulation across views for robust facial landmark detection," *Image and Vision Computing*, 2015.
- [10] M. Uříčář, V. Franc, D. Thomas, A. Sugimoto, and V. Hlaváč, "Multi-view facial landmark detector learned by the structured output svm," *Image and Vision Computing*, 2016.




Fig. 1: Cumulative error distribution curves for landmark localization showing the proportion of landmarks that have the Normalized Landmark Error below a given threshold on the **AFW**, **LFPW**, **HELEN** and **IBUG** datasets. We compare our proposed method to a baseline tree-structured Deformable Parts Model (DPM) [3], Explicit Shape Regression (ESR) [4], Robust Pose Regression (RCPR) [5] and Supervised Descent Method (SDM) [6]. We show face alignment results both including (68) and excluding (51) the points on the jawline. The legend reports the MNLE (in %) at a threshold of 0.1. Our method, ERCLM, shows good alignment performance, especially in the presence of severe occlusions and demonstrates robust generalization across datasets.




Fig. 2: Face alignment results on the **300W Indoor**, **300W Outdoor** and **300W Indoor+Outdoor** datasets evaluated over both 68 (includes jawline) and 51 (excludes jawline) landmarks. We report both the Mean Normalized Landmark Error (MNLE) and the alignment Failure Rate (FR). We compare ERQCLM against the following baselines (a) Cech et al., [7], (b) Deng et al., [2], (c) Fan et al., [8], (d) Martinez et al., [9], and (e) Uricar et al., [10]. ERCLM, although trained only on facial images captured under a laboratory setting outperforms all but Deng et al. [2], that has been trained on “in-the-wild” images similar to those in the 300W challenge [1].

| Dataset      | Metric | Multi-Modal (E+P) |       |       | Multi-Modal (E) |       |       | Multi-Modal (P) |       |       | SDPM  |       |       | Full         |              |             |
|--------------|--------|-------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
|              |        |                   |       |       |                 |       |       |                 |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |             |
| AFW          | MNLE   | 6.29              | 6.31  | 6.34  | 6.16            | 6.18  | 6.23  | 5.84            | 5.83  | 5.90  | 5.80  | 5.85  | 5.93  | 5.77         | <b>5.73</b>  | 5.79        |
|              | FR     | 9.20              | 8.01  | 9.20  | 8.01            | 7.72  | 8.01  | 5.34            | 5.34  | 6.82  | 4.75  | 4.75  | 5.93  | 5.34         | <b>4.75</b>  | 6.23        |
| HELEN TEST   | MNLE   | 5.04              | 5.06  | 5.06  | 4.94            | 4.94  | 4.95  | 4.78            | 4.79  | 4.81  | 4.79  | 4.82  | 4.80  | <b>4.71</b>  | 4.74         | 4.74        |
|              | FR     | 2.12              | 2.12  | 2.42  | 1.82            | 1.52  | 2.12  | 1.21            | 1.52  | 1.52  | 1.21  | 1.52  | 1.21  | <b>1.21</b>  | 1.52         | 1.21        |
| HELEN        | MNLE   | 5.25              | 5.25  | 5.24  | 5.14            | 5.14  | 5.13  | 4.94            | 4.94  | 4.95  | 5.05  | 5.08  | 5.07  | <b>4.89</b>  | 4.91         | 4.91        |
|              | FR     | 3.22              | 3.09  | 3.18  | 2.66            | 2.62  | 2.32  | 1.85            | 1.93  | 1.80  | 1.59  | 1.97  | 2.02  | 1.50         | 1.59         | <b>1.46</b> |
| LFPW TEST    | MNLE   | 4.56              | 4.55  | 4.54  | 4.47            | 4.47  | 4.49  | <b>4.37</b>     | 4.41  | 4.39  | 4.38  | 4.33  | 4.38  | 4.38         | 4.38         | 4.40        |
|              | FR     | 0.89              | 0.45  | 0.89  | 0.89            | 0.45  | 0.89  | 0.45            | 0.00  | 0.45  | 0.00  | 0.45  | 0.00  | 0.45         | <b>0.00</b>  | 0.45        |
| LFPW         | MNLE   | 5.06              | 5.08  | 5.06  | 4.96            | 4.98  | 4.98  | 4.83            | 4.85  | 4.83  | 4.91  | 4.89  | 4.89  | <b>4.79</b>  | 4.82         | 4.80        |
|              | FR     | 3.48              | 3.00  | 2.80  | 2.51            | 2.71  | 2.51  | 1.84            | 2.22  | 1.45  | 1.55  | 1.55  | 1.16  | 1.74         | 1.74         | <b>1.16</b> |
| IBUG         | MNLE   | 10.65             | 10.34 | 10.35 | 10.40           | 9.98  | 10.02 | 9.34            | 9.28  | 9.16  | 9.32  | 9.12  | 9.16  | 8.89         | 8.94         | <b>8.84</b> |
|              | FR     | 44.44             | 41.48 | 42.96 | 41.48           | 37.78 | 40.00 | 31.85           | 30.37 | 28.89 | 25.19 | 25.19 | 27.41 | <b>24.44</b> | 26.67        | 26.67       |
| 300W INDOOR  | MNLE   | 7.77              | 7.61  | 7.71  | 7.50            | 7.44  | 7.49  | 6.83            | 6.67  | 6.87  | 6.93  | 6.93  | 7.01  | 6.58         | <b>6.51</b>  | 6.72        |
|              | FR     | 17.00             | 18.33 | 17.00 | 15.33           | 16.67 | 16.00 | 12.33           | 11.67 | 11.33 | 11.00 | 12.33 | 11.67 | 9.33         | <b>9.33</b>  | 9.67        |
| 300W OUTDOOR | MNLE   | 8.30              | 8.29  | 8.37  | 8.03            | 8.04  | 8.14  | 7.48            | 7.35  | 7.35  | 7.37  | 7.36  | 7.47  | <b>7.13</b>  | 7.15         | 7.21        |
|              | FR     | 21.67             | 21.33 | 21.67 | 19.33           | 18.67 | 20.00 | 15.33           | 14.67 | 14.67 | 17.00 | 16.00 | 17.33 | 13.00        | <b>12.67</b> | 14.33       |
| 300W ALL     | MNLE   | 8.03              | 7.95  | 8.04  | 7.77            | 7.74  | 7.81  | 7.15            | 7.01  | 7.11  | 7.15  | 7.15  | 7.24  | 6.85         | <b>6.83</b>  | 6.96        |
|              | FR     | 19.33             | 19.83 | 19.33 | 17.33           | 17.67 | 18.00 | 13.83           | 13.17 | 13.00 | 14.00 | 14.17 | 14.50 | 11.17        | <b>11.00</b> | 12.00       |

TABLE 1: Ablative analysis of the components of ERCLM on datasets with varying difficulty, **AFW**, **HELEN TEST**, **HELEN**, **LFPW TEST**, **LFPW**, **IBUG**, **300W INDOOR**, **300W OUTDOOR** and **300W ALL**, evaluated over 68 (includes jawline). We report both the Mean Normalized Landmark Error (MNLE) and the alignment Failure Rate (FR). The three columns in each block of columns correspond to different sampling strategies: random sampling, sampling from detector confidence and greedy selection. Multiple-Modes (E+P): one model spanning pose and expressions, Multiple-Modes (E): two models, one for each expression spanning pose, Multiple-Modes (P): five models, one for each pose spanning expression, SDPM: (d) sparse PDM with 68 points instead of our proposed dense PDM and Full: our complete ERCLM algorithm with 10 CLMs and with Dense PDM.

| Dataset      | Metric | Multi-Modal (E+P) |       |       | Multi-Modal (E) |       |       | Multi-Modal (P) |       |       | SDPM        |             |             | Full         |             |             |
|--------------|--------|-------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
|              |        |                   |       |       |                 |       |       |                 |       |       |             |             |             |              |             |             |
| AFW          | MNLE   | 5.02              | 5.02  | 5.08  | 4.87            | 4.89  | 4.95  | 4.64            | 4.60  | 4.67  | <b>4.52</b> | 4.55        | 4.67        | 4.56         | 4.53        | 4.58        |
|              | FR     | 4.15              | 4.45  | 3.86  | 3.86            | 3.86  | 3.86  | 2.08            | 1.78  | 2.08  | <b>1.19</b> | 1.48        | 2.08        | 1.48         | 2.08        | 2.37        |
| HELEN TEST   | MNLE   | 3.79              | 3.78  | 3.78  | 3.74            | 3.71  | 3.70  | 3.66            | 3.68  | 3.65  | 3.66        | 3.66        | 3.64        | <b>3.64</b>  | 3.67        | 3.64        |
|              | FR     | 0.91              | 0.30  | 0.61  | 0.91            | 0.30  | 0.61  | 0.00            | 0.30  | 0.61  | 0.30        | <b>0.00</b> | 0.30        | 0.30         | 0.91        | 0.61        |
| HELEN        | MNLE   | 4.16              | 4.16  | 4.14  | 4.07            | 4.07  | 4.05  | 3.96            | 3.95  | 3.95  | <b>3.91</b> | 3.93        | 3.92        | 3.92         | 3.92        | 3.92        |
|              | FR     | 1.12              | 0.86  | 0.90  | 0.82            | 0.73  | 0.60  | 0.47            | 0.52  | 0.52  | 0.34        | 0.43        | 0.52        | <b>0.34</b>  | 0.56        | 0.47        |
| LFPW TEST    | MNLE   | 3.59              | 3.56  | 3.53  | 3.54            | 3.51  | 3.50  | 3.49            | 3.48  | 3.48  | 3.47        | <b>3.44</b> | 3.44        | 3.48         | 3.46        | 3.48        |
|              | FR     | 0.45              | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.45            | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.45            | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00        | 0.45        | 0.00        | 0.45         | <b>0.00</b> | 0.00        |
| LFPW         | MNLE   | 4.01              | 4.02  | 4.00  | 3.95            | 3.95  | 3.93  | 3.89            | 3.91  | 3.89  | 3.87        | 3.86        | <b>3.85</b> | 3.86         | 3.88        | 3.87        |
|              | FR     | 0.77              | 0.97  | 0.77  | 0.77            | 0.77  | 0.77  | 0.58            | 0.58  | 0.48  | 0.48        | 0.48        | 0.48        | 0.48         | 0.58        | <b>0.39</b> |
| IBUG         | MNLE   | 8.59              | 8.34  | 8.29  | 8.24            | 7.98  | 7.93  | 7.48            | 7.49  | 7.27  | 7.49        | 7.22        | 7.05        | 7.11         | 7.09        | <b>6.99</b> |
|              | FR     | 23.70             | 22.96 | 25.19 | 22.22           | 22.22 | 25.93 | 15.56           | 17.04 | 15.56 | 14.07       | 14.07       | 14.07       | <b>12.59</b> | 14.81       | 13.33       |
| 300W INDOOR  | MNLE   | 6.41              | 6.29  | 6.32  | 6.14            | 6.13  | 6.14  | 5.64            | 5.54  | 5.73  | 5.57        | 5.60        | 5.63        | 5.40         | <b>5.36</b> | 5.51        |
|              | FR     | 11.67             | 10.67 | 10.67 | 9.33            | 10.00 | 9.67  | 7.33            | 7.00  | 7.00  | 5.67        | 6.33        | 6.67        | <b>5.33</b>  | 6.33        | 6.00        |
| 300W OUTDOOR | MNLE   | 6.92              | 6.92  | 6.96  | 6.57            | 6.66  | 6.71  | 6.28            | 6.14  | 6.12  | 5.96        | <b>5.93</b> | 6.03        | 5.95         | 5.97        | 5.97        |
|              | FR     | 14.00             | 14.00 | 15.67 | 11.67           | 11.33 | 14.67 | 10.33           | 9.33  | 10.00 | 10.00       | 9.67        | 9.67        | <b>8.67</b>  | 9.00        | 10.00       |
| 300W ALL     | MNLE   | 6.67              | 6.60  | 6.64  | 6.36            | 6.39  | 6.42  | 5.96            | 5.84  | 5.92  | 5.77        | 5.76        | 5.83        | <b>5.67</b>  | 5.67        | 5.74        |
|              | FR     | 12.83             | 12.33 | 13.17 | 10.50           | 10.67 | 12.17 | 8.83            | 8.17  | 8.50  | 7.83        | 8.00        | 8.17        | <b>7.00</b>  | 7.67        | 8.00        |

TABLE 2: Ablative analysis of the components of ERCLM on datasets with varying difficulty, **AFW**, **HELEN TEST**, **HELEN**, **LFPW TEST**, **LFPW**, **IBUG**, **300W INDOOR**, **300W OUTDOOR** and **300W ALL**, evaluated over 51 (excludes jawline). We report both the Mean Normalized Landmark Error (MNLE) and the alignment Failure Rate (FR). The three columns in each block of columns correspond to different sampling strategies: random sampling, sampling from detector confidence and greedy selection. Multiple-Modes (E+P): one model spanning pose and expressions, Multiple-Modes (E): two models, one for each expression spanning pose, Multiple-Modes (P): five models, one for each pose spanning expression, SDPM: (d) sparse PDM with 68 points instead of our proposed dense PDM and Full: our complete ERCLM algorithm with 10 CLMs and with Dense PDM.