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Abstract
With systems for acquiring 3D surface data being evermore commonplace, it has become important to reliably extract specific shapes from the acquired data. In the presence of noise and occlusions, this can be done through the use of statistical shape models, which are learned from databases of clean examples of the shape in question. In this paper, we analyze and compare two types of such models: global models and local models. We first review how both types of models have been used in the literature, then proceed to define the models and analyze them theoretically, in terms of both their statistical and computational aspects. We then perform extensive experimental comparison to assess which type of model is better for a given task. Due to the wide availability of databases of high-quality data, we use the human face as the specific shape we wish to extract from corrupted data.

1 Introduction
Whether through laser range scanners, stereo reconstruction or structured light, methods and systems for 3D sensing and acquisition are now commonplace. However, these systems typically incur some amount of noise. Further, if we are interested in a particular object within data, it may be occluded by other objects. To extract the shape of an object of a particular class from such data it is often advantageous to use a statistical shape model to ensure that the extracted shape is valid for that object class. In this paper, we describe, analyze and compare global and local variants of such a model.

Such a statistical model must be learned from a database of instances from the object class in question. One class of shape for which there exist a number of available databases, is the shape of the human face, and this is the shape which we use for evaluation in this paper. However, we emphasize that the principles, models and algorithms discussed in this paper are applicable to any class of shapes for which a parameterized database is available.

The main reason to use a statistical shape model to fit to data, instead of a template fitting with a non-rigid iterative closest point (ICP) approach and some kind of regularization constraint, is the reduction of the search space, which results in the ability to reconstruct the underlying shape in the presence of severe noise or occlusions. These types of ambiguities are often present in real-world data captured in uncontrolled environments.

The purpose of this paper is to provide researchers and engineers with an analysis and comparison of the costs and benefits of global and local statistical models. Toward this end we make the following contributions:

• An analysis of the theoretical properties of both global and local statistical shape models.

• A quantitative and qualitative analysis, and extensive comparative evaluation of the practical performance of both global and local statistical shape models.

2 Related Work
This section reviews work related to performing statistical shape analysis for image processing applications. These applications include the analysis of two-dimensional images, videos, and three-dimensional images given either as volumetric images, such as magnetic resonance images, as three-dimensional point clouds, or as two-dimensional range images, such as images captured using depth cameras.

The first step to performing shape analysis is to acquire and register a set of training shapes that capture the shape variability that is of interest for a particular application. Subsequently, statistical shape analysis is performed on the registered set of training shapes to obtain a prior distribution for the shapes of interest. Without correspondence information, this statistical analysis is not possible.

Computing correspondences between a population of shapes is a challenging problem, and a detailed discussion about possible approaches is beyond the scope of this work. We refer the reader to a recent survey for more information [38].

In computer vision, statistical 3D shape models are commonly used to infer the three-dimensional shape of
an object from images, mostly for the purpose of image manipulation. While recently, different classes of shapes have been considered [10], shape models of human face shapes and human body shapes are of special interest. In medical image analysis, statistical shape models are commonly used to segment medical images and to find correspondences and abnormalities of anatomical shapes, respectively.

### 2.1 Human Face Shapes

We start our review by summarizing the use of statistical shape models of human faces. Blanz and Vetter [6] proposed the first statistical shape model for human faces. The model, called morphable model, captures both 3D shape and texture information and can be used to predict a 3D face shape from a single input image. A parameterized database of 3D face scans, mostly in neutral expression, is used to learn the statistical model using standard principal component analysis (PCA) (see Section 5). Given an input image in neutral expression, the learned shape space is searched to find the textured shape that best explains the input image using an optimization technique. This successful approach resulted in multiple follow-up works [2, 30].

Brunton et al. [9] use a statistical analysis based on wavelet models to learn a localized prior distribution for the 3D shape of a human face (see Section 5). This allows to capture and combine localized shape variations in different areas of the face independently. They use this information to predict the 3D face shape from two stereo photographs. As in the work by Blanz and Vetter, all faces are assumed to have a neutral facial expression.

To allow for varying facial expressions, Vlasic et al. [39] use a statistical method based on tensor algebra called multilinear model to analyze a set of faces captured of subjects performing a variety of facial expressions. This allows for the prediction of a 3D face shape from a single photograph.

Yang et al. [42] exchange the expression of a face in a single image based on a different input image of the same subject. For this application, they build multiple PCA spaces (one per expression) and combine these spaces for their application.

More recently, much work has focused on extracting a set of frames of three-dimensional face shapes from a video stream showing a face. The output of this type of algorithm is a four-dimensional sequence showing the three-dimensional face shape in motion. Dale et al. [15] extend the method by Vlasic et al. to compute such a four-dimensional sequence. This information is then used to exchange faces in video sequences.

Another avenue of recent work is to track two-dimensional range images over time. These images can be captured using depth sensors, such as the Kinect sensor. Weiss et al. [40] propose a method to track a three-dimensional face model over time using prior information on the deformation model, and to use the tracked model to drive the animation of a virtual character in real-time. Unlike the other methods discussed in this section, this method learns a statistical prior that is subject-specific. In this paper, we do not consider subject-specific priors.

### 2.2 Human Body Shapes

Allen et al. [1] proposed a statistical model for human body shapes in a standard posture that is similar to the morphable face model introduced by Blanz and Vetter. One main difference is that Allen et al. only learn information about the 3D shape and not about texture. This model has been used to predict a 3D human body shape in a standard posture from one or more images [35, 11, 7].

To allow for posture variation, Anguelov et al. [3] propose the SCAPE model. This model learns a PCA shape space for body shape variations using a database containing multiple subjects in a standard posture. Furthermore, the model learns a mapping from posture parameters (based on a skeleton) to shape changes using a database containing one subject in multiple poses. The model then combines the two variations using the assumption that body shape and posture are decorrelated. Since the SCAPE model successfully models human body shape and posture, it has been used to predict a 3D body shape in arbitrary posture from a single image [19]. Furthermore, this model can be used to predict a 3D human body shape in arbitrary posture based on a set of input images of a dressed person [4]. Such a 3D prediction can then be used to modify the input image [45]. Just like in the case of human faces, more recently, much work has focused on finding a four-dimensional sequence of three-dimensional human body shapes in motion from a video sequence. Jain et al. [23] use this to modify human body shapes in video sequences. Weiss et al. [41] propose to use the SCAPE model to compute a 3D body scan from noisy Kinect data.

A different avenue to allow for posture variation is to model shape and posture changes as correlated. This assumption is relevant, since the difference of the human body shape of the same subject in different postures depends on the body shape, e.g. on how muscular the subject is. Hasler et al. [21] propose a shape space that jointly captures shape and posture variations by performing PCA on a rotation-invariant encoding of the shapes. This shape
space is then used to predict the body shape of a dressed subject [21].

An alternative for correlating human shape and posture variations is to use a multilinear model (as Vlasic et al. do for face shapes). This avenue was explored by Hasler et al. [20] for the application of predicting 3D body shape and posture from an image.

2.3 Human Organ Shapes

In medical imaging, one is especially interested in a body part, such as an organ or part thereof. Tasks of interest include finding the shape of interest in a medical image. This decomposition of the image is often called segmentation. To solve this task, Cootes et al. [13] propose the use of a statistical prior called active shape model. The active shape model learns the distribution of a set of registered and aligned training shapes using PCA, and uses this prior information to segment a given medical image. This model is commonly used for image segmentation, see Cootes and Taylor [12] and references therein.

One problem with active shape models is that they capture global shape variations. In medical imaging, one is often interested in detecting localized shape anomalies, as these can give insights in whether or not a specific organ is affected by a disease, for instance. In an active shape model, such local variations may be distributed over several principal components, and they may be controlled by principal components that capture a small percentage of the overall shape variability.

To remedy this, Davatzikos et al. [16] used statistical analysis based on wavelet models to learn a localized prior distribution of contours in images. Nain et al. [28] extended this technique to use wavelets to perform a statistical analysis of three-dimensional shapes. Shape priors based on different types of wavelet models have been used to segment medical images [29, 25]. Yu et al. [44] show that statistical wavelet models can be used to analyze cortical folding patterns, which is a challenging task.

In the following, we provide a comparative evaluation of a global shape model based on principal component analysis and a local shape model based on a spherical wavelet representation. Our comparison uses as application a model fitting approach for human faces.

3 Statistical Shape Analysis for Model Fitting

In this section we give an overview of the generic model fitting approach. This assumes that a statistical shape model has been learned, for instance using the approaches given in Sections 4 and 5.

We represent a shape with a set of shape parameters \( s_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \), which form a vector \( s \in \mathbb{R}^d \). A generator function

\[
F(s) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{3n}
\]

(1)

generates from these shape parameters a surface mesh of \( n \) vertices. These shape parameters, and by extension the surface, are fit to an input point cloud \( P \) of \( m \) points. We do not assume any organization of the point cloud.

3.1 Training Data and Parameterization

For training, we use the neutral expressions of \( T = 100 \) subjects from the BU-3DFE database [43]. This database contains relatively clean surfaces without occlusions, and a typical cropped face contains about 7500 vertices. Furthermore, each cropped face is equipped with 83 landmark points.

We parameterize the database using the method of Salazar et al. [32] that deforms a template to each input face. This method is capable of predicting landmark points to aid in the template fitting. However, since we are given ground truth landmarks, our algorithm uses the true landmarks instead of predicted ones. This removes a potential source of error during registration. The template we use contains 2816 vertices. We choose this low-resolution template for parameterization since the database has low resolution and does not contain small shape details. While the BU-3DFE database contains six additional expressions in four different levels, we consider only neutral expressions in this paper.

Once the database is parameterized, we need to align the data to remove shape variations due to misalignment. We pre-align the data to remove rotation, translation, and uniform scale differences using generalized Procrustes analysis [17]. Note that by removing transformations that are not of interest is an important preprocessing step that yields better statistical models.

3.2 Test Data

In general, the models presented in Sections 4 and 5 can be fit to any 3D point cloud of a face. In this paper, we evaluate using a subset of the Bosphorus database [33]. This database contains clean faces as well as faces with different forms of occlusions, such as glasses, hand over
the eye or mouth, facial hair, or hair in front of the face. The resolution of this database is fairly high, and a typical face contains about 35000 vertices. Furthermore, each face is annotated with up to 22 landmarks. Figure 1 shows a model of the Bosphorus database with 22 landmark positions. As discussed in the following, the landmarks shown in red are used to compute an initial alignment of the test face to the learned shape space and the landmarks shown in green are used for error evaluation. Not all of the landmarks may be present in the database for two reasons: first, landmarks may be missing due to occlusion, and second, some landmarks are placed erroneously and we manually removed these landmarks.

3.3 Initial Alignment

To fit a statistical shape model to an input dataset, we first need to align the input data and the statistical shape model to be in the same global coordinate system. Since we consider only shape differences in the training data, the initial alignment aims to find the rotation, translation, and uniform scaling that best aligns the statistical shape model with the input data.

To compute such an initial alignment, corresponding landmarks are commonly used. These landmarks can be manually located on the mean shape of the aligned training database once. On the input data, the landmarks can be predicted in a fully automatic way using the method of Creusot et al. [14]. However, since in this paper, we use a test database that contains a set of landmarks, we choose to use a subset of these landmarks (the ones shown in red in Figure 1) to compute an initial alignment. This approach removes a potential source of fitting error due to landmark prediction inaccuracies.

3.4 Energy Minimization in Shape Space

Our goal is to fit the statistical shape model to the input data as closely as possible while staying in the learned shape space. To fit our model to data, we minimize an energy function that amounts to the sum of squared distances between each model vertex and its nearest neighbor in the input point cloud. Specifically, in this paper we use the following energy to pull the model towards the data

$$E_{data}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \min\left(\|f_i - p_{\text{NN}(i)}\|^2, \tau\right)$$

where \(f_i\) is vertex \(i\) of \(F(s)\) (see Equation 1), \(p \in P\) is a point in the input point cloud, \(\text{NN}(i)\) returns the index of the nearest neighbor in \(P\) of \(f_i\), and \(\tau\) is a truncation threshold to add robustness against outliers. We compute nearest neighbors with a k-d tree using the implementation in ANN\(^4\).

The training data is used to compute a statistical shape space. A commonly used assumption is to model the prior distribution as a multidimensional Gaussian distribution. The energy \(E_{data}\) is then often paired with an energy that is proportional to the logarithm of said prior probability distribution computed during training. Such a statistical prior provides strong regularization. In fact, it is often too strong, pulling the fitted model towards the mean shape and away from the input data, resulting in a lack of detail and distinctiveness in the fitted shape.

Patel and Smith [31] proposed an alternative prior that is aimed at maintaining the distinctiveness of the models. They model the shape space as a manifold that is at a constant Mahalanobis distance from the mean. This is based on the observation that the squared Mahalanobis distances from the mean of a set of \(d\)-dimensional normally distributed vectors form a \(\chi^2_d\) distribution with expected value equal to \(d\). Hence, Patel and Smith restrict the shapes to be on the hyper-ellipsoid at Mahalanobis distance \(\sqrt{d}\) from the mean in order to preserve shape distinctiveness. While this approach models distinctiveness using the expected Mahalanobis distance from the mean, it does not consider the normal distributions along each dimension of the shape space. That is, the modeled shape space contains highly unlikely shapes along the directions of the principal components, as can be seen for the shape at the intersection of the hyper-ellipsoid shown in red and the \(x\)-axis in Figure 2.

When fitting a statistical shape model to data, the space of possible solutions should only contain likely shapes. This ensures that only plausible results are possible. Hence, in this paper we instead choose to constrain the shape to lie within the hyper-box of \(\pm c\sigma_i\) about the mean shape, where \(\sigma_i\) is the standard deviation of the training data along dimension \(i\) of the learned statistical space, and \(c\) is a parameter controlling the amount

\(4\)http://www.cs.umd.edu/~mount/ANN/
of deviation allowed. Figure 2 shows a two-dimensional plot of this hyper-box. We demonstrate that in this shape space, by minimizing an energy function with only the data term given in Equation 2, we can maintain distinctiveness, while avoiding unrealistic shapes. This is equivalent to a prior probability of the form

$$P(s) = \prod_i P_i(s_i)$$

(3)

where

$$P_i(s_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & |s_i| \leq c\sigma_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(4)

if we assume the shape parameters $s_i$ are centered (mean subtracted). We call this a hyper-box prior.

4 Global Statistical Shape Analysis

We first describe a commonly used statistical shape space that captures the global shape variability of a set of training shapes.

4.1 PCA

Principal Component Analysis is a method which aims to reduce the complexity of a set of data. Due to its simplicity it is widely used for shape analysis. PCA is a linear transformation of a set of vectors from $\mathbb{R}^{3n}$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d \leq 3n$. A vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^{3n}$ is expressed by the scalar weights $s_i$ in a $d$-dimensional subspace, spanned by the orthogonal vectors $V_i$, by

$$F(s) = f = F + \sum_{i=1}^{d} s_i V_i,$$

(5)

where $F = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{T} F_i^{(train)}$ is the mean of the training data. For each parameterized shape of the training set we have one vector $F_i^{(train)} \in \mathbb{R}^{3n}$ that contains an ordered coordinate set of all points of the $i$-th training shape. The vectors $V_i$ are the eigenvectors of the data covariance matrix

$$\Sigma_F = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (F_i^{(train)} - F)(F_i^{(train)} - F)^T.$$

(6)

The eigenvectors $V_i$ are ordered with respect to the non-increasing corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_i$. The eigenvalues $\lambda_i$ measure the variability captured by the $i$-th principal component. More specifically, $V_i$ captures $100\frac{\lambda_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i}$% of the variability of the training data. The rank of the data covariance matrix is at most $\min(3n-1, T-1)$ and therefore the number of distinct non-zero eigenvalues and hence, the number of principal components, is at most $\min(3n-1, T-1)$.

4.2 Evaluation of Statistical Model

If a statistical model with a small number of principal components is fitted to a face, the result contains little shape detail, because the model only represents a small fraction of the total shape variability of the training data. That is, the learned shape space may contain unrealistic face shapes.

To pick a number of principal components $d$ that preserves a high amount of variability yet does not overfit the training data, we evaluate the global PCA model using the following three error measures similar to compactness, generalization, and specificity [36]. We use a slight modification of the original error measures to obtain results that are independent of the size of the training data.

Compactness measures how much variability of the training data is explained by the learned statistical model. For $d$ principal components, compactness is defined as

$$C(d) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{\lambda_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \lambda_i},$$

(7)

where $\lambda_i$ is the $i$-th eigenvalue of the data covariance matrix. The first row of Figure 2 shows the compactness plot for our training data.
Generalization measures the ability of the model to represent data, which are not part of the training set. To calculate this measure, we learn a PCA model on a subset of the training data, where one subject is excluded. The excluded subject is projected to the PCA space, reconstructed, and the distance between the source and the reconstruction is measured. To measure the distance between two faces, we use the average Euclidean vertex distance computed between all corresponding vertices. We perform this measurement for all subjects. The average and standard deviation of the distances over all subjects is shown in the second row of Figure 3.

Specificity measures the similarity between reconstructions from the statistical model and the training data. This estimates the plausibility of a random face represented using the learned shape space. To calculate specificity we choose a set of random points sampled from the distribution of the learned PCA space. For each of these points we compute the reconstruction using the PCA model and the distance to the closest face in the training data. The distance between two faces is computed as above. In the last row of Figure 3, 10000 random samples are chosen and the mean and standard deviation over all samples is shown.

Our shape space (evaluated in Figure 3) should ideally be compact, general, and specific. The compactness plot shows that 50 principal components explain more than 98% of the data variability. Furthermore, for more than 50 components, the generalization error only decreases slightly, which implies that the benefit of choosing more components is small. Finally, the specificity error still increases for more than 50 components, which means the model represents plausible faces. Hence, we choose $d = 50$ for the global fitting method. This choice for the number of principal components is also the reason for using a 50-dimensional shape space in Figure 2.

4.3 Properties

The global shape space represents the high-dimensional differences of the training faces in a low-dimensional shape space that is spanned by the corresponding eigenvectors of the $d$ largest eigenvalues of the data covariance matrix.

Figure 4 shows the variations along the first two principal components in the range of $-\sigma_i$ to $+\sigma_i$, where $\sigma_i$ denotes the standard deviation of the $i$-th principal component.

The amount of details that can be expressed by the global statistical model is limited by the details present in the training data. It would therefore be useful in some
Figure 4: Variations of the first two principal components.

applications to increase the variability of the training data
by increasing the mesh resolution of the training data by
inserting new vertices as linear combinations of existing
vertices. Unfortunately, this is not possible using this
global approach. If a vertex expressed as a fixed linear
combination of existing vertices is inserted to each train-
ing mesh, the corresponding additional vertex in the fitted
surface is identical to the corresponding fixed linear com-
bination. Therefore, if an additional vertex is chosen to be
placed on a triangle, the corresponding additional vertex
is located on the corresponding triangle of the fitted re-
sult. Hence, using fixed linear combinations to add points
to the surface of the model and fitting this extended sur-
face to a target face leads to the same result as fitting the
original model to the target face and adding the points into
the resulting surface using the fixed linear combinations.
This is a key difference to the local model reviewed in
Section 5.

4.4 Energy Minimization

While the energy in (2) is not strictly differentiable at all
points, it is continuous, and the number of points where it
is not differentiable is small. Hence, we can minimize it
using a bounded Quasi-Newton method [25]. The coordinate
bounds on the parameters enforce the condition given in (4).
This minimizer gives quadratic convergence rates
without the need for an explicit inverse Hessian. Note that
this optimization technique does not guarantee to find the
global optimum of the energy function.

4.5 Computational Complexity

Let \( t_G \) denote the number of iterations required for the
minimization to converge, and let \( m \) denote the number of
data points in the target shape. The complexity of build-
ing a k-d tree of \( m \) points in 3D is \( O(m \log m) \), and a
single nearest neighbor search takes \( O(m^{2/3}) \) time [24].
Given the nearest neighbor indices for all \( n \) points, a single
evaluation of the energy given in Equation (2) takes
\( O(n) \) time, and a single evaluation of its gradient takes
\( O(nd) \) time. Thus, the overall time complexity of fit-
ting the global PCA model to a dataset is \( O(m \log m +
t_G n(d + m^{2/3})) \). For this model, each training shape con-
tains \( n = 2816 \) vertices.

5 Local Statistical Shape Analysis

We now describe an alternative statistical shape model in
which a local basis is used to train many localized shape
priors that describe the shape variation at different locations
and scales over the surface.

5.1 Local Bases and Wavelet Transforms

A wavelet transform decomposes sampled data by pro-
jecting it onto a set of basis functions that are localized in
space and frequency.

Wavelet transforms were originally defined on reg-
ularly sampled Euclidean domains [27]. Second-
generation or lifting wavelets [37] are computed in time
linear in the number of samples in the original signal using
local lifting operations and sub-sampling at each scale.
Specifically, the data are partitioned into maximally cor-
related subsets, \( A \) and \( B \). For a 1D signal this would be
even and odd samples. Then, a prediction operator \( P \) uses
\( A \) to predict \( B \). This prediction is subtracted from the
actual values of \( B \) to give residuals or detail coefficients
\( D = \{ d : d = b - P_b(A) \forall b \in B \} \). An update oper-
ator \( U \) then uses the detail coefficients to update \( A \) yield-
ing approximation coefficients. The whole process is re-
peated on the approximation coefficients. The prediction
and update operators are collectively called lifting opera-
tors, and typically have local support, which makes them
fast to compute. The sub-sampling ensures that the overall
complexity remains linear in the number of samples.

Spherical wavelets [34] are defined on subdivision
surfaces, typically topological spheres. The particu-
lar wavelet basis we use is a biorthogonal generalized
B-spline basis that uses the Catmull-Clark subdivision scheme [5]. The prediction and update operators are B-spline interpolations from the neighboring vertices. This scheme is stable for linear and cubic B-splines; in this paper we use the linear basis as we found it produced less oscillatory surface artifacts in relatively flat surface regions.

Wavelet transforms have the following properties. First, they are localized. This means that the basis functions have compact support in both spatial and frequency domains, and as a result, so do the wavelet coefficients. In our case, a wavelet coefficient captures the shape properties of the surface at a particular location and scale. Second, they are decorrelating. This means that the wavelet coefficients represent approximately independent components of the signal projected into the wavelet basis. In the lifting scheme, this is achieved by choosing maximally correlated subsets, i.e., adjacent samples, and using one to predict the other and taking the residual. This residual, or detail coefficient, is independent of the other subset according the prediction model used by \( P \). Third, orthogonal, biorthogonal and other critically sampled wavelets are computed in linear time with respect to the number of samples. This comes at the loss of translation invariance, in contrast to overcomplete or redundant wavelets [27].

5.2 Localized PCA

Performing PCA over the whole set of wavelet coefficients would result in the same principal components as the global model, because the wavelet transform is a linear transform, and PCA essentially just rotates the data to align with the directions of greatest variations. Instead, we perform PCA locally on each coefficient, which is a 3D vector quantity, over the database.

First, let us denote the mean of each wavelet coefficient over the database

\[
s^k = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{T} s^k_i
\]

where \( k \) indexes the coefficients.

While we can perform statistical analysis on each \( s^k \) independently of other values of \( k \), we must consider their three components together. Each \( s^k \) is a 3D vector representing either the scale (absolute value) or the detail (relative value) of the shape at a particular frequency and spatial location. However, the coordinate axes in general do not correspond to the directions of greatest variation in the database. Therefore, we perform PCA on each set of coefficient vectors, to obtain 3D vectors \( r^k_i \) that represent the position along the directions of greatest variation, and \( 3 \times 3 \) matrices \( U^k \) that transform these coordinates to our original world coordinate system, as in

\[
s^k_i = s^k + U^k r^k_i
\]

where we write \( s^k = [x^k, y^k, z^k]^T \) and \( r^k = [x^k, y^k, z^k]^T \) to denote the components of these vectors. Applying the transform \((U^k)^T\) to the data diagonalizes the covariance matrix, thus making each component independent.

The reconstruction of the face shape from the model is then given by the wavelet transform

\[
F(s)_i = \sum_{o \in V(0)} \phi^0_o(i) s^o + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \sum_{l \in W(j)} \psi^j_l(i) s^l
\]

where \( i \) is the vertex index in the reconstructed surface, \( j \) is the level of wavelet coefficient, \( J \) is the number of levels used, \( V(0) \) is the set of scaling functions at level zero, \( W(j) \) is the set of wavelet functions at level \( j \), \( o \) and \( l \) are the coefficient indices, \( \phi^0_o \) is the scaling function at the coarsest level centered on location \( o \), and \( \psi^j_l \) is the wavelet function at level \( j \) and location \( l \). While the transform is expressed here in terms of basis functions, it is computed using lifting operators, which amount to weighted averages of a vertex’s local neighborhood, and it can be expressed as a matrix multiplication. The basis functions themselves, \( \phi_j \) and \( \psi_j \), are B-spline approximations to Gaussian and Mexican hat functions. For more details, see Bertram et al. [5].

To use a wavelet basis to represent shape, it must be a subdivision surface, in our case Catmull-Clark subdivision hierarchy. For training, the surfaces in the database are typically stored as triangle meshes without subdivision structure. Thus, we must resample the surfaces with the proper structure. The subdivision scheme uses quadrilateral elements, although it can handle extraordinary vertices. We resample the triangle meshes using a custom, yet straightforward, technique tailored to the fact that we are dealing with faces, which are topologically like a disc. In the future, it would be interesting to explore more general methods.

We empirically select a plane that is aligned with the front of the face, and stereographically project the triangles of the template mesh onto that plane. The surface is then resampled in a regular grid. This corresponds to resampling the surface at barycentric coordinates, and hence preserves correspondence. These same coordinates from the template mesh are used to resample each mesh in the training set. To ensure subdivision hierarchy, the grid is generated by starting with a low resolution base grid and subdividing it several times to get the full resolution grid.
5.3 Properties

The local model has the benefit that it avoids overfitting, and as a consequence we can keep all variability present in the training set. This is because the local surface properties of any given surface point are not likely to be specific to one set of faces or another. Whereas for the global model a bias in the training set, over-representation of one sex or a particular ethnicity or age range, can cause the lesser principal components to be highly specialized to that set, the geometry of a local surface patch is likely to be less dependent on the training data.

Figure 5 shows the mean shape color-coded with the magnitude of the shape variability for six levels of the wavelet subdivision. This shows the localized shape variations at different scales that are captured by this multi-resolution approach.

The dimensionality of the local model is statistically more favorable. If, as is usually the case, the number of vertices is much greater than the number of training examples, $n \gg T$, then the global model has problems of fitting to the particularities of the training set. In the local model, many independent statistical priors are learned, each with dimension 3. We have many more training examples than that. The independence of the local priors further allows an exhaustive search of the parameter space. Thus, we have no danger of getting trapped in local minima.

The drawback of these properties, in particular of retaining all the variability of the training data, is that the local model is a much higher-dimensional representation than the global model. Thus, the dimensionality of the local model is computationally much less favorable. There is, however, a trade-off that can be made by fitting the wavelet coefficients only up to a certain level, providing a less-detailed reconstruction in less time.

As the lifting operations of the wavelet transform amount to local weighted averages of vertex coordinates, the transform can be expressed as a matrix multiplication, if the surface is expressed as a vector containing the vertex coordinates. Because the transform is biorthogonal, this matrix is square and has full rank. In contrast, the global PCA in Section 4, when expressed as a matrix whose columns are the principal components $V_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, d$, has rank $d \leq \min(3n - 1, T - 1)$. As discussed in Section 4, resampling the surface at linear combinations of vertex coordinates (eg., within a triangle), does not increase the rank of the transform. However, because the rank of the wavelet transform is determined by the number of vertices, we can obtain more detail by linearly upsampling the training surfaces. This means that we can resample the training shapes at high resolution to obtain a statistical model that captures fine shape detail.

5.4 Energy Minimization

We minimize the energy $E$ using a global search of each parameter. That is, we sample uniformly within the range given by the hyper-box prior $P(r_k)$ for each component of $r_k$ sequentially, starting with the coarsest resolution coefficients and progressively increasing the resolution. For each sampled value, we reconstruct the surface using (9) and (10), and evaluate the nearest neighbor energy $E$. The parameter value that minimizes this energy is then taken as the estimate for this parameter.

5.5 Computational Complexity

Since we use a sampling approach to minimize the energy for the local model, our complexity depends not on the number of iterations of a nonlinear optimization, but on the number of samples $t_L$ per parameter. Here, we denote the number of wavelet coefficients by $n$. Note, however, that $n$ increases with increasing $J$ since all training surfaces are resampled. In our experiments, we resample all training shapes with $n = 24897$ vertices. The complexity of the nearest neighbor search remains unchanged, as does the cost of evaluating the energy. However, the energy must be evaluated $t_L$ times for each of the $n$ coefficients. Hence, our overall complexity is $O(m \log m + n(m^{2/3} + t_L n))$, which is dominated by the $O(n^2 t_L)$ part. Thus, assuming $n \gg t_G$, we expect the local model, with its higher-dimensional representation to take much longer to fit to the same point cloud. However, a trade-off between detail and running time can be made by fitting coefficients only up to some level less than the number of levels in the wavelet decomposition.

6 Comparative Evaluation

In this section we evaluate both the fitting speed and quality of the global and local models.

6.1 Experimental Setup

Implementation Details In all experiments, we set the truncation threshold $\tau$ to 10mm, and we set the parameter $c$ controlling the size of the hyper-box prior to 1.0. For the global model, we use 50 principal components. For the local model, we use a base grid of size $5 \times 7$, and we use at most $J = 6$ levels of subdivision.

Test Database We use a subset of 20 subjects (10 female and 10 male) of the Bosphorus database to test our algorithm. Each subject is present in five occlusion levels: without occlusion, with glasses, with an occlusion of one
eye by a hand, with an occlusion of the mouth by a hand, and with an occlusion of parts of the face by hair. Examples for each occlusion class can be seen in the left column of Figure 8.

**Timing** The global model can be fit in under a minute per face for the data we are using. Depending on the number of levels of coefficients that are optimized, the local model takes between about 10 minutes to over an hour to fit. Figure 6 shows the reconstruction of a Bosphorus model when optimizing the shape coefficients of the local shape space up to different levels. Note that the more levels are used, the more accurate the reconstruction becomes. However, while the reconstruction up to level zero runs in under one minute, the reconstruction up to level five runs in slightly over one hour. This gives a way to trade off computation time and reconstruction accuracy. For all the experiments in the following, we evaluate the accurate reconstructions up to level 5.

### 6.2 Landmark Distance

We first evaluate the fitting quality using a subset of the landmarks (the ones shown in green in Figure 1) located on the input data. Note that these landmarks are not used in the initial alignment. Also recall that not all of these landmarks are present in all target scans. We only evaluate the error for those landmarks present in a given scan. The landmarks that are present in the test data are considered the ground truth landmark locations. We manually placed all of the landmarks used for testing on the mean shape of the aligned training data. The position of these landmarks after fitting are the estimated landmark positions. The distance between these estimates and the available ground truth landmark positions is the error we measure for the test data under different types of occlusion.

Table 1 shows the statistics of the distances from the landmarks on the fitted model to those on the input data. Note that the local method produces lower mean and median errors for all types of occlusion. This reflects the fact that we can keep all variability in the training data without the risk of overfitting. Thus, the local model better captures local shape detail. We see that in three cases (no occlusion, subject wearing glasses, occlusion of the eye), the local method produces higher maximum errors. This reflects the fact that each part of the surface is locally fitted, and that if the nearest neighbors in that region are beyond the threshold $\tau$, they do not pull sufficiently towards the surface. The global method’s ability to capture the overall shape allows these points to get closer despite the lack of pull in that particular area.

This evaluation is commonly considered an accurate form of error measurement. However, unfortunately, it is possible only for a small subset of surface points since we require ground truth landmarks for this test. In the following, we give a less accurate, yet more dense evaluation, using a shape distance.

### 6.3 Surface Distance

We now evaluate the distance between the input scan and the fitted model over the entire surface by computing the distance to the nearest neighbor on the input data for each point on the fitted model. Table 2 shows the nearest neighbor distance over the surfaces. This gives a lower bound on the fitting error in terms of semantically meaningful correspondences, but it can be computed for the entire surface. We see that the local model produces lower mean and median errors, and higher standard deviation and maximum error. This reflects the fact that there are a relatively few points where there is not enough pull from the energy function to the data, and these points are not fitted well. In areas of the surface where the data is close enough to the initial alignment, however, the local model better fits to the surface due to the retained variability in the model. Conversely, the global model does not get as close to any points, but the global information allows the overall shape to guide it in areas where the initial alignment is not close enough to the data.

Figure 7 shows the color coded average distances to the nearest neighbors for all points on the surface. For the results without occlusion, in most regions of the face, the local shape space yields results that are closer to the input surface. However, at the nose tip and the chin, the global
model is closer to the input surface than the local model. The reason is that the initialization is often poor in these regions and that as a result the local model does not fit this area to the surface. For the models with occlusion, the additional error caused by the occlusion is generally more localized when using the local shape space than when using the global shape space. This is especially visible in the region around the left eye for the examples where the right eye is occluded by a hand (third row of Figure 7). For the local shape space, the region around the left eye has low average fitting error, while for the global shape space, this region has larger average fitting error because it is influenced by errors in the (symmetric) region around the right eye.

### 6.4 Visual Qualitative Evaluation

Figure 8 shows some examples of the fitted models for visual evaluation. Both models fit the shape model close to the input data for all of the examples. Note that overall, the results of the local method capture more shape detail than the results of the global method and that in most areas of the face, the results of the local method are fitted closer to the data than the results of the global method. A notable exception is the nose area of the subject shown in the last row of the figure. The reason is that the initialization is poor in this region, which is discussed in detail above.

The third row of Figure 8 shows a facial expression that is asymmetric in the cheek area. The output of the global method is a fairly symmetric face since the global shape prior learned the symmetric structure of the face. The output of the local method correctly captures the asymmetry in the reconstruction since the local shape prior allows for more flexibility in localized shape differences.

Figure 9 shows two results obtained using noisy and incomplete stereo and range data. The 3D stereo data used as input to our comparison is obtained using the approach by Brunton et al. [8] from two input images. The resulting point cloud has missing data, which is typical for data obtained using passive stereo approaches. For this dataset, both models fit the shape to the input data well. As in previous experiments, the result using the global model contains less detail than the result using the local model. The range data used as input to our comparison is obtained using a Kinect sensor. This dataset has low resolution, missing data, and significant data noise. In spite of these problems, both models fit the shape close to the data in most areas. For this example, the result using the global model is better in the chin region than the result using the local model. The reason is that due to poor initial alignment, the overall shape of the chin region of the result computed using the local model is far from the input surface. However, in the nose region, where the initial alignment is good, the result using the local model is closer to
Figure 8: Some fitting results. Each row shows from left to right: input data, result of global fitting, color coding of distances between global fitting result and input data, result of local fitting, color coding of distances between local fitting result and input data, and the legend for the color coding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Occlusion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>global</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glasses</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>67.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>49.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>39.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>15.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glasses</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>68.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>52.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>45.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Nearest neighbor distance statistics for global and local models. All measurements are in millimeters.

Figure 9: Fitting to noisy data. Top row from left to right: left input image of stereo data, stereo point cloud, result of global fitting, and result of local fitting. Bottom row from left to right: input Kinect frame, result of global fitting, and result of local fitting.

the input data than the result using the global model.

6.5 Limitations

Both methods are limited to datasets in which most of the surface of interest is not subject to occlusion. A case where the fitting results of both methods are not satisfactory is shown in Figure 10. Here, a large part of the input face is occluded by hair. As a result, the result of the global method is a plausible human face that is visually far from the input face. The result of the local method can achieve a visually better fitting result in areas of the face that are not subject to occlusion, such as the left side of the face. However, in occluded regions, the result suffers from the same drawbacks as the result obtained using the global method.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have performed a comparative analysis, both theoretically and experimentally, of global and local statistical shape models. We have found the following differences between the two types of models: Local models capture details better at the cost of greater computational requirements. This is in part due to the optimization strategy used in this investigation (a sampling strategy that avoids local minima), but is also due to the much higher dimensionality of the local model. The global model has much lower dimensionality and can thus be fitted to input data much faster. In some cases, the global model better captures the overall shape, height and width, of the face. The local model avoids overfitting, because local surface patches are not likely to be biased for a particular database.
the way the shape of the entire face can be. Put another way, we can reasonably assume that local surface patches from human faces have much lower variation than do entire faces, hence a limited training set has a better chance of capturing the full variability for the local model. The local model also better contains erroneous reconstruction due to occlusion to the affected areas, whereas the global model typically captures approximately symmetric shapes of human faces. Thus, an occlusion of the left side will cause poor fitting on the right as well. The wavelet transform has rank equal to the resolution with which the surface is sampled, whereas the rank of the global PCA transform is limited by the number of training samples. Hence, the local method can capture additional details by subdivision resampling.

In this paper, we have used a bare-bones fitting energy to illuminate the differences between the two types of models. More terms could be added to this energy, such as smoothing terms, or landmark terms. We have also used manually placed landmarks to avoid landmark misplacement as a source of error. Automatic landmark location and initial alignment are clear avenues for future work.
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