Gait Recognition by Applying Multiple Projections and Kernel PCA

Murat Ekinci, Murat Aykut, and Eyup Gedikli

Computer Vision Lab.
Department of Computer Engineering,
Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey
ekinci@ktu.edu.tr

Abstract. Recognizing people by gait has a unique advantage over other biometrics: it has potential for use at a distance when other biometrics might be at too low a resolution, or might be obscured. In this paper, an improved method for gait recognition is proposed. The proposed work introduces a nonlinear machine learning method, kernel Principal Component Analysis (KPCA), to extract gait features from silhouettes for individual recognition. Binarized silhouette of a motion object is first represented by four 1-D signals which are the basic image features called the distance vectors. The distance vectors are differences between the bounding box and silhouette, and extracted using four projections to silhouette. Classic linear feature extraction approaches, such as PCA, LDA, and FLDA, only take the 2-order statistics among gait patterns into account, and are not sensitive to higher order statistics of data. Therefore, KPCA is used to extract higher order relations among gait patterns for future recognition. Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) is employed as a preprocessing step to achieve translation invariant on the gait patterns accumulated from silhouette sequences which are extracted from the subjects walk in different speed and/or different time. The experiments are carried out on the CMU and the USF gait databases and presented based on the different training gait cycles. Finally, the performance of the proposed algorithm is comparatively illustrated to take into consideration the published gait recognition approaches.

1 Introduction

The image-based individual human identification methods, such as face, fingerprints, palmprints, generally require a cooperative subject, views from certain aspects, and physical contact or close proximity. These methods cannot reliably recognize non-cooperating individuals at a distance in the real world under changing environmental conditions. Gait, which concerns recognizing individuals by the way they walk, is a relatively new biometric without these disadvantages [1]-[6][8]. In other words, a unique advantage of gait as a biometric is that it offers potential for recognition at a distance or at low resolution when the human subject occupies too few image pixels for other biometrics to be perceivable.

P. Perner (Ed.): MLDM 2007, LNAI 4571, pp. 727–741, 2007.

Various gait recognition techniques have been proposed and can be broadly divided as model-based and model-free approaches. Model based approaches [13][21] aim to derive the movement of the torso and/or the legs. They usually recover explicit features describing gait dynamics, such as stride dimensions and the kinematics, of joint angles.

Model-free approaches are mainly silhouette-based approaches. The silhouette approach[8][14][9][12][3][2][6] characterizes body movement by the statistics of the patterns produced by walking. These patterns capture both the static and dynamic properties of body shape. A hidden Markov models based framework for individual recognition by gait is presented in [9]. The approach in [14] first extracts key frames from a sequence and then the similarity between two sequences is computed using the normalized correlation. The template matching method in [5] is extended to gait recognition by combining transformation based on canonical analysis and used eigenspace transformation for feature selection. In the work in [8], the similarity between the gallery sequence and the probe sequence is directly measured by computing the correlation corresponding time-normalized frame pairs. The approach in [3] presents self similarity and structural stride parameters (stride and cadence) used PCA applied to self-similarity plots that are derived by differencing. In [2], eigenspace transformation based on PCA is first applied to the distance signals derived from a sequence of silhouette images, then classification is performed on gait patterns produced from the distance vectors. Han *et. al.* [6] used the Gait Energy Image formed by averaging silhouettes and then deployed PCA and multiple discriminant analysis to learn features for fusion.

In this paper, we presents an improved silhouette-based (model-free) approach and kernel PCA is applied to extract the gait features. The main purpose and contributions of this paper:

- An improved spatio-temporal gait representation, we called gait pattern, is first proposed to characterize human walking properties for individual recognition by gait. The gait pattern is created by the distance vectors. The distance vectors are differences between the bounding box and silhouette, and are extracted by using four projections of silhouette.
- A Kernel Principal Component Analysis (KPCA) based method is then applied for feature extraction. KPCA is a state-of-the art nonlinear machine learning method. Experimental results achieved by PCA and KPCA based methods are comparatively presented.
- FFT is employed to achieve translation invariant on the gait patterns which are especially accumulated from silhouette sequences extracted from the subjects walk in different speed and/or different time. Consequently, FFT+ KPCA based method is developed to achieve higher recognition for individuals in the database includes training and testing sets do not correspond to the same walking styles.
- A large number of papers in literature reported their performance without using different training numbers. Here, we provide some quantitative comparative experiments to examine the performance of the proposed gait recognition algorithm with different number of training gait cycles of each person.

2 Gait Pattern Representation

In this paper, we only consider individual recognition by activity-specific human motion, i.e., regular human walking, which is used in most current approaches of individual recognition by gait. We first represent the spatio-temporal information in a single 2D gait template (pattern) by using multi-projections of silhouette. We assume that silhouettes have been extracted from original human walking sequences. A silhouette preprocessing procedure [8][17] is then applied on the extracted silhouette sequences. It includes size normalization (proportionally resizing each silhouette image so that all silhouettes have the same height) and horizontal alignment (centering the upper half silhouette part with respect to its horizontal centroid). In a processed silhouette sequence, the process of period analysis of each gait sequence is performed as follows: once the person (silhouette) has been tracked for a certain number of frames, then we take the projections and find the correlation between consecutive frames, and do normalization by subtracting its mean and dividing by its standard deviation, and then smooth it with a symmetric average filter. Further we compute its autocorrelation to find peaks indicate the gait frequency (cycle) information. Hence, we estimate the real period as the average distance between each pair of consecutive major peaks [20][2].

2.1 Representation Construction

Gait pattern is produced from the projections of silhouettes which are generated from a sequence of binary silhouette images, $B_t(x, y)$, indexed spatially by pixel location (x, y) and temporally by time t. An example silhouette and the distance vectors corresponding to four projections are shown in Figure 1. The distance vectors (projections) are the differences between the bounding box and the outer contour of silhouette. There are 4 different image features called the distance vectors; top-, bottom-, left- and right-projections. The size of 1D signals for left- and right-projections is the height of the bounding box. The values in the both signals are the number of columns between bounding box and silhouette at each row. The size of the 1D signals for both top- and bottom-distance vectors is the width of the bounding box, and the values of the signals are the number of rows between the box and silhouette at each column.

Thus, each gait pattern can separately be formed as a new 2D image. For instance, gait pattern image for top-projection is formulated as $P^T(x, t) = \sum_y \overline{B_t}(x, y)$ where each column (indexed by time t) is the top-projections (row sum) of silhouette image $B_t(x, y)$, as shown in Figure 1 (Middle-Top). The meaning of $\overline{B_t}(x, y)$ is complement of silhouette shape, that is empty pixels in the bounding box. Each value $P^T(x, t)$ is then a count of the number of rows empty pixels between the top side of the bounding box and the outer contours in that columns x of silhouette image $B_t(x, y)$. The result is a 2D pattern, formed by stacking row projections (from top of the bounding box to silhouette) together to form a spatio-temporal pattern. A second pattern which represents the bottom-projection $P^B(x, t) = \sum_{-y} \overline{B_t}(x, y)$ can be constructed by stacking row



Fig. 1. Silhouette representation. **(Left)** Silhouette and four projections, **(Middle)** Gait patterns produced from top and bottom projections, **(Right)** Gait patterns obtained from left and right projections.

projections (from bottom to silhouette), as shown in Figure 1 (Middle-Bottom). The third pattern $P^L(y,t) = \sum_x \overline{B_t}(x,y)$ is then constructed by stacking columns projections (from left of the bounding box to silhouette) and the last pattern $P^R(y,t) = \sum_{-x} \overline{B_t}(x,y)$ is also finally constructed by stacking columns projections (from right to silhouette), as shown in Figure 1 (Right), respectively. For simplicity of notation, we write $\sum_y$, $\sum_{-y}$, $\sum_x$, and $\sum_{-x}$ as shorthand for $\sum_{y=Top-of-the-box}^{Contour-of-silhouette}$, $\sum_{y=Bottom-of-the-box}^{Contour-of-silhouette}$, $\sum_{x=Left-side-of-the-box}^{Contour-of-silhouette}$, and $\sum_{x=Right-side-of-the-box}^{Contour-of-silhouette}$, respectively.

The variation of each component of the distance vectors can be regarded as gait signature of that object. From the temporal distance vector plots, it is clear that the distance vector is roughly periodic and gives the extent of movement of different part of the subject. The brighter a pixel in 2D patterns in Figure 1 (Middle and Right), the larger value is the value of the distance vector in that position.

3 Human Recognition Using Gait Patterns

In this section, we describe the proposed approach for gait-based human recognition. Binarized silhouettes are produced by using motion segmentation which is



Fig. 2. System diagram of human recognition using the proposed approach

achieved via background modeling using a dynamic background frame estimated and updated in time, for details see to [7]. In the training procedure, each training silhouette sequence is divided into cycles by gait cycle estimation. Training gait patterns are then computed from each cycle. To be achieve translation invariant for the situation that training and test sequences are obtained from the subjects walk different speed and/or different time, the 2D gait pattern is transformed to spectral domain by using frequency transform (FFT). Next, features useful for distinguishing between different persons are extracted by kernel PCA-based nonlinear feature extraction method from the normalized gait pattern. As a result, training gait transformation matrices and training gait features that form feature databases are obtained. This is independently repeated for each gait patterns produced from the projections. In the recognition procedure, each test gait silhouette sequence is processed to generate test gait patterns. These patterns are then transformed by transformation matrices to obtain gait pattern features. Test gait pattern features are compared with training gait pattern features in the database. This is separately performed for each gait pattern features constructed by each projections. Finally a feature fusion strategy is applied to combine gait pattern features at the decision level to improve recognition performance. The system diagram is shown in Figure 2.

3.1 Kernel PCA

The kernel PCA (KPCA) is a technique for nonlinear dimension reduction of data with an underlying nonlinear spatial structure. A key insight behind KPCA is to transform the input data into a higher-dimensional **feature space** [15]. The feature space is constructed such that a nonlinear operation can be applied in the input space by applying a linear operation in the feature space. Consequently, standard PCA can be applied in feature space to perform nonlinear PCA in the input space.

Given k class for training, and each class represents a sequence of the distance vector signals of a person. Multiple sequences of each subject can be added for training, but we have used a sequence includes one gait cycle. Let $P_{i,j}^{w}$ be the jth distance vector signal in the ith class for w projection to silhouette and M_i

the number of such distance vector signals in the ith class. The total number of training samples is $M_t^w = M_1^w + M_2^w + ... + M_k^w$, as the whole training set can be represented by $[P_{1,1}^w, P_{1,2}^w, .., P_{1,M_1}^w, P_{2,1}^w, ..., P_{k,M_k}^w]$. For ease of understanding, we denote the training samples, $P_{i,j}^w$, as $\chi_i \in \Re^N, i = 1, .., M$, where M is total number of samples.

Thus, given a set of examples $\chi_i \in \Re^N, i = 1, ...M$, which are centered, $\sum_{i=1}^M \chi_i = 0$, PCA finds the principal axis by diagonalizing the covariance matrix:

$$C = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \chi_i \chi_j^T \tag{1}$$

Eigenvalue equation, $\lambda v = Cv$ is solved where v is eigenvector matrix. First few eigenvectors are used as the basic vectors of the lower dimensional subspace. Eigen features are then derived by projecting the examples onto these basic vectors [16].

In kernel PCA, the data, χ from input space is first mapped to a higher dimensional feature space by using a map $\Phi : \Re^N \rightarrow F$, and then performing a linear PCA in F. The covariance matrix in this new space F is,

$$\overline{C} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \Phi(\chi_i) \Phi(\chi_i)^T \tag{2}$$

Now the eigenvalue problem becomes $\lambda V = \overline{C} V$. As mentioned previously we do not have to explicitly compute the nonlinear map Φ. The same goal can be achieved by using the kernel function $k(\chi_i, \chi_j) = (\Phi(\chi_i) \cdot \Phi(\chi_j))$, which implicitly computes the dot product of vector χ_i and χ_j in the higher dimensional space [15]. The most often used kernel functions are Gaussian kernel, polynomial kernels, and sigmoid kernels [15]. Gaussian kernel was used for the experimentation in this work, and it is defined as,

$$k(\chi_i, \chi_j) = exp\left(-\frac{\|\chi_i - \chi_j\|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \tag{3}$$

Pairwise similarity between input examples are captured in a matrix K which is also called Gram matrix. Each entry $K_{i,j}$ of this matrix is calculated using kernel function $k(\chi_i, \chi_j)$. Eigenvalue equation in terms of Gram matrix written as (see[15]),

$$M \mathcal{A} \Lambda = K \mathcal{A}, \tag{4}$$

with $\mathcal{A} = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_M)$ and $\Lambda = diag(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_M)$. $\mathcal{A}$ is a M x M orthogonal eigenvector matrix and Λ is a diagonal eigenvalue matrix with diagonal elements in decreasing order. Since the eigenvalue equation is solved for $\mathcal{A}$'s instead of eigenvectors V_i of Kernel PCA, we will have to normalize $\mathcal{A}$ to ensure that eigenvalues of Kernel PCA have unit norm in the feature space, therefore $\alpha_j = \alpha_j / \sqrt{\lambda_j}$. After normalization the eigenvector matrix, V, of Kernel PCA is computed as follows,

$$V = \mathcal{D} \mathcal{A} \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{D} = [\Phi(\chi_i)\Phi(\chi_2)\cdots\Phi(\chi_M)]$ is the data matrix in feature space. Now let χ be a test example whose map in the higher dimensional feature space is $\Phi(\chi)$. The Kernel PCA features for this example are derived as follows:

$$F = V^T\Phi(\chi) = \mathcal{A}^T\mathcal{B}, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{B} = [\Phi(\chi_1)\cdot\Phi(\chi)\Phi(\chi_2)\cdot\Phi(\chi)\cdots\Phi(\chi_M)\cdot\Phi(\chi)]^T$.

3.2 Similarity Measurement

Weighted Euclidean Distance (WED) measuring has initially been selected for classification [23], and is defined as follow:

$$WED : d_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{(f(i) - f_k(i))^2}{(s_k)^2} \tag{7}$$

where f is the feature vector of the unknown gait pattern, f_k and s_k denote the kth feature vector and its standard deviation, and N is the feature length. In order to increase the recognition performance, a fusion task is developed for the classification results given by each projections.

3.3 Fusion

Two different strategies were developed. In **strategy 1**, each projection is separately treated. Then the strategy is to combine the distances of each projection at the end by assigning equal weight. The final similarity using strategy 1 is calculated as follows:

$$D_i = \sum_{j=1}^{4} w_j * d_{ji} \tag{8}$$

where D_i is the fused distance similarity value, j is the algorithm's index for projection, w its normalized weight, d_i its single projection distance similarity value, and 4 is the number of projections (left, right, top, bottom). In conclusion, if any 2 of the distance similarity values in the 4 projections give maximum similarities for the same person, then the identification is determined as to be positive. Therefore, fusion strategy 1 has rapidly increased the recognition performance in the experiments.

In the experimental studies, it has been seen that some projections have given more robust results than others. For example, while a human moves in the lateral view, with respect to image plane, the back side of the human gives more individual characteristics of gait. The projection corresponding to that side can give more reliable results, and in such case, is called the dominant feature. As a result, **strategy 2** has also been developed to further increase recognition performance. In the strategy 2, if the dominant projection, or at least 2 projections of others, are positive for an individual, then the final identification decision is positive. The dominant feature in this work is automatically assigned by estimating the direction of motion objects under tracking [17].

4 Experiments and Results

We evaluate the performance of the method on CMU's MoBo database[18], and USF database [8].

4.1 CMU Database

This database has 25 subjects (23 males, 2 females) walking on a treadmill. Each subject is recorded performing four different types of walking: slow walk, fast walk, inclined walk, and slow walk holding ball. There are about 8 cycles in each sequence, and each sequences is recorded at 30 frames per second. It also contains six simultaneous motion sequences of 25 subjects, as shown in figure 3.

We did mainly different two type experiments on this database: In type I, all subjects in train set and test set walk on the treadmill at the same walking type. In type II, all subjects walk on the treadmill at different two walking types, and it is called that fast walk and slow walk. We did two kinds of experiment for each type investigation. They are: **I.1)** train on fast walk and test on fast walk, **I.2)** train on slow walk and test on slow walk. Type II: **II.1)** train on slow walk and test on fast walk; **II.2)** train on fast walk and test on slow walk.

First, we use six gait cycles of each person are selected to form a training set, and the rest is used to test. PCA-based method was employed to extract the features from gait patterns, and then the WED based NN is used for classification. The fusion was finally performed to achieve the final decision. We first tested the performance of this algorithm for Type **I**, and it is summarized in Table 1. It can be seen from Table 1 that the right person in the top one match 100% of the times for the cases where testing and training sets correspond to the same walking styles for all viewpoints.

Second, seven kinds of experiment tests were designed: one (two, three, four, five, six, or seven) gait cycle(s) of each person was randomly selected for training, and the other seven gait cycles were used for authentication, respectively. During the experiments, the features are extracted by using the eigenspace method given above. Based on these tests, the matching is separately conducted and the results for Type **I** experiment are given in Figures 4 and 5. The results illustrated in Figures 4 and 5 are obtained from the experiments: train on fast walk and test on fast walk; train slow walk and test on slow walk, respectively. The experimental


View 1 View 2 View 3 View 4 View 5 View 6

Fig. 3. The six CMU database viewpoints

Table 1. Gait Recognition across different views (CMU Data)

	CMU Gait Database View Points				
Test – Train	View 1	View 3	View 4	View 5	View 6
Fast – Fast	100	100	100	100	100
Slow – Slow	100	100	100	100	100

results show that the recognition rate is increased when the more gait cycles are used as training test. We did not need to apply kernel PCA-based feature extraction on the gait patterns, because PCA-based method had achieved the high recognition rates (100%) in this type of the experiments.



Fig. 4. Illustration of the recognition performance variation with different training gait cycles of each person. Train on fast walk, test on fast walk.

The third experiment, we called Type II, was also done on the gait sequences extracted from the subjects walk on the treadmill with different speed. It is called as slow walk and fast walk. For the case of training with fast walk and testing on slow walk, and vice versa, the dip in performance is caused due to the fact that for some individual as biometrics suggests, there is a considerable change in body dynamics and stride length as a person changes his speed. The results for Type **II** experiments are also summarized in Table 2. Table 2 shows experimental results obtained by different feature extraction methods presented in this paper. In this table, rank1 performance means the percentage of the correct subjects appearing in the first place of the retrieved rank list and rank5 means the percentage of the correct subjects appearing in any of the first five places of the retrieved rank list. The performance in this table is the recognition rate under these two definitions.



Fig. 5. Illustration of the recognition performance variation with different training gait cycles of each person. Train on slow walk and test on slow walk.

There are 8 gait cycles at the slow walking and fast walking data sets for each view. The 8 cycles in one walking type are used as train set, the 8 cycles in other walking type are used as test set. The gait patterns are produced as explained in section 2.1. The features in the gait patterns are extracted by using four different features extraction methods given in Table 2. When it is considered, it seen that kernel PCA-based feature extraction gives better performance than PCA-based method. There is quite possible translation variant problem between two gait patterns extracted from the subjects walk with different walking styles and/or different times. To achieve translation invariant for the proposed method, the gait pattern in the spatial domain is first transformed to the spectral domain by using one dimensional (1-D) FFT. 1-D FFT process is independently performed in horizontal or vertical directions for the gait patterns produced from both

Table 2. Experiments for two different walking styles with different view points. Each walking styles includes 8 gait cycles.

Train		View 1		View 3		View 4		View 5		View 6	
Test	Method	Rank: 1	5	Rank: 1	5	Rank: 1	5	Rank: 1	5	Rank: 1	5
Slow	PCA	31.5	46	44	64.5	27	58.5	29	44	46	64.5
	KPCA	33	54	46.5	68.5	34.5	60.5	35	54	48	63.5
Fast	FFT+PCA	65	89	80	91.5	63	91	64.5	87	67	87.5
	FFT+KPCA	73	89	76.5	92.5	71.5	94	64	89	76	91.5
Fast	PCA	27	50.5	52	68.5	28	67.5	26	47.5	49	65
	KPCA	39.5	62	53.5	69	31.5	59	24.5	51	49	65
Slow	FFT+PCA	61.5	85	74.5	88	62.5	90.5	64	85	73.5	88
	FFT+KPCA	66.5	89.5	79.5	91.5	61	89.5	67	90	74	88.5

the left and right-projections or for the gait patterns produced from both the top- and bottom-projections, respectively. Then PCA- and kernel PCA-based feature extraction methods are employed to achieve higher recognition rates, as illustrated in Table 2. Consequently, highest recognition rates for most view points were achieved by using FFT+KPCA based feature extraction method.

Table 3 compares the recognition performance of different published approaches on MoBo database. Several papers have published results on this data set, hence, it is a good experiment data set to benchmark the performance of the proposed algorithm. Table 3 lists the reported identification rates for eight algorithms on eight commonly reported experiments. The first row lists the performance of the proposed method. For seven experiments the performance of the proposed algorithm is always highest score. The numbers for given in Table 3 are as read from graphs and tables in the cited papers. The number of the subjects in the training set and test set is 25. In the test experiments for train on fast walk and test on slow walk, or vice versa, 200 gait patterns (25 persons X 8 gait cycles) for each experiment were used to present the performance of the proposed method.

Table 3. Comparison of several algorithm on MoBo dataset

Train	Slow		Fast		Slow		Fast	
Test	Slow		Fast		Fast		Slow	
Viewpoint	View 1	View 3	View 1	View 3	View 1	View 3	View 1	View 3
Proposed method	100	100	100	100	73	76.5	66.5	79.5
BenAbdelkader *et.al.*[3]	100	96	100	100	54	43	32	33
UMD [9][10][11]	72	-	70	-	32	-	58	-
UMD [13]	72	-	76	-	12	-	12	-
CMU [14]	100	-	-	-	76	-	-	-
Baseline [8]	92	-	-	-	72	-	-	-
MIT[19]	100	-	-	-	64	-	-	-

4.2 USF Database

The USF database [8] is finally considered. This database consists of persons walking in elliptical paths in front of the camera. Some samples are shown in Figure 6. For each person, there are up to five covariates: viewpoints (left/right), two different shoe types, surface types (grass/concrete), carrying conditions (with/without a briefcase), and time and clothing. Eight experiments are designed for individual recognition as shown in Table 4. Sarkar et. al. [8] propose a baseline approach to extract human silhouette and recognize an individual in this database. The experiments in this section begin with these extracted binary silhouette data. These data are noisy, e.g., missing of body parts, small holes inside the objects, severe shadow around feet, and missing and adding some parts around the border of silhouettes due to background characteristics. In Table 4, G and C indicate grass and concrete surfaces, A and B indicate shoe types, and L and R indicate left and



Fig. 6. Some sample images in the database described in [22][8]

right cameras, respectively. The number of subjects in each subset is also given in square bracket. Each one also includes 4-5 gait cycle sequence.

The experimental results on the standard USF HumanID Gait database version 1.7 are summarized in Table 4. In this table, the performance of PCA- and KPCA-based feature extraction methods are comparatively illustrated. The matching is also conducted independently based on weighted Euclidean distance classifier. The decision results based on the fusion strategies, explained in section 3.3, are additionally given in Table 4. Fusion 1 and Fusion 2 indicate that the results are produced by using the strategy I and the strategy II, respectively. It is observed from the experiments that, the recognition performance is increased when the strategy II is used in the fusion process.

Table 4. Classification performance for the USF data set, version 1.7

	PCA		KPCA	
Experiment	Fusion 1	Fusion 2	Fusion 1	Fusion 2
CAL[71]	78.8	85.9	84.5	90.1
CAR[71]	85.9	88.7	85.9	87.3
CBL[43]	74.4	86.04	81.3	90.6
CBR[43]	83.7	93.02	79.06	88.3
GAL[68]	86.7	92.6	88.2	92.6
GAR[68]	79.4	82.3	80.8	85.2
GBL[44]	90.9	93.1	93.1	95.4
GBR[44]	77.2	86.3	86.3	90.9

To analyze the relationship between the performance of the proposed method and number of training gait cycles of each person, four kinds of experiment types were designed: one (two, three, or four) training gait cycle(s) of each person was randomly selected for training, and the other gait cycles were used for authentication, respectively. These experimental results are given in Figure 7. KPCA- and PCA-based features extraction methods are comparatively illustrated, as well. In the Figure 7, y-axis indicates recognition rate, and x-axis indicates the number of training gait cycles of each person. When the plotted results in Figure 7 are considered, it can be seen that kernel PCA-based feature extraction approach achieves better performance than PCA-based approach. From the results we can



Fig. 7. Illustration of the recognition performance variation with different training gait cycles of each person

report that the accuracy can be greatly improved with the growth of the training gait cycles. For instance, when the proposed algorithm is trained using 1 gait cycle in the experiment **GBL**, an accuracy of 72.1% is achieved. When 4 gait cycles are used for training, a higher accuracy of 95.4% can be gotten. *It is evident that training gait cycle number can play an important role in the matching process. More training gait cycles lead to a high recognition rate.*

Table 5 compares the recognition performance of different published approaches on the USF silhouette version 1.7. The performance of the proposed algorithm is better than other approaches in GBR, GBL, CAR, CBR, CAL, and CBL, and slightly worse in GAL.

Table 5. Comparison of recognition performance using different approaches on USF silhouette sequence version 1.7

Exp.	The method	Baseline[22]	NLPR[2]	UMD-Indirect[9]	UMD-Direct[9]	GEI [6]
GAL	92.6	79	70.42	91	99	100
GBR	90.9	66	58.54	76	89	90
GBL	95.4	56	51.22	65	78	85
CAR	87.3	29	34.33	25	35	47
CBR	88.3	24	21.43	29	29	57
CAL	90.1	30	27.27	24	18	32
CBL	90.6	10	14.29	15	24	31

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we first propose to improve the spatio-temporal gait representation, which is multi-projections of silhouettes developed by our previous work

[20], for individual recognition by gait. As the others contributions and novelties in this paper, **1)** Kernel PCA based features extraction approach for gait recognition is then presented, **2)** FFT-based pre-processing is also proposed to achieve translation invariant for the gait patterns which are produced from silhouette sequences extracted from the subjects walk in different walking styles. **3)** The experimental results were finally submitted to examine the performance of the proposed algorithm with different training gait cycles. The proposed approach achieves highly competitive performance with respect to the published major gait recognition approaches.

Acknowledgments. This research was partially supported by The Research Foundation of Karadeniz Technical University (Grant No: KTU-2004.112.009.001). The authors would like to thank to Dr. R.T. Collins from Carnegie Mellon University, U.S.A., for providing us with the CMU database, Dr. S. Sarkar from the University of South Florida, U.S.A., for providing us with the USF database.

References

1. Nixon, M.S., Carter, J.N.: Automatic Recognition by Gait. Proceeding of the IEEE 94(11), 2013–2023 (2006)
2. Wang, L., Tan, T., Ning, H., Hu, W.: Silhouette Analysis-Based Gait Recognition for Human Identification. IEEE Trans. on PAMI 25(12), 1505–1518 (2003)
3. BenAbdelkader, C., Cutler, R.G., Davis, L.S.: Gait Recognition Using Image Self-Similarity. EURASIP Journal of Applied Signal Processing 4, 1–14 (2004)
4. Veres, G.V., et al.: What image information is important in silhouette-based gait recognition?. In: Proc. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition vol. 2, pp. 776–782 (2004)
5. Huang, P., Harris, C., Nixon, M.S.: Human Gait Recognition in Canonical Space Using Temporal Templates. IEE Vision Image and Signal Processing 146, 93–100 (1999)
6. Han, J., Bhanu, B.: Individual Recognition Using Gait Image Energy. IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 28(2), 316–322 (2006)
7. Ekinci, M., Gedikli, E.: Background Estimation Based People Detection and Tracking for Video Surveillance. In: Yazıcı, A., Şener, C. (eds.) ISCIS 2003. LNCS, vol. 2869, pp. 421–429. Springer, Heidelberg (2003)
8. Sarkar, S., et al.: The HumanID Gait Challenge Problem: Data Sets, Performance, and Analysis. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analaysis and Machine Intelligence 27(2), 162–177 (2005)
9. Kale, A., et al.: Identification of Humans Using Gait. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing 13(9), 1163–1173 (2004)
10. Kale, A., Cuntoor, N., Chellappa, R.: A Framework for Activity Specific Human Identification. In: IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing vol. 4, pp. 3660–3663 (2002)
11. Kale, A., Rajagopalan, A., Cuntoor, N., Krugger, V.: Gait-Based Recognition of Humans Using Continuous HMMMs. In: IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition, pp. 321–326 (2002)
12. Yanxi, L., Collins, R.T., Tsin, T.: Gait Sequence Analysis using Frieze Patterns. In: Heyden, A., Sparr, G., Nielsen, M., Johansen, P. (eds.) ECCV 2002. LNCS, vol. 2351, pp. 657–671. Springer, Heidelberg (2002)

13. BenAbdelkader, C., Cutler, R., Davis, L.: Motion-Based Recognition of People in Eigengait Space. In: IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition, pp. 254–259 (2002)
14. Collins, R., Gross, R.J., Shi, J.: Silhouette-Based Human Identification from Body Shape and Gait. In: IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition, pp. 351–356 (2002)
15. Scholkopf, B., Somala, A.J.: Learning with Kernel: Support Vector Machine, Regularization, Optimization and Beyond. MIT Press, Cambridge (2002)
16. Ali, S., Shah, M.: A Supervised Learning Framework for Generic Object Detection. In: IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, vol. 2, pp. 1347–1354 (2005)
17. Ekinci, M., Gedikli, E.: Silhouette-Based Human Motion Detection and Analysis for Real-Time Automated Video Surveillance. Turkish Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences 13(2), 199–230 (2005)
18. Gross, R., Shi, J.: The CMU motion of body (MOBO) database. Tech. Rep. CMU-RI-TR-01-18, Robotics Institute, Carnegie Mellon University (2001)
19. Lee, L., Grimson, W.: Gait Analysis for Recognition and Classification. In: IEEE, Proc. Int. Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition, pp. 155–162 (2002)
20. Murat, E.: A New Attempt to Silhouette-Based Gait Recognition for Human Identification. In: Lamontagne, L., Marchand, M. (eds.) Canadian AI 2006. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 4013, pp. 443–454. Springer, Heidelberg (2006)
21. Bazin, A.I., Nixon, M.S.: Gait Verification Using Probabilistic Methods. In: IEEE Workshop on Applications of Computer Vision, pp. 60–65 (2005)
22. Phillips, P., et al.: Baseline Results for the Challenge Problem of Human ID using Gait Analysis. In: IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition, pp. 130–135 (2002)
23. Zhu, Y., Tan, T.: Biometric Personal Identification Based on Handwriting. Pattern Recognition (2), 797–800 (2000)