

Efficient coding of facial stimuli in primate inferotemporal cortex

Miguel Ibáñez-Berganza¹, Carlo Lucibello², Luca Mariani³, and Giovanni Pezzulo^{*4}

¹Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia. Largo Barsanti e Matteucci, 53, 80125 Napoli, Italy; Sapienza University of Rome. Piazzale Aldo Moro, 5. 00185 Roma, Italy

²Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University. Via Roberto Sarfatti, 25, 20100 Milano, Italy

³Department of Physics “E. R. Caianiello”, University of Salerno. Via Giovanni Paolo II 132, 84014, Fisciano, Italy

⁴Institute of Cognitive Sciences and Technologies, National Research Council, Via San Martino della Battaglia 44, 00185 Rome, Italy

August 29, 2022

Abstract

Processing faces accurately and efficiently is a key capability of humans and other animals that engage in sophisticated social tasks. Recent studies reported a decoupled coding for faces in the primate inferotemporal cortex, with two separate neural populations coding for the geometric position of (uniformed) facial landmarks and for the image texture at fixed landmark positions, respectively. Here, we formally assess the efficiency of this decoupled coding by appealing to the information-theoretic notion of description length, which quantifies the amount of information that is saved when encoding novel facial images, with a given precision. We show that despite decoupled coding encodes two sets of (shape and texture) coordinates, it is more efficient (i.e., yields more information compression) than the widely used eigenface method, which only requires encoding the original facial images. The advantage of decoupled coding over eigenface coding increases with image resolution and is especially prominent when coding variants of training set images that only differ in facial expressions. Moreover, we demonstrate that decoupled coding entails better performance in three different tasks: the representation of facial images, the (daydream) sampling of novel facial images, and the recognition of facial identities and gender. In summary, our study provides a first principle perspective on the efficiency and accuracy of the decoupled coding of facial stimuli reported in the primate inferotemporal cortex.

*giovanni.pezzulo@gmail.com

Introduction

Recognizing faces and facial expressions with high accuracy is central for many cognitive and social tasks that primates (and possibly other animals) perform every day. Several studies reported single neurons in the ventral visual stream – and particularly in the so-called “face patches” of the inferotemporal (IT) cortex – that are exquisitely sensitive to faces [1, 2].

A recent landmark study greatly contributed to shed light on the neural code for facial identity in the IT of macaques [3]. This study reported that faces might be represented as feature vectors in a relatively low-dimensional ($\sim 50D$) *face space* [4], with IT neurons tuned to single axes of variation of the face space and insensitive to changes in other, orthogonal axes¹.

Interestingly, distinct subpopulations of neurons appear to project faces onto two distinct sets of axes, which encode the geometric shape of a face and its texture separately. The shape coordinates describe the main facial proportions, whereas the texture coordinates bring information about the detailed form of facial soft tissues, the skin texture and tonality, and cues to the facial shape in the depth dimension (through the light reflection).

From a computational perspective, these findings suggest that the IT cortex might form a generative model in which shape- and texture-related information is *decoupled* into separate factors (aka disentangled or factorised). The resulting *decoupled coding* (\mathcal{R}_D) resembles closely a computer vision model called the Active Appearance Model (AAM) [5]. A recent computational study indicates that the AAM provides a very good fit for the single cell IT data of [3], outperforming most standard deep network models of visual processing in the ventral stream [6]. While the deep networks achieve a high score in face (or object) recognition, they do so by *multiplexing* the same information into different neurons, which is the opposite of the decoupling strategy reported in IT neurons by [3]. In keeping, another computational study [7] showed that using a deep generative model (β -VAE), with the explicit objective of disentangling facial images into separate latent factors, provides a good account of IT neural firings [3].

In a series of neural network simulations [3, 6], the face processing performance of the decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) that emerges from IT recordings is compared with a simpler scheme that is standard in computer vision: *eigenface* (\mathcal{R}_E) *coding* [8, 9, 4]. In both \mathcal{R}_E and \mathcal{R}_D codings, each neuron “projects” faces linearly onto one axis of variation of the face space. However, the decoupling is different in the two. In \mathcal{R}_E coding, the neurons simply encode the projection of the input face into the axes of variation of the original set of known facial images. Rather, in \mathcal{R}_D coding, the input facial image is first divided into two sources of information: a (shape-free) average-shaped or *uniformed* facial image whose texture corresponds to that of the input face, and a (texture-free) vector of Cartesian coordinates of some facial reference points called *landmarks*, describing the input face shape. Then, in \mathcal{R}_D coding, one set of neurons encodes

¹Indeed, neurons are believed to encode principal components *linearly* but not necessarily one-to-one, see [3]. In particular, if \mathbf{y} is the vector of neurons’ normalized firing rates and \mathbf{x}' is the vector of principal components in the face space, an orthogonal matrix O relates \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{x}' : $\mathbf{y} = O\mathbf{x}'$.

the linear projection of the input *uniformed* facial image on the axes of variation of *uniformed images*, whereas another set of neurons encodes the projection of the input vector of landmark coordinates on the axes of variation of vectors of landmark coordinates. As reported in [3], the decoupled coding scheme \mathcal{R}_D explains a significantly higher fraction of neural data variance than the \mathcal{R}_E coding.

While the above studies assess that decoupling information is a key ingredient of facial processing in primates, it is still unclear why this is the case. A plausible formal rationale for the decoupling of shape and texture parameters (as done in the AAM and related models) is that they might vary independently in real life conditions. For example, small variations in facial expressions entail a significant change of shape but not texture, whereas different conditions of luminosity and age may induce significant variations in texture but not shape [3]. This line of reasoning leads to the untested idea that decoupled coding entails not just a more *accurate* but also a more *efficient* (or compact) description of facial data.

Indeed, a general principle for neural coding is obtaining the most *efficient coding* of the data from a source [10, 11]. A formal measure of code efficiency is its *description length*: the best model is the one that minimizes the amount of information (bits) required to encode both the data, in terms of the model's latent variables, and the model parameters themselves [12, 13]. This implies that a more complex model, which has more free parameters and requires more memory to be encoded, will only outperform a simpler model if it affords significantly more data compression – which in turn requires that it captures well the statistical structure of the data.

Here we use the notion of efficient coding to ask whether and in which conditions the decoupled (\mathcal{R}_D) coding revealed in monkey IT neurons is more efficient than eigenface (\mathcal{R}_E) coding. For this, we compare the description length of the two coding schemes of facial processing, using the same stimuli as in the monkey study of [3]. To preview our results, we show on info-theoretical grounds that decoupled (\mathcal{R}_D) coding is more efficient than eigenface (\mathcal{R}_E) coding for facial processing. Our results indicate that the advantage of decoupled coding increases with image resolution, and when encoding variants of training set images that differ for facial expressions. This is interesting, as it shows that the decoupled coding is most effective in a conditions that is are frequent during social cognitive tasks, such as the identification of changes of expression or age in known faces.

Finally, to further consolidate our findings, we show that decoupled coding outperforms eigenface coding in a range of cognitively relevant tasks, which include the generation of novel faces, the synthesis of unknown faces and the recognition of facial identities and gender.

Materials and methods

Database under study

In our analysis, we use the FEI database [14, 15], also used in the characterisation of the neural code of facial identity in macaques [3]. The FEI database comprises $N = 400$ pictures, accompanied by the spatial coordinates of $n_\ell = 46$ standard landmarks for each image.

Texture and shape coordinates

Let the training set consist of N_{tr} facial images, $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathbf{I}(n)\}_{n=1}^{N_{\text{tr}}}$, where $\mathbf{I}(n)$ is the n -th image, and of N_{tr} vectors of shape coordinates $\mathcal{L} = \{\boldsymbol{\ell}(n)\}_{n=1}^{N_{\text{tr}}}$, where $\boldsymbol{\ell}(n)$ is the vector of shape coordinates characterising the geometry of the n -th facial image. All images are vectors $\mathbf{I}(n) = (I_1(n), \dots, I_{d_t}(n))$ of dimension $d_t = w \times h$, where w, h are the width and height of the images in pixels (grid spacing units). The $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ -vector components are the x or y Cartesian coordinates of n_ℓ representative landmarks of the n -th facial image: $\boldsymbol{\ell}(n) = (\ell_1(n), \dots, \ell_{d_s}(n))$, with $d_s = 2n_\ell$.

Formal definitions of eigenface (\mathcal{R}_E) and decoupled (\mathcal{R}_D) codings

Here, we compare the efficiency (measured as description length) of two alternative neural codes for facial images: *eigenface* (\mathcal{R}_E) coding and *decoupled* (\mathcal{R}_D) coding; see Table 1 and Figure 1. Both the \mathcal{R}_D and the \mathcal{R}_E codings represent facial images in terms of Principal Components (PCs), but define PCs over different facial coordinates of the training set (i.e., over different databases). Specifically, they represent a generic image \mathbf{I} as follows:

1. *Eigenface coding* (\mathcal{R}_E) represents the image in terms of its PCs, \mathbf{I}' . In mathematical terms, $\mathbf{I}' = E_p^{(E)} \cdot \mathbf{I}$, where $E_p^{(E)}$ is the $p \times d_t$ matrix composed of the first p (row) eigenvectors of the unbiased estimator of the correlation matrix C of training-set images, $C_{ij} = \langle I_i(n)I_j(n) \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot \rangle = (1/N_{\text{tr}} \sum_n \cdot)$ is the empirical average over the training-set, and where all the vector components are null-averaged, $\langle x_i \rangle = 0$. This representation does not make use of the shape coordinates.
2. *Decoupled coding* (\mathcal{R}_D) represents the image in terms of two sets of PCs, one for shape and one for texture facial coordinates. To obtain these coordinates, each original image $\mathbf{I}(n)$ in the training set is first deformed by means of image-deformation algorithms (see [16, 17] and the Supporting information for details), in such a way that its landmark coordinates $\boldsymbol{\ell}(n)$ will be dragged to the *average position of the landmark coordinates in the training-database*, and that the rest of the image pixels are deformed




Figure 1: Schematic illustration of eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E , left) and decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D , right). See the main text for explanation.

coherently (so that the resulting facial image is as much realistic as possible). The resulting image will be called the *uniformed* image $\hat{\mathbf{I}}(n)$ (see figure 1). We refer to *uniformed texture coordinates*, or simply *texture coordinates*, as the *uniformed* (shape-free) image coordinates $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$, of an image \mathbf{I} given ℓ (and the average position of the landmarks $\langle \ell \rangle = \mathbf{0}$). This procedure permits decoupling the original database in two databases of coordinates: the (texture-free) shape coordinates \mathcal{L} and the (shape-free) uniformed images $\hat{\mathcal{I}} = \{\hat{\mathbf{I}}(n)\}_{n=1}^{N_{\text{tr}}}$.

The novel image \mathbf{I} to be represented is then decomposed in PCs in texture and shape spaces separately, $\hat{\mathbf{I}}' = E_p^{(t)} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}$, $\ell' = E_p^{(s)} \cdot \ell$, where $E_p^{(t)}$ are the eigenvectors of $C_{ij}^{(t)} = \langle \hat{I}_i(n) \hat{I}_j(n) \rangle$, and $E_p^{(s)}$ those of $C_{ij}^{(s)} = \langle \ell_i(n) \ell_j(n) \rangle$.

Table 1: **Outline of the two alternative schemes for the representation of facial images: Eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E) and Decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D).**

Code				
\mathcal{R}_E	(\mathbf{I}, ℓ)		projection \rightarrow	$\mathbf{I}'_p = E_p^{(E)} \cdot \mathbf{I}$
\mathcal{R}_D	(\mathbf{I}, ℓ)	uniformation \rightarrow	$(\hat{\mathbf{I}}, \ell)$	projection \rightarrow $\hat{\mathbf{I}}'_p = E_p^{(t)} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}$ $\ell'_p = E_p^{(s)} \cdot \ell$

Results

Description length analysis

Intuition behind the description length analysis

The Principal Component Analysis representation of a given set of coordinates in the face space with p principal components (p -PCA) can be viewed both as a

generative model, inducing a Gaussian distribution over facial coordinates, and as a form of data compression and dimensionality reduction [18].

These two aspects are naturally linked by the notion of *description length* [19]. PCA is a form of dimensionality reduction, since it describes each d -dimensional vector \mathbf{x} as a shorter, p -dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}'_p = E_p \cdot \mathbf{x}$. In turn, this implies a *compression* ability. Consider a database in which each coordinate x_i (say, each pixel value, if the vectors \mathbf{x} are images) varies in a range R . In the absence of any prior knowledge regarding the database content, the amount of information per sample and coordinate needed to store the raw database with precision ϵ per coordinate is simply $l_0 = \log_2(R/\epsilon)$ bits. Normally, the information needed to store the p principal components of each vector of the database $\mathcal{D}' = \{\mathbf{x}'_p(s)\}_{s=1}^N$ is lower than l_0 , even if $p = d$. Indeed, if the database exhibits significant pairwise correlations between couples of variables, many principal components will exhibit a variance λ_i lower than the average variance R^2 , and they will consequently require fewer bits to be stored.

The amount of information necessary to encode a database \mathcal{D} in terms of (the latent variables of) a probabilistic model \mathcal{M} of the database vectors is called *description length*, $L_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D})$. Crucially, the description length is formally related to the Bayesian data evidence, or joint marginal likelihood of the database \mathcal{D} according to the model \mathcal{M} in the following way: $L_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D}) = -\log_2[P_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D})|\epsilon|^d]$, where $P_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D})$ is the data evidence according to \mathcal{M} and ϵ is the precision per coordinate with which the database should be described. Description length is therefore equivalent to – and provides an information-theoretic interpretation of – Bayesian model evidence. The value of p for which the database presents a higher Bayesian evidence is the one presenting an optimal accuracy/complexity trade-off and, consequently, the one presenting a lower description length. In other words, description length analysis evaluates the efficiency of a particular code, taking into account both its accuracy and its complexity. In this perspective, a good code is the one that does not employ too much information to describe a given input with a given tolerance. Indeed, the model that presents lower description length at fixed precision, is also the one that manages to describe the database with a smaller error, $\log_2 \epsilon = -\log_2 P_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D}) - L$, when the amount L of available storing information is fixed.

In the case that we study here, the model \mathcal{M} is p -PCA and the explicit expression for $P(\mathcal{D})$ is easily interpretable [19]. Indeed, the description length may be decomposed in two terms, $L(\mathcal{D}) = S(\mathcal{D}|\theta^*) + O(\theta^*)$, that we will call the *empirical entropy* $S(\mathcal{D}|\theta^*)$ and the *Occam length* $O(\theta^*)$.² These two terms may be interpreted as the amount of information needed to encode (without losses) the database \mathcal{D} in terms of p principal components, and the model parameters θ^* once for all the vectors (that are needed to recover each vector \mathbf{x} from its principal components \mathbf{x}'), respectively. When increasing the number of model parameters p , the empirical entropy of the training database decreases, but the Occam length generally increases, since more eigenvalues E_p must be stored –

² θ^* are the model parameters (the eigenvector matrix E_p and the vector of averages $\boldsymbol{\mu}$) fitted as the Maximum Likelihood value for a training set \mathcal{D}_{tr} , that may be different from \mathcal{D} .

and they must be stored with a higher precision. Overfitting occurs when this balance is no longer worth, and the description length increases for increasing p .

Definition of the *information gap* criterion for the comparison of decoupled coding and eigenface coding

We measured the description length (in bits) of the alternative coding schemes \mathcal{R}_E and \mathcal{R}_D of facial images \mathbf{I} that belong to a set of known images that have been used to train the model (training set) and to a set of unknown images that have not been used to train the model (test set).

On the one hand, the Eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E) encodes the principal components of the original images \mathbf{I} . We denote the description length associated to the compression of a database \mathcal{I} according to \mathcal{R}_E as $L_{\mathcal{I}_{tr},p}(\mathcal{I})$. The two sub-indices of L specify the model, they are, respectively, the training set with which the model parameters have been trained,³ and the value of p . This information is enough to completely define the p -PCA model.

On the other hand, the Decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) exploits both the texture and the shape coordinates (ℓ and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$) of each facial vector; hence it has to store both sets of principal components (ℓ' and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}'$) to represent the original image. Moreover, it has to store as well the principal axes in both the space of texture and shape coordinates. The extra information cost required to store shape coordinates might be compensated by the smaller cost to store the *uniformed* texture principal components $\hat{\mathbf{I}}'$. This is because the uniformed set of images $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ might be compressed more easily, given that any inhomogeneity induced by the difference in landmark positions has been removed from the database – at least, if the resolution of the image is large enough. This implies that encoding the uniformed images could require a smaller number of PCs without loss of precision, with respect to the set of raw images.

To quantify the difference in description length between \mathcal{R}_D and \mathcal{R}_E , we define a summary measure that we call an *information gap* and which jointly considers two factors. The former factor (\mathcal{G}_1) considers the difference in the description lengths of the non-uniformed and uniformed image databases:

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = L_{\mathcal{I}_{tr},p}(\mathcal{I}) - L_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{tr},\hat{p}}(\hat{\mathcal{I}}) \tag{1}$$

bits to compress the database
bits to compress the database
of non-uniformed images \mathcal{I}
of uniformed images $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$

where $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is the database composed by the uniformed facial images in \mathcal{I} . Note that in both the description length terms, the model \mathcal{M} is assumed to be p -PCA. In these equations, p may be taken as the optimal value according to Bayesian model selection, i.e., the value (say, p^*) for which the description length of \mathcal{I} is minimum, and the same for \hat{p}^* .

³The model parameters of the multivariate Normal distribution are the covariance matrix and the average C , μ . Given \mathcal{I}_{tr} , they are set as the unbiased estimates of such quantities in the database.

The latter factor (\mathcal{G}_2) is the description length of the set of shape coordinates $\mathcal{L} = \{\ell(n)\}_n$:

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = L_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{tr}},p}(\mathcal{L}) \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the set of landmarks corresponding to the images \mathcal{I} , and \mathcal{L}_{tr} to those in \mathcal{I}_{tr} .

The information gap combines these two factors ($\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1 - \mathcal{G}_2$) and measures the efficiency (in information-theoretic terms) of decoupled coding \mathcal{R}_{D} compared to eigenface coding \mathcal{R}_{E} . Decoupled coding can be considered more efficient if the information gap \mathcal{G} is equal or greater than zero:

$$\text{Information gap in favour of } \mathcal{R}_{\text{D}} : \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1 - \mathcal{G}_2 \quad (3)$$

In other words, given a database of facial images, the representation of \mathcal{R}_{D} is more efficient than that of \mathcal{R}_{E} to the extent that it provides a more accurate description of the database, using the same amount of available information (see also the Supporting information, sec.).

We are able to compute $L_{\mathcal{D},p}$, since the Bayesian evidence of a multivariate normal distribution can be calculated analytically [20]. Note that in the case of texture coordinates (that are strongly undersampled $N \ll d_t$), it is essential to use the exact expression for the Bayesian evidence of a multivariate Normal distribution [20], instead of its more common Bayesian Information Criterion approximation [19, 21], see the Supporting information.

Information gap for known facial images in the training set, at different resolutions

In this section, we analyse how the coding efficiency \mathcal{R}_{D} varies as a function of the resolution of the database images. We expect that the information gap increases with the resolution. If the resolution is so low that the distance between pixels (normalised to the image height, h^{-1}), is of the same order of the typical deviation of landmark coordinates from their average, $\langle \ell_i^2 \rangle^{1/2}$, the uniformity will not have an effect and consequently the \mathcal{R}_{D} code may not be worth in terms of description length. In the opposite situation, $h^{-1} \ll \langle \ell_i^2 \rangle^{1/2}$, we expect a larger information gap.

To test this hypothesis, we calculate p^* for every kind of coordinate and resolution, as the minimum of the L_p curves. p^* results to be lower than N in the three kinds of coordinates (shape, non-uniformed texture, uniformed texture). Figure 2 shows the description length of uniformed images in the training set (i.e., taking $\hat{\mathcal{I}} = \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{tr}}$ in equation 1, where $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is the whole database of $N = 400$ uniformed smiling and neutral images) as a function of p , and for four different resolutions.

The description length of the image databases is slightly over-linear in the number of pixels d_t , as shown by the lack of superposition of the curves in




Figure 2: Description length of uniformed images in the training set. See the main text for explanation.

figure 2. Indeed, the largest images actually contain more information per pixel: this is the information that, according to the p -PCA model, has been lost when lowering their resolution to construct the lower-resolution databases.

As a reference value for the analysis of description length curves, it is useful to compare the values in the figure with the *uniform length* $l_0/(d_t N)$, or the minimum amount of information per sample and pixel that would take to store a database consisting in images whose pixels fluctuate *independently* around their average value in an interval of length R , being R such that the variance per pixel is equal to the empirical average variance \bar{v}_t of the database \mathcal{I} (roughly equal to 37 units per pixel out of 256 in 8-bit grayscale encoding).⁴

Figure 2 also shows the description length of non-uniformed images for the largest resolution, $w \times h = 250 \times 300$. We see that, for this resolution, the information gap in equation 1 is positive: the uniformed images are better compressed than non-uniformed images, for all values of p . The information gap per sample and coordinate $\mathcal{G}/(Nd_t)$ is, as expected, an increasing function of the resolution – see the inset of Figure 2 – indicating that the information gap increases faster than linear in d_t . Rather, for the two lowest resolutions, decoupled coding does not imply a significant information gap. Indeed, for $w = 25$

⁴In other words, if one assumes that the pixel values are uniformly distributed around their average in a d_t -dimensional hypercube of size $R = (12\bar{v}_t)^{1/2}$, then $l_0/dN = (1/2) \log_2(12\bar{v}_t) - \log_2 \epsilon$. This value is very close to the empirical entropy of the database corresponding to a PCA model with $p = 0$ (see the Supporting information): $L_0 = S_0 = (1/2) \{ \log_2(2\pi) + 1 + \log_2(\bar{v}) \} - \log_2 \epsilon$, where $\log_2 \bar{v} = \log_2 \lambda$ (see the proximity of L_0 and l_0 in figure 2).




Figure 3: Information gap for facial images in the training set. See the main text for details.

the information gap is negative, roughly equal to minus one hundred of bits per sample.

The information gap per sample of the \mathcal{R}_D coding increases rapidly with the number of pixels d_t , and it reaches more than 10000 bits per image for $w = 250$. This is evident in Figure 3, which shows the information gap per sample \mathcal{G}/N_{tr} of training set images as a function of the resolution. Figure 3 also shows the description length of shape coordinates, $L_{\mathcal{L}, p_s^*}(\mathcal{L}_{tr})$, which is independent of the image resolution (horizontal line, see the details in the Supporting information). The information gap of the image degrees of freedom results comparable with the shape coordinates' description length $L_{\mathcal{L}, p_s^*}(\mathcal{L}_{tr})$ for $w = 150$, but it is much larger for the largest resolution $w = 250$. Summarising, for the largest image resolution, the overall description length of decoupled coding is much larger than that of eigenface coding. For $d_t \gtrsim 10^4$, the condition in equation 3 is satisfied.

A significant observation is that the standard deviation per pixel, $\bar{v}_t^{1/2}$, of the order of 37 units, is *not significantly smaller* in the database of uniformed images $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$. This means that uniformed images are more easily compressible, not simply because the database is less-varying, or more homogeneous, but because of the presence of stronger pairwise correlations between pixels in the uniformed images. Stronger correlations induce a more inhomogeneous spectrum of $C^{(t)}$, say $\lambda_1^{(t)}, \dots, \lambda_p^{(t)}$ and, consequently, a lower empirical entropy S of

the associated Gaussian distribution, which, up to an additive constant, depends on the eigenvalues as $(1/2) \sum_{i \leq p} \ln \lambda_i^{(t)}$. Indeed, for the highest resolution, the excess of standard deviation per pixel and sample of non-uniformed images is $\simeq 0.8$. Neglecting the correlations, this would amount to an increment of *uniform length* $l_0/(d_t N)$ (or, equivalently, of $L_0/(d_t N)$) of $\simeq 0.04$, which is one order of magnitude lower than the texture gap \mathcal{G}_1 .

As a consistency analysis, we have calculated the information gap in two different ways: first, taking p^* according to Bayesian model selection, $p^* = \arg \max_p L_{\mathcal{D}_{tr}, p}(\mathcal{D}_{tr})$; second, taking the value that maximises the validation-set (out-of-sample) likelihood, by K -fold cross-validation of the validation/training separation of the original database (c.f. details in the Appendix). Both ways of computing the training-set information gap are consistent within the (cross-validation) statistical errors (which is not obvious, specially considered that $d_t \gg N$).

Information gap for known facial images in the training set that show different facial expressions

In this analysis, we test the hypothesis proposed in the introduction that decoupled coding is particularly effective when encoding variants of known facial images which differ only in facial expressions. By definition, variations in facial expression are expected to change mainly shape coordinates, and much less texture coordinates (that are independent of the positions of the landmarks and hence nearly independent of the facial expression). The information gap should increase in this situation, since the texture coordinates of facial images differing in expression should be more redundant, correlated and easily compressed – or, in the language of probability, they should exhibit a larger likelihood.

To test this hypothesis, we computed the training-set information gap for two databases of length $N_{tr} = 200$: the former (called “neutral”) consisting of neutral expression images of 200 different subjects and the latter (called “mixed”) corresponding to both the neutral and the smiling portraits of the same 100 (randomly selected) subjects. The red shadowed area in figure 3 indicates the difference in information gap between the “mixed” and the “neutral” training sets. While the information gap of the “mixed” database is indistinguishable from the “full” database of $N = 400$ images, the “neutral” database presents a lower information gap.

This analysis is consistent with our initial hypothesis. Notice that this result is not a trivial consequence of the fact that the “mixed” database (consisting in $N = 200$ portraits of the same 100 subjects) is more easily compressible than the “neutral” one (consisting in $N = 200$ portraits of 200 different subjects): indeed, for both *uniformed and non-uniformed* facial images, the description length of the “mixed” database is lower than that of the “neutral” database. What is less trivial is that *the gap \mathcal{G} is higher for mixed images.*

Information gap for unknown facial images in the test set that show different facial expressions

Here, we perform a variant of the above analysis aimed to test that the decoupling is particularly efficient when encoding *unknown* (not belonging to the training set) facial images that correspond to subjects that *are present* in the training set, with a different facial expression.

We have already seen that the training-set of uniformed images exhibits lower description length (and empirical entropy) than the training set of raw database images. It is hence reasonable to suppose that decoding does not only reduce the *bias error* (of the training-set) but also the *variance error* in the description of unknown facial images, belonging to a test-set.⁵

To test this hypothesis, we calculated the information gap in a test-set database \mathcal{I} in Equation 1, which is composed by $N/K = 80$ (with $K = 5$) images corresponding to smiling subjects, *whose neutral-expression images do belong to the training-set*. Notice that we will call such a set simply “test-set”. All the information-theoretical quantities are then cross-validated for different K training/test partitions of the original database (by means of the K -fold algorithm of cross-validation).

Figure 3 reveals that the information gap of the test-set is significantly higher compared to the information gap of the training-set, with a p-value lower than 10^{-4} (notice the small errorbars of the training-set information gap in the figure). The increment in information gap per sample (roughly 1/6 of the test-set gap) corresponds to the bits that one saves using the decoupled coding for unknown smiling faces, not belonging to the training-set. This implies, as expected, that the \mathcal{R}_D coding reduces both the bias and the variance errors for variants of known faces differing in facial expression only.

It is interesting to compare this result with the texture information gap of a different test-set database, which we call “non-overlapping”, in which the single folds are composed by $N/K = 80$ facial images corresponding to 40 subjects with both smiling and non-smiling expression. The non-overlapping test-set contains, in this way, images of subjects *that are not present in the training-set* (so that test- and training-sets contain information regarding different subject identities). Figure 3 shows how the texture gap of the non-overlapping database is even lower than the training-set gaps. This result shows that the decoupling code \mathcal{R}_D is less efficient to encode unknown facial images corresponding to unknown subjects. Furthermore, this results shows that while uniforming variants of known faces that differ only in facial expression implies a reduction of both the bias and the variance terms of the entropy (see 5), uniforming facial images of unknown individuals leads to a reduction of the bias term *but to a*

⁵In the language of probability, we have seen before that the uniformed images present stronger between-pixel correlations C_{ij} while presenting a roughly equal total variance (or $\text{tr}(C)$). This is the reason for which, for uniformed faces, the training-set empirical entropy ($\sum_i \ln \lambda_i$, up to a constant) is lower (hence the likelihood is higher). A lower test-set entropy would simply imply that also the term $\text{tr}(C_{\text{te}} \cdot C_{\text{tr}}^{-1}/2)$ (the difference between test- and training-set entropies, up to a constant) is significantly lower. We will call bias and variance terms of the entropy to the terms $\sum_i \ln \lambda_i$ and $\text{tr}(C_{\text{te}} \cdot C_{\text{tr}}^{-1}/2)$, respectively.

positive increment of the variance term. In any case, we stress that the overall difference between the entropy of both uniformed and non-uniformed versions of the non-overlapping test database is negative. Furthermore, the texture information gap \mathcal{G}_1 is still larger than \mathcal{G}_2 . Consequently, the decoupling code is more efficient even when processing unknown-identity facial images, albeit in this case the description length gap is lower.

Summary of the results of the description length analyses

In sum, our analysis shows that decoupled coding leads to a more efficient encoding of known facial images (i.e., in the training set) compared to eigenface coding, when the images are shown at high enough resolutions and in particular when they differ in facial expressions. Furthermore, our results show that the efficiency of the decoupled coding is magnified when the task consists in encoding unknown variants of known faces differing in facial expression.

Analysis of the performance of decoupled and eigenface coding in face processing tasks

So far, we have used the normative construct of description length to assess the efficiency of decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) and compare it to eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E). Here, we ask how the normative advantage of decoupled coding translates into a better performance in facial processing tasks and what are exactly the advantages. For this, we compare the performance of eigenface and decoupled coding in three face processing simulations that help illustrate the most important differences between the coding schemes; namely, (1) sampling artificial facial images from the learned generative model, (2) recognizing facial identity, and (3) reconstructing unknown faces. Please see the Supporting information for a supplementary (gender classification) simulation.

Simulation 1: Sampling synthetic faces from the trained generative model

The generation of artificial faces is a widely used task in AI to demonstrate the quality of a learning algorithm or encoder. In this simulation, our goal is not to challenge the performance of mainstream machine learning approaches that use deep nets with millions of parameters [22, 23, 24, 25], but rather to test the hypothesis that a very simple (20 degrees of freedom) linear model can generate realistic images, when it is based on decoupled coding.

Each PCA-based representation of the training set \mathcal{I} induces a simple generative model of faces (see the Supporting information for details). In particular, \mathcal{R}_E induces a multivariate Gaussian distribution in the space of facial images. Rather, \mathcal{R}_D , induces two separate Gaussian distributions over uniformed texture and shape coordinates, respectively. It is possible to create *synthetic* facial images by sampling from the respective probability distributions of \mathcal{R}_E and \mathcal{R}_D .




Figure 4: Examples of synthetic faces sampled from the generative models of \mathcal{R}_E (top row) and a simple variant of the decoupling \mathcal{R}_D coding scheme, which we call concatenated coding, \mathcal{R}_c (bottom row). See the main text for details.

In the case of \mathcal{R}_D , after sampling from both probability distributions, it is necessary to de-uniformize the texture and shape coordinates (see the Supporting information for details about the de-uniformization procedure).

Figure 4 shows example synthetic images created by sampling \mathbf{I} and $(\hat{\mathbf{I}}, \ell)$ from the models \mathcal{R}_E and \mathcal{R}_D , respectively. In both cases, we used $p = 20$ degrees of freedom, randomly chosen among the first 40 principal components of each model.⁶ Please note that in general, the larger the value of p , the higher the dimension of (the vector space of) the sampled facial images. When small values of p are used, the generative models produce low-dimensional variations of the average face; this implies that the synthetic faces are realistic (free from artefacts) but very stereotyped, with low variability. Rather, using larger values of p is a more compelling task, since the generative models are free to produce faces with high variability – but at the same time it is harder for them to produce realistic faces that are free from artefacts.

Figure 4 permits appreciating that with a relatively high value $p = 20$, both eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E) and decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) produce faces with high variability. However, only the faces produced by the latter are realistic and free from artefacts. This simulation therefore shows that a very simple linear model based on decoupled coding (but not on eigenface coding) can produce realistic and varied facial images.

Please note that for this comparison we consider a simple variant of the decoupling \mathcal{R}_D coding scheme, which we call concatenated coding, \mathcal{R}_c (see the Supporting information in section for a formal description). The reason is that \mathcal{R}_c permits using a single number of principal components, p , in common with \mathcal{R}_E – which therefore permits comparing the two neural codes with the same number of parameters. The results of figure 4 are qualitatively identical if one directly compares \mathcal{R}_E with \mathcal{R}_D , varying $p_t = p$ and fixing p_s to its maximum

⁶In particular, we sample 20 principal components x'_i from their respective distributions, where the index i may take the values $1, \dots, p = 40$. The remaining 20 coordinates among the first 40 coordinates are set to zero.

value, = $d_s = 92$).

Simulation 2: Facial identity recognition

The results of the description length analysis show that decoupled coding may be particularly suited to encode efficiently natural variants of known facial images, which consist in variations of facial expressions. This is because variants of a known face may affect one set of coordinates shape or texture, while leaving the other essentially unaffected. For example, recognising a known face with a different facial expression might benefit from the reuse of texture coordinates, which would be relatively unaffected.

In this simulation, we test whether and how the description length advantage of decoupled coding translates into a better capability to recognise faces with different facial expressions. For this, we exploit the fact that the FEI database includes 400 facial images of 200 subjects, with 2 images of the each subject that only vary for facial expressions: neutral or smiling. The simulative task consists in recognising which of the 200 images showing a neutral expression corresponds to a target image (excluded from the training set) in which the same person shows a smiling expression, and vice-versa.

We implement the recognition task through a nearest-neighbour classifier, using a *distance* $d_p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}(s))$ among the facial coordinates of the target smiling face \mathbf{z} , and those of all the 200 neutral expression images $\mathbf{x}(s)$. The distance $d_p(\cdot, \cdot)$ among facial coordinates is the Mahalanobis ($+L_2$) distance, known to be a better measure of facial similarity than the simple Euclidean metric between images [26][27, Chs. 5-6]⁷. The Mahalanobis metrics between a couple of vectors is a scalar product between their (normalised) first p principal components⁸, which does depend on the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the correlation matrix and, hence, on the training set. It is important to remark that that the target image coordinates are excluded from the training set (see the details in the Supporting information).

Figure 5 shows the results of the facial identity recognition task. The figure reports the misclassification error as a function of the number of principal components considered p , for each kind of coordinate (uniformed images, non-uniformed images and shape coordinates, or $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{I}, \hat{\mathbf{I}}, \ell$, respectively). The errors decrease and reach a plateau in the cases of both eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E) and decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D), but the latter shows consistently a better performance. Interestingly, this simulation permits appreciating the relative contributions of texture and shape coordinates to the task. As expected, almost all of the advantage of decoupled coding is due to texture coordinates, whereas the performance of shape coordinates is significantly lower, with a minimum error around 0.4 (notice that in such recognition task, the random choice error rate is

⁷Although surely not the most efficient method for a supervised classification analysis, we choose the Mahalanobis distance algorithm, since it is the one that uses the only the information defining our working models, i.e., C_p for each kind of coordinate.

⁸ $d_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = [(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})^\dagger \cdot C_p \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})]^{1/2}$, where $C_p = E_p^\dagger \cdot \Lambda_p \cdot E_p$, and where Λ_p is the diagonal matrix of the largest p eigenvalues.




Figure 5: Performance of in the face recognition task using the uniformed images, the non-uniformed images, and the shape coordinates. See the main text for explanation.

$1 - 1/N_{\text{train}} \simeq 0.996$, see the Supporting information). However, we notice that this last conclusion depends on the arbitrary choice of the image resolution (determining the image dimension $d_t = w \times h$) and on the number of landmarks n_ℓ (determining the shape coordinate dimension $d_s = 2n_\ell$). Using a larger number of landmarks (as it is presumably the case in the neural code [3]) will enhance the relative relevance of shape coordinates.

Finally, figure 5 reveals as well that the distance based on the concatenated code \mathcal{R}_c , which exploits the correlation between shape and uniformed texture coordinates, does not perform significantly better than that based on uniformed images. This is due to the fact that the images contain much more information than the shape coordinates, and that shape and texture coordinates are only weakly correlated (see the Supporting information).

Simulation 3: Reconstructing novel faces

The reconstruction task consists in representing novel facial images that do not belong to the training set, in terms of an expansion in p principal components only. In mathematical terms, if \mathbf{x} is a facial image, or its shape coordinates, the reconstruction of \mathbf{x} in terms of the first p principal axes is $\mathbf{x}_p = E_p^\dagger \cdot E_p \cdot \mathbf{x}$, where E_p is the $p \times d$ matrix of the first p (row) eigenvectors.⁹ In the case of the \mathcal{R}_E

⁹If \mathbf{x} corresponds to an image, the reconstructed image is different from the original one even with $p = N$ coordinates, since the matrix $E_p^\dagger \cdot E_p$ is different from the identity matrix, as far as it has rank $= p \leq N < d_t$.




Figure 6: Reconstruction of a test-set facial image with p principal components according to the representations: eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E , first row) and mixed coding (\mathcal{R}_C , second row). The 5 columns of the matrix of images represent, respectively: $p = 5, 20, 50, 100, 395$, and the original image. The image is 100×120 .

code, we simply project the original image ($\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{I}$) onto the first p eigenfaces.

Figure 6 shows the reconstruction of a novel face according to \mathcal{R}_E and \mathcal{R}_C for different values of p . The figure illustrates that \mathcal{R}_E produces a border artifact; this is because linear combinations of different facial images with different facial contours result in an image which tend to be blurred in the margin of the face. Rather, the border artifact is absent for \mathcal{R}_C , and the representation for high p is slightly more faithful. The results for different test-set images are qualitatively identical. As for Simulation 1, the results are qualitatively identical if one directly compares \mathcal{R}_E with \mathcal{R}_D , varying $p_t = p$ and fixing p_s to its maximum value, ($= d_s = 92$).

Summary of the results of the face processing tasks

In sum, our analysis shows that a tiny model using decoupled coding and only 20 degrees of freedom can be sampled to produce realistic synthetic images, whereas sampling from a model using eigenface coding produces less realistic faces with artefacts. Furthermore, decoupled coding greatly facilitates the recognition of familiar faces with novel facial expressions – especially thanks the fact that texture coordinates remain stable across different expressions. Finally, decoupled coding outperforms eigenface coding in the reconstruction of novel faces. Please see the Supporting information for an additional simulation of gender classification using the two coding schemes.

Discussion and Conclusions

Recent research in neuroscience revealed that the neural coding for facial identity in the inferotemporal (IT) cortex of macaques [3, 6] uses a decoupled coding scheme in which distinct subpopulations of neurons project faces onto two distinct sets of axes, which encode the geometric shape of a face and its texture separately. From a computational perspective, this decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) affords accurate face processing, permitting the linear decoding of facial features from single cell responses; and it outperforms widely used schemes in vision research, such as eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E) [3, 6, 7].

In this article, we aim to elucidate the normative reasons for this advantage, by appealing to the notion of *description length*, which permits quantifying the efficiency of alternative neural coding schemes in info-theoretic terms. The general idea is that the best model is the one that minimizes the amount of memory (bits) required to encode both the data and the model parameters themselves [12, 13].

We compared the efficiency of two alternative schemes: decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D), which requires coding both the principal components of uniformed facial images and their shape (landmark) coordinates; and the widely used eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E), which only requires storing the principal components of the original images. Our simulations using the same FEI database as in the monkey study of [3] show that decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) requires less information to represent the images compared to eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E), despite the latter does not require coding for the geometric coordinates of faces. Remarkably, the efficiency gain of decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) is already apparent in a small database in which N is ~ 200 ; and it is especially prominent for high resolution images and for variants of training set images that only differ in facial expressions.

Furthermore, we found that the probabilistic generative model induced by decoupled coding (\mathcal{R}_D) achieves good performance in face processing tasks, including sampling artificial or novel faces, recognising face identity and reconstructing novel faces with p principal components. Rather, a model using eigenface coding (\mathcal{R}_E) performs less accurately and produces less realistic faces with artefacts.

Taken together, these results shed light on the normative advantages of the decoupled coding for faces that was empirically reported in monkey inferotemporal (IT) cortex of macaques [3, 6], showing that it is both more efficient (in info-theoretic terms) and more accurate than the alternative eigenface scheme widely used in computer vision.

The fact that decoupled coding is more efficient than eigenface coding seems paradoxical, given that the former requires encoding both the principal components of uniformed facial images and their shape (landmark) coordinates. However, despite this apparent disadvantage, decoupled coding is more efficient, because the database of uniformed faces can be described with fewer principal components. The pixels in it are more correlated and hence can be compressed more (this is despite, perhaps counter-intuitively, the total variance of the set of uniformed facial images is not significantly lower than that of non-uniformed

facial images).

The accuracy advantage of decoupled coding is mainly due to the fact that it separates facial landmarks (*shape* coordinates) and the image texture at fixed landmark position (*texture* coordinates) – two sets of coordinates that carry information regarding naturally different aspects of human faces and can vary independently. Namely, variations in facial expressions and variations in perspective (e.g., small rotations) mainly modify shape coordinates, but not texture coordinates. Rather, variations in luminosity, suntan, or make-up only modify texture coordinates [28]. This perspective helps explain our finding that decoupled coding is more advantageous when encoding variants of known faces (in the training set) or unknown faces (in the test set). This is because when processing variants, one of the two sets of (shape and texture) coordinates will tend to remain the same as in the known, reference image.

These advantages of decoupled coding comes at the price of performing some prerequisite nonlinear computations over facial images, as landmark detection and image deformation (see also the Supporting information). We speculate that these computations might be putatively realised by early visual areas, which lie below the IT in the neural hierarchy. This speculation remains to be tested in future research.

Supporting information

Relation with Bayesian Model Selection. Bayesian model selection consists in choosing the model \mathcal{M} that maximises the Bayesian evidence of a given database \mathcal{D} . The best model \mathcal{M} is, equivalently [19], the one that minimises the description length $\min_{\mathcal{M}} L_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D})$. To verify the validity of the condition (3), we have, instead, compared the description length of *different databases*: \mathcal{I} , $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$, \mathcal{L} , according to *the same probabilistic model*, which corresponds to the normal distributions (whose maximum likelihood correlation matrices take, respectively, the values C_p , $C_{p_t}^{(t)}$ and $C_{p_s}^{(s)}$, for the three databases).

This is, hence, the opposite situation with respect to Bayesian model selection, in which one compares the evidence of the same database according to different models. It is important to remark that, in the present work, we do not aim to perform a comparison, on Bayesian grounds, between eigenface and decoupled codings, understood as probabilistic models *over the common database of original, non-uniformed facial images*. Indeed, the representation $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ induces a probability distribution in the space of non-uniformed images \mathbf{I} , that is no longer a Gaussian distribution (even if the distributions over $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ and ℓ are) since it involves the nonlinear image deformation operations, that we have completely neglected in our information-theoretical analysis. Within our working hypothesis, we neglect the *uniformation* $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ (previous to the PCA) and *de-uniformation* $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_p, \mathcal{L}_p \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{I}}', \mathcal{L}'$ (posterior to the PCA) operations from the information-theoretical analysis.

In other words, here we consider three probabilistic descriptions over separate spaces: non-uniformed images, uniformed images and shape coordinates.

Our conclusions merely rely in the information-theoretical interpretation of the Bayesian evidence of a database according to a model, that is related to the amount of information needed to store the database in terms of the model's latent variables, within a given precision. The decoupled code, understood as a probabilistic model *on the space of the original images*, would be much more complex than Gaussian. It would implicitly contain, in some (texture) latent variables, a description of the input image somehow invariant under shape transformations; other (shape) latent variables would be invariant under texture transformations of the original image. Our current analysis is to be understood as an estimation of the information theoretical gain of the facial representation in terms of (principal components of) uniformed images and landmarks, neglecting the non-linear operations of landmark detection and image deformation that lead to these two facial coordinates, from the original database of images.

Instead, we do perform a genuine Bayesian model selection when choosing the values of p , p_t , p_s that minimise the description length (that maximise the Bayesian evidence) of each database, i.e., of each type of coordinate.

Image uniformation and de-uniformation. The creation of the *uniformed* texture $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ coordinates from the original images \mathbf{I} and their shape coordinates ℓ in \mathcal{R}_D is implemented, as said before, through image deformation algorithms based on similiarity transformations [16]. Such algorithms map the original image into an image whose landmark positions ℓ will now occupy their average value in the database $\langle \ell \rangle$. Vice-versa, the reconstruction of novel images in \mathcal{R}_D requires creating a non-uniformed facial image from the reconstructed shape and texture coordinates $\ell_p, \hat{\mathbf{I}}_p$. This operation we will be called *de-uniformation*:

$$(\ell, \mathbf{I}) \xrightarrow{\langle \ell \rangle} (\langle \ell \rangle, \hat{\mathbf{I}}) \quad \text{uniformation} \quad (4)$$

$$(\ell, \mathbf{I}) \xleftarrow{\ell} (\langle \ell \rangle, \hat{\mathbf{I}}) \quad \text{de-uniformation} \quad (5)$$

where the subscripted arrow indicates the image deformation algorithm transforming an image $(\ell_1, \mathbf{I}_1) \xrightarrow{\ell_2} (\ell_2, \mathbf{I}_2)$ so that the pixel values of \mathbf{I}_2 in the positions given by ℓ_2 are those of \mathbf{I}_1 in ℓ_1 (say, $\mathbf{I}_2(\vec{\ell}_{2j}) = \mathbf{I}_1(\vec{\ell}_{1j})$ where $\vec{\ell}_{1j}$ are the original Cartesian positions of the j -th landmark), and the rest of the pixel values of \mathbf{I}_2 are changed consequently, under the requirement of smoothness. As a consistency check, we have verified that uniforming and consequently de-uniforming database images, leads to new images that are visually indistinguishable from the initial ones.

In fig.7 we illustrate the effect of the used image deformation algorithm on a picture of the FEI database.

Likelihood and evidence of the normal distribution. We report the well-known expression for the Bayesian evidence, and related formulae, of the normal distribution associated to the p -PCA representation with p principal components. Given a database \mathcal{D} composed by N d -dimensional vectors, p -PCA




Figure 7: an example of usage of the software for image deformation. The image in the center is the image deformation of the right image with the landmarks corresponding to the left image.

induces a likelihood probability distribution which is the normal distribution (supposing null averages):

$$\ln P(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, p)/(Nd) = -\frac{1}{2} [\ln(2\pi) + \ln \det(C) + \text{tr}(C^{-1} \cdot \Sigma)] \quad (6)$$

where Σ is the unbiased estimator of the correlation matrix of the data \mathcal{D} , and where the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = C$ are the theoretical correlation matrix, which in p -PCA is subject to exhibit its $d - p$ lowest eigenvalues equal to a common noise-level value v . The maximum likelihood estimation $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ for C and v are: $C^* = U\Lambda U^\dagger$ where U is an orthogonal matrix whose top p eigenvectors are those of Σ , and where the diagonal matrix Λ contains the top p eigenvalues of Σ , $\Lambda_{ii} = \lambda_i$ for $i \leq p$, and the remaining $d - p$ diagonal elements equal to $\Lambda_{ii} = v_p$ for $i > p$, with $v_p = (d - p)^{-1} \sum_{j>p} \lambda_j$.

For completeness, we report the expressions for the description length, the empirical entropy and the Occam factor, making explicit the dependence on the number of principal components p :

$$L_p(\mathcal{D}) = -\ln P_p(\mathcal{D}) - d \ln \epsilon = \quad (7)$$

$$= S_p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) + O(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \quad (8)$$

$$S_p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\ln P_p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - d \ln(\epsilon) \quad (9)$$

$$\ln P_p(\mathcal{D}) = \ln P_p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) - O_p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \quad (10)$$

where, as mentioned in the main text, in these equations $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ refers to the maximum likelihood estimator. The equation for the Bayesian evidence (under certain assumptions on the prior variance) takes the form, up to a constant factor, and for sufficiently large N [20]:

$$\ln P(\mathcal{D})/(Nd) \simeq \ln P(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})/(Nd) - \ln \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)/(Nd) \quad (11)$$

$$- \ln \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)/(Nd) := \frac{1}{2Nd} ((m+p+1) \ln(2\pi) - p \ln N - \ln |A| + \ln |p_U|) \quad (12)$$

$$m := dp - p(p+1)/2 \quad (13)$$

$$\ln |p_U| := -p \ln 2 + \sum_{j=1}^p p \ln \Gamma \left(\frac{d-j+1}{2} \right) - \frac{d-j+1}{2} \ln \pi \quad (14)$$

and where:

$$\ln |A| = \sum_{i=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{j=i+1}^d \left[\ln(\hat{\lambda}_j^{-1} - \hat{\lambda}_i^{-1}) + \ln(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \right] \right\} + m \ln N \quad (15)$$

where the λ 's are the eigenvalues of Σ in decreasing order, $\hat{\lambda}_j = \lambda_j$ for $j \leq p$ but $= v_p$ for $j > p$.

In the case $d > N$, this last term takes the form:

$$\ln |A| = \sum_{i=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{j=i+1}^p \left[\ln(\lambda_j^{-1} - \lambda_i^{-1}) + \ln(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \right] + \right. \quad (16)$$

$$\left. + (d-p) \ln(v_p^{-1} - \lambda_i^{-1}) + \sum_{j=p+1}^N \ln(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) + \right. \quad (17)$$

$$\left. + (d-N) \ln \lambda_i \right\} + m \ln N \quad (18)$$

while for $d \leq N$, it is:

$$\ln |A| = \sum_{i=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{j=i+1}^p \left[\ln(\lambda_j^{-1} - \lambda_i^{-1}) + \ln(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \right] + \right. \quad (19)$$

$$\left. + (d-p) \ln(v_p^{-1} - \lambda_i^{-1}) + \sum_{j=p+1}^d \ln(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \right\} + m \ln N. \quad (20)$$

Likelihood and evidence of shape coordinates. For shape coordinates, and for the databases considered here, it is $d_s < N$. In figure 8 we show (left) the behaviour of the training- and test-set (logarithms of the) likelihoods, along with the training- and test-set (logarithms of the) Bayesian evidences of shape coordinates (respectively, $\ln P(\mathcal{L}_{\text{tr}}|C^s)$, $\ln P(\mathcal{L}_{\text{te}}|C^s)$, $\ln P(\mathcal{L}_{\text{tr}})$, $\ln P(\mathcal{L}_{\text{te}})$). We observe that the training-set evidence behaviour is qualitatively similar to that

of the the test-set likelihood (contrary to the case of texture coordinates, see below).

When commenting the results of figure 3, we mentioned the fact that the empirical entropy of shape coordinates does not depend on the resolution. Indeed, changing the resolution in the database of shape coordinates amounts to multiply the Landmarks’ Cartesian coordinates by a factor (w/w' for horizontal, h/h' for vertical coordinates). However, the relevant quantity in these experiments is not the absolute value of the coordinates in the $w \times h$ grid units, but their normalised value in units of the image height h . If normalised coordinates are considered, the precision should be consequently normalised to be inversely proportional to h . In figure 8-Right we plot the training empirical entropy $S_p(\mathcal{L}_{\text{tr}}|C^{\text{s}}) = \ln P(\mathcal{L}_{\text{tr}}|C^{\text{s}}) - d_s \ln \epsilon_s$ for different resolutions, using the resolution-dependent precision $\epsilon_s = 0.1(h_{\text{max}}/h)$. The overlap of different curves is a consequence of the fact that no information has been lost when scaling both the coordinates and the precision.

Likelihood and evidence of texture coordinates. In figure 9 we show the behaviour of the training- and test-set (logarithms of the) likelihoods, along with the training- and test-set (logarithms of the) Bayesian evidences of texture coordinates. In this case, in which, differently from shape coordinates, it is $d_t > N$, the BIC approximation for the evidence is no longer good, and the evidence behaves differently from the test-set likelihood. We conclude that, in order to perform model selection in this case, or to estimate the Occam contribution to the description length, it is necessary to use the aforementioned expression of the Bayesian evidence due to Minka.

The concatenated code representation, \mathcal{R}_c (see figure 10), simply consists in concatenating the uniformed texture and shape coordinates in a single vector $\mathbf{y} = (\ell, \hat{\mathbf{I}})$, and to keep the first p_c principal components of the set of concatenated vectors $\mathbf{y}' = E^{(c)}\mathbf{y}$, hence treating shape and texture coordinates on the same ground. The concatenated code would exactly coincide with \mathcal{R}_D (taking $p_c = p_s + p_t$) for an image database such that shape and texture coordinates were completely uncorrelated (say, $\langle \ell_m I_i \rangle = 0 \forall m, i$). The performance of the \mathcal{R}_c code in the face processing tasks presented in section Results turn to be almost identical using texture coordinates only. The reason is that shape coordinates carry a lower amount of aggregated information and, in any case, the correlations between shape and texture coordinates are significantly smaller than those in the diagonal blocks of $C^{(c)}$. The advantage of using \mathcal{R}_c is that one may fix a single number of principal components. The daydream generation of novel facial images with the \mathcal{R}_D code (fixing $p_s = d_s$ at its maximum value) leads to almost identical results of those of \mathcal{R}_c in figure 4.

Details of the classification algorithms. The classification tasks are performed via a nearest-neighbour classifier: every vector \mathbf{x} is assigned to the class that minimizes the distance from \mathbf{x} . If a class contains more than one element, as





Figure 8: Left: Shape coordinates' likelihoods and evidences (in BIC approximation) of the test and training sets. Right: Empirical entropy of shape coordinates for the full $N_{\text{tr}} = 400$ training set, for different resolutions.




Figure 9: Uniformed texture coordinates' likelihoods and evidences of the test and training sets.




Figure 10: Schematic representation of the concatenated code.

it is the case of the gender classification task (in which the male and the female classes contain 200 vectors each, corresponding to half of the raw FEI database), the distance is computed between \mathbf{x} and the average of the elements belonging to the class. For the gender identification task we follow a leave-one-out approach: for each vector \mathbf{x} , the training-set (from which we compute the correlation matrix, defining in its turn the Mahalanobis distance $d_p(\cdot, \cdot)$) is composed by all the database vectors except for \mathbf{x} itself. The so defined training-set is as well the set from which the average vector of each class is constructed.

In the facial recognition task, we use a more economic strategy: we construct $K = 5$ training/test-set divisions (with $N_{\text{te}} = 400/K = 80$, $N_{\text{tr}} = 320$) by K -folding, in such a way that the test-set contains at most one vector per individual, and that it contains $N_{\text{te}}/2$ vectors corresponding to smiling portraits, and $N_{\text{te}}/2$ corresponding to neutral portraits. For each of the vectors of facial coordinates in the test-set, we search for its nearest neighbor among the $N_{\text{tr}} = 320$ vectors of facial coordinates in the training set. The training set is, again, the set from which we compute C_p and consequently define $d_p(\cdot, \cdot)$. Afterwards, the average value and the standard deviation of the mean of the success rate is computed by cross-validation over the $K = 5$ iterations.

Results of the gender classification task. In figure 11 we present the results of the gender classification task. We observe that the shape coordinates alone are sufficient to achieve roughly 90% of successful attempts with less than 30 PC's. Consistently with the rest of the article results, the classification performed in terms of (principal components of) uniformed facial images achieves higher success rates respect to that using (principal components of) the original original facial image (i.e., the \mathcal{R}_E representation). Furthermore, the success rate plateau is reached for a lower number of PC's ($p \simeq 30$ versus $p \simeq 40$ of \mathcal{R}_E).

Different regularisation schemes. For each generic set of facial coordinates (say, \mathcal{D}), we have so far estimated its description length according to the p -PCA model, whose number of principal components p are those that maximise the description length $p^* = \arg \min_p L_{\mathcal{D},p}(\mathcal{D})$. The inferred probability distribution is a normal distribution whose correlation matrix C_{p^*} is consequently different from the empirical correlation matrix, say $C_{p=\min\{N,d\}}$, since not all empirical eigenvalues and eigenvectors are statistically significant given the database finiteness.¹⁰ The normal distribution whose correlation is the empirical matrix would correspond, instead, to maximum likelihood inference.

Actually, there are different ways, besides p -PCA, in which the correlation matrix may be inferred beyond the maximum likelihood criterion. An alternative is *linear (identity) shrinkage* (see, for example, [29]). Linear shrinkage leads to a correlation matrix which is a convex combination between the unbiased (maximum likelihood) empirical estimator C and a completely biased (and null-variance) matrix, as the identity matrix in d dimensions 1_d . In other

¹⁰Strictly speaking, in the $N < d$ case, the inferred correlation matrix C_p is different from the empirical matrix even if $p = N$, since it has to be regularised so that its rank is $= d$ (and not $= N$).




Figure 11: the success rates in the tasks of gender classification and face recognition are here displayed -on the left- as functions of the number P of principal components; in the right column the same data (except for the geometric coordinates) are shown in a close-up.

words, the “regularised” shrunk matrix is $C_\alpha = (1 - \alpha)C + \alpha 1_d$ where α is a real number in $[0, 1]$, that may be chosen by maximum (cross-validated) out-of-sample likelihood. In the p -PCA scheme, $p = 0$ and $p = \min\{N, d\}$ are the arguments of the minimum and maximum training likelihood respectively, and p^* is comprised between them. Within the shrinkage scheme, these extreme cases correspond to $\alpha = 1$ and 0, respectively.

In order to check the robustness of our results with respect to the regularisation scheme, we have computed the information gaps (actually, the gaps in empirical entropy)¹¹ resulting from the normal probability distributions associated not with p -PCA but with linear shrinkage. We have observed that the results are qualitatively consistent with those presented here. While the lowest description length of the set of landmarks \mathcal{G}_2 is consistent with the one shown in figure 3, the description length gap \mathcal{G}_1 is significantly larger for the largest resolution, as can be seen in figure 12. Consequently, the information gap is even larger when regularising the correlation matrices with the shrinkage method.

Visualisation of the eigenvectors of the concatenated code \mathcal{R}_c . Figure 13 presents a graphical visualisation of the first five principal axes of the whole database according to the concatenated code \mathcal{R}_c (the first five eigenvectors of $C^{(c)}$).

¹¹We make notice that, in the case of p -PCA, and for texture coordinates, the texture gap \mathcal{G}_1 is essentially given by the gap between empirical entropies. The difference between the Occam factors of non-uniformed and uniformed images is negligible in front of it.




Figure 12: The same as figure 3 but with the addition of the test-set texture gap per sample \mathcal{G}_1/N computed with the shrinkage regularisation method.

Acknowledgments

We thank Matteo Marsili for his comments on the manuscript. This research received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation under the Specific Grant Agreement No. 945539 (Human Brain Project SGA3) to GP and the European Research Council under the Grant Agreement No. 820213 (ThinkAhead) to GP. M. I.-B. is supported by the grant EU FESR-FSE PON Ricerca e Innovazione 2014-2020 BraVi.




Figure 13: First five principal axes of the concatenated code \mathcal{R}_c (five largest-eigenvalue eigenvectors of $C^{(c)}$). The j -th column represents the $j = th$ eigenvector. In particular, the i -th row of the table represents the points that have all the coordinates, in the base of the principal axes, equal to zero except the i -th one, that ranges from -2σ (left) to 2σ (right); σ is taken equal to the square root of the largest eigenvalue λ_1 of the correlation matrix. In other words, the image, say \mathbf{I} in the i -th row, j -th column is obtained by de-uniformation $((\ell), \hat{\mathbf{I}}) \rightarrow (\ell, \mathbf{I})$, where ℓ and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ are obtained as: $(\ell, \hat{\mathbf{I}}) = \mathbf{y} = E^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{y}'$, and where \mathbf{y}' is the vector that exhibits null principal components except by the i -th, $y'_i = (j - 3)\lambda_1^{1/2}$, and E is the matrix of row eigenvectors of $C^{(c)}$.

References

- [1] Doris Y Tsao, Winrich A Freiwald, Roger BH Tootell, and Margaret S Livingstone. A cortical region consisting entirely of face-selective cells. *Science*, 311(5761):670–674, 2006.
- [2] Doris Y Tsao and Margaret S Livingstone. Mechanisms of face perception. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.*, 31:411–437, 2008.
- [3] Le Chang and Doris Y. Tsao. The Code for Facial Identity in the Primate Brain. *Cell*, 169(6):1013–1028.e14, 2017.
- [4] Tim Valentine, Michael B. Lewis, and Peter J. Hills. Face-Space: A Unifying Concept in Face Recognition Research. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 69(10):1996–2019, 2016.
- [5] Gareth J Edwards, Christopher J Taylor, and Timothy F Cootes. Interpreting face images using active appearance models. In *Proceedings Third IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition*, pages 300–305. IEEE, 1998.
- [6] Le Chang, Bernhard Egger, Thomas Vetter, and Doris Y Tsao. Explaining face representation in the primate brain using different computational models. *Current Biology*, 2021.
- [7] Irina Higgins, Le Chang, Victoria Langston, Demis Hassabis, Christopher Summerfield, Doris Tsao, and Matthew Botvinick. Unsupervised deep learning identifies semantic disentanglement in single inferotemporal face patch neurons. *Nature communications*, 12(1):1–14, 2021.
- [8] L. Sirovich and M. Kirby. Low-dimensional procedure for the characterization of human faces. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 4(3):519, 1987.
- [9] Matthew Turk and Alex Pentland. Eigenfaces for recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 3(1):71–86, 1991.
- [10] Fred Attneave. Some informational aspects of visual perception. *Psychological review*, 61(3):183, 1954.
- [11] Horace B Barlow et al. Possible principles underlying the transformation of sensory messages. *Sensory communication*, 1(01), 1961.
- [12] Jorma Rissanen. Modeling by shortest data description. *Automatica*, 14(5):465–471, 1978.
- [13] Jorma Rissanen. Hypothesis selection and testing by the mdl principle. *The Computer Journal*, 42(4):260–269, 1999.

- [14] Carlos Eduardo Thomaz and Gilson Antonio Giraldi. A new ranking method for principal components analysis and its application to face image analysis. *Image and Vision Computing*, 28(6):902–913, 2010.
- [15] Fei face database. <https://fei.edu.br/~cet/facedatabase.html>.
- [16] Scott Schaefer, Travis McPhail, and Joe Warren. Image deformation using moving least squares. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2006 Papers*, SIGGRAPH '06, page 533–540, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] Miguel Ibáñez-Berganza, Ambra Amico, and Vittorio Loreto. Subjectivity and complexity of facial attractiveness. *Scientific reports*, 9(1):1–12, 2019.
- [18] Michael Beyeler, Emily L. Rounds, Kristofor D. Carlson, Nikil Dutt, and Jeffrey L. Krichmar. Neural correlates of sparse coding and dimensionality reduction. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 15(6):1–33, 06 2019.
- [19] David JC MacKay and David JC Mac Kay. *Information theory, inference and learning algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- [20] Thomas P Minka. Automatic choice of dimensionality for pca. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 577–583, 2000.
- [21] In Jae Myung, Vijay Balasubramanian, and Mark A. Pitt. Counting probability distributions: Differential geometry and model selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(21):11170–11175, 2000.
- [22] Alexey Dosovitskiy and Thomas Brox. Generating images with perceptual similarity metrics based on deep networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [23] Alice J O’Toole, Carlos D Castillo, Connor J Parde, Matthew Q Hill, and Rama Chellappa. Face space representations in deep convolutional neural networks. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 22(9):794–809, 2018.
- [24] Jordan Suchow, Joshua Peterson, and Thomas Griffiths. A learned generative model of faces for experiments on human identity. *Journal of Vision*, 18(10):352–352, 2018.
- [25] Heng Liu, Xiaoyu Zheng, Jungong Han, Yuezhong Chu, and Tao Tao. Survey on gan-based face hallucination with its model development. *IET Image Processing*, 13(14):2662–2672, 2019.
- [26] Baback Moghaddam and Alex Pentland. Beyond linear eigenspaces: Bayesian matching for face recognition. In *Face Recognition*, pages 230–243. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [27] Harry Wechsler. *Reliable Face Recognition Methods*. Springer US, 2007.

- [28] Aldo Laurentini and Andrea Bottino. Computer analysis of face beauty: A survey. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, 125, 2014.
- [29] Joël Bun, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, and Marc Potters. Cleaning large correlation matrices: Tools from random matrix theory. *Physics Reports*, 666:1–109, 2017.