

EasyPortrait – Face Parsing and Portrait Segmentation Dataset

Karina Kvanchiani, Elizaveta Petrova¹, Karen Efremyan¹, Alexander Sautin,
and Alexander Kapitanov¹

SberDevices

Abstract. Recently, video conferencing apps have become functional by accomplishing such computer vision-based features as real-time background removal and face beautification. Limited variability in existing portrait segmentation and face parsing datasets, including head poses, ethnicity, scenes, and occlusions specific to video conferencing, motivated us to create a new dataset, EasyPortrait, for these tasks simultaneously. It contains 40,000 primarily indoor photos repeating video meeting scenarios with 13,705 unique users and fine-grained segmentation masks separated into 9 classes. Inappropriate annotation masks from other datasets caused a revision of annotator guidelines, resulting in EasyPortrait’s ability to process cases, such as teeth whitening and skin smoothing. The pipeline for data mining and high-quality mask annotation via crowdsourcing is also proposed in this paper. In the ablation study experiments, we proved the importance of data quantity and diversity in head poses in our dataset for the effective learning of the model. The cross-dataset evaluation experiments confirmed the best domain generalization ability among portrait segmentation datasets. Moreover, we demonstrate the simplicity of training segmentation models on EasyPortrait without extra training tricks. The proposed dataset and trained models are publicly available¹.

Keywords: Face Parsing · Portrait Segmentation · Dataset Creation

1 Introduction

Video conferencing apps have quickly gained popularity in corporations for online meetings [28] and in our habitual life to keep in touch with relatives from a distance [4]. As a result, these apps have been enhanced with various beneficial features, including face beautification, background blur, and noise reduction [2]. Such extensions can improve user experience, allowing them to change the background or smooth their skin [5].

Our work primarily aimed to integrate the described features into the video conferencing app. The app should ensure a real-time CPU-based experience on the user’s device and produce a highly accurate response. Besides, our system needs to be robust to the amount of context in images, backgrounds, persons

¹ <https://github.com/hukenovs/easyportrait>




Fig. 1: The face parsing and portrait segmentation annotation examples from the EasyPortrait dataset.

in the frame, their poses, attributes (e.g. race and age), and accessories (headphones, hats, etc.). Finally, it is preferable to improve the users’ experience with such functions as teeth whitening and accurate background changing in the case of transparent glasses lenses and uneven hair.

All these requirements impose restrictions on the solution and training dataset. We decided to exploit deep learning models solving portrait segmentation and face parsing tasks for our purpose. The system must function in real-time without any delays and produce fine-grained segmentation masks. The suitable data is required to be 1) heterogeneous in subjects, their head turns, subject-to-camera distances, scenes, and specific for videoconferencing domain subjects’ accessories like eyeglasses and headphones; 2) annotated with main face parsing classes (“skin”, “brows”, “eyes”, and “lips”) and an extra class “teeth”; 3) accurately annotated for both tasks simultaneously. The last can allow training only one model for all possible use cases and save limited resources for model inference.

Existing datasets are unsuitable for our production purposes due to the limitations described in Sec. 2. It motivated us to create the EasyPortrait dataset – our first contribution. The second is a pipeline for gathering and labeling images with fine-grained segmentation masks utilizing two crowdsourcing platforms, Yandex.Toloka² and ABC Elementary³. It allowed us to collect 40,000 pairs of images and segmentation masks from 13,705 individuals in domain-suitable scenes with different head poses and various specific videoconferencing app accessories. We considered the importance of ethnic diversity to solve problems based on persons and their facial attributes and collected images from users of various countries and continents. Images were annotated manually by 9 classes according to specially designed rules, which allowed us to cover all described cases.

We checked that such data characteristics as the number of samples and their diversity in head poses have a positive impact on the model’s robustness

² <https://toloka.yandex.ru>

³ <https://elementary.activebc.ru>

Table 1: Comparison of portrait segmentation and face parsing datasets. Because of the specifics of the tasks, we indicated the task name for the first ones and the number of classes for the second. Several datasets include images of different sizes, so the standard label was provided in the resolution column. 96% of images in the EasyPortrait are FullHD; see more information in Sec. 3.2. We also included notes about the annotation method, which can be important regarding label quality. For more transparency, 20 classes in the FaceOcc dataset contain 19 classes from CelebAMask-HQ.

Dataset	Samples	Task / Classes	Resolution	Annotation Method
EG1800, 2016 [29]	1,800	segmentation	600 × 800	Photoshop
FVS, 2018 [11]	3,600	segmentation	640 × 360	chroma-key
AIseg, 2018 [1]	34,427	matting	600 × 800	automatically
PP-HumanSeg14K, 2021 [7]	14,117	segmentation	1280 × 720	manually
The Face Synthetics, 2021 [31]	100,000	segmentation	512 × 512	automatically
Helen, 2012 [12]	2,330	11	400 × 400	automatically
LFW-PL, 2013 [10]	2,927	3	250 × 250	automatically & refined
CelebAMask-HQ, 2019 [13]	30,000	19	512 × 512	manually & checked & refined
LaPa, 2020 [19]	22,176	11	LR	automatically & refined
iBugMask, 2021 [18]	22,866	11	HR	manually
The Face Synthetics, 2021 [31]	100,000	19	512 × 512	automatically
FaceOcc, 2022 [33]	30,000	20	512 × 512	manually
EasyPortrait, 2023	40,000	9	FullHD	manually & checked

and effectiveness (Sec. 4). The generalization ability of the training data was also assessed through cross-dataset evaluation experiments (Sec. 5).

2 Related Work

In this section, we discuss existing portrait segmentation and face parsing datasets separately. We will consider them from two points of view: 1) the applicability to the videoconferencing domain and 2) data creation techniques for each segmentation task and their consequences.

2.1 Portrait Segmentation and Matting Datasets

The portrait segmentation task involves labeling every pixel in an image as either “person” or “background”. Since matting annotations can be reduced to binary ones, image matting datasets will also be considered. As videoconferencing apps always take portraits for input and not a person entirely, only datasets with waist-deep people are reviewed. Therefore, other popular image person segmentation and image matting datasets, e.g., P3M-10k [14], PPR10K [15], PhotoMatte13K/85 [16], Persons Labeled [3], are not described in this paper. We selected EG1800 [29], AiSeg [1], FVS [11], Face Synthetics [31], and HumanSeg14K [7] as the most widespread and predominantly containing photos of people from the waist up. Tab. 1 provides the numerical analysis of reviewed datasets.

Content. Chosen datasets can be divided into three groups in terms of image source: 1) downloaded from websites, 2) collected manually, and 3) generated.

The last two allow the data authors to directly determine content on their own. Images of EG1800 and AiSeg were collected from services like Flickr, which made their scenes multi-domain. The Face Synthetics dataset was completely generated, entailing primarily blurred backgrounds, and thus far from in the wild. The manually collected FVS [11] and PP-HumanSeg14 [7] portrait segmentation datasets are single-domain with a bias towards videoconferencing. The FVS dataset provides composite images from 10 conference-style green-screen videos and virtual backgrounds. As a result, FVS samples suffer from the remaining green screen around a person in the frame. The PP-HumanSeg14 dataset includes 23 different conference backgrounds and samples of participants performing actions such as waving hands and drinking water. The provided samples contain one or more labeled people with faces blurred for privacy.

Annotation. Since segmentation mask annotation is one of the most challenging problems in the computer vision field, data authors prefer automatic methods. All reviewed datasets except PP-HumanSeg14K were annotated automatically or using Photoshop (see Fig. 5 in the supplementary material for visual examples). Such methods frequently produce coarse masks that prevent accurate high-frequency parts segmentation (e.g., hair) – one of the main hardships of background removal in video conferencing.

2.2 Face Parsing Datasets

The face parsing task aims to assign pixel-level semantic labels for facial images. Generally, face parsing refers to classifying image pixels, such as brows, eyes, nose, lips, mouth, and skin. We considered several widespread face parsing datasets for our purposes (Tab. 1 and Fig. 6 in the supplementary material).

Content. The main limitation of existing face parsing datasets’ content is low diversity in head poses and the absence of specific occlusions. Such limitation is obtained by utilizing other datasets or websites like Flickr, as Helen’s [12] authors performed. They searched for “portrait” in various languages to avoid cultural bias, and manually filtered out low-quality and false positive images. The CelebAMask-HQ dataset [13] mainly contains front-facing images of celebrities from Celeba [20] with centered heads. Besides, the faces are usually occupy a significant part of the image, thus background information is mainly discarded. The LaPa dataset [19] was designed based on images from the 300W-LP [35] and Megaface [30] datasets. Received faces were aligned and mostly cropped with limited background information preserved. This image collection method was also utilized to create the iBugMask dataset [18] containing samples from Helen’s training set. The iBugMask authors focused on head pose diversity and augmented images with a synthetic rotation algorithm from 3DFFA [9], which led to huge artifacts. The Face Synthetics dataset was specifically diversified during generation by various head poses, human identities, clothes, and such occlusions as eyeglasses and face masks.

Annotation. Since the face parsing annotation process is more challenging than portrait segmentation, the data is frequently marked manually or automatically with further refining. Also, annotations of existing datasets were received

by inappropriate annotation rules, which prevented their usage due to our data limitations. First, almost all reviewed datasets relate beard to skin class and nostrils to nose class. Second, some contain glasses as skin and others – annotate transparent glasses as non-transparent ones. Such factors made the skin enhancement task impossible due to further artifacts. Finally, none of them contain separate annotations for teeth. There are other difficulties and features related to concrete ones:

- LFW-PL [10] is limited to only 3 classes (background, face, hair), which unsuitable for solving our specific problems.
- Helen’s [12] 2,330 facial images were annotated by facial part landmarks utilizing Amazon Mechanical Truck, and then masks were generated automatically. The LaPa’s [19] authors pointed out Helen’s annotation errors.
- CelebAMask-HQ [13] ignored occlusions on its own, however, the authors [33] solved this problem with the dataset extension – FaceOcc. It contains images from CelebAMask-HQ and is annotated with only one class – occlusions (eyeglasses, tongue, makeup, and others). Regardless, FaceOcc includes a beard to the skin class. We are considered FaceOcc as CelebAMask-HQ with FaceOcc.
- The iBugMask [18] contains many persons with annotated masks for only one of them.

The mentioned datasets are inappropriate for our task due to the described and other problems such as low-resolution images, limited subject quantity, privacy concerns, and poor annotation quality. In addition to general shortcomings, other datasets lack video-conferencing domain-specific characteristics like task-specific occlusions and situations, various head poses, and domain context scenes. Inspired by the above and the necessity for an appropriate dataset for video conference apps due to its widespread use, we created a new dataset, EasyPortrait, with face parsing and portrait segmentation annotations simultaneously. We intentionally diversified the EasyPortrait by head poses, subjects, scenes, subjects’ attributes such as ethnicity, and their occlusions (glasses, beards, piercing, etc.). It was annotated by all required classes for our applications, with specific rules for the skin class and occlusions especially (Tab. 4 in the supplementary material).

3 EasyPortrait Dataset

We have created a high-resolution image dataset, EasyPortrait, which contains portrait segmentation and face parsing annotations for each of 40,000 samples. This part provides our dataset creation pipeline overview, the dataset characteristics, and its splitting.

3.1 Image Collection & Labeling

Two crowdsourcing platforms, Yandex Toloka (for low-price labor) and ABC Elementary (for high-quality workers), were chosen for all stages of dataset cre-

ation. Our pipeline consists of two main stages: (1) the image collection stage, which is followed by validation completely realized on Yandex Toloka, and (2) the mask creation stage, which was accomplished on both platforms. At each stage, the responses of low-skilled workers were subjected to our quality control methods. A more detailed description is provided below.

Image Collection. The crowd workers’ task was to take a selfie or a photo of themselves in front of the computer. As we aimed to design a diverse dataset in terms of occlusions, races, and head turns and make it suitable to solve teeth whitening problems, one of the further conditions periodically supplemented the task:

- Occlusions. The sent photo should contain one of such characteristics as hands in front of the face, glasses, the tongue out, headphones, or hats.
- Head turns. The head on the sent photo should be turned in any direction at various angles.
- Teeth whitening. Random workers were asked to send photos with open mouths.
- Ethnicity. We recognized the significance of having a diverse dataset of facial images and ensured participation of individuals from various countries.

Note that all workers have signed a document on the consent to the photo publication before starting the tasks and have been notified of how the data will be used (see Fig. 7 in the supplementary material).

Image Collection Quality Check. We foresaw the possible dishonesty of the crowdworkers and checked all images for duplicates by image hash comparison. The image collection quality check also includes image validation, where images are reviewed for compliance with conditions such as the distinctness of the face, the head being entirely in the frame, and the clarity of the frame. Validation stage was available to crowdworkers only after training and examination tasks. Each image was checked from 3 to 5 times by different users for at least 80% confidence.

Image Labeling. The annotation of portrait segmentation usually has several ambiguous instances, such as occlusions in front of the person, hand-held items, hats, headphones, hair, and others. Face parsing masks are also unclear because of occlusions in front of the face, including tongue, hair, eyeglasses, beard, etc. The annotation rules directly affect the final segmentation masks and the model trained on them. Rules for annotating each class and processing occlusions for workers are given in Tab. 4 in the supplementary material.

The labeling stage was divided into parts to simplify the annotation process for the workers. All images received after the collection stage were gradually sent to the annotation of individual pairs of classes: person and background, skin and occlusions (which include such things as eyeglasses, beard, tongue out, and others), eyes and brows, lips and teeth. The crowdsourcing platform’s interface asks the worker to draw the polygons for the proposed instruction pair. After labeling, we separated the overall masks of eyes and brows into left and right ones using heuristics. Fig. 2 visualizes the mask creation stages.




Fig. 2: Example of data collection pipeline. The image was annotated with individual pair classes by 5 crowd workers. The masks are averaged with the expert-verified one and merged to obtain the final segmentation mask.

Image Labeling Quality Check. We required all workers to complete training tasks for each pair to enhance mask quality. We analyzed crowd workers’ quality in training by automatically comparing masks from expert workers under our control.

We requested ABC Elementary’s qualified workers to label each image with the subsequent verification by the platform’s experts. Due to distrust in the platform’s experts, whom we did not control, and the lack of qualified annotators to provide overlap only through them, we incorporated low-skilled annotators into the pipeline with an overlap of 5. Thus, each pair of each main image was annotated by 5 crowd workers for subsequent averaging and getting the best result. Segmentation masks were created from polygons for each annotation. We aggregated all 5 markups to one segmentation mask (see bottom of the Fig. 2), checked IoU (Intersection over Union), and compared it to a unique threshold, selected for each pair manually⁴. Then, we averaged the received aggregated mask with verified one with weights of 0.3 and 0.7, respectively.

Mask Merging. Whole masks were received by the alternate overlay of masks in the following order: person, face skin, left brow, right brow, left eye, right eye, lips, and teeth.

In addition, the decision to release the dataset to the public and ethical reasons prompted us to add the filtration stage to the end of the pipeline – checking for children under 18, naked people, religious signs, and watermarks.

⁴ The thresholds were chosen by comparing crowd workers’ masks with corresponding experts’ masks from training tasks. Based on this comparison, we determined a threshold for each pair to ensure a qualitative visual result.




Fig. 3: Image resolution, brightness, subjects, and class separability analysis. a) image resolution distribution: samples overlap with equal transparency and density reveals quantity; b), c), d) image distribution by subjects in train, validation, and test sets, respectively (each bar represents the count of images recorded by a particular subject group); e) subjects’ countries distribution; f) subjects’ devices: only smartphones, personal computers, and tablets were used while recording; g) brightness distribution; h) mask area distribution.

3.2 Dataset Characteristics

The mean and standard deviation of images in EasyPortrait are $[0.562, 0.521, 0.497]$ and $[0.236, 0.236, 0.232]$, respectively.

Classes. EasyPortrait is annotated with 9 classes, including “background”, “person”, “face skin”, “left brow”, “right brow”, “left eye”, “right eye”, “lips”, and “teeth”. We extracted all occlusions, such as glasses, hair, hands, etc., from the skin. The beard is extracted from the skin if it is clearly defined (refer to Fig. 10 in the supplementary material for details). However, such parts of a person as headphones, car belts, and others are included in the person class to facilitate background removal and streamline the data annotation process. Nevertheless, EasyPortrait is in the process of annotation with new classes, including mouth, hair, headphones, glasses, earrings, nose, hat, neck, and beard.

Diversity. The proposed dataset contains images with such scenes as an office, living room, kitchen, bedroom, outdoors, car, cafe, etc. Samples in the dataset display various clothes, hats, headphones, and medical masks (see Fig. 9 in the supplementary material for examples). They are also diverse in lighting conditions, subjects’ age, gender, and poses. Almost all images contain only one person, which is especially common at meetings through video conferencing services. We also collected images from regions such as Africa, Asia, India, and Europe, giving us approximate region and ethnic diversity (see Fig. 3e). Furthermore, some individuals in the pictures display emotions, such as smiling, expressing anger, sticking their tongue out, being surprise, and others.

Images Resolution. Most images, namely 38,353, in EasyPortrait are FullHD: the maximum side is 1,920, and the minimum side is in the range of 835 to 1,920

(Fig. 3a). The minimal resolution is 720×720 . Fig. 3h shows the dataset’s samples’ mask area distribution.

Dataset Quality. We analyzed the number of points per image for each class since images were labeled by polygons. On average, each EasyPortrait image has 655 points, from which it can be concluded that the annotation is of high quality. In comparison, Helen [12] was annotated only with 194 points per image and LaPa [19] with 106. Fig. 8 in the supplementary material provided visual mask details. An essential part of the images was annotated with the utmost carefulness.

3.3 Dataset Splitting

All annotated images were divided into training, validation, and testing sets, with 30,000, 4,000, and 6,000 samples, respectively. Training images were received from 4,398 unique users, while validation and testing images were collected from 3,468 and 6,000 unique users, accordingly (see Fig. 3b-d). Note that the test set has the maximum amount of unique users, as we aimed to make it the most subject-diverse. It is also worth mentioning that subjects from all three sets are not intersecting, eliminating any possibility of data leakage. In addition, we added the anonymized user ID hash to the annotation file. It can be used for manual dataset splitting into train, test, and validation subsets.

4 Ablation Study

An ablation study was conducted to evaluate the influence of the dataset’s primary characteristics. We examined the requirement for data volume and variability in head poses in our dataset by modifying these attributes, training the models, and then comparing the results with those achieved using the original dataset. In the ablation study, we utilized BiSeNetv2 [34], FPN [17], FCN [21], and Segformer-B0 [32] for portrait segmentation and face parsing tasks. Validation and test sets remain unchanged in all ablation experiments.

Quantitative Necessity. To evaluate the impact of data quantity, we trained selected models using varying training set sizes: 30,000 (original), 20,000, 10,000, and 5,000 images. The deterministic slice was used for a train set expansion, i.e., images in the $n[i]$ set are included in the $n[i+1]$ set. The ablation study results are provided in Fig. 4. The quantitative necessity experiments revealed an increase in metrics as the size of the training set expanded. Both portrait segmentation and face parsing metrics show an increase with the expansion of the training set size, however the portrait segmentation improvement is less prominent than the face parsing results.

Pose-Diversity Necessity. We also assess the importance of the head pose by varying pose diversity in 10,000 training images. We obtained the head pose coefficients (yaw and pitch) for each image in the dataset using 3DDFA network [9]. For both of these coefficients, we chose three coefficient windows from homogeneous to heterogeneous pose distribution: $[-7.5; 7.5]$, $[-15; 15]$ $[-200;$




Fig. 4: The impact visualization of such dataset characteristics as a) sample amount, b) head pose diversity (both for face parsing), and c) sample amount for portrait segmentation task. Solid lines correspond to models trained and tested on the EasyPortrait dataset, whereas the dotted line is the model pretrained on the EasyPortrait and tested on other datasets (see the legend for details). We evaluated all the datasets discussed in Sec. 5.2; however, for datasets without significant metric changes, we did not create visualizations. Note that all the plots have different scales.

200]. Reducing head pose heterogeneity results in declining face parsing metrics (Fig. 4). Variations in head rotations do not significantly impact portrait segmentation metrics; therefore, we did not include a plot for these experiments.

Cross-Dataset Ablation study. We also conducted an additional set of experiments: we trained the FPN model on the EasyPortrait dataset with changes in data diversity and then evaluated the model on other face parsing and portrait segmentation test sets, mentioned in Sec. 5.2.

Alterations in data quantity and variations in head pose diversity have minimal impact on portrait segmentation results, while face parsing an increase in data diversity positively influences the model’s metrics (Fig. 4). On average, head pose diversity tends to have a more significant impact on results across other datasets than data quantity changes.

5 Experiments

The main goal of extensive base experiments is to demonstrate that the dataset has the ability to train models, achieving concurrent results without the need to simulate facial occlusion or pose variations (as in [19] and [18], respectively). For this reason, we chose various models for our base experiments. We evaluate the models’ quality via the mean Intersection-over-Union (mIoU) metric [22].

5.1 Base Experiments

Separation on Two Tracks. We split our experiments into two tracks – portrait segmentation and face parsing – to transparently compare EasyPortrait with other datasets separately. This division is also necessary to avoid ambiguity and ensure the obtained metrics are representative of both tasks. The portrait segmentation is based on two EasyPortrait classes (“background” and “person”), whereas the face parsing masks include eight classes (“background”,

Table 2: Evaluation results on the EasyPortrait. Column “mIoU” is divided into two subcolumns: face parsing and portrait segmentation tasks. For face parsing, we present mIoU metrics for each class separately, while for portrait segmentation, we provide only the overall mIoU score. We additionally trained FPN and Segformer-B0 on 224 × 224, 512 × 512, and 1024 × 1024 resolutions to demonstrate the overall increasing tendency amongst both convolutional and transformer models depending on increasing resolution.

Model	Input Size	Model Size (MB)	FPS	mIoU									
				Face Parsing								PS	
				skin	l-eye	r-eye	l-brow	r-brow	lips	teeth	overall	overall	
BiSeNetv2 [34]	384	56.5	91.47	90.75	71.94	72.57	67.67	67.53	80.87	63.09	76.72	97.95	
SegFormer-B0 [32]		14.19	72.45	92.05	78.55	79.26	72.5	72.21	83.53	73.52	81.38	98.61	
FCN + MobileNetv2 [21]		31.17	66.07	90.49	69.95	70.63	66.29	66.09	79.23	59.84	75.23	98.19	
FPN + ResNet50 [17]		108.91	58.1	92.28	79.48	80.08	72.64	72.47	84.15	74.09	81.83	98.64	
DeepLabv3 [6]		260.02	25.65	91.77	73.78	74.63	69.61	69.74	83.42	70.53	79.11	98.63	
Fast SCNN [27]		6.13	93.89	88.58	58.42	58.7	58.68	58.87	73.16	44.86	67.56	97.64	
DANet [8]		190.29	42.43	91.8	74.01	74.93	70.01	69.75	83.7	70.8	79.3	98.63	
EHANet [24]		44.81	132.78	89.68	68.87	69.26	63.6	63.82	73.98	52.05	72.56	-	
SINet [25]		0.13	134.18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93.32	
ExtremeC3Net [26]		0.15	71.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96.54	
SegFormer-B0	224	14.9	74.84	90.19	68.59	70.46	65.79	65.72	77.94	60.66	74.83	98.17	
FPN + ResNet50		108.91	61.56	90.6	69.67	71.88	65.84	65.64	78.94	62.95	75.6	98.31	
SegFormer-B0	512	14.9	65.88	92.5	81.03	81.18	74.31	74.08	84.87	78.14	83.19	98.66	
FPN + ResNet50		108.91	53.14	92.55	81.55	81.47	74.33	74.38	85.27	77.77	83.33	98.64	
SegFormer-B0	1024	14.9	62.9	93.13	84.2	83.97	76.41	76.12	86.88	83.2	85.42	98.74	
FPN + ResNet50		108.91	52.34	92.94	84.55	84.24	76.11	76.11	86.93	82.62	85.37	98.54	

“skin”, “left brow”, “right brow”, “left eye”, “right eye”, “lips” and “teeth”). For portrait segmentation, we defined all classes of EasyPortrait except the background as a person, while for face parsing, we designated the person class as the background. The model configuration and training process are identical for both tasks, except for the number of classes in the decoder model’s head.

Models. We prioritized lightweight architectures for easy integration into videoconferencing apps, enabling real-time use. As general segmentation architectures, we selected BiSeNetv2 [34], DeepLabv3 [6], FPN [17], FCN [21], DANet [8], and Fast SCNN [27] models. We utilized Segformer-B0 [32] to assess the performance of the transformer model on the proposed dataset. Besides the aforementioned widespread segmentation architectures, we also experimented with models specifically designed for portrait segmentation and face parsing. For this purpose, we chose the SINet [25] and ExtremeC3Net [26] for the first one and EHANet [24] model for the second.

We trained each of these networks for 100 epochs with batch size 32. AdamW [23] was used as an optimizer and learning rate with the initial value of 0.0002. The learning rate changes according to the polynomial learning rate scheduler with factor 1.0 by default.

Augmentations and Images Resolution. Images and segmentation masks were resized to the maximum side of 384 with aspect ratio preservation and symmetrically padded to square. We used bilinear interpolation for image resizing, while nearest neighbor interpolation was applied to masks to maintain consistency among classes. At last, photometric distortion was used with a brightness

delta of 16, a contrast in the range [0.5, 1.0], saturation in the range [0.5, 1.0], and a hue delta of 5.

The results of our experiments are presented in the Tab. 2. All the models trained on our dataset achieve high metrics, with the FPN model outperforming others in face parsing and portrait segmentation tasks.

5.2 Cross-Dataset Evaluation

We conduct cross-dataset evaluation to compare our dataset with existing ones in 2 domains – face parsing and portrait segmentation.

Experiments Configuration. We train the FPN model for two segmentation tasks on each dataset. All datasets’ samples were exposed to resizing to fixed 384×384 shape and base augmentations pipeline described in Sec. 5.1. The training process and model configuration are the same as the base experiments for both tasks.

Portrait Segmentation. Besides our dataset, the model was trained and tested on HumanSeg14K [7], Face Synthetics [31], and FVS [11] portrait segmentation datasets. We couldn’t include the EG-1800 [29] and the AiSeg [1] datasets due to a lack of images on the public shared sources and inappropriate samples, respectively.

Some preprocessing steps were applied to each of the datasets:

- We led the EasyPortrait’s class “person” to a consistent appearance by labeling others classes (without “background”) as “person” class.
- FVS [11] is announced as a segmentation dataset; however, the provided masks are not binary, so we binarize them. We found out that pixel values are mostly scattered near 0 or 255; therefore, the average threshold of 127 was chosen to separate the “person” and “background” classes. The original dataset has been split into 1,326 training and 935 testing samples. We randomly sampled 200 images from the training set to design the validation.
- HumanSeg14K [7] dataset was divided into the training, validation, and test parts with 8,770, 2,431, and 2,482 samples, respectively.
- Similar to EasyPortrait’s preprocessing, we prepared the Face Synthetics [7] dataset to portrait segmentation masks. We randomly picked 75,000 training, 15,000 testing, and 10,000 validation samples.

Face Parsing. As far as the EasyPortrait skin class was annotated by the unique rules and most face parsing datasets are not annotated with the teeth class, we selected only 6 classes for cross-data evaluation: “background”, “left brow”, “right brow”, “left eye”, “right eye”, “lips”. We adopted the original annotations of face parsing datasets to the target ones:

- Such EasyPortrait classes as “teeth”, “person” and “skin” classes were mapped to the “background”.
- Since lips of the CelebAMask-HQ dataset are divided into two classes: “lower lip” and “upper lip”, we combined them into one “lips” class. The remaining classes are considered as background. All datasets below were preprocessed

Table 3: Cross-dataset evaluation results. Each cell value contains mean (among classes) IoU metrics for the corresponding training and testing sets pair. Train (test) average mIoU represents the overall mean IoU value on the listed testing (training) sets. There is a direct relationship between the high train average mIoU metric and the dataset’s generalization ability to other distributions. The low test average mIoU metric value reflects the dataset’s complexity, as a model pre-trained on a different training set struggles to achieve a high metric. This metric indicates the dataset’s suitability as a benchmark for face parsing or portrait segmentation tasks. We highlighted the best metric in each column to emphasize the dataset’s ability to generalize to other distributions. The best metric in all columns except the last one was chosen, excluding diagonal values. (upper table) The FPN model, trained on the EasyPortrait dataset for portrait segmentation, achieves state-of-the-art results and surpasses FVS results even on their own test set. (lower table) Despite the limited videoconferencing domain, we achieved concurrent results in the face parsing task.

Portrait Segmentation							
		Tested					
Dataset		EasyPortrait (ours)	FVS	HumanSeg14K	Face Synthetics	Train avg. mIoU	
Trained	EasyPortrait (ours)	98.64	97.86	93.18	97.76	96.86	
	FVS [11]	79.05	96.24	90.6	80.36	86.56	
	HumanSeg14K [7]	76.01	96.23	97.53	71.66	85.35	
	Face Synthetics [31]	84.99	57.14	57.87	99.44	74.86	
	Test avg. mIoU	84.67	86.87	84.8	87.31		
Face Parsing							
		Tested					
Dataset		EasyPortrait (ours)	CelebAMask-HQ	iBugMask	Face Synthetics	LaPa	Train avg. mIoU
Trained	EasyPortrait (ours)	81.51	76.01	39.0	51.2	61.03	61.75
	CelebAMask-HQ [13]	66.17	83.41	54.74	46.6	60.62	62.31
	iBugMask [18]	61.58	79.1	64.59	44.42	66.3	63.19
	Face Synthetics [31]	55.55	40.67	18.84	83.12	42.63	48.16
	LaPa [19]	68.56	73.92	47.66	48.05	79.02	63.44
	Test avg. mIoU	66.67	70.62	44.97	54.68	61.92	

in the same way as CelebAMask-HQ [13]. We divided the CelebAMask-HQ dataset into 22,500 training, 3,000 validation, and 4,500 test samples.

- The LaPa [19] dataset was originally split into 18,167 training, 2,000 validation, and 2,000 test samples.
- Originally, images from iBugMask [18] were split into 21,866 training and 1,000 testing examples. The validation set was randomly sampled from the training set and contains 1,866 images. Note that iBugMask [18] contains images with a bounding box for the face in the provided mask. To avoid parsing other faces, we crop them as described in the original paper.
- The Face Synthetics dataset was distributed into 75,000 training, 10,000 validation, and 15,000 test samples by us.

Results. The cross-dataset evaluation results in Tab. 3 demonstrate that the EasyPortrait has the best generalization capability regarding mIoU metrics on each portrait segmentation test set. Due to the reduced list of classes, the quantitative assessment provides limited insights into the dataset’s applicability for

the face parsing task. Besides, our domain is slightly limited⁵, which prevented achieving more optimistic results.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a large-scale image dataset for portrait segmentation and face parsing tasks. It consists of 40,000 photos of ordinary people predominantly indoors, and each image is provided with a 9-classes high-quality semantic mask. Our dataset can be used in several beautification and segmentation tasks, such as background removal, face skin enhancement, and teeth whitening, which can improve user experience in video conferencing apps. We provide extensive experiments on different models and cross-dataset comparisons for both described tasks. We also conducted an ablation study revealing the importance of such dataset characteristics as data quantity and head pose diversity for training a precise and robust model. For future work, we plan to add several occlusions to the annotation and improve the dataset by including additional classes, such as mouth, hair, headphones, glasses, earrings, nose, hat, neck, and beard.

References

1. AISeg. https://github.com/aisegmentcn/matting_human_datasets (2019) 3, 12, 1
2. 10 video conferencing trends enhanced by face ar technology. <https://www.banuba.com/blog/10-video-conferencing-trends-enhanced-by-face-ar-technology> (2020) 1
3. Persons Labeled. <https://ecosystem.supervise.ly/projects/persons> (2020) 3
4. How video tech can bring us closer than ever. <https://inlnk.ru/Vo8ydV> (2023) 1
5. There’s a filter on zoom you can use to look better on video calls while working from home. <https://www.businessinsider.com/zoom-video-conferencing-filter-touch-up-work-from-home-coronavirus-2020-3?international=true&r=US&IR=T> (2023) 1
6. Chen, L.C., Papandreou, G., Schroff, F., Adam, H.: Rethinking atrous convolution for semantic image segmentation (2017) 11
7. Chu, L., Liu, Y., Wu, Z., Tang, S., Chen, G., Hao, Y., Peng, J., Yu, Z., Chen, Z., Lai, B., Xiong, H.: Pp-humansseg: Connectivity-aware portrait segmentation with a large-scale teleconferencing video dataset. 2022 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision Workshops (WACVW) pp. 202–209 (2021) 3, 4, 12, 13
8. Fu, J., Liu, J., Tian, H., Li, Y., Bao, Y., Fang, Z., Lu, H.: Dual attention network for scene segmentation (2019) 11
9. Guo, J., Zhu, X., Lei, Z.: 3ddfa. <https://github.com/cleardusk/3DDFA> (2018) 4, 9, 3

⁵ Images in other datasets are more heterogeneous in context, displaying multiple people and different activities. EasyPortrait consistently shows a single person in front of a computer or phone.

10. Kae, A., Sohn, K., Lee, H., Learned-Miller, E.G.: Augmenting crfs with boltzmann machine shape priors for image labeling. 2013 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition pp. 2019–2026 (2013) [3](#), [5](#), [1](#)
11. Kuang, Z., Tie, X.: Flow-based video segmentation for human head and shoulders. ArXiv [abs/2104.09752](#) (2021) [3](#), [4](#), [12](#), [13](#)
12. Le, V., Brandt, J., Lin, Z.L., Bourdev, L.D., Huang, T.S.: Interactive facial feature localization. In: European Conference on Computer Vision (2012) [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [9](#)
13. Lee, C.H., Liu, Z., Wu, L., Luo, P.: Maskgan: Towards diverse and interactive facial image manipulation. 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) pp. 5548–5557 (2019) [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [13](#)
14. Li, J., Ma, S., Zhang, J., Tao, D.: Privacy-preserving portrait matting. Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia (2021) [3](#)
15. Liang, J., Zeng, H., Cui, M., Xie, X., Zhang, L.: Ppr10k: A large-scale portrait photo retouching dataset with human-region mask and group-level consistency. 2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) pp. 653–661 (2021) [3](#)
16. Lin, S., Ryabtsev, A., Sengupta, S., Curless, B., Seitz, S.M., Kemelmacher-Shlizerman, I.: Real-time high-resolution background matting. 2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) pp. 8758–8767 (2020) [3](#)
17. Lin, T.Y., Dollár, P., Girshick, R., He, K., Hariharan, B., Belongie, S.: Feature pyramid networks for object detection (2017) [9](#), [11](#)
18. Lin, Y., Shen, J., Wang, Y., Pantic, M.: Roi tanh-polar transformer network for face parsing in the wild. Image Vis. Comput. **112**, 104190 (2021) [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [10](#), [13](#)
19. Liu, Y., Shi, H., Shen, H., Si, Y., Wang, X., Mei, T.: A new dataset and boundary-attention semantic segmentation for face parsing. In: AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (2020) [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [9](#), [10](#), [13](#)
20. Liu, Z., Luo, P., Wang, X., Tang, X.: Deep learning face attributes in the wild (December 2015) [4](#)
21. Long, J., Shelhamer, E., Darrell, T.: Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation. 2015 Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) **3431–3440** (2014) [9](#), [11](#)
22. Long, J., Shelhamer, E., Darrell, T.: Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation (2015) [10](#)
23. Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F.: Decoupled weight decay regularization. 2019 The International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) [abs/1711.05101](#) (2017) [11](#)
24. Luo, L., Xue, D., Feng, X.: Ehanet: An effective hierarchical aggregation network for face parsing. Applied Sciences **10**(9), 3135 (2020) [11](#)
25. Park, H., Sjöstrand, L.L., Monet, N., Yoo, Y., Kwak, N.: Sinet: Extreme lightweight portrait segmentation networks with spatial squeeze modules and information blocking decoder. arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09099 (2019) [11](#)
26. Park, H., Sjöstrand, L.L., Yoo, Y., Kwak, N.: Extremec3net: Extreme lightweight portrait segmentation networks using advanced c3-modules. arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03093 (2019) [11](#)
27. Poudel, R.P.K., Liwicki, S., Cipolla, R.: Fast-scnn: Fast semantic segmentation network (2019) [11](#)
28. Sander, E.L.J.: Coronavirus could spark a revolution in working from home: Are we ready? The conversation (2020) [1](#)

29. Shen, X., Hertzmann, A., Jia, J., Paris, S., Price, B.L., Shechtman, E., Sachs, I.: Automatic portrait segmentation for image stylization. *Computer Graphics Forum* **35** (2016) [3](#), [12](#)
30. Taherkhani, F., Nasrabadi, N.M., Dawson, J.: A deep face identification network enhanced by facial attributes prediction (2018) [4](#)
31. Wood, E., Baltruvsaitis, T., Hewitt, C., Dziadzio, S., Johnson, M., Estellers, V., Cashman, T.J., Shotton, J.: Fake it till you make it: face analysis in the wild using synthetic data alone. 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) pp. 3661–3671 (2021) [3](#), [12](#), [13](#), [1](#)
32. Xie, E., Wang, W., Yu, Z., Anandkumar, A., Álvarez, J.M., Luo, P.: Segformer: Simple and efficient design for semantic segmentation with transformers. In: *Neural Information Processing Systems* (2021) [9](#), [11](#)
33. Yin, X., Chen, L.L.: Faceocc: A diverse, high-quality face occlusion dataset for human face extraction. *ArXiv* [abs/2201.08425](#) (2022) [3](#), [5](#), [1](#)
34. Yu, C., Wang, J., Peng, C., Gao, C., Yu, G., Sang, N.: Bisenet: Bilateral segmentation network for real-time semantic segmentation. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision* (2018) [9](#), [11](#)
35. Zhu, X., Liu, X., Lei, Z., Li, S.Z.: Face alignment in full pose range: A 3d total solution. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* (2017) [4](#)

A Supplementary material




Fig. 5: Visual comparison of existing portrait segmentation datasets. One can notice high-frequency details (e.g. hair) in segmentation masks in samples from our dataset. The AiSeg [1] dataset is not considered since it provides the extracted foreground images without corresponding annotation mask.




Fig. 6: Visual comparison of existing face parsing datasets. Only Face Synthetics [31] and EasyPortrait datasets can be used to solve background removal and face enhancement problems. None of them except EasyPortrait can be used in the teeth whitening task. We don't include LFW-PL [10] and FaceOcc [33] datasets in the visualization due to the lack of classes and the need for preprocessing, respectively.

Instructions

Description

Take a **ONE** picture of yourself according to the condition on the task page.

Rules:

- Photo should be in **landscape** orientation!
- Photo should be **not blurry**.
- The photo requirements are listed on the **task page**.
- The distance to the camera is from 0.5m to 2m*.
- The head and hair should be completely in the frame**
- Photos not taken on camera, but selected from the Internet (including a template) are not accepted!!!**

* - A specific value of the distance to the camera can be specified in the task.

Validation:

The task is considered to be completed correctly if it meets all the requirements. Otherwise, the task is **REJECTED!**

Important!

Delayed acceptance is set in the task.

All data you sent can be used for training neural networks and public projects to create open and/or free software (Open Source) under the modified CC (Creative Commons) license.

Close

Fig. 7: Example of instruction for the task with notification of further use of data for training neural networks.



Fig. 8: Examples of facial details in the EasyPortrait dataset. Samples contain many different facial expressions, with open and closed mouth, with or without teeth shown. Note that obstacles in front of the face (like glasses and a cigarette) are annotated as a class "person".

Table 4: EasyPortrait annotators rules. Visual examples are provided in Fig. 8.

Class	Rules
Person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> headphones and things in front of the person are defined as a person's class individual hairs and all empty areas closed by a person are not included in the person class
Eyebrows	stand out along a strict border, excluding individual hairs
Eyes	distinguished by whites, excluding eyelids and eyelashes
Skin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the skin class should affect only skin without hair, eyes, and other face attributes the boundaries of the skin of the face or person should be highlighted logically on overexposed or darkened photos the rare bristle also considered skin ears, second chin, and nostrils are not included in the skin class
Teeth	teeth and everything else in the open mouth stand out separately, the latter as an occlusion
Occlusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makeups and piercing are defined as occlusions the part of eyeglasses, which cover skin, should be annotated as occlusion, including sunglasses and glare on clear glasses beard with a strict border are considered occlusion the tongue out of the mouth should be annotated as occlusion




Fig. 9: Samples from EasyPortrait dataset. Note that images have different orientation and height-width ratio. Some of the pictures are overexposed, while other are underexposed.



Fig. 10: Visualization of the beard annotation rules. (up) The beard is included in the skin if it is a separate hair or barely noticeable. (bottom) The beard is excluded from the skin if it is clear.




Fig. 11: Head turns distributions for several face parsing and portrait segmentation datasets, including EasyPortrait. Yaw and pitch coefficients were obtained via 3DDFA network [9].