
FACE RECOGNITION USING SYNTHETIC FACE DATA

Omer Granoviter
omer.granoviter@datagen.tech

Alexey Gruzdev
alexey.gruzdev@datagen.tech

Vladimir Loginov
vladimir.loginov@datagen.tech

Max Kogan
max.kogan@datagen.tech

Orly Zvitia
orly.zvitia@datagen.tech



Figure 1: Example of randomly sampled 320 identities from the 30,000 used in the research. Our pipeline enables granular control of almost everything in the scene (e.g., pose, accessories, background, light, hair, eyebrows, eyes).

ABSTRACT

In the field of deep learning applied to face recognition, securing large-scale, high-quality datasets is vital for attaining precise and reliable results. However, amassing significant volumes of high-quality real data faces hurdles such as time limitations, financial burdens, and privacy issues. Furthermore, prevalent datasets are often impaired by racial biases and annotation inaccuracies. In this paper, we underscore the promising application of synthetic data, generated through rendering digital faces via our computer graphics pipeline, in achieving competitive results with the state-of-the-art on synthetic data across multiple benchmark datasets. By finetuning the model, we obtain results that rival those achieved when training with hundreds of thousands of real images (98.7% on LFW [1]). We further investigate the contribution of adding intra-class variance factors (e.g., makeup, accessories, haircuts) on model performance. Finally, we reveal the sensitivity of pre-trained face recognition models to alternating specific parts of the face by leveraging the granular control capability in our platform.

1 Introduction

Modern face recognition architectures [2, 3, 4, 5] have demonstrated exceptional performance on benchmark face recognition test sets such as Labeled Faces in the Wild (LFW) [1] and Celebrities in Frontal-Profile in the Wild (CFP-FP) [6], achieving accuracy as high as 99.85% and 99.5%, respectively. Despite these impressive results, the main challenge for developing state-of-the-art (SOTA) industrial-ready applications does not necessarily lie in refining the algorithms but rather in obtaining relevant and large-scale datasets.

Publicly available datasets satisfy conditions such as pose variability, image quality conditions, lightning condi-

tions, and accessories. However, many of these datasets have been retracted [7] (e.g., VGGFace [8], MS1M [9], MegaFace[10]) rendering the remaining datasets scarce. The datasets still available are limited by several factors.

Privacy and Ethical Concerns: The collection and use of facial images raise numerous privacy and ethical issues, which must be carefully addressed to comply with data protection regulations and ensure the responsible use of face recognition technology.

Data bias: Real-world datasets often suffer from imbalanced distributions of different demographic attributes or environmental conditions (e.g, camera orientations, light conditions). This can lead to biased models that perform

poorly on underrepresented ethnic, age or gender groups or challenging scenarios[11].

Annotation Quality: The accuracy of face recognition systems relies heavily on the quality of the annotations in the training dataset. Essentially, each class must contain only additional images from the same identity. Manual annotation is a time-consuming and labor-intensive process that may introduce errors or biases that can adversely affect the performance of the resulting models.

These limitations call for an alternative method of procuring data. In this article, we show that the usage of 3D rendered synthetic faces via the Datagen face generation platform [12, 13, 14], can outperform recent GAN methods [15, 16] and produce comparable results to those achieved via 3D synthetic data pipelines [17].

The structure of this paper is as follows: In Section 2, we discuss previous related work. In Section 3, we provide details about the dataset generation and training paradigms for all our experiments. Section 4 presents our experiments and the results associated with each experiment. In Section 5, we discuss the results and their broader implications. Finally, in Section 6, we outline potential future work that we believe is necessary in the domain of synthetic-based face recognition to further boost current performance.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- Our model attains results that are on par with the current state-of-the-art, and by leveraging the granular control our platform offers, we demonstrate the significance of intra-class variance. This is achieved by incorporating 3D rendered assets such as hats, makeup, object occlusions, hand occlusions, haircuts, and hair color changes, which contribute to the overall accuracy of our model.
- We illustrate that by using a limited number of real images and identities, our model can achieve results comparable to those obtained by models trained on hundreds of thousands of real images. Specifically, we obtain an accuracy of 98.7% on LFW [1], whereas the current real-data SOTA is 99.86% for LFW (see Table 2).
- We highlight how controlled data generation can contribute to a better understanding of the essential features for effective face-recognition algorithms. Specifically, we provide evidence of the importance of varied eyebrows by subsampling a small number of eyebrows from our dataset and showing that models trained on real data are highly susceptible to eyebrow structure variations.



Figure 2: Example of the variability in our dataset for six different identities (a row per identity). Intra-class variance is enhanced by different assets (occlusions, hats, makeup, glasses, facial hair, hair color, hair-cut) as well as the varied poses, background and lighting conditions.

2 Related Work

Publicly released real faces datasets. Publicly available datasets satisfy conditions such as pose variability, image quality conditions, lightning conditions, and accessories. Current available datasets include WebFace260M, which comprises 260 million images of 4 million identities [18], IMDbFace that contains 1.7 million images of 59,000 identities [19], MegaFace2 with 4.7 million images from 672,000 identities [20], the CASIA-Webface dataset, which comprised about 500,000 images spanning roughly 10,500 identities, [21] and the Glint360K dataset, containing a substantial volume of 17 million images across 360,000 identities [7, 22]. MS1M, another dataset that originally held approximately 10 million images of 100,000 celebrity identities, was retracted due to a high percentage of noise [9]. MS1MV1 and MS1MV2, the cleansed versions of MS1M, included approximately 3.8 million and 5.8 million images of 85,000 celebrity identities, respectively [2, 23]. Additional widely used datasets are no longer available such as VGGFace [8] and MegaFace[10] [7] rendering the remaining datasets scarce.

Generative models based Face generation. A dominant member of the deep generative algorithms, GANs [24] are used also in the domain of data generation for face recognition training [15, 25, 26, 27]. SynFace[16] reached an accuracy of 88.98% on LFW by employing the GAN based model DiscoFaceGAN [15] to generate a training dataset consisting of 10K identities with 50 images per identity. The results were further improved to 91.97% by applying Identity Mixup (IM) in the form of linear interpolation between two identities in the embedded space, indicating that the learning algorithm can be challenged to better perform with identities that are close in the embedding space. Mixing the dataset with additional 2K real identities further increased the results up to 95.78%. DiscoFaceGan results were limited by two main factors, the algorithm struggles maintaining 3D consistency [28] on variable poses, and there is a limitation to the model’s intra-class variance, most severely in its ability to generate variable facial expressions [16]. SFace [29] reached an accuracy of 91.87% on LFW for pure synthetic data. Using additional Knowledge transfer from a model trained

Data	Model	Dataset	LFW (%)	CFP-FP (%)	Age-DB (%)	Average (%)
DigiFace	ArcFace	10Kx72	93.43	85.6	74.58	84.53
Ours	ArcFace	29.7Kx20	94.91	83.38	77.58	85.29
DigiFace	AdaFace	10Kx72+100KX5	95.40	88.77	79.72	87.96

Table 1: Pure synthetic training results. First row illustrate the results of training with DigiFace dataset in our own arcFace pipeline. Second row illustrates training with Datagen data using our pipeline, third row are the highest results reported in [17]. Comparing to DigiFace on our flow (trained with arcFace) we achieve superior results of by 1.48% on LFW and 3% on AgeDB. Compared to previously submitted results on AdaFace trained on 1.22 million DigiFace images, our results fall behind on 0.49% and 2.14% on LFW and AgeDB respectively. Results on CFP-FP are lower both on our pipeline and the published results. This can be attributed to a relatively low amount of extreme yaw images.

Method	Model	Dataset	Real Images	LFW (%)	CFP-FP (%)	Age-DB (%)
Ours 600K	ArcFace	29.7KX20	40K (2Kx20)	98.37	90.93	88.98
DigiFace 500K	AdaFace	10Kx50	40K (2Kx20)	99.05	94.01	89.77
DigiFace 1.22M	AdaFace	(10Kx72 + 100Kx5)	40K (2Kx20)	99.17	94.63	90.50

Table 2: Comparison to DigiFace synthetic SOTA after finetuning. Results show that following finetuning with the same amount of data, we achieve close to SOTA results on LFW and CFP-FP datasets, falling behind on 0.68% and 0.79% respectively. These margins might be attributed to the different models (Arcface in ours vs Adaface) used for the training, as adaface showed superior published results on CFP-FP [4].

on real data reached 98.5%, while combining both approaches (knowledge transfer and regular classification training) reached 99.13%. However, this technique requires a pretrained face recognition model (e.g., FaceNet [30]) and so it is not purely trained on synthetic data).

Diffusion models (DM) [31, 32, 33] have gained increasing popularity with a fast growing community and visually striking results. As of writing the article, there is a single study comparing the ability of different DM models to create realistic and diverse faces. In the experiment, the author generates data from different models, transforms the images to an ImageNet [34] embedded space, and calculates the Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) between the embeddings of the generated and real face images. As a baseline, the author splits the 10k real images into two sets and calculates the FID between them. As expected, the comparison between real face images will receive the lowest FID score, as they are from the same distribution. Results show that at the time of writing the article, DM generated face images received much higher FID scores (approximately x5 higher than the baseline score for the best model) indicating that DM generated face images are still not comparable to real images. [35].

3D Rendered Face face generation. Microsoft released a synthetic dataset [17] consisting of 1.22M images with 110K identities, reaching a final accuracy of 96.17% on LFW trained on AdaFace[4] with a backbone of Resnet 100 [36]. Further more, they showed that using aggressive augmentations can help reduce the gap between real and simulated data, showing an increase from 88.07% to 94.55% in accuracy. DigiFace [17] was generated using the pipeline introduced at Wood et al. [37], using a generative model learned from 3D 511 unique individuals to generate

a total of 110K identities. Out of the pre-mentioned methods, our data generation platform most resembles that one used in order to create the DigiFace dataset.

3 Methods

3.1 Dataset Generation

Our dataset was generated using the Datagen [12, 13, 14] face generation SDK. The platform uses a physically-based rendering engine that renders 2D images from 3D mesh and texture models. The SDK enables easy creation of any desired distribution. Each datapoint consists of the RGB visible spectrum image, with additional meta-data and labels (e.g., key-points, segmentation maps, depth maps, normal maps, and more).

For this article, we sampled a subset of 30,000 identities from the identity pool (see figure 1. Our demographics consisted of North European (68.82%), African (8.52%), Hispanic (7.94%), Mediterranean (6.38%), Southeast Asian (5.01%), South Asian (3.32%).

For each identity, we generated 20 samples of 256x256 or 512x512 resolutions. Both the camera and the human were rotated with yaw, pitch and roll according to approximately normal distributions (compounded of several normal distributions) of mean 0, and variance of of 25°, 10°, 2.5° respectively. HDRI background was sampled randomly among Daytime, evening and night, following by a uniform rotation between [0, 360]°. This HDRI rotation process adds two types of variability. First, it changes the perceived background in the generated image. Second, it alters the direction of the light source, which in turn im-

pacts the light and shadows that are reflected on the actor. For each sample, the expression was randomly sampled from our available presets (i.e., neutral, happiness, sadness, surprise, anger, fear, contempt, disgust and mouth open). All expressions with equal probability to appear. Every identity in our platform was associated with a specific default eye color, iris shape (texture), and eyebrow style during generation. We retained these default values for each identity, as they ensured uniqueness among the different identities in our pool.

Each male sample was generated with 15% probability to receive a beard. Glasses were samples with 15% chance of appearing, regardless of gender. Eye gaze direction was also adjusted, uniformly sampled with horizontal sides between [-0.5, 0.5] and vertical sides between [0.85, 1] meters. The gaze distance was also sampled, ranging between [0.3, 6] meters.

Hair color for each sample was also modified, relative to the identity’s default values for melanin, whiteness, roughness, and redness, with uniform changes within a range of $\pm 25\%$.

Additional variability was generated by randomly adding makeup, occlusions, hats and randomized expressions. (see Figure 2) These additions were used for creating two different batches of data. First batch contained a single addition from the above list with probabilities of 3%, 2.5%, and 3.5%, for makeup, occlusions and hats, respectively. In the second batch which constitutes 17% of the data we allowed simultaneous additions of makeup, occlusions, hats, and additional randomized expressions, each generated with a probability of 15%, 50%, 70%, and 50%, respectively.¹ The randomized expressions were added in order to increase variance on-top of our platform presets and were defined by randomly sampling a single or two action units (one for the eyes, and one for the mouth), with identical probabilities.

3.2 Training

All models in this study were trained using the ArcFace loss [2], incorporating a margin of 0.5 and a scale of 64 with an IResNet50 architecture [36] backbone. Models were trained on a single 16GB NVIDIA Tesla-4 GPU with batch size set to 256 for 24 epochs with a multi-step learning rate decay by a factor of 0.1 at milestones 10, 18, and 22. In order to be as similar to our validation and test data preprocessing, we utilized the RetinaFace detector [38] for facial bounding box extraction, as opposed to using the facial bounding box modality provided by the Datagen platform. The key-point modalities were then applied to perform face alignment using the similarity transform (scale, rotation and translation). Images were resized to 112x112 and normalized, with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 0.5 for all channels. All the code was implemented using pytorch[39].

¹For more information about our platform see <https://datagen.tech>

Evaluation Protocol. Our study employs the open-set protocol for evaluating the model’s performance [3]. This approach entails using disjoint identities for testing, ensuring that they are not present in the training set. Our primary aim is to address the problem of face verification, which involves comparing pairs of facial images to ascertain if they originate from the same individual. During the test phase, we apply 10-fold cross-validation on our test set, deriving the threshold from the 9 folds and applying it to the remaining fold. The face verification average accuracy is reported on LFW[1], CFP-FP[6] and AgeDB[40] benchmark datasets.

Data Augmentations. Augmentations were adapted from [17] and implemented via the albumentations python package [41]. More specifically, we used horizontal flip with a probability of 0.5 ($p=0.5$), conversion to gray scale ($p=0.1$), Gaussian blur ($p=0.05$), Gaussian noise ($p=0.035$), motion blur ($p=0.05$), JPEG compression ($p=0.05$), downscale and upscale ($p=0.01$) and color jitter ($p=0.1$) with brightness within [0,0.15], contrast within [0,0.3] and hue within [0,0.1] saturation [0,0.1] (where all ranges indicate uniform sampling).

Fine-tuning. When finetuning our model, we used our pre-trained backbone and replaced the arcface head to consist of the fine-tune number of parameters. Learning rates were adjusted as in DigiFace [17] so that the backbone will train with $lr/100$ and the head with $lr/10$. The learning schedule and number of epochs remained the same as the regular training regime.

4 Experiments and Results

In this section, we present our experimental design and results. First, we show our result compared to the current synthetic SOTA. Secondly we present our finetuning results, and debate how they compare to both synthetic and real SOTA. Following that, we show how different intra-class-variance factors are affecting our results, and lastly we show a use-case of how controlled data can be utilized in order to understand the the importance of different face parts in face-recognition systems.

4.1 Pure synthetic training results

Our pure synthetic training results are summarized in Table 1. We compare our results to those reported by DigiFace[17] which are the current SOTA when training on pure synthetic data to the best of our knowledge, and also compare our results with those obtained by training on the DigiFace dataset with our own pipeline. Compared to previously submitted results on AdaFace trained on 1.22 million DigiFace images, we show comparable results achieving 94.91% on LFW, 83.38% on CFP-FP and 77.58% on AgeDB (rows 2 and 3 in Table 1). Our results fall behind on 0.49% and 2.14% on LFW and CFP-FP respectively, this might be attributed to both the different




Figure 3: Finetuned vs. real results on (a) LFW, (b) CFP-FP, and (c) AgeDB datasets. The synthetic model was trained on 29K identities, with 20 samples per ID (dashed line). Fine-tuned models (red dots) were with a varying number of identities (represented by the x-axis). For reference, we also trained a model with each of the real sample batches (gray dots). Pure synthetic model outperforms training on batches of real data within the examined range (up to 20K samples). In addition, fine-tuning on allows significant improvement in results relative to pure synthetic training even with a very small amount of real data.

Experiment	Dataset	LFW (%)	CFP-FP (%)	Age-DB (%)	Average (%)
Hair Variability	Baseline	94.5	83.87	74.67	84.34
	Hair-Cut Variability	94.91	83.38	77.58	85.29

Table 3: Incorporating Additional Hair Variability. The addition of hair variability resulted in an improvement in the LFW and, most notably, the Age-DB metrics. The significant increase in accuracy for Age-DB could be attributed to the high variability inherent in this database, as hairstyles tend to undergo considerable changes over an individual’s lifespan.

models used, and the different amounts of data. When using DigiFace dataset (DigiFace[17]) trained on our arcFace pipeline, (rows 1 and 2 in Table 1) we surpass DigiFace by 1.48% on LFW and 3% on AgeDB. Results on CFP-FP are lower both on our pipeline and the DigiFace published results. This might be attributed to the chosen distribution of yaw in our dataset, that does not include many profile images. The results reported contain all the variance discussed in the method section 3.

4.2 Finetune

As previously mentioned, obtaining a large quantity of real data can be challenging. However, there are situations where a limited number of samples are accessible. To examine the effects of merging real data with our synthetic dataset, we finetune a model that encompasses our full range of variability. To assess the influence of small quantities of real data, we randomly sampled varying number of identities, ranging from 10 to 2000, with 20 samples per identity. The results are summarized in Figure 3. We demonstrate that our model can achieve high accuracy comparable to those trained on hundreds of thousands of real images, even with an extremely small number of real samples. Furthermore, we show that a fine-tuned model’s performance significantly exceeds that of a model trained solely on the same amount of real data. A question raised here is whether the increase in accuracy is attributable to the photo-realism gap or to the variance gap (consisting

of intra-class and inter-class variability). Assuming that real world variance cannot be encompassed within a thousand images (50 identities with 20 sample per identity) we can observe that a photo-realism gap for face recognition exists, and attributes to a reduction in the error rate by 39.1% for LFW , 24.5% for CFP-FP and 30% for Age-DB as accuracy increases from 94.91% to 96.9%, 83.38% to 87.46% and 77.58% to 82.28% respectively 3. These results are slightly higher than those previously demonstrated on segmentation benchmarks [12], and might be attributed to the higher dependencies of face-recognition models on actual rgb pixel values as opposed to relationships between neighboring pixels. In Table 2 we compare the results of fine-tuning with 40K real samples to those reported by [17]. We achieve competitive results on LFW and CFP-FP falling behind on 0.68% and 0.79%, respectively.

4.3 Effects of generated variance

In order to explore the effects of the additional generated variance on our model we conducted two experiments. The first experiment focused on the contribution of hats, occlusions, makeup and randomized additional expressions as intra-class-variance. The second experiment was focused specifically on hair-cut variability. We separated these experiments since we hypothesized that hair-cut variance may have specific contribution to age-DB as it allows simulating significant changes of hair-cut over time often occurring along lifetime. For each experiment, we have

Experiment	Dataset	LFW (%)	CFP-FP (%)	Age-DB (%)	Average (%)
Additional variance	Baseline	93.15	81.91	74.08	83.04
	Combined	93.65	82.65	74.44	83.58
	Separate	94.27	83.8	74.87	84.31

Table 4: Additional variance experiment. In order to understand the impact of additional variance either generated together (multiple per image) or separate (single per image) on our model, we generated hats, makeup and occlusions with the probabilities of 3%, 2.5% and 3.5% respectively. The results show that the additional variance, although amassing to only 9% of our data improved results. Combined generated data, increased results by a lower value although amounting to a total variance of 17% of the data. This results might indicate that the additional multiple-per-image variance photos provided harder samples for the model to train probably due to multiple occlusions, which the model was not able to generalize well.

a baseline and the modified version. In our changed version, we swap baseline images with the samples containing the additional variance (e.g., an identity had 20 baseline samples, after the swap, it has 15 old samples, and 5 new samples containing a hat). As a result, all samples are the same, except for the swapped samples. In our general variability test (Table 4) we are examining to see the effects of hats, makeup, occlusions and expressions either combined together (with a high probability of appearing together) or separated (one per image). Our dataset consists of 27K unique identities with 20 samples per identity. The results show an increase between the baseline and the combined variability, increasing the averaged accuracy from 83.04% to 83.58% (LFW 93.15% to 93.65%). Introducing the variability separately increased the results further from 83.04% to 84.31% (LFW 93.15% to 94.27%).



Figure 4: Illustration of the different hair style clusters used in our hair variability experiment (each row represents a different cluster). Hair assets were clustered into groups where each group had the same hairline, hair type (e.g., curly, straight, wavy), thickness (e.g., fine, medium) and general appearance (e.g., oily, dry).

In the second experiment, we examine the effect of adding hair cut variability to our dataset. Our dataset consists of

29K identities with 20 samples per ID. All the hair assets existing in the platform were clustered into groups of different types. Each group maintained the same hairline, hair type (e.g., curly, straight, wavy), thickness (e.g., fine hair, medium hair, coarse hair), and general appearance (e.g., oily, dry, thin, thick), with the only varying aspect being the haircut itself (see Figure 4). As in the previous experiment, there were two datasets, a baseline and the altered dataset, where the altered dataset consisted of the same ids and the majority of the previous samples, with only the samples consisting of the varying hair styles swapped. A total of 32.8% of the samples were swapped, averaging at 6 samples per identity containing variations of hair-cut.

The results are summarized in Table 3 and show that the average accuracy has increased from 84.34% to 85.29% (LFW from 94.5% to 94.91%). Most notably, the Age-DB accuracy increased by 2.91%. Age-DB is a diverse test set, featuring images of people at different stages of their lives. This improved performance likely reflects the model’s enhanced ability to recognize faces with different hairstyles across multiple life stages, ultimately contributing to the increased accuracy on the Age-DB test set.

4.4 Controlled data use-case

To underscore the efficacy of using controlled synthetic data, we follow a case study in the context sensitivity to different face parts [42]. This area is important as it increases our understanding of what different facial parts (e.g., eyes, eyebrows, mouth, etc.) are imperative for a model to accurately classify identities.

For that purpose, we alternated two factors: eyes (colors and iris texture) and eyebrows.

First, to show how the model reacts to valid intra-class variations (Figure 5 (b) the grey line). We measure the 12 distance in the FaceNet[?] embedding space between a reference image of frontal pose and neutral expression and a set of varying poses and expressions on the same identity where all other aspects of the image remained similar (background, light conditions etc.)

Pre-trained models are expected to be agnostic to pose and expression variations and therefore, we refer to this




Figure 5: Alternating face parts. (a) The leftmost image is a simple front-facing enrollment image. The first upper row shows gradual changes in head rotation from 0° to 45° , while the second row illustrates gradual changes in facial expression intensity. (b) L2 distance sensitivity. Distances between a front facing neutral expression reference and our alternating conditions of yaw and expression intensity. The value of the gray curve are the baseline values considered valid within the intra-class variations while the blue values, well above this baseline, are prone to change the networks prediction. (c) Averaged L2 distances between a frontal facing, neutral expression with changing eyebrows (left) and eyes (right). A change to the eyebrows results in an average difference of 0.664, while a change to the eyes results in an average difference of 0.027. Overall, we observe that eyebrows are important in the context of facial recognition and alternating their appearance and shape may lead to predicting the photo as another identity, whereas the change in eyes-color and iris textures have much lower influence on the L2 distances probably due to the small face crop sizes used for most face verification models.

distances as valid intra-class variance, whereas higher L2 distances, occurring due to alternating face parts (eyes and eyebrows) would indicate values that are prone to change the networks prediction (see Figure 5 a and b).

By retaining the reference, and changing the eyebrow by a single random sampled eyebrow, we see a leap in the L2 distance (see Figure 5 b blue line). The average difference between the two conditions (the gray and blue lines in Figure 5 b) is 0.415 ± 0.107 . Additionally, in the already high intra-class variance cases (e.g., 45° and 0.9 intensity), the L2 distance can be above 1. This indicates that that eyebrows appearance is a descriptive factor for face recognition models and alternating it may lead to false rejection if the change is natural as part of styling or true rejection in case of fraud.

In the last experiment, we compare the effect of alternating eyebrows to alternating eyes. We use only frontal facing and neutral expression images in-order to check for the effects of 25 eyebrows and 100 eyes sampled from the platform pool. Different eye samples have different color and iris textures. We observe that changing the eyebrows alone account for an average increase of 0.664 in L2 distance

± 0.16 . In contrast, the model is not sensitive to the eyes, this is expected, as the image sizes in modern face recognition models are usually 112×112 (160×160 for facenet), where the eyes inhabit a small number of pixels.

5 Discussion

In this work, we have demonstrated the potential of using synthetic data for face recognition, particularly by leveraging the controlled environment offered by our 3D rendering pipeline. Our results reveal that our model, trained on synthetic data, can achieve results competitive with the state-of-the-art on multiple benchmark datasets. Moreover, we have shown that incorporating various forms of intra-class-variance in the dataset, such as hairstyles, makeup, hats, and oclusions, can improve the model's performance. This emphasizes the importance of intra-class variance in developing more robust and accurate face recognition models.

We also highlighted the advantage of fine-tuning our model with a limited number of real images. Our experiments indicate that even a small amount of real data can consid-

erably improve the model’s performance, achieving results comparable to those obtained by models trained on large-scale real datasets. This finding suggests that our approach can be beneficial in scenarios where obtaining substantial volumes of real data is challenging.

Lastly, we demonstrated the value of controlled data generation in better understanding the essential features of face recognition. By incorporating the separation of variables, we are able to understand our model’s weaknesses as well as what is needed to improve recognition by employing synthetic data. Our experiments showed that models trained on real data are highly sensitive to variations in eyebrow structure while not sensitive to eyes color and textures, suggesting that eyebrows can be an important factor in determining identity. This insight can help researchers and practitioners develop more robust and accurate face recognition systems by focusing on such discriminative features.

6 Future Work

While our study has shown promising results, several avenues for future work can be explored to further enhance the efficacy of synthetic data in the face recognition domain. With the growing power of DM models [31] grows the power of reducing the domain gap, and adding additional variance to controlled 3D synthetic data. Emerging research venues such as image to image text guided translation and inpainting [33, 43, 44] as well as controlled data generation [45] might be utilized to increase the effectiveness of 3D generated data. However, in order for these models to be effective for face recognition tasks, there must be a viable and fast way for unique identity generation and preservation. The area of personalized SD [46, 47] is still in its initial stages and further research is needed for investigating the combination of rendered data and diffusion models. An additional significant gap in deep face recognition pertains to aging [48, 49]. The challenge arises from the natural biological transformations that occur throughout our lifetimes. These alterations, which influence the overall facial structure, including changes in the jawline, ears, nose shape, addition of wrinkles and age spots and more, complicate the task of maintaining consistent and accurate recognition. There is a growing need in generating synthetic data with reliable aging simulation.

References

- [1] Gary B. Huang, Manu Ramesh, Tamara Berg, and Erik Learned-Miller. Labeled faces in the wild: A database for studying face recognition in unconstrained environments. Technical Report 07-49, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, October 2007.
- [2] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Niannan Xue, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Arcface: Additive angular margin loss for deep face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4690–4699, 2019.
- [3] Weiyang Liu, Yandong Wen, Zhiding Yu, Ming Li, Bhiksha Raj, and Le Song. Sphreface: Deep hypersphere embedding for face recognition.
- [4] Minchul Kim, Anil K Jain, and Xiaoming Liu. Adaface: Quality adaptive margin for face recognition.
- [5] Xiang An, Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Ziyong Feng, Xuhan Zhu, Jing Yang, and Tongliang Liu. Killing two birds with one stone: efficient and robust training of face recognition cnns by partial fc, 2022.
- [6] Soumyadip Sengupta, Jun-Cheng Chen, Carlos Castillo, Vishal M. Patel, Rama Chellappa, and David W. Jacobs. Frontal to profile face verification in the wild. In *2016 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 1–9, 2016. doi:10.1109/WACV.2016.7477558.
- [7] Fadi Boutros, Vitomir Struc, Julian Fierrez, and Naser Damer. Synthetic data for face recognition: Current state and future prospects, 2023.
- [8] Omkar M. Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Deep face recognition. In *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2015.
- [9] Yandong Guo, Lei Zhang, Yuxiao Hu, Xiaodong He, and Jianfeng Gao. Ms-celeb-1m: A dataset and benchmark for large-scale face recognition. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part III 14*, pages 87–102. Springer, 2016.
- [10] Ira Kemelmacher-Shlizerman, Steven M Seitz, Daniel Miller, and Evan Brossard. The megaface benchmark: 1 million faces for recognition at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4873–4882, 2016.
- [11] Mei Wang, Weihong Deng, Jiani Hu, Xunqiang Tao, and Yaohai Huang. Racial faces in the wild: Reducing racial bias by information maximization adaptation network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 692–702, 2019.
- [12] Eli Friedman, Assaf Lehr, Alexey Gruzdev, Vladimir Loginov, Max Kogan, Moran Rubin, and Orly Zvitia. Knowing the distance: Understanding the gap between synthetic and real data for face parsing, 2023.
- [13] Paul Yudkin, Eli Friedman, Orly Zvitia, and Gil Elbaz. Hands-up: Leveraging synthetic data for hands-on-wheel detection, 2022.
- [14] Ran Shadmi, Jonathan Laserson, and Gil Elbaz. Using synthetic images to uncover population biases in facial landmarks detection, 2021.
- [15] Yu Deng, Jiaolong Yang, Dong Chen, Fang Wen, and Xin Tong. Disentangled and controllable face

- image generation via 3d imitative-contrastive learning. 4 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.11660>.
- [16] Haibo Qiu, Baosheng Yu, Dihong Gong, Zhifeng Li, Wei Liu, and Dacheng Tao. Synface: Face recognition with synthetic data. 8 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07960>.
- [17] Gwangbin Bae, Martin de La Gorce, Tadas Baltrušaitis, Charlie Hewitt, Dong Chen, Julien Valentin, Roberto Cipolla, and Jingjing Shen. Digiface-1m: 1 million digital face images for face recognition. 10 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.02579>.
- [18] Zheng Zhu, Guan Huang, Jiankang Deng, Yun Ye, Junjie Huang, Xinze Chen, Jiagang Zhu, Tian Yang, Jiwen Lu, Dalong Du, et al. Webface260m: A benchmark unveiling the power of million-scale deep face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10492–10502, 2021.
- [19] Fei Wang, Liren Chen, Cheng Li, Shiyao Huang, Yanjie Chen, Chen Qian, and Chen Change Loy. The devil of face recognition is in the noise. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 765–780, 2018.
- [20] Aaron Nech and Ira Kemelmacher-Shlizerman. Level playing field for million scale face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7044–7053, 2017.
- [21] Dong Yi, Zhen Lei, Shengcai Liao, and Stan Z Li. Learning face representation from scratch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.7923*, 2014.
- [22] Xinyi Wang, Jianteng Peng, Sufang Zhang, Bihui Chen, Yi Wang, and Yandong Guo. A survey of face recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.13038*, 2022.
- [23] Jiankang Deng, Yuxiang Zhou, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Marginal loss for deep face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 60–68, 2017.
- [24] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/file/5ca3e9b122f61f8f06494c97b1afccf3-Paper.pdf.
- [25] Jianmin Bao, Dong Chen, Fang Wen, Houqiang Li, and Gang Hua. Towards open-set identity preserving face synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6713–6722, 2018.
- [26] Yujun Shen, Ping Luo, Junjie Yan, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Faceid-gan: Learning a symmetry three-player gan for identity-preserving face synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 821–830, 2018.
- [27] Xianxu Hou, Linlin Shen, Zhong Ming, and Guoping Qiu. Deep generative image priors for semantic face manipulation. *Pattern Recognition*, 139:109477, 2023.
- [28] Yu Deng, Jiaolong Yang, Jianfeng Xiang, and Xin Tong. Gram: Generative radiance manifolds for 3d-aware image generation, 2022.
- [29] Fadi Boutros, Marco Huber, Patrick Siebke, Tim Rieber, and Naser Damer. Sface: Privacy-friendly and accurate face recognition using synthetic data. In *2022 IEEE International Joint Conference on Biometrics (IJCB)*, pages 1–11. IEEE, 2022.
- [30] Florian Schroff, Dmitry Kalenichenko, and James Philbin. Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 815–823, 2015.
- [31] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In Francis Bach and David Blei, editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2256–2265, Lille, France, 07–09 Jul 2015. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/sohl-dickstein15.html>.
- [32] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- [33] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10684–10695, June 2022.
- [34] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [35] Ali Borji. Generated faces in the wild: Quantitative comparison of stable diffusion, midjourney and dall-e 2. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00586*, 2022.

-
- [36] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition, 2015.
- [37] Erroll Wood, Tadas Baltrušaitis, Charlie Hewitt, Sebastian Dziadzio, Matthew Johnson, Virginia Estellers, Thomas J. Cashman, and Jamie Shotton. Fake it till you make it: Face analysis in the wild using synthetic data alone, 2021.
- [38] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Evangelos Ververas, Irene Kotsia, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Retinaface: Single-shot multi-level face localisation in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5203–5212, 2020.
- [39] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [40] Stylianos Moschoglou, Athanasios Papaioannou, Christos Sagonas, Jiankang Deng, Irene Kotsia, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Agedb: the first manually collected, in-the-wild age database. In *proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 51–59, 2017.
- [41] Alexander Buslaev, Vladimir I. Iglovikov, Eugene Khvedchenya, Alex Parinov, Mikhail Druzhinin, and Alexandr A. Kalinin. Albuumentations: Fast and flexible image augmentations. *Information*, 11(2), 2020. ISSN 2078-2489. doi:10.3390/info11020125. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/11/2/125>.
- [42] Nova Hadi Lestriandoko, Raymond Veldhuis, and Luuk Spreeuwiers. The contribution of different face parts to deep face recognition. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, page 89, 2022.
- [43] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A. Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions, 2023.
- [44] Hadas Orgad, Bahjat Kawar, and Yonatan Belinkov. Editing implicit assumptions in text-to-image diffusion models, 2023.
- [45] Lvmin Zhang and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models, 2023.
- [46] Inhwa Han, Serin Yang, Taesung Kwon, and Jong Chul Ye. Highly personalized text embedding for image manipulation by stable diffusion, 2023.
- [47] Rinon Gal, Moab Arar, Yuval Atzmon, Amit H Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Designing an encoder for fast personalization of text-to-image models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12228*, 2023.
- [48] Manisha M Sawant and Kishor M Bhurchandi. Age invariant face recognition: a survey on facial aging databases, techniques and effect of aging. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 52:981–1008, 2019.
- [49] Leila Boussaad and Aldjia Boucetta. Deep-learning based descriptors in application to aging problem in face recognition. *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, 34 (6, Part A):2975–2981, 2022. ISSN 1319-1578. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2020.10.002>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1319157820304821>.