

# Grip-Pattern Verification for a Smart Gun

Xiaoxin Shang and Raymond N.J. Veldhuis

University of Twente, EEMCS-SAS

P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0)53 4892 842 Fax: +31 (0)53 4891 060

E-mail: [x.shang@utwente.nl](mailto:x.shang@utwente.nl)

## Abstract

In the biometric verification system of a smart gun, the rightful user of a gun is recognized based on grip-pattern recognition. It was found that the verification performance of grip-pattern recognition degrades strongly when the data for training and testing the classifier, respectively, have been recorded in different sessions. The major factors which affects the verification performance of this system are the variations of pressure distribution and hand position between the probe image and the gallery image of a subject. In this work three methods are proposed to reduce the effect of the variations: using different sessions for training, image registration, and classifier fusion. Based on these methods, the verification results have been significantly improved.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Our work focuses on the development of a prototype recognition system as part of a smart gun with grip-pattern recognition ensuring that it can only be fired by its rightful user. The smart gun is intended for use by the police, since carrying a gun in public brings considerable risks. In the US, vital statistics show that about 8% of the law-enforcement officers killed in a shooting incident were shot by their own weapons [1]. Biometric authentication is an attractive solution to this problem, because it requires minimal or no additional action by the user. This approach has been taken up by a small number of parties, both industrial and academic, who proposed a number of solutions. In [2] an authentication system based on voice verification is described. The drawback of such a system is that it is not reliable in noisy environments. Solutions based on fingerprint recognition have been described in, for example, [3]. The disadvantage of fingerprint recognition on a pistol is that it does not work in combination with gloves and that it is sensitive to dirt and weather conditions.

Grip-pattern recognition, i.e. recognition based on the pressure exerted when holding an object, does not have these disadvantages. This type of biometric recognition has been investigated by the New Jersey Institute of Technology [4], [5], by Belgian weapon manufacturer FN Herstal, and by us [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12]. The only results reported on, besides ours, were published in [5], which method differs from the one reported here in various aspects. First, in [5] the dynamics of the grip-pattern prior to firing are used, while in our approach recognition is, at present, based on a static grip pattern. Second, in [5] 16 pressure sensors are used: one on the trigger, 15 on the grip of the gun. These sensors are piezo-electric sensors, producing 16 time signals. We apply a much larger resistive sensor array, which produces a pressure image. Third,

the recognition methods of both systems differ. In [5] a method based on neural networks is presented, which seems to be trained for identification, whereas we apply likelihood-ratio based verification [13]. Another difference is the way that both systems have been evaluated. In [5] data was collected from 4 shooters, while we used data from 39 trained police officers, who are the targeted user group. The recognition results are, unfortunately, difficult to compare because in [5] the recognition rates obtained in an identification experiment were presented, while we present equal error rates in a verification experiment, which is more relevant for the final application.

The first prototype of our grip-pattern recognition system has been described in [6], [7] in terms of its design, implementation and evaluation. The sensor, used for measuring the grip pattern, is a  $44 \times 44$  piezo-resistive pressure sensor made by Tekscan Inc. [14]. An initial collection of grip patterns was gathered from a group of mostly untrained subjects with no experience in shooting. Figure 1 shows both the prototype of the smart gun and an example of a grip-pattern. From the right figure one can see the pressure pattern of the thumb in the upper-left part of the image and those of the other fingers in the lower-left part. Note that only three fingers are present, because the index finger is on the trigger of the gun. First experimental results indicated that the grip pattern contained useful information for identity verification [7].

Fig1\_left.pdf comes about here. Fig1\_right.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 1. Left: prototype of the smart gun. Right: an example of grip-pattern image.

In order to explore the verification performance of the system when used by its target user, the police, we have collected new data from a group of police officers in three sessions with one month and four months in between, approximately. The data have been processed for verification by using the recognition algorithm described in [7], [11]. The experimental results indicate that if data for training and testing come from the same session, the verification results are fairly good, with an equal-error rate (EER) of below 1%. If data for training and testing come from different sessions, with weeks or more in between, the results are unsatisfactory, i.e. about 15% EER on average. The EER is the false-accept rate (FAR), or false-reject rate (FRR), at the point of operation of the verifier where the FAR equals the FRR. Since in practice there will always be a time interval between data enrollment and verification, the across-session results are more

realistic and, therefore, need to be improved.

After analyzing the images collected in different sessions, we have found that even though the grip-pattern images from a certain subject collected within one session look fairly similar, a subject tends to produce data with larger variations across sessions. First, a variation of pressure distributions occurs between grip patterns from a subject across sessions. Second, another type of variation results from the hand shift of a subject. Figure 2 shows two images collected from one subject in two different sessions, respectively. One can see that these two images have quite different pressure distributions. Besides, the hand-grip pattern in the right image is located higher than that in the left image. Further research has shown that these variations are the main reason for the unsatisfactory across-session verification results [11]. Therefore, in order to improve the recognition results, the effect of the across-session variations of data needs to be reduced.

Fig2\_left.pdf comes about here. Fig2\_right.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 2. Grip-pattern images of a subject in different sessions.

First, we have combined the data of two out of three sessions for training in order to model the across-session variations in the training procedure better and we have used data of the remaining session for testing. This has brought significant improvement of the recognition results. Second, in order to further reduce the variation caused by the hand shift, we have applied template-matching registration (TMR) [15] as a preprocessing step prior to classification. For comparison maximum-matching-score registration (MMSR) [11] has also been implemented. It has been found that TMR is able to effectively improve the across-session verification results, while MMSR is not. However, the hand shift measured by MMSR has been proved particularly useful in discriminating impostors from the genuine users. If two images belong to the same subject, the hand shift value produced by MMSR is on average much smaller than if they belong to different subjects. This has inspired the design of a new classifier, based on both the grip pattern and the hand shift. The verification error rates have been further reduced greatly.

This paper presents and analyzes methods to improve the verification performance of the system. Section II describes the verification algorithm. Subsequently, the procedure of data collection is reviewed in Section III. Section IV presents and analyzes the experimental results.

Finally, conclusions are given in Section V.

## II. VERIFICATION ALGORITHM

It is assumed that the data are Gaussian. The verification is based on a likelihood-ratio classifier. The likelihood-ratio classifier is optimal in Neyman-Pearson sense, i.e. the FAR is minimal at a given FRR or vice versa, if the data have a known probability density function [13], [16]. The pixels in the  $44 \times 44$  image containing the grip pattern have values in the range  $[0 \dots 255]$ , corresponding to a pressure range of  $0 \dots 30$  psi [6]. These pixel values are arranged into a (in this case  $44 \times 44 = 1936$ -dimensional) column vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . Prior to classification, the measurement vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is normalized, i.e.  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1$ , and subsequently each element  $x_i$  is replaced by  $\log(x_i + \epsilon)$ , with  $\epsilon = 10^{-16}$  added to prevent problems if  $x_i = 0$ . The reason for the normalization is that it makes the verifier robust to global pressure variations. The reason for taking the logarithm is that the probability density function (PDF) of the data better approximates a Gaussian PDF.

A measured grip pattern originates either from a genuine user, or from an impostor. The grip-pattern data of a certain subject is characterized by a mean vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_W$  and a covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_W$ , where the subscript  $W$  denotes “within-class”, while the impostor data is characterized by  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_T$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T$ , where the subscript  $T$  denotes “total”. The underlying thought is that we assume that no further assumptions can be made about an impostor. Therefore, the impostor data is drawn from the density of all possible grip-patterns, which is called the total density. The matching score of a measurement  $\mathbf{x}$  with respect to this subject is derived from the log-likelihood ratio. It is computed by

$$S(\mathbf{x}) = -(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_W)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_W^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_W) + (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_T)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_T^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_T). \quad (1)$$

The superscript  $T$  denotes vector or matrix transposition. If  $S(\mathbf{x})$  is above a preset threshold, the measurement is accepted as being from the genuine user. Otherwise it is rejected. The threshold determines the FRR and the FAR of the verification.

In practice the mean vectors and covariance matrices are unknown, and need to be estimated from a set of training data. In our case, the number of training samples from each subject should be much greater than 1936. Otherwise, the algorithm would become overtrained, and estimates

of  $\Sigma_T$  and  $\Sigma_W$  would be inaccurate. In fact, as a rule of thumb it is recommended to use at least ten times as many training examples as the number of parameters to be estimated [19]. Clearly, we could not possibly acquire such a large number of measurements. This problem was solved by the following steps prior to classification. First, we whiten the data by means of principal component analysis (PCA), such that  $\Sigma_T$  becomes an identity matrix with a reduced dimensionality of  $N_{PCA}$ . At this point we make a simplifying assumption that all subjects share the same within-class covariance matrix, so that it can be estimated more accurately from the data of all the subjects. It has been proved in [7], that in this new feature space the number of modes of variations contributing to the verification is not more than  $N_{user} - 1$ , where  $N_{user}$  is the number of subjects in the training data. Moreover, these modes of variations are those with the smallest variances. Accordingly, a further dimensionality reduction is achieved by applying another orthogonal transform to the data, thus diagonalizing the within-class covariance matrix, and subsequently discarding all the modes of variations except the  $N_{user} - 1$  ones with the smallest variances. This last operation is in fact a dimensionality reduction by means of linear discriminant analysis (LDA). After LDA the total covariance matrix remains an identity matrix, while the within-class covariance matrix becomes diagonal. Both covariance matrices have a dimensionality of  $N_{LDA} = N_{user} - 1$  [7]. The whole procedure of dimensionality reduction can be represented by a multiplication by a transformation matrix  $\mathbf{F}$ . As a result, (1) can be rewritten as

$$S(\mathbf{x}) = -(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_W^{-1} (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}) + (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{r})^T (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

where

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{x}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\mu}_W, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\mu}_T, \quad (5)$$

and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_W$  denotes the resulting diagonal within-class covariance matrix. Therefore, a total of four entities need to be estimated from the training data:  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_W$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_T$ ,  $\mathbf{F}$ , and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_W$ . The reader is referred to [7] for more details of the verification method.

### III. DATA COLLECTION

We have recorded the grip-pattern data from a group of police officers in three sessions [8], with approximately one and four months in between. In total, 41 subjects have participated in both the first and the second sessions with 25 grip-pattern images recorded from each subject. Data from two subjects have not been used in the experiments in this paper, because the image quality was insufficient. In the third session, however, data have been collected from 22 subjects out of the same group and each subject contributed 50 images.

In each session, the subject was asked to pick up the gun, aim it at a target, hold it, say “ready” as a signal for us to record his grip-pattern image, and then release the gun after the recording was finished. For each subject, this procedure has been repeated for the recording of all the samples.

### IV. EXPERIMENTS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Initial experiments

##### A.1 Experiment set-up and results

Two types of experiments have been done. One is the within-session experiment, in which data for training and testing are clearly separated but come from the same session. The other is the across-session experiment, in which data collected in two different sessions are used for training and testing, respectively. The verification performance is evaluated by the overall EER of all the subjects. The EER is the false-accept rate (FAR), or false-reject rate (FRR), at the point of operation of the verifier where the FAR equals the FRR. It is computed from the likelihood-ratios of all the genuine users and impostors. In the within-session experiment, the overall EER is computed based on all the likelihood-ratios obtained from 20 runs. In each single run, 75% of the data are randomly chosen for training and the remaining 25% for testing. The number of dimensions retained after the PCA step, see Section II, is given by  $N_{\text{PCA}} = 75$ . This number was obtained experimentally and is not very critical. The number of features after the LDA step was given by  $N_{\text{LDA}} = N_{\text{user}} - 1$ . This means that  $N_{\text{LDA}} = 38$  when data from the first and second sessions were used for training and  $N_{\text{LDA}} = 21$  when data from the third second session was used.

The results are presented in Table I. As a reference, the result obtained with data collected

Fig3.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 3. FAR and FRR curves obtained from across-session, within-session, and LM-plug-in experiments. Session 1 was used for training, Session 2 for testing.

from a group of untrained subjects who have no experiences in shooting is also presented, denoted as Session 0. Table II shows the across-session experimental results. The corresponding FAR and FRR curves are shown in Figure 3. Here, as an example, the data from the first and the second session are used for training and testing respectively.

One can see that if data for training and testing come from the same session, the verification results are fairly good. Besides, much lower error rates have been obtained with data from the police officers, compared to the case where data have been collected from the untrained subjects. However, much worse verification results were produced when data collected in two different sessions were used for training and testing, respectively.

## A.2 Data characteristics

Comparing the grip-pattern images of one subject recorded in different sessions, we have found large across-session variations. That is, the hand-pressure pattern of a certain subject seems to vary greatly from one session to another. See Figure 2 for an illustration of this effect. Specifically, two types of variations have been observed. First, the pressure distribution of one's data recorded in one session is usually quite different from that recorded in another session. Second, the hand position changes from one session to another.

As a result of the across-session variations of data, the value of each entity in Section II ( $\mu_W$ ,  $\mu_T$ ,  $F$ , and  $\Lambda_W$ ) varies from session to session. To find out the variation of which entity affects the verification performance the most, we did the following "plug-in" experiment. First, we randomly split the test set into two subsets of equal size, denoted as  $A$  and  $B$ , then we use one subset, for example,  $A$  for testing. In computation of (2), each time we estimate three out of the four entities from the training set, yet the fourth one from subset  $B$ .

The experimental results are given in Table III, in which the last four rows contain the EERs obtained with  $\mu_W$ ,  $\mu_T$ ,  $F$ , and  $\Lambda_W$  estimated from subset  $B$ . As a reference, the original EERs of the across-session verification are also shown, denoted as RF. Obviously, the across-session variation in  $\mu_W$ , the mean value of each individual subject's data, affects the verification perfor-



mance the most. If this type of variation is reduced, the verification results improve dramatically and become much closer to those shown in Table I. The error rates before and after “plugging in” the mean values are shown in Figure 3. It can be observed that the FRR has decreased compared with the across-session case. On the other hand, the FAR has increased. However, this effect is not as strong as that of the decrease of FRR.

### *B. Experiments with a double trained model*

Given the analysis above, the verification results can be improved by reducing the across-session variations in the mean value of each subject’s data. Therefore, we combine data of two out of the three sessions for training and use data of the remaining session for testing. In this way both the variation of the pressure distribution and that of the hand position are modeled much better in the training procedure, compared to the case where the classifier is trained on only one session of data. Table IV shows the experimental results. One can see that great improvement has been achieved, compared to those shown in Table II.

### *C. Experiments with data registration*

To reduce the data variation caused by the hand shift further, we apply data registration as a preprocessing step prior to classification. According to our observation, only translation is relevant in the grip-pattern image registration. Two registration methods are concerned: template-matching registration (TMR) and maximum-matching score registration (MMSR). We will first introduce these approaches. The experimental results by using them will be compared afterwards.

#### C.1 Registration method description

In TMR [15], the cross correlation of a measured image and a registration-template image is computed. The location of the pixel of the highest value in the output image determines the hand shift value of the measured image with respect to the template image. If the measured image is well aligned regarding the template image, this pixel should be located precisely in the origin of the output image. In our case, the measured image, the template image, and the output image are all of the same size, i.e.  $44 \times 44$ . The shifted version of an original image after TMR can be

described as

$$\mathbf{x}_0 = \arg \max_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{\mathbf{y} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\mathbf{y}\| \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  denotes a shifted version of an original image  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\mathbf{y}$  denotes the template image for registration.

In MMSR, a measured image is aligned to such a position that the maximal matching score,  $S(\mathbf{x})$  in (2), is obtained. Specifically, an image is shifted pixel by pixel in both the horizontal and the vertical directions. After each movement a new matching score is computed. This procedure continues until the original image has been shifted to all the possible locations within a pre-defined scope of 20 pixels in each direction. In the end, the shifted image with the maximal matching score is selected as the registration result. It can be represented as

$$\mathbf{x}_0 = \arg \max_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} S(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  denotes a shifted version of the original image  $\mathbf{x}$ .

## C.2 Experimental results after registration

Prior to classification, we applied TMR and MMSR to the test data, respectively. Note that in both cases TMR has been applied to the training data in order to build up a stable after-registration model with user-specific registration templates. Specifically, among all the training samples of a certain subject, the one with the minimal Euclidean distance to their mean value was used as the registration template of this subject. This procedure was repeated iteratively till no more shift occurred to each image. Also, we only used the lower-left part, of size  $33 \times 33$ , of each image, where the fingers of the subjects are located, to compute the cross correlation. There are several reasons for this. First, for a certain subject, sometimes the positions of his thumb and his fingers do not always change in the same way, see Figure 2. Second, according to our observation sometimes the pressure pattern of one's thumb is rather unclear or even not present and, therefore, not reliable enough for the registration.

Tables V and VI present the experimental results. As a reference, the results without any data registration are also shown, represented as RF. One can see that except in one case in Table VI, the results have been improved when TMR is applied to the test data, while the results become worse when the test data are preprocessed by MMSR.

Fig4.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 4. FAR and FRR curves obtained from the across-session experiments with and without registration approaches.

The corresponding FAR and FRR curves can be found in Figure 4. In this figure the data from the first and the second session were used for training and testing, respectively. One can see that when either of the two registration methods is in use, for a certain threshold of the matching score, FRR decreases and FAR increases compared to their counterparts without any registration step. However, in the case of TMR FRR decreases more than FAR increases, while in the case of MMSR it is the other way around.

The different effects of these registration methods result from their working principles and the characteristics of the grip-pattern images. Apart from the hand shift, a large variation of the pressure distribution may exist between a measured grip pattern and the template to which it is compared, see Figure 2. Therefore, neither of the registration methods may yield an ideal result. Note that in TMR the “template image” refers to the *registration* template image, while in MMSR it refers to the *recognition* template image, i.e.  $\mu_W$  in (2). The increase in EER when MMSR is applied, shown in Table V, may be explained as follows. Since the original matching scores of the impostors will be relatively low compared to those from the genuine users, the increase in the matching scores of the impostors will be on average larger than of the genuine users. That is, the effect of the increasing FAR will be stronger than that of the decreasing FRR. In contrast, TMR, not aiming at a maximum matching score, does not increase the FAR as much as MMSR does. As a net effect, TMR improves the verification results, whereas MMSR does not.

#### D. Verification based on both grip pattern and hand shift

For each measured image, the application of both TMR and MMSR result in a value of hand shift. We found that if the measured image and the template image belong to the same subject the produced hand shift value is on average much smaller than if they belong to two different subjects respectively. This is easy to understand, since the variations of data from two different subjects are supposed to be more than those from the same subject. Therefore, it is very likely that the grip pattern of the impostor needs to be shifted more than that of the genuine user in

order to obtain the highest matching score. As an example, Figure 5 and Figure 6 present the probability distributions of the  $l^2$ -norm of the hand shifts as measured by TMR and MMSR, respectively. The training data are from the third session, and the test data from the first session. One can see that the hand shifts from the impostors are generally of small values in Figure 5, yet those in Figure 6 are much more widely distributed. From these figures it can be observed that

Fig5.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 5. Probability distributions of hand shift after TMR.

Fig6.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 6. Probability distributions of hand shift after MMSR.

genuine and impostor hand shifts are more discriminative if they are produced by MMSR than by TMR. Specifically, the hand shifts from the impostors produced by MMSR are on average larger than those produced by TMR, while the hand shifts from the genuine users have similar values produced by these two approaches. This may be because the registration results of TMR depend more on the global shapes of the hand-grip patterns, which constrains the shift values of the images from impostors to a relatively small value. See Figure 7 for an illustration of this effect.

Fig7\_leftleft.pdf Fig7\_leftcenter.pdf Fig7\_rightcenter.pdf Fig7\_rightright.pdf

Fig. 7. From left to right: template image of one subject from the first session; image of an impostor from the second session; image of the impostor after TMR; image of the impostor after MMSR.

Inspired by the special characteristic of the hand shift produced by MMSR, we implemented a new classifier as a combination of two classifiers. Specifically, one is based on the grip pattern by using the current recognition algorithm, with TMR as a preprocessing step. The other one performs the verification based on the minus  $l^2$ -norm, obtained from the hand shifts in both the vertical and the horizontal directions produced by MMSR. Note that, in both classifiers, TMR is applied to the training data to build up a stable after-registration model. A measured grip-pattern image is verified as being from the genuine user if, and only if, the verification results given by both classifiers are positive [17], [18].

This can be interpreted by Figure 8, where circles and stars represent images from the genuine

users and the impostors, respectively. Let the threshold value be set as  $-5$  on the horizontal axis, and as  $-100$  on the vertical axis. Then only those corresponding images, represented as scatter points located in the upper-right corner on the plot, will be classified as being from the genuine user, while all the other images will be rejected.

Table VII and Table VIII show that the verification results have been further improved by using the combination of these two classifiers, denoted as COM. For easy comparison, the experimental results in the third and the fourth rows of Table V are presented as well.

Fig8.pdf comes about here.

Fig. 8. Scatter graph of matching scores computed from both grip pattern and hand shift.

## V. CONCLUSION

The grip pattern has been proved to contain useful information for the identity verification. However, due to large variations of each subject's data collected in different sessions, the recognition performance of the system is not yet satisfactory. There are mainly two types of variation. One is the variation of pressure distributions. The other type of variation results from the hand shift of the subject.

To improve the verification results, we have first applied the double-trained model. The data of two sessions have been combined for training, so that the variations can be modelled better in the training procedure. In this way, significant improvement of the verification results has been achieved. Second, two registration approaches have been applied to further reduce the variation caused by the hand shift: template-matching registration (TMR) and maximum-matching score registration (MMSR). Both methods have been proved to be useful to improve the verification performance of the system. Specifically, the verification error rates have been reduced effectively, when the TMR is used as a preprocessing step prior to classification. Also, the hand shift value produced by the MMSR is on average much smaller if the measured image and the template image belong to the same subject than if they belong to two different subjects respectively. As a result, a new classifier has been designed based on both the grip patterns preprocessed by TMR, and the hand shifts produced by MMSR. The application of this combined classifier has greatly improved the verification results further.

## VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is supported by the Technology Foundation STW, applied science division of NWO and the technology programme of the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] The national Uniform Crime Reporting Program, “Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted”, tech. rep., Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2001.
- [2] G.T. Winer. *Gun security and safety system*. US Patent 5,459,957. October 1995.
- [3] H.B. Adams. *Safety trigger*. US Patent 5,603,179. Februari 1997.
- [4] M. Recce. *Unauthorized user prevention device and method*. US Patent 6,563,940. May 2003.
- [5] T. Chang, Z. Chen, B. Cheng, M. Cody, M. Liska III, W. Marshall, M. Recce, D. Sebastian, and D. Shishkin. Enhancing Handgun Safety with Embedded Signal Processing and Dynamic Grip Recognitio., *Proceedings of IECON 2005, The 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*, pages 2107–2113, Raleigh, North Caroline, USA, November 2005.
- [6] J.A. Kauffman, A.M. Bazen, S.H. Gerez, and R.N.J. Veldhuis. Grip-pattern recognition for smart guns. In *Proceedings ProRISC 2003, 14th Annual Workshop on Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, pages 379–384, Veldhoven, The Netherlands, November 2003.
- [7] R.N.J. Veldhuis, A.M. Bazen, J. Kauffman, and P.H. Hartel. Biometric verification based on grip-pattern recognition. In *Proceedings of the IS&T/SPIE 16th Annual Symposium Electronic Imaging*, vol. 5306, pages 634–641, San Jose, CA, USA, January 2004.
- [8] X. Shang, R.N.J. Veldhuis, A.M. Bazen, and W.P.T. Ganzevoort. Algorithm design for grip-pattern verification in smart gun. In *Proceedings ProRISC 2005, 16th Annual Workshop on Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, pages 674–678, Veldhoven, The Netherlands, November 2005.
- [9] I.R. Buhan, A.M. Bazen, P.H. Hartel, and R.N.J. Veldhuis. A false rejection oriented threat model for biometric systems. In D. Zhang and A.K. Jain, editors, *Advances in Biometrics, International Conference (ICB2006), Hong Kong, China*, vol. 3832 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 728–736, Springer Verlag, January 2006.
- [10] X. Shang, K. Kooi, R.N.J. Veldhuis, and W.P.T. Ganzevoort. Restoration of missing lines in grip-patterns for biometrics. In *submitted to Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> IEEE Benelux Signal Processing Symposium (SPS-2006)*, pages 95–98, Antwerp, Belgium, March 2006.
- [11] X. Shang and R.N.J. Veldhuis. Registration of hand-grip pattern in smart gun. In *Proceedings ProRISC 2006, 17th Annual Workshop on Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, pages 192–195, Veldhoven, The Netherlands, November 2006.
- [12] I.R. Buhan, J.M. Doumen, P.H. Hartel, and R.N.J. Veldhuis. Feeling is believing: A secure template exchange protocol. In S-W. Lee and S. Li, editors, *Advances in Biometrics, International Conference (ICB2007), Seoul, Korea*, vol. 4642 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 897–906, Springer Verlag, August 2007.
- [13] H.L. Van Trees, *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory*, New York, Wiley, 1968.
- [14] W.L. Maness et al. *Pressure and contact sensor for measuring dental occlusion*, United States Patent 4,856,993, August 1989.
- [15] A. Jain. *Fundamentals of digital image processing*, Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [16] A.M. Bazen and R.N.J. Veldhuis. Likelihood-Ratio-Based Biometric Verificaton. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 14, no. 1, pages 86–94, January 2004.

- [17] C. Ji, and S. Ma. Combinations of weak classifiers, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 8, no. 1, pages 32–42, January 1997.
- [18] L. Xu, A. Krzyzak, and C.Y. Suen. Methods of combining multiple classifiers and their applications to handwriting recognition, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, vol. 22, no. 3, pages 418–435, May/June 1992.
- [19] A.K. Jain, R.P.W. Duin, and J. Mao. Statistical Pattern Recognition: A Review, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 22, no. 1, pages 4–37, January 2000.

**Xiaoxin Shang** received her B.Sc. degree in Electrical Engineering in Northwestern Polytechnic University, China, in June 2001. In March 2004 she received the M.Sc. degree in Electrical Engineering from the Telecommunication Group, University of Twente, The Netherlands. From August 2004 till now she has been working as a PhD student in the Signals and Systems Group, University of Twente, The Netherlands. Since then she has been working on the project Secure Grip. Her research domain is Biometrics and Pattern Recognition.

**Raymond N.J. Veldhuis** received his engineer degree in Electrical Engineering in 1981 from the University of Twente, The Netherlands. In 1988 he received the PhD degree from Nijmegen University. From 1982 until 1992 he worked as a researcher at Philips Research Laboratories in Eindhoven in various areas of digital signal processing, such as audio and video signal restoration and audio source coding. From 1992 until 2001 he worked at the IPO (Institute of Perception Research) Eindhoven in speech signal processing and speech synthesis. He is now an associate professor at Twente University, working in the fields of biometrics, pattern recognition and signal processing.

TABLE I

WITHIN-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS.

Session	EER(%)
0	1.4
1	0.5
2	0.8
3	0.4

TABLE II

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS.

Train	Test	EER(%)
2	1	5.5
3	1	14.7
1	2	7.9
3	2	20.2
1	3	24.1
2	3	19.0



TABLE III

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS IN EER(%) WITH ONE ENTITY ESTIMATED FROM SUBSET B.

Train	2	3	1	3	1	2
Test	1	1	2	2	3	3
RF	5.5	14.7	7.9	20.2	24.1	19.0
$\mu_W$	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>
$\Lambda_w$	6.0	13.5	7.3	17.3	24.3	19.9
$\mu_T$	5.5	14.9	8.0	20.0	24.0	19.2
<b>F</b>	3.8	23.8	3.2	18.3	13.7	14.9

TABLE IV

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS WITH DOUBLE-TRAINED MODEL.

Train	Test	EER(%)
2+3	1	4.0
1+3	2	5.1
1+2	3	13.7

TABLE V

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS IN EER(%) WITH AND WITHOUT REGISTRATION APPROACHES.

Train	2	3	1	3	1	2
Test	1	1	2	2	3	3
RF	5.5	14.7	7.9	20.2	24.1	19.0
TMR	<b>3.9</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>18.9</b>
MMSR	5.8	17.7	8.0	22.9	27.7	22.8

TABLE VI

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS IN EER(%) WITH DOUBLE-TRAINED MODEL, WITH AND WITHOUT REGISTRATION APPROACHES.

Train	2+3	1+3	1+2
Test	1	2	3
RF	4.0	<b>5.1</b>	13.7
TMR	<b>3.2</b>	5.5	<b>13.1</b>
MMSR	4.4	7.7	20.1

TABLE VII

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS IN EER(%) WITH REFERENCE AND IMPROVED CLASSIFIERS.

Train	2	3	1	3	1	2
Test	1	1	2	2	3	3
RF	5.5	14.7	7.9	20.2	24.1	19.0
TMR	3.9	12.9	6.0	17.8	18.4	18.9
COM	<b>3.4</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.6</b>

TABLE VIII

ACROSS-SESSION EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS IN EER(%) WITH DOUBLE-TRAINED MODEL, WITH REFERENCE AND IMPROVED CLASSIFIERS.

Train	2+3	1+3	1+2
Test	1	2	3
RF	4.0	5.1	13.7
TMR	3.2	5.5	13.1
COM	<b>2.3</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Left: prototype of the smart gun. Right: an example of grip-pattern image. . . . .	3
2	Grip-pattern images of a subject in different sessions. . . . .	4
3	FAR and FRR curves obtained from across-session, within-session, and LM-plug-in experiments. Session 1 was used for training, Session 2 for testing. . . . .	8
4	FAR and FRR curves obtained from the across-session experiments with and without registration approaches. . . . .	11
5	Probability distributions of hand shift after TMR. . . . .	12
6	Probability distributions of hand shift after MMSR. . . . .	12
7	From left to right: template image of one subject from the first session; image of an impostor from the second session; image of the impostor after TMR; image of the impostor after MMSR. . . . .	12
8	Scatter graph of matching scores computed from both grip pattern and hand shift.	13

































