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Abstract
Human skin detection in images is a widely studied topic of Computer Vision for which it is commonly accepted that analysis of pixel color or local patches may suffice. This is because skin regions appear to be relatively uniform and many argue that there is a small chromatic variation among different samples. However, we found that there are strong biases in the datasets commonly used to train or tune skin detection methods. Furthermore, the lack of contextual information may hinder the performance of local approaches. In this paper we present a comprehensive evaluation of holistic and local Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) approaches on in-domain and cross-domain experiments and compare with state-of-the-art pixel-based approaches. We also propose a combination of inductive transfer learning and unsupervised domain adaptation methods, which are evaluated on different domains under several amounts of labelled data availability. We show a clear superiority of CNN over pixel-based approaches even without labelled training samples on the target domain. Furthermore, we provide experimental support for the counter-intuitive superiority of holistic over local approaches for human skin detection.

1 Introduction
Human skin detection is the task of identifying which pixels of an image correspond to skin. The segmentation of skin regions in images has several applications: video surveillance, people tracking, human computer interaction, face detection and recognition and gesture detection, among many others (Shaik et al., 2015; Mahmoodi and Sayedi, 2016).

Before the boom of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), most approaches were based on skin-color separation or texture features, as in Huynh-Thu et al. (2002) and Shrivastava et al. (2016). By that time, there were other approaches for image segmentation in general, like Texture Forest (Shotton et al., 2008) and Random Forest (Shotton et al., 2011). As occurred with image classification, starting from 2012, convolutional networks have made a lot of success in segmentation tasks. One of the first approaches using deep learning was patch-based classification (Ciresan et al., 2012), where each pixel is classified using a patch of the original image that surrounds it; a local approach that does not considers the pixel position in the whole image.

Shelhamer et al. (2017) introduced Fully Convolutional Networks (FCNs) for image segmentation. This new paradigm allows image segmentation to be done in a holistic manner. It is faster than the patch-based approach, and it overcame the state-of-the-art on PASCAL VOC, NYUDv2, and SIFT Flow datasets, by using Inductive Transfer Learning from ImageNet.

Following the success of FCNs, Ronneberger et al. (2015) proposed the U-Net architecture, that consists of an encoder-decoder structure initially used in biomedical 2D image segmentation.

In an U-Net, the encoder path is a typical CNN, where each down-sampling step doubles the number of feature channels. What makes this architecture unique is the decoder path, where each up-sampling step concatenates the output of the previous step with the output of the down-sampling with same image dimensions. This strategy enables precise localization with a simple network that is applied in one shot, rather than using a sliding window.

The original U-Net architecture does not take advantage of pre-trained classification networks. In order to deal with small amounts of labeled data, the authors made extensive use of Data Augmentation, which has been proven efficient in many cases (Xu et al., 2016; Vasconcelos and Vasconcelos, 2017; Perez and Wang, 2017; Wong et al., 2016).

Several variations of U-Net have been proposed since then. For example, the V-Net (Milletari et al., 2016) is also an encoder-decoder network adapted to segmentation of 3D biomedical images. Nowadays, one of the most used variations consists in replacing the encoder branch with a pre-trained classification network like Inception (Szegedy et al., 2016) or Resnet (He et al., 2016), combining the U-Net ar-
chitecture with the original approach of Fully Convolutional Networks. Another common strategy is the use of short-range residual connections in the convolutions blocks of the encoder and decoder branches of U-Net, as in Pandey et al. (2018).

In spite of all the advances that deep fully convolutional neural networks have brought for image segmentation, some common criticism are made to argue that pixel-based approaches are still more suitable for some real world applications, specially in the skin detection task. Namely,

1. the need for large training datasets (Kakumanu et al. 2007); one may not know in advance the domain of the images that will be used, therefore, no amount of labeled training data may be enough;

2. its specificity or lack of generalization; and

3. its prediction time (Brancati et al. 2017); specially for video applications where the frame-rate are around 30 or 60 frames-per-second, allowing a maximum prediction time of 17 to 33ms per image.

Those arguments seem to ignore several proposed approaches that exploit unlabeled data of the domain of interest (unsupervised domain adaptation) or labeled data and models from other domains (inductive transfer learning) to solve the lack of labeled data. Amid the fast evolution of CNNs and domain adaptation techniques, we ask ourselves: Do those criticisms still hold for the skin detection problem?

In this work, we explore the combination of unsupervised domain adaptation and inductive transfer learning applied to the skin segmentation problem. Our method uses knowledge gathered in large labeled skin datasets to improve the performance of skin segmentation in datasets with zero or little labeled data.

Our main contributions are:

1. a comprehensive evaluation of U-Net versus Patch-based CNN approaches (holistic versus local) on in-domain and cross-domain experiments applied to skin segmentation;

2. a comparison of CNN-based approaches with state-of-the-art pixel-based ones;

3. experimental assessment of the generalization power of different human skin datasets (domains); and

4. the proposal of a Domain Adaptation method capable of overcoming the dataset bias. With this method we are able to improve the F1 score on skin segmentation using little or no labeled data from the target domain.

2 Background

Transfer Learning, Domain Adaptation and Semi-Supervised Learning learning methods can be employed as means to dramatically reduce the cost of acquiring high amounts of labeled data to train Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. While semi-supervised learning exploits available unlabeled data in the same domain, transfer learning is a family of methods that deal with change of task or change of domain. Domain Adaptation (DA) is a particular case of transfer learning (Csurka 2017a).

Following the notation of Pan and Yang (2010), a domain $D$ is composed of a $d$-dimensional feature space $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with a marginal probability distribution $P(X)$. A task $T$ is defined by a label space $Y$ with conditional probability distribution $P(Y|X)$.

In a conventional supervised machine learning problem, given a sample set $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \in X$ and the corresponding labels $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \in Y$, $P(Y|X)$ can be learned from feature-label pairs in the domain. Suppose we have a source domain $D^s = \{X^s, P(X^s)\}$ with a task $T^s = \{Y^s, P(Y^s|X^s)\}$ and a target domain $D^t = \{X^t, P(X^t)\}$ with a task $T^t = \{Y^t, P(Y^t|X^t)\}$. If the two domains correspond ($D^s = D^t$) and the two tasks are the same ($T^s = T^t$), we can use conventional supervised Machine Learning techniques. Otherwise, adaptation and/or transfer methods are required.

2.1 Semi-supervised learning

Semi-supervised learning methods deal with the problem in which not all training samples have labels (Zhu 2005; Murphy 2012). Most of these methods use a density model in order to propagate labels from the labeled samples to unlabeled training samples. This step is usually combined with a standard supervised learning step in order to strengthen the classifiers, c.f. Leistner et al. (2009); Criminisi and Shotton (2013).

There are several semi-supervised learning approaches for deep neural networks. Methods include training networks using a combined loss of an auto-encoder and a classifier (Ranzato and Szummer 2008), discriminative restricted Boltzmann machines (Larochelle and Bengio 2008) and semi-supervised embeddings (Weston et al. 2008).

Lee (2013) proposed a simple yet effective approach, known as Pseudo-Labelling, where the network is trained in a supervised way, with labeled and unlabeled data in conjunction. During the training phase, for the unlabeled data, the class with the highest probability (pseudo-label) is taken as it was a true label. To account for the unbalance between true and pseudo labels, the Loss function uses a balancing coefficient to adjust the weight of the unlabeled data on each mini-batch. As a result, pseudo-label works as an Entropy Regularization strategy.

These methods assume that training and test samples belong to the same domain, or at least that they are very similar $D^s \approx D^t$. 
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2.2 Inductive Transfer Learning

When $\mathcal{D}^s \neq \mathcal{D}^t$, models trained on $\mathcal{D}^s$ may not perform well while predicting on $\mathcal{D}^t$ and if $\mathcal{T}^s \neq \mathcal{T}^t$, models trained on $\mathcal{D}^s$ may not be directly applicable on $\mathcal{D}^t$. Nevertheless, when $\mathcal{D}^s$ maintains some kind of relation to $\mathcal{D}^t$ it is possible to use some information from $\{\mathcal{D}^s, \mathcal{T}^s\}$ to train a model and learn $P(Y^t|X^t)$ through a processes that is called Transfer Learning (TL) Pan and Yang (2010).

The Transfer Learning approach is called inductive if the target task is different but related to the source task. This is the case of a technique to speed up convergence in Deep CNNs that became popularised as Fine Tuning for vision applications. If a model is trained on a dataset that is as broad as ImageNet (Russakovsky et al., 2015), one can assume that most classification tasks performed on photographs downloaded from the web are subdomains of ImageNet, $P(X^{\text{ImageNet}}) \subset P(X^{\text{cats}} \times \text{dogs})$, even though the tasks are different (e.g. $Y^{\text{ImageNet}} = \mathbb{R}^{1000}$ and $Y^{\text{cats}} \times \text{dogs} = \mathbb{R}^2$). In deep artificial neural networks, fine tuning is done by taking a pre-trained model, modifying its final layer so that its output dimensionality matches $Y^t$ and further training this model with labelled samples in $\mathcal{D}^t$.

Further to fine tuning, a wide range of techniques has been proposed for inductive TL (Pan and Yang, 2010), particularly using shallow methods, such as SVN (Aytar and Zisserman, 2011). In this paper, we focus on fine tuning due to its popularity with CNNs. The traditional fine tuning processes usually requires a relatively large amount of labeled data from the target domain (Csurka, 2017a). We propose a solution to this issue in Section 3.4.

2.3 Unsupervised Domain Adaptation

If the source and target domains are represented in the same feature space ($\mathcal{X}^s = \mathcal{X}^t$), but with different probability distributions ($P(X^s) \neq P(X^t)$) due to domain shift or selection bias, the TL problem is called homogeneous. If ($\mathcal{X}^s \neq \mathcal{X}^t$), the problem is heterogeneous TL (Csurka, 2017a; Pan and Yang, 2010). In this paper, we deal with homogeneous TL as we use the same feature space representation for source and target datasets.

Domain Adaptation is the problem where tasks are the same, but data representations are different or their marginal distributions are different (homogeneous). Mathematically, $\mathcal{T}^s = \mathcal{T}^t$ and $Y^s = Y^t$, but $P(X^s) \neq P(X^t)$. DA methods are called unsupervised (also known as transductive TL) when labeled data is available only on source domain samples.

Several approaches have been proposed for unsupervised DA, most of them were designed for shallow learning methods (Csurka, 2017a). The methods that exploit labeled samples from the source domain follow a similar assumption to that of Semi-Supervised Learning methods, with the difference that test samples come from a new domain. This is the case of Long et al. (2013) and FarajiDavar et al. (2017). Both methods start with a standard supervised learning method trained on the source domain in order to classify samples from the target domain. The classification results are taken as pseudo-(soft)labels and used to iteratively improve the learning method in a way that it works better on the target domain.

When labeled samples are not available at all, it is possible to perform unsupervised TL using methods that perform feature space transformation. Their goal is to align source and target domain samples to minimise the discrepancy between their probability density functions (Borgwardt et al., 2006).

Most of the literature on DA for visual applications is dedicated to image classification (Csurka, 2017a). To extend the DA concepts to a image segmentation problem, we treat the Skin Segmentation problem as a pixel-wise classification problem.

2.4 Related Works on Skin Detection

Brancati et al. (2017) achieved state-of-the-art results in skin segmentation using correlation rules between the YCb and YCr subspaces to identify skin pixels on images. Faria and Hirata Jr. (2018) claimed to have achieved a new state-of-the-art plateau on rule-based skin segmentation, with a variation of Brancati et al. (2017) based on neighborhood operations. On both works, several public datasets were used.

In contrast with Domain Adaptation for image classification, it is difficult to find literature focused on DA methods for image segmentation (Csurka, 2017a), specially for the skin detection problem. San Miguel and Suja (2013) use agreement among several rule-based skin segmentation, with their parameters selected by maximising agreement on correct detections and false positives to dynamically change a classifier on new data automatically without any user annotation. Kamnitsas et al. (2017) use unsupervised domain adaptation to improve brain lesion detection in MR images. Bousmalis et al. (2017) developed a generative adversarial network based model which adapts source-domain images to appear as if drawn from the target domain, a technique that enables dataset augmentation for several computer vision tasks.

In this work we compare two CNN approaches (one patch-based and one fully convolutional) with above mentioned state-of-the-art color-based methods for in-domain and cross-domain skin detection, even in the absence of target-domain labeled data.
3 Method

In this paper, we propose to combine the strengths of both inductive TL and unsupervised DA. The following sections detail our approach, models and experimental protocols.

3.1 Transfer Learning and Domain Adaptation

For inductive TL with deep networks, we use the learnt parameters from the source domain as starting point for optimisation of the parameters of the network on the target domain (“fine tuning”). The optimisation first focuses on the modified output layer, which is intimately linked with the classification task. Other layers are initially frozen, working as a feature extraction method. Next, all parameters are unfrozen and optimisation carries on until convergence. This can be seen as a way to regularise the learnt parameters on the source domain. Figure 1 illustrates this process.

In this work, we propose a method that relates the pseudo-label approach of Lee (2013), but instead of using the same model and domain for final prediction and pseudo-label generation, we use a model trained in a different domain to generate pseudo-labels for the target domain. These pseudo-labels are then used to fine-tune the original model or to train another model from scratch in a semi-supervised manner. We call this technique cross-domain pseudo-labelling. Figure 2 illustrates this procedure. The intuition behind this approach is that using a more accurate set of labels jointly with weights of a better model should lead to better results.

3.1.1 Combined approach

We propose to combine Inductive Transfer Learning and Unsupervised Domain Adaptation in order to improve final model performance. We use weights obtained from regular pseudo-label model to fine-tune another model that will be used to generate a more accurate set of pseudo-labels. These new pseudo-labels are then used in other pseudo-label training round to get the final model. Figure 3 illustrates this procedure. The intuition behind this approach is that using a more accurate set of labels jointly with weights of a better model should lead to better results.

3.2 Models

We evaluated two approaches for skin segmentation, a local (patch-based) classification method and a holistic segmentation method.

3.2.1 Patch-based CNN

The patch-based approach uses the raw values of a small region of the image to classify each pixel position based on its neighbourhood. Inspired by the architecture described by Ciresan et al. (2012), we use a 3 convolutional layer network with max pooling between convolutions, but we add ReLU activation function in the inner layers. As input, we use a patch of $35 \times 35$ pixels and 3 channels, to allow the network to capture the surroundings of the pixel. This patch size is
similar to that used by Chiesan et al. (2012) (32 x 32), but we choose an odd number to focus the prediction in the center of the patch. The output of the network consists of two fully connected layers and a sigmoid final activation for binary classification. For this approach, the images are not resized. To reduce the cost of training while maintaining data diversity, data subsampling is used so that only 512 patches are randomly selected from each image. For prediction, all patches are extracted in a sliding window fashion, making one prediction per pixel. Due to the path size, the prediction processes generates a 17 pixels wide border where this method does not predict an output, so zero padding is applied. This does not harm the predictions, since the presence of skin near the borders is rare in all datasets used.

3.2.2 Holistic segmentation

Fully convolutional neural networks (FCNs, proposed by Ronneberger et al. (2015) are CNNs in which all trainable layers are convolutional. Therefore they can be quite deep but have a relatively small number of parameters, due to the lack of fully connected layers. Another advantage of FCNs is that, in principle, the dimensionality of the output is variable and it depends on the dimensionality of the input data. FCNs gave rise to the idea of encoder-decoder architectures, which have upsampling methods, such as unpooling layers and transpose convolutions (or deconvolution layers). These methods can perform segmentation taking the whole image as an input signal and generate full image segmentation results in one forward step in the network, without requiring to break the image into patches.

Ronneberger et al. (2015) proposed an encoder-decoder architecture called U-Net, which has several skip connections that link the output of intermediate steps of the encoder to the input of their mirrorwed steps in the decoder. With this strategy, the U-Net is able to model contextual information, which increases its robustness and allows it to generate segmentation results with a much finer level of detail. This strategy is simpler and faster than more sophisticated methods, such as those that combine CNNs with conditional random fields (Arnab et al., 2018). The method of Zheng et al. (2015), which models CRFs as recurrent neural networks (CRF-as-RNN), enables a single end-to-end training/inference process for segmentation, generate sharper edges in the segmentation results in comparison to the standard U-Net. However, CRF-as-RNN is slower than U-Net due to the nature of RNNs.

Therefore, we chose to use the U-Net as the holistic segmentation method to be evaluated in this paper. Our model follows the general design proposed by Ronneberger et al. (2015), but we used a 7-level structure with addition of batch normalization between the convolutional layers, as shown in figure 4. We also used an input frame of 768 x 768 pixels and 3 channels to fit most images, and same size output.

3.3 Evaluation measures and loss function

From the literature, we have identified that the most popular evaluation criteria for image segmentation are: Accuracy (Acc), Jaccard Index (a.k.a. Intersection Over Union, IoU), Precision, Recall and F1 Score (a.k.a. SorensenDice Coefficient or Dice Similarity Coefficient, DSC). In this section, we revise them following a notation that helps to compare them. For each given class label, let \( \vec{p} \in \{0,1\}^T \) be the vector of predicted probabilities for each pixel (where \( T \) is the number pixels in each image), \( \vec{q} \in \{0,1\}^T \) be the binary vector that indicates, for each pixel, if that class has been detected, based on \( \vec{p} \), and \( \vec{g} \) be the ground truth binary vector that indicates the presence of that label on each pixel. We have the following definitions:

\[
\text{Acc} = \frac{\sum_i \vec{q} \cdot \vec{p}}{T} = \frac{\vec{q} \cdot \vec{g} + (\vec{I} - \vec{q}) \cdot (\vec{I} - \vec{g})}{T} \quad (1)
\]

\[
\text{IoU} = \frac{|\vec{q} \cap \vec{g}|}{|\vec{q} \cup \vec{g}|} = \frac{\vec{q} \cdot \vec{g}}{\sum_i \max (p_c, g_c)} = \frac{\vec{q} \cdot \vec{g}}{|\vec{q}| + |\vec{g}| - \vec{q} \cdot \vec{g}} \quad (2)
\]

\[
\text{Prec} = \frac{\vec{q} \cdot \vec{g}}{|\vec{g}|} \quad (3)
\]

\[
\text{Rec} = \frac{\vec{q} \cdot \vec{g}}{|\vec{g}|} \quad (4)
\]

\[
F_1 = \left( \frac{\text{Prec}^{-1} + \text{Rec}^{-1}}{2} \right)^{-1} = 2 \cdot \frac{\vec{q} \cdot \vec{g}}{|\vec{p}| + |\vec{g}|} \quad (5)
\]

Also, from (2) and (3) we can derive that the Jaccard index and \( F_1 \) score are monotonic in one another:

\[
\text{IoU} = \frac{F_1}{2 - F_1} \quad \therefore F_1 = \frac{2 \cdot \text{IoU}}{1 + \text{IoU}} \quad (6)
\]
As such, there is no quantitative argument to prefer one over the other. Qualitatively, though, we recommend using $F_1$ score as it is a more prevalent metric in other fields. Although accuracy has been widely used, we consider that not to be a good metric, as its numerator only not only considers true positives, but also true negatives, and a null hypothesis gives high accuracy on imbalanced datasets.

As for the loss function, training objective and evaluation metric should be as close as possible, but $F_1$ score is not differentiable. Therefore, we used a modified (and differentiable) SørensenDice coefficient ($F_1$), given by equation 7, where $s$ is the smoothness parameter that was set to $s = 10^{-5}$. The derived loss function is given by 8.

$$\text{softDiceCoef}(\vec{p}, \vec{g}) = \frac{s + 2\vec{p} \cdot \vec{g}}{s + |\vec{p}| + |\vec{g}|}$$ (7)

$$\text{DiceLoss}(P, G) = 1 - \text{softDiceCoef}(P, G)$$ (8)

### 3.4 Data augmentation

In both local and holistic models, the image pixels are normalized to 0 to 1 and the sigmoid activation function applied to the output. In both models we also used data augmentation, randomly varying pixels values in the HSV colour space. For the U-Net model we also used random shift and flip.

### 4 Experiments and results

The main goal of our experiments is to evaluate the performance of homogeneous transductive fine-tuning, cross-domain pseudo-labelling, and a combined approach in several domains and under different availability of labeled data on the target domain. To achieve this goal, we used four well-known datasets dedicated to skin segmentation (described in Section 4.1) and permuted them as source and target domain. The first set of experiments (Sections 4.2 and 4.3) was designed to evaluate the amount of bias in each dataset. Next, for each pair of datasets and for each approach we performed a range experiments using different amounts of labeled training data from the target domain (Section 4.4).

#### 4.1 Datasets

The datasets we used were Compaq [Jones and Rehg, 1999] – a very traditional skin dataset with 4,670 images of several levels of quality; SFA [Casati et al., 2013] – a set of 1,118 face images obtained from two distinct datasets, some of them with white background; Pratheepan [Yogarajah et al., 2010] – 78 family and face photos, randomly downloaded from Google; and VPU [San Miguel and Suja, 2013] – 290 images extracted from video surveillance cameras.

In order to evaluate the methods, [San Miguel and Suja, 2013] proposed a pixel-based split of training and testing samples (not image based) for the VPU dataset, making it impossible to evaluate holistic methods. The other datasets do not have a standard split of samples. For this reason, we adopted the same test split reported by the authors of SFA Casati et al. [2013], which uses 15% of the images for testing and the remaining for training on all these datasets.

As discussed in Section 3.3, most works on Skin Segmentation report their results in terms of Precision (Prec), Recall and $F_1$ score. So, we use these metrics while comparing our results with others. In these situations we also provide Accuracy (Acc) and Intersection over Union (IoU). When comparing results of our own approaches, in more dense tables, we just present results in terms of $F_1$ score.

#### 4.2 In-domain evaluations

The same-domain training evaluation results are shown on tables 1, 2, 3 and 4. Our fully convolutional U-Net model surpassed all recent works on skin segmentation available for the datasets in study, and, in most of the cases, our patch-based CNN model stands in second, confirming the superiority of the deep learning approaches over color-based ones. The results also show that the datasets have different levels of difficulty, being VPU the most challenging one and SFA the least challenging one. The best accuracy was obtained on VPU, but this is because this is a heavily unbalanced dataset where most pixels belong to background. As for all remaining criteria, the best results occured on SFA, which confirms our expectation, as SFA is a dataset of frontal mugshot style photos.

#### 4.3 Cross-domain baseline results

The cross-domain capabilities of our models and generalization power of domains are shown on table 5, which presents source only mean $F_1$ scores results without any transfer or adaptation to target dataset. As we can see, source dataset Compaq in conjunction with the U-Net Model presented the best generalization power on targets SFA and Pratheepan.

### Table 1: Same domain results on the SFA dataset (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>IoU</th>
<th>Prec</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faria (2018)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92.88</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>55.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our p-based</td>
<td>91.14</td>
<td>82.17</td>
<td>89.71</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>90.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our U-Net</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>92.80</td>
<td>96.65</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>96.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Same domain results on the Compaq dataset (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>IoU</th>
<th>Prec</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F_1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branc.(2017)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our p-based</td>
<td>90.18</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>58.92</td>
<td>73.59</td>
<td>65.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our U-Net</td>
<td>92.62</td>
<td>54.47</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>71.64</td>
<td>70.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Same domain results on the Pratheepan dataset (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>IoU</th>
<th>Prec</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F(_1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branc.(2017)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>81.99</td>
<td>65.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faria (2018)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.81</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>66.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our p-based</td>
<td>87.12</td>
<td>55.57</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>82.49</td>
<td>69.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our U-Net</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Same domain results on the VPU dataset (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>IoU</th>
<th>Prec</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F(_1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMig.(2013)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>73.90</td>
<td>56.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our p-based</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>46.34</td>
<td>42.82</td>
<td>44.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our U-Net</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source dataset Pratheepan also in conjunction with the U-Net Model did better on targets Compaq and VPU. These source-only setups surpassed the respective color-based approaches shown on previous tables, except for the VPU dataset.

Note that the patch-based model surpassed U-Net when using source domains with low generalization power like SFA and VPU. For example, using VPU as source domain and SFA as target, patch-based reached mean F\(_1\) score of 82.63%, while U-Net only got 14.83%. Using SFA as source and Compaq as target, patch-based also surpassed U-Net (54.80% vs. 18.92%). These results are expected, since SFA and VPU are datasets of very specific domains with little variation in the type of scenes between their images (SFA images are close-ups on faces and VPU images are typical views from conference rooms or surveillance cameras). On the other hand, Compaq and Pratheepan include images with a wide range of layouts. Therefore, SFA and VPU only offer relevant information at a patch level for skin detection, their contexts are very specific, which hinders their generalisation ability. If the goal is to design a robust skin detector and avoid negative transfer, our results show that it is better to use Compaq or Pratheepan as source samples.

Table 5: Cross-domain mean F\(_1\) scores (%) obtained without transfer nor adaptation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Source Domain</th>
<th>Target Domain</th>
<th>SFA</th>
<th>Compaq</th>
<th>Pratheep.</th>
<th>VPU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-net</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaq</td>
<td>86.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratheep.</td>
<td>80.66</td>
<td>63.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPU</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>48.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>62.92</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaq</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.59</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratheep.</td>
<td>80.04</td>
<td>62.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPU</td>
<td>82.63</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Domain adaptation from Compaq to SFA using no real labels from target. From left to right: target test image, ground truth and results with source only, DA based on cross-domain pseudo-labels and the combined DA+TL approach.

Figure 6: Domain adaptation from Compaq to Pratheepan using no real labels from target (same setting as Figure 5).

4.4 Domain Adaptation Results

Following the recommendation in the previous section, we performed domain adaptation experiments using Compaq and Pratheepan as source datasets. Table 6 presents the F\(_1\) scores obtained by the methods and settings we evaluated. For each source→target pair, we indicate in bold face which result was better than the target-only method. We evaluated the effect of the amount labeled target samples given and present results ranging from no labels (0%), i.e. an unsupervised domain adaptation setting, to all labels (100%) given in the target training set, i.e., an inductive transfer setup. Target only results are provided for comparison purposes, i.e, within domain experiments with the number of training labels ranging from 5 to 100%. The target only results are expected to be an upper bound in performance when 100% of the training labels are used because there is no domain change, but they may suffer from the reduced training set size in comparison to the domain adaptation settings.

Compaq has confirmed our expectations of being the most generalizable source dataset, not only for being the most numerous in terms of sample images but also due to their diversity in appearance. The use of Compaq as source lead to
Table 6: U-Net mean $F_1$ scores under different scenarios and domain adaptation approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Target Training Label Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>Target only</td>
<td>Source only</td>
<td>86.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine-tuning only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined approach</td>
<td>89.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaq</td>
<td>Pratheepan</td>
<td>Source only</td>
<td>75.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine-tuning only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined approach</td>
<td>76.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPU</td>
<td>Pratheepan</td>
<td>Source only</td>
<td>23.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine-tuning only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined approach</td>
<td>82.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratheepan</td>
<td>Compaq</td>
<td>Source only</td>
<td>80.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine-tuning only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined approach</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPU</td>
<td>Pratheepan</td>
<td>Source only</td>
<td>36.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine-tuning only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined approach</td>
<td>02.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

very good results on SFA and Pratheepan as targets. These results are illustrated in figures 5 and 6, respectively, which show the effects of using different domain adaptation methods with no labels from target dataset. Note that when using Compaq as source and Pratheepan as target, the gain of the domain adaptation approaches is very expressive when compared to target only training. DA methods got better results using any amount of labels on the target training set, being the combined approach the better option in most cases. Using 50% of training data our cross-domain pseudo-label approach was better than regular supervised training with 100% of training data. Besides that, all the results of DA methods with no labels were better than the state-of-the-art results of color-based approaches presented in Section 4.2.

When VPU is the target dataset, Pratheepan outperformed Compaq as source dataset. However, the pseudo-labels caused negative transfer, leading to very bad results when DA was used. The results with fine-tuning TL were better than regular supervised training with all evaluated amounts of training labels. In this scenario, the reference color-based approach by San Miguel and Suja (2013) was beaten starting from 10% of training label usage. Results with 5, 10, 50% are shown for two sample images in Figure 7.

Still with Pratheepan as source dataset, but with Compaq as target, the “source only” result was reasonable and surpassed color-based approach. However, we observed that DA/TL methods did not remarkably improve the results from regular supervised training. Figure 8 shows the results of fine-tuning from Pratheepan to Compaq.

4.5 Discussion

Although most approaches for skin detection in the past have assumed that skin regions are nearly textureless, our results give the unintuitive conclusion that texture and context play an important role. A holistic segmentation approach like fully convolutional networks, taking the whole image as input, in conjunction with adequate domain adaptation methods, has more generalization power than local approaches like color and patch-based. The improvement level and best DA
The domain adaptation approach varies depending on how close target and source domains are and the diversity of the samples in the source dataset. The closer the domains and the higher the source variety, the higher the improvement. For example, a very positive transfer from Compaq→SFA was observed because Compaq is more diverse and includes samples whose appearance is somewhat similar to those of SFA. This is intuitive, as these approaches depend on the quality of the pseudo-labels. When the transition between domains goes from specific to diverse datasets, the pseudo-labels are expected to be of low quality, thus, not contributing to the target model training.

On these situations, fine-tuning has showed to be more effective, although with the drawback of requiring at least some few labeled images for training.

Domain Adaptation methods have also showed improvements when compared to regular supervised training in cases where the target has few images, like Pratheepan and VPU. The level of improvement depends on the amount of labeled target training data and on the similarity of source and target domains. The higher the amount, the lower the improvement, and the higher the similarity, the higher the improvement. Figure 9 shows a comparison of regular supervised training versus the combined approach in the Compaq→Pratheepan scenario with different proportions of labeled target training samples. For each target test image, the first row is regular supervised training and the second is the combined DA approach.

Figure 8: Adaptation from Pratheepan to Compaq with fine-tuning TL using different amounts of labels on the target training set (following the same setting as Figure 7).

Figure 9: Comparison of source only vs. DA combined approach in the Compaq→Pratheepan scenario with different proportions of labeled target training samples. This scenario is good for pseudo-label approach, since Compaq has more diversity than Pratheepan. Note the superiority of combined approach in each level of training data.

Figure 10, on the other hand, shows the comparison of regular supervised training versus the fine-tune approach in the Pratheepan→VPU scenario. As Pratheepan does not cover scenes that occur on VPU, the fine-tune approach perform better than cross-domain pseudo-labels in this scenario.

Another important aspect to be addressed is the criticism for the unfitting of CNN approaches for real-time applications due to their prediction times. The criticism is probably valid for patch-based CNN approaches, but it does not hold for our FCN holistic approach. The average prediction time of our patch-based CNN, using a simple Nvidia GTX-1080Ti, with a frame size of 768×768 pixels, is 7 secs per image which may not be suitable for real time applications, indeed. However, our U-Net prediction time is 80ms per frame for the same setup, which is more than enough for real time skin-detection. Brancati et al. (2017) has reported prediction time of about 10ms per frame with frame size of 300×400 pixels (8× faster on images that are 5× smaller), which is faster, for sure, but does not disqualify U-Net for real-time applications.
5 Conclusions

We proposed novel approaches of U-net and Patch-based CNNs in same-domain and cross-domain scenarios and compared them with the state-of-the-art pixel-based solutions for skin detection. We also conducted experiments to evaluate different domain adaptation methods for overcoming dataset bias in skin detection.

Our evaluation of in-domain skin detection approaches on different domains/datasets showed the expected and uncontested superiority of CNN based approaches over color based ones. Our U-Net model obtained $F_1$ scores which were on average 30% better than the state-of-the-art recent published color based results. In more homogeneous and clean datasets, like SFA, our $F_1$ score was 73% better. Even in more difficult and heterogeneous datasets, like Pratheepan and VPU, our U-Net CNN was more than 10% better.

More important, we experimentally came to the unintuitive conclusion that a holistic approach like U-net, besides being much faster, gives better results than a patch-based local approach.

We also concluded that the common critique of lack of generalization of CNNs does not hold true against our experimental data. With no labeled data on the target domain, our DA method $F_1$ score improves color based results in 60% for homogeneous target datasets like SFA and 13% in heterogeneous datasets like Pratheepan.

Note that the approaches for both inductive transfer learning (TL) and unsupervised domain adaptation (DA) are baseline methods. More sophisticated approaches have been proposed for both problems, such as Long et al., 2013, FarajiDavar et al., 2017, Csurka, 2017a. Our study shows that, despite the simplicity of the chosen methods, they greatly contribute to the improvement in the performance on skin segmentation across different datasets, showing that even better results are expected with more sophisticated methods.

Among the possible directions for future work we propose the use of iterative DA methods which progressively improve pseudo labels, e.g. FarajiDavar et al., 2011, Long et al., 2013. Another possibility is to exploit a metric that compares the distribution of source and target samples in order to avoid negative transfer by automatically suggesting whether to use DA, TL, the combined approach or if it is better to disregard the source domain and use only the target samples (when labeled samples are available). A similar idea has been used by FarajiDavar et al., 2014, but with a different goal: automatic selection of classifiers for transfer learning.

The use of GANs-based methods for DA (Tzeng et al., 2017) is also a promising avenue for future work.

5.1 Code and weights availability

All source code developed to perform the training and the evaluations, along side the resulting models weights will be made available from http://cic.unb.br/~teodecampos/ upon acceptance of the paper.
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