Biometrics Verification: a Literature Survey

A. H. MIR[*]
Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering, National Institute of Technology, Hazratbal, Srinagar, J&K (India)
S. RUBAB
Department of Physics, National Institute of Technology, Hazratbal, Srinagar, J&K (India)
Z. A. JHAT
Department of Electronics, Islamia College of Science and commerce, Srinagar, J&K (India)

ABSTRACT
Biometric verification refers to an automatic verification of a person based on some specific biometric features derived from his/her physiological and/or behavioral characteristics. A biometric verification system has more capability to reliably distinguish between an authorized person and an imposter than the traditional systems that use a card or a password. In biometrics, a person could be recognized based on who he/she is rather than what he/she has (ID card) or what he/she knows (password). Currently, biometrics finds use in ATMs, computers, security installations, mobile phones, credit cards, health and social services. The future in biometrics seems to belong to the multimodal biometrics (a biometric system using more than one biometric feature) as a unimodal biometric system (biometric system using single biometric feature) has to contend with a number of problems. In this paper, a survey of some of the unimodal biometrics will be presented that are either currently in use across a range of environments or those still in limited use or under development, or still in the research realm.

Keywords: Biometrics, Unimodal Biometrics, Multimodal Biometrics, Verification, Identification, Recognition.

IJCIR Reference Format:
Mir A.H, Rubab, S and Jhat, Z. A. Biometrics Verification: a Literature Survey**.** Journal of Computing and ICT Research, Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp 67-80. http://www.ijcir.org/volume5-number2 /article7.pdf

1. INTRODUCTION

Human verification has traditionally been carried out by using a password and/or ID cards. These methods can be easily breached, for password can be guessed and ID card can be stolen, thus rendering them unreliable [Jain et al. 2006]. Biometrics refers to identifying a person based on his or her physiological or behavioral characteristics; it has the capability to reliably distinguish between an authorized person and an imposter. A biometrics system is a recognition system which operates by acquiring biometric data from an individual, extracting feature sets and comparing it with the template set in the database. Depending upon the application context, the identity of a person can be resolved in two ways: verification and identification. In the former, a person to be identified submits a claim; which is

[*] Author's address: A. H. Mir, Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering, National Institute of Technology, Hazratbal, Srinagar, J&K (India). ahmir@rediffmail.com
S. Rubab, Department of Physics, National Institute of Technology, Hazratbal, Srinagar, J&K (India). *ask_rubab@yahoo.co.in*
Z. A. Jhat. Department of Electronics, Islamia College of Science and commerce, Srinagar, J&K (India). *zahoorjhat@gmail.com*

International Journal of Computing and ICT Research, ISSN 1818-1139 (Print), ISSN 1996-1065 (Online), Vol.5, No.2 pp 67-80. December 2011.

either accepted or rejected. In the latter, a person is identified without a person claiming to be identified. In literature, however, verification and identification are interchangeably used for biometrics recognition [Jain et al. 1997].

2. BIOMETRICS

There are many biometrics in use today and a range of biometrics that are still in the early stages of development. Biometrics can, therefore, be divided into two categories: those that are currently in use across a range of environments and those still in limited use or under development, or still in the research realm. Here we present literature survey for some of the biometrics of the two categories.

2.1. Biometrics Currently in Use across a Range of Environments

2.1.1. Fingerprint

Fingerprint is the pattern of ridges and valleys on the tip of a finger and is used for personal verification of people. Fingerprint based recognition method because of its relatively outstanding features of universality, permanence, uniqueness, accuracy and low cost has made it most popular and a reliable technique and is currently the leading biometric technology [Jain et al. 2004]. There is archaeological evidence that Assyrians and Chinese ancient civilizations have used fingerprints as a form of identification since 7000 to 6000 BC [Maltoni et al. 2003]. Henry Fauld in 1880 laid the scientific foundation of the modern fingerprint recognition by introducing minutiae feature for fingerprint matching [Maltoni et al. 2003]. Current fingerprint recognition techniques can be broadly classified as Minutiae-based, Ridge feature-based, Correlation-based [Jain and Prabhkar, 2001] and Gradient based [Aggarwal et al. 2008].

Most automatic fingerprint identification systems employ techniques based on minutiae points [Jain and Prabhkar, 2001]. Although the minutiae pattern of each finger is quite unique, noise and distortion during the acquisition of the fingerprint and errors in the minutiae extraction process result in a number of missing and spurious minutiae [Chikkerur et al. 2006]. To overcome the difficulty of reliably obtaining minutiae points from a poor quality fingerprint image, ridge feature-based method is used. A ridge is a pattern of lines on a finger tip. This method uses ridge features like the orientation and the frequency of ridges, ridge shape and texture information for fingerprint matching. However, the ridge feature-based methods suffer from their low discrimination capability [Maltoni et al. 2003]. The correlation-based techniques make two fingerprint images superimposed and do correlation (at the intensity level) between the corresponding pixels for different alignments. These techniques are highly sensitive to non-linear distortion, skin condition, different finger pressure and alignment [Yousiff et al. 2007]. Most of these techniques use minutiae for alignment first.

The smooth flow pattern of ridges and valleys in a fingerprint can be also viewed as an oriented texture [Jain and Prabhkar, 2001]. [Jain et al. 2000] describe a global texture descriptor called ‘Finger Code’ that utilizes both global and local ridge descriptions for an oriented texture such as fingerprints. A variation to this method is used by [Chikkerur et al. 2006] that use localized texture features of minutiae and another one by [Zhengu et al. 2006] that uses texture correlation matching. Further, [Aggarwal et al. 2008] proposed gradient based approach to capture textural information by dividing each minutiae neighbourhood locations into several local regions of which histograms of oriented gradients are then computed to characterize textural information around each minutiae location. Recently, [Jhat et al. 2011] proposed that Texture feature of Energy of a fingerprint can be used for effecting fingerprint verification.

Face

Face recognition for its easy use and non intrusion has made it one of the popular biometric [Chellappa, 1995]. A summary of the existing techniques for human face recognition can be found in [Chellappa et al. 1995; Zhao et al. 2003]. Further, a survey of existing face recognition technologies and challenges is given [Abate et al. 2007]. A number of algorithms have been proposed for face recognition. Such algorithms can be divided into two categories: geometric feature-based and appearance-based. Appearance-based methods include: Eigenfaces [Turk and Pentland, 1991], Fisherfaces [Belhumeur et al. 1997], Independent Component Analysis (ICA) [Bartlett et al. 2002], Kernel Principal Component Analysis (KPCA) [Scholkopf et al. 1999, Kim et al. 2002], Kernel Fisher Discriminant Analysis (KFDA) [Liu 2004, Yang 2002], General Discriminant Analysis (GDA) [Baudat and Anouar, 2000], Neural Networks [Lawrence et al. 1998], and Support Vector Machine (SVM) [Phillips, 1999; Jonsson et al. 2002].

An inherent drawback of appearance-based methods is that the recognition of a face under a particular lighting and pose can be performed reliably when the face has been previously seen under similar circumstances. Further, in appearance-based methods the captured features are global features of the face images and facial occlusion is often difficult to handle in these approaches. Geometric feature-based methods are robust against variations in illumination and viewpoints but very sensitive to feature extraction process. The geometry feature-based methods analyze explicit local facial features, and their geometric relationships. The geometry feature-based methods include: Active Shape Mode [Cootes et al. 1995; Yuille, 1991], Elastic Bunch Graph matching [Wiskott et al. 1997] and Local Feature Analysis (LFA) [Penev and Atick 1996].

Recognition of faces from still images or 2D images is a difficult problem, because the illumination, pose and expression changes in the images create great statistical differences and the identity of the face itself becomes shadowed by these factors. To overcome this problem 3D face recognition has been proposed which has the potential to overcome feature localization, pose and illumination problems, and it can be used in conjunction with 2D systems. Research using 3D face data to identify humans was first published by [Cartoux et al. 1989]. The 3D face data encodes the structure of the face and so is inherently robust to pose and illumination variations. Applying HMMs to 3D face verification was first attempted by [Achermann et al. 1997]. A recent advance for 3D face verification has been to show the applicability of the Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) parts-based approach [Mccool et al. 2008]. The drawbacks of 3D face recognition include high cost and decreased ease-of-use for laser sensors, low accuracy for other acquisiton types, and the lack of sufficiently powerful algorithms.

Iris

The iris is a thin circular diaphragm, which lies between the cornea and the lens of the human eye. A survey on the current iris recognition technologies is available in [Bowyer et al. 2008]. [Flom and Ara, 1987] first proposed the concept of automated iris recognition. It was John Daugman who implemented a working automated iris recognition system [Daugman, 1993; Daugman, 2003]. Though Daugman's system is the most successful and most well known, many other systems have also been developed. An automatic segmentation algorithm based on the circular Hough transform is employed by [Wildes, 1997]. [Boles and Boashash, 1998] extracted iris features using a 1-D wavelet transform. [Sanchez-Avila and Sanchez-Reillo, 2002], further developed the iris representation method proposed by Boles et al. [Lim et al. 2001] extracted the iris feature using 2-D Haar wavelet transform and [Park et al. 2003] utilized directional filter banks to extract the normalized directional energy as a feature. [Kumar et al. 2003] employed correlation filters. Recently Ma et al. proposed two iris recognition methods, one using multi-channel Gabor filters [Ma et al. 2002] and the other using circular symmetric filters [Ma et al. 2002]. Later, they proposed an improved method based on characterizing key local variations with a particular class of wavelets, recording a position sequence of local sharp variation points in these signals as features [Ma et al. 2004]. Several other methods have also been developed for iris recognition. [Chen et al. 2006] proposed using Daugman's 2-D Gabor filter with quality measure enhancement. [Du et al. 2006] proposed using 1-D local texture patterns and [Sun et al. 2005] proposed using moment- based iris blob matching.

Hand geometry

Hand geometry refers to the geometric structure of the hand that is composed of the lengths of fingers, the widths of fingers, and the width of a palm, etc. The advantages of a hand geometry system are that it is a relatively simple method that can use low resolution images and provides high efficiency with great users' acceptance [Golfarelli et al. 1997, Jain et al. 1999]. A brief survey of reported systems for hand-geometry verification can be found in [Golfarelli et al. 1997;Jain et al. 1999; Sanchez-Reillo et al. 2000; Pavesic et al.]. An elaborate survey on hand geometry verification is given in [Dutan, 2009]. Geometrical features of the hand constitute the bulk of the hand features adopted in most of the hand recognition systems. One advantage is that geometrical features are more or less invariant to the global positioning of the hand and to the individual planar orientations of the fingers. Among numerous geometrical measures include lengths, widths, areas, and perimeters of the hand, fingers and the palm. [Jain et al. 1999], have shown that hand geometrical features solely are not sufficiently discriminative. Therefore, for more demanding applications one must revert to alternative features such as hand global shape, appearance and/or texture. [Jain et al. 1999] thus use 16 axes predetermined with the aid of five pegs. [Sanchez-Reillo et al. 2000] use a similar set of geometric features, containing the widths of the four fingers measured at different latitude, the lengths of the three fingers and the palm. [Wong and Shi, 2002], in addition to finger widths, lengths and interfinger baselines, employ the fingertip regions. [Bulatov et al. 2002] describe a peg-free system where 30 geometrical measures are extracted from the hand images. In addition to widths, perimeters and areas of the fingers, they also incorporate the radii of inscribing circles of the fingers.

The other approach in hand geometry verification is contour-based [Jain and Duta, 1999]. The contour is completely determined by the black-and-white image of the hand and can be derived from it by means of simple image-processing techniques. It can be modelled by features that capture more details of the shape of the hand than the standard geometrical features do. Accordingly, various techniques have been proposed to obtain and mathematically represent these hand features [Sanchez-Reillo, 2000; Alexandra et al. 2002]. Recently, [Yoruk et al. 2006] introduced a more accurate and detailed representation of the hand using the Hausdorff distance of the hand contour, and Independent Component Analysis (ICA).

Palmprint

Palmprint is the region between the wrist and fingers. Palmprint features like ridges, singular points, minutia points, principal lines, wrinkles and texture can used for personal verification [Shu and Zhang, 1998]. There are two types of palmprint verification systems: high resolution and low resolution. High resolution system employs high resolution images, while low resolution system employs low resolution images. In high resolution images, ridges, singular points and minutia points are used as features. In low resolution images, it is principal lines, wrinkles and texture that are used as features. Palmprint verification techniques can be mainly divided into four categories: (1) line based [Zhang and Zhang, 2004;Han et al. 2003;Lin et al. 2005;Wu et al. 2004;Wu et al. 2006;Liu and Zhang, 2005;Liu et al. 2007]; (2) texture based [Zhan et al. 2003, Kong et al. 2006]; (3) orientation based [Kong and Zhang, 2006, Kong et al. 2006]; and (4) appearance based [Wu et al. 2005; Connie et al. 2005;Lu et al. 2003;Wu et al. 2003; Ribaric and Fratric 2005;HU et al. 2007;Yang et al. 2007].

A line in a palmprint is its basic feature. Line based approaches, therefore, play an important role in palmprint verification. Zhang et al. used overcomplete wavelet expansion and directional context modeling technique to extract principal lines-like features [Zhang and Zhang, 2004]. Han et al. proposed using Sobel and morphological operations to extract the line like features from palmprint images [Han et al. 2003]. Lin et al. applied the hierarchical decomposition mechanism to extract principal palmprint features, which includes directional and multi-resolution decompositions [Lin et al. 2005]. Additionally, Wu et al. and Liu et al. proposed two different approaches based on palm lines in which the palm lines were regarded as a kind of roof edge, and extracted according to the zero-cross points of lines' first-order derivative and the magnitude of second derivative [Wu et al. 2004; Wu et al. 2006;Liu and Zhang, 2005;Liu et al. 2007]. The main approaches based on texture extract exploit 2-D Gabor filter [Zhang et al. 2003, Kong et al. 2006]. Zhang and Kong et al. proposed an approach based on texture called as PalmCode for palmprint verification, which exploit zero-crossing information on a palmprint image by using Gabor filter [Zhang et al. 2003]. Subsequently, Kong et al. used fusion rule at feature layer to further improve PalmCode, named as FusionCode [Kong et al. 2006].

Recently, orientation codes have been found to be most promising methods, since the orientation feature contains more discriminative power than other features, and is more robust for the change of illumination. Kong and Zhang were the first who investigated the orientation information of the palm lines for palmprint verification and their approach was defined as Competitive Code [Kong and Zhang, 2004, Kong et al. 2006]. Wu et al. proposed another approach based on orientation named as palmprint orientation code (POC) [Wu et al. 2005]. Moreover, some important appearance based approaches [Connie et al. 2005;Lu et al. 2003;Wu et al. 2003; Ribaric and Fratric 2005;Hu et al. 2007;Yang et al. 2007] include such methods as principal component analysis (PCA), independent component analysis (ICA), locality preserving projections (LPP), linear discriminant analysis (LDA), etc., have also been exploited for palmprint verification.

Speaker /voice

Speaker/voice verification combines physiological and behavioral factors to produce speech patterns that can be captured by speech processing technology. Inherent properties of the speaker like fundamental frequency, nasal tone, cadence, inflection etc. are used for speech authentication. Speaker recognition systems are classified as text-dependent (fixed-text) and text- independent (free-text). The text-dependent systems generally perform better than text-independent systems because of the foreknowledge of what is said can be exploited to align speech signals into more discriminant classes. The text-dependent systems, however, require a user to repronounce some specified utterances, usually containing the same text as the training data. A survey of text-dependent verification techniques is given in [H´ebert, 2008].

Text-dependent systems are also called Fixed Phrase Verification Systems, where a fixed phrase is used both during the training and the verification time and thus the Dynamic Time Wrapping (DTW) [Furui, 1981] approach has been mostly used for such systems. Nowadays, Text-dependent systems based on Hidden Markov Model (HMM) using Gaussian or multi-Gaussian distributions [BenZeghiba and Bourland, 2006] are more popular. In text independent speaker verification, the users are not restricted to any fixed or prompted phrases. They have the freedom to say whatever they want. To account for the expected freedom of utterances different methods have been proposed such as: Long-term statistics and multidimensional autoregressive [Montacie et al. 1992]; Vector quantization [Soong et al. 1997]; HMMs [Naik et al. 1989]; Artificial Neural Networks(ANN) [Farrell et al. 1994]; Gaussian Mixture Models (GMMs) [Reynolds and Rose 1995; Reynolds et al. 2000]; and SVM [Campbell et al. 2006]. The GMMs are the basis in most of the Speaker verification systems today. Recently, the combined GMM-SVM method [Djemili et al. 2007] has been shown to give gave slightly better results than the GMM method alone.

Signature

Handwritten signature is one of the first accepted civilian and forensic biometric verification technique in our society [Abuhaiba, 2007]. Human verification is normally very accurate in identifying genuine signatures. Signature verification systems use the distinctive behavioural features of a signature (such as speed, pressure and stroke order) to verify the identity of the user, as opposed to a simple physical crosscheck of one signature and another. The signature verification problem can be classified into two categories: offline and online. Off-line method identifies signatures using an image processing procedure whereby the user is supposed to have written down completely the signature onto a template that is later captured by a CCD camera or scanner to be processed. On-line signature verification involves the capturing of dynamic signature signals such as pressure of pen tips, time duration of whole signature and velocity along signature path. On-line systems use special input devices such as tablets, while off-line approaches are much more difficult because the only available information is a static two-dimensional image obtained by scanning pre-written signatures on a paper; the dynamic information of the pen-tip (stylus) movement such as pen-tip coordinates, pressure, velocity, acceleration, and pen-up and pen- down can be captured by a tablet in real time but not by an image scanner. The off-line method, therefore, needs to apply complex image processing techniques to segments and analyse signature shape for feature extraction. Hence, on-line signature verification is potentially more successful. Nevertheless, off-line systems have a significant advantage in that they do not require access to special processing devices when the signatures are produced. Types of signature verification, methods and performance evaluation can be found in [Plamondon and Lorette, 1989; Leclerc and Plamondon, 1994; Plamondon and Srihari, 2000]. Among the many offline signature verification techniques, HMM-based [Camino et al 1999;Fang et al. 2002], Fuzzy Logic [Hanmandlu et al. 2005; Ismail and Gad, 2000; Simon et al. 1997], Neural Networks (NNs) [Vélez et al. 2003], Neuro-fuzzy [Franke et al. 2002], Genetic Algorithms (GAs) [Ramesh AND Narasimha, 1999], Elastic Graph Matching [Fang et al. 2002], Dynamic Time Warping [Shanker and Tajagopalan, 2007], Optimal Displacements Functions [Muzukami et al. 2002] and Fuzzy Snake Model [Vélez José et al. 2009] are worth noting. Similarly for online signature verification, so far there have been many widely employed methods, for example, Artificial Neural Networks [Martens and Claesen 1996;Wu et al. 1997; KATONA et al. 1995], Dynamic Time Warping [Mautner et al. 2002;Rhee et al. 2001; Quan and Ji, 2005.], and the Hidden Markov Models [Nelson et al. 1994; Bourlard and Morgan, 1998].

2.2. Biometrics in Limited Use or Underdevelopment, or Still in the Research Realm

2.2.1. Earshape

It is known that the shape of the ear and the structure of the cartilegenous tissue of the pinna are distinctive. Although a newcomer in the biometrics field, ears have long been used as a means of human identification in the forensic field. A small literature on ear biometrics is given in [Pun and Moon, 2004; Yan and Bowyer, 2005]. A recent survey on ear biometrics has been provided by [Hurley et al. 2008]. Although ear recognition is a relatively new topic, researchers have already come up with various approaches which drastically differ from each other in terms of acquisition, raw data interpretation and feature extraction. Some of them hve been widely used in human verification, e.g. Principal Component Analysis PCA [Victor et al. 2002], Neural Networks [Carreira-Perpinan, 1995] and Force field transformation [Hurley et al. 2005].

Most ear biometric approaches have exploited the ear's planar shape. One of the first ear biometric works utilizing machine vision was introduced by [Burge and Burger, 1998] based on adjacency graph which was calculated from a Voronoi diagram of the ear curves. [Hurley et al. 2005] used force field feature extraction to map the ear to an energy field. The geometrical properties of ear curves have also been used for recognition [Choras, 2005; Iannarelli, 1989]. The most prominent example of these has been proposed by [Iannarelll, 1989], was based on measurements between a numbers of landmark points, determined manually. [Naseem et al. 2008] have proposed the use of sparse representation, following its successful application in face recognition. The 3D structure of the ear has also been exploited, and good results have been obtained [Yan and Bowyer 2007; Chen and Bhanu, 2007]. [Yan et al. 2007] captured 3D ear images using a range scanner and having segmented the ear, they used Iterative Closest Point (ICP) registration for recognition. [Chen et al. 2007] proposed a 3D ear detection and recognition system using a model ear for detection, and using a local surface descriptor and ICP for recognition. Though using 3D can improve the performance, using 2D images is consistent with deployment in surveillance or other planar image scenarios. In related studies [Akkermans et al. 2005] developed an ear biometric system based on the acoustic properties of the outer and middle ear.

2.2.2. Knuckle crease

The image pattern formation from the finger-knuckle bending is highly unique and makes this surface a distinctive biometric identifier [Woodard and Flynn, 2005]. [Woodard and Flynn, 2005] were the first to exploit the use of finger knuckle surface in biometric systems. However, their work did not provide a practical solution in establishing an efficient system using the outer fingers. Later, [Kumar and Ravikanth, 2007; Kumar and Ravikanth, 2009] proposed another approach to personal authentication using 2D finger-back surface imaging features. In Kumar’s later work [Kumar and Zhou, 2009; Kumar and Zhou, 2009] used the robust line orientation code proposed in Jia et al. 2008 to extract the orientation of the finger-back surface images. Few works have also studied use of knuckle print texture on the fingers as a biometric characteristic for recognition. Li et al. 2003 used a hierarchical classification method to study knuckle print based on location and line features [LI et al. 2004]. In Ribaric and Fratric, 2005, principal Component Analysis was employed to project finger images into lower dimensional subspace. Apart from that, [Loris and Alessandra, 2009] also investigated knuckle features by fusing the knuckle print pattern from the middle and ring fingers. Recently, Kumar and Ravikanth, 200] has detailed the usage of finger knuckle surface for online user identification using combination of sub-space features.

2.2.3. Brain/EEG

Using elctroencephalogram (EEG) as a biometric is a new approach. Poulos et al, 1999 have proposed to model the EEG signal using autoregressive (AR) models and then using Kohonen’s Vector Quantizer (VQ) for the classification. Paranjape et al, 2001 also proposed to represent the EEG signal using AR models, however, discriminant analysis is employed to perform the classification. Palaniappan and Ravi, 2003 further investigated features based on the spectral power of the signal together with a fuzzy Neural Network for the classification. More recently Gaussian Mixture Models and Maximum a Posteriori model adaptation has been proposed in S´ebastien, 2007.

2.2.4. Heart sound/ECG

The use the electrocardiogram (ECG) as a biometric has been found to give relatively high result for human recognition [Biel et al. 2001; Israel et al. 2005]. Israel et al, 2005 investigated the effect of the state of anxiety of an individual on its ECG features through a series of high and low stress tasks. Test results show that the features extracted from the ECG signal are unique to an individual and invariant to the individual state of anxiety. Israel et al, 2005 also found that the identification performance is independent of the electrode placements. However, ECG for identification is generally cumbersome due to the many electrodes required [Biel et al. 2001].

3. MULTIMODAL BIOMETRICS VERFICATION

Most of the biometric systems that are in use in practical application use a single piece of information for recognition and are as such called unimodal biometric systems. The unimodal biometric recognition systems, however, have to contend with a variety of problems like non-universality, susceptibility to spoofing, noise in sensed data, intra –class variations, inter-class similarities. Some limitations of the unimodal biometric systems can be alleviated by using multimodal system [Brunelli and Falavigna, 1995]. A biometric system that combines more than one sources of information for establishing human identity is called a multimodal biometric system. Combining the information cues from different biometric sources using an effective fusion scheme can significantly improve accuracy [Hong et al, 1999] of a biometric system.

The information fusion in multibiometrics can be done in different ways: fusion at the sensor level, feature extraction level, matching score level and decision level. Sensor level fusion is rarely used as fusion at this level requires that the data obtained from the different biometric sensors must be compatible, which is seldom the case. Fusion at the feature extraction level is not always possible as the feature sets used by different biometric modalities may either be inaccessible or incompatible. Fusion at the decision level is too rigid as only a limited amount of information is available. Fusion at the matching score level is , therefore, preferred due to presence of sufficient information content and the ease in accessing and combining match scores [Ross, 2007].

A number of works showing advantages of multimodal biometric verification systems have been reported in literature. Brunelli and Falavigna, 1995 have proposed personal identification system based on acoustic and visual features, where they use a HyperBF network as the best performing fusion module. Duc et al, 1997 proposed a simple averaging technique combining face and speech information. Kittler et al, 1998 have experimented with several fusion techniques using face and voice biometrics, including sum, product, minimum, median, and maximum rules and they have found that the best combination results are obtained for a simple sum rule. Hong and Jain, 1998 proposed a multimodal personal identification system which integrates face and fingerprints that complement each other. The fusion algorithm combines the scores from the different experts under statistically independence hypothesis. Ben-Yacoub et al, 1999 proposed several fusion approaches, such as Support Vector Machines (SVM), tree classifiers and multi-layer perceptrons, combining face and voice biometrics. Pigeon and Vandendorpe, 1998 proposed a multimodal person authentication approach based on simple fusion algorithms to combine the results coming from face and voice biometrics. Choudhury et al, 1999 proposed a multimodal person recognition using unconstrained audio and video and the combination of the two features is performed using a Bayes net. Ross and Jain, combine face, fingerprint and hand geometry biometrics combining them under sum, decision tree and linear discriminant- based method. The sum rule is reported to outperform others. Various other biometric combinations have been proposed [Jain et al. 2004; Chen and Chu, 2005; Nageshkumar et al. 2009] that report that combining more than one biometric modalities together result in improved performance than using them alone.

4. CONCLUSION

Biometrics refers to an automatic authentication of a person based on his physiological and/or behavioral characteristics. The usage of biometrics as a reliable means of authentication is currently gaining momentum, thou the industry is still evolving and emerging. The unimodal biometric recognition systems have to contend with a variety of problems and thus presently the amount of applications employing unimodal biometric systems is quite limited. Some limitations of the unimodal biometric systems can be alleviated by using multimodal biometric systems, which integrate information at various levels to improve performance. The future of biometrics can thus be envisaged to perhaps belong to multimodal biometric systems.

REFERENCES

ABATE A. F., NAPPI M., RICCIO D., AND SABATINO G. 2007. 2D and 3D face recognition: A survey. *Pattern Recognit Letters*, Vol. 28, pp. 1885-1906.

ABUHAIBA I. S. I., 2007. Offline Signature Verification Using Graph Matching. *Turk J Elec Engin*, Vol. 15(1).

ACHERMANN B., JIANG X., AND BUNKE H. 1997. Face recognition using range images. In *International Conference on Virtual Systems and MultiMedia*, pp. 129–136.

AGGARWAL G., RATHA N. K., TSAI-YANG J., AND BOLLE R. M. 2008. Gradient based textural characterization of fingerprints. *In proceedings of IEEE International conference on Biometrics: Theory, Applications and Systems*.

AKKERMANS A. H. M., KEVENAAR T. A. M., AND SCHOBBEN D. W. E. 2005. Acoustic ear recognition for person identification. In *AutoID'05*, pp. 219–223.

ALEXANDRA L., WONG N. AND PENGCHENG S. 2002. Peg-Free Hand Geometry Recognition Using Hierarchical Geometry and Shape Matching. *IAPR Workshop on Machine Vision Applications*, Nara, Japan, pp. 281-284.

BARTLETT M. S., MOVELLAN J. R., AND SEJNOWSKI T. J. 2002. Face recognition by independent component analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, Vol. 13, pp. 1450–1464.

BAUDAT G. AND ANOUAR F. E. 2000. Generalized discriminant analysis using a kernel approach. *Neural Computation*, Vol. 12, pp. 2385–2404.

BELHUMEUR P. N., HESPANHA J. P., AND KRIEGMAN D. J. 1997. Eigenfaces vs. Fisherfaces: recognition using class specific linear projection. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 19, pp. 711–720.

BEN-YACOUB S., ABDELJAOUED Y., AND MAYORAZ E. 1999. Fusion of Face and Speech Data for Person Identity Verification. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, Vol. 10(5), pp. 1065-1075.

BENZEGHIBA M. AND BOURLAND H. 2006. User-customized password speaker verification using multiple reference and background models. *Speech Communication*, Vol. 48, pp. 1200–1213.

BIEL L., PETTERSSON O., PHILIPSON L., AND WIDE P. 2001. ECG analysis: A New Approach in Human Identification. *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas*., Vol. 50 (3), pp. 808–812.

BOLES W.W. AND BOASHASH B. 1998. A Human Identification Technique using images of the iris and wavelet transform. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process*, Vol. 46, pp. 1185–1188.

BOURLARD H. AND MORGAN N.1998. Hybrid HMM/ANN systems for speech recognition: overview and new research directions. In *Adaptive Processing, in Lect. Notes Artif. Intell*., Vol. 1387, pp. 389–417.

BOWYER K. W., HOLLINGSWORTH K., AND FLYNN P. J. 2008. Image Understanding for Iris Biometrics: a Survey. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, Vol. 110.

BRUNELLI R. AND FALAVIGNA D. 1995. Personal Identification Using Multiple Cues. *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 17(10), pp. 955-966.

BULATOV Y., JAMBAWALIKAR S., KUMAR P., AND SETHIA S. 2002. Hand Recognition Using Geometric Classifiers. *DIMACS Workshop on Computational Geometry*, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, pp. 14-15.

BURGE M. AND BURGER W. 1998. Ear Biometrics. In *A. Jain, R. Bolle, and S. Pankanti, editors, BIOMETRICS: Personal Identification in a Networked Society*, pp. 273–286. Kluwer Academic.

CAMINO J. L., TRAVIESO C. M., MORALES C. R., AND FERRER M. A., 1999. Signature Classification by hidden Markov models. In *IEEE 33th Internat. Carnahan Conf. on Security Technology*, pp. 481–484.

CAMPBELL W., CAMPBELL J., REYNOLDS D., SINGER E., AND TORRES-CARRASQUILLO P., 2006. Support Vector Machines for Speaker and Language Recognition. *Computer Speech and Language*, Vol. 20, pp. 210–229.

CARREIRA-PERPINAN, 1995. Compression neural networks for feature extraction: Application to human recognition from ear images. *M. Sc. thesis, Faculty of Informatics*, Technical University of Madrid, Spain.

CARTOUX J. Y., LAPRESTE J. T., AND RICHETIN M. 1989. Face authentication or recognition by profile extraction from range images. In *Workshop on Interpretation of 3D Scenes*, pp. 194–199.

CHELLAPPA R., WILSON C. L., AND SIROHEY C. 1995. Human and machine recognition of faces: A survey. *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 83, no. 5, pp. 705-740.

CHEN C., AND CHU C. 2005. *Fusion of Face and Iris Features for Multimodal Biomertics*. Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg.

CHEN H. AND BHANU B. 2007. Human ear recognition in 3D. *IEEE TPAMI*, Vol. 29(4), pp. 718–737.

CHEN Y., DASS S. C. AND JAIN A. K. 2006. Localized iris image quality using 2-D wavelets. *IEEE Int Conf. Biometrics*.

CHIKKERUR S., PANKANTI S., JEA A., AND BOLLE R. 2006. Fingerprint Representation using Localized Texture Features. *The 18th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*.

CHORAS M., 2005. Ear biometrics based on geometrical feature extraction. *Electronic Letters on Computer Vision and Image Analysis*, Vol. 5(3), pp. 84–95.

CHOUDHURY T., CLARKSON B., JEBARA T., AND PENTLAND A. 1999. Multimodal Person Recognition Using Unconstrained Audio and Video. In *Second International Conference on Audio- and Video-based Biometric Person Authentication*, 22-23, Washington D.C., USA, pp. 176–181.

CONNIE T., JIN A. T. B., ON M. G. K., AND LING D. N. C. 2005. An Automated Palmprint Recognition System. *Image Vision Comput*., Vol. 23 (5), pp. 501–515.

COOTES T. F., TAYLOR C. J., COOPER D. H., AND GRAHAM J. 1995. Active Shape Models—their Training and Application. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, Vol. 61, pp. 38–59.

DAUGMAN J. G., 1993. High Confidential Visual Recognition by Test of Statistical Independence. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell*., Vol. 15, pp. 1148–1161.

DAUGMAN J. G. 2003. The Importance of being random: statistical principles of iris recognition. *Pattern Recognition* Vol. 36, pp. 279–291.

DJEMILI RAFIK, BEDDA MOULDI, AND BOUROUBA HOCINE. 2007. A Hybrid GMM/SVM System for Text Independent Speaker Identification. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering*, Vol. 1.

DU Y., IVES R. W., ETTER D. M., AND WELCH T. B. 2006. Use of one-dimensional iris signatures to rank iris pattern similarities. *Opt Eng*, Vol. 45, 037110–201.

DUC B., MAÝTRE G., FISCHER S., AND BIGUN J. 1997. Person Authentication by Fusing Face and Speech Information. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Audio and Video-based Biometric Person Authentication*, 12-24, Crans-Montana, Switzerland, pp. 311-318.

DUTA N., 2009. A Survey of Biometric Technology Based on Hand shape. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 42, pp. 2797 – 2806.

FANG B., FANG B., LEUNG C., TANG Y.Y., KWOK P., TSE K.W., AND WONG I.K., 2002. Off-line Signature Verification with Generated Training Samples. *IEEE Proc. Vision Image Signal Process*, Vol. 149 (2), pp. 85–90.

FARRELL K., MAMMONE R., AND ASSALEH K. 1994. Speaker Recognition Using Neural Networks and Conventional Classifiers. *IEEE Trans. on Speech and Audio Processing,* Vol. 2, pp. 194–205.

FLOM L. AND ARAN S., 1987. Iris Recognition System, U.S. Patent 4,641,349.

FRANKE K., ZHANG Y. N., AND KÖPPEN M. 2002. Static Signature Verification Employing a Kosko neuro-fuzzy approach. In *N. R. Pal, M. Sugeno (Eds.), AFSS 2002, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 2275, pp. 185–190.

FURUI S. 1981. Cepstral Analysis Technique for Automatic Speaker Verification. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, Vol. 29, pp. 254–272.

GOLFARELLI M., MAIO D., AND MALTONI D. 1997. On the error-reject trade-off in biometric verification systems. *IEEE Trans. PAMI*, Vol. 19(7), pp. 786–796.

H´EBERT M. 2008. Text-dependent speaker recognition. In *Springer handbook of speech processing*, *J. Benesty,M. Sondhi, and Y.Huang, Eds., Springer Verlag*, pp. 743–762.

HAN C. C., CHENG H. L., LIN C. L., AND FAN K. C. 2003. Personal authentication using palmprint features. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 36 (2), pp. 371–381.

HANMANDLU M., YUSOF M. H. M., MADASU V. K. 2005. Off-line signature verification and forgery detection using fuzzy modeling. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 38, pp. 341–356.

HONG L. AND JAIN A. 1998. Integrating Faces and Fingerprints for Personal Identification. In *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 20(12), pp. 1295–1307.

HONG L., JAIN A. AND PANKANTI S. 1999. Can Multibiometrics Improve Performance? In *Proceedings AutoID'99*, Summit, NJ, pp. 59-64.

HU D. W., FENG G.Y., AND ZHOU Z.T. 2007. Two-dimensional locality preserving projections (2DLPP) with its application to palmprint recognition. *Pattern Recognition,* Vol. 40 (1), pp. 339–342.

HURLEY D. J., ARBAB-ZAVAR B., AND NIXON M. S. 2008. The ear as a biometric. In *A. Jain, P. Flynn, and A. Ross, editors, Handbook of Biometrics*, pp. 131–150, Springer.

HURLEY D. J., NIXON M. S., AND CARTER J. N., 2005. Force field feature extraction for ear biometrics. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, Vol. 98, pp. 491–512.

IANNARELLI A., 1989. *Ear Identification*. Paramount Publishing Company, Freemont, California.

ISMAIL M. AND GAD S. 2000. Off-line arabic signature recognition and verification. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 33 pp. 1727–1740.

ISRAEL S. A., IRVINE J. M., CHENG A., WIEDERHOLD M. D. AND WIEDERHOLD B. K. 2005. ECG to identify individuals. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 38 (1), pp. 133–142.

JAIN A. K. AND DUTA N. 1999. Deformable Matching of Hand Shapes for Verification. *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. 857- 861.

JAIN A. K. AND PRABHKAR S. 2001. Fingerprint Matching Using Minutiae and Texture Features. *Proceeding of International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pp. 282-285.

JAIN A. K., HONG L., PANKANTI S., AND BOLLE R. 1997. An Identity-Authentication System using Fingerprints. *In Proceeding of the IEEE,* Vol. 85, pp. 1365-1388.

JAIN A. K., NANDAKUMAR K., LU X., AND PARK U. 2004. Integrating Faces, Fingerprints, and Soft

Biometric Traits for User Recognition. *Proceedings of Biometric Authentication Workshop, LNCS* 3087, pp. 259-269, Prague.

JAIN A. K., PRABHKAR S., HONG L., AND PANKANTI S. 2000. Filterbank-Based Fingerprint Matching. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 9, pp. 846-853.

JAIN A. K., ROSS A., AND PANKANTI S. 1999. A prototype hand geometry-based verification system. In *Proceedings of 2nd Int. Conference on Audio and Video-based Biometric Person Authentication (AVBPA*), pp. 166-171.

JAIN A. K., ROSS A., AND PANKANTI S. 1999. A prototype hand geometry based verification system. In *Proceedings of the second International Conference on Audio- and Video-Based Personal Authentication (AVBPA),* pp. 166–171, Washington.

JAIN A. K., ROSS A., AND PANKANTI S. 2006. Biometrics: A Tool for Information Security. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, Vol. 1.

JAIN A. K., ROSS A., AND PRABHKAR S. 2004. An Introduction to Biometric Recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology, special issue on Image and Video – Based Biometrics*, Vol. 14, pp. 4-20.

JHAT Z. A., MIR A. H. AND RUBAB S. 2011. Fingerprint Texture Feature for Discrimination and Personal Verification. *International Journal of Security and its Applications*, Vol. 5, No. 3.

JIA W., HUANG D. S., AND ZHANG D. 2008. Palmprint verification based on robust line orientation code. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 41 (5), pp. 1504–1513.

JONSSON K., KITTLER J., LI Y. P., AND MATAS J. 2002. Support vector machines for face authentication. *Image and Vision Computing*, Vol. 20, pp. 369–375.

KATONA E., PALAGYI K., AND TOTH N.1995. Signature verification using neural nets. In *Proceedings of the 9th Scandinavian Conference on Image Analysis*, SCIA'05, Uppsala, Sweden, pp. 1115–1122.

KIM K. I., JUNG K. AND KIM H.J. 2002. Face recognition using kernel principal component analysis. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, Vol. 9, pp. 40–42.

KITTLER J., HATEF M., DUIN R. P. W., AND MATAS J. 1998. On Combining Classifiers. In *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 20(3), pp. 226–239.

KONG A. AND ZHANG D. 2004. Competitive coding scheme for palmprint verification. In *Proceedings of the 17th ICPR*, Vol. 1, pp. 520–523.

KONG A., ZHANG D., AND KAMEL M. 2006. Palmprint identification using feature level fusion. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 39, pp. 478–487.

KONG A., ZHANG D., AND LU G. M, 2006. A study of identical twin's palmprints for personal verification. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 39 (11), pp. 2149–2156.

KUMAR A. AND RAVIKANTH C. 2007. Biometric authentication using finger-back surface. In *Proceedings of CVPR'07*, pp. 1-6.

KUMAR A. AND RAVIKANTH C. 2009. Personal authentication using finger knuckle surface. *IEEE Trans. Information Forensics and Security*, Vol. 4 (1), pp. 98-109.

KUMAR A. AND RAVIKANTH CH. 2009. Personal authentication using finger knuckle surface. *IEEE Trans. Info. Forensics & Security*, Vol. 4(1), pp. 98-110.

KUMAR A. AND ZHOU Y. 2009. Human identification using knuckle codes. In *Proceedings of BTAS'09*.

KUMAR A. AND ZHOU Y., 2009. Personal identification using finger knuckle orientation features. *Electronic Letters*, Vol. 45 (20), pp. 1023-1025.

KUMAR B., XIE C. AND THORNTON J. 2003. Iris verification using correlation filters. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Audio- and Video-Based Biometric Person Authentication*, pp. 697–705.

LAWRENCE S., GILES C. L., TSOI A. C., AND BACK A. D., 1998. Face recognition: A convolutional neural network approach. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, Vol. 8, pp. 98–113.

LECLERC F. AND PLAMONDON R. 1994. Automatic signature verification: the state of the art. *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence,* Vol. 8, pp. 643-660.

LI Q., QIU Z., SUN D., AND WU J. 2004. Personal Identification using knuckleprint. *SINOBIOMETRICS*, Guangzhou, Vol. 2004, pp. 680-689.

LI W., ZHANG D., AND XU Z. 2003. Palmprint Identification by Fourier Transform. *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 16(4), pp. 417-432.

LIM S., LEE K., BYEON O., AND KIM T. 2001. Efficient iris recognition through improvement of feature vector and classifier. *ETRI Journal*, Vol. 23, pp. 1–70.

LIN C. L., CHUANG T. C., AND FAN K. C. 2005. Palmprint verification using hierarchical decomposition. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 38 (12), pp. 2639–2652.

LIU C. J. 2004. Gabor-based kernel PCA with fractional power polynomial models for face recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 26, pp. 572–581.

LIU L. AND ZHANG D. 2005. A novel palm-line detector. In *Proceedings of the 5th AVBPA*, pp. 563–571.

LIU L., ZHANG D., AND YOU J. 2007. Detecting wide lines using isotropic nonlinear filtering. *IEEE Trans. Image Procession*, Vol. 16 (6), pp. 1584–1595.

LORIS N. AND ALESSANDRA L. 2009. A multi-matcher system based on knuckle-based. *Neural Computing and Applications*, Springer London, Vol. 18(1), pp. 87-91.

LU G. M., ZHANG D., AND WANG K. Q. 2003. Palmprint recognition using eigen palms features. *Pattern Recognition Lett*., Vol. 24 (9–10), pp. 1463–1467.

MA L., WANG Y., AND TAN T. 2002. Iris recognition based on multichannel Gabor filtering. *Proceedings of ACCV 2002*, Vol. I, pp. 279–283.

MA L., WANG Y., AND TAN T., 2002. Iris recognition using circular symmetric filter. *16th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, Vol. II, pp. 414–417.

MA L., WANG Y., TAN T., AND ZHANG D. 2004. Efficient iris recognition by characterizing key local variations. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, Vol. 13, pp. 739–749.

MALTONI D., MAIO D., JAIN A. K., AND PRABHKAR S., 2003. *Handbook of Fingerprint Recognition.*

MARTENS R. AND CLAESEN L., 1996. Online signature verification by dynamic time warping. In *IEEE Proceedings of ICPR'96*.

MAUTNER P., ROHLIK O., MATOUSEK V., AND KEMPP J. 2002. Signature verification using ART-2 neural network. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Neural Information Processing*, ICONIP'OZ, pp. 636–639.

MCCOOL C., CHANDRAN V., SRIDHARAN S., AND FOOKES C., 2008. 3D face verification using a free-parts approach. *Pattern Recognition Lett*., pp. 1190–1196.

MONTACIE C., DELEGLISE P., BIMBOT F., AND CARATY M.J. 1992. Cinematic techniques for speech processing: temporal decomposition and multivariate linear prediction. *Proc. IEEE Intl. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing* (San Francisco, CA), pp. I-153-156.

MUZUKAMI Y., MIIKE H., YOSHIMURA M. AND YOSHIMURA I. 2002. An off-line signature verification system using an extracted displacement function. *Pattern Recognition Lett*., Vol. 23, pp. 1569–1577.

NAGESHKUMAR M., MAHESH P. K., AND SHANMUKHA SWAMY M.N. 2009. An Efficient Secure Multimodal Biometric Fusion using Palmprint and Face Images. *IJCSI International Journal of Computer Science Issues*, Vol. 2.

NAIK J., NETSCH L., AND DODDINGTON G. 1989. Speaker verification over long distance telephone lines. In *Proc. Int. Conf.on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP 1989)(*Glasgow, May 1989), pp. 524–527.

NASEEM I., TOGNERI R., AND BENNAMOUN M. 2008. Sparse representation for ear biometrics. In *ISVC'08*, pp. 336–345, Las Vegas, Nevada.

NELSON W., TURIN W., AND HASTIE T. 1994. Statistical methods for online signature verification. *Int. J. Pattern Recogn. Artif. Intell*., Vol. 8 (3), pp. 749–770.

PALANIAPPAN R. AND RAVI K.V. R. 2003. A new method to identify individuals using signals from the brain. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Information Communications and Signal Processing*, Singapore, pp. 15-18.

PARANJAPE R. B., MAHOVSKY J., BENEDICENTI L., AND KOLES Z., 2001. The Electroencephalogram as a Biometric. *Proceedings of the Canadian Conference On Electrical And Computer Engineering*, Vol. 2, pp. 1363-1366.

PARK C., LEE J., SMITH M., AND PARK K. 2003. Iris-based personal authentication using a normalized directional energy feature. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Audio- and Video-Based Biometric Person Authentication*, pp. 224–232.

PAVESIC N., RIBARIC S., AND RIBARIC D. Personal authentication using hand-geometry and palmprint features – the state of the art. In *Workshop Proceedings – Biometrics: Challenges arising from Theory to Practice*, pp. 17–26, Cambridge, UK.

PENEV P. AND ATICK J. 1996. Local feature analysis: A general statistical theory for object representation.

PHILLIPS P. J.1999. Support vector machines applied to face recognition. In *Proceedings of the 1998 Conference on Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems II*, MIT Press, pp. 803–809.

PIGEON S. AND VANDENDORPE L., 1998. Multiple Experts for Robust Face Authentication. In *SPIE, Editor, Optical Security and Counterfeit Deterrence*, II 3314, pp. 166-177.

PLAMONDON R. AND LORETTE G. 1989. Automatic signature verification and writer identification: state of the art. *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 22, pp. 107-131.

PLAMONDON R. AND SRIHARI S. N. 2000. Online and offline handwriting recognition: a comprehensive survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence,* Vol. 22, pp. 63-84.

POULOS M., RANGOUSSI M., CHRISSICOPOULOS V., AND EVANGELOU A., 1999. Person identification based on parametric processing on the EEG. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Electronics, Circuits and Systems*, Vol. 1, pp. 283-286.

PUN K. AND MOON Y., 2004. Recent advances in ear biometrics. *Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition*, pp. 164–169.

QUAN Z. AND JI H., 2005. Aligning and segmenting signatures at their crucial points through DTW. In *The First International Conference on Intelligent Computing ICIC2005, in Lect. Notes Comput. Sci*., Vol. 3644, pp. 49–58, 2005.

RAMESH V. E. AND NARASIMHA M., 1999. Off-line signature verification using genetically optimized weighted features. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 32, pp. 217–233.

REYNOLDS D., AND ROSE R. 1995. Robust text-independent speaker identification using Gaussian mixture speaker models. *IEEE Trans. on Speech and Audio Processing,* Vol. 3, pp. 72–83.

REYNOLDS D., QUATIERI T., AND DUNN R. 2000. Speaker verification using adapted Gaussian mixture models. *Digital Signal Processing,* Vol. 10, pp. 19–41.

RHEE T. H., CHO S. J., AND KIM J. H. 2001. Online signature verification using model-guided segmentation and discriminative feature selection for skilled forgeries. In *6th ICDAR*, Seattle, Washington, USA, pp. 645–649.

RIBARIC S. AND FRATRIC I. 2005. A Biometric identification system based on Eigenpalm and eigenfinger features. *IEEE Trans. Pattern. Anal. Mach. Intell*., Vol. 27 (11), pp. 1698–1709.

RIBARIC S. AND FRATRIC I., 2005. A biometric identification system based on Eigenpalm and eigenfinger features. *IEEE Trans Pattern and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 27(11), pp. 1698-1709.

ROSS A. AND JAIN A. K. 2003. Information Fusion in Biometrics. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, Vol. 24(13), pp. 2115-2125.

ROSS A., 2007. An Introduction to Multibiometrics. In *Proceedings of the 15th European Signal Processing conference (EUSIPCO)*,(Pozan, Poland).

S´EBASTIEN MARCEL A JOS´E DEL R. MILL´AN. 2007. Person Authentication using Brainwaves (EEG) and Maximum A Posteriori Model Adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence – Special Issue on Biometrics*.

SANCHEZ-AVILA C. AND SANCHEZ-REILLO R. 2002. Iris-based biometric recognition using dyadic wavelet transform. *IEEE Aerosp. Electron. Syst. Mag*., Vol. 17, pp. 3–6.

SANCHEZ-REILLO R. 2000. Hand Geometry Pattern Recognition Through Gaussian Mixture Modeling. *15th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 2, pp. 937-940.

SANCHEZ-REILLO R., SANCHEZ-AVILA C., AND GONZALEZ-MARCOS A. 2000. Biometric Identification through hand geometry measurements. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 22, pp. 1168–1171.

SANCHEZ-REILLO R., SANCHEZ-AVILA C., AND GONZALEZ-MARCOS A. 2000. Biometric Identification through hand geometry measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 22(10), pp. 1168-1171.

SCHOLKOPF B., MIKA S., BURGES C. J. C., KNIRSCH P., MULLER K. R., RATSCH G. AND SMOLA A. J., 1999. Input space versus feature space in kernel-basedmethods. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, Vol. 1, pp. 1000–1017.

SHANKER A. P. AND TAJAGOPALAN A. N., 2007. Off-line signature verification using DTW. *Pattern Recognition Lett.,* Vol. 28, pp. 1407–1414.

SHU W. AND ZHANG D., 1998. Automated Personal identification by Palmprint. *Optical Engineering*, Vol. 37(8), pp. 2359-2362.

SIMON C., LEVRAT E., SABOURIN R., AND BREMONT J., 1997. A fuzzy Perception for Off-line

Handwritten Signature Verification. In *Proc. of the BSDIA'97,* pp. 261–272.
SOONG F., JUANG B.H., AND RABINER L. 1987. A Vector Quantization Approach to Speaker Recognition. *AT & T Technical Journal*, Vol. 66, pp. 14–26, 1987.
SUN Z., WANG Y., TAN T., AND CUI J. 2005. Improving iris recognition accuracy via cascaded classifiers. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man. Cybern*—Part C:Appl Rev, 35.
TURK M. AND PENTLAND A. 1991. Eigenfaces for recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, Vol 3, pp. 71–86.
VÉLEZ J., SÁNCHEZ A., AND MORENO A. B. 2003. Robust off-line signature verification using compression networks and positional cuttings. In *Proc. IEEE Conf. on NN for Signal Processing* (NNSP'03), Vol. 1, pp. 627–636.
VÉLEZ JOSÉ, SÁNCHEZ ÁNGEL, MORENO BELÉN, AND ESTEBAN JOSÉ L., 2009. Fuzzy shape-memory snakes for the automatic off-line signature verification problem. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, Vol. 160, pp. 182 – 197.
VICTOR B., BOWYER K.W. AND SARKAR S. 2002. An Evaluation of Face and Ear Biometrics. *Proc. Int'l Conf. Pattern Recognition,* pp. 429-432.
WILDES R. P., 1997. Iris Recognition: an Emerging Biometric technology. *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 85, pp. 1348–1363.
WISKOTT L., FELLOUS J. M., KRUGER N., AND MALSBURG C.V., 1997. Face recognition by elastic bunch graph matching. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 19, pp. 775–779.
WONG A. L. N. AND SHI P. 2002. Peg-free hand geometry recognition using hierarchical geometry and shape matching. In *Proceedings of IAPR Workshop on Machine Vision Applications*, Japan, pp. 281-284.
WOODARD D. L. AND FLYNN P. J. 2005. Finger surface as a biometric identifier. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, Vol. 100(3), pp. 357-384.
WU Q. Z., JOU CH., AND LEE S.Y., 1997. Online Signature Verification Using LPC Cepstrum and neural networks. *IEEE Trans. Syst*., Vol. 27 (1), pp. 148–153.
WU X. Q., WANG K. Q., AND ZHANG D., 2005. Palmprint Authentication based on Orientation Code Matching. *In AVBPA, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 3546, pp. 555–562.
WU X. Q., ZHANG D., AND WANG K. Q., 2003. Fisherpalms based Palmprint Recognition. *Pattern Recognition Lett.*, Vol. 24 (15), pp. 2829–2838.
WU X. Q., ZHANG D., AND WANG K. Q., 2006. Palm line Extraction and Matching for Personal Authentication. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. A*, Vol. 36 (5), pp. 978–987.
WU X. Q., ZHANG D., WANG K. Q., AND HUANG B. 2004. Palmprint Classification Using Principal Lines. *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 37 (10), pp. 1987–1998.
YAN P. AND BOWYER K. W., 2007. Biometric recognition using 3D ear shape. *IEEE TPAMI*, Vol.29(8), pp. 1297–1308.
YAN P. AND BOWYER K.W., 2005. Empirical Evaluation of Advanced Ear Biometrics. *Empirical Evaluation Methods in Computer Vision (EEMCV 2005*), San Diego.
YANG J., ZHANG D., YANG J.Y. AND NIU B., 2007. Globally Maximizing Locally Minimizing: Unsupervised Discriminant Projection with Applications to Face and Palm Biometrics. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, Vol. 29 (4), pp. 650–664.
YANG M., 2002. Kernel Eigenfaces vs. Kernel Fisherfaces: Face Recognition using Kernel Methods. In *Proceedings of the Fifth IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition* Washington, DC, pp. 205–211.
YORUK E., KONUKOGLU E., SANKUR B. AND DARBON J., 2006. Shape-based hand recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing,* Vol. 15 (7), pp. 1803–1815.
YOUSIFF A. A. A., CHOWDHURY M. U., RAY S., AND NAFAA H. Y., 2007. Fingerprint Recognition System using Hybrid Matching Techniques. *6th IEEE/ACIS International Conference on Computer and Information Science*, pp. 234-240.
YUILLE A. L., 1991. Deformable templates for face recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 3, pp. 59–70.
ZHANG D., KONG A., YOU J., AND WONG M., 2003. Online palmprint identification. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell*., Vol. 25 (9), pp. 1041–1050.
ZHANG L. AND ZHANG D., 2004. Characterization of Palmprints by Wavelet Signatures via directional Context modeling. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. B*., Vol. 34 (3), pp. 1335–1347.

ZHAO W., CHELLAPPA R., PHILLIPS P., AND ROSENFELD A. 2003. Face recognition: A literature Survey. *ACM computing Surveys*, Vol. 35, p. 399-458.

ZHENGU O., FENG J., SU F., AND CAI A., 2006. Fingerprint Matching with Rotation-Descriptor Texture Features. *The 18th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, pp. 417-420.