

Research Article

DOOMRED: A New Optimization Technique for Boosted Cascade Detectors on Enforced Training Set

Dong Woo Park¹ and Kyoung Mu Lee²

¹Information & Technology Laboratory, LG Electronics Institute of Technology, 16 Woomyeon-dong, Seocho-gu, Seoul 137-724, Korea

²Department of Electrical Engineering, ASRI, Seoul National University, 599 Gwanangno, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 151-742, Korea

Correspondence should be addressed to Kyoung Mu Lee, kyoungmu@snu.ac.kr

Received 31 August 2007; Revised 27 December 2007; Accepted 19 February 2008

Recommended by Olivier Lezoray

We propose a new method to optimize the completely-trained boosted cascade detector on an enforced training set. Recently, due to the accuracy and real-time characteristics of boosted cascade detectors like the Adaboost, a lot of variant algorithms have been proposed to enhance the performance given a fixed number of training data. And, most of algorithms assume that a given training set well exhibits the real world distributions of the target and non-target instances. However, this is seldom true in real situations, and thus often causes higher false-classification ratio. In this paper, to solve the optimization problem of completely trained boosted cascade detector on false-classified instances, we propose a new base hypothesis weight optimization algorithm called DOOMRED (Direct Optimization Of Margin for Rare Event Detection) using a mathematically derived error upper bound of boosting algorithms. We apply the proposed algorithm to a cascade structured frontal face detector trained by AdaBoost algorithm. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed algorithm has competitive ability to maintain accuracy and real-time characteristic of the boosted cascade detector compared to those of other heuristic approaches while requiring reasonably small amount of optimization time.

Copyright © 2008 D. W. Park and K. M. Lee. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the boosted cascade detector [1] became the most popular method for an object detection in computer vision. Due to its accuracy and real-time characteristic, many works have been proposed to enhance the original one [2–4]. However, most researches on the boosted cascade detector have concentrated on the learning problem for a fixed number of initial training data. The basic assumption made in the researches is that the distributions of the target and nontarget objects obtained from the given fixed number of initial training data are good enough to reflect the real distributions, which is seldom true in practice. This is because it is almost impossible to know the exact distribution of the target as well as nontarget instances in real situations. As a result, the detector trained with the fixed number of initial training data cannot work properly in the real applications.

The problem we would like to address in this paper is “what should be done to a completely trained object

detector when false-classified instances occur in the real applications?” More specifically, the key issue can be stated as “how can we enhance the detection rate with the false-rejected instances while maintaining the false positive rate to be low?” We call this problem as the “optimization on the enforced training set.” To the best of our knowledge, there has been no report in literature on this problem for the case of boosted detector. Note that, for the boosted cascade detector, this problem is not easy to solve for several reasons. First, in boosting algorithms, selection of the base hypothesis and its weights are executed in sequential fashion based on some implicit conditions, so there is no explicit rule to modify the completely trained detector. Second, because of the huge amount of computational time for the training, retraining the cascade detector is impractical. Third, in a cascade structured detector, most of the target instances should not be rejected by any single layer in it. So, in case false-rejected target instances are enforced, a simple heuristic solution such as lowering the threshold of each layer will increase the false positive rate at each layer exponentially,

resulting overall great amount of computational burden in real applications.

To overcome these difficulties, the optimization algorithm for a boosted cascade detector on an enforced training set needs the following three conditions:

- (1) an explicit optimization rule guaranteed by the mathematical background,
- (2) less optimization time than the time for the retraining,
- (3) low false positive rate while maintaining the expected detection rate for a given target training set.

In this paper, we propose a fast algorithm called DOOM-RED (direct optimization of margin for rare event detection) that optimizes the base hypothesis weight set of each single layer detector in a boosted cascade detector, especially when the false-rejected target instances are enforced. Note that, in a boosting algorithm, the base hypothesis selection procedure from the large candidate base hypothesis set usually demands high-computational cost. This is the reason why we focus on the optimization of the base hypothesis weight set for the performance enhancement of a boosted cascade detector. In this respect, DOOMRED may be categorized as a kind of back-fitting which is a well-known optimization algorithm in the machine learning field [5].

2. BOOSTING ALGORITHM

Boosting is a well-known machine learning method that constructs a binary classification rule from certain training data set. The basic idea of a boosting algorithm is somewhat simple though clear such that an ensemble combination of multiple base hypotheses makes one strong hypothesis. The base hypothesis means a classification rule which has slightly better accuracy than random choice on a given training data set, which has error slightly less than 0.5. Meanwhile, the strong hypothesis indicates a classification rule that has high accuracy on the given training data set. Because constructing a highly accurate classification rule at one try is hard, a boosting algorithm constructs one accurate classification rule by combining multiple classification results from several base hypotheses. At this point, two important issues will be what base hypotheses to select from abundant candidate base hypothesis set, and how to combine them to make one accurate classification rule. In a learning procedure, both the training data set S and the candidate base hypothesis set H should be predefined. Then, for T iterations, corresponding base hypotheses $h \in H$ are selected sequentially from the candidate base hypothesis set H by updating the weight distribution of the training instances contained in S using an implicit cost function. The merit of the boosting algorithm is that the selection procedure of the base hypothesis can compensate the performance of the previously selected base hypotheses. If an instance is classified correctly by the base hypothesis selected in previous iteration, its weight decreases and vice versa. By updating the importance of each instance for every iteration, a base hypothesis that has good accuracy on instances not correctly classified by previously selected base hypothesis is selected. After T iterations, T base hypotheses are selected and the final classification rule is

obtained by a linear combination (or ensemble combination) of T base hypotheses. The final outcome of the boosting algorithm is a binary classification rule $f(x)$ on the test instance x , which is labeled by $y \in \{-1, 1\}$ as shown in (1) where $\sum_{i=1}^T w_i = 1$, $w_i > 0$, $h_i(x) \in \{-1, 1\}$. We limit our work in the range of boosting algorithms which deal with hypotheses h having only binary outputs -1 and 1 :

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^T w_i h_i(x) = \begin{cases} \geq \theta_T, & x \in \text{class 1 (target)}, \\ < \theta_T, & x \in \text{class 2 (non-target)}. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Note that each of the finally selected base hypothesis h_i corresponds to a basis of the feature space where instances are distributed, and the set of T base hypotheses' weight set is a gradient of a linear decision boundary. For this reason, the training procedure of a boosting algorithm can be interpreted as "data dimension reduction," that is selecting base hypotheses which makes the distribution of class 1 ($y = -1$) and class 2 ($y = 1$) instances in feature space separable with a linear decision boundary.

When $f(x)$ is used as a general binary classifier, the threshold $\theta_T = 0$. However, when $f(x)$ is used as a rare-event detector such as a frontal face detector, θ_T is usually set in the range $-1 < \theta_T \leq 0$. This is to guarantee the detection rate of $f(x)$ to be a specific goal value.

3. SINGLE LAYER DETECTOR OPTIMIZATION

3.1. Problem statement

Note that our problem is how to optimize the classification rule $f(x)$ when false classified instances in real application are added to the original training data set used in a forward training procedure. In detection problem, usually the number of nontarget object instances in real world is far larger than that of target object instances. So, the detection problem is often referred as "rare event detection" problem to indicate this situation. And, in general, a high detection rate results in a high false positive rate and vice versa. When constructing a detection rule, the way decreasing the false positive rate sacrificing detection is not used. This is because the detection rule with low detection rate is meaningless. As a result, the objective of constructing a detection rule may be defined as minimizing the false positive rate while fixing the detection rate to a specific goal value. In a cascade detector [1], usually, instances rejected by any subdetector in cascade are rejected forever for fast detection speed. Although the cascade detector is very appropriate for fast detection speed, this model is very hard to arrange when some false classified instances, especially false classified target instances, are enforced. To make a cascade detector to have a specific goal detection rate even when enforced target instances are added to the original training data set, every subdetector in cascade should be arranged not to lose enforced target-object instances. There are two heuristic solutions to this problem. First one is to simply retrain the whole cascade detector. The only remaining problem of it is that training cascade detector with




FIGURE 1: (a) Mean-shifted sigmoid function in (13) when $\theta = 0.5$. (b) Digitized version of (a) when the margin is segmented in the size 0.25.

a boosting algorithm when large training set is given requires substantially long training time. To train a boosted frontal face cascade detector, the size of training data set should be about several ten thousands because training set should include all instances that represents the face’s large variance in appearance. For the frontal face detection problem, the training time for a cascade detector is minimally about several days using the fastest source codes such as OpenCV and maximally several weeks [1]. So, retraining cascade detector for every time when some instances are enforced is impractical. Second heuristic solution is to adjust the threshold θ_T of each subdetector to make each one satisfies the specific goal detection rate as in (1). One obvious drawback of this approach is that the solution also increases the false positive rate exponentially. This will result in decreasing the detection speed of the whole cascade detector in real applications.

To overcome the shortcomings of the two heuristic solutions, in this work, we proposed a new optimization method for subdetectors in a boosted cascade detector that can minimize the false positive rate while maintaining the goal detection rate in reasonably small amount of




FIGURE 2: The ROC curves of the single layer detectors when the detector is initially trained with (a) 1000 (b) 2000 (c) 3000 target instances.







FIGURE 3: The ROC curves of the single layer detectors when the detector contains (a) 3 (b) 100 (c) 200 base hypotheses.

optimization time. Our basic idea is to optimize the decision boundary of each subdetector only. The reason is that the most portion of training time of the boosting algorithm comes from base hypothesis selection procedure. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 describe a mathematically derived optimization rule and an optimization algorithm that we propose.

3.2. Optimization rule

In this section, an upper bound on test error of the classification rule $f(x)$ in (1) is derived in a more generalized form than the work in [6]. Based on the derived equation, the factors that affect the accuracy of the boosted detector may be extracted. Then, by adjusting the controllable factors, the boosted detector can be optimized on the enforced training set.

Since the AdaBoost algorithm was proposed [7], it has been shown from the subsequent experiments that the




FIGURE 4: The ROC curves of the single layer detectors when the number of (a) 10 (b) 20 (c) 40 false rejected target instances are enforced.






FIGURE 5: The optimization time for the case in (a) Figure 2, (b) Figure 3, (c) Figure 4.

gap between the training error and test error decreases as the number of selected base hypotheses increases even after the training error reached to zero. These results show that the AdaBoost algorithm does not fit to the basic machine learning theory, Occam's razor, saying that the classification rule should be as simple as possible to minimize the gap between the training error and test error. To explain this phenomenon, the upper bound on error of voting methods such as the AdaBoost algorithm has been derived mathematically in [6].

However, the upper bound derived in [6] works only for the general binary classification problem, when $\theta_T = 0$ in (1). To make the upper bound on error of the boosting algorithm applicable even for the rare-event detection problem (when $-1 < \theta_T \leq 0$), we derive a more generalized error upper bound in Theorem 1. So, (2) can be used as an upper bound of the false positive rate in real applications when θ_T is tuned in the range $-1 < \theta_T \leq 0$ to get a specific goal detection rate. The proof is given after Theorem 1 following the similar procedure in [6].

Theorem 1. *Let P be a distribution over (x, y) , $y \in \{-1, 1\}$, and let S be a set of k examples chosen independently at random according to P . Assume that the base hypothesis space H is finite, and let $\delta > 0$. Then with the probability of at least $1 - \delta$ over the random choice of the training set S , every function f made as a combination of $h \in H$ satisfies the following bound for all $-1 < \theta_T \leq 0$, $0 < \theta < 1$, and $0 < -\theta_T + \theta < 1$:*

$$\begin{aligned} Pr_P[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T] &\leq Pr_S[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta] \\ &+ O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\left(\frac{\log k \log |H|}{\theta^2} + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)^{1/2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Proof. For the sake of the proof, we define C_N to be the set of unweighted average over N elements from H :

$$C_N = \left\{ f : x \mapsto \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h_i(x) \mid h_i \in H \right\}. \quad (3)$$

We allow the same $h \in H$ to appear multiple times in the sum. This set will play the role of the approximating set in the proof. \square

Any majority vote classifier $f \in C$ can be associated with a distribution over H as defined by the coefficients w_i . By choosing N elements of H independently at random according to this distribution, we can generate an element of C_N . Using such a construction, we map each $f \in C$ to a distribution Q over C_N . That is, a function $g \in C_N$ distributed according to Q is selected by choosing h_1, \dots, h_N independently at random according to the coefficients w_i and defining $g(x) = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N h_i(x)$.

Our goal is to upper bound the generalization error of $f \in C$. For any $g \in C_N$ and $\theta > 0$, we can separate this probability into two terms:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_P[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T] \\ & \leq \Pr_P\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] + \Pr_P\left[yg(x) > \frac{\theta}{2}, yf(x) \leq -\theta_T\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This holds because, in general, for two events A and B ,

$$\Pr[A] = \Pr[B \cap A] + \Pr[\bar{B} \cap A] \leq \Pr[B] + \Pr[\bar{B} \cap A]. \quad (5)$$

As (4) holds for any $g \in C_N$, we can take the expected value of the right-hand side with respect to the distribution Q and get

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_P[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T] \\ & \leq \Pr_{P,g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] \\ & \quad + \Pr_{P,g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) > \frac{\theta}{2}, yf(x) \leq -\theta_T\right] \\ & = E_{g \sim Q}\left[\Pr_P\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right]\right] \\ & \quad + E_P\left[\Pr_{g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) > \frac{\theta}{2}, yf(x) \leq -\theta_T\right]\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We bound both terms in (6) separately, starting with the second term. Consider a fixed example (x, y) and take the probability inside the expectation with respect to the random choice of g . It is clear that $f(x) = E_{g \sim Q}[g(x)]$. So, the probability inside the expectation is equal to the probability that the average over N random samples from a distribution over $\{-1, +1\}$ is larger than its expected value by more than $\theta/2$. The Chernoff bound yields

$$\Pr_{g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) > \frac{\theta}{2} \mid yf(x) \leq -\theta_T\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{N\theta^2}{8}\right). \quad (7)$$

To upper bound the first term in (7) we use the union bound. That is, the probability over the choice of S that there exists any $g \in C_N$ and $\theta > 0$ for which

$$\Pr_P\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] > \Pr_S\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] + \varepsilon_N \quad (8)$$

is at most $(N+1)|C_N| \exp(-2m\varepsilon_N^2)$. The exponential term $\exp(-2m\varepsilon_N^2)$ comes from the Chernoff bound which holds for any single choice of g and θ . The term $(N+1)|C_N|$ is an upper bound on the number of such choices where we have used the fact that, because of the form of functions in C_N , we need only to consider values of θ of the form $2i/N$ for $i = 0, \dots, N$. Note that $|C_N| \leq |H|^N$.

Thus, if we set $\varepsilon_N = \sqrt{(1/2m) \ln((N+1)|H|^N/\delta_N)}$, and take expectation with respect to Q , we get with probability at least $1 - \delta_N$,

$$\Pr_{P,g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] \leq \Pr_{S,g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] + \varepsilon_N \quad (9)$$

for every choice of θ and every distribution Q .

To finish the argument we relate the fraction of the training set on which $yg(x) \leq \theta/2$ to the fraction on which

$yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta$, which is the quantity that we measure. Using (5) again, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{S,g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}\right] \\ & \leq \Pr_{S,g \sim Q}[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta] \\ & \quad + \Pr_{S,g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}, yf(x) > -\theta_T + \theta\right] \\ & = \Pr_S[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta] \\ & \quad + E_S\left[\Pr_{g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2}, yf(x) > -\theta_T + \theta\right]\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

To bound the expression inside the expectation we use the Chernoff bound as we did for (7) and get

$$\Pr_{g \sim Q}\left[yg(x) \leq \frac{\theta}{2} \mid yf(x) > -\theta_T + \theta\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{N\theta^2}{8}\right). \quad (11)$$

Let $\delta_N = \delta/(N(N+1))$ so that the probability of failure for any N will be at most $\sum_{N \geq 1} \delta_N = \delta$. Then combining (6), (7), (9), (10), and (11), we get that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for every $\theta > 0$ and every $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_P[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T] & \leq \Pr_S[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta] + 2 \exp\left(-\frac{N\theta^2}{8}\right) \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2m} \ln\left(\frac{N(N+1)^2 |H|^N}{\delta}\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Finally, the statement of the theorem follows by setting $[N = (4/\theta^2) \ln(m/\ln |H|)]$.

$\Pr_P[A]$ and $\Pr_S[A]$ denote the probabilities of the event A when (x, y) is chosen according to P and uniformly at random from the set S , respectively. Above Theorem 1 verifies that factors that affect the upper bound on test error does not vary when $\theta_T = 0$ or $-1 < \theta_T \leq 0$. Now, the four variables that can affect the upper bound on test error of $f(x)$ can be summarized as follows:

$|H|$: the size of the candidate base hypothesis set,

k : the size of the training data set,

$\Pr_S[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta]$: the portion of nontarget training instances whose margin is under θ ,

θ : the goal marginal value.

Let us examine how those four factors affect the upper bound on error of the initially trained $f(x)$ when some false-classified training instances are enforced. First, $|H|$ is unchanged. Second, k is increased resulting in the lower upper bound on test error. Finally, $\Pr_S[yf(x) \leq -\theta_T + \theta]$ and θ remain as two controllable factors. Thus, an optimization rule can be derived as a conclusion: to minimize the test false positive rate when θ_T is adjusted to set the detection rate to a specific goal value, maximize the number of nontarget training instances whose margin $yf(x) + \theta_T$ are larger than the specific θ while maximizing θ , too. This suggests a rule for the optimization of the base hypothesis weight set of the single layer detectors in a boosted cascade detector.

3.3. DOOMRED

In this section, we propose a simple and fast algorithm DOOMRED that optimizes the base hypothesis weight set $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_T\}$ of $f(x)$ in such a way to maximize the number of nontarget training instances whose margins are above a specific θ value. Algorithm 1 shows the pseudocode of DOOMRED. In [8], an algorithm named DOOM is introduced. DOOM optimizes the base hypothesis weight set $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_T\}$ to minimize the cost function of the margins of the training instances. This optimization process results in the minimization of the classification error. However, DOOM cannot be directly applied to the detection problem. The reason is that basically DOOM is a two-class classification algorithm, and moreover it deals with the entire training instances of both classes in its optimization process. Since there are absolutely large amount of nontarget instances than that of target instances in rare-event detection problem, DOOM might show worse performance, especially low detection rate, when it is used for a rare-event detector. To solve this problem, we design the DOOMRED algorithm in which the target and the nontarget instances are dealt with separately in the optimization process.

DOOMRED is designed by adopting a simple steepest-gradient descent method. It is to guarantee the simplicity of the algorithm to minimize the computational burden for the optimization. Although DOOMRED only modifies the weights of the base hypotheses, there are great amount of training instances to deal with, which might result in a great amount of optimization time.

Before the optimization procedure, we need to define a marginal cost function to be minimized, that should be a monotonically decreasing function defined in the range from -1 to a specific θ value. The mean shifted sigmoid function in (13) and Figure 1 is an example. It represents the importance of each training instance during the optimization procedure:

$$C_\theta(m) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(a \times (m - (\theta - 1)/2))}, \quad \text{where } a > 0. \quad (13)$$

In DOOMRED, first, among the target and nontarget instances contained in the target training set S_P and the nontarget training set S_N , the instances whose margins are under the predefined θ_P and θ_N are classified into the sets E_P and E_N , respectively. The training instances contained in E_P and E_N only affect the modification of the base hypothesis weight set W . Then each base hypothesis weight $w_i \in W$ is modified to increase the margin of instances both in E_P and E_N . w_i is increased if it decreases the summation of the marginal cost function $C_\theta(m)$ ($\text{cost}(W)$) of the instances in E_P and E_N , and vice versa. The amount of modification of w_i is determined by the characteristic of the marginal cost function $C_\theta(m)$. For an example, when (13) is used as a $C_\theta(m)$, instances whose margins are around $(\theta - 1)/2$ largely affect the amount of modification of w_i . These two simple processes are iterated until $\text{cost}(W)$ or variance of W converges. Note that DOOMRED may decrease the margins of the training instances which are not contained in the sets

TABLE 1: Parameter settings for the single layer optimization method in Algorithm 2 used in our experiments.

| Parameter | Value |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| $C_\theta(m)$ | Figure 1(b) |
| N_W | 300 |
| Variance of θ_P | 0.0 to 0.5 (step 0.1) |
| Variance of θ_N | 0.4 to 0.8 (step 0.1) |
| Prec | 0.01 |

E_P and E_N . However, we also note from (2) that, after a certain value of θ is determined, the accuracy of $f(x)$ is not affected by the instances whose margins are above θ . It is because once θ is determined, the only issue we should consider is the portion of training instances whose margins exceed θ . After each DOOMRED execution, the threshold value is adjusted to make the training detection rate to be the specific goal value.

3.4. Single layer optimization method

Although we have derived a simple and clear optimization rule for a boosted single layer detector from Theorem 1, one problem still remains that (2) does not provide the exact values of the key parameters to minimize the test error for the nontarget set. Since our objective is to find a globally optimal solution, DOOMRED is executed on the various randomly selected initial values of the base hypothesis weight set W_R , θ_P , and θ_N . Among these various trials, W_S and θ_S which have the least false positive rate on the validation nontarget set S_{NV} are selected as the final output when the detection rate is fixed on the training target set S_P . The final output of the optimization is a boosted detector $f(x)$ that is expressed with the original H , $W = W_S$, and $\theta_T = \theta_S$. The pseudocode of the single layer detector optimization is given in Algorithm 2.

4. CASCADE DETECTOR OPTIMIZATION

For the optimization of a boosted cascade detector, the false-classified instances occurred in the real application are enforced to the first layer of the cascade detector. Then the optimization method for a single layer detector in Algorithm 2 is applied to each layer. In order not to degrade the efficiency of the cascade detector, the target and nontarget instances which are not rejected by any prelayer are used for the optimization of the postlayers.

5. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

5.1. Experimental environments

We tested the proposed algorithm to the frontal face detection problem. A face database used for our experiments contains 7143 24×24 sized face instances. Nonface instances are cropped from a 2179 natural scene images collected from the world wide web. Then both target and nontarget instances are divided into three groups. The first group is used as an initial training set, and the false-classified

```

DOOMRED ( $H, W, S_P, S_N, \theta_P, \theta_N, \text{prec}$ )
  exe = true
  while (exe)
     $E_P = [(x, y) \mid (x, y) \in S_P, yf(x) < \theta_P], E_N = [(x, y) \mid (x, y) \in S_N, yf(x) < \theta_N]$ 
     $g = -\nabla_W \text{cost}(W)$ 
    if ( $W + g$  has any negative valued element)
      scale  $g$  that no element of  $W + g$  has negative value
    if (weight Sum ( $g$ )  $\geq$  prec)
       $W_B = \text{normalize}(W + g)$ 
      if ( $\text{cost}(W_B) < \text{cost}(W)$ )       $W = W_B$ 
      else exe = false
    else exe = false
  return  $W$ 

```

Notations

$H := \{h_i \mid i = 1, \dots, T\}$, number of T base hypotheses set
 $W := \{w_i \mid i = 1, \dots, T, 0 < w_i < 1, \sum_{i=1}^T w_i = 1\}$, base hypothesis weight set
 $S_P := \{(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i = \text{target training instance}, y_i = 1\}$
 $S_N := \{(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i = \text{non-target training instance}, y_i = -1\}$
 $\text{cost}(W) = \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in E_P} C_{\theta_P}(y_i f(x_i)) + \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in E_N} C_{\theta_N}(y_i f(x_i))$
 $\text{weight Sum}(W) = \sum_{i=1}^T w_i, w_i \in W$
 $\text{normalize}(W) = \text{scale } W \text{ that } \sum_{i=1}^T w_i = 1$

ALGORITHM 1: The pseudocode of DOOMRED.

instances among the second group by the completely trained detector are used as the enforced training data. The last group is used to measure the test errors.

Table 1 shows the parameter settings for the optimization method used in the single layer detector in Algorithm 2. First, the digitized sigmoid function shown in Figure 1(b) is defined as $C_\theta(m)$. Since the exponential function requires large computational burden, the region from -1 to specific θ is divided into 100 segments and the gradient of each segment is precomputed. Second, N_W and the variation ranges of θ_N and θ_P are set constant for all layers. These fixed values are determined by our tuning process. It might seem to be unreasonable to fix N_W to be independent of T , which is the number of the base hypotheses of $f(x)$. However, for the boosted cascade detectors in most of real applications, no more than 200 base hypotheses are used to construct each single layer detector in the cascade detector. The number 300 for the random base hypothesis weight set is enough to make the performance of DOOMRED stable when the number of base hypothesis is under 200.

Experiments are performed on various boosted frontal face detectors trained using the Adaboost algorithm with different conditions of the size of initial training set, base-hypotheses contained, and the enforced target training set. Note that since DOOMRED only modifies the weights of the base hypotheses, the performance of DOOMRED depends on the quality of the initial feature space constructed in the learning procedure.

The performance of DOOMRED is evaluated based on two criteria; (1) ROC curve, (2) optimization (or training) time. The first factor is critically related to the accuracy and the detection time in real applications. The second factor is related to the training or optimization cost of a detector. This

factor is particularly important since a boosting algorithm generally requires a large amount of training time. The performance of DOOMRED is compared to those of other heuristic solutions such as the adjusting threshold θ_T of single layer detector and retraining.

5.2. Experiments on single layer detectors

Figures 2, 3, and 4 show the ROC curves of various single layer detectors. In Figure 2, each original (or initial) detector was trained to have 200 base hypotheses. The face instances as many as 1000, 2000, 3000, and two times of each for the nonface instances were given as an initial training set. Then, false-rejected face instances which were not contained in the initial training set were enforced as many as 2000 false-classified nonface instances were enforced for the threshold adjusting and DOOMRED solutions, while 500 false-classified nonface instances were enforced for the retraining since the Adaboost algorithm occasionally failed to finish the learning procedure when 2000 nonface instances were enforced. In Figure 2, we can see that the amount of improvement in the accuracy by DOOMRED increased as the number of the initial training instance increased. Because DOOMRED deals with the weight set of base hypotheses only, the performance of DOOMRED seems to be affected by the quality of the base hypotheses selected during the initial training process.

In Figure 3, each initial detector was trained to have the number of base hypotheses of 3, 100, and 200. The sizes of the initial face and nonface training sets were 2000 and 4000, respectively. The sizes of the enforced face and nonface sets were same as in Figure 2. Except for the case when the number of the base hypotheses was




FIGURE 6: (a) The false positive rates of the boosted cascade frontal face detectors before and after the optimization. (b) ROC curves of the boosted cascade frontal face detectors before and after the optimization estimated on CMU+MIT frontal face test images composed of 130 images containing 507 faces.

3, DOOMRED demonstrated stable and also remarkable performances compared with those of the other approaches. In the case when the number of the base hypotheses was 3, DOOMRED failed to increase the accuracy. This was because there were large amount of the face instances which were determined as -1 (nonface) by all the 3 base hypotheses. There was no chance for these faces to be determined as faces by only adjusting the weights of base hypotheses using DOOMRED.

In Figure 4, one initial detector was trained to have 200 base hypotheses with 2000 face and 4000 nonface instances. Then 10, 20, and 40 false-rejected face instances which were not contained in the initial training set were enforced. The size of the enforced nonface set were same as in Figure 2.

TABLE 2: The average number of the base hypotheses evaluated per each nonface instance and the optimization (or training) time estimated on Pentium 4 2.8 GHz PC.

| Detector | Average num. of base hyp. | Optimization Time(min) |
|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| F2500 org. detector | 13.9 | 8291 |
| F2500 doomred | 17.6 | 704 |
| F2500 thres adj. | 20.3 | 4 |
| F5265 org. detector | 14.2 | 17431 |

It can be observed that DOOMRED increased the accuracy of the detectors when more enforced training instances were given. DOOMRED still showed stable and remarkable performance compared with those of the heuristic solutions. An interesting observation in our experiments was that the retraining sometimes failed to select 200 base hypotheses whose errors on the training set were under 0.5. A conclusion we can make on the single layer detector experiments is that DOOMRED exhibits a more stable and better performance than the other two naive approaches. The only exception was when the detector was initially trained with excessively small number of base hypotheses.

Figure 5 shows the optimization (training) time for the tests in Figures 2, 3, and 4. DOOMRED required only less than 11.3% of the computation time for the retraining method, while showing similar or better test false positive rates as shown in Figures 2, 3, and 4. Although the threshold adjusting method was fast by taking only a few minutes for any case, the performance was not satisfactory.

5.3. Experiments on cascade detectors

For this experiment, two boosted cascade frontal face detectors were initially constructed using AdaBoost algorithm. One was trained with an insufficient number of training data including 2500 face and 5000 nonface instances, and it was composed of 30 layers (2500-face detector). The second cascade detector was trained with an abundant number of training data including 5265 face and 10530 nonface instances, and was composed of 30 layers (5265-face detector). Each cascade detector was constructed sequentially with one 3-base hypotheses, one 5-base hypotheses, three 20-base hypotheses, and two 50-base hypotheses layers. The number of base hypotheses of all the postlayers was set to 200. Then 431 false-rejected face instances which were not contained in the initial training set were enforced to the first layer of the 2500-face detector. Due to occasional failures in the learning procedure of the retraining solution as mentioned in Section 5.2, tests for the performance of the retraining method were substituted by that of the 5265-face detector. Note that the 5265-face detector may be considered as a detector retrained with 2500 initial faces and 2765 enforced faces.

In Figure 6(a), the 2500-face detector shows the steepest decrement in the test false positive rate while showing the worst accuracy as can be seen in Figure 6(b). Meanwhile, the 5265-face detector shows similarly a low false positive rate

```

OptimizeSingleLayer ( $H, S_{PI}, S_{PE}, S_{NI}, S_{NE}, D_G, \text{prec}$ )

 $S_P := \text{sum } S_{PI} \text{ and } S_{PE}, S_N := \text{sum } S_{NI} \text{ and } S_{NE}$ 
divide  $S_N$  into  $S_{NT}$  and  $S_{NV}$ 
for (number of  $N_W$ )
     $W_R = \text{randomly generated base hypothesis weight set of } H$ 
    for (various  $\theta_P$  and  $\theta_N$ )
         $W_O = \text{DOOMRED } (H, W_R, S_P, S_{NT}, \theta_P, \theta_N, \text{prec})$ 
        adjust  $\theta_T$  to get  $D_G$  on  $S_P$  with  $H, W_O$ 
        if (least false positive rate is made on  $S_{NV}$  with  $H, W_O, \theta_T$ )
             $W_S = W_O, \theta_S = \theta_T$ 

return  $W_S, \theta_S$ 

Notations
 $H$ : base hypothesis set
 $S_{PI}, S_{NI}$ : initial target, non-target training set
 $S_{PE}, S_{NE}$ : enforced target, non-target training set
 $D_G$ : goal detection rate of single layer detector

```

ALGORITHM 2: The pseudocode for the optimization of the boosted single layer detector on the enforced training set.

at each single layer detector while showing good accuracy. As the 431 false-rejected faces were enforced to the 2500-face detector, the threshold adjusting method demonstrated good accuracy in the ROC curve even compared to that of the 5265-face detector as shown in Figure 6(b). We think that this is because the informative training instances (enforced training instances) effectively compensated the distribution of the initial training set. However, one problem of this heuristic method is that the detector becomes slower in real applications as the number of the enforced instance increases. In Table 2, the average number of the base hypotheses calculated per nonface instance is shown, which is critically related to the detection time in real applications. When the threshold θ_T of each layer was simply adjusted to acquire 99.5% of the training detection rate, the detection time increased by 46.0% and 42.9% compared to those of the 2500-face detector and 5265-face detectors. However, if DOOMRED was applied, these computational cost increments decreased to 26.6% and 23.9% while showing the best accuracy among those of three other cases in Figure 6(b). Note also that the optimization time of DOOMRED on the 2500-face detector was 704 minutes as shown in Table 2. This is barely 8.5% and 4.0% of the training time required in the 2500-face detector and 5265-face detectors, respectively. Therefore, we can conclude that the proposed DOOMRED is a reasonable solution for the optimization of the boosted cascade detector on the enforced training set considering its excellent performance to enhance the detection speed and accuracy in reasonable optimization time.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed DOOMRED, an algorithm to modify the base hypothesis weight set initially constructed by a boosting algorithm. It can be applied to the boosted single layer or cascade detector when the false-classified training

set is enforced. Experimental results demonstrated that DOOMRED excellently enhanced the performance of the boosted single layer or cascade detectors compared to those of other heuristic approaches while requiring reasonable optimization time. DOOMRED, however, showed weak performance when the number of the base hypotheses is small. To overcome this limitation, we are planning to develop an efficient algorithm that can substitute the inappropriate base hypotheses with the optimal ones.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported in part by the ITRC program by Ministry of Information and Communication and in part by Defense Acquisition Program Administration and Agency for Defense Development, South Korea, through the Image Information Research Center under the Contract UD070007AD.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Viola and M. Jones, "Rapid object detection using a boosted cascade of simple features," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR '01)*, vol. 1, pp. 511–518, Kauai, Hawaii, USA, December 2001.
- [2] A. Demiriz, K. P. Bennett, and J. Shawe-Taylor, "Linear programming boosting via column generation," *Machine Learning*, vol. 46, no. 1–3, pp. 225–254, 2002.
- [3] S. Z. Li and Z. Zhang, "FloatBoost learning and statistical face detection," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1112–1123, 2004.
- [4] P. Viola and M. Jones, "Fast and robust classification using asymmetric adaboost and a detector cascade," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 14*, pp. 1311–1318, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, USA, 2002.

-
- [5] T. J. Hastie and R. J. Tibshirani, *Generalized Additive Models*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, London, UK, 1990.
 - [6] R. E. Schapire, Y. Freund, P. L. Bartlett, and W. S. Lee, "Boosting the margin: a new explanation for the effectiveness of voting methods," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1651–1686, 1998.
 - [7] Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire, "A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 119–139, 1997.
 - [8] L. Mason, P. L. Bartlett, and J. Baxter, "Improved generalization through explicit optimization of margins," *Machine Learning*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 243–255, 2000.

Special Issue on Personalization of Mobile Multimedia Broadcasting

Call for Papers

In recent years, the widespread adoption of multimedia computing, the deployment of mobile and broadband networks, and the growing availability of cheap yet powerful mobile have converged to gradually increase the range and complexity of mobile multimedia content delivery services for devices such as PDAs and cell phones. Basic multimedia applications are already available for current generation devices, and more complex broadcasting services are under development or expected to be launched soon, among which mobile and interactive television (ITV). Among the many challenging issues opened by these developments is the problem of personalization of such services: adaptation of the content to the technical environment of the users (device and network type) and to their individual preferences, providing personalized assistance for selecting and locating interesting programmes among an overwhelming number of proposed services.

This special issue is intended to foster state-of-the-art research contributions to all research areas either directly applying or contributing to solving the issues related to digital multimedia broadcasting personalization. Topics of interest include (but are not limited to):

- Mobile TV
- Mobile multimedia broadcasting personalization
- Interactive broadcasting services/interactive television
- Personalization and multimedia home platform (MHP)
- Multimedia content adaptation for personalization
- User behavior and usage modelling
- Standards for modelling and processing (MPEG-21, CC/PP, etc.)
- Personalization issues in DVB-H, DMB, MediaFLO, CMMB, MBMS, and other systems
- Mobile web initiative
- Personalized multimedia and location-based services
- Security and digital rights management
- Applications for personalized mobile multimedia broadcasting with cost-effective implementation

Authors should follow the International Journal of Digital Multimedia Broadcasting manuscript format described at the journal site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijdmb/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Manuscript Due | March 1, 2008 |
| First Round of Reviews | June 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | September 1, 2008 |

Guest Editors

Harald Kosch, University of Passau, 94030 Passau, Germany; harald.kosch@uni-passau.de

Jörg Heuer, Siemens AG, 80333 Munich, Germany; joerg.heuer@siemens.com

Günther Hölbling, University of Passau, 94030 Passau, Germany; guenther.hoelbling@uni-passau.de

László Böszörményi, University Klagenfurt, 9020 Klagenfurt, Austria; laszlo@itec.uni-klu.ac.at

David Coquil, University of Passau, 94030 Passau, Germany; david.coquil@uni-passau.de

Special Issue on Synchronization in Wireless Communications

Call for Papers

The last decade has witnessed an immense increase of wireless communications services to keep pace with the ever increasing demand for higher data rates combined with higher mobility. To satisfy this demand for higher data rates, the throughput over the existing transmission media had to be increased. Several techniques were proposed to boost up the data rate: multicarrier systems to combat selective fading, ultrawide band (UWB) communications systems to share the spectrum with other users, MIMO transmissions to increase the capacity of wireless links, iteratively decodable codes (e.g., turbo codes and LDPC codes) to improve the quality of the link, cognitive radios, and so forth.

To function properly, the receiver must synchronize with the incoming signal. The accuracy of the synchronization will determine whether the communication system is able to perform well. The receiver needs to determine at which time instants the incoming signal has to be sampled (timing synchronization), and for bandpass communications the receiver needs to adapt the frequency and phase of its local carrier oscillator with those of the received signal (carrier synchronization). However, most of the existing communication systems operate under hostile conditions: low SNR, strong fading, and (multiuser) interference, which make the acquisition of the synchronization parameters burdensome. Therefore, synchronization is considered in general as a challenging task.

The objective of this special issue (whose preparation is also carried out under the auspices of the EC Network of Excellence in Wireless Communications NEWCOM++) is to gather recent advances in the area of synchronization of wireless systems, spanning from theoretical analysis of synchronization schemes to practical implementation issues, from optimal synchronizers to low-complexity ad hoc synchronizers. Suitable topics for this special issue include but are not limited to:

- Carrier phase and frequency offset estimation and compensation
- Doppler shift frequency synchronization
- Phase noise estimation and compensation
- Timing recovery
- Sampling clock offset impairments and detection
- Frame synchronization
- Joint carrier and timing synchronization

- Joint synchronization and channel estimation
- Data-aided, non-data-aided and decision directed synchronization algorithms
- Feedforward or feedback synchronization algorithms
- Turbo-synchronization
- Synchronization for MIMO receivers
- Signal processing for (distributed) synchronization
- Acquisition and tracking performance analysis
- Spreading code acquisition and tracking
- Theoretical bounds on synchronizer performance
- Design of efficient training sequences or pilots

Authors should follow the EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking manuscript format described at the journal site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/wcn/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable.

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Manuscript Due | July 1, 2008 |
| First Round of Reviews | October 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | January 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Heidi Steendam, Department of Telecommunications and Information Processing (TELIN), Ghent University, 9000 Gent, Belgium; heidi.steendam@telin.ugent.be

Mounir Ghogho, School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, Leeds University, 182 Woodhouse Lane, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK; m.ghogho@leeds.ac.uk

Marco Luise, Department of Information Engineering, University of Pisa, 56122 Pisa, Italy; m.luise@iet.unipi.it

Erdal Panayirci, Department of Electronics Engineering, Kadir Has University, 34083 Istanbul, Turkey; eeapanay@khas.edu.tr

Erchin Serpedin, Department of Electrical Engineering, A&M University, College Station, TX 77840, USA; serpedin@ece.tamu.edu

Special Issue on Applications of Signal Processing Techniques to Bioinformatics, Genomics, and Proteomics

Call for Papers

The recent development of high-throughput molecular genetics technologies has brought a major impact to bioinformatics, genomics, and proteomics. Classical signal processing techniques have found powerful applications in extracting and modeling the information provided by genomic and proteomic data. This special issue calls for contributions to modeling and processing of data arising in bioinformatics, genomics, and proteomics using signal processing techniques. Submissions are expected to address theoretical developments, computational aspects, or specific applications. However, all successful submissions are required to be technically solid and provide a good integration of theory with practical data.

Suitable topics for this special issue include but are not limited to:

- Time-frequency representations
- Spectral analysis
- Estimation and detection
- Stochastic modeling of gene regulatory networks
- Signal processing for microarray analysis
- Denoising of genomic data
- Data compression
- Pattern recognition
- Signal processing methods in sequence analysis
- Signal processing for proteomics

Authors should follow the EURASIP Journal on Bioinformatics and Systems Biology manuscript format described at the journal site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/bsb/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the EURASIP Journal on Bioinformatics and Systems Biology's Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Manuscript Due | June 1, 2008 |
| First Round of Reviews | September 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | December 1, 2008 |

Guest Editors

Erchin Serpedin, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3128, USA; serpedin@ece.tamu.edu

Javier Garcia-Frias, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716-7501, USA; jgarcia@ee.udel.edu

Yufei Huang, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Texas at San-Antonio, TX 78249-2057, USA; yhuang@utsa.edu

Ulisses Braga Neto, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3128, USA; ulisses@ece.tamu.edu

Special Issue on Challenges on Complexity and Connectivity in Embedded Systems

Call for Papers

Technology advances and a growing field of applications have been a constant driving factor for embedded systems over the past years. However, the increasing complexity of embedded systems and the emerging trend to interconnections between them lead to new challenges. Intelligent solutions are necessary to solve these challenges and to provide reliable and secure systems to the customer under a strict time and financial budget.

Typically, intelligent solutions often come up with an orthogonal and interdisciplinary approach in contrast to traditional ways of engineering solutions. Many possible intelligent methods for embedded systems are biologically inspired, such as neural networks and genetic algorithms. Multi-agent systems are also prospective for an application for nontime critical services of embedded systems. Another field is soft computing which allows a sophisticated modeling and processing of imprecise (sensory) data.

The goal of this special issue is to provide a forum for innovative smart solutions which have been applied in the embedded systems domain and which are likely useful to solve problems in other applications as well.

Original papers previously unpublished and not currently under review by another journal are solicited. They should cover one or more of the following topics:

- Smart embedded (real-time) systems
- Autonomous embedded systems
- Sensor networks and sensor node hardware/software platforms
- Software tools for embedded systems
- Topology control and time synchronization
- Error tolerance, security, and robustness
- Network protocols and middleware for embedded systems
- Standardization of embedded software components
- Data gathering, aggregation, and dissemination
- Prototypes, applications, case studies, and test beds

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/es/guidelines.html>. Authors should follow the EURASIP Journal on Embedded Systems manuscript format described at the journal's site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/es/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal's Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

| | |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Manuscript Due | August 1, 2008 |
| First Round of Reviews | November 1, 2008 |
| Publication Date | February 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Bernhard Rinner, University of Klagenfurt, 9020 Klagenfurt, Austria; bernhard.rinner@uni-klu.ac.at

Wilfried Elmenreich, University of Klagenfurt, 9020 Klagenfurt, Austria; wilfried.elmenreich@uni-klu.ac.at

Ralf Seepold, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, 28911 Leganes, Spain; ralf@it.uc3m.es

Volker Turau, Technische Universita"t Hamburg-Harburg, 21073 Hamburg, Germany; turau@tuhh.de

Markus Kucera, University of Applied Sciences, Regensburg, Germany; markus.kucera@informatik.fh-regensburg.de

Special Issue on CNN Technology for Spatiotemporal Signal Processing

Call for Papers

A cellular neural/nonlinear network (CNN) is any spatial arrangement of mainly locally coupled cells, where each cell has an input, an output, and a state that evolves according to some prescribed dynamical laws. CNN represents a paradigm for nonlinear spatial-temporal dynamics and the core of the cellular wave computing (also called CNN technology). Partial differential equations (PDEs) or wave-like phenomena are the computing primitives of CNN. Besides, their suitability for physical implementation due to their local connectivity makes CNNs very appropriate for high-speed parallel signal processing.

Early CNN applications were mainly in image processing. The possible availability of cellular processor arrays with a high number of processing elements opened a new window for the development of new applications and the recovery of techniques traditionally conditioned by the slow speed of conventional computers. Let us name as example image processing techniques based on active contours or active wave propagation, or applications within the medical image processing framework (echocardiography, retinal image processing, etc.) where fast processing provides new capabilities for medical disease diagnosis.

On the other hand, emerging applications exploit the complex spatiotemporal phenomena exhibited by multilayer CNN and extend to the modelling of neural circuits for biological vision, motion, and higher brain function.

The aim of this special issue is to bring forth the synergy between CNN and spatiotemporal signal processing through new and significant contributions from active researchers in these fields. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Theory of cellular nonlinear spatiotemporal phenomena
- Analog-logic spatiotemporal algorithms
- Learning & design
- Bioinspired/neuromorphic arrays
- Physical VLSI implementations: integrated sensor/processor/actuator arrays
- Applications including computing, communications, and multimedia

- Circuits, architectures and systems in the nanoscale regime
- Other areas in cellular neural networks and array computing

Authors should follow the EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing manuscript format described at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/asp/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Manuscript Due | September 15, 2008 |
| First Round of Reviews | December 15, 2008 |
| Publication Date | March 15, 2009 |

Guest Editors

David López Vilarino, Departamento de Electrónica y Computación, Facultad de Física, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; dlv@dec.usc.es

Diego Cabello Ferrer, Departamento de Electrónica y Computación, Facultad de Física, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; diego@dec.usc.es

Victor M. Brea, Departamento de Electrónica y Computación, Facultad de Física, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain; victor@dec.usc.es

Ronald Tetzlaff, Lehrstuhl für Grundlagen der Elektrotechnik, Fakultät für Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik, Technische Universität Dresden, Mommsenstraße 12, 01069 Dresden, Germany; r.tetzlaff@iap.uni-frankfurt.de

Chin-Teng Lin, National Chiao-Tung University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan; ctpeter.lin@msa.hinet.net

RESEARCH LETTERS IN SIGNAL PROCESSING

Why publish in this journal?

Research Letters in Signal Processing is devoted to very fast publication of short, high-quality manuscripts in the broad field of signal processing. Manuscripts should not exceed 4 pages in their final published form. Average time from submission to publication shall be around 60 days.

Why publish in this journal?

Wide Dissemination

All articles published in the journal are freely available online with no subscription or registration barriers. Every interested reader can download, print, read, and cite your article.

Quick Publication

The journal employs an online “Manuscript Tracking System” which helps streamline and speed the peer review so all manuscripts receive fast and rigorous peer review. Accepted articles appear online as soon as they are accepted, and shortly after, the final published version is released online following a thorough in-house production process.

Professional Publishing Services

The journal provides professional copyediting, typesetting, graphics, editing, and reference validation to all accepted manuscripts.

Keeping Your Copyright

Authors retain the copyright of their manuscript, which is published using the “Creative Commons Attribution License,” which permits unrestricted use of all published material provided that it is properly cited.

Extensive Indexing


Articles published in this journal will be indexed in several major indexing databases to ensure the maximum possible visibility of each published article.

Submit your Manuscript Now...

In order to submit your manuscript, please visit the journal’s website that can be found at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/rlsp/> and click on the “Manuscript Submission” link in the navigational bar.

Should you need help or have any questions, please drop an email to the journal’s editorial office at rlsp@hindawi.com

ISSN: 1687-6911; e-ISSN: 1687-692X; doi:10.1155/RLSP



RESEARCH LETTERS IN
SIGNAL PROCESSING

Hindawi Publishing Corporation
<http://www.hindawi.com>

Volume 2007

Editorial Board

Tyseer Aboulnasr, Canada
T. Adali, USA
S. S. Agaian, USA
Tamal Bose, USA
Jonathon Chambers, UK
Liang-Gee Chen, Taiwan
P. Dan Dan Cristea, Romania
Karen Egiazarian, Finland
Fary Z. Ghassemlooy, UK
Ling Guan, Canada
M. Haardt, Germany
Peter Handel, Sweden
Alfred Hanssen, Norway
Andreas Jakobsson, Sweden
Jiri Jan, Czech Republic
Soren Holdt Jensen, Denmark
Stefan Kaiser, Germany
C. Chung Ko, Singapore
S. Maw Kuo, USA
Miguel Angel Lagunas, Spain
James Lam, Hong Kong
Mark Liao, Taiwan
Stephen Marshall, UK
Stephen McLaughlin, UK
Antonio Napolitano, Italy
C. Richard, France
M. Rupp, Austria
William Allan Sandham, UK
Ravi Sankar, USA
John J. Shynk, USA
A. Spanias, USA
Yannis Stylianou, Greece
Jarmo Henrik Takala, Finland
S. Theodoridis, Greece
Luc Vandendorpe, Belgium
Jar-Ferr Kevin Yang, Taiwan

Hindawi Publishing Corporation

410 Park Avenue, 15th Floor, #287 pmb, New York, NY 10022, USA

HINDAWI