

**DEVELOPMENT OF A MULTI-INSTANCE CONTINGENT FUSION
ALGORITHM FOR THE VERIFICATION OF INFANT
FINGERPRINTS**

**ODU, TIWALADE OLUBUKOLA
(CU023010092)**

**B.Eng, Computer Engineering, Covenant University, Ota
M.Eng, Computer Engineering, Covenant University, Ota**

FEBRUARY, 2024

**DEVELOPMENT OF A MULTI-INSTANCE CONTINGENT FUSION
ALGORITHM FOR THE VERIFICATION OF INFANT
FINGERPRINTS**

BY

ODU, TIWALADE OLUBUKOLA

(CU023010092)

B.Eng, Computer Engineering, Covenant University, Ota

M.Eng, Computer Engineering, Covenant University, Ota

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE
STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE AWARD OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D) DEGREE IN
COMPUTER ENGINEERING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
ELECTRICAL AND INFORMATION ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF
ENGINEERING, COVENANT UNIVERSITY, OTA, OGUN STATE,
NIGERIA**

FEBRUARY, 2024

ACCEPTANCE

This is to attest that this thesis is accepted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in Computer Engineering in the Department of Electrical and Information Engineering, College of Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria

Miss Adefunke F. Oyinloye
(Secretary, School of Postgraduate Studies)

Signature and Date

Prof. Akan B. Williams
(Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies)

Signature and Date

DECLARATION

I, ODU, TIWALADE OLUBUKOLA (CU023010092) declare that this thesis is a representation of my work, and was written and implemented by me under the supervision of Dr. Moses O. Olaniyan and Dr. Isaac A. Samuel of the Department of Electrical and Information Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria, and Professor Tokunbo Ogunfunmi of the School of Engineering, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, U. S. A. I attest that this thesis has in no way been submitted either wholly or partially to any other university or institution of higher learning for the award of a Doctor of Philosophy degree. All information cited from published and unpublished literature have been duly referenced.

ODU, TIWALADE OLUBUKOLA

Signature and Date

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the thesis titled “**DEVELOPMENT OF A MULTI-INSTANCE CONTINGENT FUSION ALGORITHM FOR THE VERIFICATION OF INFANT FINGERPRINTS**” is an original research work carried out by **ODU, TIWALADE OLUBUKOLA (CU023010092)**, in the Department of Electrical and Information Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, meets the requirements and regulations governing the award of Doctor Philosophy (Ph.D) degree in Computer Engineering and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. Moses O. Olaniyan
Supervisor

Signature and Date

Prof. Tokunbo Ogunfunmi
Co-supervisor

Signature and Date

Dr. Isaac A. Samuel
Co-supervisor

Signature and Date

Dr. Isaac A. Samuel
Head of Department

Signature and Date

Prof. Akan B. Williams
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

Signature and Date

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to the Almighty God who strengthened and helped me through this programme, the memory of my father, Dcn. Moses Akano Majekodunmi and my ever-supportive family. I am grateful for the privilege to make you proud.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My infinite gratitude goes to God, the leader of my life, for ordering my steps in His word from the commencement of this research to its successful end. He strengthened me on the numerous days I wanted to quit. I am thankful for the opportunities afforded me by the Chancellor and Chairman of the Board of Regents, Covenant University, Dr. David O. Oyedepo in the pursuit of this vision. The challenges I encountered strengthened my resolve to finish strong. Special thanks to the Management of Covenant University led by the Vice-Chancellor, Prof. Abiodun H. Adebayo, for providing an enabling research environment.

I am immensely grateful to the Management of the School of Post Graduate Studies, Covenant University, led by Prof. Akan B. Williams; the Dean College of Engineering, Prof. David O. Olukanni; the Heads (past and present) and Staff of the Department of Electrical and Information Engineering. You helped in moulding me to become a star. I am especially grateful to my supervisors, Dr. Moses O. Olaniyan, for his selfless mentoring, Dr. Isaac A. Samuel, who was used by God to prevent me from quitting when a successful end seemed impossible, Prof. Tokunbo Ogunfunmi, who has painstakingly held my hand on this PhD journey, Prof. Aderemi A. Atayero, who lovingly guided me from my undergraduate days to my postgraduate degree, Late Prof. Tunji S. Ibiyemi, who charted the path for my sojourn in the field of biometrics, Dr. Joke A. Badejo, who has been my mentor and guide on my postgraduate journey, Dr. Tolulope Adesina, who helped me to see this research in a new light, Dr. Omoruyi Osemwegie, who was instrumental in major milestones of this research, and Dr. Kennedy Okpokpujie for his consistent push. You all helped to bring out the best in me.

My eternal gratitude goes to my dearest husband, Engr. Emmanuel O. Odu, thank you for your unconditional love, prayers, sacrifices and words of comfort and encouragement in the face of seeming impossibilities, my children, Zoe A. Odu, and Asher-David O. Odu, thank you for your love and understanding that inspired me to make progress despite the challenges, my mom, Dcns. Abiola I. Majekodunmi, thank you for your intercession, sacrifices, motivation and corrections, my late dad, the memories of how proud you always were of me prevented me from giving up on this journey, my one and only brother, Engr. Adeniyi A. Majekodunmi thank you for your help, prayers, sacrifices and words of encouragement.

I am also grateful for the consistent support of my friends and colleagues, Dr. Temitope O. Takpor, Dr. Funmi Moninuola, Dr. Oluwadamilola I. Oshin, Dr. Senarita Okuboyejo, Dr. Itunu

Isewon, Mr. Bidemi & Mrs. Tina Alejo, Mr. Babafemi Odusote, Engr. (Mrs.) Timilehin F. Sanni, Dr. Charles Onuh, Dr. Mercy Kayode-Adeyemi, Engr. (Mrs.) Ayodele Ifijeh, to mention a few.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGES
TITLE PAGE	ii
ACCEPTANCE	iii
DECLARATION	iv
CERTIFICATION	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
ABSTRACT	xvi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Aim and Objectives	5
1.4 Scope of the Study	5
1.5 Justification for the Study	5
1.6 Thesis Organization	6
CHAPTER TWO	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Preamble	7
2.2 Biometrics	7
2.3 Fingerprint Recognition	10
2.4 Multibiometrics	14
2.5 Fusion	14
2.5.1 Levels of fusion	16
2.5.2 Sources of fusion	18
2.6 Contingent fusion	22
2.7 Biometric recognition of children	22
2.8 Fingerprint recognition of children	25
2.9 Performance Evaluation Metrics	34
2.9.1 Choice of accuracy metric	36
2.9.2 Verification error rates	37
2.9.3 Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve	44
2.9.4 Detection Error Trade-off (DET) curve	47
2.9.5 The difference between identification and verification	50
2.10 Existing gaps in literature	50
2.11 Chapter Summary	51
CHAPTER THREE	52
METHODOLOGY	52
3.1 Preamble	52
3.2 Conceptual Framework	52
3.3 Fingerprint Acquisition	53

3.3.1	Ethics Approval	53
3.3.2	Study Site	53
3.3.3	Study Population	53
3.3.4	Subject Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	53
3.3.5	Infant Fingerprint Data Acquisition Protocol	55
3.4	Fingerprint Pattern Analysis	56
3.4.1	Fingerprint Pre-processing	57
3.4.2	Fingerprint Feature Extraction	57
3.5	Fingerprint Matching	62
3.6	Multi-Instance Contingent Fusion	67
3.7	Experimental Protocol	72
3.7.1	Experiment 1: Session 2 (Query) compared with Session 1 (Enrolment)	73
3.7.2	Experiment 2: Session 3 (Query) compared with Session 2 (Enrolment)	73
3.7.3	Experiment 3: Session 3 (Query) compared with Session 1 (Enrolment)	73
3.7.4	Experiment 4: Fusion of the match scores of the LT and RI fingers in Experiment 1	73
3.7.5	Experiment 5: Fusion of the match scores of the LT and RI fingers in Experiment 2	73
3.7.6	Experiment 6: Fusion of the match scores of the LT and RI fingers in Experiment 3	74
3.8	Chapter Summary	74
CHAPTER FOUR		75
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		75
4.1	Preamble	75
4.2	Fingerprint Acquisition	75
4.3	Covenant University Neonate and Infant Fingerprint (CU-NIF) Dataset	77
4.4	Fingerprint Pre-processing	78
4.5	Feature Extraction	79
4.6	Matching	79
4.7	Experimental Results	80
4.7.1	Experiment 1	80
4.7.2	Experiment 2	82
4.7.3	Experiment 3	85
4.7.4	Experiment 4	87
4.7.5	Experiment 5	90
4.7.6	Experiment 6	92
4.8	Discussion	95
4.9	Chapter Summary	98
CHAPTER FIVE		99
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		99
5.1	Summary	99
5.2	Conclusion	99
5.3	Contributions to Knowledge	100
5.4	Recommendations for Future Work	100
5.5	Limitations of the Research	100
REFERENCES		101
APPENDIX A		113
APPENDIX B		114
APPENDIX C		117
APPENDIX D		119
APPENDIX E		120

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES	LIST OF FIGURES	PAGES
2.1	The fundamental components of a generic biometric system	9
2.2	The five major classes of fingerprint patterns	11
2.3	(a) Level 1 features (b) Level 2 features, and (c) Level 3 features	11
2.4	Fingerprint image showing its singular points and minutiae	12
2.5	Levels of fusion	16
2.6	Sources of fusion in a fingerprint recognition system	18
2.7	FMR and FNMR for a given threshold t are displayed over the genuine and impostor score distributions	39
2.8	Genuine and impostor scores distribution	41
2.9	FMR(t) and FNMR(t) curves derived from the distribution of the scores in Figure 2.8	42
2.10	DET curve derived from the FMR(t) and FNMR(t) curves in Figure 2.9	43
2.11	ROC curve plots verification accuracy against FMR, where FMR is on a logarithmic scale	44
2.12	An ideal impostor and genuine scores distribution and ROC curve. TN (True Negative) = Impostor Scores, TP (True Positive) = Genuine Scores, TPR (True Positive Rate) = $1 - \text{FNMR}$, and FPR (False Positive Rate) = FMR	45
2.13	Impostor and genuine scores distribution and ROC curve of a system with a 70% chance of distinguishing between genuine and impostor. FN (False Negative) = FNM (False Non-Match) and FP (False Positive) = FM (False Match)	46
2.14	Impostor and genuine scores distribution and ROC curve of a system with a 50% chance of distinguishing between genuine and impostor	46
2.15	An example of FMR(t) and FNMR(t) curves, where the points corresponding to EER, ZeroFNMR, and ZeroFMR are highlighted	49
2.16	Typical operating points of different applications displayed on a ROC curve	50

3.1	Infant Fingerprint Verification Framework	52
3.2	Infant Fingerprint Verification Architecture	54
3.3	Digital Persona U.are.U 4500 fingerprint reader	55
3.4	The process of acquiring the fingerprints of a participant	56
3.5	Fingerprint feature extraction process	57
3.6	Pixel patterns used to detect ridge endings	59
3.7	Pixel patterns used to detect minutiae	60
3.8	Intra-fingerprint minutiae comparison	63
3.9	Compatible pair-wise minutia measurements between two fingerprints that generate an entry into an inter-fingerprint compatibility table	65
3.10	Flowchart of multi-instance contingent fusion for the verification of infant fingerprints	68
4.1	Screenshot of the fingerprint acquisition process	75
4.2	The fingerprints of Subject_82 at 3 months, 9 months and 4 months old respectively	76
4.3	The fingerprints of Subject_95 at 1 week, 7 weeks and 5 months old respectively	76
4.4	The fingerprints of Subject_96 at 6 days, 6 weeks, and 6 months old respectively	76
4.5	The fingerprints of Subject_190 at 2 months, 3 months, and 9 months old respectively	76
4.6	The fingerprints of Subject_246 at 5 weeks, 2 months, and 3 months old respectively	77
4.7	The number of participants for each age group	78
4.8	Pre-processed fingerprint images	78
4.9	The minutiae features detected by the feature extraction algorithm	79
4.10	Minutiae matching	79
4.11	Genuine and impostor scores distribution of the verification of Session 2 fingerprints with Session 1 fingerprints	80
4.12	FMR and FNMR curves of Experiment 1	81
4.13	ROC curve of Experiment 1 with $AUC = 0.776925$	81

4.14	DET curve of Experiment 1	82
4.15	Genuine and impostor scores distribution of the verification of Session 3 fingerprints with Session 2 fingerprints	83
4.16	The FMR and FNMR curves of Experiment 2	83
4.17	The ROC curve of Experiment 2 with $AUC = 0.761160$	84
4.18	The DET curve of Experiment 2	84
4.19	Genuine and impostor scores distribution of the verification of Session 3 fingerprints with Session 1 fingerprints	85
4.20	The FMR and FNMR curves of Experiment 3	86
4.21	The ROC curve of Experiment 3 with $AUC = 0.681872$	86
4.22	The DET curve of Experiment 3	87
4.23	Genuine and impostor scores distribution of the fusion of the left thumb and right index fingers in Experiment 1	88
4.24	The FMR and FNMR curves of Experiment 4	88
4.25	The ROC curve of Experiment 4 with $AUC = 0.794337$	89
4.26	The DET curve of Experiment 4	89
4.27	Genuine and impostor scores distribution of the fusion of the left thumb and right index fingers in Experiment 2	90
4.28	The FMR and FNMR curves of Experiment 4	91
4.29	The ROC curve of Experiment 5 with $AUC = 0.803351$	91
4.30	The DET curve of Experiment 5	92
4.31	Genuine and impostor scores distribution of the fusion of the left thumb and right index fingers in Experiment 3	93
4.32	The FMR and FNMR curves of Experiment 6	93
4.33	The ROC curve of Experiment 6 with $AUC = 0.696175$	94
4.34	The DET curve of Experiment 6	94

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	LIST OF TABLES	PAGES
2.1	Assessment of the most popular biometric traits focusing on the key criteria that influence the selection of a biometric trait for a particular application	8
2.2	Comparison of four (4) of the most popular biometric traits that have been explored for the recognition of children	24
2.3	Summary of Related Works	31
4.1	CU-NIF Dataset Statistics	77
4.2	Verification Performance before and after fusion	95
4.3	Verification accuracy before and after contingent fusion, for time lapses between the query and enrolment fingerprints	97
4.4	Benchmarking the result of this study with extant studies that used 500ppi fingerprint images.	98

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AUC	Area under the ROC curve
EER	Equal Error Rate
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FMR	False Match Rate
FMR100	The lowest FNMR for FMR \leq 1%
FMR1000	The lowest FNMR for FMR \leq 0.1%
FNMR	False Non-Match Rate
IAFIS	Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System
ppi	Pixel per inch
ROC	Receiver Operating Characteristic
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WHO	World Health Organisation
ZeroFMR	The lowest FNMR for FMR = 0%
ZeroFNMR	The lowest FMR for FNMR = 0%

ABSTRACT

Birth registration is a fundamental right for children, but approximately 237 million children below the age of 5 lack proper documentation, making them vulnerable to identity theft, newborn swapping, and child abduction. Traditional birth certificates are not reliable as they can be falsified or stolen. To address this issue, biometric birth registration, specifically using fingerprints, offers a digital identity that can last a lifetime. While other biometric traits like face, iris, palmprint, and footprint have been explored, fingerprints are the most widely accepted due to their ubiquity, ease of acquisition and widespread acceptance. However, challenges in infant fingerprint recognition include intra-class variation, the need for robust algorithms for low-resolution fingerprint images, and a lack of publicly available demographic infant fingerprint datasets. Therefore, this study aims to create a relevant dataset of infant fingerprints and develop a multi-instance contingent fusion algorithm to verify these fingerprints. The study involved obtaining fingerprints from 250 infants aged 1 day to 10 months using a fingerprint reader with a resolution of 500 ppi. The acquired fingerprints were pre-processed, and minutiae features were extracted using the MINDTCT algorithm. The extracted features of the enrolment and query fingerprints were compared using the BOZORTH3 matching algorithm, and a match score was obtained. This match score was compared to a threshold, with scores below the threshold resulting in the rejection of the infant's identity and scores above the threshold accepting it. The multi-instance contingent fusion algorithm was developed to accommodate situations where a baby's identity cannot be verified with one finger. It allows for verifying the baby's identity using a second finger. If both fingers fail to verify the identity, the match scores from both fingers are fused and compared to a predetermined threshold. The infant's identity is considered genuine if the fused score surpasses the threshold. Conversely, the baby's identity is only denied if the fused score falls below the threshold. The uniqueness of contingent fusion is that the match scores are only fused when neither of the two fingers can verify the infant's identity, thereby reducing computational complexity. The results show that for infants between 0 – 3 months old at the time of enrolment, without the multi-instance contingent fusion algorithm, the system generated verification accuracies of 34.1%, 35.71% and 11.9% for time-lapses of 1 month, 3 months and 6 months respectively, between enrolment and query fingerprints while the multi-instance contingent fusion algorithm generated verification accuracies of 73.8%, 69.05% and 57.14% for time lapses of 1 month, 3 months and 6 months respectively, between enrolment and query fingerprints. In conclusion, a dataset of infant fingerprints with a resolution of 500 ppi was developed, and the identities of babies older than 6 months were successfully verified with the fingerprint images acquired when they were younger than 6 months by employing the developed multi-instance contingent fusion algorithm. Longitudinal acquisition of infant fingerprint images and the inclusion of ancillary information, like gender and ethnicity, are therefore recommended to improve the accuracy of the verification system.

Keywords: contingent fusion, digital identity, infant fingerprint dataset, intra-class variation