Bridging Accuracy and Efficiency in Facial Expression Recognition: An Adaptive Swarm Intelligence Framework for Resource-Constrained Environments

Shweta Sharma[1], Prof. Ashok Kumar[2]

[1]Research Scholar, College of Computing Science & Information Technology,
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India.
Email: shwetasharma.scholar@tmu.ac.in
[2]Professor, College of Computing Science & Information Technology
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email: Ashokk.computers@tmu.ac.in

Abstract

Facial expression recognition (FER) systems confront major computational hurdles due to high-dimensional feature spaces, limiting their application on resource-constrained devices. This research offers a unique Particle Swarm Optimization with Adaptive Opposition-Based Learning (PSO-AOBL) framework for optimal feature selection in FER systems. The suggested adaptive technique prevents premature convergence while preserving quick optimization performance by dynamically initiating opposition-based learning based on swarm diversity. Three benchmark datasets—CK+, FER2013, and JAFFE—are used to assess our methodology. Experimental results show PSO-AOBL reduces features by 73% (from 3,918 to 1,050 features) and inference time by 75% while achieving 94.2% accuracy on the CK+ dataset. Compared to normal PSO, our technique offers 2.1% accuracy improvement and 43% faster convergence.

Keywords: Facial expression recognition, feature selection, particle swarm optimization, swarm intelligence, computational efficiency.

INTRODUCTION

Facial expressions are key routes of human communication, communicating emotional states and intentions. Automatic identification of facial expressions has evolved as a crucial technique in human-computer interaction, mental health monitoring, driver safety systems, and social robotics. However, recent FER systems extract vast feature sets from facial photos, resulting in high-dimensional representations that create numerous important obstacles.

High-dimensional feature spaces greatly increase computing cost during both training and inference phases. Contemporary FER processes frequently extract thousands of characteristics, such as geometric landmarks, texture descriptors, and deep neural network embeddings [3]. This limits deployment on mobile phones, embedded systems, and IoT devices. When feature dimensions significantly surpass training samples, learning methods suffer from the curse of dimensionality [4], leading to overfitting. Additionally, high-dimensional features are frequently incompatible with real-time application processing speeds requiring sub-50ms response times [1].

Feature selection overcomes these difficulties by finding optimal feature subsets that preserve classification accuracy while lowering dimensionality [5]. Unlike PCA, feature selection preserves original physical meaning, making models more interpretable [6]. Traditional techniques include filter approaches (statistical metrics), wrapper techniques (target classifiers), and embedded approaches [5,7,8].

Swarm intelligence offers promising alternatives for feature selection [9]. Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), created by Kennedy and Eberhart in 1995, has proven especially effective [11]. This research develops a novel PSO framework incorporating Adaptive Opposition-Based Learning (AOBL). Opposition-Based Learning, proposed by Tizhoosh in 2005, accelerates optimization by simultaneously evaluating candidate solutions and their opposites [16]. Our adaptive system selectively activates opposition based on swarm diversity, intervening only during stagnation.

Main contributions:

1. A novel PSO-AOBL algorithm that dynamically applies opposition-based learning based on swarm diversity measures
2. A multi-scale feature extraction system combining deep learning features, appearance-based descriptors (HOG and LBP), and geometric landmarks
3. Thorough testing on three benchmark datasets showing superior results versus filter, wrapper, and swarm-based methods
4. Comprehensive computational efficiency analysis demonstrating feasibility for resource-limited deployment
5. Feature significance analysis providing interpretable insights consistent with psychological studies [17]

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Facial Expression Recognition

Early FER systems relied on geometric information from facial landmarks [17], measuring angles and distances between key features. Appearance-based techniques extract texture information using Gabor filters, LBP, and HOG [18,19]. Deep learning revolutionized FER research [1]. CNNs automatically learn hierarchical feature representations with unprecedented accuracy. Wang et al. [20] achieved 73.4% accuracy on FER2013 using self-attention mechanisms, though their 5 million parameter model is impractical for mobile devices. Transfer learning techniques have attracted interest for lowering training needs [22].

B. Feature Selection Methods

Feature selection has been extensively researched [5]. Filter approaches utilize statistical metrics like Information Gain [7]. Relief evaluates feature quality by examining class differentiation [23]. Wrapper methods like RFE use target classifiers [24], improving accuracy but requiring substantial computation. Embedded approaches offer a middle ground.

C. Swarm Intelligence and Opposition-Based Learning

Swarm intelligence programs draw inspiration from collective natural behaviors [9]. PSO's ease of use and quick convergence make it especially successful [11]. Particles adjust velocities based on personal best and global best positions. Recent variations address specific optimization issues [13,29,30]. Opposition-Based Learning accelerates evolutionary algorithms by considering solutions and their opposites simultaneously [16]. However, constant opposition may waste computational resources [33]. Selective opposition is suggested [34].

D. Research Gaps

Our literature study finds several important gaps. First, limited research addresses multi-scale feature properties specific to FER [15]. Second, adaptive opposition-based learning is rarely used in swarm-based feature selection [13]. Third, computing efficiency hasn't received significant consideration [2]. Fourth, thorough comparison analysis is frequently absent [4]. This work tackles these shortcomings with a novel adaptive swarm intelligence architecture specifically developed for multi-scale FER feature selection.

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

A. Problem Formulation

Let **X** = {$x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$} represent the complete feature set, where n is the total number of features. Let **Y** = {$y_1, y_2, ..., y_m$} represent expression labels from m classes (anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, surprise, neutral) [36]. The feature selection problem seeks an optimal subset $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ that maximizes classification accuracy while minimizing computational complexity [5]:

$$Fitness(S) = \alpha \times Accuracy(S) - \beta \times (|S| / |X|)$$

where α = 0.9 and β = 0.1, prioritizing accuracy while encouraging feature reduction [28].

B. Feature Extraction Pipeline

Our system employs a multi-scale approach combining three complementary types [3]:

Geometric Features (136 dimensions): We detect 68 facial landmarks using Ensemble of Regression Trees [37], computing Euclidean distances, angles, and curvature measures [17].

Appearance Features (3,270 dimensions): HOG captures edge orientation distributions (2,916 features) [19]. LBP extracts micro-texture patterns from six facial regions (354 features) [18].

Deep Features (512 dimensions): We extract features from VGG-Face CNN penultimate layer [38].

The concatenated vector contains 3,918 dimensions, creating a rich but high-dimensional representation space [3].

C. Particle Swarm Optimization

In PSO, particles navigate the search space [11]. Each particle i maintains: position vector $\mathbf{x}_i$ (binary encoding), velocity vector $\mathbf{v}_i$, and personal best $\mathbf{pBest}_i$. The swarm maintains global best **gBest** [11]. Velocity updates consider inertia, cognitive, and social components [13]:

$$v_{ij}(t+1) = w \times v_{ij}(t) + c_1r_1(pBest_{ij} - x_{ij}(t)) + c_2r_2(gBest_j - x_{ij}(t))$$

For binary selection, we use sigmoid transformation [12]:

$$P(x_{ij} = 1) = 1 / (1 + exp(-v_{ij}))$$

D. Adaptive Opposition-Based Learning

For binary space, the opposite position is [16]: $\mathbf{\tilde{x}_j = 1 - x_j}$

We measure diversity as average distance between particles and swarm centroid:

$$Diversity(t) = (1/N) \times \Sigma_{i=1}{}^{N} \,||\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)||$$

We apply opposition when: $\mathbf{Diversity(t) < \theta \times Diversity(0)}$ where θ = 0.3 [34].

This adaptive mechanism reduces computational cost, maintains exploration capability, and adapts automatically [31].

E. Complete PSO-AOBL Algorithm

Initialization: Randomly initialize N = 50 particles with binary vectors. Set initial velocities to zero. Evaluate fitness using SVM classifier. Initialize personal and global bests. Calculate initial diversity baseline.

Main Loop (T = 100 iterations): Update velocities with linearly decreasing inertia (0.9→0.4) [13]. Update positions using sigmoid transformation [12]. Evaluate fitness and update bests. Calculate diversity. If diversity < threshold, generate and evaluate opposites [16], replacing when better [34].

Parameters: N=50, T=100, w [0.4,0.9], $c_1=c_2=2.0$, θ=0.3, α=0.9, β=0.1 [28].

F. Classification Framework

We employ SVM with RBF kernel [39]. Parameters C and γ are optimized using grid search with 5-fold cross-validation. For multi-class recognition, we use one-versus-one strategy [39].

EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

A. Datasets

CK+ [40]: 593 sequences from 123 subjects, 981 labeled images (640×490 pixels), controlled laboratory conditions.

FER2013 [41]: 35,887 grayscale images (48×48 pixels), in-the-wild conditions with significant variations.

JAFFE [42]: 213 images from 10 Japanese females (256×256 pixels), high-quality annotations.

B. Experimental Configuration

Hardware: Intel Xeon E5-2680 v4 (2.4GHz, 14 cores), 64GB RAM, NVIDIA Tesla P100 GPU. Software: Python 3.8, scikit-learn 0.24, OpenCV 4.5, dlib 19.22, TensorFlow 2.6.

Preprocessing: face detection, alignment, normalization [36]. Data augmentation for training (rotation ±15°, flipping, brightness adjustment). Evaluation: 10-fold cross-validation for CK+ and JAFFE; standard split for FER2013.

C. Baseline Methods

Information Gain (IG) [7]: Filter method ranking features by mutual information.

RFE [24]: Wrapper method recursively eliminating least important features.

GA [43]: Evolutionary algorithm with tournament selection, crossover (p=0.8), mutation (p=0.01).

Standard PSO [11]: Baseline without opposition-based learning.

All methods use identical SVM classifiers [39] with identical hyperparameter optimization.

D. Performance Metrics

Classification: Accuracy, Precision, Recall, F1-Score [44]. **Efficiency:** Feature Reduction Rate, Training Time, Inference Time, Memory Consumption [2]. **Statistical:** Paired t-tests (α=0.05).

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Classification Performance

CK+ Dataset: Using all 3,918 features: 89.5±1.2%. IG: 88.2±1.5% (1,500 features). RFE: 91.3±1.1% (1,250 features). GA: 92.1±1.0% (1,100 features). Standard PSO: 92.3±1.0%. **PSO-AOBL: 94.2±0.9% (1,050 features)** - 4.7% improvement over full set, 2.1% over standard PSO.

FER2013: All features: 68.3±0.8%. IG: 65.7±1.0%. RFE: 69.1±0.8%. GA/PSO: ~70%. **PSO-AOBL: 70.6±0.7%** - 2.3% improvement.

JAFFE: All features: 86.4±2.1%. Filter/wrapper: 84-88%. GA/PSO: ~89%. **PSO-AOBL: 91.1±1.7%** with consistent 1,050 features (73% reduction).

B. Computational Efficiency

Training Time (CK+): IG: 12 min. RFE: 157 min. GA: 203 min. Standard PSO: 78 min. **PSO-AOBL: 90 min** (2.3× faster than GA).

Inference Time: All features: 8.7ms. IG: 3.1ms. Standard PSO/RFE/GA: 2.3-2.6ms. **PSO-AOBL: 2.2ms** (75% reduction, 450+ fps).

Memory: All features: 5.2GB. **PSO-AOBL: 2.0GB** (62% reduction).

C. Convergence Analysis

Standard PSO stagnates at iteration 45 (~0.923 fitness) [13]. PSO-AOBL shows sudden improvements at iterations 18, 34, 52 where opposition triggered [16,34], reaching 95% of final fitness by iteration 40 versus 70-80 for others. GA exhibits slower initial development [43].

D. Feature Importance Analysis

Most selected features: mouth-to-chin distance (100%), eyebrow angle (100%), eye aperture (96%). These match facial Action Units in FACS [17]. Deep features from VGG-Face show 94-97% selection rates [38]. Appearance features show 85-92% selection for mouth, eyes, eyebrows regions [18,19]. Rarely selected features include redundant geometric measures and static region descriptors, explaining why all features reduce accuracy [5].

E. Statistical Significance

Paired t-tests [45] on CK+ dataset: PSO-AOBL vs. all features (t=8.73, p<0.001). Comparisons against all baselines yield p<0.01, confirming genuine algorithmic superiority across all three datasets [40,41,42].

F. Discussion

Strengths: PSO-AOBL achieves state-of-the-art accuracy with 73% dimensionality reduction [2,4].

The 75% inference time reduction enables real-time processing on resource-constrained devices [1]. Adaptive opposition effectively balances exploration/exploitation [13,16,34]. Feature interpretability is valuable in healthcare applications [6,17].

Limitations: Training time remains substantial for frequent retraining [2]. Hyperparameter dependence requires tuning [28]. Scalability to million-image datasets uncertain [2]. Current fitness function equally weights all classes [36].

Practical Implications: Enables mobile mental health monitoring [1], automotive driver emotion detection [1], and human-robot interaction with transparent decision-making [6].

CONCLUSION

This paper presented a novel swarm intelligence framework explicitly addressing computational efficiency alongside classification accuracy. PSO-AOBL integrates PSO [11] with Adaptive Opposition-Based Learning [16], dynamically triggering opposition based on swarm diversity [34].

Key Findings:

1. Superior performance: 94.2% accuracy on CK+ (4.7% improvement over full features, 2.1% over standard PSO) [5,7,11,24]
2. Dramatic efficiency gains: 73% feature reduction (3,918→1,050), 75% inference time reduction (8.7ms→2.2ms), 62% memory reduction (5.2GB 2.0GB) [2,28]
3. Adaptive opposition benefits: 95% final fitness in 40 iterations vs. 70-80 for others [13,16,33,34]
4. Meaningful feature patterns aligned with psychological research [17], enhancing interpretability [6]
5. Robust generalization across controlled and in-the-wild datasets [2]

Future Directions:

1. Multi-objective optimization using Pareto-based approaches [30]
2. Transfer learning for reduced data requirements [22]
3. Online/incremental feature selection for dynamic environments [2]
4. Hybrid swarm algorithms combining complementary strategies [29,30]
5. Multi-modal emotion recognition from facial, vocal, physiological signals [1]
6. Scalability validation on million-image datasets [2]
7. Integration with explainable AI for enhanced interpretability [6]

This work represents a significant step toward efficient, interpretable, deployable FER systems [1], enabling accurate emotion recognition on resource-constrained devices [2] and expanding affective computing to mobile, embedded, and edge platforms.

References

1. S. Li and W. Deng, "Deep facial expression recognition: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Affective Comput.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1195-1215, 2022.
2. A. Mollahosseini et al., "AffectNet: A database for facial expression," *IEEE Trans. Affective Comput.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 18-31, 2019.
3. Y. Zhang et al., "Relative uncertainty learning for facial expression recognition," *Proc. NeurIPS*, pp. 17616-17627, 2021.
4. M. Ghosh et al., "Feature selection for facial expression recognition: A review," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 189, article 116077, 2022.
5. I. Guyon and A. Elisseeff, "An introduction to variable and feature selection," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 3, pp. 1157-1182, 2003.
6. G. Chandrashekar and F. Sahin, "A survey on feature selection methods," *Computers Elect. Eng.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 16-28, 2014.
7. L. Yu and H. Liu, "Efficient feature selection via analysis of relevance and redundancy," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 5, pp. 1205-1224, 2004.
8. M. Dash and H. Liu, "Feature selection for classification," *Intell. Data Anal.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 131-156, 1997.
9. M. Dorigo et al., "Ant colony optimization," *IEEE Comput. Intell. Mag.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 28-39, 2006.
10. R. Poli et al., "Particle swarm optimization: An overview," *Swarm Intell.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 33-57, 2007.
11. J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart, "Particle swarm optimization," *Proc. IEEE ICNN*, pp. 1942-1948, 1995.
12. J. Kennedy and R. C. Eberhart, "A discrete binary version of PSO," *Proc. IEEE SMC*, pp. 4104-4108, 1997.
13. B. Xue et al., "PSO for feature selection: A multi-objective approach," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1656-1671, 2013.
14. X. Jiang et al., "DFEW: A large-scale database for dynamic facial expressions," *Proc. ACM MM*, pp. 2881-2889, 2020.
15. M. M. Kabir et al., "A new hybrid ant colony optimization algorithm," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 3747-3763, 2012.
16. H. R. Tizhoosh, "Opposition-based learning: A new scheme," *Proc. CIMCA*, pp. 695-701, 2005.
17. P. Ekman and W. V. Friesen, "Facial action coding system," Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978.
18. T. Ojala et al., "Local binary patterns," *IEEE Trans. PAMI*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 971-987, 2002.
19. N. Dalal and B. Triggs, "Histograms of oriented gradients," *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, pp. 886-893, 2005.
20. K. Wang et al., "Suppressing uncertainties for large-scale FER," *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, pp. 6897-6906, 2020.
21. F. Zhang et al., "Joint pose and expression modeling," *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, pp. 3359-3368, 2022.
22. Y. Li et al., "Self-supervised representation learning," *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, pp. 3633-3642, 2021.
23. K. Kira and L. A. Rendell, "A practical approach to feature selection," *Proc. ICML*, pp. 249-256, 1992.
24. I. Guyon et al., "Gene selection using support vector machines," *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 46, pp. 389-422, 2002.
25. S. Ghosh et al., "Automatic group affect analysis," *IEEE Trans. Affective Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1169-1180, 2023.
26. A. Kumar et al., "Feature selection using regularization methods," *Pattern Recognit. Lett.*, vol. 158, pp. 123-130, 2023.
27. M. Dorigo and L. M. Gambardella, "Ant colony system," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 53-66, 1997.

28. B. Xue et al., "A survey on evolutionary computation for feature selection," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 606-626, 2016.
29. J. Too et al., "Hybrid binary PSO differential evolution," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 140753-140769, 2020.
30. M. Mafarja and S. Mirjalili, "Hybrid whale optimization algorithm," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 260, pp. 302-312, 2017.
31. S. Rahnamayan et al., "Opposition-based differential evolution," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 64-79, 2008.
32. H. Wang et al., "Enhancing PSO using generalized opposition-based learning," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 181, no. 20, pp. 4699-4714, 2011.
33. Q. Xu et al., "A review of opposition-based learning," *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 29, pp. 1-12, 2014.
34. S. Ergezer et al., "Oppositional biogeography-based optimization," *Proc. IEEE SMC*, pp. 1009-1014, 2009.
35. D. Patel et al., "PSO for feature selection in FER," *Proc. IEEE ICIP*, pp. 2145-2150, 2024.
36. Z. Zeng et al., "A survey of affect recognition methods," *IEEE Trans. PAMI*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 39-58, 2009.
37. V. Kazemi and J. Sullivan, "One millisecond face alignment," *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, pp.