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## Individuality

Biometric Individuality (of a population with respect to a comparison methodology): The probability that two (different) randomly selected writers from the population have indistinguishable writing profiles with respect to the comparison methodology being used.


- Fixed RNMP so we can study the RMP as a function of document size.
- We will control the RNMP at $1 \%$ and model the RMP as a function of the size of writing samples selected from each writer's body of handwriting.


## Match Probability

- Random Match Probability (RMP) is the chance of randomly selecting two subjects from the population and then randomly selecting a writing sample (of a given size) from each subject that is declared a match by the biometric.
- Random Non-Match Probability (RNMP) is the chance of randomly selecting a single subject and then sampling two documents from the selected subject's body of handwriting that are declared a non-match with respect to the biometric


## Pilot Study

- ~434 different writers
- Approximately 10 samples (5 in print and 5 in cursive) of a modified "London Letter" paragraphs per writer
- Collected from volunteers at the FBI, training classes, and at various conferences over a 2-year period.
- Two of the five script paragraphs from each of 100 writers.
- "FBI 100" data set


## Data Processing

- Automated process represents each segment by a graphical isomorphism
- Referred to as an isocode.
- Each document is reduced to the frequency of isocodes used to write each letter.
- Writing samples then consists of a set of isocode/letter pairs.
- Each writing sample is represented as a cross-classified table of isocode by letter.


## Data Processing

Accumulate across characters

Frequency Distribution of Letter/lsocode Usage in a Single Writing Sample

|  | Isocode 1 | Isocode 2 | .... | Isocode M |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| .... |  |  |  |  | $\ldots$ |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| A |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| .... |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |
| Z |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| a |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| .... |  |  |  |  | $\ldots$ |
| z |  |  |  |  | 2 |

## Sub-sampling Algorithm: RNMP

RNMP sub-sampling algorithm :

1. Randomly select one writer.
2. For the selected writer, construct two "random" writing samples by selecting, without replacement, a pre-specified number of characters from that individual' s collection of documents: $n 1$ being the number of characters making up the writing sample from the first writing sample, and $n 2$ being the number of characters making up the second writing sample.
3. Compare the two "random" writing samples using the chi-squared similarity score.

Application of the re-sampling algorithm many, many times over a variety of writing sample sizes results in a set of "data" of the form:
( $n 1, n 2, x$ ) where $x=$ chi-squared similarity score.

## Sub-Sampled Within-Writer Similarity Scores

## ( $K=1000$ for each document size)

Writing Sample Size 100 vs 100


Writing Sample Size 400 vs 400


Writing Sample Size $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ vs $\mathbf{7 0 0}$


Writing Sample Size 200 vs 200


Writing Sample Size 500 vs 500


Writing Sample Size $\mathbf{8 0 0}$ vs $\mathbf{8 0 0}$


Writing Sample Size $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ vs $\mathbf{3 0 0}$


Writing Sample Size 600 vs 600


Writing Sample Size 900 vs 900


## Sub-sampling Algorithm: RMP

RMP sub-sampling algorithm :

1. Randomly select two writers without replacement.
2. For each selected writer, construct a "random" writing sample by selecting, without replacement, a pre-specified number of characters from that individual's collection of documents: $n 1$ being the number of characters making up the writing sample from the first selected writer, and $n 2$ being the number of characters making up the writing sample from the second selected writer.
3. Compare the two "random" writing samples using the chi-squared similarity score and record whether or not a match has occurred.

Application of the re-sampling algorithm many, many times over a variety of writing sample sizes results in a set of "data" of the form:
( $n 1, n 2, x$ ) where $x=1$ if the two writing samples match; 0 if the two writing samples do not match.

## RMP Modeling



## RMP Modeling: Equal Document Sizes



## The Modeled Variance



## Properties of the Estimators

1. Consistent as the number of Writing Samples and the number of simulated documents tends to infinity.

- The Writing Sample Size can remain fixed!!

2. Asymptotically Normal Estimators.
3. Unbiased for the RMP and $E\left(p_{i}^{2}\right)$.

## The Design of an Individuality Study

- The sub-sampling models provide guidance on the relationship between the size of a writing sample collected and the RMP.
- Basic probability inequalities can give an idea on the behavior of upper confidence bounds on the RMP.
- Given combination of writing sample size and number of sampled writers.
- The ideal setting is when we have a sample of documents from a large number of people and observe no matches when the collected documents are combined.


## Confidence Bounds



95\% Upper Confidence Bounds for the RMP when no observed matches are observed with $n$ writers.

## Writing-Sample Sizes Needed for Specified Number of Writers

- Based on a one sided version of Chebyshev's inequality.
- Sometimes called Cantilli' s inequality.
- The probability of observing no matches when comparing writing samples pairwise from each of $n$ writers is at least $50 \%, 80 \%$, and $95 \%$ for the following writing sample sizes

|  | Probability of No Matches |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Writers (N) | $50 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| 50 | 751 | 828 | 916 |
| 100 | 869 | 945 | 1032 |
| 200 | 985 | 1062 | 1147 |
| 500 | 1137 | 1213 | 1298 |
| 700 | 1193 | 1268 | 1353 |
| 1000 | 1251 | 1326 | 1411 |
| 2000 | 1364 | 1439 | 1523 |

## The Determination of Writing Sample Size

The chance of observing a match in the $n(n-1) / 2$ pairwise comparisons is a function of the writing sample size.

For example, say the desired upper confidence bound on the RMP is 1 in 100,000 .

1. Then the smallest number of writers we could use to achieve this bound is 700 .
2. To have at least an $80 \%$ chance of achieving no matches in the 244650 cross- comparisons:
3. We would need to have each person submit a writing sample of about 1268 characters

## An Example
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