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Abstract

Current state-of-the-art segmentation techniques for ocular images are critically dependent on large-scale annotated datasets, which are labor-intensive to gather and often raise privacy concerns. In this paper, we present a novel framework, called BiOcularGAN, capable of generating synthetic large-scale datasets of photorealistic (visible light and near infrared) ocular images, together with corresponding segmentation labels to address these issues. At its core, the framework relies on a novel Dual-Branch StyleGAN2 (DB-StyleGAN2) model that facilitates bimodal image generation, and a Semantic Mask Generator (SMG) that produces semantic annotations by exploiting DB-StyleGAN2’s feature space. We evaluate BiOcularGAN through extensive experiments across five diverse ocular datasets and analyze the effects of bimodal data generation on image quality and the produced annotations. Our experimental results show that BiOcularGAN is able to produce high-quality matching bimodal images and annotations (with minimal manual intervention) that can be used to train highly competitive (deep) segmentation models that perform well across multiple real-world datasets. The source code will be made publicly available.

1. Introduction

Modern biometric systems are predominantly based on convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and transformer models, which rely on massive annotated (training) datasets to achieve competitive performance [29]. While large-scale datasets can today easily be collected from the web for many biometric modalities, such collection procedures often raise privacy and copyright-related concerns [12, 25]. Additionally, the annotation of such large-scale datasets is today (in most cases) still a manual, labor-intensive, and time-consuming task. These points are especially true for datasets dedicated to the segmentation of ocular images (in various imaging domains), where, next to the data collection, the generation of high-quality (multi-class) semantic annotations is known to be a costly endeavor [40, 42].

Researchers are, therefore, increasingly looking into automatic techniques that allow for the generation of synthetic datasets that require no (or minimal) human intervention during the annotation process [8, 24, 30, 44]. However, several challenges are associated with such an approach: (i) the synthetic (training) samples need to be as close as possible to the expected real-world data to allow for the trained model to perform well during deployment, (ii) the synthesis procedure must allow for the generation of large and diverse datasets that can cater to the data needs of modern deep learning models, and (iii) data annotations need to be produced automatically, without (or with minimal) supervision. To meet these challenges, existing solutions often resort to Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [10, 13] due to their ability to generate highly photorealistic and detailed synthetic data and the fact that the model’s internal representations can be exploited to generate semantic seg-
mentation labels alongside the generated images [44].

Motivated by the needs for large-scale synthetic datasets and the capabilities of recent generative models, we present in this paper a novel data generation framework, called BiOcularGAN, capable of generating aligned photorealistic (bimodal) ocular images in the visible (VIS) and near-infrared (NIR) domains along with corresponding segmentation masks, as illustrated in Figure 1. The key components of the framework are a novel dual-branch StyleGAN2 (DB-StyleGAN2) model, which extends the capabilities of the existing StyleGAN to bimodal data synthesis, and a data annotation procedure, inspired by [44], that exploits the semantic information encoded by the bimodal synthesis network for segmentation mask generation. To evaluate the proposed approach, we conduct experiments with five diverse datasets and investigate the effects that the shared VIS and NIR generation process has on the quality of the synthesized images. Furthermore, we analyze the ability of BiOcularGAN to generate useful datasets by observing how well current semantic segmentation models, trained on synthetic data, generalize to diverse real-world datasets. In summary, we make the following main contributions in this paper:

- We present BiOcularGAN, a powerful framework for generating large labeled datasets of ocular images based on bimodal data representations that can be used to train contemporary segmentation models.
- We design a bimodal generative model, i.e., the Dual-Branch StyleGAN2 (DB-StyleGAN2), capable of synthesizing visually convincing (aligned) ocular images in both the visible and near-infrared domains.
- We show that using bimodal information as the basis for generating segmentation masks leads to improvements in the quality of the generated annotations compared to solutions using only a single modality, e.g., the state-of-the-art DatasetGAN [44].

2. Related work

Image and Dataset Generation. Image synthesis techniques have experienced rapid development in the past decade, most notably due to the introduction of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [10]. Overtime, a myriad of improvements and iterations to the GAN model have been proposed, from manipulating latent space distributions [3] to using multiple discriminator networks [7]. Despite numerous advancements [13, 27], some of the inner workings of the generator networks remained poorly understood [1].

More recently, a powerful new generation model, called StyleGAN, was proposed by Karras et al. in [16]. With its high-resolution image synthesis capabilities, the model drastically outperformed other unconditional image generation techniques across a variety of datasets. Since then, the authors further iterated on the model (with StyleGAN2 and StyleGAN3) [17, 15] and addressed several of its characteristic artifacts with changes to model architecture and training procedures. Most notably, Karras et al. [14] also introduced various image augmentations to the discriminator, thus immensely lowering the amount of training data required to train the StyleGAN2 model.

Several approaches have also been proposed to enable the synthesis of segmentation masks alongside images generated by StyleGAN, either by using separate generator branches [24] or by exploiting the feature space of the generator [30, 44]. The latter approach showcased the ability to generate high quality datasets of paired images and segmentation masks, with only a few annotated examples, and was aptly named DatasetGAN [44]. In this paper, we build on the outlined advances and present, to the best of our knowledge, the first StyleGAN2-based model for bimodal data synthesis. As we demonstrate in the experimental section, the model leads to visually convincing generation results and allows us to synthesize large datasets of matched ocular images in the VIS and NIR imaging domains with corresponding segmentation masks.

Ocular Synthesis. Despite the considerable progress in generative models, only a limited number of solutions capable of generating photorealistic high-quality ocular images have so far been presented in literature. Shrivastava et al. [37] presented one of the initial GAN-based models for ocular synthesis, capable of converting pre-rendered ocular images [41] into more realistic ones. Lee et al. [23] built on this approach with the use of CycleGAN [45]. However, the resulting images remained rather noisy and often did not match the original gaze direction. Concurrently, Kohli et al. [21] explored convolutional GAN models for iris generation. Despite significant artifacts, they successfully performed presentation attacks on the recognition systems of the time. Based on the need for large datasets, Facebook organized the OpenEDS Synthetic Eye Generation challenge [9]. Buhler et al. [4] emerged victorious with their Seg2Eyes model, a mix of StyleGAN [16] and GauGAN [31], capable of generating identity-preserving ocular images based on the desired style and input segmentation masks. Kaur et al. [18] introduced the EyeGAN model for the same task, and later upgraded it with a cyclic training mechanism [19] to ensure consistency of gaze direction and style. Boutros et al. [2] proposed an alternative solution to the problem with a novel D-ID-network solution. Nevertheless, the generated images still often feature visible artifacts. Despite significant improvements in ocular synthesis, all current approaches generate images of only a single modality. In addition, they are also solely focused on identity preserving image generation, which can limit the diversity of generated datasets and requires input segmentation masks. Different from these works, we focus on generation of random datasets of bimodal VIS and NIR data, along with
matching annotations. The bimodal aspect is especially useful from a segmentation aspect, since NIR images often contain important cues that are not present in VIS images, and vice versa. Furthermore, we rely on the use of current state-of-the-art StyleGAN variants, thus allowing stable training on smaller datasets.

3. Methodology

The main contribution of this work is the BiOcularGAN framework that allows for photo-realistic generation of bimodal ocular images and the corresponding segmentation masks. In this section, we provide a detailed description of BiOcularGAN and elaborate on its main characteristics.

3.1. Overview of the BiOcularGAN framework

The proposed BiOcularGAN framework, shown in Figure 2, consists of two main components: (i) the Dual-Branch StyleGAN2 (DB-StyleGAN2) synthesis network, which generates pixel-aligned VIS and NIR ocular images, and (ii) the Semantic Mask Generator (SMG) that produces corresponding semantic segmentation masks. Jointly, these components allow for the generation of matching photo-realistic bimodal ocular images along with corresponding high-quality annotations and, consequently, for the creation of synthetic large-scale datasets that can be used for training data-hungry deep learning (segmentation) models.

Formally, the BiOcularGAN procedure starts with an input latent code $z \in Z$ that is first transformed into an intermediate latent representation $w \in W$ and then fed to the DB-StyleGAN2 generator $G$, which produces the pixel-aligned VIS and NIR ocular images, $x_{vis} \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times H \times 3}$ and $x_{nir} \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times H}$, respectively, i.e.:

$$\{x_{vis}, x_{nir}\} = G(f(z)), \quad (1)$$

where the latent-space transformation $w = f(z)$ is implemented with a mapping network, as shown in Figure 2. To generate the semantic segmentation masks, the feature maps computed along the different layers of DB-StyleGAN2 are pooled and then fed to the semantic mask generator $S$, similarly to [44], i.e.: $\Omega = S(\phi_1(z), \phi_2(z), \ldots, \phi_k(z))$, where $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times H}$ is the generated segmentation mask, $\phi$ is a mapping implemented within the generator $G$, and $k$ is the number of feature maps used. Thus, given a latent code $z$, drawn from a normal distribution, BiOcularGAN generates a triplet of the following form: $\{x_{vis}, x_{nir}, \Omega\}$.

3.2. Dual-Branch StyleGAN2

The key component of BiOcularGAN is the novel Dual-Branch (DB) StyleGAN2 generator that extends the original StyleGAN2 [17, 14] for bimodal data generation. As illustrated in Figure 3, the generator consists of a mapping network $f$ that follows a fully connected design, similarly to [17], as well as a dual-branch synthesis network, and is trained using two discriminators, $D_{VIS}$ and $D_{NIR}$, one for the VIS and one for the NIR images. Details on the generator and discriminators are given below.

**The Generator** ($G$) is responsible for producing the synthetic (NIR and VIS) ocular images and builds on recent insights and advancements in image generation [14, 17]. Similarly to the original StyleGAN2 design, it consists of a succession of so-called style blocks that produce synthetic images of progressively higher resolution, as shown on the left side of Figure 3. These blocks take the intermediate latent representation $w$, transformed through $k$ learned affine transformations $A$, as the style input, which is modulated based on weights $w_z$ and then passed to a so-called “demodulation” operation [17], which mimics the effects of normalization. This processed style is then incorporated into the convolutional weights. The network starts from a constant input $c (4 \times 4 \times 512)$. After each convolutional layer, the noise input (from the noise broadcast operation $B$) and bias $b_x$ are applied to the signal, which is then passed through a leaky ReLU activation function. To enable bimodal image generation, the style blocks in DB-StyleGAN2 contain two output branches, one for generating VIS and the other...
for generating NIR data at a specific resolution, where each branch features a $1 \times 1$ convolution layer – denoted as tVIS ("toVIS") and tNIR ("toNIR") in Figure 3. The outputs of these branches are upsampled and merged with the output of the higher-resolution style block to construct the final VIS and NIR images, thus, forming the DB-synthesis network, capable of generating photo-realistic VIS and NIR images - as shown on the right part of Figure 3.

The Discriminators ($D_{VIS}, D_{NIR}$) aim to determine, whether images are real or artificially generated, and help to ensure that the data generated by the DB generator is as close to the training data distribution as possible. For BiOcularGAN, we utilize two discriminators, $D_{VIS}, D_{NIR}$, one for each branch of the DB-synthesis network, corresponding to the VIS and NIR image modalities, as shown on the right part of Figure 3. The discriminators take a pair of real (or fake) bimodal images as input and first pass them through $1 \times 1$ convolutional layers denoted as fVIS ("from VIS") and fNIR ("from NIRM"). The processed input is then passed through a ResNet-like [11] downsampling architecture, with each block consisting of two convolution layers and a separate skip connection. The output of each of the discriminators is a binary decision, i.e., real or fake. The two discriminators share the same architecture.

### 3.3. DB-StyleGAN2 training

Different from StyleGAN2, our dual-branch model produces two semantically similar output images in two distinct imaging domains. The training is, therefore, done with adversarial learning objectives involving two discriminators. Because of the (dual) bimodal output produced by DB-StyleGAN2, the training follows a multi-task learning regime, where the correlations between the two tasks (i.e., VIS and NIR image generation) help to efficiently capture the shared semantic content of the ocular images. Following the unimodal learning strategy used with StyleGAN2 [17, 14] and insight from [22, 26], we use a non-saturating soft-plus loss $L = \log(1 + \exp(x))$ with $R_1$ regularization for the adversarial learning objectives:

$$L_G = g(-D_{VIS}(x_{vis})) + g(-D_{NIR}(x_{nir}))$$

and

$$L_\omega = g(D_\omega(x)) + g(-D_{\omega}(x^*_d)) + \frac{\gamma}{2} E \left[ | \nabla D_{\omega}(x_{vis}) |^2 \right],$$

where $\omega = \{VIS, NIRM\}$, the generated (fake) images $x_{vis}$ and $x_{nir}$ are produced with Eq. (1), the superscript $*$ denotes real (training) images and the regularization parameter $\gamma$ is computed based on the resolution $r_{vis}$ and batch size $bs$ using $\gamma = 2 \times 10^{-4} \frac{r_{vis}^2}{bs}$ [17].

### 3.4. Semantic Mask Generator (SMG)

To generate semantic masks for the bimodal images generated by the DB-StyleGAN2 model, we rely on the semantic information encoded in the feature maps produced along the DB-StyleGAN2 model during the synthesis process. To interpret the encoded information, we use an ensemble of Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP) classifiers, similar to [44], which are utilized within our Semantic Mask Generator (SMG) to predict the semantic class label of each pixel in the generated bimodal ocular data.

However, different from the procedure of Zhang et al. [44], we extract feature maps after each of the $k$ convolutional layers in the dual-branch synthesis network (in Figure 3), from which the bimodal images of a certain resolution are generated. This allows us to capture the semantic information of the ocular images right before it is rendered in a certain imaging domain. We then upsample these feature maps to the output resolution and construct a $W \times H \times d$ tensor, from which $d$-dimensional feature vectors $d$ corresponding to each of the $WH$ image pixels can be obtained. Using these feature vectors as input, we train an ensemble of 10 tree-layer MLPs to classify pixels into the semantic classes. Here, manual annotations over a small set of generated bimodal images are used as the ground truth for the training procedure. We note that a majority voting strategy is utilized.

---

1Here, $d$ is the total number of feature maps extracted from the $k$ layers.
The main characteristics of the datasets are summarized in the Dataset (SMD) [6], SBVPI [40, 34] and MOBIUS [39].

We use five datasets for training and evaluation of BiOcularGAN, i.e., the PolyU cross-spectral Iris database (PolyU) [28], CrossEyed [35, 36], the Sclera Mo-bilation of BiOcularGAN, i.e., the PolyU cross-spectral Iris dataset.

### Table 1: Summary of the experimental dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th># Images</th>
<th># IDs</th>
<th># Eyes</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Modality†</th>
<th>Purpose‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PolyU [28]</td>
<td>12540</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>640 × 480</td>
<td>NIR/VIS</td>
<td>TR/SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossEyed [36]</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3264 × 2448</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD [6]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3264 × 2448</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBVPI [40, 34]</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3000 × 1700</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBIUS [39]</td>
<td>3542</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3000 × 1700</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†NIR – near infrared, VIS – visible light
‡TR – training, SV – synthesis validation, SE – segmentation experiments

We list over the predictions of the MLP ensemble to minimize the randomness of the learning stage. Once trained, the SMG can be used together with the DB-StyleGAN2 model to generate unlimited amounts of pixel-level aligned bimodal ocular images with corresponding semantic ground truth masks. Here, a single forward pass is needed to generate one triplet \(\{x_{vis}, x_{nir}, \Omega\}\).

### 4. Experiments and result

#### 4.1. Experimental setup

**Datasets.** We use five datasets for training and evaluation of BiOcularGAN, i.e., the PolyU cross-spectral Iris database (PolyU) [28], CrossEyed [35, 36], the Sclera Mobile Dataset (SMD) [6], SBVPI [40, 34] and MOBIUS [39]. The main characteristics of the datasets are summarized in Table 1, while the key details are provided below:

- **Cross-spectral datasets:** The PolyU and CrossEyed datasets contain ocular images captured in the near infrared (NIR) and visible light (VIS) spectra. The acquisition procedure for both datasets was performed with custom sensors capable of simultaneous acquisition of the NIR and VIS images. The images in PolyU are aligned with pixel-level correspondences, while the CrossEyed data is loosely aligned, i.e., with small (random) perturbations in scale and position in the NIR-VIS image pairs. For our experiments, the image pairs of both datasets are split into subject disjoint training and evaluation parts in a ratio of 9 : 1. The training part is used to learn the DB-StyleGAN2 model and annotation procedure, whereas the (hold-out) evaluation part is reserved for the performance evaluation.

- **Visible spectrum datasets:** The SMD, SBVPI and MOBIUS datasets consist of high-resolution VIS ocular images captured primarily for research into sclera biometrics. All three datasets have manual annotations of some key regions of the ocular images, e.g., the sclera, iris or pupil, and are therefore used to evaluate the performance of the segmentation models trained with the annotated data generated by BiOcularGAN.

**Implementation Details.** All components of BiOcularGAN were implemented in PyTorch and are made publicly available from URL. The Dual-Branch StyleGAN2 is implemented based on the StyleGAN2-ADA variant from [14]. The main part of the DB-StyleGAN2 is initialized with weights pretrained on the FFHQ dataset (of resolution 256 × 256) and then optimized further using the Adam optimizer [20] with a learning rate of 0.0025 and a batch size of 16. For the other hyperparameters, we use the recommended values \(\beta_1 = 0, \beta_2 = 0.99, \epsilon = 10^{-8}\) for both, the generator and the two discriminators. We train all models for 2500 kimgs or until training diverges – due to the low amount of training data. To combat model divergence, we enable data augmentation in the form of horizontal image flipping and additionally employ the adaptive discriminator augmentation procedure proposed in [14]. For the Semantic Mask Generator (SMG), training is performed based on the cross-entropy loss and the Adam optimizer [20], with a learning rate of \(10^{-3}\). Each MLP classifier is trained on randomly sampled image pixels in batches of 64. The training is stopped once no improvement is observed in the learning objective over 50 batches following the third epoch, similarly to [44]. Additional implementation details can be found in the publicly released source code.

**Experimental Hardware.** All experiments are conducted on a Desktop PC with an Intel i9-10900KF CPU with 64 GB of RAM and an Nvidia 3090 GPU with 24 GB of video RAM. Using this hardware, we trained two DB-StyleGAN2 models, one on PolyU and one on CrossEyed – denoted as DB-StyleGAN2-P and DB-StyleGAN2-CE hereafter. Once converged, the models are able to generate visually convincing bimodal ocular images of 256 × 256 pixels in size, as demonstrated in the following sections.

#### 4.2. Synthesis evaluation

In the first set of experiments, we explore the capabilities of the trained DB-StyleGAN2 models.

**Visual Evaluation.** Figure 4 shows a selection of (real) VIS and NIR images from the PolyU and CrossEyed datasets, as well as a few examples generated by the two trained DB-StyleGAN2 models. As can be seen, both models are capable of generating high-quality and visually convincing images that well match the visual characteristics of the training data in the visual as well as near infrared domain. The trained models are able to synthesize crisp image details, such as individual eyelashes, eyebrows, skin textures and even reproduce the specular reflections present in the training samples. Due to the dual-branch design of the DB-StyleGAN2 model, these fine image details are also consistent across the bimodal image pairs.

**VIS-NIR Pair Alignment.** While DB-StyleGAN2-P was trained on the per-pixel aligned data from PolyU, the

---

2 Removed for the review.
PolyU samples | CrossEyed samples | DB-StyleGAN2-P | DB-StyleGAN2-CE

VIS images

NIR images

Original images | Synthesized images

Figure 4: **Visual examples of original and generated ocular images in both domains.** The first two columns show samples from the PolyU and CrossEyed datasets and the last two columns show examples of images generated by the DB-StyleGAN2 models trained on the PolyU (DB-StyleGAN2-P) and CrossEyed (DB-StyleGAN2-CE) datasets. Zoom in for details.

PolyU DB-StyleGAN2-P CrossEyed DB-StyleGAN2-CE

Figure 5: **Illustration of NIR-VIS alignment.** Shown are composite images, where the luma channel in the VIS image (in the YCrCb space) was replaced by the NIR image.

PolyU DB-StyleGAN2-P CrossEyed DB-StyleGAN2-CE

Figure 6: **Generated sample images (left) and nearest samples (right) from the training set.** Note that the models learn to generate novel data instances that share important semantic characteristics with the training images.

training of DB-StyleGAN2-CE was performed with the loosely aligned images from CrossEyed. Nonetheless, both models produce well-aligned NIR and VIS images due to the shared style blocks in the StyleGAN2 model that capture the semantics of the ocular images, while the two branches generate the final output images within the specific imaging domains. To visualize the alignment of the original and synthesized image pairs, we generate composite images, where the RGB data from the VIS samples is first transformed into the YCrCb color space and the Y component is then replaced by the NIR channel. This composition changes the overall color characteristics of the images, as most clearly seen by the PolyU examples in Figure 5, which now exhibit eye-color and skin-tone changes, but also highlights the misalignment between the two image domains in the form of color artifacts.

As can be observed, there is little color artifacts in the original PolyU data and corresponding composite image generated with the DB-StyleGAN2-P model, suggesting that the VIS and NIR data are well aligned in both cases. The only artifacts present are due to differences in specular reflections. Conversely, there is obvious misalignment in the CrossEyed data, as evidenced by the eyelash-shaped
color artifacts. Nevertheless, the trained DB-StyleGAN2-CE model still generates well aligned bimodal ocular images. The loose alignment of the training data has no adverse effect on the alignment of the synthesized images.

**Image Diversity.** Next, we qualitatively analyze the diversity of the images generated by the trained DB-StyleGAN2 models. Specifically, we are interested in the variations of ocular images the models are able to produce with respect to the data seen during training. To this end, we show in Figure 6 a randomly generated image pair produced by the DB-StyleGAN2-P and DB-StyleGAN2-CE models (left column of each presented example) as well as the most similar VIS-NIR pair from the training data – where the similarity is measured in terms of Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the VIS images. Several interesting observations can be made from the presented examples, i.e.: (i) the generated images share obvious similarities with the training data in terms of visual appearance, (ii) the models generate distinct data samples that differ from the training examples in terms of gaze direction, eye shape and color (for VIS), eyelash arrangement, eyelid appearance, pupil size, skin and iris texture, and other similar factors, and (iii) despite appearing similar in the VIS domain at first glance, considerable differences are present in the NIR domain in the presented examples, suggesting that the combined (bimodal) ocular images generated by the models are distinct.

**State-of-the-Art Comparison and Ablations.** We compare the DB-StyleGAN2 models to the standard (unimodal) StyleGAN2 model from [16]. We note that StyleGAN2 represents a state-of-the-art model for image generation and while StyleGAN version 3 (StyleGAN3) was also introduced recently [15], it only offers superior performance (in terms of texture consistency) when generating sequences of images (or videos) but does not ensure improvements in the quality of the generated images. We train four StyleGAN2 versions for the comparisons using the NIR and VIS images from the two training dataset, i.e., PolyU and CrossEyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>LPIPS ↓ (T)†</th>
<th>LPIPS ↓ (H)†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PolyU</td>
<td>StyleGAN2</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>0.561 ± 0.084</td>
<td>0.561 ± 0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolyU</td>
<td>StyleGAN2</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>0.491 ± 0.066</td>
<td>0.492 ± 0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolyU</td>
<td>DB-StyleGAN2</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>0.593 ± 0.082</td>
<td>0.561 ± 0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolyU</td>
<td>DB-StyleGAN2</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>0.504 ± 0.064</td>
<td>0.504 ± 0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossEyed</td>
<td>StyleGAN2</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>0.476 ± 0.064</td>
<td>0.477 ± 0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossEyed</td>
<td>StyleGAN2</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>0.415 ± 0.060</td>
<td>0.422 ± 0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossEyed</td>
<td>DB-StyleGAN2</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>0.453 ± 0.068</td>
<td>0.456 ± 0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossEyed</td>
<td>DB-StyleGAN2</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>0.391 ± 0.063</td>
<td>0.392 ± 0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T) – training data; (H) – hold-out validation set

Table 2: Comparison of the computed LPIPS scores. The LPIPS scores (lower is better ↓) computed between 5000 generated images and (i) the training (T) or (ii) hold-out validation set (H).
tion process is based on latent space sampling, it is also challenging to produce matching samples in both domains using the unimodal models, whereas this is handled seamlessly in DB-StyleGAN2 through the dual-branch design. In Table 2 we show a comparison of the Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarities (LPIPS) \[43\] between 500 randomly generated images and the training (T) and held-out validation (H) data from each dataset. As can be seen, on PolyU all models perform similarly (within the standard deviations), whereas our bimodal design has a slight advantage on CrossEyed, suggesting that the generated images are somewhat closer to the real data on average.

To get further insight into the synthesis capabilities of DB-StyleGAN2, we use \( t \)-distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (\( t \)-SNE) \[38\] and visualize the distribution of features extracted from different types of images in Figure 8. For this purpose, we select a ResNet-101 model pretrained on ImageNet (from PyTorch) as a feature extractor and use the 2048-dimensional output of the penultimate model layer as the feature representation of the ocular images \[11\]. We generate 250 test images for the analysis by randomly sampling the latent space of the two DB-StyleGAN2 and all four unimodal StyleGAN2 models. As can be seen, the distributions corresponding to the generated images overlap reasonably well with the distributions of the original images (marked \( \text{Real} \)) for both types of models. However, in certain cases the unimodal models generate less overlap with the training-data distribution than the bimodal models – see results for CrossEyed VIS for example.

**Time Complexity.** In Table 3 we summarize the training and run-time complexity of the DB-StyleGAN2 model on both datasets in comparison to the unimodal StyleGAN2 versions using our experimental hardware. Here, the run-time complexity is estimated over 1000 random samples. Note that training of the bimodal models takes longer, as twice the amount of data needs to be processed compared to the unimodal models. However, because of the significantly better convergence, the training time is increased only around 11% with the PolyU data and by 33% on CrossEyed. At run-time, we see comparable time complexity - around 14ms for the bimodal and 11ms for the unimodal models. However, we note again that for generating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Training time [hours](^\d)</th>
<th>Run-time [ms]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB-StyleGAN2</td>
<td>(\sim 20h) (\sim 24h)</td>
<td>13.994 ± 0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StyleGAN2</td>
<td>(\sim 18h) (\sim 18h)</td>
<td>11.232 ± 0.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\d\) Approximate estimate

Table 3: **Training and run-time complexity.** The bimodal DB-StyleGAN2 model takes longer to train than the unimodal StyleGAN2, but is able to match the run-time performance of its unimodal counterpart.

Figure 9: **Sample segmentation results.** The results were generated with two U-Net models, trained on artificial data generated by the DatasetGAN and BiOcularGAN frameworks, learned with the DB-StyleGAN2-P model.

ocular images in the NIR and VIS domain, the unimodal StyleGAN2 model needs to be run twice.

### 4.3. Bimodal data annotation and segmentation

In the second set of experiments, we explore the advantages that bimodal information brings to the segmentation-mask generation process. To this end, we manually annotate 8 ocular images generated by each of the two DB-StyleGAN models using 4 target segmentation classes, i.e., the pupil, the iris, the sclera and the background. We use the NIR images as the basis for the manual annotation procedure (due to better contrast, distinct borders, etc.), but due to the alignment of the artificial bimodal images, these segmentation masks are also applicable to the VIS data. Using the generated annotations, we then train the mask generation procedure and synthesize a dataset of 5000 pairs of VIS and NIR images with corresponding segmentation masks. Finally, we learn a DeepLab-V3 \[5\] and U-Net \[32\] segmentation model using the artificial dataset. Public implementations are used to foster reproducibility\(^3\). To test the performance of the trained models, we use the (frontal gaze) VIS images from SMD, MOBIUS and SBVPI. Thus, segmentation performance with VIS images is used as a proxy for the quality of the generated segmentation masks.

**State-of-the-art Comparison.** In Table 4, we report the results of the segmentation experiments in terms of the Intersection-Over-Union (IoU), \( F_1 \) score and overall Pixel error following established methodology \[33, 39\] and compare the performance ensured by our BiOcularGAN to the unimodal DatasetGAN procedure from \[44\]. Here, the DatasetGAN approach is learned from the unimodal StyleGAN2 model trained on VIS images, and again with 8 manually annotated images. Interestingly, the segmentation

\[^3\]U-Net: [https://github.com/milesial/Pytorch-UNet](https://github.com/milesial/Pytorch-UNet)

Table 4: Cross-dataset segmentation performance comparison of models trained on artificially generated datasets.

The segmentation models trained on 5000 images generated by BiOcularGAN outperform the ones trained on 5000 images generated by DatasetGAN across all datasets and performance measures (IoU and F1 scores along with pixel errors).

models trained with the artificial dataset generated by the proposed BiOcularGAN framework clearly outperform the models trained with DatasetGAN on all three test datasets and across all three performance measures. This suggests that the joint bimodal supervision used to train the DB-StyleGAN model helps to better capture the semantic information of the images in the model layers and consequently leads to higher quality training data. This observation is further supported by the sample results in Figure 9, where we again see better segmentation performance with the BiOcularGAN framework. Here, the examples were generated with U-Net and the BiOcularGAN and DatasetGAN frameworks trained using the PolyU data.

Fine-grained Segmentation. Because only a few annotations are needed to produce training data for learning segmentation models, we manually annotate 2 images with a 10-class markup as shown on the left side of Figure 10. We then train a segmentation model (i.e., U-Net) with the dataset generated by BiOcularGAN using this fine-grained markup. The right part of Figure 10 shows some qualitative segmentation results generated with images from the SMD, MOBIUS and SBVPI datasets. Note that despite the fact the BiOcularGAN framework relied only on the DB-StyleGAN2-P model (that generates ocular images of mostly Asian subjects) and was learned with only 2 annotated images, the trained segmentation model still perform reasonably well with images from all three test datasets.

Time Complexity. The training of the data annotation procedure takes around 13 minutes on PolyU and 11 minutes on CrossEyd using 8 annotated images per dataset with our hardware setup. At run-time, a single segmentation mask is produced in 77.8 ms on average for an 256×256 image produced by the DB-StyleGAN2 model.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented BiOcularGAN, a framework for generating synthetic datasets of ocular images with cor-

Figure 10: Fine-grained segmentation examples. On the left are the training images and manually generated 10 class markup (pupil, pupil boundary, iris, iris boundary, sclera, upper eyelid, lower eyelid, inner lower eyelid, lacrimal caruncle and background). The right part shows sample results generated for the test images.

Table 4: Cross-dataset segmentation performance comparison of models trained on artificially generated datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seg. Model</th>
<th>Labels from</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>MOBIUS</th>
<th>SBVPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IoU</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>IoU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pixel error [%]</td>
<td>Pixel error [%]</td>
<td>Pixel error [%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepLab-V3</td>
<td>DatasetGAN [44]</td>
<td>0.691 ± 0.057</td>
<td>0.750 ± 0.101</td>
<td>0.723 ± 0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net</td>
<td>BiOcularGAN (ours)</td>
<td>0.630 ± 0.084</td>
<td>0.756 ± 0.065</td>
<td>0.782 ± 0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. Appendix

In this appendix, we present some additional results and discussions not included in the main part of the paper. Specifically, we (i) analyze the impact the number of annotated images has on the quality of the training data generated by the BiOcularGAN framework, (ii) show examples of qualitative segmentation results as a function of the number of annotated images used to learn the BiOcularGAN framework, (iii) present a broader cross-section of qualitative results generated based on the fine-grained 10-class markup, and (iv) provide additional implementation details.

A.1. Impact of manual annotations

To get a better insight into the behavior of the BiOcularGAN framework, we investigate in this section how the number of annotated images affects the performance of the segmentation models trained with the synthetic training data produced by the BiOcularGAN framework. For this experiment, we train a U-Net segmentation model with training data produced with the BiOcularGAN framework, (as expected) the segmentation performance increases with the number of manually annotated images across all test datasets and with respect to all performance measures reported. If we focus on the \( F_1 \) score, for example, we see an increase from 0.767 when using 2 annotated images to 0.853 when using 8 on the SMD dataset. Similarly, the \( F_1 \) results are also improved on the MOBIUS and SBVPI dataset, where an increase from 0.651 and 0.866 (with 2 annotated images) to 0.674 and 0.891 (with 8 annotated images) is seen, respectively. Nonetheless, even with only 2 manually annotated images, BiOcularGAN is still able to produce training data of reasonable quality for learning the segmentation model. Thus, if a higher level of granularity is needed in the segmentation masks, a suitable trade-off can be selected between the labor-intensive manual annotation process and the desired segmentation performance.

Table 5: Impact of the number of manually annotated images on segmentation performance. The table shows segmentation results generated with a U-Net model learned based on training data produced with the BiOcularGAN framework, where the framework itself was learned with either 2, 4 or 8 manually annotated images.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seg. Model</th>
<th>Labels from</th>
<th>SMD(\uparrow)</th>
<th>Pixel error (%)</th>
<th>MOBIUS(\uparrow)</th>
<th>Pixel error (%)</th>
<th>SBVPI(\uparrow)</th>
<th>Pixel error (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-Net (BiOcularGAN)</td>
<td>2 annotations</td>
<td>0.696 ± 0.102</td>
<td>0.767 ± 0.116</td>
<td>0.046 ± 0.022</td>
<td>0.554 ± 0.177</td>
<td>0.651 ± 0.198</td>
<td>0.094 ± 0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net (BiOcularGAN)</td>
<td>4 annotations</td>
<td>0.696 ± 0.091</td>
<td>0.781 ± 0.099</td>
<td>0.046 ± 0.021</td>
<td>0.564 ± 0.166</td>
<td>0.629 ± 0.181</td>
<td>0.087 ± 0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net (BiOcularGAN)</td>
<td>8 annotations</td>
<td>0.722 ± 0.081</td>
<td>0.852 ± 0.070</td>
<td>0.041 ± 0.025</td>
<td>0.584 ± 0.173</td>
<td>0.674 ± 0.187</td>
<td>0.082 ± 0.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Example training data generated by BiOcularGAN. The figure shows a comparison in the quality of segmentation masks generated as a function of the number of manually annotated images used to learn the mask-generation procedure of BiOcularGAN.

Figure 12: Example segmentation results as a function of the number of images used for training BiOcularGAN. Note how the quality of the segmentations increases when more images are used to learn the mask-generation procedure of BiOcularGAN.

Qualitative Results. To put the results reported in Table 5 into perspective, we show in Figure 11 visual examples of the training data produced by BiOcularGAN with respect to the number of annotated images used. Note that we only present the generated segmentation mask overlaid over the VIS images (and not also the corresponding NIR images) to keep the presentation uncluttered. Note how the quality of the annotations gets refined with a larger number of annotated images. This quality increase is then also reflected
Figure 13: Example (fine-grained) segmentation results on three test datasets. The presented examples were generated with a U-Net model trained with synthetic data produced by the BiOcularGAN framework. The mask-generation procedure of BiOcularGAN was learned with 2 manually annotated images that included 10 classes, i.e., the pupil, the pupil boundary, the iris, the iris boundary, the sclera, the upper eyelid, the lower eyelid, the inner part of the lower eyelid, the lacrimal caruncle and the background. The figure is best viewed electronically and zoomed-in for details.

in the performance of the trained segmentation models, as seen by the sample segmentation results in Figure 12. Here, U-Net models were used again to generate the sample results, as they ensured somewhat better performance than the DeepLab-V3 competitors in the experiments presented in the main part of the paper.

A.2. Fine-grained segmentation

In the main part of the paper, we showed examples of segmentation results generated based on a detailed 10-class markup that included the pupil, the boundary of the pupil, the iris and its boundary, the sclera, the upper eyelid, the lower eyelid, the inner part of the lower eyelid, the lacrimal caruncle and the background. Because the number of examples presented was limited due to space constraints, we show in Figure 13 a broader cross-section of visual results from all three test datasets, i.e., SMD, MOBIUS and SBVPI. The results were again generated with a U-Net model trained using the synthetic data produced by BiOcularGAN, where the mask generation procedure was learned with only 2 annotated images.

As can be seen from the presented examples, we are able to learn a well-performing segmentation model capable of locating a large amount of semantic classes in highly diverse ocular images. Note, for example, that the ocular data produced by the DB-StyleGAN2-P model corresponds largely to subject of Asian origin. While this is well-matched by the SMD dataset, images in MOBIUS and SBVPI come exclusively from Caucasian subjects. Nonetheless, the training data produced by the BiOcularGAN framework contains sufficiently rich information to allow the trained segmentation model to also generalize reasonably well to the two Caucasian datasets.

A.3. Additional implementation details

Mapping network. The mapping network of the DB-StyleGAN2 follows the design from [16] and consists of 8 fully-connected layers. As input it takes a 512-dimensional randomly sampled latent vector $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, and converts it into a 512-dimensional intermediate latent vector $w \in \mathbb{W}$. The network shares training parameters with the generator.

Segmentation models. All segmentation experiments in the main part of the paper as well as the appendix were conducted with the DeepLab-V3 [5] and U-Net [32] segmentation models. For all experiments, the two models were trained using the Adam optimizer [20] with a learning rate of $10^{-4}$ and a batch size of 8. To guide learning, the cross-entropy loss function was used. During training, the learning rate was decreased by a factor of 10, if the validation loss did not improve for 5 consecutive epochs. The training procedure was stopped once the validation loss did not improve for 10 epochs in a row.