

Comparison and Combination of State-of-the-art Techniques for Handwritten Character Recognition: Topping the MNIST Benchmark

Daniel Keysers

daniel.keysers@dfki.de

Image Understanding and Pattern Recognition (IUPR) Group
German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI)

May 2006

Abstract

Although the recognition of isolated handwritten digits has been a research topic for many years, it continues to be of interest for the research community and for commercial applications. We show that despite the maturity of the field, different approaches still deliver results that vary enough to allow improvements by using their combination. We do so by choosing four well-motivated state-of-the-art recognition systems for which results on the standard MNIST benchmark are available. When comparing the errors made, we observe that the errors made differ between all four systems, suggesting the use of classifier combination. We then determine the error rate of a hypothetical system that combines the output of the four systems. The result obtained in this manner is an error rate of 0.35% on the MNIST data, the best result published so far. We furthermore discuss the statistical significance of the combined result and of the results of the individual classifiers.

1 Introduction

The recognition of handwritten digits is a topic of practical importance because of applications like automated form reading and handwritten zip-code processing. It is also a subject that has continued to produce much research effort over the last decades for several reasons:

- The problem is prototypical for image processing and pattern recognition, with a small number of classes.
- Standard benchmark data sets exist that make it easy to obtain valid results quickly.

- Many publications and techniques are available that can be cited and built on, respectively.
- The practical applications motivate the research performed.
- Improvements in classification accuracy over existing techniques continue to be obtained using new approaches.

This paper has the objective to analyze four of the state-of-the-art methods for the recognition of handwritten digits [3, 9, 15, 26] by comparing the errors made on the standard MNIST benchmark data. (A part of this work has been described in [13].) We perform a statistically analysis of the errors using a bootstrapping technique [5] that not only uses the error count but also takes into account which errors were made. Using this technique we can determine more accurate estimates of the statistical significance of improvements.

When analyzing the errors made we observe that — although the error rates obtained are all very similar — there are substantial differences in *which* patterns are classified erroneously. This can be interpreted as an indicator for using classifier combination. An experiment shows that indeed a combination of the classifiers performs better than the single best classifier. The statistical analysis shows that the probability that this results constitutes a real improvement and is not based on chance alone is 94%.

2 Related work

This paper is of course only possible because the results of the four chosen base methods [3, 9, 15, 26] were available¹. These approaches are presented in more detail in Section 4. We are aware that there exist other methods that also achieve very good classification error rates on the data used, e.g. [18]. However, we feel that the four methods chosen comprise a set of well-motivated and self-contained approaches. Furthermore, they represent the different classification methods most commonly used (in the research literature), that is, the nearest neighbor classifier, neural networks, and the support vector machine. All four methods use the appearance-based paradigm in the broad sense and can thus be considered as being sufficiently general as to be applied to other object recognition tasks.

There is a large amount of work available on the topic of classifier combination as well (an introduction can be found e.g. in [16]) and much work exists on applying classifier combination to handwriting recognition (e.g. [4, 7, 8, 12]). Note that we do not propose new algorithms for classification of handwritten digits or for the combination of classifiers. Instead, our contribution is to present a statistical analysis that compares different classifiers and to show that their combination improves the performance even though the individual classifiers all reach state-of-the-art error rates by themselves.

¹We would like to thank Patrice Simard for providing the recognition results to us and the authors of [3, 9] for listing the errors in the respective papers.




Figure 1: Example images from the MNIST data set.

3 The MNIST task

The modified NIST handwritten digit database (MNIST, [17]) contains 60,000 images in the training set and 10,000 patterns in the test set, each of size 28×28 pixels with 256 graylevels. The data set is available online² and some examples from the MNIST corpus are shown in Figure 1.

The preprocessing of the images is described as follows in [17]: “The original black and white (bilevel) images were size normalized to fit in a 20×20 pixel box while preserving their aspect ratio. The resulting images contain gray levels as result of the antialiasing (image interpolation) technique used by the normalization algorithm. [...] the images were centered in a 28×28 image by computing the center of mass of the pixels and translating the image so as to position this point at the center of the 28×28 field.” Note that some authors use a ‘deslanted’ version of the database.

The task is generally not considered to be ‘difficult’ (in the sense that absolute error rates are high) recognition task for two reasons. First, the human error rate is estimated to be only about 0.2%, although it has not been determined for the whole test set [27]. Second, the large training set allows machine learning algorithms to generalize well. With respect to the connection between training set size and classification performance for OCR tasks it is argued [28] that increasing the training set size by a factor of ten cuts the error rate approximately to half the original figure.

Table 1 gives a comprehensive overview of the error rates reported for the MNIST data. One disadvantage of the MNIST corpus is that there exists no development test set, which leads to effects known as ‘training on the testing data’. This is not necessarily true for each of the research groups performing experiments, but it cannot always be ruled out. Note that in some publications (e.g. [26]) the authors explicitly state that all parameters of the system were chosen by using a subset of the training set for validation, which then rules out the overadaptation to the test set. However, the tendency exists to evaluate one method with different parameters or different methods several times on the same

²<http://www.research.att.com/~yann/ocr/mnist/>

data until the best performance seems to have been reached. This procedure leads to an overly optimistic estimation of the error rate of the classifier and the number of tuned parameters should be considered when judging such error rates. Ideally, a development test set would be used to determine the best parameters for the classifiers and the results would be obtained from one run on the test set itself. Nevertheless a comparison of ‘best performing’ algorithms may lead to valid conclusions, especially if these perform well on several different tasks. Note that Dong gives lower error rates than in [11] of 0.38 to 0.44 percent on his web page (accessed February 2005), but it remains somewhat unclear how these error rates were obtained and if possibly these low error rates are due to the effect of ‘training on the testing data’. Also, [31] try a variety of SVMs and

Table 1: Error rates for the MNIST task in %. The systems marked with * are those we use for analysis and combination.

| reference | method | ER |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|
| [27] AT&T | human performance | 0.2 |
| — | Euclidean nearest neighbor | 3.5 |
| [19] U Lige | decision trees + sub-windows | 2.63 |
| [17] AT&T | deslant, Euclidean 3-NN | 2.4 |
| [20] Kyushu U | elastic matching | 2.10 |
| [14] RWTH | one-sided tangent distance | 1.9 |
| [6] AT&T | neural net LeNet1 | 1.7 |
| [21] UC London | products of experts | 1.7 |
| [22] U Québec | hyperplanes + support vector m. | 1.5 |
| [24] TU Berlin | support vector machine | 1.4 |
| [6] AT&T | neural net LeNet4 | 1.1 |
| [27] AT&T | tangent distance | 1.1 |
| [14] RWTH | two-sided tangent d., virt. data | 1.0 |
| [10] CENPARMI | local learning | 0.99 |
| [25] MPI, AT&T | virtual SVM | 0.8 |
| [17] AT&T | distortions, neural net LeNet5 | 0.82 |
| [17] AT&T | distortions, boosted LeNet4 | 0.7 |
| [30] U Singapore | bio-inspired features + SVM | 0.72 |
| [9] Caltech,MPI | virtual SVM (jitter) | 0.68 |
| [3] UC Berkeley | shape context matching | *0.63 |
| [11] CENPARMI | support vector machine | 0.60 |
| [31] U Singapore | deslant, biology-inspired features | 0.59 |
| [1] Boston U | cascaded shape context | 0.58 |
| [9] Caltech,MPI | deslant, virtual SVM (jitter,shift) | *0.56 |
| [1] Boston U | shape context matching | 0.54 |
| [15] RWTH | deformation model (IDM) | *0.54 |
| [18] Hitachi | preprocessing, support vector m. | 0.42 |
| [26] Microsoft | neural net + virtual data | *0.42 |
| this work | hyp. comb. of 4 systems (*) | 0.35 |

networks which yield error rates ranging from 0.59 percent to 0.81 percent. The IDM [15] as described in the Section 4 was not optimized for the MNIST task. Instead, all parameter settings were determined using the smaller USPS data set and then the complete setup was evaluated once on the MNIST data.

Figure 2 shows the ‘difficult’ examples from the MNIST test set. At least one of the four state-of-the-art systems misclassifies each sample. (These systems are marked with ‘*’ in Table 1.) Those samples that are misclassified by all four systems are marked by a surrounding frame. This presentation is possible because both in [9] and in [3] the authors present the set of samples misclassified by their systems. Furthermore, Patrice Simard kindly provided the classification results of his system as described in [26] for all test data. The availability of these results also makes it possible to determine the error rate of a hypothetical system that combines these four best systems as described in the following Section 4.

Some of the images in Figure 2 are a good illustration of the inherent class overlap that exists for this problem: some instances of e.g. ‘3’ vs. ‘5’, ‘4’ vs. ‘9’, and ‘8’ vs. ‘9’ are not distinguishable by taking into account the observed image only. This suggests that we are dealing with a problem with non-zero Bayes error rate. Further improvements in the error rate on this data set might therefore be problematic. For example, consider a classifier that classifies the second framed image as a ‘9’: despite the fact that this classifier would not make an error with this decision according to the class labels, we might prefer a classifier that classifies the image as a ‘4’. Note that recently [29] has presented a more detailed discussion of different types of errors made by state-of-the-art classifiers for handwritten characters.

4 The classifiers and their combination

We briefly describe the four systems for handwritten digit recognition that we compare and combine. Then, we discuss the statistical significance of their results and present a simple classifier combination of these four methods that achieves a (hypothetical) error rate of 0.35%.

Shape context matching. [3] presents the shape context matching approach. The method proceeds by first extracting contour points of the images. In the case of handwritten character images the resulting contour points trace both sides of the pen strokes the character is composed of. Then, at each contour point a local descriptor of the shape as represented by the contour points is extracted. This local descriptor is called a shape context and is a histogram of the contour points in the surrounding of the central point. This histogram has a finer resolution at points close to the central point and a coarser for regions farther away, which is achieved using a log-polar representation.

The classification is then done by using a nearest neighbor classifier (although the authors chose to use only one third of the training data for the MNIST task). The distance within the classifier is determined using an iterative matching based on the shape context descriptors and two-dimensional deformation.




Figure 2: Difficult examples from the MNIST test set along with their target labels. At least one of the four state-of-the-art systems (cp. Table 1) misclassifies these images. The framed examples are misclassified by all four systems.

The shape contexts of training and test image are assigned to each other by using the Hungarian algorithm on a bipartite graph representation with edge weights according to the similarity of the shape context descriptors. This assignment is then used to estimate a two-dimensional spline transformation best matching the two images. The images are transformed accordingly and the whole process (including extraction of shape contexts) is iterated until a stopping criterion is reached. The resulting distance is used in the classifier.

Recently, [1] discuss a cascading technique to speed up the slow nearest neighbor matching by “two to three orders of magnitude”. While the result that this discussion is based on only used the first 20,000 training samples for reasons of efficiency and resulted in an error rate of 0.63% [2], [1] report an error rate of 0.54% for the full training set and 0.58% for the cascaded classifier that uses only about 300 distance calculations per test.

Invariant support vector machine. [9] presents a support vector machine (SVM) that is especially suited for handwritten digit recognition by incorporating prior knowledge about the task. This is achieved by using virtual data or a special kernel function within the SVM. The special kernel function applies several transformations to the compared images that leave the class identity unchanged and return the kernel function of the appropriate pair of transformed images. This method is referred to as kernel jittering. The second uses so-called virtual support vectors. This approach consists of first training a support vector machine. Now, the set of support vectors contains sufficient information about the recognition problem and can therefore be considered a condensed representation of the training data for discrimination purposes. The method proceeds to create transformed versions of the support vectors, which are the virtual support vectors. In the experiments leading to the error rate of 0.56% the transformations used were image shifts within the eight-neighborhood plus horizontal and vertical shifts of two pixels, thus resulting in $9 + 4 = 13$ virtual support vectors for each original support vector. (This experiment also used the deslanted version of the MNIST data [17].) On this new set of virtual support vectors, another support vector machine was trained and evaluated on the test set.

Pixel-to-pixel image matching with local contexts. [15] presents deformable models for handwritten character recognition. It is shown that a simple zero-order matching approach called image distortion model (IDM) can lead to very competitive results if the local context of each pixel is considered in the distortion. The local context is represented by a 3×3 surrounding window of the horizontal and vertical image gradient, resulting in an 18-dimensional descriptor. The IDM allows to choose for each pixel of the test image the best fitting counterpart of the reference image within a suitable corresponding range. The distance as determined by the best match between two images is then used within a 3-nearest-neighbor classifier. More elaborate models for image matching are also discussed, but only small improvements can be obtained at the cost of much higher computational costs. The IDM can be seen as the best compromise between high classification speed and high recognition accuracy while being conceptually very simple and easy to implement.

Convolutional neural net and virtual data. [26] presents a large convolutional neural network of about 3,000 nodes in five layers that is especially designed for handwritten character classification. The new concept in the approach is to present a new set of virtual training images to the learning algorithm of the neural net in each iteration of the training. The virtual training set is constructed from the given training data by applying a separate two-dimensional random displacement field that is smoothed with a Gaussian filter to each of the images. This makes it possible to generate a very large amount of virtual data in the order of 1,000 virtual samples for each original element of the training data set. The data is generated on the fly in each training iteration and therefore does not have to be saved, which avoids the problems with data handling. Apart from the generation of virtual examples there is another point where prior knowledge about the task comes into play, namely the use of a *convolutional* neural net. This architecture, which is described in greater detail in [17], contains prior knowledge in that it uses tying of weights within the neural net to extract low-level features from the input that are invariant with respect to the position within the image, and only in later layers of the neural net the position information is used.

Discussion and combination. We can observe that all four methods take special measures to deal with the image variability present in the images, using virtual data and image matching methods. At the same time the concrete classification algorithm seems to play a somewhat smaller role in the performance as nearest neighbor classifiers, support vector machines, and neural networks all perform very well. Only a slight advantage of the neural net can be seen in the possibility to use very large amounts of virtual data in training because the training proceeds in several iterations, which need not use the same data but can use distorted samples of the images instead.

Figure 2 shows all the errors made by one of the four classifiers. It is remarkable that only eight samples are classified incorrectly by all four systems. This observation naturally suggests the use of classifier combination to further reduce the error rate. The availability of the results of the other classifiers makes it possible to determine this error rate of a simple hypothetical combined system.

However, we are somewhat restricted for the choice of combination scheme, because for two of classifiers we only know if the result was correct or not. We thus decided to use a simple majority vote combination based on the four classifiers, where the neural net classifier is used for tie-breaking (because it has the best single error rate). Note that the result is only an upper bound of the error rate that a real combined system would have, because we do not use the class labels the patterns were assigned to (but only the information if the decision was correct or not). This means that in case of a disagreement between the falsely assigned classes we could have a correct assignment when using the class labels. Furthermore, it seems likely that the use of the confidence values of the component classifiers in the combination scheme could also improve the joint decision.

Using the described hypothetical combination, the resulting error rate is 0.35%. In the following section we will show that this improvement has a prob-

Table 2: Probabilities of improvement for all pairs of the four used classifiers and their combination according to a bootstrap analysis. Probabilities in boldface show **significant** improvements with respect to the 5% level. This table can be read as follows: the classifier in each row improves over the classifiers given in the columns with the stated probability (e.g. the probability of improvement for SVM over SC is 0.60). The second table shows the difference in error rates for comparison. SC: shape context matching; SVM: invariant support vector machine; IDM: image distortion model; CNN: convolutional neural net with distortions; CC: combination of the four classifiers;

| probability of improvement | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|----|
| | SC | SVM | IDM | CNN | CC |
| SC | — | | | | |
| SVM | 0.60 | — | | | |
| IDM | 0.85 | 0.58 | — | | |
| CNN | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.92 | — | |
| CC | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.94 | — |

| difference in error rate | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|----|
| | SC | SVM | IDM | CNN | CC |
| SC | — | | | | |
| SVM | 0.07 | — | | | |
| IDM | 0.09 | 0.02 | — | | |
| CNN | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.12 | — | |
| CC | 0.28 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 0.07 | — |

ability of 94% to be an improvement that is not based on chance alone but constitutes a real improvement.

5 Statistical analysis of results

As mentioned above, we can perform a more detailed analysis of the results of the four methods described in the previous section because we do not only know the error rate of the classifiers but also the exact patterns for which an error has occurred. Therefore, we do not have to assume that the classifiers have been evaluated on independent data and are thus able to derive tighter estimates of the level of confidence of an improvement.

The more detailed analysis shown here is an estimation of the probability that a classifier performs generally better than a second classifier (probability of improvement) by using the decisions of the two classifiers on the same test samples. We estimate this probability by drawing a large number of bootstrap samples from the test data set and observing the relative performance of the two classifiers on these resampled test sets [5]. This estimation tells us more than just using a comparison based on the individual error rates alone. For example, we will intuitively be more inclined to believe that the first classifier is better if it leads to better classifications on 2% of the test data and to the same results on the remaining 98% than if the first classifier performs better on 30%

of the test data but worse on 28% of the data. (For an interesting discussion of significance in the context of comparisons of machine learning algorithms, see [23].) Table 2 shows the probabilities of improvement based on this technique for the four methods described above along with the differences in error rate. [17] states that improvements of more than 0.1% in the error rate may be considered significant. The analysis performed here allows a more detailed assessment of the significance of improvements.

We observe that the improvements between the three classifiers based on shape context, virtual support vectors, and the image distortion model, do not differ statistically significantly (at the 5% level). On the other hand, the neural net based classifier shows significant improvements over the classifiers based on shape context and virtual support vectors, but not over the classifier based on the image distortion model. Finally, the improvements of the combined classifier over the single classifiers is highly significant except for the improvement with respect to the neural net, where the improvement has a significance level of 6%. This value is not beneath the commonly used 5% threshold, but sufficiently close to it to convince us that the improvement is not based on chance alone.

6 Conclusion

We presented a statistical analysis of the results of four state-of-the-art systems for handwritten character recognition on the MNIST benchmark. By using the fact that the systems were tested on the same data, we were able to derive more specific results than it would have been possible by using the error rates (and number of tests) alone. During the analysis, we observed that the four systems had a higher variability in the results than we initially expected. Specifically, only eight errors were common among all classifiers. This observation motivated a combination of the classifiers, which resulted in an error rate of 0.35%, the lowest error rate reported on this data set so far. The statistical analysis resulted in a probability of improvement of 94% for the combination with respect to the best single classifier.

In the view of the low error rates that are achieved by current methods on the MNIST data, we may have reached a point at which further improvement may be largely due to random effects and overadaptation to the (test) data. Some of the errors observed also show that the Bayes error rate of the problem is also larger than zero. This underlines the necessity to present statistical analyses of improvement claims and the measures taken to avoid training on the testing data within all publications using these data in the future. These results may also be viewed as a hint that it is necessary to promote benchmark data sets of similar impact as the MNIST data for new and more complex problems.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially funded by the BMBF (German Federal Ministry of Education and Research), project IPeT (01 IW D03).

Appendix

For completeness, we list the numbers of the MNIST test patterns that are misclassified by the four systems and their combination in this appendix.

Shape Context [3] 210, 448, 583, 692, 717, 948, 1034, 1113, 1227, 1248, 1300, 1320, 1531, 1682, 1710, 1791, 1879, 1902, 2041, 2074, 2099, 2131, 2183, 2238, 2448, 2463, 2583, 2598, 2655, 2772, 2940, 3063, 3074, 3251, 3423, 3476, 3559, 3822, 3851, 4094, 4164, 4202, 4370, 4498, 4506, 4663, 4732, 4762, 5736, 5938, 6555, 6572, 6577, 6598, 6884, 8066, 8280, 8317, 8528, 9506, 9643, 9730, 9851

SVM [9] 448, 583, 660, 675, 727, 948, 1015, 1113, 1227, 1233, 1248, 1300, 1320, 1531, 1550, 1682, 1710, 1791, 1902, 2036, 2071, 2099, 2131, 2136, 2183, 2294, 2489, 2655, 2928, 2940, 2954, 3031, 3074, 3226, 3423, 3521, 3535, 3559, 3605, 3763, 3870, 3986, 4079, 4762, 4824, 5938, 6577, 6598, 6784, 8326, 8409, 9665, 9730, 9750, 9793, 9851

IDM [15] 446, 448, 552, 717, 727, 948, 1015, 1113, 1243, 1682, 1879, 1902, 2110, 2131, 2183, 2344, 2463, 2524, 2598, 2649, 2940, 3226, 3423, 3442, 3559, 3602, 3768, 3809, 3986, 4054, 4164, 4177, 4202, 4285, 4290, 4762, 5655, 5736, 5938, 6167, 6884, 7217, 8317, 8377, 8409, 8528, 9010, 9506, 9531, 9643, 9680, 9730, 9793, 9851

Neural Net [26] 583, 948, 1233, 1300, 1394, 1879, 1902, 2036, 2131, 2136, 2183, 2463, 2583, 2598, 2655, 2928, 2971, 3289, 3423, 3763, 4202, 4741, 4839, 4861, 5655, 5938, 5956, 5974, 6572, 6577, 6598, 6626, 8409, 8528, 9680, 9693, 9699, 9730, 9793, 9840, 9851, 9923

Combination 448, 583, 948, 1113, 1233, 1300, 1682, 1879, 1902, 2036, 2131, 2136, 2183, 2463, 2583, 2598, 2655, 2928, 2940, 3423, 3559, 3763, 4202, 4762, 5655, 5938, 6572, 6577, 6598, 8409, 8528, 9680, 9730, 9793, 9851

References

- [1] V. Athistos, J. Alon, and S. Sclaroff. Efficient Nearest Neighbor Classification Using a Cascade of Approximate Similarity Measures. In *CVPR 2005, Int. Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, volume I, pages 486–493, San Diego, CA, June 2005.
- [2] S. Belongie, J. Malik, and J. Puzicha. Shape Context: A New Descriptor for Shape Matching and Object Recognition. In T. K. Leen, T. G. Dietterich, and V. Tresp, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 13*, pages 831–837. MIT Press, April 2001.
- [3] S. Belongie, J. Malik, and J. Puzicha. Shape Matching and Object Recognition Using Shape Contexts. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 24(4):509–522, April 2002.

- [4] U. Bhattacharya, S. Vajda, A. Mallick, B. B. Chaudhuri, and A. Belaid. On the Choice of Training Set, Architecture and Combination Rule of Multiple MLP Classifiers for Multiresolution Recognition of Handwritten Characters. In *International Workshop on Frontiers in Handwriting Recognition (IWFHR'04)*, pages 419–424, Tokyo, Japan, October 2004.
- [5] M. Bisani and H. Ney. Bootstrap Estimates for Confidence Intervals in ASR Performance Evaluation. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, volume 1, pages 409–412, Montreal, Canada, May 2004.
- [6] L. Bottou, C. Cortes, J. S. Denker, H. Drucker, I. Guyon, L. Jackel, Y. Le Cun, U. Müller, E. Säckinger, P. Simard, and V. N. Vapnik. Comparison of Classifier Methods: A Case Study in Handwritten Digit Recognition. In *Proc. of the Int. Conf. on Pattern Recognition*, pages 77–82, Jerusalem, Israel, October 1994.
- [7] K. Chellapilla, M. Shilman, and P. Simard. Combining Multiple Classifiers for Faster Optical Character Recognition. In *DAS 2006, Int. Workshop Document Analysis Systems*, volume 3872 of *LNCS*, pages 358–367, Nelson, New Zealand, February 2006.
- [8] J. Dahmen, D. Keysers, and H. Ney. Combined Classification of Handwritten Digits using the 'Virtual Test Sample Method'. In *MCS 2001, 2nd Int. Workshop on Multiple Classifier Systems*, volume 2096 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 109–118, Cambridge, UK, May 2001. Springer.
- [9] D. DeCoste and B. Schölkopf. Training Invariant Support Vector Machines. *Machine Learning*, 46(1-3):161–190, 2002.
- [10] J. X. Dong, A. Krzyzak, and C. Y. Suen. Local learning framework for handwritten character recognition. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 15(2):151–159, April 2002.
- [11] J.-X. Dong, A. Krzyzak, and C. Y. Suen. Fast SVM Training Algorithm with Decomposition on Very Large Data Sets. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 27(4):603–618, April 2005. Additional results at <http://www.cenparmi.concordia.ca/~people/jdong/HeroSvm.html>.
- [12] S. Günter and H. Bunke. Combination of Three Classifiers with Different Architectures for Handwritten Word Recognition. In *International Workshop on Frontiers in Handwriting Recognition (IWFHR'04)*, pages 63–68, Tokyo, Japan, October 2004.
- [13] D. Keysers. *Modeling of Image Variability for Recognition*. PhD thesis, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany, March 2006.
- [14] D. Keysers, J. Dahmen, T. Theiner, and H. Ney. Experiments with an Extended Tangent Distance. In *Proc. 15th Int. Conf. on Pattern Recognition*, volume 2, pages 38–42, Barcelona, Spain, September 2000.
- [15] D. Keysers, C. Gollan, and H. Ney. Local Context in Non-linear Deformation Models for Handwritten Character Recognition. In *ICPR 2004, 17th Int. Conf. on Pattern Recognition*, volume IV, pages 511–514, Cambridge, UK, August 2004.
- [16] J. Kittler. On Combining Classifiers. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 20(3):226–239, March 1998.
- [17] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-Based Learning Applied to Document Recognition. *Proc. of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, November 1998.
- [18] C.-L. Liu, K. Nakashima, H. Sako, and H. Fujisawa. Handwritten Digit Recognition: Benchmarking of State-of-the-Art Techniques. *Pattern Recognition*, 36(10):2271–2285, October 2003.

- [19] R. Mare, P. Geurts, J. Piater, and L. Wehenkel. A Generic Approach for Image Classification Based on Decision Tree Ensembles and Local Sub-Windows. In K.-S. Hong and Z. Zhang, editors, *Proc. of the 6th Asian Conf. on Computer Vision*, volume 2, pages 860–865, Jeju Island, Korea, January 2004.
- [20] N. Matsumoto, S. Uchida, and H. Sakoe. Prototype Setting for Elastic Matching-based Image Pattern Recognition. In *ICPR 2004, 17th Int. Conf. on Pattern Recognition*, volume I, pages 224–227, Cambridge, UK, August 2004.
- [21] G. Mayraz and G. Hinton. Recognizing Handwritten Digits Using Hierarchical Products of Experts. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 24(2):189–197, February 2002.
- [22] J. Milgram, R. Sabourin, and M. Cheriet. Combining Model-based and Discriminative Approaches in a Modular Two-stage Classification System: Application to Isolated Handwritten Digit Recognition. *Electronic Letters on Computer Vision and Image Analysis*, 5(2):1–15, 2005.
- [23] S. L. Salzberg. On Comparing Classifiers: Pitfalls to Avoid and a Recommended Approach. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 1(3), 1997.
- [24] B. Schölkopf. *Support Vector Learning*. Oldenbourg Verlag, Munich, 1997.
- [25] B. Schölkopf, P. Simard, A. Smola, and V. Vapnik. Prior Knowledge in Support Vector Kernels. In M. I. Jordan, M. J. Kearns, and S. A. Solla, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 10*, pages 640–646. MIT Press, June 1998.
- [26] P. Simard. Best Practices for Convolutional Neural Networks Applied to Visual Document Analysis. In *7th Int. Conf. Document Analysis and Recognition*, pages 958–962, Edinburgh, Scotland, August 2003.
- [27] P. Simard, Y. Le Cun, and J. Denker. Efficient Pattern Recognition Using a New Transformation Distance. In S. Hanson, J. Cowan, and C. Giles, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 5*, pages 50–58, San Mateo, CA, 1993. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [28] S. J. Smith, M. O. Bourgoin, K. Sims, and H. L. Voorhees. Handwritten Character Classification Using Nearest Neighbor in Large Databases. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 16(9):915–919, September 1994.
- [29] C. Y. Suen and J. Tan. Analysis of Errors of Handwritten Digits Made by a Multitude of Classifiers. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 26(3):369–379, 2005.
- [30] L.-N. Teow and K.-F. Loe. Handwritten Digit Recognition with a Novel Vision Model that Extracts Linearly Separable Features. In *Proc. CVPR 2000, Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, volume 2, pages 76–81, Hilton Head, SC, June 2000.
- [31] L.-N. Teow and K.-F. Loe. Robust Vision-Based Features and Classification Schemes for Off-Line Handwritten Digit Recognition. *Pattern Recognition*, 35(11):2355–2364, November 2002.