

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu\_4)




Fig 3: Identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec\_3)




Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type




Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.




Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities




Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type




Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type




Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity




Fig 9: Solo-Twin and Twin-Twin similarity scores




Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing




Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N




Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing




Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft\_4  
 Developer: Microsoft  
 Submission Date: 2018\_06\_20  
 Template size: 2048 bytes  
 Template time (2.5 percentile): 726 msec  
 Template time (median): 745 msec  
 Template time (97.5 percentile): 1095 msec  
 Investigation rank 5 — FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0015 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense  
 Identification rank 25 — FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0259  
 FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sense