Test event generation for a fall-detection IoT system

Lorena Gutiérrez-Madroñal*, Luigi La Blunda†, Matthias F. Wagner† and Inmaculada Medina-Bulo*
*UCASE Software Engineering Research Group, University of Cádiz, Av. Universidad de Cádiz, 10, 11519
Puerto Real, Spain Email: {lorena.gutierrez, inmaculada.medina}@uca.es
†WSN and IOT Research Group, Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences, Nibelungenplatz 1, 60318 Frankfurt
am Main, Germany Email: {l.lablunda, mfwagner}@fb2.fra-uas.de

Abstract—The Internet of Things (IoT) is a popular paradigm which has been applied to different areas such as smart cities, medicine or business processes. One of the main drawbacks of an IoT system is the amount of information it has to manage and to monitor. This information arrives as events that need to be processed in real time in order to make correct decisions. The Event Processing Languages (EPLs) were designed to handle this information by defining event patterns which describe relevant situations to be detected and filter the information. In the majority of the relevant situations to detect, the events have a specific behaviour which must be analysed not only to define the event patterns, but also to simulate them to test the IoT system. Moreover, in several situations it is quite difficult to obtain test events with specific values: adverse environment conditions, rise or fall in blood pressure, heart attack, falls, among others. In this paper we introduce a complete study of falls as relevant situations; we show an analysis of the fall-involved events of two types of falls based on an IoT prototype, the event patterns to detect the falls and their test using the IoT-TEG (IoT - Test Event Generator) tool. The fall analysis has highlighted the necessity to improve IoT-TEG with a new functionality which allows defining the desired conduct by defining behaviour rules.

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the progress of health care, the longevity of people increases and this leads to an ageing society. According to the survey of the *Robert Koch Institute* [1], 53.7% of accidents in the age group over 60 are caused by falls. Statistically, about one-third of the elderly people suffer severe lesions and the half of them suffer fall-events repeatedly [2]. Falls are not caused by a single cause, 90% of them occurred from multiple factors. These factors refer to old-age or illness (intrinsic factors) or external factors e.g. hazards which occur at home, in traffic or during activities of daily life (extrinsic factors) [2]. Jean-Eric Lundy, an emergency doctor at the hospital Cochin in Paris reported that yearly more than 20 million elderly over the age of 65 in Europe experience fall-situations, that lead to traumatic based cases of death [3]. Additionally, people affected by Dementia and Parkinson have a higher risk to fall. In accordance with [4] research proved that Dementia-patients have a 20 times higher risk and Parkinson-patients a 10 times higher risk of falling than healthy people of the same age. To counteract these life-threatening situations a fast and fully automated assistance is needed, because an unconscious person may not be able to call the emergency services. An approach could be continuous monitoring of medical and/or physical signals via a wearable sensor network (see Figure 1). A prototype in form of a belt was developed, which is worn on the hip by the patient and consists of a five sensor nodes Body Area Network (BAN) [5], [6].


Fig. 1. Scheme fall simulation where a person has a wareable sensor network in form of a belt. [5], [6]

The EPLs have been designed to address the main problems of IoT systems. In particular, EPLs are used to define critical situations in order to filter the information and to make correct decisions according to the obtained data. These critical situations are defined using event patterns and event rules. Among the existing EPLs, the EPL of EsperTech [7] is used the most often. In our study, the critical situations are the falls, so the obtained data from the mentioned prototype are used to define an EPL of EsperTech pattern to detect falls.

The first step of this prototype is to identify a fall from a fast movement, a sitting or laying down movement, but the final goal of the system is to predict the falls and act to prevent them. Given that to test this system is crucial, test events which simulate falls are necessary. In the literature different type of falls can be found, and it is necessary to identify all of them in order to tell them apart from a non-fall: in this study, two types of falls will be analysed.

IoT-TEG [8], [9] is a tool which automatically generates test events of many types. Thanks to the obtained data from the sensors we have checked that the measured parameter during a fall, the acceleration, has a specific behaviour. As a consequence, the test events must be generated according to its behaviour. This problem is solved with the new functionality that IoT-TEG includes which is introduced in this paper.

In this study of falls as relevant situations, our main contributions are:

- **A study of the fall detection prototype evolution**: the system which is been used is continuously being improved. We describe the evolution of its architecture, how the data is analysed and the detected problems.
- **An analysis of the major parameter in a fall**: while a person is falling, the acceleration is the parameter that

can measure the movement of the body. This parameter is analysed in order to know its behaviour during two types of falls.

- **New definitions of two types of falls**: after the analysis of the acceleration during two types of falls a new definition for each one has been done. The obtained data of the fall-detection prototype is used to define EPL of EsperTech patterns to detect those types of falls.
- **A new functionality of the IoT-TEG system** which allows to simulate the behaviour of different event attributes in order to generate test events following a specific pattern.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. Section II describes not only the related work of event generators, but also the existing solutions for fall-detection. Section III provides the basic knowledge of falls and EPLs. A brief introduction of IoT-TEG and its new functionality appear in Section IV. The architecture of the fall detection system and the fall analysis are introduced in Section V. Section VI describes the improvements on the prototype, a new fall type analysis, a comparison of the obtained results and some detected problems. Finally, in Section VII, we conclude our paper and make recommendations for future work.

II. RELATED WORK

An overview about event generators reveals that the first event generators [10], [11] were focused on extremely specific topics such as environmental conditions for the simulation of high energy physics events at particle colliders. Nowadays, we can find papers that address the same issues [12], but the technology surrounds us and the people and business need to control and monitor the things around them. The received information allows them to make decisions and to act according to it. This is the reason of the creation of the IoT platforms, which are the key for the development of scalable IoT applications and services that connect objects, systems and people to each other. However, not every IoT platform is a real IoT platform [13]; for instance, some event generators that are integrated in an enterprise software packages, which are increasingly allowing the integration of IoT devices, are often not advanced enough to be classified as a full IoT platform. Examples are given in the following lines:

- The Timing System [14] provides a complete timing distribution system including timing signal generation. Its event generator is responsible for creating timing events which are sent out as serialised event frames.
- The company Starcom [15] has developed an event generator to solve the problem of managing a huge number of events. They state that their generator is capable of controlling the end event action, so the exact managers requirements can be filtered. The tool is included in a kit distributed with their system.
- The WebLogic Integration Solutions [16] allow the managing and monitoring of entities and resources required for WebLogic Integration applications. This system contains an event generator module which allows the creation and deployment of the event generators included

as part of WebLogic Integration. The mentioned events generators allow to define event types but they are not capable to simulate a specific behaviour with a set of generated events. The relevant situations in IoT systems are a sequence of activities with a determined behaviour; that is why IoT-TEG [8], [9] includes this option.

Talking about fall-detection, there are several solutions that propose wearable sensors. We are going to focus our attention in the approach proposed by Li et al. [17]; their wearable fall-detection solutions, which will be explained subsequently, was used for the development of our prototype. They introduce a fall-detection method based on a BAN that consists of two wearable sensor nodes. These two nodes comprise an accelerometer and gyroscope and are worn on the chest, node A, and thigh node B, (see Figure 2). The principle of this method differentiates between static postures and dynamic postures:

- Static postures: standing, sitting, laying and bending.
- Dynamic postures
  - Activities of daily life: walking, walk on stairs, sit, jump, lay down and run.
  - Fall-like motions: quick sit down upright and quick sit-down reclined.
  - Flat surface falls: fall forward, fall backward, fall right and fall left.
  - Inclined falls: fall on stairs.

Fig. 2. System architecture according to Li et al. [17]

To decrease the computational effort of the microcontroller a three-phase algorithm was proposed, which is structured as follows:

1) Phase activity analysis: check if person is in a static or dynamic position.
2) Phase position analysis: if existing posture coincides with static posture, check whether the current position corresponds to laying.
3) Phase state transition analysis: if in laying position, examine whether this transition was intentional or unintentional. The previous 5 seconds are used to analyse it. In the case that this position was unintentional, the system classifies it as a fall.

The weak point of this method is the differentiation between jumping into bed and falling against a wall with seated posture.

III. BACKGROUND

A. Fall analysis

The approach used to detect falls is based on the basic idea proposed by [18], [19]. A typical acceleration pattern during a fall-event is a decreasing acceleration close to 0g (free fall), followed by an increasing acceleration value (see Figure 3). In a stationary position, the acceleration measured is around 1g ($9.81m/s^2$) and during falling around 0g ($0m/s^2$). Upon the impact to the ground (fall-event), the maximum acceleration (peak-value) is reached for a short time period and it is greater than 1g. This pattern can be used to detect fall-events using the integrated accelerometer of the sensor nodes. Important to know is that the acceleration magnitude which is illustrated in the Formula 1 was used for the fall-detection:

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\alpha_x^2 + \alpha_y^2 + \alpha_z^2} \tag{1}$$

Fig. 3. Acceleration during impact [19].

Taking into consideration the depicted Figure 3, we can apply the following rule to evaluate the incoming acceleration data:

$$\alpha_{max} - \alpha_{min} > 1g \tag{2}$$

in a 1 second window and α_{min} preceded α_{max}; where α_{max} is the maximum acceleration value, α_{min} is the minimum acceleration value and $1g \approx 9.81m/s^2$. Looking at the rule an event is categorised as a fall when the difference between α_{max} and α_{min} is greater than 1g and α_{min} is followed by α_{max}. Important: this should happen within a time window of 1 second due to the fact, that a fall can occur in less than 1 second [20]. To apply this rule we used the EPL of EsperTech [7] in an IoT system which detects falls.

B. Fall patterns with EPL of EsperTech

Etzion and Niblett [21] defined *event processing agents* as software modules that process events. Such agents are specified using an EPL, and there are a number of styles of EPLs in use. The following styles are included: rule-oriented, imperatives and stream-oriented.

The EPL our work is based on is EPL of Esper [7], a stream-oriented language. The main reasons of its selection are: it is an extension of Structured Query Language (SQL), it can be embedded into Java applications and it is open source.

An EPL statement starts executing continuously during runtime. While the execution is taking place, EPL queries will be triggered if the application receives pre-defined or timer triggering events.

Example 1. EPL of EsperTech query example
```
select A as temp1, B as temp2 from
  pattern [every temp1.temperature > 400 ->
  temp2.temperature > 400]
```

In the above example (see Example 1) of a "nuclear reactor control system", its temperature gauges take a reading of the core temperature every second and send the data to a central monitoring system. The EPL of EsperTech query throws a warning if we have 2 consecutive temperatures above a certain threshold (400 degrees Celsius). This is a situation where a quick reaction to emerging patterns is needed in a stream of data events. A quick reaction is also needed in fall detection.

Because of the difficulties to simulate falls, IoT-TEG is used in order to get the fall-test events automatically. IoT-TEG can be adapted or modified, if it is necessary, to generate any test events, even after the improvements in the fall-detection prototype.

IV. IoT TEST EVENT GENERATOR

IoT-TEG [8], [9] is a Java-based tool which takes an event type definition file and a desired output format IoT-TEG is made up of a *validator* and an *event generator* (Figure 4). The validator ensures the definition follows the rules set by IoT-TEG. The generator takes the definition and generates the indicated number of events according to it.


Fig. 4. IoT-TEG Architecture [8], [9].

Previous studies suggested there were no differences in testing effectiveness between using events generated by IoT-TEG, or events recorded from various case studies [8], [9]. Moreover, thanks to its implementation, IoT-TEG can be used to do different types of tests: functional, negative, integration, stress, etc; indeed an example of its usability can be found in [8], [22], where IoT-TEG has been used to apply mutation testing [23].

An event type is defined using XML language and its attributes have to be defined using the `<field>` element. A new property in IoT-TEG has been defined, the `custom_behaviour`, which it is included in the `<field>` element to define the desired behaviour of any event attribute. In the `custom_behaviour` property the path to the file that includes the behaviour of the event attribute has to be written.

For the sake of clarity, Example 2 shows the complete fall event definition (FallEventType) that we are going to use. The fall event type has one attribute, the acceleration, which follows an specific behavior depending on the type of fall.

Example 2. Fall event type definition

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<event name="FallEventType">
<block name="feeds" repeat="100">
 <field name="acceleration" quotes="false" type="Float"
 custom_behaviour="/Path/To/Rule/File"></field>
</block>
</event>
```

In order to explain how the user has to define the desired behaviour of an event attribute, we are going to use the behaviour of the acceleration during a fall (see Figure 3). In a XML file the number of simulations has to be indicated, the events involved in a simulation will be calculated according to the total number of events to generate and the desired simulations. For example, if the number of test events to generate is 100, this is indicated in the event type definition file (see Example 2) as `repeat="100"`, and if the number of desired simulations is 5, this is indicated as `simulations="5"`, in the behaviour rules definition file (see Example 3). So, the number of events involved to simulate the behaviour, a fall, is 20.

Variables can be defined if they are needed in the behaviour rules definition file. They can be defined using the `<variables>` tags. To define them a name and a value have to be given to the variables. The value can be defined as a fixed value with the `value` property, or using a range with the `min` and `max` properties. For example, `Base` variable is used to define the acceleration of a person in a stationary position. Some variables are involved in the value of another variables; this is indicated using the variable with an specific format `$(variable)`. In addition, arithmetic operations can be done in the definition of the variable values.

Once the variables are defined, the `<rules>` tags are used to define the acceleration behaviour in Figure 3. A `weight` must be assigned to each behaviour rule to calculate the number of events to generate for each one for each simulation. Following the example and the assigned `weight` in Example 3, if 20 events simulate a fall $20 * 0,25 = 5$ events will be generated for the first rule, another 5 events for the second rule, 1 event for the third rule, and the remained events for the fourth rule. We have to assign zero to the weight `weight="0"` to indicate how the remained events have to be generated.

To define the rules, `min`, `max` and `value` properties can be used as well as the arithmetic operations and the references to another variables, see Example 3. Moreover, the `sequence` property can be used to obtain values lower or higher than the one generated previously. The `sequence` property values are `inc`, to increase the value, or `dec`, to decrease the value; examples of their usage will be shown in the following sections.

Thanks to the included properties and parameters in the IoT-TEG new functionality, the desired behaviour rules can be defined. In the fall rules, the involved event attribute is the acceleration, and its behaviour during the fall is defined by four rules: the stationary position values, first and fourth rules, will be obtained from a range from 9.81-0.25 to 9.81+0.25, because depending on the person and the place the acceleration can be different; the fall, the second rule, is defined as a range between 0 and the fifth part of $1g$, and the impact value, the third rule, is from a range between $2gs$ and $6gs$.

Example 3. Rules to define a fall

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<custom_conditions simulations="5">
<variables>
 <variable name="Base" value="9.81"/>
</variables>
<rules>
 <rule weight="0.25" min="$(Base)-0.25" max="$(Base)+0.25"/>
 <rule weight="1" min="$(Base)*2" max="$(Base)*6"/>
 <rule weight="1" min="0.0" max="$(Base)/5"/>
 <rule weight="0" min="$(Base)-0.25" max="$(Base)+0.25"/>
</rules>
</custom_conditions>
```

V. PROTOTYPE

A. Architecture

The system architecture is an important part to provide a precise and reliable fall-analysis. Additionally, the aspect of patient compliance should be taken into consideration, because the system should be developed not only from the developer point of view, but it should be accepted by the patients. An important requirement of the elderly is that the hardware design must facilitate the freedom of movement. Furthermore, the system has to guarantee a reliable functionality and redundancy to protect the wearable system against a total system failure. Jämsä et al. [24] state that the best position of an accelerometer is near the waist. With reference to these aspects a BAN in form of a belt was developed which includes a five sensor nodes which is based on ZigBee/IEEE 802.15.4[1].


Fig. 5. Fall-detection belt [5], [6]

Four of the sensor nodes are acting as end-devices (S1-S4) and the other node as a coordinator. The end-devices have attached an accelerometer and gyroscope which acquire continuously sensor data and is sent wirelessly to the coordinator using the ZigBee protocol. The data is sent in the following format:

$$|\alpha|, \omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z$$

- $|\alpha| \rightarrow$ This value represents the acceleration magnitude which is calculated by Formula (1). This value is a reference for impact detection. The unit measure is m/s^2.
- $\omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z \rightarrow$ represent the angular velocity in X, Y and Z direction respectively. The unit measure is degree per second (dps).

[1]http://www.zigbee.org/

The coordinator receives the incoming data and it has the function to evaluate the patient's status.

To test the system's accuracy different fall-types were reproduced with several test people. A test procedure based on Li et al. [17] and Pannurat et al. [26] was developed which includes several motions and fall-types which are typical in nursing homes and hospitals.

Taking into account the architecture of the prototype and the rule to define a fall, see Equation (1), the EPL of EsperTech pattern to define the fall situation is the one shown in the Example 4.

Example 4. Fall pattern
```
select a1.accelS1, a2.accelS1, a1.accelS2, a2.accelS2 from
  pattern [every(a1=BodyEvent(a1.accelS1 <= 9.81) ->
  a2=BodyEvent(a2.accelS1 -a1.accelS1 >= 9.81 and
  a1.PersonID = a2.PersonID)
  where timer:within(1sec)) or every
  (a1=BodyEvent(a1.accelS2 <= 9.81)
  -> a2=BodyEvent(a2.accelS2-a1.accelS2 >= 9.81
  and a1.PersonID = a2.PersonID) where timer:within(1sec))]
```

The illustrated EPL query is based on the physical principle depicted in Figure 3. Important to know is that for the EPL query two nodes were used (one frontal sensor node & one lateral sensor node) to apply the fall-detection, but in the future this query will be extended to four sensor nodes. The four node architecture (see Figure 5) is currently only used for redundancy purposes. With the *select* statement the event properties are selected to create a pattern for fall-detection. In the given example the following event properties are selected:

- `a1.accelS1`: starting acceleration value of node 1.
- `a2.accelS1`: subsequent acceleration value of node 1.
- `a1.accelS2`: starting acceleration value of node 2.
- `a2.accelS2`: subsequent acceleration value of node 2.

Taking into consideration the selected event properties the query checks if the starting acceleration of sensor node 1 is $<= 9.81$ m/s^2 which means the person is in a stationary position in which the earth's gravity of 1g (9,81 m/s^2) acts on the body. Additionally, the subsequent acceleration of the first node checks if the subtraction of the subsequent acceleration and the first acceleration within a time window of 1 second is $>= 9.81$ m/s^2 which means that the patient has suffered an impact to the ground. Using the *OR* disjunction the second sensor node can be added and the statement is able to detect a fall in case one of the nodes matches the EPL query and the values of the acceleration correspond to the same person.

B. Fall simulation test events

Our goal is to study the acceleration behaviour during a fall in order to generate test events. The selected fall consists on rolling in the bed and fall (RBF) [17], [26]. In this study we have used a healthy subject, and we have recorded falls with all possible realism while also trying to avoid risks. The person has been doing RBF type falls for a period of 2 minutes. The analysed data and videos can be found in [27]. In the following lines the steps to simulate the fall with the generated events are described, theses steps are very similar to the ones followed by [28], [29]:

1. Study of the values: Given that the sensor 1 is the one that suffers the impact, its acceleration values are the first to be analysed. Figure 6 shows the normalised acceleration data ($N(m/s^2)$) from sensor 1 while the person was falling. The normalised acceleration is shown on the Y-axis, and the time in milliseconds (ms) on the X-axis.

While performing the data analysis, it has to be taken into account that the values suffer alterations because several factors: the person's movement, the person bouncing against something (floor, wall, etc), the collocation of the sensors to the original position after a fall, sensor pressure because of an impact or the person is laying over it, etc.


Fig. 6. Sensor 1 acceleration.

2. Fall identification and analysis: After the previous study, the peaks of the acceleration are identified. These peaks, or maximum values, are when the sensor suffers the impact. Because of the mentioned noise, two ranges of the obtained values are extracted in order to analyse data properly. Please, see the highlighted parts in Figure 6; with respect to the X-axis $[210, 360]$ (Fall 1) and $[900, 1050]$ (Fall 2). The range of extracted values are a set of data that happen in less than a time window of 1 second, to meet the fact described in [20]. So as to compare both RBF falls the acceleration values are normalised according to their impact value. The Table I shows the values to analyse where the impact value is highlighted with colour green.

TIME (s.ms)	ACCEL. (m/s^2)	N. ACCEL. (N(m/s^2))	TIME (s.ms)	ACCEL. (m/s^2)	N. ACCEL. (N(m/s^2))
0	6,29	0,02	0	5,98	0,08
10	7,57	0,05	10	6,31	0,08
20	20,7	0,33	20	8,2	0,13
30	24,07	0,41	30	9,21	0,16
40	21,01	0,34	40	19,92	0,43
50	10,81	0,12	50	21,8	0,48
60	7,71	0,05	60	16,52	0,34
70	6,87	0,04	70	14,41	0,29
80	7,06	0,04	80	9,97	0,18
90	5,23	0,00	90	6,54	0,09
100	51,58	1,00	100	3,01	0,00
110	11,01	0,12	110	42,34	1,00
120	12,12	0,15	120	8,96	0,15
130	11,77	0,14	130	10,14	0,18
140	11,26	0,13	140	9,81	0,17
150	11,16	0,13	150	10,45	0,19

TABLE I
RBF FALL ACCELERATION, FALL (RANGE) 1 AND FALL (RANGE) 2

The obtained data do not have a timestamp, so given that every 10 milliseconds the system sends the data, we have divided the values according to this time. To compare the

RBF falls the time in the Table I starts in 0 ms and then increase in 10 ms, that is what it is shown in the first column of the Table. The second column shows the acceleration values (m/s^2) and the normalised acceleration values are deployed in the third column $(N(m/s^2))$ according to the fall maximum value. In Figure 7 a comparison of the normalised acceleration behaviour during the previous RBF falls is shown. This comparison shows a similar behaviour of the acceleration during the RBF falls. Moreover, the acceleration in these two RBF falls follow the rule that define a fall, see Equation (2), see Section III-A.


Fig. 7. Acceleration comparative.

The goal is to simulate this type of fall with events to test the IoT system, so we have to analyse the values of the acceleration before and after the impact. Taking into account that the maximum value of the acceleration is when the impact occurs (α_{max}), the acceleration behaviour during a RBF fall develops as follows:

1) from a value less than the half of α_{max}, the acceleration value increases to obtain a value in the range:

$$[\alpha_{max}/2 - 0.5, \alpha_{max}/2 + 0.5]$$

The person is rolling on the bed.
2) if the acceleration obtains a value in the previous range, its value decreases until the minimum value α_{min}. The person is falling, a free fall.
3) the acceleration value goes from the minimum value α_{min} to the maximum value α_{max}. The person suffers the impact.
4) the acceleration value is established with values around the half of α_{max}. The person is laying on the floor.

The same analysis process has been done to the rest of sensors, and the behaviour of the acceleration of all of them follows the same pattern.

Taking into account the architecture of the prototype and the previous rules to define a RBF fall, the EPL of EsperTech pattern to the define a RBF fall is the one shown in the Example 5.

Example 5. RBF pattern
```
select a1.accelS1, a2.accelS1, a3.accelS1, a4.accelS1 from
pattern[every(a1 = BodyEvent(a1.accelS1 <= 9.81) ->
a2 = BodyEvent(a2.accelS1 - a1.accelS1 >= 9.81) ->
a3 = BodyEvent(a3.accelS1 < 9.81) ->
a4 = BodyEvent(a4.accelS1 - a3.accelS1 >= 9.81
and a2.accelS1 = a4.accelS1 / 2 ± 0.5) where
timer:within(1sec))]
```

The displayed EPL query depicts a recognition pattern which could be used to detect the rolling out of bed. Given that all the sensors are following the same pattern, one sensor node (S1) was used to create the query which makes it easier to understand the pattern. With the *select* statement the event properties are selected to create a fall-detection pattern.

Taking into consideration that the RBF fall is a complex event to detect, this event has been divided in the following phases: stationary phase (e.g. laying), rolling phase, free fall phase and impact phase.

The EPL query first checks if the starting acceleration `a1.accelS1` is $<= 9.81$m/s^2 which means that the person is laying on the bed (stationary position). Additionally, the subsequent property is checked. If the difference between the successive acceleration value (`a2.accelS1`) and the previous one (`a1.accelS1`) is $>= 9.81$ m/s^2 then the person has a transition to the rolling phase. If the person is falling after turning, the subsequent acceleration value should be < 9.81 m/s^2 which means that the person is in the free fall phase. Additionally, if the difference between the current acceleration value (`a4.accelS1`) and the previous one (`a3.accelS1`) is $>= 9.81$ m/s^2, it is an indication for a fall. For a query to recognise this event as a fall all these sequences should happen within a time window of 1 second.

3. To define the fall event: Once the fall acceleration behaviour has been observed, the next step is to define the fall event in order to generate test events with IoT-TEG [8], [9]. Given that the involved event attribute in this fall is the acceleration, the Example 2 in Section IV can be used to define the fall event (FallEventType). The rules to define the behaviour of the acceleration in this type of fall is shown in Example 6.

Example 6. Rules to define a RBF fall
```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<custom_conditions simulations="5">
<variables>
 <variable name="Impact" min="40.0" max="156.96"/>
 <variable name="Roll" min="$(Impact)/2-0.5"
  max="$(Impact)/2+0.5"/>
 <variable name="Fall" min="0.0" max="$(Roll)/5"/>
</variables>
<rules>
 <rule weight="0.25" min="$(Roll)/4" max="$(Roll)"
  sequence="inc"/>
 <rule weight="0.25" min="$(Roll)" max="$(Fall)"
  sequence="dec"/>
 <rule weight="1" value="$(Impact)"/>
 <rule weight="0" min="$(Roll)/2-0.25"
  max="$(Roll)/2+0.25"/>
</rules>
</custom_conditions>
```

To define the acceleration behaviour during a RBF fall three variables are defined: `Roll`, `Fall` and `Impact`. `Impact` will be the maximum value α_{max}, `Fall` will be the minimum value α_{min} and the `Roll` variable is defined by a range where the acceleration value will be obtained according to the `Impact` value. In order to obtain a low value, a range between 0 and the fifth part of `Roll` is assigned to the `Fall` variable.

In the RBF fall rules, the involved event attribute is the acceleration, and its behaviour during the fall is defined by four rules; in the first rule the acceleration value increases to a value close or equal to `Roll`, in the second rule the acceleration value decreases to a value close or equal to `Fall`, in the third

rule the acceleration value is equal to `Impact`, it obtains the highest value and in the fourth rule the acceleration value is established in a range which is lower than `Roll`.

It has to be emphasised that to obtain these rules for the definition of the acceleration behaviour several tests have been done. Once we obtained the desired results, test events were generated as they were necessary. The Figure 8 shows the acceleration values of some of the generated RBF falls using IoT-TEG and the new functionality.

Fig. 8. IoT-TEG generated RBF falls.

The generated events which simulate RBF falls follow the pattern of the acceleration during a RBF fall. So, these generated events can be used to test the fall detection system.

VI. Improved Prototype

A. Architecture

Taking into consideration the architecture of the prototype described in the previous section significant improvements were done. The improved hardware architecture is also based on four sensor nodes (S1-S4), but with the following significant innovations:

- A new hardware platform which is based on Arduino Primo Core [30]: This microcontroller provides built-in sensors and a Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) interface for wireless data transmission. This satisfies the requirement of patient compliance which includes unrestricted movement.
- A different power supply mode is used for the improved prototype. Instead of using the Lithium Polymer (LIPO) batteries, the Arduino Primo Core is supplied by a coin cell. This is an important aspect due to the fact, that exposing the LIPO-batteries to permanent shocks will damage them and drastically shorten their lifespan. Additionally, with the usage of coin cells, we have reached a lifespan of 2 to 3 weeks without exchanging the battery.
- The improved prototype is using BLE for wireless data transmission. Using BLE brings the advantage to build up a communication infrastructure with the smartphone to automatically inform the emergency services without any additional hardware.
- The dataset which is sent by the sensor nodes (S1- S4) is composed as follows and includes the values of $\alpha_i, i \in x, y, z$ in unit m/s^2:

```
SensorID, X-Acceleration, Y-Acceleration,
         Z-Acceleration
```

Compared to the dataset format of the previous prototype the sensor identification number was added and the significantly change is that only the single axis values of the accelerometer are sent. Based on the individual axis values of the accelerometer, the orientation of the person can also be determined.

B. Fall simulation test events

The second fall to generate the test events consists on the impact of the person with a wall and falling on the knees and then on the chest: *fall against wall* (FAW). In this study we have used two healthy subjects, and we have recorded falls with all possible realism while also trying to avoid risks. They have been doing fall-tests for a period of 2 minutes, the FAW fall type. The analysed data and videos can be found in [27].

In this analysis the same steps that the ones described in Section V have been done:

Study of the values: Given that the sensor 1 is the one that suffers the impact, its acceleration values $|\alpha|$ are the first to be analysed. The acceleration values $|\alpha|$ have been normalised ($N(m/s^2)$). After the normalisation the impacts of the falls, peaks, have to be detected; we have considered a peak when the normalised acceleration is greater than 0,7 ($N(m/s^2) > 0,7$). After applying the previous rule in all the fall data and taking into account the alterations because the mentioned factors, the impacts are detected.

Fall identification and analysis: Once the peaks are detected, a range of values, including the peaks, are selected in order to analyse data properly and to study the acceleration behaviour during FAW fall. The range of extracted values are a set of data that happen in less than a time window of 1 second, to meet the fall rule of [20] described in Equation (2), see Section III-A. The Table II shows the acceleration value during one FAW fall of person 1 and person 2.

Time (s.ms)	Accel. (m/s^2)	N. Accel. ($N(m/s^2)$)	Time (s.ms)	Accel. (m/s^2)	N. Accel. ($N(m/s^2)$)
57.311	3,63	0,01	25.254	8,53	0,09
57.359	3,43	0,00	25.303	10,79	0,19
57.408	7,85	0,17	25.352	11,28	0,22
57.506	10,99	0,30	25.401	13,83	0,34
57.506	6,47	0,12	25.449	9,42	0,13
57.554	4,61	0,05	25.503	8,63	0,09
57.603	4,22	0,03	25.546	0,89	0,10
57.651	22,86	0,77	25.596	8,04	0,07
57.700	28,84	1,00	25.645	13,93	0,35
57.749	21,78	0,72	25.693	22,7	0,76
57.800	9,03	0,22	25.742	10,59	0,19
57.846	10,79	0,29	25.791	8,63	0,09
57.900	10,79	0,29	25.841	8,34	0,08
57.944	9,32	0,23	25.888	6,67	0,00
57.996	13,15	0,38	25.937	17,46	0,51
58.042	20,99	0,69	25.986	27,76	1,00
58.186	28,25	0,98	26.082	11,58	0,23
58.188	27,47	0,95	26.084	11,38	0,22
58.240	10	0,26	26.134	10,5	0,18
58.286	10,99	0,30	26.181	8,83	0,10
58.334	11,67	0,33	26.230	12,75	0,29

TABLE II
FAW FALL ACCELERATION, PERSON 1 AND 2

The first and fourth columns of the Table II represent the seconds (s) and milliseconds (ms) when the acceleration was

measured. The second and fifth columns show the acceleration values $|\alpha|$ (m/s^2) and in the third and sixth columns are deployed the normalised acceleration values ($N(m/s^2)$) according to the fall maximum value. In Figure 9 a comparison of the normalised acceleration behaviour during the previous FAW falls of person 1 and person 2 is shown. These comparisons show a similar behaviour of the acceleration during the FAW fall.


Fig. 9. Acceleration comparison during FAW fall.

For the FAW, we have decided to define the acceleration behaviour with normalised values; so the normalised acceleration behaviour during the FAW consists on:

1) the variation of its values while the person is walking. We have divided this rule in two rules:
   a) The normalised acceleration values increase in a range [0, 0.35].
   b) The normalised acceleration values decrease in a range [0, 0.35].
2) as a consequence of the impact of the person against a wall, the acceleration normalised value has to be greater than 0.7.
3) the normalised acceleration values decreases to a range [0, 0.35]. The values of the acceleration are in the mentioned range depending on the size of the person; the larger person results in a longer range and if the person retains a position prior to a fall thanks to the wall. Moreover, a subtle peak could appear as a consequence of a rebound.
4) a second impact happens when the person hit the ground, the acceleration normalised values has to be greater than 0.7.
5) finally, the person is laying on the ground and the normalised acceleration value decreases. The values of the acceleration are between [0.10, 0.35] and no subtle peaks appear.

The same analysis process has been done to the rest of sensors, and the behaviour of the acceleration of all of them follows the same pattern.

Taking into account the architecture of the prototype and the previous rules to define a FAW fall, the EPL of EsperTech pattern to the define a FAW fall is the one shown in the Example 7.

Example 7. FAW pattern

```
select a1.accelS1, a2.accelS1, a3.accelS1, a4.accelS1,
a5.accelS1
from pattern[every(a1 = BodyEvent(a1.accelS1 >= 9.81) ->
a2 = BodyEvent(a2.accelS1 < 9.81) ->
a3 = BodyEvent(a3.accelS1 - a2.accelS1 >= 9.81) ->
a4 = BodyEvent(a4.accelS1 < 9.81) ->
a5 = BodyEvent(a5.accelS1 - a4.accelS1 >= 9.81)
where timer:within(1sec)]
```

This event has been divided in the following phases: dynamic phase (e.g. walking), free fall to wall phase, wall impact phase, free fall phase and impact phase.

The EPL query checks if the starting acceleration `a1.accelS1` is $>= 9.81$ m/s^2 which means that the person is walking. The next acceleration value (`a2.accelS1`) is used to detect the free fall phase to the wall. If `a2.accelS1` is < 9.81 m/s^2 it indicates that the person is falling against the fall. Additionally, if the difference between the current acceleration value (`a3.accelS1`) and the previous acceleration value (`a2.accelS1`) is $>= 9.81$ m/s^2 it indicates the impact against a wall. After that, the person suffered the impact against a wall the upcoming acceleration value (`a4.accelS1`) should be less than 9.81 m/s^2. This indicates that the person is falling to the ground. If the difference between the successive value (`a5.accelS1`) and the previous value (`a4.accelS1`) is $>= 9.81$ m/s^2 it means that the person has suffered an impact to the ground. To classify this event as a FAW fall this pattern flow should happen within a time window of 1 second.

To define the fall event: Once the fall acceleration behaviour has been observed, the next step is to define the fall event in order to generate test events with IoT-TEG [8], [9]. Given that the involved event attribute in this fall is the acceleration, the Example 2 in Section V can be used to define the fall event (FallEventType). The rules to define the behaviour of the acceleration in this type of fall is shown in Example 8.

Example 8. Rules to define a FAW fall

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<custom_conditions simulations="5">
<variables>
 <variable name="Base" value="9.81"/>
 <variable name="ImpactWall" min="$(Base)+$(Base)*0.7"
  max="$(Base)*3"/>
 <variable name="Impact" min="$(Base)+$(Base)*0.7"
  max="$(Base)*3"/>
</variables>
<rules>
 <rule weight="0.25" min="0" max="$(ImpactWall)*0.35"
  sequence="inc"/>
 <rule weight="0.25" min="0" max="$(ImpactWall)*0.35"
  sequence="dec"/>
 <rule weight="1" value="$(ImpactWall)"/>
 <rule weight="0.25" min="0" max="$(Impact)*0.35"/>
 <rule weight="1" value="$(Impact)"/>
 <rule weight="0" min="$(Base)+$(Base)*0.10"
  max="$(Impact)*0.35"/>
</rules>
</custom_conditions>
```

To define the acceleration behaviour during a FAW fall three variables are defined: `Base`, `ImpactWall` and `Impact`. Given that the acceleration behaviour during a FAW fall has been according to the normalised values, the variables and rules have been defined according to that analysis. The acceleration value in a stationary position is a variable depending on the person, so we have considered the established value, $1g \approx 9.81 m/s^2$. That is the fixed value of the `Base` variable. To determine the values of the impacts, we have taken into account that the normalised value have to be $> 0, 7$. So, to

ensure that the impacts, `ImpactWall` and `Impact`, have a value meeting the mentioned condition the minimum value of the impact is the sum of the `Base` and `Base` multiplied by `Base*0,7`; and the maximum value of the impacts is $3g \approx 9,81 * 3 =$ `Base*3`.

Given that we have considered to define the FAW fall behaviour rules according to the normalised values, the values to generate depend on the maximum value. Due to there are two values that can be the highest one, `ImpactWall` or `Impact`, the rules that depend on the maximum value contain the reference to the value, `ImpactWall` or `Impact`, according to the proximity of the rule. For instance, the first and second FAW fall rules contain a reference to `ImpactWall`, the impact in the wall (third rule), which happens after the person is walking, something described in the first and the second rules. The fourth and sixth rules contain a reference to `Impact`, the impact on the ground (fifth rule), which happens after the person is falling and the person is laying on the floor, fourth and sixth rules.

It is important to highlight that to obtain these rules to define the behaviour of the normalised acceleration several tests have been done. Once we obtained the desired results, test events were generated as they were necessary. The Figure 10 shows the acceleration values of some of the generated FAW falls using IoT-TEG and the new functionality.


Fig. 10. IoT-TEG generated FAW falls.

The generated events which simulate FAW falls follow the pattern of the acceleration during a FAW fall. So, these generated events can be used to test the fall-detection system.

The improvements in the new prototype are encouraging. They affect not only in the way of obtaining the data, but also in the format and their values. The impact values from one analysis to the other are quite different, this is because several reasons that are described in Section VI-C. The difference of values was not a problem for IoT-TEG to define the behaviour rules and to generate the test events. That means that the introduced functionality can be adapted to the analysed behaviour. Moreover, it has to be emphasised that the application of the new functionality covers any event attribute which follows a behaviour; so IoT-TEG is not limited.

C. Detected problems

After testing the current fall-detection prototype, some problems were found. Moreover, some considerations will be applied in future tests.

First of all, we are going to explain the problems related to the prototype:

- Synchronisation problem of the data acquisition with n sensor nodes.
- Fall data from the beginning should always be discarded because the sensors start sending data at different times. The Table III will be used to explain the problem. Let us say that in "fall 1", there are more than 30 values that define the fall, and later in "fall 3", there are 12 values that define the fall. So, in order to analyse the falls and compare the acceleration behaviour, it is difficult to work with that information. A comparison of two FAW falls with the synchronisation problem is shown in Figure 11; the sensor 1 acceleration values for the first FAW fall are coloured in blue and the sensor 1 acceleration values for the second FAW fall are coloured in red. The first fall is one fall from the beginning of the simulation, and the second one is from the middle of the simulation.

TIME (s.ms)	ACCEL. (m/s^2)	N. ACCEL. ($N(m/s^2)$)	TIME (s.ms)	ACCEL. (m/s^2)	N. ACCEL. ($N(m/s^2)$)
25.561	9,81	0,11	25.546	8,73	0,1
25.561	9,81	0,11	25.596	8,04	0,07
25.562	11,38	0,17	25.645	13,93	0,35
25.564	11,38	0,17	25.693	22,76	0,76
25.609	15,11	0,33	25.742	10,59	0,19
25.610	15,11	0,33	25.791	8,63	0,09
25.610	15,11	0,33	25.841	8,34	0,08
25.611	15,11	0,33	25.888	6,67	0
25.612	31,4	1	25.937	17,46	0,51
25.612	23,84	0,69	25.986	27,76	1
25.657	23,84	0,69	26.082	11,58	0,23
25.657	23,84	0,69	26.084	11,38	0,22
25.658	23,84	0,69			
25.659	23,84	0,69			
25.660	9,52	0,10			
25.660	9,52	0,10			
25.706	9,52	0,10			
25.706	9,52	0,10			
25.707	9,52	0,10			
25.707	9,52	0,10			
25.708	23,74	0,69			
25.709	23,74	0,69			
25.756	23,74	0,69			
25.756	23,74	0,69			
25.757	27,86	0,85			
25.758	27,86	0,85			
25.758	9,52	0,1			
25.759	9,52	0,1			
25.760	9,52	0,1			
25.804	7,06	0			
25.805	7,06	0			
25.805	7,06	0			
25.806	7,06	0			

TABLE III
SYNCHRONISATION PROBLEM, FALL 1 AND FALL 2

The acceleration values show that in less than 250 milliseconds there are more than 30 values from "fall 1", and in more than 350 milliseconds there are 12 values from "fall 2". There is a lack of synchronisation not only in the amount of data, but also in the time.

- Some sensors transmit more data than the others, i.e. the sensors are not sending the same amount of data, even sometimes there is no data. The four sensors were

Fig. 11. Synchronisation problem; comparison of acceleration values during two FAW falls.

working while the FAW fall-simulation, but the obtained acceleration values were from three of them, one of the sensor did not transmit data in one moment of the simulation, see Figure 12.


Fig. 12. Synchronisation problem; acceleration values from the four sensors during a FAW fall.

If we focus our attention to the hardware, the duration of the battery is also something to improve. Nowadays the duration of the battery is around 2 or 3 weeks, it depends on its use. If we want to use this IoT system with patients, specially with elderly people, or people that need special treatment, we have to increase the duration of the battery in order to change it as little as possible.

The analysis has revealed that while we were studying the acceleration data tests, some of its values could be misinterpreted. This is because the test person that is falling for the simulation, stands up very fast. Given that we have been cautious in our analysis and we have been checking not only the values but also the videos and matching them, we have detected this issue. So, in our future tests, the test person should wait at least 2 seconds laying on the floor after the fall for a better fall simulation. In a real situation, if a person falls and stands up this means that the person is conscious and is able to move and call to the emergency services, if it is necessary. On the contrary, if the person falls and does not stand up this means that maybe the person is unconscious or is not able to move and call the emergency services. Therefore, waiting at least 2 seconds between falls in our test scenarios,

it will help not only to understand better the behaviour of the acceleration values but also to do a better fall-simulation.

Comparing the measured values of the fall-events (forward fall, fall against wall and rolling out of bed) of the two prototypes, it can be determined that the measured impact values of the first prototype are considerably higher than those of the improved solution. This difference is caused by multiple reasons. The main reason is the different experimental set-up of the first prototype and the improved solution. The hardware design of the first prototype is bulky compared to the improved one. Due to the bulky construction the sensor nodes are more exposed to vibrations and shocks, which results in higher impact values. Additionally, the sensor nodes shifted during the fall. The result was that the test person repositioned the sensor nodes which leads to influence the impact value (acceleration magnitude). Taking this aspect into consideration, a smaller microcontroller platform, which was described in VI, was used to solve this problem. Despite the design differences in the two prototypes, we are able to compare fall-types.

VII. Conclusions and Future Work

The generated events using IoT-TEG [8], [9] follow the behaviour of the analysed falls: RBF and FAW. The implemented functionality allows to generate events by defining rules which describe a desired behaviour. We can assign behaviour rules as many event attributes as the event type contains, and the values of each event attribute will follow the assigned behaviour. The introduced functionality of IoT-TEG is able to adapt to the behaviour of the analysed event attribute, because it was developed as a tool to generate test events for any system which manages events and needs to be tested.

According to the falls, we have detected the necessity to define the EPL query for each fall-type in the literature; this will help to identify a fall from a no-fall. Moreover, it will be interesting to add different types of sensors such as an air pressure sensor, and medical data such as ECG, in order to identify and characterise the falls.

The main future work is to improve the IoT-TEG [8], [9] tool in order to generate faithful test events which simulate the relevant situations that need to be filtered and, sometimes, are very difficult to imitate: adverse environment conditions, rise or fall in blood pressure, heart attack, falls... IoT-TEG is a tool under development, so more functionalities will be added to cover the test necessities. In order to improve IoT-TEG, more real events will be analysed which let us know the real situations and behaviour of the events.

The introduced IoT-TEG functionality will be improved with a new property. This property will allow to generate values which follow behaviour rules but depends from another event attribute value. IoT-TEG has the option to generate dependent values thanks to the `dependence` property. This property generates the event attribute value according to a fixed value; so we will extend the tool with the option to define a dependence rule between event attributes.

To generate test events, reliable data transmission of all four sensor nodes (S1-S4) must be guaranteed. As described

in the Section VI-C the synchronisation problem can lead to data loss during data transmission and thus influences the analysis of falls (see Table III). For this reason, the use of a real-time system based microcontroller platform is planned, which facilitates the synchronisation of the sensor nodes using a priority-controlled task scheduler. In addition, the battery lifespan should be extended and the hardware design of the prototype should be as small as possible so that patients are not restricted in their movements.

After studying the work of Jämsä et al. [24] we are going to include in our future work the analysis of the different postures after the fall.

Fall-detection systems are safety critical. Therefore, new developments will include hazard analysis methods to satisfy safety standards, i.e. IEC61508, IEC60601, etc.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

[1] G. Varnaccia, *Das Unfallgeschehen bei Erwachsenen in Deutschland: Ergebnisse des Unfallmoduls der Befragung Gesundheit in Deutschland aktuell 2010*, ser. Beiträge zur Gesundheitsberichterstattung des Bundes. Robert-Koch-Institut, 2013.

[2] N. Schott and A.-K. Kurz, "Stürze bei älteren Erwachsenen: Risikofaktoren – Assessment – Prävention: Ein Review," *Zeitschrift für Sportpsychologie*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 45–62, 2008.

[3] APA-OTS, "Eu fördert Fallwatch, ein Erkennungssystem, das Senioren nach Stürzen schneller hilft," https://goo.gl/51o8X3, 2013.

[4] Monks - Ärzte im Netz GmbH, "Demenzkranke stürzen besonders häufig," https://goo.gl/rdkfL2.

[5] L. La Blunda and M. Wagner, "Fall-detection belt based on body area networks," in *Proceedings of Biotelemetry XXI (ISOB conference)*. Leuven (Belgium): Faculteit Ingenieurswetenschappen KU Leuven, 2016, vol. 1, pp. 21–24.

[6] ——, "The usage of body area networks for fall-detection," in *Proceedings of the eleventh International Network Conference (INC 2016)*. Frankfurt am Main: Alekseev, S. and Dowland, P. S. and Ghita, B. and Schneider, O., 2016, pp. 159–163.

[7] EsperTech, "Espertech website," http://www.espertech.com/esper/index.php, 2018.

[8] L. Gutiérrez-Madroñal, "Generación automática de casos en procesamiento de eventos con epl - authomatic generation of cases in event processing using epl," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cadiz, 2017.

[9] L. Gutiérrez-Madroñal, I. Medina-Bulo, and J. Domínguez-Jiménez, "IoTTEG: Test event generator system," *Journal of Systems and Software*, 2017.

[10] M. A. Dobbs, S. Frixione, E. Laenen, K. Tollefson, H. Baer, E. Boos, B. Cox, R. Engel, W. Giele, J. Huston *et al.*, "Les houches guidebook to monte carlo generators for hadron collider physics," *arXiv preprint hep-ph/0403045*, 2004.

[11] M. L. Mangano and T. J. Stelzer, "Tools for the simulation of hard hadronic collisions," *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, vol. 55, pp. 555–588, 2005.

[12] K. Grzegorczyk, V. Baggiolini, and K. Zieliski, "Complex event processing approach to automated monitoring of particle accelerator and its control system," *Computer Science*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. 351, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://journals.agh.edu.pl/csci/article/view/1007

[13] IoT-Analytics, "White paper - iot platforms - the central backbone for the internet of things," https://iot-analytics.com/5-things-know-about-iot-platform/, 11-2015.

[14] Micro_Research_Finland_Oy, "Event generator," http://www.mrf.fi/index.php, 2016.

[15] Starcom_Systems, "The event generator," https://www.starcomsystems.com, 2016.

[16] Oracle, "Introducing the weblogic integration administration console," https://docs.oracle.com, 2016.

[17] Q. Li, J. A. Stankovic, M. A. Hanson, A. T. Barth, J. Lach, and G. Zhou, *Accurate, Fast Fall Detection Using Gyroscopes and Accelerometer-Derived Posture Information*. In Wearable and Implantable Body Sensor Networks, 2009. BSN 2009. Sixth International Workshop on (pp. 138-143): IEEE, 2009.

[18] H. Gjoreski, A. Rashkovska, S. Kozina, M. Lustrek, and M. Gams, "Telehealth using ecg sensor and accelerometer," in *2014 37th International Convention on Information and Communication Technology, Electronics and Microelectronics (MIPRO)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 270–274.

[19] S. Kozina, H. Gjoreski, M. Gams, and M. Luštrek, "Efficient activity recognition and fall detection using accelerometers," in *International Competition on Evaluating AAL Systems through Competitive Benchmarking*. Springer, 2013, pp. 13–23.

[20] M. Lüder, G. Bieber, and R. Salomon, "Sturzerkennung mittels luftdruck–und beschleunigungssensorik," *Ambient Assisted Living*, vol. 2, pp. 27–01, 2009.

[21] O. Etzion and P. Niblett, *Event Processing in Action*, 1st ed. Greenwich, CT, USA: Manning Publications Co., 2010.

[22] L. Gutiérrez-Madroñal, A. García-Domínguez, and I. Medina-Bulo, "Evolutionary mutation testing for IoT with recorded and generated events," *Software: Practice and Experience*, vol. 0, no. 0, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/spe.2629

[23] Y. Jia and M. Harman, "An analysis and survey of the development of mutation testing," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 649–678, Sept 2011.

[24] T. Jämsä, M. Kangas, I. Vikman, L. Nyberg, and R. Korpelainen, "Fall detection in the older people: From laboratory to real-life," *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences*, vol. 63, no. 3, p. 253, 2014.

[25] L. La Blunda, "Die Sturzerkennung basierend auf Body Area Networks," 2016.

[26] N. Pannurat, S. Thiemjarus, and E. Nantajeewarawat, "Automatic fall monitoring: A review," *Sensors*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 12 900–12 936, 2014.

[27] L. Gutiérrez-Madroñal, "Github repository," https://github.com/lorgut/FallDetectionData, 2018.

[28] A. Collado-Villaverde, M. D. R-Moreno, D. F. Barrero, and D. Rodriguez, "Machine learning approaches to detect elderly people falls using sound," *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: From Theory to Practice*, vol. 10350, 2017.

[29] A. Collado Villaverde, M. R-Moreno, D. Barrero, and D. Rodriguez, *Triaxial Accelerometer Located on the Wrist for Elderly Peoples Fall Detection*. Springer, Cham, 09 2016.

[30] Arduino, "Arduino website," https://www.arduino.cc/en/Guide/ArduinoPrimoCore, 04-29-2018.