JOURNAL ARTICLE EVALUATION

- By Shrimayee Datta RA2111003010555

Title : Anomaly recognition from surveillance videos using 3D convolution neural network

Authors :
- Ramna Maqsood
- Usama Ijaz Bajwa
- Gulshan Saleem
- Rana Hammad Raza
- Muhammad Waqas Anwar

Journal : Springer Science+Business Media, LLC part of Springer Nature 2021

Date : 19 February 2021

Volume : 1

Pages : 24

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The title of the research article "Anomaly recognition from surveillance videos using 3D convolution neural network" does give an indication of the type of study being reported. The title suggests that the study revolves around the recognition of anomalies from surveillance videos using a specific type of neural network architecture, namely 3D convolutional neural network (3D ConvNets).

   The use of the term "recognition" implies that the study is focused on identifying and classifying anomalies within surveillance videos. This suggests that the study is likely descriptive or causal-comparative in nature.

   Descriptive studies aim to describe characteristics or features of a phenomenon, in this case, anomalous activities in surveillance videos. The title indicates that the study aims to describe how anomalies are recognized using a 3D ConvNets approach.

   Causal-comparative studies, on the other hand, compare two or more groups to determine if there is a causal relationship between variables. In this case, the study might compare the effectiveness of 3D ConvNets in recognizing anomalies compared to other methods, or it might compare the recognition performance across different types of anomalies.

2. In the title "Anomaly recognition from surveillance videos using 3D convolution neural network," the independent and dependent variables are not explicitly mentioned. However, we can infer them based on the context of the research topic and the use of terminology.

   I. Independent Variable:
   The independent variable in this study is likely the type of neural network architecture used for anomaly recognition, specifically the 3D convolutional neural network (3D ConvNets). The researchers are exploring how the implementation of this specific neural network architecture affects the recognition of anomalies in surveillance videos. Other independent variables could include any parameters or settings associated with the 3D ConvNets model.

II. Dependent Variable:
The dependent variable in this study is the effectiveness or accuracy of anomaly recognition. The researchers aim to evaluate how well the 3D ConvNets model performs in identifying and classifying anomalies within surveillance videos. The accuracy of anomaly detection, measured in terms of AUC (Area Under the Curve) or other performance metrics, would be the dependent variable of interest.

While the title does not explicitly state the independent and dependent variables, the research topic and focus on anomaly recognition using a specific neural network architecture imply the presence of these variables within the study..

3. In the provided excerpt from the article, specific statistical tools or methods are not explicitly mentioned. However, the article primarily discusses the methodology and approaches used in anomaly recognition from surveillance videos, focusing on deep learning techniques, particularly 3D convolutional neural networks (3D ConvNets).

   While statistical analysis may not be the central focus of this research, the evaluation of the proposed approach's performance typically involves the use of metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, F1 score, or area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC-ROC). These metrics assess the effectiveness of the anomaly recognition model in classifying anomalous events accurately.

   Furthermore, the article may discuss any preprocessing techniques, data augmentation methods, or model evaluation strategies, which could indirectly involve statistical analysis or machine learning algorithms.

B. ANALYZING THE VARIABLES

The independent variable in the study described is the type of neural network architecture used for anomaly recognition, specifically the 3D convolutional neural network (3D ConvNets). This variable represents the methodological approach or technique chosen by the researchers to perform anomaly recognition from surveillance videos.

In terms of the nature of the measurements:

1. The type of neural network architecture (3D ConvNets) is a categorical variable, falling under the nominal scale of measurement. It represents different methods or approaches to performing anomaly recognition.

2. The implementation of the 3D ConvNets model could be considered a discrete variable, as it represents a specific choice made by the researchers in the study. However, within the context of the model's parameters, there may be continuous variables involved, such as learning rates or filter sizes, which are not explicitly mentioned in the provided excerpt.

Overall, the independent variable in this study is categorical (specifically nominal) and discrete, representing the choice of using 3D ConvNets for anomaly recognition.

C. HYPOTHESES

1. The article does not explicitly mention any hypotheses. Instead, it primarily focuses on describing the research problem, the methodology used (utilizing 3D Convolutional Neural Networks for anomaly recognition), and the contributions of the study.

   While hypotheses are a common component of research studies, especially in experimental or hypothesis-testing research designs, they may not always be explicitly stated in descriptive or exploratory studies. In this case, the article appears to present a descriptive study aimed at addressing the challenge of anomaly recognition from surveillance videos using deep learning techniques, particularly 3D ConvNets.

   Based on the provided paper, the focus seems to be more on describing the methodology, findings, and contributions rather than on testing specific hypotheses.

2. Based on the provided excerpt, the article does not explicitly state any hypotheses. However, we can infer potential hypotheses based on the context of the research problem and the objectives outlined in the text.

   A possible hypothesis for the study could be:

   Alternative Hypothesis (H1):
   Implementing a 3D convolutional neural network (3D ConvNets) for anomaly recognition from surveillance videos will result in higher accuracy compared to other methods.

   Null Hypothesis (H0):
   There is no significant difference in accuracy between implementing a 3D ConvNets model and other methods for anomaly recognition from surveillance videos.

   This hypothesis assumes that the researchers are testing the effectiveness of using 3D ConvNets for anomaly recognition compared to alternative methods. The alternative hypothesis suggests that there will be a significant difference in accuracy favoring the 3D ConvNets approach, while the null hypothesis posits that there will be no significant difference.

   Whether these hypotheses are appropriate for the study depends on the research objectives and the methodology employed. If the study aims to compare the performance of 3D ConvNets with other methods for anomaly recognition, then these hypotheses would be relevant.

3. Based on the provided excerpt, the authors did not specify a specific alpha risk level for rejecting the null hypothesis. The excerpt primarily focuses on describing the research problem, methodology, and contributions, without delving into specific details about hypothesis testing or statistical significance.

   In hypothesis testing, the alpha risk level (α) represents the probability of incorrectly rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true. Commonly used alpha levels include 0.05 (5%) and 0.01 (1%). Without explicit mention of the alpha level in the excerpt, we cannot determine the specific value chosen by the authors.

   In the absence of a specified alpha level, it's reasonable to assume that a conventional value such as $\alpha = 0.05$ might have been used, as it is a common choice in many research studies. However, it's also possible that the authors might have chosen a different alpha level based on the specific requirements of their study or statistical conventions in their field.

D. SAMPLE

To determine whether the sample size was large enough, we would typically consider several factors:

1. Statistical Power: Statistical power refers to the likelihood of detecting a true effect if it exists. A larger sample size generally increases statistical power, allowing for a better chance of identifying significant results if they are present in the population.

2. Effect Size: The magnitude of the effect being studied also influences sample size requirements. Larger effects can be detected with smaller sample sizes, whereas smaller effects may require larger samples to detect with sufficient power.

3. Variability: The variability or spread of the data affects sample size calculations. Greater variability typically necessitates larger sample sizes to achieve the same level of precision in estimating population parameters.

4. Desired Confidence Level and Margin of Error: The desired level of confidence in the study results and the acceptable margin of error also play a role in determining sample size. Higher confidence levels and smaller margins of error require larger sample sizes.

Without specific values for (N) (sample size) and the standard deviation, it's challenging to compute the standard error of the mean or determine the critical region for rejecting the null hypothesis. However, generally speaking, a larger sample size is desirable as it tends to improve the reliability and generalizability of study findings.

The critical region for rejecting the null hypothesis would depend on the specific statistical test being conducted and the chosen significance level (usually denoted by (alpha)). Common significance levels include (alpha = 0.05) or (alpha = 0.01), indicating a 5% or 1% chance of rejecting the null hypothesis when it's actually true, respectively. The critical region is determined based on the chosen significance level and the distribution of the test statistic under the null hypothesis.

In summary, while the specific values needed to compute the standard error of the mean and determine the critical region are not provided, we can generally conclude that larger sample sizes are preferable for enhancing the reliability and robustness of study findings.

E. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Without specific details on the statistical analysis performed in the study, it's challenging to determine whether appropriate statistical tools were used. However, I can provide some general considerations:

   A. Homogeneity of Variance Test (F-Max Test):
   - The homogeneity of variance assumption, also known as homoscedasticity, is often important in statistical analysis, especially for ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and linear regression.

   - The F-Max test, also known as Levene's test, is commonly used to assess whether the variances of the dependent variable are equal across different groups or conditions.

   - To perform Levene's test, you would typically calculate the absolute deviations of each observation from the group mean, then perform an ANOVA on these deviations, and finally test whether the variance of the deviations differs significantly across groups.

B. Nature of Measurement for Variables:

- The nature of measurement for both independent and dependent variables can influence the choice of statistical tools.

- If the independent variable is categorical and the dependent variable is continuous, ANOVA or regression analysis might be appropriate.

- If both variables are categorical, techniques like chi-square test or logistic regression could be suitable.

- For continuous variables, correlation analysis or linear regression might be applicable.

- The number of independent and dependent variables and their relationships with each other could also suggest the type of statistical tool to be used. For example, if there are multiple independent variables and a continuous dependent variable, multiple regression analysis could be appropriate.

2. **A. Use of Graphic Charts:**

- Graphic charts can be instrumental in visually representing data and conveying results in a clear and concise manner.

- If graphic charts were used in the study, their helpfulness in showing the results would depend on various factors such as the complexity of the data, the clarity of the visualization, and how well they align with the research questions and hypotheses.

- Bar graphs, histograms, line graphs, and scatter plots are commonly used to represent different types of data and relationships between variables.

B. Constructing Graphic Charts:

- Let's consider constructing a bar graph based on the reported data provided in the text:

- We have statistics on the spatially augmented UCF Crime Dataset, including the number of videos for anomalous and normal classes. Let's use this data to create a bar graph.
  - Data:
  - Anomalous Videos: 1040
  - Normal Videos: 80

- Bar Graph:

  X-axis: Video Class (Anomalous, Normal)

  Y-axis: Number of Videos

  Bar 1: Anomalous Videos (Height: 1040)

  Bar 2: Normal Videos (Height: 80)

- The bar graph visually represents the stark difference in the number of anomalous videos compared to normal videos, providing a clear overview of the dataset composition.

Constructing visualizations directly from the reported data helps in understanding the data distribution and facilitates interpretation of results, even if they were not originally presented in graphical form.

3. Relating the results to the hypotheses is a critical aspect of research analysis and interpretation. It helps to determine whether the observed outcomes support or refute the proposed hypotheses and provides insights into the validity of the study's theoretical framework.

   To assess if the investigator relates the results to the hypotheses, we would look for clear connections between the findings and the specific hypotheses outlined in the study. This might involve:

   I. Stating the hypotheses explicitly: The investigator should clearly state the hypotheses at the beginning of the study to provide a framework for interpreting the results.

   II. Analyzing the results in light of the hypotheses: After presenting the findings, the investigator should discuss how the results align with or diverge from the expected outcomes posited by the hypotheses.

   III. Drawing conclusions based on hypothesis testing: The investigator should draw conclusions based on whether the data support or reject the hypotheses. This involves discussing the implications of the findings in relation to the original research questions and theoretical framework.

   IV. Addressing unexpected results: If the results deviate from the expected outcomes, the investigator should provide possible explanations and discuss how these unexpected findings might inform future research or modify existing theories.

   V. Considering limitations and alternative interpretations: It's essential for the investigator to acknowledge any limitations of the study and consider alternative interpretations of the results that may not fully align with the initial hypotheses.

   By evaluating these aspects, we can determine whether the investigator effectively relates the results to the hypotheses and provides a comprehensive analysis of the study findings.

4. Determining whether the investigator over-concludes, meaning drawing conclusions beyond what the data actually support, requires a careful examination of the study's findings and the strength of the evidence presented. Here's how we can assess if the conclusions are supported by the data:

   I. Consistency with results: Are the conclusions consistent with the patterns observed in the data? If the conclusions align with the data and are supported by the findings presented, it suggests that the investigator is not over-concluding.

   II. Limitations acknowledgment: Does the investigator acknowledge the limitations of the study and potential factors that might influence the conclusions? Recognizing the study's limitations demonstrates a balanced interpretation of the results and helps to avoid over-concluding.

   III. Alternative explanations: Has the investigator considered alternative explanations for the findings? Exploring alternative interpretations indicates a thorough analysis of the data and guards against prematurely drawing unwarranted conclusions.

   IV. Generalizability: Does the investigator appropriately discuss the generalizability of the findings? If the conclusions are cautiously framed within the context of the study's scope and population, it indicates a responsible approach to drawing conclusions.

   V. Avoidance of speculative claims: Are the conclusions grounded in empirical evidence, or do they rely on speculative claims? Conclusions should be based on the data presented rather than on unfounded assumptions or speculations.

   By examining these aspects, we can assess whether the investigator has appropriately drawn conclusions supported by the data or if there is evidence of over-conclusion. It's important for researchers to strike a balance between interpreting the findings and acknowledging the limitations inherent in any study.