Mini-Project (ML for Time Series) - MVA 2023/2024

Esteban Christiann mailto:esteban.christiann@ens-paris-saclay.fr
Alexi Canesse mailto:alexi.canesse@ens-lyon.fr

January 9, 2024

What is expected for these mini-projects? The goal of the exercise is to read (and understand) a research article, implement it (or find an implementation), test it on real data and comment on the results obtained. Depending on the articles, the task will not always be the same: some articles are more theoretical or complex, others are in the direct line of the course, etc... It is therefore important to balance the exercise according to the article. For example, if you have reused an existing implementation, it is obvious that you will have to develop in a more detailed way the analysis of the results, the influence of the parameters etc... Do not hesitate to contact us by email if you wish to be guided.

The report The report must be at most FIVE pages and use this template (excluding references). If needed, additional images and tables can be put in Appendix, but must be discussed in the main document. The report must contain a precise description of the work done, a description of the method, and the results of your tests. Please do not include source code! The report must clearly show the elements that you have done yourself and those that you have reused only, as well as the distribution of tasks within the team (see detailed plan below.)

The source code In addition to this report, you will have to send us a Python notebook allowing to launch the code and to test it on data. For the data, you can find it on standard sites like Kaggle, or the site https://timeseriesclassification.com/ which contains a lot of signals!

The oral presentations They will last 10 minutes followed by 5 minutes of questions. The plan of the defense is the same as the one of the report: presentation of the work done, description of the method and analysis of the results.

Deadlines Two sessions will be available :

- **Session 1**
  - Deadline for report: December 18th (23:59)
  - Oral presentations: December 20th and 22th (precise times TBA)
- **Session 2**
  - Deadline for report: January 9th (23:59)
  - Oral presentations: January, 11th and 12th (precise times TBA)

1 Introduction and contributions

The Introduction section (indicative length : less than 1 page) should detail the scientific context of the article you chose, as well as the task that you want to solve (especially if you apply it on novel data). **The last paragraph of the introduction must contain the following information**:

- Repartition of work between the two students

  Esteban : Inpainting, outlier detection and ringing removal.
  Alexi : Detrending, rereferencing, step removal.

- Use of available source code or not, percentage of the source code that has been reused, etc.

  The source code available is in matlab. This is a shitty language and releasing a paper with only a matlab implementation is equalivalent to not releasing source code. Furthermore, it was poorly written and unreadable without any damn documentation. We only looked at the code to get the details missing in the paper because the paper lacks details. (freaking learn to write dammit). AND FOR GOD'S SAKE $d(t) \neq d$. Writting things like $d(t)/std(d(t))$ makes you look like a five years old.

- Use of existing experiments or new experiments (e.g. test of the influence of parameter that was not conducted in the original article, application of the method on a novel task/data set etc.)

  TODO

- Improvement on the original method (e.g. new pre/post processing steps, grid search for optimal parameters etc.)

  TODO

2 Method

The Method section (indicative length : 1 to 2 pages) should describe the mathematical aspects of the method in a summarized manner. Only the main steps that are useful for understanding should be highlighted. If relevant, some details on implementation can be provided (but only marginally).

A subsection for each method. Short paragraph to introduce it and then pseudo code + one small figure as exemple. We each do the methods we implemented.

2.1 Robust detrending

```
detrending(signal):
    weights = [1, 1, ..., 1] # weights for outlier detection (0 means outlier)
    iterrate n_iter times:
```

```
        projected_signal = fit_to_basis_using_weights(signal, weights)
        error_on_projection = abs(signal - projected_signal)
        for t in len(signal):
            if error_on_projection[t]/std(error_on_projection) > threshold:
                weights[t] = 0
            else:
                weights[t] = 1
    return signal - fitted_signal # detrended signal
```

2.2 Inpainting

2.3 Outlier detection

2.4 Robust rereferencing

```
rereferencing(signal):
    weights = 1 - outlier_detection(signal) # 1 : valid data / 0 : outlier
    weighted_mean = mean_using_weights(signal, weights)
    return signal - weighted_mean
```

2.5 Step removal

```
# Recursively look for steps in the signal
step_detection(signal, depth)
    ∀(t,T) M[t][T] = mean(x[t:T+1])
    ∀(t,T) V[t][T] = $\sum_{i=t}^{T}(x_i - M_t^T)^2$

    t0 = argmin(V[1][t] + V[t][T], t) # most likely position to be a step
    if not(is_step(signal, t0)): # Check if t0 is indeed the position of a step
        return [] # no steps

    # Check for steps on both sides of t0
    steps_left = step_detection(signal[:t0], depth - 1)
    steps_right = t0 + step_detection(signal[t0:], depth - 1) # + t0 because signal si shifted

    return concatenate(steps_left, [t0], steps_right)

step_removal(signal, depth):
    steps = step_detection(signal, depth)

    for step in steps:
        signal[steps:] -= difference_mean_before_and_after_step(signal, step)

    return signal # Without steps
```

2.6 Ringing removal

3 Data

MEG and EEG data are medical recordings which make them a scare ressource. They should also be shared with great care. We used data from [Lit16], the same data as the one used in the original article. The protocol used to record these MEG signals are described in [Osw+16]. The recordings we used are from "phantom090715_BrainampDBS_20150709_07.ds" because this dataset is described as being the most realistic.

The data is sampled at 2,400Hz. Each recording is 4 minutes long and contains 303 channels. Channels are correlated.

We did not pre-process our data as the algorithms we use are the main steps of pre-processing. Only denoising is not presented in the methods here. We did not applied any denoising because denoising should be applied *after* the application of the methods presented in the article. Indeed, artefacts could greatly impact denoising. Furthermore, MEG data is complicated and we do not understand the field enough to even know when we would remove actual data. The authors of the recording implemented two sensor-level denoising methods. They first used S3P-a technique based on eigenvalue decomposition of the complex cross-spectral density matrix (this technique is similar to SSA studied in the lectures); the second is pTSSS which defines subspaces using singular value decomposition. These successfully removed artefacts related to the stimulation and low level frequencies. However, this did not improved their ability to perform the task of their experiment.

We also manually generated some signals using the sum of a polynomial and white noise on top of which we added an artificial glitch. This was meant to be easy to use and interpret data.

4 Results

The Result section (indicative length : 1 to 2 pages) should display numerical simulations on real data. If you re-used some existing implementations, it is expected that this section develops new experiments that were not present in the original article. Results should be discussed not only based on quantitative scores but also on qualitative aspects. In particular (especially if your article focuses on black box methods), please provide some feedbacks whether the method was adapted to the data or not and whether the hypothesis behind the approach you used were validated or not.

TODO.

References

[Lit16] Vladimir Litvak. "Magnetoencephalography (MEG) recordings from a phantom with Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS) artefacts". In: (Oct. 2016). DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.4042911.v3. URL: https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/phantom090715_BrainampDBS_20150709_01_ds_zip/4042911.

[Osw+16] Ashwini Oswal et al. "Analysis of simultaneous MEG and intracranial LFP recordings during Deep Brain Stimulation: a protocol and experimental validation". In: *Journal of neuroscience methods* 261 (2016), pp. 29–46.