1. Baseline Setup & Motivation

1.1 Dataset Overview

- Each gesture video is 30 frames, classified into one of 5 categories (Thumbs Up, Thumbs Down, Left Swipe, Right Swipe, Stop).
- Goal: Build a model that classifies these gestures accurately while balancing model size (for real-time inference on smart TVs).

1.2 Initial Architecture

- CNN + RNN approach:
 - o TimeDistributed Convolutional layers to extract spatial features from each frame.
 - A GRU layer to capture temporal sequences across frames.
 - o Final Dense layers for classification into 5 classes.

1.3 Early Results

- We started with two conv layers (16, 32 filters), stride or pooling for downsampling, and GRU(32).
- Initial metrics were ~60-70% training accuracy and ~45-50% validation accuracy, indicating underfitting and some overfitting signs.

2. Preprocessing & Data Handling

2.1 Frame Selection

. Instead of using all 30 frames, we typically sampled 15 frames (every other frame) to reduce computational load.

2.2 Cropping & Resizing

- Experiment: Cropping out unnecessary borders or background. Moderate cropping helped if gestures were centered, but we had to avoid losing key motion on the edges.
- Resize:
 - Switched to 64×64 frames (down from 100×100) to reduce GPU memory usage and speed up training.
 - $\bullet \quad \text{Adjusted pooling steps accordingly (two } \quad \text{MaxPooling2D(2x2)} \quad \text{layers => final flattened dimension } \sim 8192).$

2.3 Normalization

• Simple division by 255.0 to get pixel values in [0,1]. This kept the CNN stable during training.

2.4 Custom Generator

- Reads subfolders for each video, loads frames, applies preprocessing, then yields (batch_data, batch_labels).
- Shuffles data each epoch and can handle leftover samples.

3. Model Evolution & Experiments

3.1 Adding a Third Convolutional Layer

- Reason: Deeper CNN might capture richer spatial features.
- Observation: Training accuracy improved by ~5%, validation by ~3%. Some risk of additional overfitting if not combined with dropout.

3.2 Filter Sizes & GRU Units

- Tried (8,16), (16,32), (16,32,64) for conv filters. Larger filters improved training accuracy but needed more regularization.
- GRU: We tested 16 vs. 32 units. 32 gave ~2-4% better validation accuracy while doubling the parameter count.

3.3 Regularization

- Dropout: Inserted after Flatten, inside the GRU (dropout=0.2, recurrent_dropout=0.2), and sometimes after a Dense(64) layer. Helped reduce overfitting by ~5-7% in the training-validation accuracy gap.
- EarlyStopping & ReduceLROnPlateau:
 - EarlyStopping (patience=10) prevented unnecessary epochs once the model began to overfit.
 - ReduceLROnPlateau (patience=5, factor=0.1) helped find a smaller learning rate if the validation loss stagnated.

3.4 Data Augmentation

• Explored simple horizontal flips, slight random cropping, and brightness shifts. Some gestures (e.g., Left vs. Right Swipe) might be sensitive to flips, so

4. Final Results & Observations

- 1. Training Accuracy: ~97.43%
 - The model is almost perfect on the training set, with a low training loss of 0.1162.
- 2. Validation Accuracy: ~80%
 - The validation accuracy is good but shows a gap of ~17% compared to the training set.
 - Validation Loss: 0.7871—significantly higher than the training loss, reflecting overfitting.
- 3. Learning Rate: 0.001
 - · A standard starting rate for Adam. With such a high training accuracy, the limiting factor is generalization rather than convergence speed.

Interpretation:

• The large gap between training (97.43%) and validation (80%) indicates the model is **overfitting**. Even though we introduced dropout and used EarlyStopping, the network has learned the training set extremely well and doesn't generalize as strongly as we'd like.

Potential Next Steps

- 1. Increase Regularization:
 - Add more dropout, or raise dropout rates (e.g., 0.3).
 - Explore L2 weight decay on convolution and GRU layers.
- 2. Refine Data Augmentation:
 - o More varied transforms (random zoom, shifts, or partial rotations) to boost diversity.
- 3. Reduce Model Complexity:
 - If feasible, decrease the number of Conv filters or reduce GRU units from 32 to 16. This might lower training accuracy but could also close the gap by
 preventing memorization.
- 4. Transfer Learning:
 - Use a pretrained CNN (e.g., MobileNet) in TimeDistributed fashion and only fine-tune top layers.

5. Conclusion

Through systematic adjustments-frame resizing, layer additions, dropout, and data augmentation-we achieved:

- ~97.43% on training data
- ~80% on validation data

The model now clearly demonstrates **high capacity** but also **overfitting**. Future efforts will focus on **improving generalization** via stronger regularization or transfer learning while maintaining real-time performance on embedded hardware.