



UNIVERSITAT  
ROVIRA i VIRGILI

ARTIFICIAL VISION AND  
PATTERN RECOGNITION

## Lab Assignment 2

**Student:**

*Giorgio Rossi*

December 1, 2020

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Implementation of the Algorithm</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Algorithm phases . . . . .	2
2.2	Input . . . . .	3
2.3	Output . . . . .	3
<b>3</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Metrics . . . . .	3
3.2	LBP1 Test . . . . .	3
3.3	LBP2 Test . . . . .	4
3.4	HOG1 Test . . . . .	4
3.5	HOG2 Test . . . . .	4
3.6	LBP2 & HOG1 Test . . . . .	4
3.7	LBP2 & HOG2 Test . . . . .	4
3.8	Final Considerations . . . . .	4

## 1 Introduction

I have collected all the material related to this laboratory, code, paper and report on a Github repo, available at [jeorjebot/action\\_recognition\\_urv](https://github.com/jeorjebot/action_recognition_urv).

The algorithm is coded on a [Matlab Live Script](#), same as the previous assignment, in order to visualize better the output and have a nice GUI.

## 2 Implementation of the Algorithm

### 2.1 Algorithm phases

I have implemented the four phases described in the assignment, plus some other phases useful to the functioning of my algorithm. All the phases are the following:

1. **Struct Creation phase**, that takes in input a proper directory of the dataset, such as `TrainSet` or `TestSet`, and creates a structure with useful informations for the other phases, such as for each image the class and the path. This phase is coded in the `create_struct` MatLab function and it is computed on the train set and the test set.
2. **Preprocessing phase**, in which the images are smoothed, resized (256x256) and the illumination is normalized with the Histogram Equalization (HE) [1] technique. I personally have skipped the smooth step since without smooth I have achieved better results. This phase is coded in the `preprocessing` and `preprocess_image` functions.
3. **Features Extraction phase**, on which the HOG [2] and LBP [3] features are extracted from each image.

I wanted to achieve similar dimensions from the LBP and HOG features extracted from each images, and since with the default parameters the HOG features have a dimensionality of **approx. 35000**, so I have modified the parameters of the LBP extraction method to achieve a similar dimensionality. In fact I have set the `CellSize` parameter to 32, and increased `NumNeighbors` and `Radius`, to encode more details.

4. **SVM Training phase**, on which I have trained the SVM classifier. I have tried firstly a training only with LBP features, then only with HOG features, and then with the concatenation of LBP and HOG features. I have used the `fitcecoc` function provided by MatLab.
5. **SVM Prediction phase**, on which I have predicted the class of the test set using the SVM trained in the previous phase. Accordingly to what I have written before, I have experimented firstly with only LBP features, then only with HOG features, and then with the concatenation of LBP and HOG features. I have used the `predict` function provided by MatLab.

6. **Metrics Computation phase**, on which the algorithm compute some metrics from the Confusion Matrix, such as the number of **correct classified and misclassified**, **accuracy**, **precision**, **sensitivity**, **specificity** and **F1 score**, for each class and for the overall prediction (using the mean due to the homogeneous number of test images for each class). This phase is coded in the `print_results` and the `compute_misclassified` functions.

## 2.2 Input

The algorithm requires no input, but needs to be placed in the same directory of the `Dataset` directory. So for starting the algorithm we have to create a directory and put inside the `Dataset` folder (with the two sets `TrainSet` and `TestSet`) and the MatLab (Live) Script `Action_Recognition.mlx`.

## 2.3 Output

The algorithm creates a `Preprocessed` directory with the images obtained from the Preprocessing phase, and gives in output the figure of the Confusion Matrix, a table with the metrics for each class and the metrics for the overall prediction.

# 3 Results

## 3.1 Metrics

I have reported in this table the 6 tests that I have conducted on my algorithm. The metrics are **correct classified**, **misclassified**, **accuracy**, **precision**, **sensitivity**, **specificity** and **F1 score**.

	+	-	Acc	Prec	Sens	Spec	F1
<b>LBP1</b>	27.14	72.85	79.18	27.46	27.14	87.85	0.266
<b>LBP2</b>	35	65	81.42	36.78	35	89.16	0.347
<b>HOG1</b>	38.57	61.42	82.44	38.59	38.57	89.76	0.380
<b>HOG2</b>	36.42	63.57	81.83	36.43	36.42	89.40	0.361
<b>LBP2 &amp; HOG1</b>	39.28	60.71	82.65	39.61	39.28	89.88	0.389
<b>LBP2 &amp; HOG2</b>	41.42	58.57	83.26	42.65	41.42	90.23	0.416

## 3.2 LBP1 Test

In this test I have used the default parameters of the `extractLBPFeatures` function. For each image I have obtained an array of **59** features and I have used only this features to train and test the SVM.

### 3.3 LBP2 Test

In this test I have changed the default parameters of the `extractLBPFeatures` function, setting `CellSize` to 16, `NumNeighbors` to 12, `Radius` to 3. For each image I have obtained an array of **34560** features and I have used only this features to train and test the SVM.

### 3.4 HOG1 Test

In this test I have used the default parameters of the `extractHOGFeatures` function. For each image I have obtained an array of **34596** features and I have used only this features to train and test the SVM.

### 3.5 HOG2 Test

In this test I have changed the default parameters of the `extractHOGFeatures` function, setting `CellSize` to 12. For each image I have obtained an array of **14459** features and I have used only this features to train and test the SVM.

### 3.6 LBP2 & HOG1 Test

In this test I have **concatenated** the features obtained in the **LBP2 Test** and **HOG1 Test** for the training and testing of the SVM. I have combined the two features since the dimension of each array of feature was similar.

### 3.7 LBP2 & HOG2 Test

In this test I have **concatenated** the features obtained in the **LBP2 Test** and **HOG2 Test** for the training and testing of the SVM. There are more LBP features than HOG features ( the ratio is 0.4) but the resulting metrics are better!

### 3.8 Final Considerations

Further changes to the parameters did not change the results, so the best results are achieved by the LBP2 & HOG2 Test.

I have calculated the metrics with the following formulas:

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN} \quad (1)$$

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (2)$$

$$Sensitivity = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (3)$$

1	12	4	4				
2	2	4	4	3		4	3
3	4	4	8	2		1	1
4		4	1	9	2	2	2
5			2	3	9	2	4
6		1		5	1	9	4
7	1	1		3	2	6	7
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Predicted Class

Figure 1: The Confusion Matrix of the final test

$$Sensitivity = \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \quad (4)$$

$$F1 - score = \frac{2TP}{2TP + FP + FN} \quad (5)$$

Where **TP** is **True Positive**, **TN** is **True Negative**, **FP** is **False Positive** and **FN** is **False Negative**.

## References

- [1] *Histogram Equalization*. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Histogram\\_equalization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Histogram_equalization).
- [2] *Histogram of Oriented Gradients - HOG*. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Histogram\\_of\\_oriented\\_gradients](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Histogram_of_oriented_gradients).
- [3] *Local Binary Patterns - LBP*. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Local\\_binary\\_patterns](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Local_binary_patterns).