

Poznan University of Technology
Faculty of Computing
Institute of Computing Science

Bachelor's thesis

**GESTURE RECOGNITION LIBRARY FOR LEAP MOTION
CONTROLLER**

Michał Nowicki, 95883
Olgierd Pilarczyk, 100449
Jakub Wąsikowski, 101560
Katarzyna Zjawin, 98826

Supervisor
dr inż. Wojciech Jaśkowski

Poznań, 2014

Tutaj przychodzi karta pracy dyplomowej;
oryginał wstawiamy do wersji dla archiwum PP, w pozostałych kopiach wstawiamy ksero.

Streszczenie

Niniejsza praca jest poświęcona nowym możliwościom zastosowania gestów do interakcji człowieka z komputerem, które pojawiły się wraz z wprowadzeniem na rynek urządzenia Leap Motion. Leap Motion to innowacyjne urządzenie, które udostępnia dane dotyczące pozycji rąk oraz palców w przestrzeni trójwymiarowej z dokładnością do 0,01mm. Rezultatem niniejszej pracy jest przeznaczona dla programistów oraz dedykowana dla kontrolera Leap Motion, biblioteka LeapGesture, która zawiera algorytmy do nauki oraz rozpoznawania gestów. Autorzy pracy zbadali możliwości sensora w zastosowaniu do rozpoznawania układów dloni (gestów statycznych), wykonywanych ruchów ręki (gestów dynamicznych) oraz rozróżniania palców. Statyczne gesty są rozpoznawane za pomocą mechanizmu maszyn wektorów wspierających (SVM) z wykorzystaniem filtracji medianowej danych wejściowych oraz przy wykorzystaniu zależności pomiędzy kolejnymi rozpoznanymi gestami w danym oknie czasowym. Praca zawiera także badania różnych wektorów cech, których wybór ma znaczny wpływ na uzyskiwane rezultaty. Zaproponowane podejście do wybranych cech umożliwiło rozpoznawanie zbioru gestów należących do pięciu klas z dokładnością 99% oraz zbioru gestów należących do dziesięciu klas z dokładnością 85%. Gesty dynamiczne (ruch ręki oraz palców) są rozpoznawane za pomocą ukrytych modeli Markowa (HMM). Przyjęte podejście umożliwiło osiągnięcie 80% skuteczności rozpoznawania gestów dynamicznych należących do sześciu klas. Moduł rozróżniania palców ręki dla badanych zbiorów osiągnął dokładność rozpoznawania wynoszącą 93%. W bibliotece zostały zaimplementowane wyżej wymienione podejścia w języku C++, dzięki czemu biblioteka LeapGesture może być użyta w aplikacji dowolnego typu dla wielu zastosowań.

Abstract

This thesis studies the new possibilities to gesture interfaces that emerged with a Leap Motion sensor. The Leap Motion is an innovative, 3D motion capturing device designed especially for hands and fingers tracking with precision up to 0.01mm. The outcome of the thesis is the LeapGesture library dedicated to the developers for Leap Motion Controller that contains algorithms allowing to learn and recognize gestures. The authors examined the data provided by the sensor in context of recognition of hand poses (static gestures), hand movements (dynamic gestures) and in task of a finger recognition. The static gestures are recognized using the Support Vector Machine (SVM) with median filtering an input data and using the correspondences between consecutive recognitions. The thesis contains evaluation of different feature sets, which have a significant impact on the recognition rate. The chosen feature set allowed to recognize a set of five gestures with 99% accuracy and a set of ten gestures with 85%. The dynamic gestures (movements of a hand and fingers) are recognized with the Hidden Markov Models (HMM). Recognition with HMMs allowed to achieve accuracy of 80% for a set containing six classes of dynamic gestures. Finger recognition algorithms proposed in this thesis works with 93% accuracy on a recorded dataset. The LeapGesture library contains presented approaches using a C++ interface, that can be easily used in any application for many purposes.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Motivation	1
1.2	Objectives	2
1.3	Thesis organization	2
1.4	Contributions	2
2	Introduction to gesture recognition	4
2.1	Taxonomies of gestures proposed in literature	4
2.2	State of the art methods	6
2.2.1	Sensors	6
2.2.2	Gesture representation	7
2.2.3	Gesture recognition methods	8
3	Leap Motion controller	12
3.1	Controller	12
3.2	Data access	13
4	Gesture recognition for Leap Motion	14
4.1	Classification of gestures	14
4.2	Gesture data representation	16
4.3	Preprocessing	16
5	Static Gesture Recognition	18
5.1	Proposed Methods	18
5.2	Evaluation Methodology	20
5.2.1	Assumptions	20
5.2.2	Recorded Datasets	20
5.3	Experiments	22
5.3.1	Evaluation of Feature Sets	22
5.3.2	Preprocessing	23
5.3.3	Postprocessing	24
5.4	Finger recognition	27
5.4.1	Methods	27
5.4.2	Evaluation methodology	28
5.4.3	Features	28
5.5	Experiments	29
6	Detection of dynamic gestures	32

6.1	Proposed methods	32
6.1.1	Hidden Markov Model	32
6.1.2	Forward-Backward Algorithm	33
6.1.3	Viterbi Algorithm	34
6.1.4	Baum-Welch Algorithm	34
6.1.5	Structure of the HMM	34
6.1.6	HMM Observation from Leap Motion Data	35
6.1.7	Total Processing Algorithm	37
6.2	Evaluation Methodology	38
6.3	Experiments	38
6.3.1	Choosing Number of Observation Classes with Machine Learning	38
6.3.2	Choosing Feature Set	40
6.3.3	Choosing Number of Observation Classes	42
6.3.4	Choosing Learning Rate	43
6.3.5	Choosing Number of States in HMM	43
7	LeapGesture library dedicated for Leap Motion controller	45
7.1	Architecture	45
7.1.1	Learning	45
7.1.2	Testing	46
7.1.3	Elements of library	47
7.1.4	Model	48
7.2	Processes	49
7.2.1	The learning process	49
7.2.2	The recognition process	50
7.3	Gesture recorder and visualizer	51
7.3.1	LMR files	51
7.3.2	Visualizer	52
7.3.3	Recorder	53
7.4	External libraries used	54
8	Conclusions	55
	Bibliography	56

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Nowadays, human-computer interaction is mainly based on the pointing or typewriter-style devices. This kind of interaction can limit the natural ways of manipulation using the hands, which may result in a complication of simple tasks. One of the overcomplicated control examples is rotating a three-dimensional object. Using a computer mouse, a user needs to grab the object and rotate it using the mouse, which can only operate in a two-dimensional space. The rotation operation represented by the mouse's movement is unintuitive for humans and users need a few attempts to understand how it works. In the real world, however, the rotation task is natural thus it is simple how to move hands to rotate the object in a desired way.

Therefore, there exists a need for more natural human-computer interfaces. One of the proposed approaches involves hand gestures that are interpreted by a computer. Utilizing hands in a human-computer interface is supported by the fact, that they are even used for non-verbal communication, such as sign or body language. The another advantage of hands is that manipulative tasks performed using hands in real the world could be interpreted as a series of gestures and used as computer input.

The newest sensors provide data that can be successfully used to recognize gestures and therefore control a computer. Currently, there are several devices that yield data useful for the gesture recognition. An example of such a controller is Microsoft Kinect. It provides a three-dimensional point cloud of the observed scene, but was designed for applications that interpret the movement of the whole body of the user. That is why it lacks the needed accuracy for hand gesture recognition.

Another device that is designed to track the movements of a hand and fingers is Leap Motion Controller developed by Leap Motion, Inc. released in July 2013. The Leap Motion is a small device, which can be placed in front of a computer. It features extreme finger detection accuracy up to 0.01 mm. The controller provides information about a position of each finger and a hand detected in the observed space. The SDK attached to the device allows to recognize three pre-defined gestures: a circle motion with one finger, a swipe action and tapping on the virtual keys. The Leap Motion Controller provides information about every detected hand. This device transmits data with frequency up to 100 Hz. Leap Motion Controller is a sensor that can potentially revolutionize the human-computer interactions.

Currently, there exists no library for gesture recognition that supports the data provided by the Leap Motion Controller. This is an important limitation when creating Leap Motion-based applications. Right now, when developers want to create applications utilizing the gesture recognition, they need to operate on low-level, unprocessed data and need to implement the gesture recognition

on their own. This additional work overhead could be minimized using high-level library.

1.2 Objectives

Therefore, the goal of this thesis is to develop the library for gesture recognition dedicated to Leap Motion device, which will help developers to implement applications using gestures as a human-computer interface.

The goal will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:

- to design the library architecture,
- to compare existing methods in the context of hand gesture recognition,
- to select and implement algorithms for gesture recognition,
- to implement additional modules enabling the recording and reviewing of gestures saved in a format supported by the library,
- to create a sample gestures database,
- to perform gesture recognition tests using Leap Motion Controller.

The additional requirement of the library is that the processing should be realized in real time.

The recognition modules are based on Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Hidden Markov Models (HMM). SVM is a supervised learning algorithm, which uses set of hyperplanes for non-linearly division of input vectors to different classes. HMM is an example of an unsupervised learning algorithm, where model tries to find a hidden structure of data using provided training samples. Algorithms used in this thesis belong to a group of machine learning algorithms.

The thesis was developed from October 2013 till January 2014.

1.3 Thesis organization

The thesis is structured in the following manner. Chapter 2 contains an overview of the literature concerning the gesture recognition problem. This part includes descriptions of gestures taxonomies and state of the art methods used for gesture recognition. The presentation of Leap Motion Controller is in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 is devoted to gestures recognizing in the context of Leap Motion Controller. It contains also descriptions of gestures classification, data representations and additional processing steps for hand gestures recognition using the Leap Motion device. The following Chapter 5 describes proposed methods, evaluation methodology and experiments for static gesture recognition. Chapter 6 presents a description of dynamic gesture recognition. Chapter 7 contains a description of the created library — its architecture, processes, modules, dependencies on other open-source libraries, and an example of its usage. Chapter 8 concludes the thesis and provides possible future works.

1.4 Contributions

Michał Nowicki:

- described dynamic gestures (Chapter 6),
- described static gestures (Chapter 5 expect Section 5.4),

- implemented code of processing algorithms for static and dynamic gestures recognition without an integration into the library,
- performed experiments evaluating the static and dynamic gesture recognition.

Olgierd Pilarczyk:

- wrote the description of Leap Motion controller (Chapter 3),
- described data models (Section 4.2), data preprocessing (Section 4.3),
- described library architecture (Section 7.1 expect Subsection 7.1.4, Section 7.4, Section ??),
- implemented preprocessing and integration dynamic gesture module to library.

Jakub Wąsikowski:

- wrote the introduction to gesture recognition (Chapter 2),
- described classification of gestures (Section 4.1) and confusion matrix of static gestures,
- participated in research and definition of gesture classification,
- implemented finger recognition, recorder and vizualizer, model and format of gestures recordings, determining the number of clusters for dynamic gestures, class for cross validation, integration static gesture and finger recognition modules to library.

Katarzyna Zjawin:

- wrote the introduction (Chapter 2),
- described finger recognition (Section 5.4),
- described the data model (Subsection 7.1.4), processes (Section 7.2), recorder and visualizer (Section 7.3),
- participated in research and definition of gesture classification,
- implemented and tested finger recognition,
- implemented recorder and visualizer, model and format of gestures recordings.

Chapter 2

Introduction to gesture recognition

2.1 Taxonomies of gestures proposed in literature

The vast multiplicity of gestures that human can perform makes the number of classes to which we can divide these gestures substantial. Therefore the classification can be performed in different ways, taking into account different characteristics of gestures. The majority of presented theories include the knowledge that originates from a variety of science such as anthropology, linguistics, cognitive science and other. In this Section, review of the most common gesture classifications in Human Computer Interaction (HCI) context is provided. It is focused mainly on gestures that relate to hand and arm movements.

The basic classification of gestures is the division into static and dynamic gestures. Group of static gesture includes fixed gestures which are not take into account the changes in time. Dynamic gestures is group of time varying gestures.

There is also another general division considered by Kammer et al. [24] due to the type of actions activated by the gesture, to online and offline. The first group includes gestures which are processed during performing. It is the group of direct manipulation gestures that provide additional information about dynamics of gesture. They are often used to manipulate objects in space. The second one is the group of action gestures, which are processed at the end of gesture. Most often these are gestures that convey the occurrence of specific meaning.

Karam and schraefel [25] proposed more extensive gesture taxonomy dedicated for Human Computer Interaction. Their classification is based on Quek et al. [36] publication, which provides clarification of gestures taxonomies presented in the past literature. Karam and schraefel defined following gesture classes: deictic, gesticulation, manipulation, semaphores and sign language. In another publication, Aigner et al. [41] presented classification, which are more tailored for hand gesture recognition purposes, drawing on concepts from Karam and Schraefel work. They distinguished five categories of gestures:

- pointing – used to point object or indicate direction. Formally, it involve pointing to establish the identity or spatial location of an object within the context of the application domain [25]. This applies not only to indicate by the index finger, but also by any finger or any number of fingers. It is also independent of finger orientation and curvature, while gesture has a indication meaning. Equivalent to deictic gesture in Karam and Schraefel literature.
- semaphoric – group which consists of gesture posture and dynamics of gesture, which are used to convey specific meanings. Formally, semaphoric approaches may be referred to as “communicative” in that gestures serve as a universe of symbols to be communicated




FIGURE 2.1: The classification of gestures proposed by Aigner et al. [41]

to the machine [36]. Due to the fact that semaphoric are symbolic gestures, their layout can be unrelated to their meaning. Distinguished three semaphoric gesture types of static, dynamic and strokes. The first one concerns specific hand posture, such as thumbs-up meaning approval symbol. Dynamic semaphorics convey their meaning through movement, for example waving of hand to greet somebody. The last one group are similar to dynamic semaphorics gesture, but this represents fast, stroke-like movements, such as swipe gesture.

- iconic – used to demonstrate shape, size, curvature of object or entities. In contrast to the semaphoric gestures, their layout or motion path is strictly related to their meaning. Iconic gestures can be divided into static and dynamic. The former group is performed by hand postures, such as rectangle formed by the thumb and forefingers of both hands. The latter group is often used to map edge line of objects by means of motion paths. For instance showing a simplified sine function characteristics with finger movements.
- pantomimic – used to imitate performance of specific task or activity without any tools or objects. Pantomimic gesture are characterized by a high variability of posture and movements. An example of this gesture type can be weapon reload or movement of a knife slicing bread.
- manipulation – used to control the position, rotation and scale of the object or entity in space. Manipulation gestures constitute a direct interaction between the manipulated object and a hand or a tool that performs gesture. It follows, that the movement of the manipulated object must be strictly dependent on the motion gesture.

2.2 State of the art methods

In this Section, review of the state-of-the-art in human gesture recognition is presented. The problem of gesture recognition can be divided in two main problems: the gesture representation problem and the decision/inference problem. Therefore, this review includes discussion about enabling technology, gesture representations and analysis of recognition methods. Additionally, general problems related to the recognition of gestures and their common solutions are introduced.

2.2.1 Sensors

In this Subsection, the sensors for gesture recognition are overviewed. The main existing gesture recognition approaches related to type of the devices are as follow:

- non-vision-based devices – tracking devices, instrumented gloves, armbands and others,
- vision-based devices – using one or many cameras.

Non-vision-based Sensors

This type of devices use various technologies to detect motions, such as accelerometers, multi-touch screens, EMG sensors and other, which include different types of detectors. There are few categories of non-vision-based devices [23]:

- wearable – this kind of device is in the form of garment, which includes sensors needed to recognize arrangement and motions of examined part of the body. It often occur in the form of gloves (CyberGlove®), armband (Myo) or the whole outfit (IGS-190). For instance, CyberGlove® device was used in the system developed by Kevin et al. [26], which recognizes multi-dimensional gestures using condensation-based trajectory matching algorithm. These devices are often related to biomechanical and inertial technologies,
- biomechanical – type of device, which use biomechanical techniques such as electromyography, to measure parameters of gesture. An example of using this type of device is the project developed by Kim et al. [27] for Realtime Biosignal Interfacing based on EMG sensors. Example of these devices is Myo armband, which detects gestures and movements using EMG sensors,
- inertial – these devices measure the variation of the earth magnetic field in order to detect the motion. This kind of devices use accelerometers [29] and gyroscopes [20] to measurements,
- haptics – various kinds of touch screens. For instance, Webel et al. [50] developed module for dynamic gestures recognition in multi-touch devices,
- electromagnetic – these devices measure the variation of an artificial electromagnetic field generated by wireless networks, electronic devices or produced by themselves. An example of such devices is WiSee, which leverages ongoing wireless transmissions in the environment (e.g., WiFi) to enable whole-home sensing and recognition of human gestures [35].

Vision-based Sensors

Vision-based sensors include one or several cameras and provide performed data from the captured video sequences. Processing of frame is based on filtering, analyzing and data interpreting. The following types of vision-based technology can be distinguished [23][51]:

- typical video cameras – gesture recognition techniques based on data derived from monocular camera using detection methods such as color or shape based techniques, learning detectors from pixel values or 3D model-based detection,
- stereocameras – techniques based on captured images from two cameras, which provide an approximation of the recorded data to a 3D model representation,
- active techniques – require the projection of some form of structured light. Examples of this kind devices are Kinect or Leap Motion,
- invasive techniques – systems which require using of body markers such as color gloves [48], LED lights (Play Station Move controller).




FIGURE 2.2: Diagram of gesture representation

2.2.2 Gesture representation

In this Subsection, overview the spatial modeling of gestures is provided. In particular, greater importance is placed on one type of spatial gesture representations, called the 3D model-based. Depending on the type of the input data, the approach for recognize gesture could be done in different ways. There are following two main types of gesture representation defined in literature [22][32]:

- 3d model-based,
- appearance-based.

3D model-based

Defines the 3D spatial decription of the human body parts. They can be classified in two large groups:

- volumetric models,
- skeletal models.

Volumetric models reproduce with high accuracy the shape of the hand or arm. Real object is often interpreted as mesh of vertices or non-uniform rational B-spline (NURBS) ordered in space. This model is commonly used for computer vision purposes or for computer animation. The drawback of this approach is that, it is computationally demanding and difficult to analyze in real time.

Simplified models of the hand or arm with the reduced set of parameters (such as skeletal models) are often used [32].

As indicated earlier, instead of dealing with all the parameters of volumetric type, model can be reduced to set of equivalent joint angle parameters together with segment lengths. These are known as skeletal models. There are several advantages of using this representation type:

- Simplified model with the most important parameters allows the detection program to focus on the significant parts of the body.
- Due to the smaller amount of data, the processing algorithms are faster.

Appearance-based

The second group of models do not use direct description of the spatial object points, because this model is based on shape of hands or arms in the visual images. The gestures are modeled by relating the appearance of any gesture to the appearance of the set of predefined, template gestures [32]. In this group distinguished a large variety of models. The most used 2D models are:

- color based model – in general, using body markers to track the motion of the body part,
- binary silhouette based model – models based on the geometric properties of the object silhouette,
- deformable gabarit based model – they are generally based on deformable active contours,
- motion-based model – based on the motion of individual pixels or image part description.

2.2.3 Gesture recognition methods

As it was written earlier, one of the main issues of gesture recognition is the decision problem. Currently several solutions have been proposed, which can be used regardless of device type or data representation for different classes of gestures. Classification of gestures, which should be taken into account while choosing gesture recognition method, are static and dynamic division. For each of them may be used different tools due to the different properties of these gestures. In the case of static gesture recognition, an important feature is arrangement of object, which performs a gesture, in other words, how the individual parts of the object are arranged in relation to each other. For dynamic gestures — as described in the previous Subsection — a very important feature is the variation in time (dynamics of the gesture or dynamics of individual parts of the object performing the gesture).

To recognize static gestures, general classifier, neural network or template-matcher can be used. Methods which are capable to recognize dynamic gestures have to take into account the aspect of time. An example of this kind of method is Hidden Markov Model.

Static gesture recognition

Different techniques to perform accurate static gesture recognition have been described in the literature. The most common methods are neural networks, Support Vector Machines and simple pattern techniques [43].

A neural network (NN) is an information-processing system that has been developed as generalizations of mathematical models of human cognition or neural biology. A neural network is characterized by its pattern of connections between the neurons, method of determining the weights

on the connections, and its activation function [14]. They can be used both for static and dynamic gestures.

Hasan et al. [19] presented hand gesture recognition based on shape analysis. Tests were conducted for six static gestures using multi-layer perception of neural network and back-propagation learning algorithm. NN architecture consisted of one hidden layer (100 nodes), 1060 inputs and 6 output for each gesture. They achieved a recognition rate of 86.38% for a training set of 30 images and a testing set of 84 images.

Xu et al. [52] developed virtual training system of Self-Propelled Gun based on static gesture recognition and hand translations and rotations. The input data for algorithms was captured using a 18-sensor DataGlove. To recognize gestures was used feed-forward neural network with 40 nodes in single hidden layer, 18 input and 15 output nodes. The back-propagation using a variable learning rate is selected as training method. The tests were conducted on a set of 300 hand gestures from five different people — 200 gestures for training set and 100 for testing set. With the use of these methods the authors reached gesture recognition performance of 98%.

In publication of Stergiopoulou and Papamarkos publication [47] can be found static gesture recognition through other type of neural network — Self-Growing and Self-Organized Neural Gas (SGONG). To quote the authors, SGONG is innovative neural network that grows according to the morphology of hands in a very robust way. The algorithms were tested for 31 hand gestures that derive from the combination of shown and hidden fingers. Data were collected from a camera, and the recordings of hand were created in a vertical position on uniform background. With these assumptions, gesture recognition rate of 90.45% have been reached but required average computation time was about 1.5 s, using a 3 GHz CPU.

Support-Vector Machine (SVM) is a classification method invented by Vapnik [8]. SVM is a supervised learning algorithm used for classification and regression analysis, based on the mapping of characteristics extracted from instances namely the feature vectors to points in space. SVM constructs in multi-dimensional space, set of hyperplanes, which non-linearly divide points in this space (input vectors) to different classes. Support Vector Machines can be called a maximum margin classifier, because the resulting hyperplanes maximize the distance between the 'nearest' vectors of different classes. These "nearest" vectors are called support vectors.

Chen and Tseng [6] presented system based on training SVM which allows effective recognition gesture in popular game, rock-paper-scissors. One of the challenges of their work was to teach the classifier to recognize multiple-angle hand gesture. The collection of training and testing data were images from video camera, which are preprocessed using conversion to grayscale and histogram equalization. Data were collected from 5 different people for the right hand only. For the learning set consisted of 420 images and testing set of 120 images, the recognition rate of 95% was achieved.

Rahman and Afrin [38] presented hand gesture recognition system which recognizes static hand gesture for alphabet of 10 letters using Biorthogonal Wavelet Transform and SVM. Input data in the form of images — in addition to filtering — are transformed by the Canny edge detection method and then processed sequentially through Radon and Biorthogonal Wavelet Transformations. Finally, the data in this form are transmitted to the SVM classifier. To achieve robustness of the method to varying conditions, authors used a large dataset — 800 positive samples and 1500 negative image samples. Average recognition rate was 87.4%.

Liu et al. [30] proposed recognition method based on SVM and Hu moments which applied to Chinese Driver Physical Examination System. For collection of 2416 positive samples and 3050 negative samples from 20 people recognition rate of 96.5% have been reached.

Ren and Zhang [40] proposed other recognition method named by them as MEB-SVM. This method combines the SVM with minimum enclosing ball (MEB) and — according to the authors

— allows to reduce computation with effective separation of all kinds of vectors in hyperspace. The input data used to test this method are images which are initially binarized and then contour line is retrieved. Finally, contour line is converted by means of Fourier transform, so that data are independent of translation, rotating and zooming. Their method achieved a recognition rate of 92.9%.

Dominio et al. [11] presented novel hand gesture recognition based on depth data using Kinect device. The proposed processing consists following, main steps: extraction hand region from the depth map and subdivided it into palm and finger samples, extraction set of features based on finger tips and center of the hand, classification by SVM. Based on 1,000 different depth maps with 10 gestures performed by 10 different people, they achieved mean recognition rate of 99.5%.

Other popular methods are *simple pattern recognition techniques*. This group includes methods based on a simple comparison the characteristics of new problem instance with instances seen in training, instead of performing explicit generalization. In the case of gesture recognition, output information of algorithm is evaluated on the basis of similarity of the gesture to other pre-defined or learned gestures, for which belonging to groups is known. Basis on this, it is concluded that the newly read gesture belongs to the group. These techniques are generally based on efficient lazy learning methods such as instance-based learning methods. In the context of gesture recognition, the most widely used algorithm is the k-nearest neighbour.

Ziae et al. [57] combine naïve Bayes classifier with k-nearest neighbors algorithm for static gesture recognition purposes. Based on the dataset from the camera consisting of 580 samples for the 3 gestures, authors have achieved 93% of recognition rate.

Chang et al. [5] proposed new approach for static gesture recognition based on Zernike moments (ZMS) and pseudo-Zernike moments (PZMs), which provide greater independence from the translation of gestures. For gesture classification, k-nearest neighbor has been used, which directly processes the data from the ZMS and PZMs. In addition, authors used a minimum bounding circle, which supports the decomposition of hand silhouette into the finger parts and palm part. For dataset of 600 samples with 6 gestures performed by 10 people, gesture recognition rate of 97.3% has been reached.

Dynamic gesture recognition

Referring to the previously proposed classification of gestures may be considered that dynamic gestures include a wide range of existing types of gestures and have an important role in inter-personal communication as well as in HCI. Therefore, many approaches were proposed to gesture recognition taking into account the temporal aspect of gestures. Shen et al. [44] propose following division of these approaches:

- model-based methods,
- exemplar-based methods.

The first one includes methods that are based on the 3D model-based gesture representation, and which assume that the hand was detected and hand movements are being tracked. Model-based approaches include Hidden Markov Models (HMM), Finite State Machines (FSM), Time Delay Neural Networks (TDNN) and self-organizing networks, which preserve topology.

Exemplar-based is group of methods, which performs recognition by exemplar or template matching. These methods use a visual representation of data such as spatio-temporal local features, motion trajectories, bag-of-features representation and other. However, this approach of dynamic gesture recognition will not be considered in thesis.

First model-based method is *Hidden Markov Models*. HMM is considered as specific form of dynamic Bayesian network and is doubly stochastic process with an underlying stochastic process that is not observable (it is hidden), but can only be observed through another set of stochastic processes that produce the sequence of observed symbols [37]. This model is represented by set of finite states connected by transitions. Each state is characterized by the state transition probabilities and probability distribution of emitting output tokens. HMM is one of the most commonly used methods for dynamic gesture recognition.

The use of HMM in the context of gesture recognition has been proposed by Yamato et al. [53]. In this approach, a discrete HMM and image feature vector sequence converted to symbolic sequences by vector quantization have been used to recognize six classes of tennis strokes.

Yang and Xu [54] proposed use of multi-dimensional Hidden Markov Model for handdrawn gestures recognition purposes. For tests, 9 gestures representing numbers from 1 to 9 was defined. Based on the 6-states Bakis model, the training set consisting of 100 samples and a test set of 450 samples, achieved recognition rate 99.78%.

In publication of Starner and Pentland [45] HMM was used for real-time recognizing sentence-level American Sign Language. The authors achieved a processing speed of 5 frames per second with recognition rate of 99.2% for 494 sentences.

In recent work also proposed new approaches and improvements to HMM method, such as using semantic network model (SNM) which introduces semantic states [39], hidden state conditional random field model [49] and non-parametric HMM for exemplar-based gesture recognition [12].

Finite State Machines or Finite State Automation are computational models that allow to design sequential logic circuits. FSM consist a finite number of states, which one of them is marked as the current state. The transition between the states is performed in the case of occurrence of the corresponding event. FSM is also defined by a states set and collection of transition conditions.

Davis and Shah [9] used FSM for hand gesture recognition using model based approach. In their approach, fingers tracking has been applied to determine the motion paths and to find the start and stop positions of gestures. Gesture was modelled as set of vectors with motion key, using motion correspondence algorithm.

Hong et al. [21] also applied FSM for gesture recognition using sequences of states in spatial-temporal space as gestures model. Each state is represented by multidimensional Gaussian.

Another method is *Time Delay Neural Networks* (TDNN), which is a group of neural networks with a special architecture. The main feature of this approach is that recognition is independent of the time offset of the sample. TDNN operates on sequential data.

Yang and Ahuja [56] applied TDNN to recognize American Sign Language (ASL), just like Starner and Pentland in the aforementioned publication. They provided extracting and classifying of two-dimensional dynamic gestures. Using motion trajectories, multiscale segmentation and affine transformations authors achieved 96.21% for testing set of ASL gestures.

The last approach is *self-organizing networks*, which are characterized by automatic adapting to the input data. This allows to dynamically adapt the network to new data.

Florez et al. [15] presented approach based on self-organizing neural network, which are capable of characterizing hand posture as well as movements. Their method reached recognition rate of 97.08% for 12 gestures.

Chapter 3

Leap Motion controller

3.1 Controller

Leap Motion is an USB sensor device released in July 2013 by Leap Motion Inc., designed to provide realtime tracking of hands and fingers in three-dimensional space with 0.01 milimeter accuracy. It allows a user to get information about objects located in device's field of view (about 150 degree with distance not exceeding 1 meter).

Details of how Leap Motion performs 3D scene capturing have not been revealed by Leap Motion, Inc. However, it is known that hardware consists of three infrared LEDs which are used for scene illumination, while two cameras spaced 4 centimeters apart capture images with 50-200 fps framrate, dependant whether USB 2.0 or 3.0 is used.



FIGURE 3.1: Leap Motion controller with Micro-USB plug

3.2 Data access

Unlike Microsoft Kinect, Leap Motion does not provide access to raw data in the form of a cloud of points. Captured data is processed by proprietary drivers supplied by vendor and accessible through API. Leap Motion was intended to be a human-computer interface, not general purpose 3D scanner, so it is optimised for recognizing human hands and pointy objects.

The main data container we get from Leap Motion API is a Frame. Average framerate while using dual core laptop and USB 2.0 interface, is 50 frames per second. One frame consists of hands, fingers, pointables (objects directly visible by controller), and additional information, like gestures recognized by simple built-in recognition mechanism, frame timestamp, rotation, translation, and scaling data.

For purposes of this project, we have created our own data format. It contains only information necessary for us and allows us to easily save captured frames to file, and read them later for processing and testing purposes.

Chapter 4

Gesture recognition for Leap Motion

4.1 Classification of gestures




FIGURE 4.1: Classification of gestures proposed in the thesis

In Section 2.1 the three main classifications of gestures based on the existing literature have been presented. Particularly important for further research and to properly define the problem of gesture recognition may be the last of the presented taxonomies, which defines a wide range of possible gestures occurring in human-computer interaction.

It should be noticed that the previously mentioned classifications are defined strictly due to the characteristics of individual gestures, which may cause the selection of appropriate gesture recognition methods difficult. Therefore, it was decided to propose a new taxonomy that will be based on previously presented taxonomies [24][25][41] and in addition will be focused on the gesture recognition methods and will be defined strictly in the context of gesture recognition.

The proposed classification involves the following division by conveyed informations:

- action gestures (1),
- parametrized gestures (2).

The former group (1), represents gestures, which their identification is based only on detection of gesture occurrence. This means that action gestures have assigned some meaning, and the occurrence of this type of gesture implies execution of pre-defined action. It should also be noted that gestures of this type do not convey any additional parameters which define or describe the action. An example of this type can be gesture showing open hand, which could mean stop playing music. Another example might be a moving index finger in circles, which means rotating previously selected object of the specified number of degrees.

Gestures, which may be included into a parameterized gestures (2), provide additional parameters related to the context of the gesture. In contrast to previous group, parametrized gestures carry additional meaning or parameters needed to perform the gesture. An example of this kind of gestures might be a similar gesture to the previously mentioned instance of action gestures — making circles through moving finger — but in this case — in addition to returned information about recognized gesture — a value of angle, which should be used to rotate selected object, is also be conveyed.

Action gestures (1) is divided into static (1.1) and dynamic (1.2). The former group relates to gestures, that are not variable in time, therefore hand posture, its position and rotation are fixed during hand gesture performing. It should also be mentioned that these gestures should be independent of the orientation relative to the environment and the occurrence of this gesture is detected only on the basis of hand posture.

Dynamic action gestures (1.2) refer to the group of gestures which are constant and non-parametrized variable over time in terms of hand posture, position and rotation in space. This group is further divided into global, local and mixed. Global were detected based on a fixed hand posture and specified movement, which may relate both to changes in position and rotation. In the case of local, hand posture is only variable in time, while the mixed include gestures, for which both the hand posture, as well as the position and rotation vary with time.

For parameterized gestures (2) division of locally (1.1), globally (1.2) and mixed parameterized gestures is distinguished. Globally parameterized gestures include gestures, whose parameters are determined by values of position and rotation or its changes of the hand. For instance, swipe gesture can be considered as globally parameterized gesture, where the parameter is the length of the swipe motion. Recognition of globally parameterized gestures is performed on the basis of unchanging hand posture or specific changes in the shape of the hand posture over time.

Locally parameterized gestures (1.2) include gestures whose the hand posture or its changes are parameterized, for example a distance between index finger and thumb of one hand may be a parameter for scaling gesture. Gestures of this kind should be independent of the position and rotation in space. Recognition should be based on the hand posture, which can be problematic when it will be time-varying.

Mixed parameterized group (1.3) represents gestures which both

- hand posture or hand posture changes over time,
- and hand posture values or changes of position and rotation

are parametrized. Gestures of this group are recognized based on hand posture. Classification presented above relates to the previously described taxonomy proposed by Aigner et al. at follows:

- pointing gestures – represented by mixed parameterized gestures,
- static semaphoric – represented by static action gestures,
- dynamic and stroke semaphoric – represented by dynamic action gestures,
- static iconic – for demonstrating the shapes of objects represented by static action gestures and for presenting the size of object by locally parameterized gestures,
- dynamic iconic – mainly represented by dynamic action gestures, but can also be globally parameterized gestures for indicating the size of the objects,
- pantomimic – represented mostly by mixed dynamic action gestures, assuming that they are always performed in the same way,

- manipulation – represented by all types of parametrized gestures.

In this thesis all mentioned types of action gestures are considered. Recognition approaches of static action gestures are described in Chapter 5 and methods for dynamic action gestures are presented in Chapter 6. Support for parametrized gestures by LeapGesture is envisaged for the further development of the library.

4.2 Gesture data representation

LeapSDK provides built-in classes representing real-world object seen by the controller. The basic data unit we get from Leap Motion is a Frame. Frame contains objects like Hands and Pointables (Fingers and Tools), described by features directly related real attributes.

Hand is an object representing a regular human hand. It contains Fingers, and is described by three dimensional values, like: position of center of hand, normal vector and direction vector (pointing from the center to the end of fingers).

Pointables are objects like Fingers or Tools (which are longer and thinner than Fingers). Both are described by the same set of features: position of tip, pointing direction vector, length and width.

- Frame:
 - Hands (position of center, normal vector, direction vector)
 - * Pointables: (tip position, pointing direction, length, width)
 - Fingers
 - Tools

All positions are expressed in millimeters, relative to position of controller which is always located in the center of the 3D space. Manufacturer claims, that the accuracy of device is about 0.01mm. Experiments shown results better than 0.2mm, using an industrial robot moving an object in controllers' field of view. This is more than enough, as accuracy of positioning human hand is about 0.4mm. [16]

4.3 Preprocessing

Stability of images acquired and used by Leap Motion to provide the information about hands and finger can be different. Strong sunlight or fast movements may result in obtaining data that is noisy. Sometimes, the noisy information processed by Leap Motion result short-time lost tracking of fingers, or non-existing objects appear in a view. Those short-time malfunctions happen usually last less than five frames and additional preprocessing can be introduced.

The preprocessing principle is based on a median filter – it uses a window with defined size w to detect and remove noisy information. For a given frame and every unique finger detected in the window of frames, the algorithm checks if the processed finger is a real finger or a noise information. The neighbourhood of width w can be understood as set of $w/2$ frames that were recorded earlier than the currently analyzed frame and $w/2$ frames that were recorded later. In this neighbourhood, the occurrences of a finger (f_x) are counter and decision is made:

- if $f_x > w/2$ then a finger is believed to be a real finger,
- otherwise, a finger is believed to be a data noise.

If the finger does not exist in a current frame and described check indicates that it should, then its position is calculated using linear interpolation of finger positions in two closest frames. Otherwise, a finger is simply removed.

It is worth noticing, that preprocessing introduces delay in data transmission to the next processing blocks of gesture recognition. Using wider width of preprocessing causes linear grow in delay time. For example, while capturing data with framerate equal to 50 frames per second and a window size equal four, the delay would be equal to:

$$\frac{w/2 + 1}{fps} = \frac{3}{50} = 0.06s. \quad (4.1)$$

The delay of $0.06s$ is not affecting the recognition speed, but larger windows may introduce noticeable delay that might be undesirable in the application of the library.

Chapter 5

Static Gesture Recognition

As mentioned in Subsection 2.2.3, the gestures can be divided into two main groups: static gestures and dynamic gestures. The static gestures can be understood as a position and orientation of fingers and a hand in a single moment. The dynamic gestures are defined as a movement of hands in time. The problem of static gesture recognition is a subject of this chapter. The proposed approach is presented, followed by the introduction to the evaluation scheme. In the last section, the performed experiments are described, which were used to examine the effectiveness of proposed approach.

5.1 Proposed Methods

The static gesture recognition problem can be stated as a problem invariant to time. That means that for each detected hand, its position and orientation can be treated as a new data point, uncorrelated to previously shown gestures. With this assumption, one can easily generate multiple samples from the sensors in short time, but it also gives an opportunity to look at the static gesture recognition problem as a problem of classification.

In literature, most of the approaches uses two-dimensional representation of gestures, which makes recognition problems relatively simple and therefore allows to use simple classification algorithms, e.g., k-NNs [17]. The three-dimensional representation of data is more complicated to model by the set of features and finally successfully label. The 3D data yield by the sensor is represented in the sensor's coordinate system. Due to this fact, even a small change of the position or orientation of a hand with respect to the location of the sensor can negatively affect the gesture recognition system. All of those distortions should not prevent the system from recognizing those gestures if they are similar. To meet those requirement, it is needed to define what is the “small” change in orientation resulting in treating the static gestures as the same one.

In application of the library presented in this thesis, it is assumed that the learning process can be done offline, while strict online requirements has to be met for the recognition part.

To meet listed requirements, the Support Vector Machines (SVMs)[8] were used as a robust classification algorithm. The SVMs were chosen as there exist a solid mathematical background supporting the simple idea of maximizing the margin between classes. The SVMs are popular in the recent research trends and are commonly used in biology, robotics or IT for solving data classification problems. Another advantage is the existence of the open-source library libSVM [4], which contains an efficient implementation of the SVM in many programming languages. In the original work, SVMs were designed to be able to classify between two classes, but the idea was expanded to utilize the one-vs-all classification allowing to differentiate between multiple classes. This might be a drawback, as for n classes, it is necessary to train n SVMs, each to classify




FIGURE 5.1: SVM is a classification algorithm looking for the hyperplane that maximizes the margin between classes¹

one class against all samples from the rest of the classes. The efficiency of SVMs depends on correctly choosing the kernel function used to map the separation problem into higher dimension with expectation to achieve a classification problem that can be separated. There exists several kernel functions:

- linear: $K(x_i, x_j) = x_i^T x_j$,
- polynomial: $K(x_i, x_j) = (\gamma x_i^T x_j + r)^d$, $\gamma > 0$,
- radial basis function (RBF): $K(x_i, x_j) = \exp(-\gamma \|x_i - x_j\|^2)$, $\gamma > 0$,
- sigmoid: $K(x_i, x_j) = \tanh(\gamma x_i^T x_j + r)$,

where γ , r , and d are kernel parameters. According to the authors of the library [4], linear kernels perform the best, when used for linearly separable problems, while RBF kernels are the most versatile ones and are recommended for most of the applications.

The problem of classification assumes that each sample consists of set of features, which describe a sample and can be used to distinguish it from the other samples. Additionally, each sample has a known or unknown label, which define the membership of the sample to the classification class. The samples with known labels can be used to train the classification system. The trained classification system is used to predict the labels for the unlabelled samples.

In application of gesture recognition the classification is divided into two modes: the training part (offline) and the recognition part (online). The static gesture processing flow is presented in Fig. 5.2. In the training part, the library is provided with the recorded, labelled samples of static gestures. From those samples, the sets of features are computed, which are used to train the classifier. The recognition part assumes to have trained classifier. The recognition part is provided

¹http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Svm_max_sep_hyperplane_with_margin.png

with samples of static gestures without labels. For each sample the sets of features are computed and then given as input to the trained classifier. The classifier provides the information of the predicted gesture's class membership (label) for each input sample.




FIGURE 5.2: Proposed solution blocks for learning and recognition parts of static gestures recognition problem

While the presented approach can be treated as state-of-the-art approach it still cannot be used without defining proper feature sets for gesture recognition. The naive solution would be to use the raw data from Leap Motion sensor as the feature set. This solution was tested, but provided poor results as the raw data points are dependent on the position, orientation and scale of hand. Even a small movement in any direction resulted in decrease of classification accuracy. The literature suggests to compute a set of features invariant to wanted transformations, which can allow to fully distinguish between different classes [3, 4]. To achieve feature set with those properties, it has to be introduced taking into account the application. Also, as the gesture recognition problem using the data similar to the data provided by the Leap Motion sensor has not been yet examined by the researchers, seeking right feature set is a task of the thesis. The task is approached in experimental Section 5.3.

5.2 Evaluation Methodology

5.2.1 Assumptions

To provide a user with a library working in different conditions, it was assumed that a gesture is treated as the same one independently with respect to the translation, rotation and scale of the hand. This assumption means that the static gesture rotated by unknown angles, translated in the sensor coordinate system and also with different hand sizes should still be recognized as the same gesture. Invariance to the rotation, translation and scale poses a great challenge to the recognition, but allows the future users of the API to fully utilize the power of the library. It is worth mentioning that, it does not reduce the possible applications of the library, as an assignment of a static gesture to an already defined class allows to find the transformation between the model of the class and the observed gesture. This transformation can be used to examine the parameters of the instance of the model, e.g., rotation of the hand.

5.2.2 Recorded Datasets

To propose and test the quality of the features ten static gestures were chosen:

1. the peace sign,
2. a fist,
3. full hand with space between each finger,

4. “I love you” sign from American Sign Language,
5. sign “gun” created by putting thumb and forefinger up, while holding the rest fingers in a fist,
6. all fingers in a fist with exception of thumb, which is up,
7. the sign X made with the forefingers of both hands,
8. the sign “Time” used e.g. by coaches in basketball games.
9. sign simulating rotating a knob by two fingers,
10. sign simulating rotating a knob by five fingers.




FIGURE 5.3: Recorded static gestures used for evaluation

The gestures are also presented in Fig. 5.3.

The sample data of each gestures were recorded using the continuous mode of recording, while moving the hands in different directions and changing the orientation of the hands. The hands were moved and rotated as each repeated static gesture is always a little bit different from the previously recorded samples. In total, for each of the proposed classes, each author of this thesis recorded approximately 1000 samples. The recorded dataset was called the static 10 set and was used in further evaluation.

Having samples with known labels, the whole dataset was separated into training and testing sets in relation 2 : 1. For the training, the k-fold cross-validation (CV) scheme was used, which searches for optimal C and γ parameters of SVM. This method is used to find the optimal parameters of the classification system, while estimating the performance is done on the testing data not used in the training part. In a standard version of the CV, the gathered data is divided into two sets: one containing $k - 1$ parts of the data and the other 1 part of the data. The first is used to train the classification system, while the rest of the gathered data is used to estimate how well the system is learnt. In the next iteration, the CV parts are shuffled by still having the ratio of training and validation sets. After the training, the final performance is estimated by calculating the percent of correctly recognized labels to the total size of the testing set.

5.3 Experiments

5.3.1 Evaluation of Feature Sets

The goal of the first experiments was to find the proper set of features. Several feature sets were proposed and tested. The first vector of features consisted of:

- number of fingers in a frame,
- euclidean distances between consecutive finger's tips,
- absolute angles between consecutive fingers.

This feature set did not take into account the relative position of fingers to the hand. The second feature set is the first feature set extended by the distances between consecutive finger tips and the position of the hand's palm. The third feature set contains features from the second feature set extended by the five angles between fingers and normal of hand's palm. The firstly tested set of all static gestures contained other then described gestures, but some of them were undistinguishable for the Leap Motion as the gestures did not have any visible fingers. Few of those gestures like fist or "Time" were used in classification to examine, how and if the recorded data with almost no information can be used to classify more challenging gestures. But for experiments the five gestures set was also chosen, which could be distinguishable using the data provided by Leap Motion. The gestures: peace, hand, "I love you", fist with thumb up and rotating knob by 5 fingers were chosen and called the static 5 set. The experiments were also conducted for the static 5 set. The results achieved using proposed feature sets on the static 5 set and the static 10 set are presented in Table 5.3.1.

TABLE 5.1: Results obtained by proposed feature sets using the libSVM library

	5 gestures, CV	5 gestures, testing set	10 gestures, CV	10 gestures, testing set
feature set 1	87.1%	87.9%	70.0%	68.4%
feature set 2	87.1%	87.9%	70.0%	68.4%
feature set 3	87.1%	87.9%	70.0%	68.4%
feature set 4	81.2%	81.0%	68.4%	68.6%
feature set 5	86.5%	85.1%	77.1%	77.5%
feature set 6	92.8%	93.1%	80.5%	81.2%

For the problem of recognition on the static 5 set, three first feature sets resulted in over 87% recognition rate on testing sets. The same tests for the problem of recognition of 10 gestures resulted in lower recognition rates. For feature sets 1–3 the recognition rate was below 70%, which could be unsatisfying from the perspective of the purpose of the application. The results for feature sets 1–3 are the same, which suggests than additional information in the feature set 2–3 is not used for classification. The further analysis revealed that the fingers in the data provided by Leap Motion SDK are numbered accordingly to the position in Z axis of the tip of the finger. This means that when finger's tips are approximately on the same position in Z axis, the numbering can change rapidly and proposed features are compared between different fingers. To achieve features that would be invariant to the numbering of the fingers, the feature set was slightly modified. Instead of containing the absolute angles and distances between consecutive fingers, it was proposed to contain the five greatest values of angles and five greatest values of distances between all combinations of finger pairings. The same sorting approach was used for the angles and distances between fingers and hand's palm. The feature sets 1, 2, 3 with sorting scheme were respectively called feature sets 4, 5, 6. Again, the static 5 set and the static 10 set were used to

evaluate those methods. The results are presented in Table 5.3.1. This approach was tested on the same training set and allowed to increase the recognition rate. The best results in both tasks were achieved in case of feature sets 6. The simple alleviation of finger numbering problem allowed to top the previous results with recognition rates 93.096% for the static five set and 81.235% for the static 10 set.

TABLE 5.2: Results obtained by proposed feature sets using the libLinear library

	5 gestures, CV	5 gestures, testing set	10 gestures, CV	10 gestures, testing set
feature set 1	78.3%	78.3%	50.6%	50.6%
feature set 2	78.3%	78.3%	50.6%	50.6%
feature set 3	78.3%	78.3%	50.6%	50.6%
feature set 4	78.2%	78.2%	50.7%	50.6%
feature set 5	79.5%	79.5%	55.3%	55.3%
feature set 6	88.1%	88.1%	64.7%	64.8%

While using more data and longer feature sets usually allows to achieve better results, it also increases the learning time. In case of 5000 training samples the typical training process of radial SVM took approximately 12 hours on a desktop PC with Intel Core i7 and 6 GB of RAM. This computing time can be unacceptable by the users of the library. This is why the tests with another SVM library, libLinear [13] were performed. The libLinear's implementation of SVM utilizes linear kernels and is dedicated for large data training sets with multiple number of features. This library reduced the training time to about 5 seconds. Again, the same tests as for the libSVM were performed to compare both approaches. All achieved results are presented in Table 5.3.1. For the static 5 set, the libLinear achieved 88.1% on the testing set while using feature set 6 compared to 93.1% achieved by libSVM in the same condition. In this case, the libLinear might be good choice as the recognition rate is lower only by about 5%. For the static 10 set, libLinear achieved 64.830% compared to 81.235% of LibSVM, which is a significantly lower recognition rate. It's up to user to decide which library to use, but in most recognition applications, the library can be learnt offline and only used online. That is why, the authors of this thesis recommend the SVM with RBF kernels for static gesture recognition task.

From the results obtained by the libSVM and libLinear on different feature sets, the feature set 6 was chosen as the one yielding the best results and used in further analysis.

For the problem of recognition on the static 10 set, an additional experiment on the testing set was performed, which presents the recognition rates achieved for each class. As a result, the confusion matrix was computed, which can be used to check which static gesture is hard to recognize. The fig. 5.4 shows the results of the experiment. Gestures containing two hands have the smallest recognition rate. The reason for such low recognition rate can be caused by reading error from the device, which performs poorly with overlapping objects. For gesture "Time", the perpendicular position of hands to the Leap Motion and joined finger tips of one palm to the other are another problem. It can be also noticed that the fist is often confused with exposed thumb gesture (no. 6).

5.3.2 Preprocessing

Another factor, that might have an influence on the results is the preprocessing part, which should allow to partially remove noise from the data and thus increase the recognition rates. The preprocessing has been presented in Section ???. The preprocessing operates in the window of hands




FIGURE 5.4: Recognition rates of classes for the feature set 6

poses recorded over time, which size can be modified. The typical library usage allowed to gather data with $60Hz$, while it is assumed that the recognition can be performed with a lower framerate. The difference can be efficiently used by defining the appropriate preprocessing window. For this reason, the experiments with no preprocessing and preprocessing with width size equal to 5, 10, 15, 20, 30 were performed and the influence on the recognition rate was examined. The results are presented in Table 5.3.2. The achieved results confirm the need and importance of proper data preparation in task of data classification. For gesture recognition task using static 5 set, preprocessing allowed to increase the recognition rate from 93.1% to over 99% for window sizes equal or wider than 15. In recognition of static 10 set, the preprocessing allowed to increase recognition rate from 81.2% to over 84% for windows sizes equal or wider than 10. From those results, the preprocessing width of 10 was chosen as the one allowing to significantly improve recognition rate in almost any possible application of the library. The preprocessing of width 10 was used for all further experiments if not stated otherwise.

5.3.3 Postprocessing

All of already presented experiments, treated the classification results of consecutive hand poses as time-independent and not correlated with each other. In real applications, it can be safely assumed that the consecutively detected hands are similar to each other and there is a non-zero probability that those hands define the same gesture. The remaining question to be answered was the impact of combining the consecutive recognition results for the achieved, total recognition rate. It is important to use not only the class labels for the tested dataset, but also the measure of

TABLE 5.3: The recognition rate achieved with feature set 6 and different sizes of preprocessing window

preprocessing	5 gestures, CV	5 gestures, testing set	10 gestures, CV	10 gestures, testing set
off	92.8%	93.1%	80.5%	81.2%
width = 2	95.6%	96.5%	82.7%	83.2%
width = 5	95.9%	96.7%	83.1%	83.6%
width = 10	98.8%	99.0%	83.6%	84.1%
width = 15	99.0%	99.2%	84.1%	84.5%
width = 20	99.1%	99.2%	84.3%	84.8%
width = 30	99.2%	99.4%	84.8%	85.3%

classification rate for all possible classes provided by SVM. This data can be combined to measure the membership rate for each class in a window of chosen width. Then the predicted class is the class with a maximal measure. Formally, when there is a need to classify between k classes, the result for i -th data in dataset can be represented as:

$$l(i) = [l_{i1}, l_{i2}, \dots, l_{ik}], \quad (5.1)$$

where l_{ik} is the probability measure of i -th data belonging to the k -th class. Using a window of width w , the new estimate of classes l' can be computed using the equation:

$$l'(i, w) = F(l(i-w), l(i+1-w), \dots, l(i)), \quad (5.2)$$

where F represents the aggregation function with w vector arguments, e.g., the sum of elements of each input vector. The recognized label is the number of the vector component with the highest value:

$$\text{label} = \arg \max_k \{r(i, w)_k\}. \quad (5.3)$$

The first approach to defining the sum operator is the operator of simple adding the elements of vectors l . The second proposition is to multiple the corresponding elements of vectors l . The third approach utilizes the idea of calculating the median elements of vectors l . The three approaches were compared using feature set 6 with preprocessing width equal to 10 for the static 5 and the static 10s sets already used in previous experiments. Simultaneously, the test were performed for different widths of window and are presented in Fig. 5.5. For almost all possible widths, the summation operator demonstrated the best recognition rate. For 5 static gestures, the summation with width equal to 10 allowed to achieve the recognition rate over 99.5% gaining over 0.5% when compared to solution without postprocessing. Interestingly, windows wider than 12 resulted in lower recognition rate than the result obtained by the window width equal to 10. For 10 static gesture recognition problem, a window of size 50 allowed to improve the recognition rate by over 5% to the value over 89%. In this case, wider window resulted in better results. Similarly to the preprocessing window size, also in postprocessing too wide window results in delayed recognition rate of a shown gesture. Also, too wide window may not lead to better results. Therefore, the postprocessing window size of 10–15 is recommended by the authors of this thesis.

Using summation as the aggregation operator treats the currently achieved result and the results from the previous classifications as equally affecting the current recognition. Especially for wider windows, it can be assumed that the current measurement is more important than the measurement from the distant past. That is why, the idea of weighted sum was introduced. The chosen weights should have the highest weight for the current measurement and smaller values for results that were achieved earlier in time.




FIGURE 5.5: Evaluation of different aggregation operators for result combining in case of different window sizes

For this task, the weights can be taken from half of the Gaussian distribution with maximal peak reached for the currently achieved result with weights slowly decreasing for measurements further away in time. For Gaussian, the mean was assumed to be equal to 0. The standard deviation σ was the parameter, for which different values were tested. The results were obtained on the five and ten static sets. The achieved results are presented in Fig. 5.6. For 5 gestures, small σ resulted in the weights equal to 0 for the wider window size and therefore not using the whole information available in the specified window. For greater σ , it can be observed that the achieved recognition rate is similar. The σ value equal to 10 resulted in the best recognition for almost all window sizes. For problem of 10 static gestures recognition problem, greater σ values produced results that are comparable to the results achieved with the summation as aggregation function. The usage of different weights also comes with greater computing cost. This approach did not allow to increase the recognition rate and can be omitted without effecting the recognition.

From the presented results, the summation is recommended as the aggregation operator by the




FIGURE 5.6: Evaluation of weights for postprocessing distributed accordingly to normal distribution

authors of this thesis.

5.4 Finger recognition

Finger recognition module is responsible to verify which particular fingers are detected during gesture recognition. The module can be used for additional processing on the user side, for which the information about the visible fingers can often be significant. It can also assist interpretation of data derived from parametrized gestures. The user can also use the module to better fit dataset features to the characteristics of selected gestures.

5.4.1 Methods

For this module the same classification algorithms (kernel functions) were used as those which had the best results in static gesture recognition. As in the case of static gesture recognition libSVM

library was used with RBF kernel.

5.4.2 Evaluation methodology

In the objectives for static gesture recognitions (Subsection 5.2.1) it was mentioned that the process must be independent of the position, rotation, sizes of hand and fingers. This objective applies also to finger recognition. However, for the fingers recognition one additional objective was determined. This process should be independent of fingers arrangement. For example it does not matter whether the forefinger is straightened or bent, because this is the same finger. For the static gesture recognition fingers arrangement should be taken into consideration, because two static gestures, which use the same fingers and have other arrangement of fingers, should be distinguished.

Recorded dataset

The dataset was collected by two different people. Each of them recorded 32 classes, which reflect all the possible combinations of fingers arrangements. The next step was to select from 32 classes of gestures, those which are the most frequently used by people in everyday life. Those 15 selected classes contained gestures, which are natural for human and do not cause pain. People use them as specific sign like peace sign. From the dataset four data collections were created used in the experiments:

- dataset A – 32 gestures recorded by two people – this dataset consists of 58614 samples,
- dataset B – 15 gestures recorded by two people – 28729 samples,
- dataset C – 32 gestures recorded by one person – 36190 samples,
- dataset D – 15 gestures recorded by one person – 18611 samples.

5.4.3 Features

As mentioned in the previous section it is important that the fingers recognition process is independent of things like position of hand or size of finger. Thus, 6 features were selected, which are independent of following parameters.

1. Finger count.
2. Distance between two nearest base points of a finger (example of base point has been marked in Fig. 5.7.1 as point B). To appoint a finger base point a reversed normalized direction vector has to be multiplied by the length of a finger. Then the beginning of this vector is placed in the finger tip position. The end of the vector indicates the finger base point (Fig. 5.7.1). An example of distance between two nearest base points of a fingers is showed in Fig. 5.7.2.
3. Ratio of a finger's thickness to the maximal finger's thickness. Leap Motion controller can return information about the thickness of the fingers (Fig. 5.7.3). There are known relationships between the thicknesses of the fingers, for example that the thumb is the thickest finger. Just like in the previous feature ratio was used in order to become independent of size of finger.
4. Angles between two nearest fingers. In Fig. 5.7.4 this feature has been shown. It is obtained by calculating the angle between finger direction vectors of two consecutive fingers.

5. Angles between a given finger and the first finger relative to palm position. To calculate this angle three positions are needed:

- two finger tip positions,
- a palm position.

The next step is to determine the line segments between palm position and finger tip positions. The searched angle is between two designated segments. This angle is shown in Fig. 5.7.5.




FIGURE 5.7: Features used for finger recognition

During testing a new feature was created based on the feature 2 called 2b. This feature is a ratio of distance between two nearest base points of a finger to the minimal (non-zero) distance between two nearest base points. It is very similar to the previous one. The difference is that in this case ratio of distances is used instead of the actual values. Thanks to this, the feature 2b is independent of the size of hand.

5.5 Experiments

Tests were performed using cross validation and testing set. In the case of the testing set ratio of training set to testing set was 2:1.

For the tests several combinations of previously described features were created:

- 1,2,4
- 1,3,5
- 1,3,4,5
- 1,2,3,4,5

All sets of features have been tested for all four datasets described in Subsection 5.4.2. The recognition rate can be seen in Table 5.5. It can be concluded that the highest recognition rate is achieved when all features are used. However, feature 2 is not independent of the size of the hand. Therefore, a new feature has been designed using the ratio of two values obtained from feature 2. Then the test was performed for a set of: 1, 2b, 3, 4, 5 for all datasets. The result for this test is in the last line of the Table 5.5. Interestingly, despite the fact that the modified feature is independent of the size of a hand, feature 2b had an inferior influence on the recognition rate. The feature 2, which operates on the actual value of the distance between fingers, had a greater impact on the recognition rate by about 5.4%.

TABLE 5.4: Results obtained by experimental feature sets for different data collections

features	dataset A, CV[%]	dataset A, testing set[%]	dataset B, CV[%]	dataset B, testing set[%]	dataset C, CV[%]	dataset C, testing set[%]	dataset D, CV[%]	dataset D, testing set[%]
1,2,4	75.4%	74.9%	87.3%	86.9%	78.4%	77.9%	90.6%	90.3%
1,3,5	76.3%	75.4%	87.5%	87.1%	79.6%	78.9%	91.5%	91.2%
1,3,4,5	78.1%	75.4%	87.5%	87.1%	79.6%	78.9%	91.5%	91.2%
1,2,3,4,5	83.2%	81.5%	90.3%	89.8%	85.8%	85.1%	93.0%	92.8%
1,2b,3,4,5	76.6%	75.8%	87.6%	87.3%	79.8%	79.2%	91.6%	91.2%

It is worth to mention that it seemed that the feature 4 (angles between two nearest fingers) will have a substantial contribution to finger recognition. However, the results showed that this feature has impact only on dataset A processed using cross-validation, while in other cases brought nothing.

Distinguishing coefficient of particular classes for a set of features: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for 15 classes recorded by two people is shown in Fig. 5.8.

The graph indicates that classes with the worst recognition rates are:

- the clenched fist (no fingers), and
- the hand with stretched out index finger.

The rest of the gesture recognition has a level of approximately 90% and above. Based on these tests it can be deduced that the fewer fingers to differentiate, the worse the outcome is. This is due to the characteristics of the feature sets, because the vast majority of the features is based on dependency between two fingers. So when the number of fingers is low, the finger recognition module receives too little information to differentiate fingers.

Preprocessing

In the second round of tests it was verified how preprocessing will affect the finger recognition process. The set of features 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, which achieved the best recognition rate in previous test, was also used in this test. Also all datasets (A, B, C, D) were used. For tests the preprocessing width of 4 was chosen.

Table 5.5 presents the test results for a set of features: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 with and without preprocessing. It can be concluded that the use of preprocessing in finger recognition slightly improved the recognition rate. This may be due to selected window width, which makes that while preprocessing is working on one specific frame, it takes into account nine contiguous frames. In this




FIGURE 5.8: Recognition rates of 15 classes for finger recognition using dataset B

TABLE 5.5: Comparison of the recognition rate achieved with and without preprocessing with feature set 1,2,3,4,5

prepro- cessing	dataset A, CV[%]	dataset A, testing set[%]	dataset B, CV[%]	dataset B, testing set[%]	dataset C, CV[%]	dataset C, testing set[%]	dataset D, CV[%]	dataset D, testing set[%]
on	83.3%	82.8%	90.5%	90.0%	86.5%	86.0%	93.3 %	93.0%
off	83.2%	81.5%	90.3%	89.8%	85.8%	85.1%	93.0%	92.8%

setting small irregularities in the data are corrected. If the window would be bigger, anomalies lasting several tens of frames would also be detected. In this situation, new problems would arise, for example, transitions between classes would be much later detected and thus there would be a lot of long lasting incorrect recognitions.

Chapter 6

Detection of dynamic gestures

6.1 Proposed methods

The dynamic gesture recognition problem is a problem, where the input data consist of a list of consecutive positions and orientations of hand and fingers. Moreover, the important factor for recognition is the time dependencies between sequences of hand and finger positions. Another challenge comes with the fact, that the gestures performed slower and faster should be recognized as the same dynamic gesture.

The proposed solution utilizes parts of the solution used for recognition of the static gestures. Each frame of the captured data is described by the feature set similarly to the static solution presented in Chapter 5. The set of features for each frame is then processed by the Hidden Markov Model scheme.

6.1.1 Hidden Markov Model

A HMM can be considered a finite, N -element set of states (a graph), which are associated with the probability distribution. A Hidden Markov Model is model of a system with the Markov property. The Markov property means that the next, future state depends only on the previous state and probability of transition between those states. The first introduction of HMM comes from the work of L. E. Baum et al. [1], who proposed the mathematical background for HMMs.

The transitions between states are represented by the transition probabilities usually stored in $N \times N$ matrix T . In every state, one of the observation from the finite, K -element observation set can be generated with observation probability usually represented by the $N \times K$ emission matrix E . The finite set of all possible observation is called the alphabet. The HMM also consist of a N -element vector of initial state probabilities Π of the hidden starting state. Each HMM can be fully defined by the (T, E, Π) .

The example HMM can be seen in Fig. 6.1. The HMM in the figure consists of N states $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, N\}$ and K possible observations $\{O_1, O_2, \dots, O_k\}$. The probabilities T_{ij} define the transition probability from state i -th to state j -th. The probabilities E_{ij} define the observation probability of generating j observation while being in state i . The non-zero transition and emission probabilities are represented in Fig 6.1 by arrows.

The HMM can be understood as a directed graph with two types of weighted vertices. This way, each state is represented by one type of vertices while observations can be shown as second type of vertices. There are no edges between vertices representing observations. The probability values for edges are stored in T and E matrices.

There are three main algorithms used with the HMMs:




FIGURE 6.1: A simple Hidden Markov Model (HMM) consisting of N states and K possible observations

- Forward-Backward algorithm [34, 55],
- Viterbi algorithm [34, 55],
- Baum-Welch algorithm [34, 55].

The algorithms are shortly described in the following subsections.

6.1.2 Forward-Backward Algorithm

The Forward-Backward algorithm is used to find the posterior probability of given states given the set of observations. Given the set of N hidden state variables $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N\}$ and a sequence of t observations $o_{1:t} = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_t\}$, the algorithm computes probability of state given the observed sequence $P(X_i|o_{1:t})$. The algorithm utilizes a dynamic programming approach, by performing three steps in a loop:

1. computing forward probabilities,

2. computing backward probabilities,
3. computing smoothed values.

The forward pass phase for all states $i = 1, \dots, N$ computes probability $P(X_i|o_{1:k})$, where k is smaller than t , which represent the probability of ending up in state X_i after first k observations. The backward pass computes probability $(P(o_{k+1:t})|X_i)$, which are the probabilities of observing the rest of the observations from the state X_i . The smoothing part uses Bayes rule to compute the probability of state X_i given the whole observation sequence:

$$P(X_k|o_{1:t}) = P(X_k|o_{1:k}, o_{k+1:t}) \propto P(o_{k+1:t}|X_k)P(X_k|o_{1:k}). \quad (6.1)$$

The time complexity of this algorithm is $O(N^2T)$, where T is the length of observation sequence and N is the number of possible states.

6.1.3 Viterbi Algorithm

The Viterbi algorithm is used to find the most likely sequence of hidden states that best explain the set of observations. The set of those states is called the Viterbi path. The path can be found using the dynamic programming and implementing the equations:

$$\begin{cases} V_{1,k} = P(o_1|k)\Pi_k & \text{for } k = 1..N \\ V_{t,k} = P(o_t|k) \arg \max_{x \in X} (a_{x,k}V_{t-1,x}) & \text{for } k = 1..N \text{ and } t = 2..T \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

The solution can be understood as finding a path with maximum probability $\arg \max_{x \in X} (V_{T,x})$. The time complexity of the algorithm is $O(N^2T)$, where N is the number of states and T is the observation length and is equal to the complexity of the Forward-Backward algorithm.

6.1.4 Baum-Welch Algorithm

The Baum-Welch algorithm is the algorithm used to find the unknown parameters of the HMM. For each training example, the algorithms computes the state transition probabilities, observation probabilities in each state and initial probabilities, which maximize the likelihood of observed sequence. Having the set of sequences of observations, the algorithm can be used to train HMM to detect the sequences similar to the ones used in learning process. The algorithm uses the results obtained by the Forward-Backward algorithm to iteratively update the probabilities in the emission and the transition matrices. The training process is stopped after the desired level of a convergence is reached.

6.1.5 Structure of the HMM

In the dynamic gesture recognition task, we adopted a structure of HMM where each state has non-zero transition probabilities to itself and to the next state in the sequence. The proposed structure is presented in Fig. 6.2 and was proposed by Yang et al. [55]. The states can be understood as the phases of hand movement that happen when a wanted gesture is performed. The self-transitions are used to model the different speeds of the gestures and thus allow to achieve a more robust system. This structure after training process can be used to measure the probability that the dynamic gesture occurred given the set of observations.

Having the single dynamic gesture recognition problem modelled as the sequence of N states in which k -th state is connected by the edges to the k and $(k+1)$ state and to the all observations. The problem of distinguishing M gestures translates to the problem of computing probabilities for




FIGURE 6.2: Structure of the HMM's states and non-zero transitions used to detect a single dynamic gesture

M sequential graphs. The problem of finding whether and what dynamic gesture occurred is the problem of finding the probabilities from each of the M HMMs. Alternatively, the M HMMs can be combined into one HMM were those single HMMs are treated as parallel paths. The structure of proposed single HMM is presented in Fig. 6.3. In this structure, the recognition process is a process of finding, which of the parallel paths is the most probable.




FIGURE 6.3: Structure of the HMM's states and non-zero transitions used to simultaneously detect one of M dynamic gestures

6.1.6 HMM Observation from Leap Motion Data

One of the problems when designing the system is a problem of correctly preparing the set of observations from the Leap Motion data. Most of the proposed solutions in the literature assume that the observations are one-dimensional [34, 55]. This poses a challenge as the raw data from Leap Motion is high-dimensional. This is the reason, why it is needed to reduce the dimensionality of the observation of the single hand in the predefined moment in time.

To do this, unsupervised clustering algorithms were introduced. For this task we examined 3 methods:

- Chinese whispers [2, 7],
- Girvan-Newman clustering [18],

- k-means with additional methods to determine the number of clusters. [46, 31].

Chinese Whispers

Chinese whispers algorithm is an efficient randomized graph-clustering algorithm, which is time-linear in the number of edges. The algorithm was proposed in work by Biemann [2] and thoroughly examined in Natural Language Processing problems. The main advantage of the algorithm is the ability to independently determine the number of classes. In tests, we used the implementation available in dLib-ml library [28], which provides multiple implementations of machine learning algorithms.

Girvan-Newman Clustering

Girvan-Newman clustering is a hierarchical algorithm used to detect clusters in a data represented as a graph. The algorithm progressively removes edges from the original network until it reaches the maximal number of iterations or an error condition is met. An adjacency matrix is used to represent the edges between data, where edge value is the similarity between two data points. The algorithm iteratively calculates the eigenvalues of a created matrix using the power iteration method. In case of a complete graph, this algorithm is relatively slow.

K-means Clustering

Another proposed approach is k-means clustering algorithm. The idea for the algorithm comes from polish mathematician Hugo Steinhaus, but the first practical application has been presented by MacQueen [31]. The algorithm initially randomly selects k starting points and iteratively performs two steps utilizing the idea of expected-maximization [10]:

1. For each data sample the algorithm calculates the distances to k centroids and labels the samples with the label of the centroid with the smallest distance.
2. For each class, the algorithm recalculates centroids position to the averaged position of all samples belonging to class.

The algorithm stops after the maximum number of iterations or when the change between two consecutive iterations is smaller than defined value. Unfortunately, the algorithm requires prior knowledge of the number of expected classes. Nevertheless, there exist heuristics methods aiding in correctly choosing the number of classes. One of those methods is plotting the sum of squares error(SSE) between elements within each class against the number of chosen classes. The plot is then visually inspected and the fall in error is sought. The argument for which the drastic error drop is observed is believed to be the correct number of classes in the provided data.

Another, more formal approach introduces the measure of dissimilarity and is called Silhouette width [42]. Declaring $a(i)$ as the average dissimilarity measure to other samples in the same cluster and $b(i)$ as the lowest average dissimilarity measure to samples in the other clusters which i is not a part of. The measure of each cluster corrected is proposed to be computed by:

$$s(i) = \frac{b(i) - a(i)}{\max \{a(i), b(i)\}} \quad (6.3)$$

The big value of $s(i)$ implies good clustering, while small value of $s(i)$ suggests that the number of classes was not properly chosen. The $s(i)$ values are used to find the proper number of clusters.




FIGURE 6.4: Solution blocks of learning and testing parts used in the dynamic gesture recognition

6.1.7 Total Processing Algorithm

The designed processing algorithm is presented in Fig. 6.4. The solution consists of two parts: an offline learning and an online recognition. In learning part, the raw data is preprocessed and then the feature set is extracted. Those features are extracted for all recorded positions in training data. Then one of the unsupervised clustering algorithms is used to find the clusters in the data and then classify those feature sets into observation clusters. Computed sequences of observation classes represent each dynamic gesture as a series of one-dimensional observations. For each dynamic gesture, the corresponding HMM is learnt using the Baum-Welch algorithm on the sequence of observations. The Baum-Welch algorithm computes the matrices that maximizes the probability for one sequence of observations. The problem of training on multiple training data was encountered. Using the idea presented by Petrushin [34], where each matrix trained by one training example is incorporated into hmm's transition matrix using addition with a learning rate μ . Denoting the transition matrix of HMM by T and learnt transition matrix T_{new} , it can be written:

$$T = (1 - \mu) \times T + \mu \times T_{new}. \quad (6.4)$$

The same idea is applied to the emission matrix E and learnt emission matrix E_{new} :

$$E = (1 - \mu) \times E + \mu \times E_{new}. \quad (6.5)$$

The learning rate μ is a value between 0 and 1. Smaller learning rates results in slower learning, but bigger values may result in no convergence of learning. Finding correct learning rate is a task of one of the experiments. Another problem encountered using this approach is the fact, that matrices no longer represent the probability as the total values in rows do not add to 1.0. Therefore, each row of new matrices is normalized to 1.0.

When dealing with multiple training examples, the learnt solution may adapt to the training samples, but perform poorly on the testing set. The problem is known as overfitting to the training samples. To deal with potential problem, the k-fold cross validation was utilized in a similar approach as in the static gestures presented in Chapter 5. To complete the training process, each trained HMM is combined into one recognition structure.

In the recognition, the raw data from Leap Motion is preprocessed, then each frame is labelled accordingly to the classes learnt by the unsupervised clustering algorithm. The next step includes providing the set of observations to HMMs and running the Viterbi algorithm. The Viterbi algorithm computes a probability of the the most likely sequence. Then the maximum probability for each HMM is calculated. If the maximum probability is above threshold, the gesture is assumed to be correctly recognized with the label of the HMM with the maximum probability sequence.

6.2 Evaluation Methodology

To evaluate the quality of recognition achieved by proposed processing pipeline, 6 dynamic gestures were chosen. For each of those gestures, we recorded 120 samples (30 samples per each author). The recorded data contains recordings in different positions with respect to the Leap Motion coordinate system and with different speeds to measure the wanted invariance and robustness of the proposed approach. The chosen dynamic gestures are:

1. “123” – counting to three using fingers of one hand,
2. “door” – it’s a gesture performed while trying to grasp a handle of a door and then open the door,
3. “circle” – making a circle in the air with the forefinger,
4. “scissors” – simulating cutting an object with scissors made by a forefinger and a middle finger,
5. “gun” – a thumb and an index finger are up with rest of the fingers in a fist. The hand moves up simulating a firing from a gun.
6. “moving the object” – performing the task of grasping an invisible object, moving it and letting it go in a different place.

The $120 \times 6 = 720$ samples were divided into training set containing 66,7% of recordings and testing group containing the remaining 240 recordings. The recorded dataset was called the dynamic 6 set. The part of the gestures recorded by Katarzyna were used to find the proper number of observation clusters. The training set was used to train each HMM separately on the training data of each gesture. Preliminary results revealed that initialization of HMM matrices has an impact on the achieved results. Due to no prior knowledge, the random initialization was chosen. This approach did not yield reliable solutions in all situation and therefore each training process is performed 10 times and a model with the best recognition rate from cross-validation is returned. Each training cycle of all HMMs takes 1 – 10 minutes, with total training part taking 25 – 60 minutes. If not stated otherwise, the learning rate μ was set to 0.1, k-cross validation was performed for $k = 5$ and the number of states in one HMM was set to 10.

6.3 Experiments

The experiments are divided into subsections, where in one subsection impact of one parameter is tested. In first subsection, the number of observation clusters using only the dataset is examined. The second subsection contains experiments involving different feature sets. Those subsections are followed by tests involving the impact of number of observation clusters on the total recognition rate of dynamic gestures. In subsection four, different learning rates are examined. The last subsection presents the impact of the state count on the recognition rate.

6.3.1 Choosing Number of Observation Classes with Machine Learning

The performed experiments started with testing the unsupervised clustering methods to determine the correct number of observations. Based on the successful static gesture recognition, each of the hand poses was represented by the vector of values containing:

- a number of detected fingers,

- the 5 greatest angles between the finger's tip vector and palm normal,
- the 5 greatest angles between the finger's tip vectors,
- the 5 greatest distances between the tip positions of fingers.

In order to measure a difference between hand poses, the distance function was introduced as the L2 norm between feature vectors for each hand pose:

$$d(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{16} (x_i - y_i)^2} \quad (6.6)$$

The Chinese whispers and Girven-Newman algorithms use the similarity function $s(x, y)$ which was defined using the difference function $d(x, y)$:

$$s(x, y) = \frac{1.0}{\max \{d(x, y), \text{eps}\}} \quad (6.7)$$

where eps was the numerical epsilon.

For the Chinese Whispers and Girven-Newman clustering the typical parameters from dlib-ml library were used — the Chinese Whispers maximal iterations were set to 100, while the Girven-Newman algorithm was run with maximal iterations equal to 2000 and precision epsilon was equal to $1e-4$. For the SSE analysis the publicly available script was used [33]. The script automatically calculates the k-means clustering algorithm for chosen range of k values and presents the figures, which can be a helpful in determining the correct number of classes. For the Silhouette width analysis R script was written.




FIGURE 6.5: Squared error inside clusters (SEE) as a function of number of clusters for the k-means algorithm

The SSE analysis usually does not yield the direct answer. The tool provides several plots, but the most interesting one is presented in Fig. 6.5. Looking at this plot, there is a significant drop in SSE for the cluster numbers equal to 5 and 10. It is expected that either of those numbers is the correct choice when it comes to the number of classes for k-means algorithm.

The Silhouette width approach run on the same data estimated that there are 4 distinguishable clusters. The Girvan-Newman algorithm did not provide any estimate within 24 hours and therefore was considered impractical. Chinese whispers algorithm with typical parameters

TABLE 6.1: Comparison of suggested number of clusters for the dataset containing all positions of hand in all dynamic gesture recordings made by Katarzyna

Girven-Newman recordings by Katarzyna	Chinese whispers no convergence	SSE vs clusters 613	Silhouette width 5 or 10	4
---	------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	---

estimated that data contained 613 clusters. The proposed values of clusters for different methods are presented in the Table 6.1.

Due to the inconclusive results, the analysis of the correct class number was postponed until the correct feature set is chosen. Until stated otherwise, the class number was assumed to be equal to 10.

6.3.2 Choosing Feature Set

The next challenge was to find the feature set describing one gesture in time, that would contain all necessary information about the dynamic nature of the gesture. All performed tests were evaluated on the dynamic 6 set described in Section 6.2.

The first feature set consists of features encoding the information about the speed of the hand. For each i -th hand position in recorded sequence, the $(i - 10)$ -th position was also considered. The feature set consisted of the recorded displacement of hand in X , Y , Z directions. The number of fingers is also added to feature set containing:

- a finger count in i -th hand position,
- a finger count in $i - 10$ -th hand position,
- a displacement of a hand position in X axis,
- a displacement of a hand position in Y axis,
- a displacement of a hand position in Z axis.

The presented approach allowed to achieve 64.6% on cross-validation set of the dynamic 6 set. Due to the small number of samples in the testing set, the total recognition rate was calculated on all available data from the dynamic 6 set. Using all samples recognition rate was equal to 61.8%, which is too small to be used in real applications.

The analysis revealed that previous approach suffered from the fact, that the encoded speeds are represented in the coordinate system of the Leap Motion. Executing the gesture with different angle to the Leap Motion's coordinate system makes the feature set completely different and sometimes results in mislabelling. Therefore, the feature set was supposed to encode the information with respect to the local coordinate system of hand. In new approach, a magnitude of the displacement is calculated. It is independent of the chosen orientation of the coordinate system. To represent the direction of movement, the normalized displacement vector is computed as a vector connecting the center of $i - 10$ -th hand position with i -th hand position. Then, the dot product between normalized displacement vector and palm normal in $i - 10$ position is calculated. A dot product between the normalized displacement vector and the palm direction is also computed. The resulting feature contains:

- a finger count in i -th hand position,
- a finger count in $i - 10$ -th hand position,

- a magnitude of the hand's displacement,
- a dot product of the normalized displacement vector and the palm's normal in $i - 10$ -th position,
- a dot product of the normalized displacement vector and the palm's direction in $i - 10$ -th position.

This approach allowed to improve the recognition rate to 69.6% in a cross-validation and to 67.5% on the whole dynamic 6 set, but was still not satisfying from the practical point of view.

From the observation of changes in the feature set values on the recorded gestures, it was concluded that sometimes only the fingers are changing positions, while position of hand is steady. The previous approaches, did not encode this information in feature vectors, which made those changes invisible to the further processing part. Therefore, the new feature vector contains also the information about the displacement of each corresponding finger. In order to keep the feature size small, it was decided to only incorporate the magnitude of those displacements. Due to the nature of Leap Motion's erratic numbering of fingers, those magnitudes were also sorted. The total of four top values were added to feature vector resulting in feature set:

- a finger count in i -th hand position,
- a finger count in $i - 10$ -th hand position,
- a magnitude of the hand's displacement,
- a dot product of the normalized displacement vector and the palm's normal in $i - 10$ -th position,
- a dot product of the normalized displacement vector and the palm's direction in $i - 10$ -th position,
- the 4 greatest magnitudes of finger displacements.

The obtained results were even worse than the ones achieved for the feature set two — 66.1% compared to the previously achieved 67.5% on the whole dynamic 6 set. The further inspection revealed that, while adding displacement of fingers helps in most situations, it can also pose a great risk. Leap Motion sensor can sometimes change the finger numbering resulting in the displacements calculated between different fingers. This leads to a big, artificial, phantom displacement. Therefore, the idea of using a displacement of fingers was abandoned.

Looking at the recorded gestures, it seemed that speed information is not sufficient to correctly detect the sequences of gestures combining in one dynamic gesture. The new feature set contains also the information about the static hand positions allowing to distinguish between dynamic gestures that are comprised of sequential static gestures. The new feature set contained the already proposed speed part with additional static encoding that was successfully used in static gesture recognition:

- a finger count in i -th hand position,
- a finger count in $i - 10$ -th hand position,
- a magnitude of the hand's displacement,
- a dot product of the normalized displacement vector and the palm's normal in $i - 10$ -th position,

- a dot product of the normalized displacement vector and the palm's direction in $i - 10$ -th position,
- the 4 greatest euclidean distances between all combination of finger's tips in i -th position,
- the 4 greatest absolute angles between all combination of finger's vectors in i -th position,
- the 4 greatest euclidean distances between finger's tips and palm's position in i -th position,
- the 4 greatest absolute angles between finger's vectors and palm's normal in i -th position.

The experiments showed that the proposed approach allowed to improve recognition rate. On the other hand, it was believed that the sophisticated static part of feature set is dominating the dynamic part of the feature set, which prevents the method from achieving better results. Therefore, the 5-th proposed feature set consists of static part represented only by the 4 greatest euclidean distances between all combination of finger's tips in i -th position and the 4 greatest absolute angles between all combination of finger's vectors in i -th position. Similarly, feature sets 6, 7, 8 were also the propositions containing the reduced encoding of the static parts, but did not improve significantly over already received results. The results obtained by all proposed feature sets are presented in Table 6.3.2.

TABLE 6.2: Results obtained by the HMM approach using different feature sets

	6 gestures, CV	6 gestures, whole dataset
feature set 1	64.6%	61.8%
feature set 2	69.6%	67.5%
feature set 3	68.5%	66.1%
feature set 4	77.9%	76.1%
feature set 5	66.7%	63.9%
feature set 6	72.9%	70.4%
feature set 7	71.9%	69.2%
feature set 8	78.1%	77.2%

The best results were obtained for feature set 8, but the results obtained by the full static representation (feature set 4) are not significantly worse. For further assessment, the feature set 4 was chosen as the one that describes each gesture with more information and therefore is believed to work better for gestures that were not included in the experiments.

6.3.3 Choosing Number of Observation Classes

The next experiments were performed to test what is the best number of observation classes for k-means algorithm. Previous tests to find the correct number of clusters were performed in Subsection 6.3.1, but yield inconclusive results. Therefore, the tests were performed using the processing algorithm to impact of number of classes on the total recognition rate. The tests were conducted using feature set 4 and learning rate $\mu = 0.05$.

The results are presented in Table 6.3.3. The best obtained results are for the number of clusters $k = 5$ and $k = 6$ for which an increase in the recognition rate when compared to the previously achieved results. The recognition rate in cross-validation was equal to 79.6% and 77.6% on the whole dataset.

TABLE 6.3: Results obtained by the HMM approach using feature set 4 and different numbers of class clusters

	6 gestures, CV	6 gestures, whole dataset
$k = 4$	77.3%	74.7%
$k = 5$	79.6%	77.6%
$k = 6$	79.6%	77.6%
$k = 8$	77.7%	76.0%
$k = 10$	77.9%	76.1%
$k = 12$	78.5%	77.4%

6.3.4 Choosing Learning Rate

The next experiments involved finding the best learning rate. Using predefined learning rate may be dangerous as small value may mean small convergence, while too big step may result in not converging to the locally best solution. In our application, the stable learning rate through whole training process was chosen to minimize the number of parameters. The further developments may involve using learning rate that is changing depending on the already training error. The experiments were conducted on the same dataset using feature set four, five observation classes and learning rates:

- $\mu = 0.01$
- $\mu = 0.05$
- $\mu = 0.1$
- $\mu = 0.2$

The achieved results are presented in Table 6.3.4. In proposed application, the learning rate $\mu = 0.05$ allowed to achieve the best results and is recommended by the authors of this thesis.

TABLE 6.4: Results obtained by the HMM approach using feature set 4, 5 observation classes and different learning rates

	6 gestures, CV	6 gestures, whole dataset
$\mu = 0.01$	77.5%	76.9%
$\mu = 0.05$	80.4%	79.0%
$\mu = 0.1$	79.6%	77.6%
$\mu = 0.2$	69.6%	69.7%

6.3.5 Choosing Number of States in HMM

The only parameter not tested in the already described experiments is the number of state each HMM is composed of. The previously used value was equal to 10 states. In the experiments four different values were tested: 5, 10, 20 and 30. The results from experiments are presented in Table 6.3.5. The performed experiments confirmed that smaller number of states (5) results in lower recognition rate as the HMM is not complicated enough to fully learn the presented model of the dynamic gesture. The number of states greater than 10 did not improve the results achieved using 5 states. When choosing the number of states, it is also important to remember about the complexity of algorithms, which are grow quadratically with the number of states, which affects the learning and recognition times. The performed experiments and theoretical computational

complexity confirm that the computational complexity grows quadratically with the chosen number of states.

TABLE 6.5: Results obtained by the HMM approach using feature set 4, 6 observation classes and a different number of states

	6 gestures, CV	6 gestures, whole dataset
$K = 5$	74.0%	73.6%
$K = 10$	79.6%	77.6%
$K = 20$	77.5%	76.5%
$K = 30$	77.9%	76.3%

Chapter 7

LeapGesture library dedicated for Leap Motion controller

One of the main goals of creating a library for gesture recognition using Leap Motion, was simplifying the task for developers and creating a consistent, easy to use interface for in-applications use. A library can be treated as a black box which takes data frames as an input and responds only if a gesture from a defined set has been recognized. It was written using C++.

7.1 Architecture

The library is divided into three main modules:

- static gesture recognition module,
- dynamic gesture recognition module,
- fingers recognition module.

Each of those modules has its own separate API — for learning, and for testing (recognition).

7.1.1 Learning

Learning process does not use separate threads. It is intended to be run single time by developer. As an input, it takes:

1. set of recordings,
2. learning configuration (parameters specific for given module).

Returned output is:

1. results – assessment of process, achieved recognition rate,
2. model, usually a file, which can be used for recognition process.

Sample code presenting how to perform static gesture learning for two classes:

```
1 vector<pair<const char*, const char*>> input;
2 input.push_back(make_pair("gesture1.lmr", "gesture1"));
3 input.push_back(make_pair("gesture2.lmr", "gesture2"));
4
5 TrainingStaticRecConf conf;
6 conf.configurationPath = "/home/user";
```

```

7 conf.configurationName = "test";
8
9 Learning::learnStatic(input, conf);

```

7.1.2 Testing

Testing is about gathering data from Leap Motion controller and processing them in a separate threads.

The general workflow is as following:

1. Developer creates object of his own class, implementing RecognizedGestureListener,
2. Developer creates LeapProcess object, specifies which modules should be run and supplies RecognizedGestureListener object,
3. Developer creates configuration object and sets it as appropriate field in LeapProcess
 - a) class TestingStaticRecConf, field staticRecConfiguration – for static gestures
 - b) class TestingDynamicRecConf, field dynamicRecConfiguration – for dynamic gestures
 - c) class TestingFingerRecConf, field fingerRecConfiguration – for fingers recognition
4. developer attaches LeapListener object to a LeapProcess object,
5. developer starts the process,
6. if a gesture recognition event happens, an user supplied method is executed




FIGURE 7.1: Timing diagram of processing static and dynamic gestures

Sample code showing testing (recognition) for model prepared in previous step:

```

1 // specifies method which will be executed after successful recognition
2 class MyGestures: public RecognizedGestureListener {
3
4     void onStaticRecognized(TestingResult *tr) {

```

```

5   if(tr->testClassResults[0].classTrainRate > 0.5) {
6     cout << "CLASS 0!" << endl;
7   }
8   else cout << "CLASS 1!" << endl;
9 }
10
11 void onDynamicRecognized() {}
12
13 };
14
15 int main(int argc, char **argv) {
16
17   // create instance of recognized gesture actions
18   MyGestures *gst = new MyGestures();
19
20   // create new data processor (for static gestures only)
21   LeapProcess *process = new LeapProcess(gst, true, false);
22
23   // specify settings: path where model with given name is located
24   TestingStaticRecConf settings("/home/user", "test");
25   process->staticConf = &settings;
26
27   // create a listener and attach it to a process
28   LeapListener listener(3); // 3 = radius of preprocessing windows
29   listener.attachToProcess(process);
30
31   // create a Leap Motion controller object and direct its data output to a
32   // listener
33   Controller c(listener);
34
35   // start processing
36   process->start();
37
38   // as processing works in a separate thread, application can now perform other
39   // tasks
40   cin.get();
41
42   // stop processing
43   c.removeListener(listener);
44 }
```

7.1.3 Elements of library

- LeapProcess – main class, acting as an interface between Leap Motion device, application and processing threads.
- LeapListener – class responsible for gathering data from Leap Motion and feeding them to processing threads (via LeapProcess).
- FileListener – as above, but data comes from a file, not controller. Used mainly for testing.
- TestingResult – class containing results of testing process:
 - bool recognized – notifies if a gesture has been recognized
 - string className – name of class with highest recognition rate
 - string genericClassName – generic name of class with highest recognition rate

- vector<TestingClassResult> testClassResults – vector of TestingClassResult
- TestingClassResult – contains testing results for a single class
 - double classTrainRate – recognition rate for given class
 - string className – name of a class
 - string genericClassName – generic name of class
- RecognizedGesture – abstract class containing methods which will be executed after successful recognition
- GestureFinger, GestureHand, GestureFrame, Vertex - classes representing respectively: Frame, Hand and Finger, with additional Vertex class, which simplifies operations on 3D points
- StorageDriver – class for I/O operations on LMR files
- LMpre – class containing data preprocessing methods

7.1.4 Model

While data obtained from Leap Motion Controller are being processed, they are stored using a specially created classes representing the data. The most important class is GestureFrame, which represents a single frame captured from device. All gathered data is stored in a vector containing elements of GestureFrame type. GestureFrame holds the following information:

- timestamp,
- list of data of detected hands in the frame, stored in a vector containing elements of GestureHand type.

GestureHand stores parameters of hand performing a gesture. In one instance of GestureFrame many instances of GestureHand can be stored. GestureHand holds the following information:

- hand id,
- plam position,
- stabilized palm position,
- palm normal vector,
- palm direction,
- list of fingers of particular hand, stored in a vector containing elements GestureFinger type,
- ordered value, obtained during hand sorting.

GestureFinger stores parameters of one finger. In one instance of GestureHand many instances of GestureFinger can be stored. GestureFinger contains:

- finger id,
- tip position,
- stabilized tip position,
- finger direction,

- finger length,
- finger width,
- ordered value, obtained during finger sorting.

7.2 Processes

7.2.1 The learning process

The learning process is a process of teaching LeapGesture library a new gesture by API user. First gestures must be recorded gestures in LMR format. To obtain recordings in this format user may use Gesture Recorder – a module included in the library, which records data from Leap Motion Controller and saves it as LMR file. When all desired gestures are prepared, the user starts the process of learning by [tutaj dodać informacje jak uruchomić ten proces - prawdopodobnie jakas komenda + jakieś parametry typu -d uczenie gestów dynamicznych, -s uczenie gestów statycznych + pliki LMR jako argumenty].




FIGURE 7.2: Diagram showing the learning process for LeapGesture library

The first step in the learning process, which is performed by the system is the preprocessing of data. Training data should be deprived of noise or should not have lost fingers for several frames. According to user-specified parameters, the system will learn the gesture as a static or dynamic gesture. System uses Support Vector Machine (SVM) for learning of static gesture. For dynamic gestures it uses Hidden Markov Model (HMM). The learning process for static gestures:

1. In the first stage, data which will be used during the learning are preprocessed.
2. Data are scaled using internal scaling module. The result of this step are scale and range files. In the scale file scaled data is stored. The range file contains information that enables to scale any data in the same way.
3. Scale file with scaled data is transmitted to a training module. Data is processed using SVM algorithm. Additionally during the learning process k-validation is performed and results are returned to the user. In the process model file is created, which is used during static gesture recognition process.

[opisać learning process dla dynamicznych]

7.2.2 The recognition process

The recognition process is a process of recognizing the gesture performed by the API user. During this process, the system uses the information obtained from the learning process. [Opis procesu recognition process, przedstawienie scenariusza uzycia w stosunku do architektury]




FIGURE 7.3: Diagram showing the recognition process for LeapGesture library

Modules handlers are implemented using the Observer pattern. For each of the modules are specified relevant events that are reported in the key moments of recognition such as: moment in which particular gesture began to be recognized, moment in which the particular gesture stopped being recognized, moment in which frame processing is finished. The user can handle events received in specific module by implementing appropriate listener interface and adding reference to listener list in specific library module. During gesture recognition process user can use from 1 to 3 listeners. Each listener is on a separate thread.

Methods for a static gesture observer:

- onStart – signals the start of the gesture,
- onFrame – returns a list of recognized gestures with matching probabilities,
- onGesture – signals the end of the gesture and returns a list of recognized gestures with matching probabilities.

Methods for a dynamic gesture observer:

- onStart, onFrame – have the same purposes as in the case of static observer,
- onGesture – signals the end of the gesture and returns a list of recognized gestures with matching probabilities and parameter values.

Methods for a finger differentiation observer:

- onFrame – returns a list of matched classes with probabilities,

- onChange – signals a change of fingers arrangement.

As in the learning process for recognizing static gestures system uses SVM and for dynamic gestures – HMM. For finger differentiation system uses Support Vector Machine. However, there are other classes than those used for static gestures recogniton.

7.3 Gesture recorder and visualizer

Recorder and vizualizer module is an additional part of library that allows users for easy management of gestures recordings. The recorder collects data from Leap Motion Controller, converts it into data representation described in Section ??nd writes it to the LMR file, which is supported by the LeapGesture library. Visualizer enables users to see the recorded gestures stored in LMR format. Data gathered from Leap Motion, used to recognize gestures are very large and the data processed in the library have a specific format. Therefore, it was necessary to create an auxiliary program, that it would facilitate the work with data in the fastest and most user-friendly way.

7.3.1 LMR files

This is a file format specially developed for the LeapGesture library, supported by various modules for example by the visualizer. The file structure is as follows:

- Line represents one frame.
- One frame contains: timestamp and hand parameters.
- Hand parameters include: hand id, palm position, stabilized palm position, palm normal vector, palm direction vector and detected fingers parameters.
- Finger parameters include: finger id, finger tip position, stabilized tip position, finger direction vector, finger length and finger width.

Example lines from LMR file:

```
4.78984#7 -9.15495;113.759;46.292 0;0;-0.157914;-0.981575;0.107585 -0.0196983;-0.105799;-0.994192f1 -64.0011;122.41;-28.5433 -64.831;125.304;-38.845 -0.574857;0.0254502;-0.817858 50.4269 13.0854
16.6761#7 -8.94345;113.525;46.2299 0;0;-0.158215;-0.981508;0.107745 -0.0193809;-0.106012;-0.994176f1 -63.8514;122.144;-28.6825 -64.8135;125.248;-38.6638 -0.575861;0.0261358;-0.81713 50.4225 13.0803
27.4361#7 -8.72478;113.293;46.1443 0;0;-0.159539;-0.981183;0.108754 -0.0203256;-0.106877;-0.994065f1 -63.5346;121.826;-28.7338 -64.7892;125.183;-38.475 -0.576776;0.0265335;-0.816472 50.3783 13.1248
```

This example shows a frame containing a hand with one finger exposed. The color red is used to mark frame timestamp, the blue color highlights information about hand, and the color green indicates information about the exposed finger.

Technical information regards LMR files:

- Timestamp and hands are separated by “#”.
- In specified hand occurs hand parameters and fingers.

- Hand parameters are separated by space, and finger are separated by “f” (hands parameters and fingers are separated by “f” too).
- Specified finger has parameters, which are split by “ ”.
- Values in the trivalent parameters are separated by a semicolon.

7.3.2 Visualizer

Visualizer presents the contents of the LMR files. As mentioned earlier, each line of the file is a separately converted frame obtained from Leap Motion Controller. In one moment only one frame is displayed. Almost all fields of the model are visualized:

- palm position,
- palm normal vector,
- palm direction,
- tip position,
- finger direction,
- finger length.




FIGURE 7.4: Screenshot of the visualizer

An example of parameter, which is not visualized, is finger width, in order not to obscure the image.

List of Visualizer features:

- Program can read the LMR files chosen by the user.
- The user can load many files at once and select one of the recordings from the drop-down list.
- To facilitate the user work with visualizer, program has implemented windowing interface.
- The user has ability to rotate and zoom camera.
- Slider is available in order to move between frames of the recording.
- Visualizer has option to play recorded gesture, which the user can turn on and off by pressing the play/stop button.
- There is also a button to enter the recorder mode.

7.3.3 Recorder

Recorder is part of the described module, which is responsible for collecting information from Leap Motion Controller and saving it to LMR file.




FIGURE 7.5: Screenshot of the recorder

Each frame read from the Leap Motion is captured, and then converted to the previously described model. Then the model is saved by the appropriate sub-module to LMR file. The conversion process contains also sorting hands and fingers. Hands are sorted by X coordinate of palmPosition. In the case of sorting fingers, the usual sort by the X coordinate is not enough. The order of the fingers must be independent of hand rotation, therefore a different method for fingers sorting had to be proposed. Fingers are sorted by distance between finger tip position

and the plane perpendicular to the surface of the hand. The plane has to contain the direction vector of a hand. This plane can be determined using the palm position, the direction vector and a normalized normal vector of the hand. Below is the formula for the distance (d) between finger tip position and designated plane.

$$d = -(f - pp) \cdot (\hat{hd} \times \hat{hn})$$

Where:

f : is the finger tip position

pp : is the palm position

\hat{hd} : is a normalized hand direction vector

\hat{hn} : is a normalized hand normal vector

List of Recorder features:

- Turning on and off recording is done by using space key.
- After recording window automatically appears, in which can be chosen where to save the file.
- The recorder cooperates with the visualizer. During recording performed gesture is visualized.
- There is a button to enter the visualizer mode.

7.4 External libraries used

- LeapSDK – allows to access Leap Motion device and its API
- pthread – library used to create lightweight processes (threads), to allow simultaneous (multithreaded) processing and provide task synchronization
- LIBSVM – ”A Library for Support Vector Machines”, provides SVM classifying abilities
- Dlib – provides k-means clustering, Chinese Whispers and Newman’s Clustering algorithms
- HMMlib – a C++ library for general Hidden Markov Models
- Boost – C++ extensions library, provides smart pointer mechanism for HMMlib

Chapter 8

Conclusions

This thesis describes LeapGesture, which is the hand gesture recognition library dedicated for Leap Motion Controller. This library includes modules for static and dynamic gesture recognition and also fingers recognition. Developed library provides recognition of all types of action gestures. Static action gestures are supported by static gesture processing thread, while the dynamic gesture processing thread provides recognition of dynamic action gestures. Additionally, comparison of existing gesture recognition methods, implementation of additional modules enabling the recording and reviewing of gestures, creation of sample gestures database and performance of tests has been conducted.

The results obtained for the static gesture recognition suggest that those gestures are easy to recognize using the SVM with appropriate pre and postprocessing. The differences between the recognition rates for different feature sets even values reaching up to 13% show that choosing different feature sets can have a major impact on the performance of recognition. Additionally, it is important not to undermine the influence of the data preprocessing. Even the usage of the relatively simple median filter allowed to boost the recognition rate by 6%. Although, the authors believe that the proposed parameters of processing module work well in many scenarios, there might be some specific cases that need different parameters or different feature sets to achieve good results. It is also worth noting, that this and any another approach will not work properly if during the performance of static gestures, hands and fingers are not correctly detected by the Leap Motion. Therefore it is recommended to always choose gestures that have visible and separated fingers from the sensor's perspective. For the proposed approach, recognition rate of 99% for five classes of gestures and 85% for ten classes of gestures in the static gesture recognition task were achieved. Satisfactory results of 93% were also obtained for the task of fingers recognition for 15 of 32 classes of fingers arrangements.

When it comes to the task of dynamic gesture recognition, Leap Motion might not be the best sensor choice. Leap Motion provides great accuracy for static hand and fingers, but the data for dynamically moved hands are usually noisy. The problems arise with short, lost finger tracking or temporal finger occlusions that are hard to detect and cope with on the library-level. The proposed preprocessing module tries to alleviate those negative impacts, but the preprocessed data is still far from ideal. Nevertheless the proposed approach with Hidden Markov Models allowed to recognize five classes of dynamic gestures with 80% accuracy.

As part of the further development of the library, the authors intend to improve the efficiency of dynamic gesture recognition by testing other possible feature sets and to develop methods that will allow to preprocess data derived from Leap Motion more efficiently. Supporting of parameterized gestures is also envisaged.

Bibliography

- [1] Leonard E. Baum and Ted Petrie. Statistical inference for probabilistic functions of finite state markov chains. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37(6):1554–1563, 12 1966.
- [2] C. Biemann. Chinese whispers - an efficient graph clustering algorithm and its application to natural language processing problems. *Proceedings of the HLT-NAACL-06 Workshop on Textgraphs-06*, 2006.
- [3] Christopher M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics)*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 2006.
- [4] Chih-Chung Chang and Chih-Jen Lin. LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2:27:1–27:27, 2011. Software available at <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvm>.
- [5] Chin-Chen Chang, Jiann-Jone Chen, Wen-Kai Tai, and Chin-Chuan Han. New approach for static gesture recognition. *J. Inf. Sci. Eng.*, 22(5):1047–1057, 2006.
- [6] Yen-Ting Chen and Kuo-Tsung Tseng. Developing a multiple-angle hand gesture recognition system for human machine interactions. In *Industrial Electronics Society, 2007. IECON 2007. 33rd Annual Conference of the IEEE*, pages 489–492, 2007.
- [7] Sven Teresiak Chris Biemann. *Disentangling from Babylonian Confusion – Unsupervised Language Identification*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. Software available at <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvm>.
- [8] Vladimir Vapnik Corinna Cortes. *Support-vector networks*.
- [9] James Davis and Mubarak Shah. Visual gesture recognition, 1994.
- [10] Arthur P Dempster, Nan M Laird, and Donald B Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 1–38, 1977.
- [11] Fabio Dominio, Mauro Donadeo, Giulio Marin, Pietro Zanuttigh, and Guido Maria Cortelazzo. Hand gesture recognition with depth data. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE International Workshop on Analysis and Retrieval of Tracked Events and Motion in Imagery Stream*, ARTEMIS '13, pages 9–16, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM.
- [12] Ahmed Elgammal, Vinay Shet, Yaser Yacoob, and Larry S. Davis. Learning dynamics for exemplar-based gesture recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, CVPR'03, pages 571–578, Washington, DC, USA, 2003. IEEE Computer Society.
- [13] Rong-En Fan, Kai-Wei Chang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Xiang-Rui Wang, and Chih-Jen Lin. Liblinear: A library for large linear classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 9:1871–1874, June 2008.
- [14] Laurene Fausett, editor. *Fundamentals of Neural Networks: Architectures, Algorithms, and Applications*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1994.

- [15] Francisco Flórez, Juan Manuel García, and José García. Hand gesture recognition following the dynamics of a topology-preserving network. In *Proceedings of the Fifth IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition*, FGR '02, pages 318–, Washington, DC, USA, 2002. IEEE Computer Society.
- [16] Bartholomäus Rudak Frank Weichert, Daniel Bachmann and Denis Fisseler. Analysis of the accuracy and robustness of the leap motion controller. *Sensors 2013, vol 5*, 2013.
- [17] Nicholas Gillian and Joseph Paradiso. The gesture recognition toolkit. In *New England Machine Learning Day*, London, 2012.
- [18] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(12):7821–7826, 2002.
- [19] Haitham Hasan and S. Abdul-Kareem. Static hand gesture recognition using neural networks. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pages 1–35, 2012.
- [20] Andreas Höfer, Aristotelis Hadjidakos, and Max Mühlhäuser. Gyroscope-based conducting gesture recognition. In *NIME 2009 Proceedings: International Conference on New Interfaces for Musical Expression*, pages 175–176, 2009.
- [21] Pengyu Hong, Matthew Turk, and Thomas S. Huang. Constructing finite state machines for fast gesture recognition. In *In Proc. 15th ICPR*, pages 691–694, 2000.
- [22] Thomas S. Huang and Vladimir I. Pavlovic. Hand gesture modeling, analysis, and synthesis. In *In Proc. of IEEE International Workshop on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition*, pages 73–79, 1995.
- [23] M.B. Kaâniche. *Human Gesture Recognition*. 2009.
- [24] Dietrich Kammer, Georg Freitag, Mandy Keck, and Markus Wacker. Taxonomy and overview of multi-touch frameworks: Architecture, scope and features. In *Workshop on Engineering Patterns for Multitouch Interfaces*, Berlin, 2010.
- [25] Maria Karam and M. C. Schraefel. A taxonomy of gestures in human computer interactions. Technical report, 2005.
- [26] N.Y.Y. Kevin, S. Ranganath, and D. Ghosh. Trajectory modeling in gesture recognition using cybergloves reg; and magnetic trackers. In *TENCON 2004. 2004 IEEE Region 10 Conference*, volume A, pages 571–574 Vol. 1, 2004.
- [27] Jonghwa Kim, Stephan Mastnik, and Elisabeth André. Emg-based hand gesture recognition for realtime biosignal interfacing. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, IUI '08, pages 30–39, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
- [28] Davis E. King. Dlib-ml: A machine learning toolkit. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 10:1755–1758, December 2009.
- [29] Jiayang Liu, Zhen Wang, Lin Zhong, J. Wickramasuriya, and V. Vasudevan. uwave: Accelerometer-based personalized gesture recognition and its applications. In *Pervasive Computing and Communications, 2009. PerCom 2009. IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1–9, 2009.
- [30] Yun Liu, Zhijie Gan, and Yu Sun. Static hand gesture recognition and its application based on support vector machines. In *Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking, and Parallel/Distributed Computing, 2008. SNPD '08. Ninth ACIS International Conference on*, pages 517–521, 2008.
- [31] J. MacQueen. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. *Proc. 5th Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. Probab., Univ. Calif. 1965/66, 1*, 281–297 (1967)., 1967.

- [32] Vladimir I. Pavlovic, Rajeev Sharma, and Thomas S. Huang. Visual interpretation of hand gestures for human-computer interaction: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 19:677–695, 1997.
- [33] Matthew Peebles. R Script for K-Means Cluster Analysis. [on-line]
<http://www.mattpeebles.net/kmeans.html>, 2011.
- [34] Valery A Petrushin. Hidden markov models: Fundamentals and applications. In *Online Symposium for Electronics Engineer*, 2000.
- [35] Qifan Pu, Sidhant Gupta, Shyamnath Gollakota, and Shwetak Patel. Whole-home gesture recognition using wireless signals. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing & Networking*, MobiCom '13, pages 27–38, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM.
- [36] Francis Quek, David McNeill, Robert Bryll, Susan Duncan, Xin-Feng Ma, Cemil Kirbas, Karl E. McCullough, and Rashid Ansari. Multimodal human discourse: Gesture and speech. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.*, 9(3):171–193, September 2002.
- [37] L. Rabiner and B.-H. Juang. An introduction to hidden markov models. *ASSP Magazine, IEEE*, 3(1):4–16, 1986.
- [38] Md. Hafizur Rahman and Jinia Afrin. Hand gesture recognition using multiclass support vector machine. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 74(1):39–43, July 2013. Published by Foundation of Computer Science, New York, USA.
- [39] S. Rajko, Gang Qian, T. Ingalls, and J. James. Real-time gesture recognition with minimal training requirements and on-line learning. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2007. CVPR '07. IEEE Conference on*, pages 1–8, 2007.
- [40] Yu Ren and Fengming Zhang. Hand gesture recognition based on meb-svm. In *Embedded Software and Systems, 2009. ICESS '09. International Conference on*, pages 344–349, 2009.
- [41] Hrvoje Benko Michael Haller David Lindbauer Alexandra Ion Shengdong Zhao Roland Aigner, Daniel Wigdor and Jeffrey Tzu Kwan Valino Koh. Understanding mid-air hand gestures: A study of human preferences in usage of gesture types for hci. Technical report, November 2012.
- [42] Peter J. Rousseeuw. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 20(0):53 – 65, 1987.
- [43] Alexandre Savaris and Aldo von Wangenheim. Comparative evaluation of static gesture recognition techniques based on nearest neighbor, neural networks and support vector machines. *J. Braz. Comp. Soc.*, 16(2):147–162, 2010.
- [44] Xiaohui Shen, Gang Hua, Lance Williams, and Ying Wu. Dynamic hand gesture recognition: An exemplar-based approach from motion divergence fields. *Image Vision Comput.*, 30(3):227–235, March 2012.
- [45] T. Starner and A. Pentland. Real-time american sign language recognition from video using hidden markov models. In *Computer Vision, 1995. Proceedings., International Symposium on*, pages 265–270, 1995.
- [46] Hugo Steinhaus. Sur la division des corps matériels en parties. *Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci., Cl. III*, 4:801–804, 1957.
- [47] E. Stergiopoulou and N. Papamarkos. Hand gesture recognition using a neural network shape fitting technique. *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.*, 22(8):1141–1158, December 2009.
- [48] Robert Y. Wang and Jovan Popović. Real-time hand-tracking with a color glove. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 28(3):63:1–63:8, July 2009.

- [49] Sy Bor Wang, A. Quattoni, L. Morency, D. Demirdjian, and T. Darrell. Hidden conditional random fields for gesture recognition. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, volume 2, pages 1521–1527, 2006.
- [50] Sabine Webel, Jens Keil, and Michael Zoellner. Multi-touch gestural interaction in x3d using hidden markov models. In Steven Feiner, Daniel Thalmann, Pascal Guitton, Bernd Fröhlich, Ernst Kruijff, and Martin Hachet, editors, *VRST*, pages 263–264. ACM, 2008.
- [51] Ying Wu and Thomas S. Huang. Vision-based gesture recognition: A review. In *Proceedings of the International Gesture Workshop on Gesture-Based Communication in Human-Computer Interaction*, GW '99, pages 103–115, London, UK, 1999. Springer-Verlag.
- [52] Deyou Xu, Wuyun Yao, and Yongliang Zhang. Hand gesture interaction for virtual training of spg. In *ICAT Workshops*, pages 672–676. IEEE Computer Society, 2006.
- [53] J. Yamato, Jun Ohya, and K. Ishii. Recognizing human action in time-sequential images using hidden markov model. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 1992. Proceedings CVPR '92., 1992 IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, pages 379–385, 1992.
- [54] Jie Yang and Yangsheng Xu. Hidden markov model for gesture recognition. Technical Report CMU-RI-TR-94-10, Robotics Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, May 1994.
- [55] Jie Yang and Yangsheng Xu. Hidden markov model for gesture recognition. Technical report, DTIC Document, 1994.
- [56] Ming-Hsuan Yang and N. Ahuja. Recognizing hand gesture using motion trajectories. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 1999. IEEE Computer Society Conference on.*, volume 1, pages –472 Vol. 1, 1999.
- [57] Pujan Ziaie, Thomas Müller, Mary Ellen Foster, and Alois Knoll. A naïve Bayes classifier with distance weighting for hand-gesture recognition. In *Advances in Computer Science and Engineering*, volume 6 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, pages 308–315. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.



© 2014 Michał Nowicki, Olgierd Pilarczyk, Jakub Wąsikowski, Katarzyna Zjawin

Poznan University of Technology
Faculty of Computing
Institute of Computing Science

Typeset using L^AT_EX in Computer Modern.

BibT_EX:

```
@mastersthesis{ key,  
    author = "Michał Nowicki \and Olgierd Pilarczyk \and Jakub Wąsikowski \and Katarzyna Zjawin",  
    title = "{Gesture recognition library for Leap Motion Controller}",  
    school = "Poznan University of Technology",  
    address = "Poznań, Poland",  
    year = "2014",  
}
```